

**The Debate Over the Moment of Eucharistic
Consecration at the Council of Florence (1439):
An Analysis of the Arguments Presented by Juan de Torquemada
and Mark of Ephesus.**

Ewan Davies

**Cardiff University
School of History, Archaeology and Religion**

Thesis submitted to Cardiff University in fulfilment of the requirement for the
degree of Master of Philosophy

September 2023

Contents.

Abstract.....	4
Acknowledgements.....	6
Introduction	7
0.1. The Need for an Analysis of the Florentine Debate concerning Eucharistic Consecration	7
0.1.1 Putting into Context the Eastern Orthodox Rejection of the Florentine Agreement concerning Eucharistic Consecration.....	9
0.2. An Overview of this Dissertation’s Structure.....	20
Chapter One: The Origins of the Conciliar Debate	24
1.1. An Analysis of the Pre-Conciliar Developments of the Nature and Moment(s) of Eucharistic Consecration within Eastern Orthodoxy: Nicholas Kabasilas, Symeon of Thessalonika, and Makarios Makres.	24
1.2. An Analysis of the Pre-Conciliar Developments of the Nature and Moment(s) of Eucharistic Consecration within Roman Catholicism.....	35
1.3. An Analysis of the Florentine Debate concerning Eucharistic Consecration within the Wider Context of the Council.	49
Chapter Two: The Post-Florentine <i>Status Quaestionis</i> of the Doctrine of Eucharistic Consecration... 58	
2.1. The Doctrine of Eucharistic Consecration within Eastern Orthodoxy following Ferrara-Florence.	58
2.2 The Doctrine of Eucharistic Consecration within the Roman Catholic Church following Ferrara-Florence.	62
Chapter Three: An Analysis of Juan de Torquemada’s <i>Sermo Prior</i>	68
3.1. Torquemada’s Background.	68
3.2. Torquemada’s Method of Research and His Use of Literary Sources.	78
3.2.1. The <i>Status Quaestionis</i> Concerning Torquemada’s Contribution to the Florentine Eucharistic Debates.....	79
3.2.2. An Analysis of Torquemada’s Use of His Literary Sources within the <i>Sermo Prior</i>	82
Chapter Four: An Analysis of Mark of Ephesus’ <i>Λίβελλος</i>	141
4.1. The <i>Status Quaestionis</i> of Mark’s Life, Writings, and Theological Framework.	141
4.1.1. An Overview of Mark of Ephesus’ Influence within Eastern Orthodox Theology and His Status in Eastern Orthodox Scholarship	145
4.2. Mark’s Background.	157
4.3. The Provenance of Mark’s Eucharistic <i>Λίβελλος</i>	186
4.3.1. Putting Into Context Mark’s Pessimism towards the Council’s Prospect for Reunion.	186
4.4. An Analysis of Mark’s Use of His Literary Sources within His <i>Λίβελλος</i>	189
4.4.1. An Analysis of Mark’s Use of Liturgical Source Material.	195
4.4.2. The Flaws within Mark’s <i>Λίβελλος</i>	196

4.4.3. Mark's Use of the Analogy of the Annunciation and Incarnation with Eucharistic Transmutation.....	198
4.4.4. Basil the Great and John Chrysostom	218
4.4.5. Pseudo-Dionysius	223
4.4.6. The Conclusion of the <i>Λίβελλος</i>	229
Chapter Five: An Analysis of Torquemada's <i>Sermo Alter</i>	231
5.1. An Analysis of the <i>Sermo Alter</i> 's Structure and Source Material	231
5.1.1. Aquinas.....	233
5.1.2. Pseudo-Dionysius and John of Damascus	238
5.1.3. Basil	242
5.2. The Subsequent Debates Between Torquemada and the Byzantine Contingent	250
5.3. The Conclusion of the Byzantine Participation at Ferrara-Florence: The Signing of <i>Laetentur Caeli</i>	258
Chapter Six: A Summation of This Dissertation's Findings and Conclusions.	260
Bibliography	264
Primary Sources	264
Secondary Literature.....	284
Dissertations.	322
Appendices.....	324
Appendix One: A Comparison of Mark of Ephesus' Transcriptions of His Liturgical Texts' Epicleses with their Critical Editions Published in Anton Hänggi and Irmgard Rahl, eds., <i>Præx Eucharistica</i>	324

Abstract.

This dissertation aims to analyse the contributions of Markos Eugenikos, the Metropolitan of Ephesus, and the Castilian Dominican friar, Juan de Torquemada, to the debates concerning the nature and moment(s) of Eucharistic consecration at the Council of Florence which took place in June 1439, after both individuals were appointed by the Byzantine Imperial and Latin Churches respectively to articulate and defend their Church's stances on this matter.

The author will begin by putting this conciliar debate into its broader historical context, particularly with regards to the Latin-Byzantine debates concerning Eucharistic consecration in the late medieval period. The author will then move on to examine the magisterial statements issued by the Latin and Byzantine Churches concerning the nature and moment(s) of Eucharistic consecration following Ferrara-Florence in the second chapter in order to assess Mark of Ephesus' and Torquemada's doctrines in terms of their dogmatic authority.

Chapters Three and Four will then examine how Torquemada and Mark of Ephesus both advocated their Churches' doctrines of the nature and moment(s) of Eucharistic consecration after both individuals were respectively commissioned by Pope Eugenius IV and Emperor Ioannes VIII to fulfil this objective. Each chapter will first provide an overview of the pertinent factors within both Torquemada's and Mark's backgrounds that informed the tenor of their literary and oral contributions to this Florentine debate and the nature of the source material they evoked to support their respective doctrines. The author will then assess the arguments put forward by Mark and Torquemada in their own right, paying particular attention to how accurately each individual exegeted the Patristic and liturgical

source material they evoked to defend their respective Church's doctrines of Eucharistic consecration.

Chapter Five will move on to examine how Torquemada responded to Mark of Ephesus' claims within the subsequent public conciliar debate which occurred on June 20th. The author will again examine how accurately Torquemada exegeted the Patristic and liturgical source material he evoked to defend the Latin Church's doctrine of Eucharistic consecration in the face of the criticisms previously put forward by Mark of Ephesus. The author concludes this chapter by encapsulating the conciliar proceedings preceding the promulgation of *Laetentur Caeli* on July 6th. This will allow the author to provide some context relating to the subsequent divisions between the Roman Catholic and Eastern Orthodox Churches concerning Eucharistic consecration, alongside the other matters of doctrine and praxis, referred to in this dissertation's introductory Chapter.

To conclude, Chapter Six will summate this dissertation's findings: The author will aim to conclude that, in contrast to Torquemada's Eucharistic *Cedula* and two *Sermones*, Mark's doctrine of the nature and moment(s) of Eucharistic consecration offers a relatively firmer basis from which modern-day Roman Catholic and Eastern Orthodox ecumenists could attempt to establish some form of consensus on this question.

Acknowledgements.

I would like to thank Dr Josef Lössl and Dr Shaun Tougher for their invaluable supervision and feedback over this past year. I would like to thank my mother, Beverley, and sister, Cara, for their love and support during this same period. I would also like to thank Fr Sam Aldred and Fr Mark Griffiths for their guidance and support for me over this past year.

Introduction

0.1. The Need for an Analysis of the Florentine Debate concerning Eucharistic Consecration

Regarding the sources of ecclesial division within Roman Catholic-Eastern Orthodox ecumenical dialogue, the nature and moment(s) of Eucharistic consecration, particularly the Eucharistic epiclesis' function, has historically been sidelined by issues including the *filioque*, Papal Primacy, and Purgatory, especially since the twentieth century. To clarify this terminology, 'epiclesis' was broadly understood by both late medieval Hellenophone and Latin theologians to denote a petition to God, especially the Hypostasis of the Father, to commission the Holy Spirit to operate on items to be sanctified.¹ Within the Byzantine Rite, the liturgical tradition which prevails within the Eastern Orthodox Churches, the Eucharistic epiclesis is accompanied by the celebrant priest making a Sign of the Cross over the Eucharistic host.² Within his 1968 article, 'L'Eucharistie et le Saint-Esprit,' the Canadian Dominican theologian and ecumenist, Jean-Marie Roger Tillard, recognized the importance

¹ Whereas scholars such as the Anglican theologian, John Walton Tyrer, *The Eucharistic Epiclesis* (Liverpool: Longmans, Green, 1917), esp. pp. 5-6, argued that *ἐπίκλησις*, in a theological context, referred to a solemn petition, Tyrer's conclusion was countered by the Roman Catholic Benedictine theologian, Richard Hugh Connolly, Richard Hugh Connolly, 'On the Meaning of 'Epiclesis,'" *Downside Review* (January 1923): 28-43, esp. 29-30, who, based upon a philological analysis of the term, argued that the term was principally employed within the Christian Patristic tradition to refer to a formula which concerned the employment of the divine name. Cf. Odo Casel, 'Zur Epiklese,' *Jahrbuch für Liturgiewissenschaft* 3 (1923): 100-1; Casel, 'Neue Beiträge zur Epiklese-Frage,' *Jahrbuch für Liturgiewissenschaft* 4 (1924): 169-77; Johannes Betz, *Die Eucharistie in der Zeit der griechischen Väter* (Freiburg: Herder, 1955), pp. 320-42.

² See *L'Euclologio Barberini gr. 336*, ed. by Stefano Parenti and Elena Velkovska (Rome: C.L.V.-Edizioni Liturgiche, 1995), p. 78, which shows how the earliest available manuscript of the Byzantine Rite's *Liturgy of St John Chrysostom* includes the rubric for the celebrant to bless the Eucharistic gifts when petitioning the epiclesis. Cf. Hugh Wybrew, *The Orthodox Liturgy: The Development of the Eucharistic Liturgy in the Byzantine Rite*, repr. (Crestwood: St Vladimir's Seminary Press, 2003), p. 157; Michael Zheltov, "The Moment of Eucharistic Consecration in Byzantine Thought," ed. by Maxwell E. Johnson in *Issues in Eucharistic Praying in East and West. Essays in Liturgical and Theological Analysis* (Collegeville, MN: A. Pueblo Books, 2012), pp. 263-306 (277).

of articulating the Spirit's intra-Eucharistic role within such ecumenical dialogue.³ However, Tillard regarded the Eucharistic epiclesis' consecratory status as of secondary importance to these attempts at ecclesial reconciliation.⁴

Conversely, several theologians have acknowledged the nature and moment(s) of Eucharistic consecration's ecumenical dialogical significance. For example, as the Eastern Orthodox theologian, Pavel Evdokimov, argued within his 1968 article, 'Eucharistie - Mystère de l'église,' the issue of the nature and moment(s) of Eucharistic consecration, particularly concerning the epiclesis, was so pertinent in the context of ecumenical dialogue that it even took primacy over the *filioque*.⁵

Given this scholarly attentiveness to the need to resolve this issue within modern-day Roman Catholic-Eastern Orthodox relations, this dissertation will assess how these ecclesial communions attempted to address this question at the Council of Florence between June and July 1439. In particular, this dissertation will analyse the literary and oracular contributions of the Castilian Dominican theologian, Juan de Torquemada, and Mark, the Metropolitan of Ephesus, who were appointed by these two communions to delineate their respective doctrines of the nature and moment(s) of Eucharistic consecration thereto.

This dissertation aims to exhibit that this conciliar debate's broader significance for modern-day ecumenical dialogue derives from the fact that this debate not only marked the first general conciliar attempt to doctrinally define the nature and moment(s) of Eucharistic

³ Jean-Marie Roger Tillard, 'L'Eucharistie et le Saint-Esprit,' *Nouvelle Revue Théologie* 90(4) (1968): 363-87 (387): "la dimension pneumatique du mystère eucharistique... est donc non seulement essentielle à une théologie intégrale du Mémorial du Seigneur mais primordiale..."

⁴ Tillard, 'L'Eucharistie et le Saint-Esprit,' 387: "Au-delà de toute la question, à notre avis assez secondaire, de l'épiclesse, elle implique une vision exacte des véritables relations du Seigneur Jésus et de l'Esprit." Cf. Tillard, 'L'Eucharistie et le Saint-Esprit,' 364, 379.

⁵ Pavel Evdokimov, 'Eucharistie – Mystère de l'église,' *La pensée orthodoxe* 2 (1968): 53-69 (62).

consecration, but that the arguments offered by Mark of Ephesus within the *Λίβελλος* (*Book*) he produced on the Byzantine Imperial Church's behalf offers a broadly coherent framework from which twenty-first theologians and prelates of the Roman Catholic and Eastern Orthodox ecclesiastical communions could attempt to establish some form of consensus on this question.⁶ Nonetheless, this dissertation will detail how the Latin-Eastern Orthodox consensus concerning the nature and moment(s) of Eucharistic consecration which was established by the Council of Florence's "*Όρος, Laetentur Caeli*, proved to be ephemeral. This was to a large extent the case given that the Council of Florence insufficiently resolved several sources of doctrinal division to a significant extent because of the priority given to the practical needs on the part of the Byzantine contingent to secure military and financial aid for the Byzantine Empire from their Latin counterparts at the expense of their intention to safeguard their Church's doctrine.

0.1.1 Putting into Context the Eastern Orthodox Rejection of the Florentine Agreement concerning Eucharistic Consecration

To put this failure to reunite the Latin and Eastern Orthodox Churches on this question into context, one must consider the major Latin Christian attempts to restore communion between the Latin and Eastern Orthodox Churches prior to Ferrara-Florence.

⁶ Within this dissertation, the author primarily relies upon the critical edition published by Louis Petit in the *Patrologia Orientalis*, Vol. 17 (Paris: Firmin-Didot, 1923), pp. 426-34. This critical edition is principally based upon the version of the work in *MSS Ambrosianus 653*, fols. 3-6, *Paris 1218*, fols. 121-5; *Oxonienis Laud. 22*, fols. 69-76^{va}, *Paris. 1261*, fols. 50-7. See Petit, ed., *Marci Ephesii Libellus de consecratione Eucharistia*, p. 426, *apparatus*. The full title of the work in Petit's edition is "*Ότι οὐ μόνον ἀπό τῆς φωνῆς τῶν δεσποτικῶν ῥημάτων ἀγιάζονται τὰ θεία δῶρα, ἀλλ' ἐκ τῆς μετὰ ταῦτα εὐλογίας τοῦ ἱερέως δυνάμει τοῦ ἁγίου Πνεύματος* (*That Not Only By The Saying Of The Dominical Words Are The Sacred Gifts Sanctified, But Also By The Blessing Of The Priest By Power Of The Holy Spirit*). For brevity, the author will denote this work as the *Λίβελλος*, a Greek abbreviation of the Latin title provided by Petit, *Libellus de consecratione Eucharistia*.

Following the Conquest of Constantinople during the Fourth Crusade in 1204, a number of Latin Christian successor states were instituted, commonly referred to as the *Λατινοκρατία* – the ‘Rule of the Latins’. Within several such states, the secular authorities installed their own Latin Rite ecclesial hierarchies, who commonly attempted to impose their own praxis upon their Hellenophone Orthodox populations.⁷ After the capture of Constantinople in 1261 by the Empire of Nicaea, the general council, the Second Council of Lyons in 1274, formally reunified the two communions as the Byzantine Imperial contingent under Emperor Michael VIII Palaiologos’ auspices assented to this end.⁸ Nonetheless, such attempts were unsuccessful to a significant extent because of the prevailing ecclesiological and cultural divergences between the Latin and Byzantine Rite Orthodox Churches.

Concerning the ecclesiological divergences, several Latin Christian magisterial documents fleshed out the Roman See’s Primacy over the entire communion of Christian Churches to the extent of asserting its universal jurisdiction on a doctrinal and a disciplinary level.⁹ Nonetheless, while the Byzantine Church beheld a tradition of affirming Roman

⁷ For example, the first Latin Patriarch of Constantinople, Tommaso Morosini, forbade the celebration of the Byzantine Rite within Constantinople unless they commemorated him as Patriarch on August 15th, 1206. See Michael Angold, “Thomas Morosini, First Latin Patriarch of Constantinople (1205-1211). A Reappraisal,” in *Crusading and Trading between West and East. Studies in Honour of David Jacoby*, ed. by Sophia Menache, Benjamin Z. Kedar and Michel Balard (London: Routledge, 2019), pp. 17-34 (28ff). Additionally, as Georgios Akropolites, *The Histories*, 17, ed. and trans. by Ruth Macrides (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007), pp. 154-5 recorded, Pope Innocent III sent Cardinal Pelagio Galvani as his legate to Constantinople in 1213. Pelagius imposed the closure of every Byzantine Rite church within the city and imprisoned many Byzantine Rite clergy and monastics. Likewise, Raymond Janin, ‘Les sanctuaires de byzance sous la domination latine (1204-1261),’ *Études byzantines* 2 (1944): 134-84 (134) highlighted how thirty-two Byzantine Imperial Orthodox Churches in Constantinople were subjected to Latin jurisdiction throughout the history of the Latin Empire of Constantinople.

⁸ For the Second Council of Lyons’ constitutions, see Giuseppe Alberigo, P. P. Joannou, Claudio Leonardi, Paulo Prodi, eds., *Conciliorum oecumenicorum decreta* (Freiburg im Breisgau: Herder, 1962), pp. 285-307. See Deno John Geanakoplos, *Emperor Michael Palaeologus and the West 1258-1282. A Study in Byzantine-Latin Relations* (Cambridge, M.A.: Harvard University Press, 1959), pp. 258-76 for an overview of the Byzantine Imperial participation at the Second Council of Lyons and the Imperial motivations for establishing ecclesial reunion.

⁹ See esp. Innocent III, *Epistola 353 ad Constantinopolit. Imperitori* [i.e., Alexios III Angelos, dated to 1198], in *Patrologia Latina*, Vol. 214 (Paris: Typis J.-P. Migne, 1855), cols. 235-7 (esp. 236c-7a); *Epistola 354 ad Patriarchae Constantinopolitano* [i.e., Ioannes X Kamateros, also dated to 1198], in *Patrologia Latina*, Vol. 214,

Primacy,¹⁰ many Byzantine Orthodox remained reluctant to affirm such universal jurisdiction. Rather, there was a tendency amongst such Orthodox to prioritise the canonical authority of general councils wherein the Pentarchic Patriarchs were represented, especially the first seven Ecumenical Councils which were mutually acknowledged by both the Eastern Orthodox and Latin Churches.¹¹ For example, during the pre-conciliar negotiations between the Latin and Byzantine Orthodox Churches in November 1434, the Dominican theologian and participant at the Council of Basel, John of Ragusa, recorded that, when the Byzantine legates were asked how they defined an ecumenical council, they responded that such a council required not only the Pope's *placet*, but also the attendance of a legate from each of the Pentarchic Patriarchates, and the universal consent of the Western and the Eastern Churches.¹²

cols. 327-9 (esp. 327d-8d); *Constitutions of the Fourth Lateran Council*, can. 5, ed. and trans. by Norman Tanner in *Decrees of the Ecumenical Councils*, Vol. 1, 235-6 (236); Aloysius L. Täutu, ed., *Acta Urbani IV, Clementis IV, Gregorii X (1261-1276)* (Rome: Typis Polyglottis Vaticanis, 1953), p. 67 for the *Professio Fidei* given to Emperor Michael VIII by Pope Clement IV in March 1267 which upheld this conception of the nature of the See of Rome's Primacy, and which was formally accepted by both the Latin and Byzantine Churches at the Second Council of Lyons on July 6th, 1274. Cf. Joseph Gill, *Byzantium and the Papacy 1198-1400* (New Brunswick, N.J.: Rutgers University Press, 1979), esp. pp. 11-3, 116-7, 136-8; Brian Tierney, *Origins of Papal Infallibility 1150-1350* (Leiden: Brill, 1972), esp. pp. 45-7.

¹⁰ See e.g., Theophylact of Ohrid, *Enarratio in Evangelium S. Matthaei*, c. 16, v. 18, in *Patrologia Graeca*, Vol. 123 (Paris: Typis J.-P. Migne, 1864), col. 320a-c; *Enarratio in Evangelium S. Lucae*, c. 2, vv. 22-3, in *Patrologia Graeca*, Vol. 123, col. 1073d; *Commentarius in Ioannis Evangelium*, c. 21, v. 15, in *Patrologia Graeca*, Vol. 124 (Paris: Typis J.-P. Migne, 1864), cols. 309a-13a; Neilos Kabasilas, *De causis dissensionum in ecclesia*, in *Patrologia Graeca*, Vol. 149 (Paris: Typis J.-P. Migne, 1865), esp. cols. 685b, 704d-5d, 708a; Symeon of Thessalonica, *Dialogus contra haereses*, c. 29, in *Patrologia Graeca*, Vol. 155 (Paris: Typis J.-P. Migne, 1866), cols. 120-1, for examples of the Hellenophone Orthodox acknowledgement of this doctrine of the Primacy of Rome following the emergence of the so-called 'Schism of 1054.' Cf. Francis Dvornik, *Byzantium and the Roman Primacy*, trans. by Edwin A. Quain (New York: Fordham University Press, 1966), esp. pp. 135-44, 154-63.

¹¹ For a lucid explication of this ecclesiology vis-à-vis the Papacy, the Pentarchy and the general councils, see the arguments given by Niketas, Archbishop of Nicomedia, during his debate with Anselm, Bishop of Havelberg, on April 3rd, 1136, in Constantinople for the purpose of resolving the differences between the Latin and Byzantine Imperial Churches. Anselm of Havelberg, *Dialogi*, III, c. 7, in *Patrologia Latina*, Vol. 188 (Paris: Typis J.-P. Migne, 1858), cols. 1217d-9a. Cf. Dvornik, *Byzantium and the Roman Primacy*, Quain, trans, pp. 124-67 for the development of these Eastern Orthodox conceptions of Papal Primacy following the 'Schism of 1054'. Cf. Martin Jugie, *Le schisme byzantin: aperçu historique et doctrinal* (Paris: Lethielleux, 1941), esp. pp. 37-8, 222-3, 232 for the development of the Eastern Orthodox theology of Pentarchic authority.

¹² John of Ragusa, *De modo quo Greci fuerant reducendi ad ecclesiam per concilium Basiliense*, ed. by Johannes Haller in *Concilium Basiliense. Studien und Quellen zur Geschichte des Konzils von Basel*, Vol. 1: *Studien und Dokumente* (Basel: R. Reich, 1896), pp. 353-4.

These attempts to restore Latin-Byzantine ecclesiastical communion were hindered by the prevalent cultural antipathy of many Hellenophone Orthodox towards Latin Rite Christians. To a significant extent, this antipathy derived from the fear amongst these Hellenophone Orthodox that ecclesial reunion would lead to a restoration of what many Orthodox perceived to be the oppressive *Λατινοκρατία* established following the Fourth Crusade, which saw the suppression of the Byzantine Rite in favour of the Latin Church's praxis.¹³ This perception was exacerbated by the Latin Church's consistent insistence that the Byzantines must first submit to the Roman See before any military or financial aid would be provided.¹⁴ These tensions were thereby highly influenced by the perceived danger of having a fundamentally incommensurate set of doctrines and customs imposed upon the Hellenophone populace.¹⁵

¹³ See e.g., Barlaam the Calabrian, *Barlaami Oratio pro unione. Avenione habita coram Benedicto XII Pontifice Maximo*, in *Patrologia Graeca*, Vol. 151 (Paris: Typis J.-P. Migne, 1857), cols. 1331-42, esp. 1333a-b, wherein Barlaam alluded to this fear amongst the Byzantine Imperial populace as a stumbling-block towards ecclesial reunion.

¹⁴ For example, as Sylvestros Syropoulos, *Les "Mémoires" du Grand Ecclésiarque de l'Église de Constantinople Sylvestre Syropoulos sur le concile de Florence (1438-1439)*, 2.13, ed. by Vitalien Laurent (Rome: Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique, 1971), p. 114, detailed, when the Franciscan Provincial of Tuscany, Antonio de Massa had arrived within the Imperial capital on September 10th, 1422, on an embassy for Pope Martin V, against the background of the Ottomans having imminently lifted their siege on the city, Antonio related to his Imperial counterparts that Pope Martin was willing to provide support the city but maintained that ecclesial reunion must first be established. Cf. Augustin Theiner, ed., *Annales ecclesiastici Caesaris Baronii*, 1422, 5-15, Vol. 27 (Barri-Ducis: Guerin, 1864), pp. 525-9. It is also important to note that this antipathy was worsened by the fact that Constantinople relied to a significant degree on the Aegean and Ionian Islands for their supply of food during the fifteenth century, which at this point were governed by Western Christian polities and corporations such as the Republic of Venice and the Catalan Company as well as Western European nobility such as the Tocco family of Benevento, who governed the Despotate of Epirus from 1416. See esp. Donald M. Nicol, *Byzantium And Venice: A Study In Diplomatic And Cultural Relations* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988), pp. 317-37; Nicol, *The Despotate of Epiros 1267-1479: A Contribution to the History of Greece in the Middle Ages* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1984), pp. 157-215; Kenneth W. Setton, "The Catalans and Florentines in Greece 1380-1462," in H. W. Hazard, ed., *A History of the Crusades: The Fourteenth and Fifteenth Centuries* (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1969), pp. 225-77; Nada Zečević, *The Tocco of the Greek Realm: Nobility, Power and Migration in Latin Greece (14th-15th Centuries)* (Belgrade: Makart, 2014).

¹⁵ This antipathy is further exemplified by the coeval production of popular anti-Latin polemical literature including the satirical dialogue between a Hellenophone Orthodox and Latin Christian, *Panagiotae cum azymita disputatio*, set during Michael VIII Palaiologos' reign, which refuted various perceived Latin errors, including the Eucharistic use of azymes and the *filioque* clause. See *Panagiotae cum azymita disputatio*, in Afanasii Vasil'ev, ed., *Anecdota graeco-byzantina. Pars prior* (Moscow: Imperial University, 1893), pp. 179-88.

Ecclesial reunion nevertheless offered a means through which military and financial support for the Byzantine Empire could be secured amidst the threat posed by the ascendant Ottoman Empire.¹⁶ This threat was especially exacerbated by the Byzantine defeat to the Ottomans at the Second Battle of Maritsa on September 26th, 1371,¹⁷ whereupon the Byzantine Empire accelerated its appeals to Western Europe for military and financial support. While such support was provided, for example, by a Western military coalition led by King Sigismund of Hungary and Croatia in 1396, the Ottoman-led contingent under Sultan Bayezid I defeated this campaign at the Battle of Nicopolis in September of this year.¹⁸

Cf. Tia M. Kolbaba, *The Byzantine Lists. Errors of the Latins* (Urbana and Chicago: University of Illinois Press, 2000), p. 29ff; Martin Hinterberger, 'How should we define vernacular literature?', Delivered at the "Unlocking the Potential of Texts: Interdisciplinary Perspectives on Medieval Greek" conference in the Centre for Research in the Arts, Social Sciences, and Humanities, University of Cambridge, 18th-19th July 2006: 1-16 (10). <<http://www.mml.cam.ac.uk/greek/grammarofmedievalgreek/unlocking/Hinterberger.pdf>> [accessed August 1st, 2023]. Cf. Georgios Pachymeres, *Relations historiques*, VI.24, Vol. 2 of 5, ed. by Albert Failler, trans. by Vitalien Laurent (Paris: Institut français d'études byzantines, 1984), pp. 618-21, who detailed how, following the Second Council of Lyons, Michael VIII Palaiologos mandated the burning of all such anti-Latin literature and issued the death penalty for those who were caught continuing to possess these works, indicating that they were broadly diffused within Hellenophone confines.

¹⁶ See e.g., Demetrios Kydones, *Oratio ad suos de admittendo contra Turcas Latinorum subsidio*, in *Patrologia Graeca*, Vol. 154 (Paris: Typis J.-P. Migne, 1857), cols. 959-1008, esp. 969, wherein Demetrios emphasised the close military connection between the Byzantine Empire and the Latins in the context of his broader aim to secure Latin military support against the Ottomans. The treatise was written in 1366 against the background of the capture of Gallipoli from the Ottomans by a Latin contingent led by Emperor Ioannes V Palaiologos' cousin, Amadeo VI, Count of Savoy, who was soon to arrive within the Byzantine Imperial Capital. Demetrios sought to emphasise that the Byzantine populace should receive this Latin contingent as allies. Judith Ryder, "The Career and Writings of Demetrios Kydones," in Martin Hinterberger and Chris Schabel, eds., *Greeks, Latins, and Intellectual History 1204-1500* (Leuven: Peeters, 2011), pp. 243-62 (253-4). Cf. Dionysios A. Zakythinos, *La Grèce et les Balkans* (Athens: s.n., 1947), pp. 46-56 for a discussion of this intra-Byzantine belief in the need for Latin Christian military aid. Cf. Halil İnalçık, *The Ottoman Empire: The Classical Age, 1300-1600*, trans. by Norman Itzkowitz and Colin Imber (New York: Praeger, 1973), 3-16, for an overview of the Ottoman advancements into south-eastern Europe during the fourteenth century.

¹⁷ See Ivan Đurić, *Le Crépuscule de Byzance* (Paris: Maisonneuve et Larose, 1966), pp. 13-4, who highlighted that, following this defeat, the Ottomans took control of most of the Byzantine Imperial possessions in the Balkans.

¹⁸ For an analysis of this campaign's defeat, see Aziz Suryal Atiya, *The Crusade of Nicopolis* (London: Methuen and Co., 1934), esp. pp. 89-97. Cf. Charles L. Tipton, 'The English at Nicopolis,' *Speculum* 37 (1962): 533-40; Kelly DeVries, 'The Lack of a Western European Military Response to the Ottoman Invasions of Eastern Europe from Nicopolis (1396) to Mohacs (1526),' *The Journal of Military History* 63(3) (1999): 539-59 (540-4), for the composition of the Western European contingents during this campaign.

The Ottoman expansion into the West was temporarily impeded during the early fifteenth century by the succession crisis which emerged following Bayezid I's defeat against the Timurid Empire at the Battle of Ankara in 1402.¹⁹ However, ecclesial reunion again became a mutual priority for the Byzantine Empire and Latin Christendom following Murad II's ascension to the Ottoman Sultanate in 1421: In June 1422, Murad launched a siege on Constantinople which, despite being lifted in late August 1422,²⁰ unravelled the Byzantine Empire's socio-political and military weaknesses. In particular, after visiting the Byzantine capital on two occasions between 1437 and 1438, the Castilian voyager, Pero Tafur, lamented within the *Travels and Adventures* that the city was thinly populated and many Constantinopolitans suffered considerable want, highlighting also that the Byzantine Empire had a severely reduced army.²¹ Additionally, the Ottoman conquest of Thessalonica – which

¹⁹ See Marie-Mathilde Alexandrescu-Dersca Bulgaru, *La campagne de Timur en Anatolie, 1402*, repr. (London: Variorum, 1977), esp. pp. 68-111; Dimitris J. Kastritsis, *The Sons of Bayezid. Empire Building and Representation in the Ottoman Civil War of 1402-1413* (Leiden/Boston: Brill, 2007), esp. pp. 41-78, for an analysis of the Timurid campaign against the Ottomans in Anatolia in 1402 and for its consequences upon the Ottoman Empire.

²⁰ See Andrea Massimo Cuomo, ed. and trans., *Ioannis Canani de Constantinopolitana Obsidione Relatio: A Critical Edition, with English Translation, Introduction, and Notes of John Kananos' Account of the Siege of Constantinople In 1422* (Berlin: De Gruyter, 2016), p. 38, lines 338-44, who described how as the Byzantine Imperial defenders witnessed their Ottoman counterparts fleeing from the siege, they attributed their victory to the intercession of the Virgin Mary. However, one should also situate this victory against the background of the Byzantine Imperial interference in the coeval intra-Ottoman conflicts: In particular, Ioannes VIII Palaiologos, who had been elevated as co-Emperor with his father, Manuel II Palaiologos, in January 1421, bolstered the claim of Murad's younger brother, Küçük Mustafa, to the Ottoman Sultanate, which led Murad to return with his troops to Anatolia to quell Mustafa's rebellion. See e.g., Doukas, *Decline and fall of Byzantium to the Ottoman Turks*, XXVIII.2-XXIX.1, Harry J. Magoulias, ed., (Detroit: Wayne State University Press, 1975), pp. 161-9. Cf. John W. Barker, *Manuel II Palaeologus (1391-1425): A Study in Late Byzantine Statesmanship* (New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press, 1969), p. 366; Colin Imber, *The Ottoman Empire 1300-1481* (Istanbul: Isis Press, 1990), p. 91. Cf. Doukas, *Decline and fall of Byzantium*, XXIII.6, Magoulias, ed., p. 133, for the circumstances of Ioannes VIII's elevation as co-Emperor.

²¹ See esp. Pero Tafur, *Travels and Adventures, 1435-1439*, trans. by Malcolm Letts (London: Routledge, 1926), pp. 123, 139, 145-6. Cf. A. A. Vasiliev, 'Pero Tafur, a Spanish Traveler of the Fifteenth Century and His Visit to Constantinople, Trebizond, and Italy,' *Byzantion* 7 (1932): 75-122, esp. 91-7, 102-17; Michael Angold, "The Decline of Byzantium Seen Through the Eyes of Western Travellers," in Ruth Macrides, ed., *Travel in the Byzantine World* (Aldershot: Routledge, 2002), pp. 213-32 (223-5), for more information relating to Tafur's journeys to the Imperial capital. See also the testimony of Mark of Ephesus himself when addressing Pope Eugenius IV at the Council of Ferrara, which refers to the contemporaneous state of affairs within the environs around Constantinople. Mark of Ephesus, *Oratio ad Eugenium Papam Quartum*, ed. by Louis Petit in *Patrologia Orientalis*, Vol. 17 (Paris: Firmin-Didot, 1923), pp. 3361-41 (339): "Λάβε μοι κατὰ νοῦν τὰ τῶν χριστιανῶν

had historically been one of the most politically and culturally most important Byzantine Imperial πόλεις – on March 29th, 1430, exemplified the acute threat which the Ottoman expansion within the Balkans and the Near East posed to Western Christian political and economic interests in these regions given that, from 1423, Thessalonica had in fact been under Venetian occupation.²² Thus, the Byzantine and Latin Christian ecclesiastical and secular hierarchies mutually acknowledged the pressing need to expediently establish a politico-ecclesial reunion from which they could cooperate towards the diminishment of this mutual threat.

Considering these factors, after the Byzantine contingent were formally reunified with the Latin Church at the Council of Florence through the promulgation of *Laetentur Caeli* on July 6th, 1439, on February 1st, 1440, Emperor Ioannes VIII and his entourage arrived back in Constantinople. As the Hellenophone chronicler, Doukas, recounted in his *Historia Turco-Byzantina*, composed c. 1462, many Byzantine Fathers who had signed *Laetentur Caeli* asserted to the Constantinopolitan populace that they repudiated their earlier support for the Florentine reunion, claiming they had ‘sold their faith’ at Florence because of ‘fear of

αἵματα, τὰ καθ' ἑκάστην ἐκχεόμενα τὴν ἡμέραν, καὶ τὴν ὑπὸ βαρβάρους πικρὰν δουλείαν, καὶ τὸν ὄνειδισμόν τοῦ σταυροῦ τοῦ Χριστοῦ, προσέτι, δὲ θυσιαστηρίων ἀνατροπὴν, εὐκτηρίων οἴκων καθαίρεσιν θεῶν ὕμνων ἀργίαν, ἀγίων τόπων κατάσχεσιν, ἱερῶν σκευῶν καὶ ἐπίπλων διανομὴν... (My English translation:) Take note of the blood of Christians, which is poured out each day, and the bitter slavery of the barbarians [i.e., the Ottomans], and the reproach of the Cross of Christ, in addition to the desecration of altars, the cleansing of sacred houses, the purging of the holy celebrations, the confiscation of holy places, and the distribution of sacred vessels and vestments...” Cf. the Florentine Franciscan, Cristoforo Buondelmonti, *Description des îles de l'Archipel, Version Grecque Par Un Anonyme*, 65, Vol. 1, ed. and trans. by Émile Legrand (Paris: E. Leroux, 1897), pp. 84-90 (84), who, having journeyed to Constantinople in 1422, described the city as τὴν τληπαθεστάτην πόλιν. Cf. Angold, “The Decline of Byzantium,” p. 228. Moreover, after visiting the Imperial capital between 1432 and 1433, the Burgundian traveller, Bertrandon de la Broquiere, *Le voyage d'outremer de Bertrandon de La Broquière*, ed. by Charles Henri Auguste Schefer, repr. (Paris: E. Leroux, 1972) pp. 153, 167-9, similarly described the lamentable condition of the city and its surrounding area.

²² That this conquest was a watershed moment in the Latin-Byzantine negotiations for an ecumenical council is suggested by the fact that, by July 1430, a new Byzantine embassy had been sent to Venice to engage in such diplomacy. See Freddy Thiriet, ed., *Régestes des délibérations du Sénat de Venise concernant la Romanie (1400-1430)*, Vol. 2 of 3 (Paris: Mouton, 1959), p. 277; Ivan Mariano, “The Council and Negotiations with the Greeks,” in Michiel Decaluwé, Thomas M. Izbicki, Gerald Christianson, eds., *A Companion to the Council of Basel* (Leiden/Boston: Brill, 2017), pp. 310-39 (330).

the Franks' and monetary privilege.²³ Although Doukas' account was likely tinged with hyperbole, it nonetheless indicates the motivations behind the initial Byzantine acceptance of the terms of the Florentine reunion and their posterior rejection thereof.²⁴

Against this background, the anti-unionist project gained prominence within the Eastern Orthodox Churches: Alongside the post-conciliar activities of Mark of Ephesus and his disciples including Georgios-Gennadios Scholarios, Theodoros Agallianos, and Mark's younger brother, Ioannes Eugenikos,²⁵ which will be detailed in Chapter Two, several Byzantine delegates who had signed *Laetentur Caeli* later promulgated a formal rejection of the Florentine Reunion between May 1440 and 1441.²⁶ Likewise, having been commissioned by Pope Eugenius to instill the Florentine Union within the Eastern Orthodox Churches under the jurisdiction of the Metropolitan of Kiev and all Rus',²⁷ Cardinal Isidore²⁸ was imprisoned

²³ Doukas, *Decline and Fall of Byzantium to the Ottoman Turks*, XXXI.9, Magoulias, ed. and trans., pp. 181-2.

²⁴ Concerning Doukas' historiographical hermeneutic, Magoulias, ed., "Introduction," in Doukas, *Decline and Fall of Byzantium to the Ottoman Turks*, p. 38 encapsulated that Doukas was "[a]n agent of Genoese interests, pro-Latin in his sentiments... [he] emerges... as a Unionist aristocrat who has no compassion for the anti-Unionist commoners of Constantinople... [who h]e reviles... as being vulgar and baseborn. He is convinced that Church Union was a necessary concession to the preservation of the [Byzantine] state." See e.g., Syropoulos, *Les Mémoires* 5.37, Laurent, ed., p. 290, wherein Syropoulos described how the Byzantine contingent's subsidies from the Latin Church were delayed until the former had submitted their draft delineating the issues requiring resolution in Ferrara in early summer 1438. What this anecdotal example suggests is that financial considerations did to some extent play a part in the Byzantine contingent's actions vis-à-vis reunion at Ferrara-Florence.

²⁵ For example, Ioannes Eugenikos produced a polemical antirrhetic which systematically refuted *Laetentur Caeli*. See Eleni Rossidou Koutsou, ed., *An annotated critical edition of John Eugenikos' Antirrhetic of the Decree of the Council of Ferrara-Florence* (Nicosia: Kykkos Research Centre, 2006).

²⁶ Jean Darrouzès, *Les Régestes des actes du Patriarcat de Constantinople. 1. Les actes des patriarches*, Vol. 7: *Les regestes de 1410 à 1453. Suivi des Tables générales des fascicules I-VII*, no. 3384 (Paris: Socii Assumptionistae Chalcedonenses, 1991), pp. 50-1. Cf. Scholarios, *Liste des écrits antiunionistes*, in Martin Jugie, Xénophon Sidéridès, Louis Petit, eds., *Oeuvres Complètes*, Vol. 3 (Paris: Maison de la Bonne Presse, 1930), pp. 179, line 27-180, line 5, wherein Scholarios claimed that four such formal declarations were issued against *Laetentur Caeli*.

²⁷ Cf. Pope Eugenius IV, *Ad Imperatorem Ioannem VIII* [dated to November 28th, 1439], in Georg Hofmann, ed., *Epistolae Pontificiae ad Concilium Florentinum Spectantes*, n. 233 (Rome: Pontificium Institutum Orientalium Studiorum, 1940), pp. 143-4, wherein Pope Eugenius detailed to Emperor Ioannes VIII that Isidore would be returning to the Grand Duchy of Moscow to instill the Florentine reunion within his metropolitanate. Marios Philippides and Walter K. Hanak, *Cardinal Isidore c. 1390-1462. A Late Byzantine Scholar, Warlord, and Prelate* (Abingdon: Oxford, 2018), pp. 98-9.

²⁸ Isidore had been elevated to the Cardinalate on December 18th, 1439, alongside both Juan de Torquemada and Bessarion. See Salvador Miranda, *The Cardinals of the Holy Roman Church*, <<https://cardinals.fiu.edu/bios1439.htm>> [accessed August 1st, 2023].

within Chudov Monastery in Moscow in 1441 after being deposed by an episcopal synod convoked by the Muscovite Grand Duke, Vasilii II, on charges of heresy.²⁹

The intra-Byzantine support for the Florentine reunion was further weakened by the Ottoman victories over the Latin and Byzantine military contingents during the Varna Crusade on November 10th, 1444,³⁰ and later over the army led by the Kingdom of Hungary at the Battle of Kosovo in October 1448.³¹ Both defeats effectively hindered the potential for Constantinople to be salvaged from an Ottoman offensive via the Balkans and unravelled the restricted efficacy that Latin Christian military and financial support could provide for the Byzantine Empire. Under Ioannes VIII's successor, Konstantinos XI Palaiologos, additional attempts were made to instil the Florentine Reunion within the Empire. For example, on December 12th, 1452, Konstantinos and Cardinal Isidore concelebrated the Divine Liturgy in Hagia Sophia. Therein, *Laetentur Caeli* was recited in both Latin and Greek

²⁹ Isidore was particularly charged with postulating the Spirit's dual procession *ad intra* and permitting the Eucharistic use of either unleavened or leavened bread. See *Полное Собрание Русскихъ Лѣтописей*, Vol. 6 of 46: *Софійскіе летописи* (St Petersburg: Типография Эдуарда Праца, 1853), pp. 162-7, esp. 164-7, for the epistle which the then-Bishop of Ryazan, Iona, who succeeded Isidore as Metropolitan of Kiev and All Rus', wrote to Ioannes VIII on behalf of Grand Duke Vasilii and the Synod of Moscow detailing why Isidore was deposed, while also imploring the Byzantine Empire to return to doctrinal orthodoxy and repudiate the Florentine reunion. Isidore was ultimately liberated in 1442. Cf. Joseph Gill, *Personalities of the Council of Florence and Other Essays* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1964), pp. 72-3; Innokenti Pavlov, "The Ferrara-Florentine Union: A View from Moscow. Historical Retrospective and Contemporary Appraisal," in Giuseppe Alberigo, ed., *Christian Unity. The Council of Ferrara-Florence. 1438/39-1989* (Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1991), pp. 493-507; Philippides and Hanak, *Cardinal Isidore*, pp. 104-113.

³⁰ Pope Eugenius IV issued his encyclical, *Ad perpetuam rei memoriam*, on January 1st, 1443, formally calling for a Crusade. See *Annales ecclesiastici Caesaris Baronii*, 1443, nn. 14-9, Vol. 28, ed. by Augustin Theiner (Barri-Ducis: Guerin, 1864), pp. 400-4. See Colin Imber, ed. and trans., *The Crusade of Varna, 1443-45* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2006), for a variety of the contemporaneous Hellenophone, Latin Christian, and Ottoman literary sources concerning this crusade and its consequences. For more information relating to this Crusade and its aftermath, see Martin Chasin, "The Crusade of Varna," in H. W. Hazard and N. P. Zacour, ed., *A History of the Crusades*, Vol. 6: *The Impact of the Crusades in Europe*, Kenneth M. Setton, general ed. (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1989), pp. 276-310; John V. A. Fine, Jr., *The Late Medieval Balkans: A Critical Survey from the Late Twelfth Century to the Ottoman Conquest* (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1994), p. 548-54; Oskar Halecki, *The Crusade of Varna. A Discussion of Controversial Problems* (New York: Polish Institute of Arts and Sciences, 1943); Imber, "Introduction," in *The Crusade of Varna*, pp. 1-39.

³¹ See John V. A. Fine, Jr., *Late Medieval Balkans*, pp. 554-8 for an overview of this campaign.

and ecclesial union was formally proclaimed.³² Nonetheless, such attempts were only temporarily successful: Following the successful Ottoman Siege of Constantinople on May 29th, 1453, and the subsequent reorganisation of the Ecumenical Patriarchate, Latin-Eastern Orthodox communion was once again effectively severed.³³ While the Latin Church made several attempts to convoke a crusade to expel the Ottoman Empire from Constantinople during the mid-to-late fifteenth century, these attempts achieved little success.³⁴

³² See Isidore of Kiev, *Ad Papam Nicolaum V* [dated to July 15th, 1453], in Agostino Pertusi, ed., *La Caduta di Costantinopoli*, Vol. 1 of 2 (Rome: Fondazione L. Valla, 1976), pp. 92-101 (92), wherein Isidore claimed that the whole Imperial capital participated in this Divine Liturgy: “Fuerunt enim omnes usque ad minorem una cum imperatore uniti et, gratia Dei...” However, one should treat Isidore’s claims with caution as one cannot definitively conclude that every anti-unionist participated. Cf. Doukas, *Decline and Fall of Byzantium to the Ottoman Turks*, XXXVI.1-2, Magoulias, ed. and trans., p. 203; Laonikos Chalkokondyles, *De origine ac rebus gestis Turcarum*, VIII, in Immanuel Bekker, ed., *Corpus Scriptorum Historiae Byzantinae*, Vol. 10 (Bonn: Weber, 1843), pp. 382-4; Steven Runciman, *The Fall of Constantinople, 1453* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1965), esp. pp. 68-72.

³³ In particular, on January 6th, 1454, the Ecumenical Patriarchate was restored by Sultan Mehmed II, who elevated Gennadios Scholarios thereto. See Georgios Sphrantzes, *Χρόνικον*, III, c. XI, in *Corpus Scriptorum Historiae Byzantinae*, Vol. 29, ed. by Immanuel Bekker (Bonn: Weber, 1838), pp. 304-8. As will be elucidated, before the Fall of Constantinople, Scholarios led the anti-unionist *Ἱερά Σύναξις* following his former teacher, Mark of Ephesus’ death. See also Marie-Hélène Blanchet, *Georges-Gennadios Scholarios (vers 1400-vers 1472). Un Intellectuel Orthodox Face à la Disparition de l’Empire Byzantin* (Paris: Institute Français d’Études Byzantines, 2008), pp. 67-192 for Scholarios’ first elevation to the Ecumenical Patriarchate and his activity therein. Cf. Blanchet, *Scholarios*, pp. 383-450 for his leadership over the *Ἱερά Σύναξις*.

³⁴ For example, Bessarion sent an epistle dated to July 23rd, 1453, to the Venetian Doge, imploring the Republic to undertake an anti-Ottoman campaign. See Nicolae Iorga, ed., *Notes et extraits pour servir à l’histoire des croisades au XV^e siècle*, Vol. 2 (Paris: E. Leroux, 1899), pp. 518-9. Likewise, in late 1455, Pope Callixtus III began organising a campaign to restore Constantinople to Christianity which came to fruition in May 1456, when Cardinal Ludovico Scamparo led a naval campaign financed and equipped by Alfonso, King of Aragon and of Naples. Nonetheless, while this campaign had some success in expelling the Ottomans from both Lemnos and Samothrace as well as defeating an Ottoman naval fleet off the coast of Lesbos in late summer 1457, the contingent ultimately took some respite on Hospitaller Rhodes before venturing back to the Italian Peninsula. See Ludwig Pastor, *The History of the Popes from the Close of the Middle Ages*, ed. by Frederick Ignatius Antrobus Vol. 2 of 40 (London: John Hodges, 1891), pp. 371-6. Moreover, Callixtus’ successor, Pius II, promulgated his encyclical, *Vocavit nos Pius*, on October 13th, 1458, convoked a council calling upon the European Christian polities to organise an anti-Ottoman crusade. See Leodrisio Crivelli, *De expeditione Pii Papae II adversus Turcos*, ed. by Giulio C. Zimolo (Bologna: N. Zanichelli, 1950), pp. 91-6 for this bull. This council assembled at Mantua and whose sessions formally began on June 1st, 1459, and included representatives from the Kingdoms of Bosnia Cyprus, Hungary, Naples, the Empire of Trebizond, Hospitaller Rhodes, the Despotate of Epirus, and a number of Papal curial officials including Bessarion and Juan de Torquemada, before delegates from the Duchy of Milan and the Republic of Venice as well as English, French and Holy Roman Imperial representatives arrived later that year. While the Holy Roman Empire agreed to provide infantry, cavalry, and the Italian states agreed to provide naval support, this campaign did not come to fruition. See Charles A. Frazee, *Catholics and Sultans. The Church and the Ottoman Empire 1453-1923* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1983), pp. 12-3; Else Hocks, *Pius II. und der Halbmond* (Freiburg: Herder, 1941), pp. 101-30 for an analysis of this council.

This rupture was exacerbated by the fact that some Hellenophone Orthodox authors writing following the Byzantine Empire's dissolution such as Georgios Sphrantzes pinpointed the Florentine Reunion as a key factor behind the Byzantine Empire's demise. According to Sphrantzes, given that the Byzantine Emperor and Imperial Church had entered into apostasy through supporting this union, the Ottoman accession exemplified God's retribution for these putative errors.³⁵ Ultimately, the Florentine Reunion was formally repudiated through the *Ὁρος* promulgated by the Pan-Orthodox Council convoked by Ecumenical Patriarch Maximos III in 1482, and which met between 1483 and 1484 under his successor, Symeon I, in the Church of Theotokos Pammakaristos.³⁶ Accounting for the political, social, economic, and military factors that informed the dissatisfactory terms of the Florentine Reunion, and also impeded its effectuation within the Eastern Orthodox Churches, this dissertation aims to exemplify that, if utilised within modern-day ecumenical dialogue, Mark of Ephesus' *in fieri* doctrine of Eucharistic consecration offers a firm foundation from which some degree of Latin-Eastern Orthodox doctrinal consensus could be established.

³⁵ See Georgios Sphrantzes, *Chronicon Minus*, in *Patrologia Graeca*, Vol. 156 (Paris: Typis J.-P. Migne, 1866), cols. 1025-80 (1046c). Ihor Ševčenko, 'Intellectual Repercussions of the Council of Florence,' *Church History* 24(4) (1955): 291-323 (300). Indeed, some Latin Christian and Hellenophone pro-unionist authors also perceived the Fall of Constantinople to have resulted from the Byzantines' ambivalence and infidelity towards the Florentine union. See, e.g., Leonardo of Chios, *Historia Constantinopolitanae urbis a Mahumete II captae*, in *Patrologia Graeca*, Vol. 159 (Paris: Typis J.-P. Migne, 1857), cols. 923-52 (925d-7b). Ioannes Plousiadenos, *Expositio pro sancta et cecumenica synodo Florentina*, in *Patrologia Graeca*, Vol. 159, cols. 1109-1394 (1328c, 1337c-d, 1368c, 1372a), and *Ubertini Pusculi Brixienensis Constantinopoleos Libri IV*, Liber I, lines 381-4, 581-3, ed. by Adolf Ellissen. *Analekten der mittel- und neugriechischen Literatur*, Vol. 4 of 5 (Leipzig: Otto Wigand, 1857), pp. 20, 24, for this perception recounted in verse form, composed c. 1455, by the Italian humanist, Ubertino Pusculo, who witnessed the Fall having ventured to Constantinople to study under Ioannes Argyropoulos. Cf. M. J. McGann, *Haeresis castigata, Troia vindicata: The Fall of Constantinople in Quattrocento Latin Poetry*, *Res publica litterarum* 7 (1984): 137-45.

³⁶ For this Council's Acts, see Mache Paizes-Apostolopoulou and D. G. Apostolopoulos, eds., *Ἐπίσημα Κείμενα τοῦ πατριαρχείου. Τα σωζόμενα ἀπὸ τὴν περίοδο 1454-1498*. (Athens: ΘΕΣΜΟΙ ΚΑΙ ΙΔΕΟΛΟΓΙΑ ΣΤΗ ΝΕΟΕΛΛΗΝΙΚΗ ΚΟΙΝΩΝΙΑ, 2016), pp. 184-9. For an overview of the Council, see Archimandrite Nektarios Karsiotis, *Ἡ Σύνοδος Φερράρας - Φλωρεντίας ἀπὸ τῆς ὑπογραφῆς τοῦ ὄρου ἐνώσεως ἕως καὶ τῆς καταργήσεως αὐτοῦ. Μελέτη φιλολογικὴ καὶ ἱστορικὴ*, Ph. D. Thesis (National and Kapodistrian University of Athens, 2019), pp. 770-91.

0.2. An Overview of this Dissertation's Structure.

To achieve this dissertation's aim, Chapter One will expoit the pre-conciliar developments within the Latin-Eastern Orthodox discussions regarding the nature and moments of Eucharistic consecration to frame the debate which emerged at Florence. To enable an assessment of the dogmatic authority and coherence of both Juan de Torquemada's and Mark of Ephesus' doctrines of Eucharistic consecration from the perspective of the magisterium of the modern-day Roman Catholic and of the Eastern Orthodox Churches, Chapter Two will move on to expoit the post-Florentine magisterial statements issued by both sets of Churches concerning the nature and moment(s) of Eucharistic consecration.

Chapters Three and Four will then examine how Torquemada and Mark of Ephesus both expoit their Churches' de facto doctrines of the nature and moment(s) of Eucharistic consecration after both individuals were respectively commissioned by Pope Eugenius IV and Emperor Ioannes VIII. Each chapter will first provide an overview of the factors within both Torquemada's and Mark's backgrounds that informed the tenor of their literary and oral contributions to this Florentine debate and the nature of the source material they evoked to support their respective doctrines.

Chapter Three will elucidate that Torquemada's attempt to assert that the Eucharistic gifts are strictly transmuted upon the priest(s)' recitation of the Words of Institution, or the dominical words, in the *Sermo Prior*, delivered before both the Latin and Byzantine conciliar contingents on June 16th, 1439, failed to garner the Byzantine contingent's acceptance. This failure, it will be argued, was largely informed by the florilegal and at times pseudepigraphal nature of the Patristic source material which Torquemada

evoked to support his doctrine. Based upon such material, Torquemada overemphasised the degree to which his doctrine was universally supported by both the antecedent Latin and Hellenophone theological traditions. Moreover, the nature of such material hindered Torquemada from taking into broader consideration that some of his own Latinophone authorities including Ambrose of Milan and Augustine of Hippo could be interpreted to have upheld the invocation's consecratory function within their bodies of work.

Chapter Four will exemplify that, compared to Torquemada's *Sermo Prior*, Mark's *Λίβελλος*, which was composed between June 16th and 19th, 1439 after Torquemada delivered his *Sermo Prior* at the public Latin-Byzantine conciliar debate, provided a broadly more contextualised and accurate analysis of its own liturgical and Patristic source material. Mark was similarly hindered by restrictions in time and access to literary source material insofar as he was ostensibly unable to engage with several of the Latin Patristic texts which had been cited by Torquemada, such as those by Ambrose and Paschasius Radbertus. Nonetheless, Mark effectively exhibited how several ecumenically venerated Hellenophone authorities including Basil the Great, John Chrysostom, Pseudo-Dionysius, and John of Damascus affirmed the epiclesis' consecratory function. In particular, Mark acknowledged that these authorities conceived Eucharistic transmutation to function as an *in fieri* process, which could best be analogised by God's operation upon the Virgin Mary at the Annunciation: Just as God first transmuted the substance of the Virgin's flesh into the Incarnate Christ, so too do the dominical words substantially transmute the Eucharistic gifts. However, just as this transmutation of the Virgin's flesh was 'perfected' by the Holy Spirit's 'overshadowing' operation, likewise is the Eucharistic gifts' transmutation 'perfected' by a similar Pneumatic operation, incited by the epiclesis.

Chapter Five will detail how, after Ioannes VIII related several of the arguments within the *Λίβελλος* during a private meeting with a body of Latin Fathers led by Cardinal Giuliano Cesarini, who functioned as Pope Eugenius' principal negotiator with the Byzantine Fathers at Ferrara-Florence,³⁷ Torquemada was commissioned by Eugenius to orally refute these arguments within another public conciliar debate which occurred on June 20th. When analysing the contents of Torquemada's *Sermo Alter*, it will be shown that Torquemada ultimately secured the Byzantine contingent's acceptance of his single-moment doctrine of Eucharistic consecration and his application of the four Aristotelian causes to explicate this mystery. However, this Chapter will detail how the *Sermo Alter* bore similar limitations to the *Sermo Prior* concerning the use of pseudepigrapha and *florilegia* which would hinder the applicability of its contents within the context of modern-day ecumenical dialogue. Additionally, while Torquemada evoked Byzantine Rite liturgical material such as Leo the Tuscan's Latin translation of the *Liturgy of St John Chrysostom* to support his claim regarding the epiclesis' non-consecratory nature therein, not only did Torquemada misattribute this Latin translation to Basil the Great but offered an interpretation of its epiclesis which significantly discorded with the Hellenophone liturgical tradition concerning its consecratory function. The author concludes this chapter by encapsulating the conciliar proceedings preceding the promulgation of *Laetentur Caeli* on July 6th. This will allow the author to provide some context relating to the subsequent divisions between the Roman

³⁷ See Juan de Segovia, *Historia Gestorum Generalis Synodi Basiliensis*, I, c. 26, in František Palacký, Ernst Ritter von Birk, Karl Stehlin, Konrad Wilhelm Hieronimus, eds., *Monumenta conciliorum generalium seculi decimi quinti. Concilium Basiliense. Scriptores*, Vol. 2 of 4 (Vienna: Typis C.R. Officinae Typographicae Aulae et Status, 1873), pp. 53-4 (54), wherein Segovia detailed how, on February 1st, 1431, Cesarini was appointed by Pope Martin V as President of the Council of Basel, one of whose roles was the "reductio orientalis ecclesiae." See also Ivan Mariano, "The Council and Negotiations with the Greeks," in Michiel Decaluwé, Thomas M. Izbicki, Gerald Christianson, eds., *A Companion to the Council of Basel* (Leiden: Brill, 2017), pp. 310-39, esp. pp. 312-3, 317, 324-6, 332-6, for analyses of Cesarini's role in the pre-conciliar negotiations with the Byzantine contingent.

Catholic and Eastern Orthodox Churches concerning Eucharistic consecration, alongside the other matters of doctrine and praxis, referred to in this dissertation's introductory Chapter.

To conclude, Chapter Six will summate this dissertation's findings: The author will reemphasise that, in contrast to Torquemada's Eucharistic *Cedula* and two *Sermones*, Mark's doctrine of the nature and moment(s) of Eucharistic consecration offers a firmer basis from which modern-day Roman Catholic and Eastern Orthodox ecumenists could attempt to establish some form of consensus on this question.

Chapter One: The Origins of the Conciliar Debate

- 1.1. An Analysis of the Pre-Conciliar Developments of the Nature and Moment(s) of Eucharistic Consecration within Eastern Orthodoxy: Nicholas Kabasilas, Symeon of Thessalonika, and Makarios Makres.

Before analysing and evaluating Torquemada's and Mark of Ephesus' doctrines of the nature and moment(s) of Eucharistic consecration, one must situate these doctrines within the context of the pre-conciliar Latin-Byzantine debates over this question in the lead-up to the Council of Florence. The author will aim to show that these debates significantly framed the discussions which occurred at Florence. In particular, during the late fourteenth century, Nicholas Kabasilas Chamaetos,³⁸ acted as one of the first Byzantine Rite theologians to polemically engage with Latin Christians over whether the Byzantine Rite's Eucharistic epicleses possessed a consecratory function during the Divine Liturgy. To put Kabasilas' polemics into context, one should consider that, following the doctrinal definition of Eucharistic transubstantiation at the Fourth Lateran Council in 1215,³⁹ the Latin Church began to canonically formalise and mandate the elevation and adoration of the host and chalice immediately following the dominical words, cultivating an intra-Latin understanding that these formulae fully realised Christ's Body and Blood.⁴⁰

³⁸ Kabasilas was his mother's surname, and the Kabasilas family were prominent members of the Thessalonikan aristocracy, including his uncle, Neilos Kabasilas. This fact helps to explain why Nicholas scarcely used his paternal surname, Chamaetos. Cf. Athanasios Angelopoulos, 'Τό γενεαλογικόν δένδρον τῆς οἰκογενείας τῶν Καβασιλῶν,' *Μακεδονικά* 17 (1977): 367-96.

³⁹ *Conc. Lateranense IV 1215 IV (Oecum. XII)*, cap. 1, in Heinrich Denzinger, ed., *Enchiridion symbolorum definitionum et declarationum de rebus fidei et morum* (Fribourg: Herder, 1911), pp. 189-90.

⁴⁰ One pertinent canonical example is Pope Honorius III's 1219 decretal, *Sane*, which mandated that celebrants immediately elevate and revere the Eucharistic bread following the dominical words' recitation helped to proliferate this conception of the dominical words' fully consecratory nature, particularly following this decretal's incorporation into the *Decretales Gregorii IX* as compiled following 1230 the Dominican canonist, Raymond of Peñafort, at Pope Gregory IX's behest. See *Quinque compilationes antiquae nec non Collectio canonum Lipsiensis*, ed. by Emil Friedberg (Leipzig: Tauchnitz, 1882), p. 178; Cf. Thomas M. Izbicki, *The Eucharist in Medieval Canon Law* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2015) pp. 107-8. For example,

For example, Pope John XXII ordered two Eastern Orthodox bishops in the Latin Christian Kingdom of Cyprus, Leo, Bishop of Solea, and Olbianos, Bishop of Leukara, to instruct their Greek and Syriac Eastern Orthodox congregations that the precise moment of the Eucharistic gifts' transmutation was the dominical words' recitation.⁴¹ This Papal instruction was instigated by a dispute which emerged between 1313 and 1314 between the Papal Legate, Pierre de Pleine-Chassaigne, and the Greek Orthodox ecclesial hierarchy in Cyprus, when Pierre was notified that the Greek and Syriac Eastern Orthodox congregations prostrated during the priest's transference of the Eucharistic gifts to the altar during the Great Entrance.⁴² As this prostration preceded the dominical words, Peter regarded this act to be an idolatrous and heretical abuse based upon his belief that the Eucharistic gifts had yet to be transubstantiated.⁴³ The legate subsequently incarcerated the two aforementioned bishops alongside Hilarion, Bishop of Karpasia, for allegedly engendering a

within his epistle, *Sub Catholicae*, addressed to his legate in the Kingdom of Cyprus, Odo, the Bishop of Tusculum, dated to March 6th, 1254, Pope Innocent IV instructed Odo to allow his Eastern Orthodox congregations to continue celebrating their own liturgical rites so long as they recite the dominical words at the consecration. See S. J. E. Domo, ed., *Acta et Decreta Sacrorum Conciliorum Recentiorum: Collectio Lacensis*, Vol. 2 of 7 (Freiburg im Breisgau: Herder, 1876), cols. 446-8 (447). While some Roman Catholic theologians prior to the mid-to-late twentieth century including Réginald Garrigou-Lagrange have cited *Sub Catholicae* as evidence for a Roman Catholic Magisterial precedent of affirming the dominical words' sole consecratory function, this epistle made no reference to the exclusion of the epiclesis or to its putatively non-consecratory nature. Cf. Réginald Garrigou-Lagrange, *Commentarium in Summa theologicam S. Thomae. De Eucharistia* (Paris: Desclée de Brouwer & Co., 1943), p. 178.

⁴¹ "Pope John XXII to Bishop Leo of Solea and Bishop Olivarios of Lefkara, Avignon, 30 January 1321," ed. and trans. by Chris Schabel in *The Synodicum Nicosiense and other documents of the Latin Church of Cyprus, 1196-1373* (Nicosia: Cyprus Research Center, Nicosia, 2001), pp. 341-5 (344-5); Maria Paschali, "Negotiating identities in fourteenth-century Famagusta: Saint George of the Greeks, the liturgy and the Latins," ed. by Tassos Papacostas and Guillaume Saint-Guillain in *Identity/Identities in Late Medieval Cyprus. Papers given at the ICS Byzantine Colloquium, London, 13-14 June 2011, King's College London: Centre for Hellenic Studies-CRC* (Nicosia: Cyprus Research Center, 2014), pp. 281-301 (287).

⁴² Cf. Chris Schabel, 'The Greek bishops of Cyprus, 1260-1340, and the *Synodikon Kyprion*,' *Κυπριακαὶ Σπουδαὶ* 64-65 (2000-1): 217-234 (219-30), who argued that this dispute occurred in May 1313. Conversely, Nicholas Coureas, *The Latin Church in Cyprus, 1313-1378* (Nicosia: Cyprus Research Centre, 2010), p. 426 dated this incident to May 1314.

⁴³ "John XXII to Bishop Leo of Solea and Bishop Olivarios of Lefkara," Schabel, ed. and trans., p. 342.

mass revolt for denouncing this practice.⁴⁴ In 1340, Elias of Nabinaux, the Latin Archbishop of Nicosia, reiterated Pope John's earlier instruction by ordering non-Latin clergy to continue informing their congregations that the dominical words functioned as the precise moment of the Eucharist gifts' transubstantiation to ensure that Christ's Body and Blood were revered at the correct time.⁴⁵

Against this background, Kabasilas possibly witnessed similar Latin criticisms of the putatively consecratory nature of the Byzantine Rite's Eucharistic epicleses within Thessalonica, wherein Kabasilas was born during the early 1320s,⁴⁶ and continued to correspond with the city and several of its residents throughout his lifetime.⁴⁷ It is also possible that Kabasilas encountered such criticisms within Constantinople, wherein

⁴⁴ "John XXII to Bishop Leo of Solea and Bishop Olivarios of Lefkara," Schabel, ed. and trans., pp. 343-4; Schabel, "The Status of the Greek Clergy in Early Frankish Cyprus," in Julian Chrysostomides and Charalambos Dendrinis, eds., *"Sweet Land...": Lectures on the History and Culture of Cyprus* (Camberley: Porphyrygenitus, 2006), pp. 165-207 (187-8); Nicholas Coureas, Gilles Grivaud, Chris Schabel, "Frankish & Venetian Nicosia, 1191-1570," ed. by Demetres Michaelides in *Historic Nicosia* (Nicosia: Rimal Publications, 2012), pp. 111-229 (133-4).

⁴⁵ See "Synodicum Nicosiense, stat. IV," Schabel, ed., in *Synodicum Nicosiense*, p. 262. Coureas, *Latin Church in Cyprus*, p. 445; Paschali, "Negotiating Identities in Fourteenth-Century Famagusta," p. 287.

⁴⁶ See the 1351 epistle Kabasilas wrote to Empress Anna of Savoy, who governed as regent for Ioannes V Palaiologos, wherein Kabasilas details that he was not yet thirty years old: Nicholas Kabasilas, *Τῆς εὐσεβεστάτης ἀυγούστης περὶ τόκου*, ed. by Rodolphe Guiland in "La traite inédit "Sur l'usure" de Nicolas Cabasilas," in *Mélanges Sp. Lampros* (Athens: ΕΠΙΤΡΟΠΗ ΕΚΔΟΣΕΩΣ ΚΑΤΑΛΟΙΠΩΝ, 1935), pp. 269-77 (274): "Καὶ μὴν οὐδέ ἐκείνῳ νομίζω τῷ νόμῳ χώραν εἶναι παρ' ὑμῖν ὃν ἔθεσαν Ἀθηναῖοι τὸν εἶσω τριάκοντα ἐτῶν μὴ δικηγορεῖν ἐξεῖναι."

⁴⁷ For example, during the Byzantine Civil War of 1341 and 1347, Nicholas produced works such as his *Λόγος περὶ τῶν παρανόμως τοῖς ἀρχουσιν ἐπὶ τοῖς ἱεροῖς τολμωμένων*, wherein Nicholas polemically engaged with the Zealots of Thessalonica, and particularly denounced their seizure of ecclesiastical property. Cf. Ihor Ševčenko, ed., 'Nicolas Cabasilas' "Anti-Zealot" Discourse: A Reinterpretation,' *Dumbarton Oaks Papers* 11 (1957): 81-171 (91-125) for this work. See Ševčenko, "'Anti-Zealot" Discourse,' 90-1, for dating. Another example of this contact is exemplified by Kabasilas' literary engagement with Neilos. In particular, Neilos, had explicitly rejected Thomas Aquinas' theology of God *ad intra*, particularly with regards to the Spirit's procession, within a polemical treatise, which Nicholas subsequently completed following his uncle's death. For this work, see *Nilus Cabasilas et theologia S. Thomae. De Processione Spiritus sancti*, ed. by Emmanuel Candal (Rome: Bibliotheca Apostolica Vaticana, 1945). Kabasilas returned to Thessalonica around 1362 upon his father's death, which was followed shortly thereafter by Neilos' death around 1362. Over the following couple of years, Kabasilas principally addressed matters relating to familial property, in addition to engaging with his literary work, as likely exemplified by his metrical work dedicated to his uncle, *Εἰς τὸν τοῦ ἑαυτοῦ Θεοῦ τάφον κυροῦ Νεῖλου τοῦ Θεσσαλονίκης*, in *Codex Parisinus Graecus 1213*, fol. 287^v.

Kabasilas studied rhetoric, philosophy, theology, and law during the late 1330s.⁴⁸ Therein, Kabasilas later formed a part of Emperor Ioannes VI Kantakouzenos' intellectual circle. In addition, Kabasilas resided in the city after vacating the See of Thessalonica between the mid-1360s through to his death during the 1390s.⁴⁹ Within chapter twenty-nine of his *Ἑρμηνεία τῆς Θείας Λειτουργίας (Commentary on the Divine Liturgy)*, Kabasilas described how 'certain Latins' challenged the Byzantine Orthodox by maintaining that, following the dominical words, it was not necessary to further petition for the Eucharistic gifts' hallowing given that the dominical words had perfected their transmutation.⁵⁰ Additionally, Kabasilas claimed that these Latins utilised John Chrysostom's homily, *Εἰς τὴν προδοσίαν τοῦ Ἰούδα (On the Betrayal of Judas)*, the contents and provenance of which will be elaborated in

⁴⁸ An epistle which Gregorios Akindynos composed to Nicholas between 1341 and 1342 lauding Kabasilas' erudition, indicates that Kabasilas must have completed his intra-Constantinopolitan studies by this point. See Angela Constantinides Hero, ed. and trans., *Letters of Gregory Akindynos*. Dumbarton Oaks Texts 7 (Harvard: Harvard University Press, 1983), pp. 60-3.

⁴⁹ Nicholas returned to Constantinople around 1364, where he likely retired from public office and undertook a monastic vocation. This likelihood is detailed within Emperor Manuel II's epistle to Kabasilas, who described the life of virtue Nicholas was undertaking. See Manuel II Palaiologos, *Τῶν Καβάσιλα*, ed. by Émile Legrand in *Lettres de l'empereur Manuel Paléologue* (Amsterdam: Hakkert, 1962), p. 8. Cf. Athanasios Angelopoulos, *Νικόλαος Καβάσιλας Χαμάετος Ἡ ζωὴ καὶ τὸ ἔργον αὐτοῦ* (Thessaloniki: Το Πατριαρχικὸ Ἰδρυμα Πατερικῶν Μελετῶν, 1970), pp. 18-74 (72); Deno Geanakoplos, *Byzantium: Church, Society, and Civilization Seen through Contemporary Eyes* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1984), p. 186, for scholars who support this likelihood. See Boris Bobrinsky, *The Mystery of the Trinity. Trinitarian Experience and Vision in the Biblical and Patristic Tradition*, Anthony P. Gythiel, trans., (Crestwood, N.Y.: St Vladimir's Seminary Press, 1968), pp. 483-8; Marie-Hélène Congourdeau, "Introduction," in Congourdeau, ed. and trans., *Nicolas Cabasilas. La vie en Christ*, Vol. 1: *Livres I-IV. Sources Chrétiennes* 355 (Paris: Éditions du Cerf, 1989), pp. 11-67 (11-6); George T. Dennis, "Prosopography. The Correspondents of Manuel II Palaeologus and Persons Mentioned in His Letters," in Dennis, ed. and trans., *The Letters of Manuel II Palaeologus*. Dumbarton Oaks texts 4 (Harvard: Harvard University Press, 1977), xxvii-lx (xxx-xxiv); J. M. Hussey, *The Orthodox Church in the Byzantine Empire* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1986), p. 360; Raymond-Joseph Loenertz, 'Chronologie de Nicolas Cabasilas 1345-1354,' *Orientalia Christiana Periodica* 21 (1955): 205-31 (205-16); Myrrha Lot-Borodine, *Nicolas Cabasilas. Un maître de la spiritualité byzantine au XIV^e Siècle* (Paris: Éditions de l'Orante, 1958), pp. 1-4; Constantine N. Tsiropalis, 'The Career and Writings of Nicolas Cabasilas,' *Byzantion* 49 (1979): 414-27 (415-21); Walther Völker, *Die Sakramentsmystik des Nikolaus Kabasilas* (Wiesbaden: Steiner, 1977), pp. 1-5, for scholars who have claimed that Kabasilas remained a layman. Cf. Konstantinos Paidas, ed. and trans. (modern Greek), *Ψευδοπροφήτες, μάγοι και αιρετικοί στο Βυζάντιο κατά τον 14^ο αιώνα. Επτά ανέκδοτες ομιλίες του πατριάρχου Κωνσταντινουπόλεως Καλλίστου Α΄*, (Athens: KANAKH, 2011), pp. 158-273 for three anti-Latin homilies produced c. 1357-8, wherein the Ecumenical Patriarch Kallistos I referred to Latin Christian missionary activity within Constantinople as well as the growth of an Hellenophone Latinophile body in the Imperial Capital. Cf. Paidas, *Ψευδοπροφήτες*, pp. 50-7 for commentary on these homilies.

⁵⁰ Paraphrased from Kabasilas, *Sacrae Liturgiae Interpretatio*, c. 29.1, in *Patrologia Graeca*, Vol. 150, cols. 367-492 (428): "Ἐνταῦθα δὲ τινες Λατίνοι τῶν ἡμετέρων ἐπιλαμβάνονται. Φασὶ γὰρ μετὰ τον τοῦ Κυρίου λόγον... πρὸς το ἁγιασθῆναι τα δῶρα, μηδεμιᾶς εὐχῆς ἔτι δεῖσθαι, ὡς ὑπὸ τοῦ Κυριακοῦ λόγου τελούμενα..."

Chapters Three and four, to support this conclusion: Chrysostom was interpreted by these ‘certain Latins’ to have interlinked the dominical words with God’s single eternally-effective creative imperative to ‘Be fruitful and multiply...’ in Genesis 1:28.⁵¹

To counter these Latin claims, Kabasilas evoked the example of marriage to argue that, while this aforementioned divine command functions as the principal cause of human procreation, marriage functions as the mode through which humans synergistically accord with this divine command towards the telos of reproduction.⁵² Likewise, just as the dominical words ‘energise’ Eucharistic transmutation, Kabasilas maintained that the celebrant(s) prayer and invocation to the Spirit are not wholly ‘energising’ *per se*. Rather, they function as the necessary context for ensuring this divine action by allowing the faithful to participate thereat.⁵³ Furthermore, within the subsequent chapter of his *Ἑρμηνεία*, Kabasilas explicitly maintained that this Pneumatic invocation is explicitly directed towards the Eucharistic gifts’ transmutation.⁵⁴ This interpretation, it will be shown, functioned as the principal source for the Eastern Orthodox orators within the debates concerning Eucharistic consecration at Florence, who implicitly utilised Kabasilas’ reasoning to affirm the consecratory nature of the Eucharistic epiclesis.

⁵¹ Paraphrased from Kabasilas, *Sacrae Liturgiae Interpretatio*, c. 29.1, in *Patrologia Graeca*, Vol. 150, col. 428: “Ὅτι δε οὗτος ἐστὶν ὁ λόγος, καὶ τα δῶρα τελειῶν, ὁ μακάριος, φασί, Χρυσόστομος μαρτυρεῖ λέγων ὅτι καθάπερ ὁ δημιουργικὸς λόγος, το «Αὐξάνεσθε καὶ πληθύνεσθε.» [Gen. 1:28], καὶ εἴρηται μὲν ἅπαξ ὑπὸ τοῦ Θεοῦ, ἐνεργεῖται δὲ αἰεὶ οὕτω καὶ λόγος οὗτος ἅπαξ δηθεῖς ὑπὸ τοῦ Σωτήρος, διὰ παντός ἐνεργεῖ...”

⁵² Paraphrased from Kabasilas, *Sacrae Liturgiae Interpretatio*, c. 29.4, in *Patrologia Graeca*, Vol. 150, col. 429: “Ὅσκειν καθάπερ ἐκεῖ πρὸς παιδοποιίαν ἀναγκαῖον ἠγοῦμεθα τὸν γάμον καὶ μετὰ γάμον ὑπὲρ αὐτοῦ τοῦτου πάλιν εὐχόμεθα, καὶ οὐ δοκοῦμεν ἀτιμάζειν τὸν δημιουργικὸν λόγον, εἰδότες αἴτιον αὐτόν τῆς γενέσεως, ἀλλὰ τὸν τρόπον τοῦτον διὰ γάμου, διὰ τροφῆς...”

⁵³ Paraphrased from Kabasilas, *Sacrae Liturgiae Interpretatio*, c. 29.4, in *Patrologia Graeca*, Vol. 150, col. 429: “...καὶ ἐνταῦθα πιστεύομεν αὐτόν εἶναι τὴν ἐνεργοῦντα τὸ μυστήριον, τὸν τοῦ Κυρίου λόγον· ἀλλ’ οὕτω, διὰ ἱερέως, δι’ ἐντεύξεως αὐτοῦ καὶ εὐχῆς.”

⁵⁴ Paraphrased from Kabasilas, *Sacrae Liturgiae Interpretatio*, c. 30.8, in *Patrologia Graeca*, Vol. 150, col. 435: “...αὕτη ἡ εὐχή οὐδὲν ἕτερον ἐστὶ δυναμένη τοῖς δώροις, ἢ τὴν εἰς τὸ Κυριακὸν σῶμα καὶ αἷμα μεταβολὴν.” Christiaan Kappes, *The Epiclesis Debate at the Council of Florence* (Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 2019), pp. 28-9.

As will be elaborated, Mark of Ephesus appropriated Kabasilas' analogisation of childbearing and marriage with Eucharistic transmutation, an analogy which had precedence within both the Hellenophone and Latin theological traditions, whereby Christ's supernatural conception typologised the Eucharistic gifts' supernatural transmutation: According to this analogy, the Virgin's body was substantially transmuted through the Spirit's supernatural intervention into Christ's foetus just as the Eucharistic matter is supernaturally transmuted through a similar Pneumatic operation into Christ's Body and Blood.

One should also highlight that Kabasilas' *Ἑρμηνεία* likely evoked a non-extant Greek edition of the twelfth century Latin theologian, Peter Lombard's *Libri IV Sententiarum*,⁵⁵ for his sole reference to the *Canon Missae*. Within the passage likely cited by Kabasilas, Lombard characterised the *Canon Missae*'s post-dominical petition, the *Supplices te rogamus*, as consecratory and epiclesic.⁵⁶ To put this citation into context, it is probable that an edition of Lombard's *Libri Sententiarum* was accessible within Hellenophone Orthodox environs from the early-to-mid fourteenth century. For example, when negotiating the

⁵⁵ Cf. Philipp W. Rosemann, *The Story of a Great Medieval Book: Peter Lombard's "Sentences"* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2007) for an overview of the *Sententiarum*'s background.

⁵⁶ Kabasilas, *Sacrae Liturgiae Interpretatio*, c. 30.1-2, in *Patrologia Graeca*, Vol. 150, col. 433: "...καὶ ἡ τῶν Λατίνων Ἐκκλησία... μετὰ τὸν τοῦ Κυρίου λόγον εὐχέσθαι ὑπὲρ τῶν δώρων οὐ παραιτοῦνται... Τίς δὲ ἡ εὐχῆς «Κέλευσον ἀνενεχθῆναι τὰ δῶρα ταῦτα ἐν χειρὶ ἀγγέλου εἰς τὸ ὑπερουράνιον σου θυσιαστήριον.» ... (My English translation:)...and the Latin Church... after the Lord's word[s], do not refrain from praying for the [Eucharistic] gifts... And this [their] prayer, 'Command that these gifts be elevated in the hand of the angel to your supercelestial alter.'" Compare Kabasilas' citation to Lombard, *Sententiarum*, IV, dist. 13, c. 1, ed. by the Fathers of the Collegium S. Bonaventurae, Vol. 2, p. 816: *Missa enim dicitur eo quod caelestis nuntius ad consecrandum vivifi cum corpus adveniat, juxta dictum sacerdotis: Omnipotens Deus, jube haec perferri per manus sancti Angeli tui in sublime altare tuum...* (My English translation:) The Mass is so called because the celestial messenger arrives to consecrate the living body, just as the priest states, 'Almighty God, command that these offerings be brought to your sublime altar by the hands of your holy angel.' The Byzantine conciliar contingent invoked this passage almost word-for-word before Pope Eugenius at Florence. See *Acta Graeca*, Gill, ed., p. 441: "Κέλευσον **προσ**ενεχθῆναι τὰ δῶρα ταῦτα ἐν χειρὶ ἁγίου ἀγγέλου εἰς τὸ ὑπερουράνιον σου θυσιαστήριον." Cf. Demetrios Kydones, "Erste Abteilung: Texte und Uebersetzungen: 'Liturgia S. Gregorii Magni,' eine grieschische Uebersetzung der römischen Messe," ed. by Anton Baumstark in Baumstark, ed., *Oriens Christianus (1901-1941): Essays on Eastern Christianity* (Piscataway: Gorgias Press, 1904), pp. 1-27 (20-1): "πρόσταξον **ἀπ**ενεχθῆναι ταῦτα διὰ χειρὸς ἀγγέλου ἁγίου σου εἰς τὸ ἐπουράνιον σου θυσιαστήριον."

terms for Latin-Byzantine ecclesial reunion with a Papal delegation comprised of Richard of England and Francesco da Camerino between 1333 and 1334, Barlaam the Calabrian likely evoked *Liber I* for his citation Augustine's *De Trinitate* within his apologetical treatise, the *Σύνταγμα*, for the purpose of countering the doctrine of the Spirit's dual procession *ad intra*. Within his citation, Barlaam's terminology notably diverged from that of Maximos Planoudes' Greek translation of *De Trinitate* produced c. 1280, indicating that Barlaam likely did not made recourse to Planoudes' translation in this context.⁵⁷

As Konstantinos Palaiologos exemplified, within his *Ἐλεγχος ὧδε τῆς πλάνης τῶν Λατίνων* (*Treatise on the Error of the Latins*), the Thessalonian author and subsequent

⁵⁷ Barlaam the Calabrian, *Σύνταγμα*, 45, ed. by Antonis Fyrigos in *Barlaam Calabro opere contro i latini*. Studi et Testi 348 (Vatican City: Bibliotheca Apostolica Vaticana, 1998), p. 664: “Καὶ ὁ ἅγιος δὲ Αὐγουστίνος, ἐν βίβλῳ πεντεκαίδεκάτῃ *Περὶ τῆς Ἁγίας Τριάδος* οὐχ ἅπαξ, ἀλλὰ πολλάκις τὸ Πνεῦμα τὸ Ἅγιον κυρίως καὶ ἰδίως φησὶν ἐκ τοῦ Πατρὸς ἐκπορεύεσθαι... (My English translation:) And also the holy Augustine, in Book Fifteen of [his] *Concerning the Holy Trinity* does not simply say once, but many times, that the Holy Spirit principally and uniquely proceeds from the Father.” Taking into consideration Barlaam's use of the terms *κυρίως καὶ ἰδίως* or ‘principally and uniquely’ to render the Latin *principaliter* derived from the reformulation of Lombard's excerpt from this same passage as rendered into Greek. Thus, compare Barlaam's excerpt to Peter Lombard, *Sententiarum*, I, dist. 12, c. 2, Fathers of the Collegium S. Bonaventurae, eds., Vol. 1, pp. 81-2: “Augustinus tamen in XV libro De Trinitate dicit quod **Spiritus Sanctus principaliter procedit de Patre**... «...et de quo **procedit principaliter Spiritus Sanctus, nisi Deus Pater**». Ecce audisti quia Spiritus Sanctus principaliter procedit a Patre... (My English translation:) However, in Book Fifteen of *De Trinitate*, Augustine stated that the Holy Spirit proceeds principally from the father... «...and from whom would the Holy Spirit principally proceed, if not God the Father.» Behold, you have heard that the Spirit proceeds principally from the Father.” Moreover, contrast Barlaam's excerpt from *De Trinitate* with Maximos Planoudes' translation, which was plausibly accessible to Barlaam, and which conversely stated: “ἐξ οὗ ἐγεννήθει ὁ λόγος καὶ ἐξ οὗ ἐκπορεύεται **ἀρχοειδῶς** τὸ Πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον εἰ μὴ ὁ Θεὸς Πατὴρ... Ὁ Πατὴρ γὰρ μόνος οὐκ ἔστιν ἐξ ἑτέρου καὶ διὰ τοῦτο μόνος **ἀγέννητος** προσηγόρευται... (My English translation: From whom is the Word begotten and from whom does the Spirit principally proceed if not God the Father... For the Father alone is not from another and because of this, [He] alone is proclaimed to be unbegotten...” Quoted from Manuel Papathomopoulos, Isabella Tsavari & Gianpaolo Rigotti, eds., *Αὐγουστίνου, Περὶ Τριάδος βιβλία πεντεκαίδεκα, ἅπερ ἐκ τῆς Λατίνων διαλέκτου εἰς τὴν Ἑλλάδα μετήνεγκε Μάξιμος ὁ Πλανούδης*, 17.29, Vol. 2 of 2 (Athens: Ακαδημία Αθηνῶν, 1995), pp. 933, lines 59-64; 981, lines 113-9. Cf. Antonis Fyrigos, ‘Quando Barlaam Calabro conobbe il Concilio di Lione II (1274)?’, *Rivista di studi bizantini e neoellenici* 17-19 (1980-82): 247-65 (253-4, n. 23). See also Gianpaolo Rigotti, ‘Massimo Planude traduttore del *De Trinitate* di S. Agostino,’ in Claudio Moreschini & Giovanni Menestrina, eds., *La traduzione dei testi religiosi* (Brescia: Morcelliana, 1994), pp. 185-96; Wolfgang O. Schmitt, ‘Lateinische Literatur in Byzanz: Die Übersetzungen des Maximos Planudes und die moderne Forschung,’ *Jahrbuch der österreichischen byzantinischen Gesellschaft* 17 (1968): 127-47. For treatments of Barlaam's debates with these papal delegates, see Tia M. Kolbaba, ‘Three Treatises on Papal Primacy: Introduction, Edition, and Translation,’ *Revue des études byzantines* 53 (1995): 41-115 (50-2); Robert E. Sinkewicz, ‘A New Interpretation for the First Episode in the Controversy between Barlaam the Calabrian and Gregory Palamas,’ *Journal of Theological Studies* 31(2) (1980): 489-500 (490, 492-4). Cf. Raymond Joseph Loenertz, *La Société des Frères Peregrinants. Étude sur l'Orient Dominicain*, Vol. 1 (Rome: Institutum historicum FF. praedicatorum, 1937), pp. 125-30, for these two Dominicans' missions within the Near East more broadly.

Athonite monastic,⁵⁸ Matthaios Blastares, also upheld that the Spirit proceeds solely from the Father *ad intra* and likely did so by making recourse to similar citations from Augustine's *De Trinitate* within Lombard's *Sententiarum*.⁵⁹

Another Hellenophone theologian who likely evoked this non-extant edition of Lombard's *Sententiarum* within a Sacramentological context was the late fourteenth and early-fifteenth century Constantinopolitan monastic, Symeon who, from c. 1416 to 1417 through to his death in 1429, governed as the Archbishop of Thessalonica.⁶⁰ Pertinently,

⁵⁸ Pantelis Paschos, *Ὁ Ματθαῖος Βλάσταρης καὶ τὸ ὑμνογραφικὸν ἔργον του* (Thessaloniki: Ἴδρυμα Μελετῶν Χερσονήσου του Αἵμου, 1978), pp. 61-76.

⁵⁹ Konstantinos Palaiologos, 'The Use of Latin Theological Sources in Matthaios Blastares' *Treatise on the Error of the Latins*,' *Nicolaus* 40 (2013): 49-70 (60-2). Cf. Franz Tinnefeld, 'Intellectuals in Late Byzantine Thessalonike,' *Dumbarton Oak Papers* 57 (2003): 153-72 (156, 162, 171); for an analysis of the intellectual and literary milieu within which Kabasilas and Blastares operated in Thessalonica.

⁶⁰ Symeon's comments concerning Baptism and extreme unction indicate his encounter with the *Sententiarum*. For example, many contemporaneous Byzantine lists of Latin errors obfuscated the unique Latin praxis of a non-Sacramental post-Baptismal anointment with the *σφραγίς* (seal) of Confirmation on the infant. See esp. Kolbaba, *Byzantine Lists*, p. 204. Nonetheless, Symeon's assertion that chrismation must accompany Baptism suggests that he was aware of and sought to add correctives to this reference to how Latin Rite priests could in rare instances administer chrism within the *Libri Sententiarum*. See Symeon of Thessalonica, *De Sacramentis*, 43, in *Patrologia Graeca*, Vol. 155 (Paris: Typis J.-P. Migne, 1866), cols. 173-238 (188a-c): "Ἡ γὰρ ἐπίθεσις τῶν χειρῶν τὸ μύρον παρεῖχεν, ὡς καὶ ἐν τοῖς ἀποστόλοις ἐγένετο, καὶ δι' αὐτῶν πολλοῖς ἄλλοις... Καὶ ὀνάγκη τούτῳ σφραγίζεσθαι πάντα πιστὸν τῷ βαπτίσματι, ἵνα καὶ το θεϊότατον βάπτισμα πας βαπτισθεὶς τέλειον ἔχη ἐν ἑαυτῷ. Εἰ γὰρ ὁ Σωτὴρ τὸ Πνεῦμα ἐδέξατο βαπτιζόμενος, καὶ οἱ βαπτισθέντες παρὰ Φιλίππου τὸ Πνεῦμα ἐλάμβανον τῇ ἐπιθέσει τῶν χειρῶν Πέτρου καὶ Ἰωάννου, ἵνα μὴ ἀτελεῖς ᾧσι καὶ ἀσφράγιστοι τῷ Πνεύματι, καὶ οἱ βαπτιζόμενοι, καὶ μὴ (ὡς τὰ των Λατίνων, ἢ τινῶν ἄλλων βρέφη) ἀτελεῖς μένωσι καὶ ἀσφράγεστοι... (My English translation:) the laying on of the hands required myron, as was also done in the [age of the] apostles and unto many others through them... And the faithful must always be sealed [with] this [myron] in baptism, in order that each baptizand might have [this] most holy baptism perfect in and of itself. For by baptism the Saviour received the Spirit, and those whom Philip baptized received the Spirit through Peter's and John's [laying on of] hands [with myron] in order that they might not be imperfect and unsealed by the Spirit, and that the [others who are] baptized might also not be imperfect and unsealed (as are the Latins or some other infants)... Compare Symeon's passage to Lombard, *Sententiarum* IV, dist. 7, cc. 2-3, in *Fathers of the Collegium S. Bonaventurae*, eds., *Libri IV Sententiarum*, Vol. 2, pp. 785-6: "...Sacramentum ab aliis perfici non potest nisi a summis sacerdotibus, nec tempore Apostolorum ab aliis quam ab ipsis Apostolis legitur peractum fuisse [Acts 8:17], nec ab aliis quam qui locum eorum tenant, perfici potest aut debet... Licet autem presbyteris baptizatos tangere in pectore, sed non chrismate signare in fronte... Gregorius tamen Ianuario episcopo ita scribit: «Pervenit ad nos quosdam scandalizatos fuisse, quod presbyteros chrismate tangere eos qui baptizati sunt... Sed si de hac re omnino aliqui contristantur, ubi episcopi desunt, ut presbyteri etiam in frontibus baptizatos chrismate tangere debeant...» (My English translation:)...the Sacrament cannot be performed by others except by the highest priests, nor in the time of the Apostles [cf. Acts 8:17] is it read that it was performed by anyone other than the Apostles themselves, nor can it nor should it be [performed by] any other than those who take their place... It is licit for priests to touch the baptized on the breast, but not to sign [them] with chrism on the forehead... However, [Pope] Gregory I wrote to Januarius, Bishop [of Cagliari] thus: "It has come to our attention that some have been scandalised because priests should touch those who have been baptized with chrism... But if some people are at all saddened by this matter, where there are no

within his *Ἐρμηνεία περὶ τε τοῦ Θειοῦ Ναοῦ* (*Exposition on the Divine Temple*), Symeon accorded with Kabasilas by arguing that particular formulae such as the dominical words are not inherently sufficient for the Eucharist's perfection. For Symeon, because Sacramental consecration is effectuated through the Spirit's grace, as Christ imparted to His Apostles and their ordained successors, the celebrant must petition the epiclesis and perform a manual blessing over the Eucharistic gifts to guarantee this Pneumatic operation.⁶¹ Scholars such as Michael Zheltov have argued that Symeon's doctrine concerning the epiclesis' consecratory necessity was limited insofar as Symeon did not elucidate why the Spirit necessarily operates when the priest petitioned the epiclesis rather than through reciting the dominical words. Likewise, Zheltov pinpointed that Symeon did not sufficiently explicate the particular consecratory significance of the priest's manual blessing of the Eucharistic gifts.⁶² However, it is likely that Symeon conceived the priest, the various prayers of the Eucharistic anaphora, and the concomitant physical actions of the celebrant, to function as non-causal *sine quibus non* which, in virtue of their dominical and Apostolic institution, can guarantee God's intra-Sacramental activity.

Neither Kabasilas' nor Symeon's work evidently engendered any negative responses on the Latin contingent's part within the pre-conciliar Latin-Byzantine dialogue held in Rome during the winter of 1429 and 1430.⁶³ Indeed, therein, one of the principal Byzantine

bishops, the priests should also touch the baptized with chrism on their foreheads..." Cf. Gregory I, *Epistola XXVI, ad Januariam Episcopum*, in *Patrologia Latina*, Vol. 77 (Paris: Typis J.-P. Migne, 1862), cols. 694-6 (695). Cf. 'A New Narrative for the Reception of Seven Sacraments into Orthodoxy: Peter Lombard's Sentences in Nicholas Cabasilas and Symeon of Thessalonica and the Holy Synaxis's Utilization of John Duns Scotus,' *Nova et Vetera* 15(2) (2017): 465-501 (485-7).

⁶¹ Symeon of Thessalonica, *Expositio de divino templo et de sacerdotibus ac diaconis episcopisque, ac de sacris stolis quibus horum quilibet induitur; necnon de divina missa, ubi singulorum quæ in illa divino ritu peraguntur, ratio redditur. Transmissa viris piis Cretensibus*, 88, in *Patrologia Graeca*, Vol. 155 (Paris: Typis J.-P. Migne, 1866), cols. 697-750 (736-7).

⁶² See Zheltov, "The Moment of Eucharistic Consecration in Byzantine Thought," p. 279.

⁶³ See Syropoulos, *Les Mémoires*, 2.15, Laurent, ed., p. 12; Gill, *Council of Florence*, p. 42.

representatives, Makarios Makres, upheld that Eucharistic transmutation is perfected by the Spirit's operation at the epiclesis:⁶⁴ According to Makres' *Bíos*, composed by an anonymous author closely affiliated with Makres shortly following Makres' passing on January 7th, 1431,⁶⁵ Makres' Latin interlocutors inquired into the significance of the Byzantine Rite's elevation of the Eucharistic gifts at the post-epicletic τὰ ἅγια τοῖς ἁγίοις.⁶⁶ The Latin representatives' preoccupation with the Byzantine Church's liturgical praxis between the epiclesis at this elevation likely derived from the fact that the rubrics of many fifteenth-century Latin liturgical rites presumed that Eucharistic transubstantiation immediately preceded the first moment of their elevation and adoration, demarcated by the recitation of the dominical words. Thus, after participating in the Byzantine Divine Liturgy, these Latin representatives likely did not understand why, following the dominical words, the Byzantine Rite did not prescribe these elements' elevation.⁶⁷ In response, Makarios postulated that

⁶⁴ Pertinently, Makres received both coeval and posthumous detraction from some of his compatriots given his receptive stance towards ecclesial reunion as well as his alleged willingness for the council to take place within the Italian Peninsula rather than Constantinople. The fifteenth century Byzantine chronicler, George Sphrantzes detailed that, on this basis, the Ecumenical Patriarch Joseph II perceived Makres to be a heretic, an accusation which Sphrantzes unambiguously rejected. See Sphrantzes, *Chronicon Minus*, in Vasile Grecu, ed., *Georgios Sphrantzes Memorii 1401-77 in anexa Pseudo-Phrantzes: Macarie Melissenos Cronica 1258-1481* (Bucharest: Ed. Academiei Republicii Socialiste Romania, 1966), p. 50. As Syropoulos, *Les Mémoires*, 5.12, Laurent, ed., p. 266 claimed, Makres made a significant impression upon his Roman counterparts for his capacity to defend and elucidate Byzantine Orthodox doctrine during the pre-conciliar negotiations.

⁶⁵ Sphrantzes, *Chronicon Minus*, Grecu, ed., p. 70.

⁶⁶ *Bíos kai politeía tou 'Osiou patros hmwon Makariou tou to epiklin Makri hghoumenou chrematísantos en tñ sebasimotátē monē tou Pantokrátoros*, in Asterios Argyriou, ed., *Macaire Makrès et la polémique contre l'Islam: édition princeps de l'Éloge de Macaire Makrès et de ses deux oeuvres anti-islamiques, précédée d'une étude critique* (Vatican City: Bibliotheca Apostolica Vaticana, 1986), pp. 185-236 (220): "[Latin objection]: «Τί δήποτε φάσκοντες τῶν προοιχομένων εἶκενα τὰς μερίδας οἱ καθ' ὑμᾶς ἱερεῖς αἴροντες;» (My English translation:) In light of your predecessors, what do you priests altogether believe when you elevate the [Eucharistic] particles?"

⁶⁷ See F. E. Brightman, ed., *Liturgies Eastern and Western*, Vol. 1: *The Eastern Liturgies* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1896), pp. 341 for the rubrics for elevation within the ninth century editions of the *Liturgies of St Basil* and *St John Chrysostom*. See Miguel Arranz, 'Le 'sancta sanctis' dans la tradition liturgique des églises,' *Archiv für Liturgiewissenschaft* 15 (1973): 31-67; Robert F. Taft, *A History of the Liturgy of St. John Chrysostom*, Vol. 5: *The Pre-Communion Rites* (Rome: Pontificio Istituto Orientale Studiorum, 2000), pp. 231-40, for the history of the elevation within the Byzantine Rite. See also Zheltov, "The Moment of Eucharistic Consecration in Byzantine Thought," pp. 293-301 for an analysis of the interpretative history of the elevation's consecratory role within the Byzantine Rite.

the elevation occurs at this moment given that the epiclesis functions as the stage in the Eucharistic Prayer whereby the Eucharistic gifts are hallowed through prompting the Spirit's descent and perfective operation thereupon.⁶⁸

As will be shown within the following chapters, the principles and arguments put forward by both Kabasilas and Makres concerning the nature and moment(s) of Eucharistic consecration foreshadowed the nature of the arguments put forward by the Byzantine Fathers at the Florentine discussions. Nonetheless, the strict time constraints allotted for the research and formal discussion of this topic prevented both the Byzantine and Latin Fathers from exacerbating this controversy, and instead saw the need to arrive at an expedient solution to this problem to effectuate ecclesial reunion.⁶⁹

On this score, given that many scholars who have analysed the Latin-Byzantine debates at the Council of Ferrara-Florence, as well as those scholars who have examined the historical doctrinal divergences between the Latin and Eastern Orthodox Churches, have overlooked the significance of Mark's engagement within the dispute over the nature and moment(s) of Eucharistic consecration, this dissertation aims to fill this scholarly gap by exemplifying how Mark offered a highly lucid and coherent explication of the *de facto* Byzantine Imperial doctrine of Eucharistic consecration which could be employed by both Roman Catholic and Eastern Orthodox ecumenists today to establish some form of doctrinal consensus on this doctrine.

⁶⁸ Paraphrased from *Bíos*, Argyriou, ed., in *Macaire Makrès et la polémique contre l'Islam*, p. 220: "...ἀγιάζεται ταῦτα ὑπό τε τοῦ ἱερέως ἐν τῇ ἐπικλήσει... Ὁ μὲν οὖν ἱερεὺς ποιεῖται τὴν ἐπικλήσιν τοῦ Ἁγίου Πνεύματος ἐπὶ τὰ προκείμενα δῶρα, ἡ δὲ χάρις κάτεισιν ἄνωθεν τελεσιουργοῦσα ταῦτα... (My English translation:) [the Eucharistic gifts] are consecrated by the priest in the epiclesis... The priest petitions the epiclesis of the Holy Spirit over the gifts in question, and the grace of the Holy Spirit perfects their consecration..." See Kappes, *Epiclesis Debate*, p. 30.

⁶⁹ Given that the conciliar discussions of this topic began on June 10th and formally concluded on June 27th, merely eighteen days were allotted for this topic overall. Cf. Éphrem Boularand, 'L'Épiclèse au Concile de Florence,' *Bulletin de littérature ecclésiastique* 60 (1959): 244-53.

1.2. An Analysis of the Pre-Conciliar Developments of the Nature and Moment(s) of Eucharistic Consecration within Roman Catholicism.

This section will focus upon the pre-Florentine developments within the Latin Church vis-à-vis the nature and moment(s) of Eucharistic consecration for the purpose of framing the Florentine debate. One must begin by emphasizing that the nature and moment(s) of Eucharistic consecration remained a disputed question within high and late Medieval Latin Christian theology and must be located in the broader intra-Latin debates concerning Sacramental causality.

While twelfth-century Latin theologians such as Lombard could plausibly be interpreted to have conceived the *Supplices te rogamus* to be a consecratory epiclesis, two key factors forestalled the proliferation of this intra-Latin tradition, particularly from the early thirteenth century: Against the background of the publication of Latin translations of the *Corpus Aristotelicum* and early and high medieval Arabic and Jewish philosophical and theological literature during the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, a number of medieval Latin theologians increasingly began to assess Sacramental causality according to the causal principles elucidated within these translations.⁷⁰ Thus, many Latin Christian theologians from the thirteenth century onwards interpreted the Fourth Lateran Council's definition of Eucharistic transubstantiation according to the Aristotelian axiom whereby the Eucharistic elements underwent a change in substantial form.⁷¹ Such theologians sought to identify the particular single form, instituted by Christ at the Last Supper, which transubstantiated the

⁷⁰ Cf. Robert Pasnau, "The Latin Aristotle," in Christopher Shields, ed., *The Oxford Handbook of Aristotle* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012), pp. 665-89, esp. 666-9 for an overview of these translations.

⁷¹ See esp. Aristotle, *Physics*, Vol. 1: Books 1-4. Book 2, c. 3, ed. and trans. by P. H. Wicksteed and F. M. Cornford (Cambridge, M.A.: Harvard University Press, 1957), pp. 128-9; *Metaphysics*, Vol. 1: Books 1-9. Book 8, c. 6, ed. and trans. by Hugh Tredennick (Cambridge, M.A.: Harvard University Press, 1933), pp. 422-4.

Eucharistic matter, in line with the Aristotelian principle that the substantial form which gives each physical item its specific character.⁷²

One example of this development can be found in the *Summa fratris Alexandri*. This work compiled and edited several texts attributed to the Franciscan Alexander of Hales following the latter's death under the direction of the Franciscan theologians affiliated with the University of Paris, Odo Rigaldus and Jean de la Rochelle.⁷³ The *Summa* explicitly maintained that only the dominical words were transmutative, rejecting any preceding hypotheses that Christ could have transmuted the Eucharistic gifts with an unknown blessing during the Last Supper given that Christ would not have deceived His Church over the nature of this profound mystery.⁷⁴

Pertinent to Torquemada's subsequent engagement in the Florentine debate concerning Eucharistic consecration on behalf of the Latin Church were the contributions of the thirteenth century Dominican scholar, Thomas Aquinas, to the late medieval Latin discussions concerning Sacramental causality. Throughout his literary oeuvres, Aquinas upheld a notion of instrumental Sacramental causality whereby each item within a causal chain, qua agent, possesses powers oriented to certain intentions, such as to consecrate a

⁷² See esp. Aristotle, *Categories V*, in *Categories. On Interpretation. Prior Analytics*, ed. and trans. by H. P. Cooke and Hugh Tredennick (Cambridge, M.A.: Harvard University Press, 1938), pp. 19-20.

Cf. e.g., William of Auxerre, *De Sacramento Eucharistiae*, c. 4, in *Gulielmus de Alvernia. Opera Omnia* (Venice: Ex Officina Damiani Zenari, 1591), fols. 410-30 (421-7), for one of the first Latin Christian authors to employ hylomorphic terminology within the context of Sacramental theology during the thirteenth century. Cf. M. Gierens, *De Causalitate sacramentorum, seu De Modo explicandi efficientiam sacramentorum novae legis* (Rome: Pontifical Gregorian University, 1935), pp. 27-9.

⁷³ See Sophie Delmas, "Alexandre de Halès et le studium franciscain de Paris: Aux origines de la question des chaires franciscaines et de l'exercice quodlibétique," in Andreas Sohn and Jacques Verger, eds., *Die reulierten Kollegien im Europa des Mittelalters und der Renaissance: Les colleges réguliers en Europe au Moyen Âge et à la Renaissance* (Bochum: D. Winkler, 2012), pp. 17-47; Delmas, "Odo Rigaldi, Alexander of Hales and the *Summa Halensis*," in Lydia Schumacher, ed., *The Summa Halensis* (Berlin: De Gruyter, 2020), pp. 267-83.

⁷⁴ See Alexander of Hales, *Alexandri Alensis Angli Summae Theologiae: Pars Quarta*, q. 10, m. 4, a. 2; q. 10, m. 5, a. 1, in Vol. 4 of 4 (Cologne: Sumptibus Ioannis Gymnici, sub Monoerote, 1622), pp. 247-52; 261-66.

Sacrament, through which such intentions are effectuated.⁷⁵ Aquinas also drew a twofold distinction of efficient causes into principal and instrumental agents, with the former acting as the first mover and the latter acting as the mover which is moved by the former:

Sacramentologically, instrumental causes are thereby given causal powers by God Who, as the principal agent, moves these causes and allows them to participate in producing the Sacrament's effect.⁷⁶ For Aquinas, a finite corporeal creature such as the celebrant of a

⁷⁵ See, e.g., Aquinas, *Summa Theologiae* III, q. 64, a. 8, co., in *Sancti Thomae de Aquino Opera omnia iussu Leonis XIII P. M. edita* (abbr. to *Editio Leonina*), Vol. 12, pp. 51-2: "Respondeo dicendum quod, quando aliquid se habet ad multa, oportet quod per aliquid determinetur ad unum, si illud effici debeat. Ea vero quae in sacramentis aguntur, possunt diversimode agi, sicut ablutio aquae, quae fit in Baptismo, potest ordinari et ad munditiam corporalem, et ad sanitatem corporalem, et ad ludum et ad multa alia huiusmodi. Et ideo oportet quod determinetur ad unum, idest ad sacramentalem effectum, per intentionem abluentis. Et haec intentio exprimitur per verba quae in sacramentis dicuntur, puta cum dicit, ego te baptizo in nomine patris, et cetera/answer that, when a thing is indifferent to many uses, it must needs be determined to one, if that one has to be effected. Now those things which are done in the sacraments, can be done with various intent; for instance, washing with water, which is done in baptism, may be ordained to bodily cleanliness, to the health of the body, to amusement, and many other similar things. Consequently, it needs to be determined to one purpose, i.e., the sacramental effect, by the intention of him who washes. And this intention is expressed by the words which are pronounced in the sacraments; for instance, the words, "I baptize thee in the name of the Father," etc." All English translations of the *Summa Theologiae* from *The Summa Theologiae*, trans. by the English Dominican Fathers (New York: Benzinger Bros., 1947), <<https://isidore.co/aquinas/summa/>> [accessed August 1st, 2023] unless stated otherwise.

⁷⁶ Aquinas, *Summa Theologiae*, III, q. 62, a. 1, co., in *Opera Omnia*, Vol. 12. *Editio Leonina*, pp. 19-20: "Et ideo aliter dicendum, quod duplex est causa agens, principalis et instrumentalis. Principalis quidem operatur per virtutem suae formae, cui assimilatur effectus, sicut ignis suo calore calefacit. Et hoc modo non potest causare gratiam nisi Deus, quia gratia nihil est aliud quam quaedam participata similitudo divinae naturae, secundum illud II Pet. I, *magna nobis et pretiosa promissa donavit, ut divinae simus consortes naturae*. Causa vero instrumentalis non agit per virtutem suae formae, sed solum per motum quo movetur a principali agente. Unde effectus non assimilatur instrumento, sed principali agenti, sicut lectus non assimilatur securi, sed arti quae est in mente artificis. Et hoc modo sacramenta novae legis gratiam causant, adhibentur enim ex divina ordinatione ad gratiam in eis causandam. Unde Augustinus dicit, XIX contra Faust., haec omnia, scilicet sacramentalia, fiunt et transeunt, virtus tamen, scilicet Dei, quae per ista operatur, iugiter manet. Hoc autem proprie dicitur instrumentum, per quod aliquis operatur. Unde et Tit. III dicitur, *salvos nos fecit per lavacrum regenerationis*/We must therefore say otherwise, that an efficient cause is twofold, principal and instrumental. The principal cause works by the power of its form, to which form the effect is likened; just as fire by its own heat makes something hot. In this way none but God can cause grace: since grace is nothing else than a participated likeness of the Divine Nature, according to 2 Pet. 1:4: "He hath given us most great and precious promises; that we may be partakers of the Divine Nature." But the instrumental cause works not by the power of its form, but only by the motion whereby it is moved by the principal agent: so that the effect is not likened to the instrument but to the principal agent: for instance, the couch is not like the axe, but like the art which is in the craftsman's mind. And it is thus that the sacraments of the New Law cause grace: for they are instituted by God to be employed for the purpose of conferring grace. Hence Augustine says (*Contra Faust.* XIX): "All these things," viz. pertaining to the sacraments, "are done and pass away, but the power," viz. of God, "which works by them, remains ever." Now that is, properly speaking, an instrument by which someone works: wherefore it is written (Tit. 3:5): "He saved us by the laver of regeneration"; *Summa Theologiae*, III, q. 62, a. 4, ad. 4, in *Opera Omnia*, Vol. 12. *Editio Leonina*, p. 25: "...sicut eadem vis principalis agentis instrumentaliter

Sacrament could be given the causal power to produce a supernatural effect, such as Sacramental consecration: While such a power perfectly inheres in God, as the principal agent, the celebrant, as an instrumental cause, could imperfectly possess this power proportionate to this instrument's nature, namely, insofar as God operates within a particular celebrant through the infusion of the active and indelible character of the priesthood into his soul, to confect the Sacrament through pronouncing Christ's words, the Sacramental forms.⁷⁷ To summarise, the celebrant functions in *persona Christi*, being

invenitur in omnibus instrumentis ordinatis ad effectum, prout sunt quodam ordine unum; ita etiam eadem vis sacramentalis invenitur in verbis et rebus, prout ex verbis et rebus perficitur unum sacramentum/Just as the one same power of the principal agent is instrumentally in all the instruments that are ordained unto the production of an effect, forasmuch as they are one as being so ordained: so also the one same sacramental power is in both words and things, forasmuch as words and things combine to form one sacrament.”; *Scriptum Super Sententiis*, IV, d. 1, q. 1, a. 4, qa. 1, resp., rev., ed. and trans. by the Aquinas Institute, <<https://aquinas.cc/la/en/~Sent.IV.D1.Q1.A4.qa1>> [accessed August 1st, 2023]: “...causa efficiens dupliciter potest dividi. Uno modo ex parte effectus; scilicet in disponentem, quae causat dispositionem ad formam ultimam; et perficientem, quae inducit ultimam perfectionem... actio instrumenti quandoque pertingit ad ultimam perfectionem, quam principale agens inducit aliquando autem non; semper tamen pertingit ad aliquid ultra id quod competit sibi secundum suam naturam, sive illud sit ultima forma, sive dispositio, alias non ageret ut instrumentum/...an efficient cause can be divided in two ways. In one way, on the part of the effect, that is, in the disposing cause, which causes a disposition to the final form; and in a perfecting cause, which introduces the final perfection... the action of an instrument sometimes attains to the final perfection that the principal agent intends, and sometimes it does not. Nevertheless, it always attains to something beyond what it is capable of according to its own nature, whether that be the final form, or a disposition; otherwise it would not work as an instrument.”; *Summa Contra Gentiles*, IV, c. 56, 7, in *Opera Omnia*, Vol. 15. *Editio Leonina*, p. 189: “Nec est inconveniens quod per res visibiles et corporales spiritualis salus ministretur: quia huiusmodi visibilia sunt quasi quaedam instrumenta Dei incarnati et passi; instrumentum autem non operatur ex virtute suae naturae, sed ex virtute principalis agentis, a quo applicatur ad operandum. Sic igitur et huiusmodi res visibiles salutem spiritualem operantur, non ex proprietate suae naturae, sed ex institutione ipsius Christi, ex qua virtutem instrumentalem consequuntur/Nor is it unreasonable that spiritual well-being be dispensed by means of visible and corporeal things; since these visible elements are, as it were, instruments of God's Incarnation and Passion. Now an instrument is effective not by virtue of its nature, but by virtue of the principal agent, by whom it is applied to act. So too these visible elements effect spiritual well-being, not by any property of their nature, but by Christ's institution, from which they derive their instrumental efficacy.” English trans. by the English Dominican Fathers in *The Summa contra gentiles of Saint Thomas Aquinas, The Fourth Book* (New York: Benzinger, 1929), p. 219.

⁷⁷ See Aquinas, *Summa Theologiae* III, q. 62, a. 4, ad. 1, in *Opera Omnia*, Vol. 12. *Editio Leonina*, p. 25: “Ad primum ergo dicendum quod virtus spiritualis non potest esse in re corporea per modum virtutis permanentis et completae, sicut ratio probat. Nihil tamen prohibet in corpore esse virtutem spiritualem instrumentalem, in quantum scilicet corpus potest moveri ab aliqua substantia spirituali ad aliquem effectum spiritualem inducendum; sicut etiam in ipsa voce sensibili est quaedam vis spiritualis ad excitandum intellectum hominis, in quantum procedit a conceptione mentis. Et hoc modo vis spiritualis est in sacramentis, in quantum ordinantur a Deo ad effectum spiritualem/A spiritual power cannot be in a corporeal subject, after the manner of a permanent and complete power, as the argument proves. But there is nothing to hinder an instrumental spiritual power from being in a body; in so far as a body can be moved by a particular spiritual substance so as to produce a particular spiritual effect; thus in the very voice which is perceived by the senses there is a certain

delegated as Christ's representative for the purpose of celebrating the divinely-instituted order of Sacraments through his sacerdotal ordination.

Given the increasing recourse to Aristotelian hylomorphism to explicate Sacramental causality within thirteenth century Latin Christian theology discussed above, Aquinas also put forward a doctrine of Sacramental causality whereby the Sacramental matter is informed by *one* substantial form into the Sacramental 'substance':⁷⁸ Vis-à-vis the Eucharist, the dominical words' recitation inform the Eucharistic gifts into the substance of Christ's

spiritual power, inasmuch as it proceeds from a mental concept, of arousing the mind of the hearer. It is in this way that a spiritual power is in the sacraments, inasmuch as they are ordained by God unto the production of a spiritual effect."; *Summa Theologiae* III, q. 78, a. 1, co.: "Secundo, quia formae aliorum sacramentorum proferuntur ex persona ministri, sive per modum exercentis actum, sicut cum dicitur, ego te baptizo, vel, ego te confirmo; sive per modum imperantis, sicut in sacramento ordinis dicitur, accipe potestatem, etc.; sive per modum deprecantis, sicut cum in sacramento extremae unctionis dicitur, per istam unctionem et nostram intercessionem, et cetera. Sed forma huius sacramenti profertur ex persona ipsius Christi loquentis, ut detur intelligi quod minister in perfectione huius sacramenti nihil agit nisi quod profert verba Christi/Secondly, because the forms of the other sacraments are pronounced in the person of the minister, whether by way of exercising an act, as when it is said, "I baptize thee," or "I confirm thee," etc.; or by way of command, as when it is said in the sacrament of order, "Take the power," etc.; or by way of entreaty, as when in the sacrament of Extreme Unction it is said, "By this anointing and our intercession," etc. But the form of this sacrament is pronounced as if Christ were speaking in person, so that it is given to be understood that the minister does nothing in perfecting this sacrament, except to pronounce the words of Christ."

⁷⁸ See, e.g., Aquinas, *Summa Theologiae* I. q. 76, aa. 3-4, in *Opera Omnia*, Vol. 12. *Editio Leonina*, pp. 182-5, within which Aquinas posited that one must uphold that an item can only possess one substantial form at a time to explicate its unity; otherwise, one would be unable to distinguish a unity which is substantial and one which is simply accidental. As will be detailed, Aquinas' doctrine of hylomorphism was conceived to result in heterodoxy. For example, based upon this doctrine, within his quodlibetal questions of Easter 1270, Aquinas upheld the doctrine that, during the Triduum, Christ's corpse could only be equivocally denoted as a human body. See *Quodlibet*, III, q. 2, a. 2, co. Thus, if the deceased body, being uninformed by the rational soul, does not retain its identity, then Christ's Body during the Triduum could not be the body He possessed prior to His Crucifixion. Nonetheless, Aquinas rejected this position within his quodlibetal questions of Easter 1271 by positing that Christ' corpse during the Triduum was numerically identical with His living body. See Aquinas, *Quodlibet* IV, q. 5, co. Cf. Jean-Pierre Torrell, *Saint Thomas Aquinas*, Vol. 1 of 2: *The Person and His Work*, trans. by Robert Royal (Washington, D.C.: Catholic University of America Press, 1996), p. 211ff, for the dating of these two works. See *Robertus Kilwardby Ord. Praed., Archiepiscopus Cantuariensis quodam errorem in grammaticalibus, logicalibus, et naturalibus de consensus magistrorum Oxoniensam condemnat, In Naturalibus*, prop. 13, *Chartularium Universitatis Parisiensis*, ed. by Heinrich Denifle and Emile Chatelain, Vol. 1 of 4 (Paris: Delalain, 1889), p. 559, my English translation: "Likewise, that the a living and a dead body are equivocally [called] a body, and the dead body is a body only in a certain respect (*Item quod corpus vivum et mortuum est equivoce corpus, et corpus mortuum secundum quod corpus mortuum sit corpus secundum quid*)." By condemning this proposition on March 18th, 1277, the council of *periti* from the University of Oxford presided over by the Dominican theologian and philosopher, Robert Kilwardby, Archbishop of Canterbury, implicitly denounced the doctrine which Aquinas upheld within his quodlibetal questions of Easter 1270. Cf. Roberto Zavalloni, *Richard de Mediavilla and the Controversy on the Plurality of Forms* (Louvain: L'Institut Supérieur de Philosophie, 1951), for an overview of the background to this controversy.

Body and Blood as the celebrant articulates Christ's own words, instituted with the intention to consecrate, as God's instrumental cause, Who, as stated above, is the principal agent of Sacramental consecration.⁷⁹

Contrary to Aquinas, within the redacted edition of his lectures on Lombard's *Liber IV Sententiarum* in the *Ordinatio*, likely delivered during his tenure as a *baccalaureus sententiarum* at the University of Paris in early 1303,⁸⁰ the Franciscan scholar, John Duns Scotus, strongly objected to the former's doctrine of Sacramental causality. While accepting Aquinas' claim that instrumental causes do not possess inherent causal powers, but play a role within the caused effect's production via the principal agent's motion,⁸¹ Scotus argued that a material item could not possess a supernatural causal power as this power would either exist as an indivisible form, which was not possible as only the intellective soul could inform matter thus, or this power would function as an accidental extension, from which Scotus claimed that a supernatural form could not be extended in this manner.⁸² Scotus also posited that because a Sacrament is a conglomeration of items including verbal formulae and physical actions, which always have their being temporally rather than eternally, a Sacrament nor its concomitant items could not be the kinds of entities which function as

⁷⁹ See Aquinas, *Summa Theologiae* III, q. 78, a. 4, co., in *Opera Omnia*, Vol. 12. *Editio Leonina*, p. 211.

⁸⁰ See Antoine Vos, *The Theology of John Duns Scotus* (Leiden/Boston: Brill, 2018), p. 18.

⁸¹ Scotus, *Ordinatio* IV, dist. 1, pars 1, q. unica, nn. 26-7, 31, 34, in *B. Ioannis Duns Scoti Ordinis Fratrum Minorum. Opera Omnia*, Vol. 11 (Vatican City: Typis Polyglottis Vaticanis, 2008), pp. 13-4, 14-5.

⁸² See Scotus, *Ordinatio* IV, dist. 1, pars. 3, q. 1-2, in *B. Ioannis Duns Scoti Ordinis Fratrum Minorum. Opera Omnia*, Vol. 11, p. 105: "Illa virtus supernaturalis, si sit in sacramento, aut est ibi indivisibiliter aut divisibiliter, id est aut tota in toto et in qualibet parte, aut tota in tota et pars in parte. Non primo modo, quia inter omnes perficientes materiam, sola intellectiva ponitur talis; non secundo modo, quia extenderetur per accidens in subiecto. - quod est contra rationem virtutis spiritualis... (My English translation): If in the Sacrament there is a supernatural power, it is either indivisible or divisible, that is, either as the whole in the whole and in every part, or as the whole in the whole and as a part in a part. [But it could] not [be in the first way because among all those [viz. forms] which perfect matter, only the intellect is ordered thus. [And it could] not [be] in the second way because the supernatural power would be extended by accident in the subject, which contravenes the notion of a spiritual power."

agents with the casual power to consecrate the Sacraments whose activity is instantaneous.⁸³

Consequently, Scotus maintained that a given Sacrament and its items are instead non-causal *sine qua non*: God has ordained to bestow the supernatural effect of a given Sacrament when celebrated, as established by His *pactio*, or covenant, with His Church.⁸⁴ Thus, the celebrant's recitation of the Sacrament's formulae and the performance of its actions do not cause Eucharistic transmutation *per se*. Rather, they are the essential context for God's operation in the Eucharistic gifts in virtue of His covenant with His Church.

For Scotus, the celebrant thereby functions as a 'dispositive' cause of Eucharistic consecration: the celebrant could freely opt, given their automotive will, to cooperate in the Eucharist's consecration, and acts as the essential context for God, the sole efficient cause of the Sacrament, to operate upon and transubstantiate the Eucharistic gifts.⁸⁵ As will be

⁸³ Scotus, *Ordinatio IV*, dist. 1, pars. 3, q. 1-2, in *B. Ioannis Duns Scoti Ordinis Fratrum Minorum. Opera Omnia*, Vol. 11, p. 100: "Sacramenta autem communiter non possunt habere actionem suam in instant... quia in sacramentis communiter, requiruntur verba et alia multa (ut patebit inferius), illa autem non possunt habere 'esse' in instanti, ergo in tempore: quare nec agere actione sua naturali – ergo, nec supernaturali... (My English translation:) But commonly the Sacraments cannot have their action instantaneously... because the Sacraments commonly require words and various other things [for their perfection]... but these things cannot have their being instantaneously, therefore [they have their being] in time: thus, as they can neither act [instantaneously] through their natural activity, therefore, neither can they act [in this manner] supernaturally..." Cf. Scotus, *Ordinatio IV*, dist. 1, pars. 3, q. 1-2, in *B. Ioannis Duns Scoti Ordinis Fratrum Minorum. Opera Omnia*, Vol. 11, p. 105. See also Richard Cross, *Duns Scotus* (New York/Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1999), pp. 156-7.

⁸⁴ Scotus, *Ordinatio IV*, dist. 1, pars. 3, q. 1-2, in *B. Ioannis Duns Scoti Ordinis Fratrum Minorum. Opera Omnia*, Vol. 11, pp. 109-10: "...ergo ibi tantum est hoc modo - aliter quam in alio corpore - ex determinatione voluntatis propriae, qua disponit sic cooperari tali corpori. Haec autem dispositio, manifestata Ecclesiae, dicitur 'promissio' vel 'pactio.' (My English translation:) ...[God] he is there [in the Sacrament] in this mode – differently to how He is in another body – from the determination of His own will, through which He is disposed to cooperate as such with this body. But this disposition, when manifested to the Church, is called a 'promise' or 'pact'..." Cf. Cross, *Duns Scotus*, p. 157.

⁸⁵ Scotus, *Ordinatio IV*, d. 13, q. 1, *opinion propria*, in *B. Ioannis Duns Scoti Ordinis Fratrum Minorum. Opera Omnia*, Vol. 12 (Vatican City: Typis Polyglottis Vaticanis 2010), p. 481: "...'instrumentum' potest intelligi multipliciter, sed - ad propositum - agens dispositivum dicitur 'instrumentum.' Et sic minister, habens actionem propriam humanam praeviam actioni divinae tamquam dispositionem necessariam, non simpliciter sed ex ordinatione Dei paciscentis cum Ecclesia, quod ad talem actum ministri facit talem actum sibi proprium... actio autem sua est actio instrumentalis respectu actionis principalis, eo modo aliquo quo sectio est ad formam scamni, quia ad illam sequitur regulariter illa forma est ordinatione principalis agentis... prolatio verborum posset dici actio instrumentalis respectu conversionis seu confectionis corporis Christi, quia ad illam

elucidated, this doctrine harmonized with Mark of Ephesus' analogization between Eucharistic transmutation and the Virgin acting as a quasi-dispositive cause in Christ's Incarnation by providing her moral fiat at the Annunciation. This doctrinal commensurability helps to support this dissertation's conclusion that those Florentine Fathers aligned with the Franciscan tradition possessed the conceptual tools to arrive at a more effective consensus with their Byzantine counterparts concerning Eucharistic consecration.

Indeed, given that some late fourteenth- and fifteenth century Franciscan theologians including Peter of Candia continued to adhere to Scotus' doctrine of 'dispositive' Eucharistic causality within their own oeuvres,⁸⁶ the Franciscan Florentine *periti* could have evoked these principles of Sacramental causality within the conciliar debates to pose an *aporia* to the Latin Church's insistence that the Byzantine Fathers adhere to Torquemada's single moment hylomorphic doctrine of Eucharistic consecration which alternative Roman Catholic theological schools such as their own did not, nor were obliged by the Roman Catholic Magisterium, to uphold. In particular, they could have hypothetically arrived at a consensus with their Byzantine counterparts whereby the epiclesis and the Signs of the Cross functioned as necessary conditions for valid Eucharistic consecration given that,

prolationem sequitur regulariter ista conversio vel confectio. Et sic, actione alicuius creaturae instrumentaliter agentis, conficitur corpus Christi... eo modo quo agens praeivium dicitur instrumentaliter agere ad formam principalem, quam tamen non attingit, et actio eius dicitur esse 'instrumentalis,' quia dispositiva et praevia." (My English translation:) ...one can understand 'instrument' in multiple ways... one can call a dispositive agent an instrument. And the minister [viz., concerning Eucharistic consecration] is thus, having a proper human act preceding God's act as the necessary disposition, not absolutely, but through God's ordinance, who formed a pact with the Church that, when the minister undertakes such an act, He would undertake [such] an act [which is] proper to Himself... but [the minister's] own act is an instrumental act concerning the principal agent in the manner akin to what cutting is to a bench's form of a bench, because it [viz., the cutting] regularly follows the form through the principal agent's ordinance... [Likewise] one can call reciting the [dominical] words an instrumental act concerning the conversion or confection of Christ's Body because this conversion or confection regularly succeeds the recitation. And therefore, through the creature's act as an instrumental agent, Christ's Body is confectioned... in the mode in which one says a preceding agent instrumentally acts by the principal form, [the terminus of] which it nonetheless does not reach, and one says that its act is instrumental because it is dispositive and prevenient."

⁸⁶ See Peter of Candia, *In Libros IV Sententiarum*, q. un., a. 1, pars. 1, nn. 32-4, ed. by Chris Schabel and Paul J. J. M. Bakker, <<http://candia.ucy.ac.cy/SentIV-1-1a.htm>> [accessed August 1st, 2023].

in contrast to the orthodox Thomistic hylomorphic doctrine of Sacramental causality, the Franciscan school upheld an enduring tradition of positing that a plurality of forms could inhere in a single subject.

For example, a number of pre-eminent high and late medieval Franciscan theologians including Bonaventure and Scotus invoked texts such as John of Damascus' *Ἐκδοσης ἀκριβῆς τῆς ὀρθοδόξου πίστεως* (*Exact Exposition of the Orthodox Faith*), translated into Latin as *De fide Orthodoxa*. Therein,⁸⁷ when treating the soul-body relationship in humans, John maintained that, while these two items are formed simultaneously, the body and soul are both *οὐσίαις* with their own respective matter-form combinations.⁸⁸ Thus, the non-ensouled human body and its various non-subsistent elements are disposed to higher functions through being unified with and organised by the intellectual soul.⁸⁹ Pertinently, when examining his Eucharistic *Λίβελλος* in Chapter Four, Mark of Ephesus will be shown to have invoked this principle to explicate that the posit that

⁸⁷ The first complete Latin translation of *De fide orthodoxa* was produced by Burgundio of Pisa most likely between 1153 and 1154 at Pope Eugenius III's behest. Cf. Eligius M. Buytaert, ed., "Introduction," in *De fide orthodoxa: Versions of Burgundio and Cerbanus* (St Bonaventure, N.Y.: The Franciscan Institute, 1955), ix-xv. As highlighted by Jacques-Guy Bougerol, "The Church Fathers and the *Sentences* of Peter Lombard," in Irena Backus, ed., *The Reception of the Church Fathers in the West. From the Carolingians to the Maurists* Vol. 1 of 2 (Leiden: Brill, 1997), pp. 113-64 (133); Philipp W. Rosemann, *Peter Lombard* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004), p. 38, through Peter Lombard's probable use of Burgundio's translation, he was able to introduce this translation into the medieval Latin theological and philosophical sphere of discourse by reproducing excerpts of *De fide orthodoxa* within his *Libri Sententiarum*. Cf. Buytaert, 'St. John of Damascus, Peter Lombard, and Gerhoh of Reichersberg,' *Franciscan Studies* 10 (1950): 323-43, who nonetheless disputes that Lombard read Burgundio's translation when producing his *Libri Sententiarum*. Against this background, given that Bonaventure's *Magister* of Theology at the University of Paris, Alexander of Hales, was known to have subdivided the various chapters of Lombard's *Libri Sententiarum* into its distinctions, Bonaventure likely was initially mediated access to *De fide orthodoxa* through his instruction in Lombard's *Libri Sententiarum* under Alexander. See Ignatius Brady, 'The Distinctions of Lombard's *Book of Sentences* and Alexander of Hales,' *Franciscan Studies* 25 (1965): 90-116. See also Matthew Beckmann, "Bonaventure and Alexander: Friend or Foe?" in Michael F. Cusato, Steven J. McMichael, eds., "*Non enim fuerat Evangelii surdus auditor...*" (*1 Celano 22*): *Essays in Honor of Michael W. Blastic, O.F.M. on the Occasion of his 70th Birthday* (Leiden: Brill, 2020), pp. 382-95 for a lucid analysis of Bonaventure's relationship to Alexander of Hales.

⁸⁸ See esp. John of Damascus, *Ἐκδοσης ἀκριβῆς τῆς ὀρθοδόξου πίστεως*, 2.12, 3.16, in Kotter, ed., *Die Schriften*, Vol. 2, pp. 75-80, 153-5; *Capita Philosophica*, 4, in Bonifatius Kotter, ed., *Die Schriften*, Vol. 1, pp. 58-9.

⁸⁹ Cf. John of Damascus, *Capita Philosophica*, c. 4 in Kotter, ed., *Die Schriften*, Vol. 1, p. 58: "Ἔστιν οὖν τὸ μὲν σῶμα οὐσία, τὸ δὲ χρῶμα συμβεβηκός."

the *οὐσία* of Christ's Eucharistic Body was fully present following the dominical words. This Eucharistic *οὐσία* will be shown to have been analogously identified with the *οὐσία* of flesh derived from the Virgin at the Incarnation, which, through the Spirit's intervention at the epiclesis, is 'perfected', just as Christ's foetal flesh was subsequently ensouled through similar Pneumatic activity.

To exemplify this mutual Latin and Hellenophone recourse to the doctrine of a multiplicity of forms, within his *Super II Sententiarum*, Bonaventure elucidated that each form in a given item disposes its parcel of matter to receive further forms up to the point whereby this matter's appetite to be informed is fulfilled. Thus, in contradistinction to Thomistic hylomorphism, Bonaventure maintained that *one* substantial form does not necessarily bestow unity upon a subject. Hence, Bonaventure claimed that while the soul is a matter-form composite, this composite can still unify with a body to instantiate an individual human.⁹⁰

Building upon Bonaventure's insights, within his *Ordinatio*, Scotus also postulated that some subjects possess multiple substantial forms. For example, when addressing what form precisely designated the transubstantiated Eucharistic gifts, working under the presupposition that Christ's intellectual soul did not inform these gifts, Scotus maintained that composite beings possess a *forma corporeitatis*: With a segment of matter, this form functions as the proximate matter of a given composite being, rendering it as an individual item. This proximate matter is thus actualised and animated by the ultimate form, which, for human beings, is the intellectual soul. Invoking the example of Christ's Body during the

⁹⁰ See Bonaventure, *In II Sententiarum*, d. 17, a. 1, q. 2, ad. 6, in *Doctoris seraphici S. Bonaventurae opera omnia*, Vol. 2 (Quaracchi: Collegium S. Bonaventurae, 1885), pp. 415b-16b. Cf. Bonaventure, *In II Sent.*, d. 3, p. 1, a. 1, q. 1, in *Opera omnia*, Vol. 2, p. 89; *In II Sent.*, d. 7, p. 2, a. 2, q. 1, resp., in *Opera omnia*, Vol. 2, pp. 197-9; *In II Sent.*, d. 18, a. 2, q. 3, in *Opera omnia*, Vol. 2, pp. 452-3; *Collationes in Hexaemeron*, col. 4, 10, in *Opera omnia*, Vol. 5 (Quaracchi: Collegium S. Bonaventurae, 1891), pp. 350b-1a.

Triduum, while the intellectual soul no longer animates the human body following death, the human body remains numerically one for a limited period through the *forma corporeitatis* which continues to organise its segment of matter. However, because this form cannot sufficiently sustain this corporeal unity *per se*, the body progressively decomposes.⁹¹

To further support this dissertation's conclusion that these developments put forward within the late medieval Franciscan tradition could have helped to resolve the Florentine Eucharistic disputes, one should highlight that some Byzantine Florentine Fathers including Mark of Ephesus utilised the same Patristic literary material when engaging within similar theological and philosophical questions. For example, when postulating that that human resurrection is logically necessary, Mark began his argumentation by maintaining the angels' composite nature. Building upon the axiom that simplicity solely pertains to God, Mark posited that all creatures, corporeal and incorporeal, must thereby be composite.⁹² Mark thereby concluded that humans must be resurrected given that the human soul must be in union with its body lest it be rendered simple. Likewise, the angels must also be composite lest they themselves also be simple.⁹³ Mark thus agreed with some late medieval Franciscan theologians including Bonaventure who upheld the angels'

⁹¹ Scotus, *Ordinatio* IV, dist. 11, pars. 1, a. 2, q. 1, *opinio propria*, in *B. Ioannis Duns Scoti Ordinis Fratrum Minorum. Opera Omnia*, Vol. 12, pp. 267-8. Cf. Richard Cross, "The Plurality of Forms," in *The Physics of Duns Scotus: The Scientific Context of a Theological Vision* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1998), pp. 47-76, esp. 55-71.

⁹² See Mark of Ephesus, *Περὶ Ἀναστάσεως*, ed. by Schmemmann, p. 54, lines 34-40. Nonetheless, see Mark of Ephesus, *Πρὸς Θεοδόσιον μοναχὸν ἐκπέσοντα*, in Marios Pilavakis and Christian Chivu, eds., *Ὁ Ἅγιος Μάρκος ὁ Εὐγενικός. Τὰ εὕρισκόμενα ἅπαντα*, Vol. 1 of 2 (Bucharest: Editura Gândul Aprins, 2009), pp. 304-24 (304-5), wherein Mark claimed that the angels' knowledge of God is not intervened by matter.

⁹³ Mark of Ephesus, *Περὶ Ἀναστάσεως*, Schmemmann, ed., 54-5. See also Mark of Ephesus, *Oratio prima de igne purgatorio* 14.8, Petit, ed., in *Patrologia Orientalis*, Vol. 15, pp. 58-9, within which Mark claimed that Matt. 25:41's description of the burning of the demons in Hell pertains to the demons' material substrate, in contradistinction to the disembodied human soul which cannot be subject to any 'burning' in Purgatory given that this form is without its designated matter.

hylomorphic composition.⁹⁴ In fact, to affirm this same conclusion, Mark evoked John of Damascus' *Ἐκδοσις* wherein John claimed that, while angels appear incorporeal and immaterial compared to humans, they are nonetheless composite relative to God, solely to whom incorporeality and immaterial truly pertain.⁹⁵

While the Franciscan Florentine Fathers would plausibly have been cautious in designating items such as the epiclesis as necessary forms for Eucharistic consecration in light of the late medieval Latin canonical and scholarly departure from addressing the question of whether the *Supplices te rogamus* could be identified as a consecratory invocation, they did possess the Sacramentological framework to arrive at an effective resolution concerning the nature and moment(s) of Eucharistic consecration with their Byzantine counterparts. One should consider that many late medieval Latin Scholastic theologians acknowledged that certain items could be distinguished to pertain *simpliciter* or *secundum quid*, namely, that these items pertained absolutely or in a certain respect. Thus, by acknowledging that the Sacraments could comprise multiple forms, the Franciscan Florentine Fathers could have utilised such a distinction to address whether any cause existed within the Eucharist's consecration which could withhold this consecration's perfection even though the celebrant, the intention to consecrate, and the formulae for the Eucharistic gifts' consecration are all in act.⁹⁶

⁹⁴ See esp. Bonaventure, *In II Sententiarum*, d. 3, a. 1, q. 1, conc., in *Doctoris Seraphici Opera Omnia*, Vol. 2 (Quaracchi: Collegii S. Bonaventurae, 1885), pp. 90-1.

⁹⁵ Mark of Ephesus, *Περὶ Ἀναστάσεως*, Schmemmann, ed., p. 54, lines 43-6. Cf. John of Damascus, *Expositio Fidei*, II.3, Kotter, ed., *Die Schriften des Johannes von Damaskos*, Vol. 2 (Berlin/New York: De Gruyter, 1973), p. 45. For a discussion of Mark's claims here, see Nicholas Conostas, "Mark Eugenikos," in Carmelo Giuseppe Conticello and Vassa Conticello, eds., *La théologie byzantine et sa tradition*, Vol. 2 of 2 (Turnhout: Brepols, 2002), pp. 411-75 (esp. 453-6); Tikhon Alexander Pino, "Thomas Aquinas and Mark of Ephesus on the Body-Soul Relationship," in Denis Searby, ed., *Latins and Greeks Learning from Each Other in Byzantium* (Berlin: De Gruyter, 2018), pp. 291-307 (297-9).

⁹⁶ Cf. Kappes, *Epiclesis Debate*, pp. 238-40.

Based upon the previously discussed Scotistic adherence to God being the direct and sole efficient cause of all Sacramental consecration, such Franciscan theologians would likely have concluded that God could still hinder Eucharistic consecration: As God bestowed spiritual authority upon His Church concerning the Sacraments,⁹⁷ the Church establishes certain conditions upon their celebration to ensure their validity. For example, the Church would normally dominically require the penitent be contrite, orally confess their sins, and undertake satisfaction for the penitent to most efficaciously receive the Sacrament's supernatural effect. While Aquinas upheld that contrition, verbal confession, and satisfaction were all integral parts for perfect penance,⁹⁸ several Franciscan theologians including Scotus as well as Byzantine conciliar *periti* such as Gennadios Scholarios, writing following Ferrara-Florence, maintained that, in extraordinary circumstances, only contrition of heart was requisite.⁹⁹ In extraordinary instances whereby the penitent could not explicitly confess their sins or undertake satisfaction, Scotus, for example, argued that the priest could still absolve the penitent through his dominically-instituted Apostolic authority to

⁹⁷ Cf. Matt. 16:19, 18:18.

⁹⁸ See e.g., Aquinas, *Summa Theologiae* III, q. 90, a. 1, conc., in n *Opera Omnia*, Vol. 12. *Editio Leonina*, p. 354: "...plures actus humani requirantur ad perfectionem poenitentiae, scilicet contritio, confessio et satisfactio..."; For Aquinas' understanding of the Sacrament of Penance, cf. esp. Gilles Emery, 'Reconciliation with the Church and Interior Penance: The Contribution of Thomas Aquinas on the Question of the *Res et Sacramentum* of Penance,' *Nova et Vetera* 1(2) (2003): 283-302 (esp. 292-302).

⁹⁹ Gennadios Scholarios, *Sur la différence entre les péchés véniels et les péchés mortels*, 7, in Martin Jugie, Xenophon Sidéridés, Louis Petit, eds., *Oeuvres Complètes de Gennade Scholarios*, Vol. 4 (Paris: Maison de la Bonne Presse, 1935), pp. 274-84 (281, lines 3-8), written during his stay(s) at the Prodromos Monastery near Serres following his departure from the Ecumenical Patriarchate (c. 1457-60, 1464?): "Δραστηριώτατον δὲ καὶ κατὰ τῶν θανασίμων ἀμαρτημάτων ἡ μετάνοια φάρμακον, ἂν ἀληθῆς ἦ καὶ βεβαία ἐν συμπιβῆ καρδίας καὶ ἐξαγορεύσει καὶ ικανοποιήσει συνισταμένη. Ὅπου δὲ ὁ θάνατος ἐπιών, ἢ ἄλλη τις ἀνάγκη τὴν ἐξαγόρευσιν καὶ τὴν ικανοποίησιν εἴργει, ἢ τῆς καρδίας συνπιβῆ ἐξαρκεῖ ἀληθῆς οὐσα... (My English translation:) And repentance is also a remedy for mortal sins if it is true and sure in the contrition of the heart, and if it is orally confessed and satisfied. But where death is at hand, or other extraordinary circumstances hinder oral confession and satisfaction, the contrition of the heart can comprise true [penance]..." For dating, see Jugie, "Introduction," in Jugie, Sidéridés, Petit, eds., *Oeuvres Complètes*, Vol. 4, xvi-xvii, who highlighted that the autographic version of Scholarios' work in *MS Par. 1289* was composed at Prodromos. Cf. Blanchet, *Scholarios*, pp. 482-7, for the dating of Scholarios' stay(s) at Prodromos. See also Kappes, 'A New Narrative for the Reception of Seven Sacraments into Orthodoxy,' 494-8.

beseech God to forgive.¹⁰⁰ Thus, the additional conditions which would normally be required in Penance function as accidental forms are nonetheless given Sacramental efficacy through a particular Church's Sacramental canons.¹⁰¹ Where such Franciscan and Byzantine theologians diverged from late medieval theologians including Aquinas principally concerned whether accidental forms could function as *sine quibus non* for the divine provision of Sacramental Grace given their belief that God, as the Sacraments' sole efficient cause, could still willfully hinder a Sacrament's consecration.

Consequently, when analysing the Florentine conciliar debates, one must keep in mind that the Franciscan Florentine *periti* possessed the Sacramentological framework to accurately interpret their Byzantine counterparts' assertion that other items in addition to the dominical words such as the epiclesis and three Signs of the Cross functioned as essential criteria for the Eucharist's valid celebration. In particular, it is possible, the author

¹⁰⁰ See, e.g., Scotus, *Ordinatio* IV, dist. 20, q. unica, in *Ioannis Duns Scoti Opera Omnia*, Vol. 13 (Vatican City: Typis Polyglottis Vaticanis, 2011), p. 231: "poenitentia vera, sive interior sola sive exterior cum susceptione sacramenti poenitentiae, sufficit ad salute, cuius in extremis... (My English trans.:) true penance, whether interior or exterior, alongside the reception of the Sacrament of Penance, suffices for any person's salvation in extreme cases." For a succinct overview of Scotus' doctrine of the Sacrament of Penance, see Vos, *Theology of John Duns Scotus*, pp. 378-81. See esp. Vos, *Theology of John Duns Scotus*, p. 379: "[For Scotus,] Repentance is primarily the elementary fact of life that takes life seriously. Then, one is convinced that it is just that one's own sin is not left as it was. Our lives need assessment, even if there is the view that we are to blame and do not go off. This implies that one ought to will that guilt is to be reckoned with, that punishment is fair, and reconciliation needed, even if we do not have adequate emotions. The crucial connections are contingent. Repentance belongs to the area of will, just as the disposition of love. However, contrition... confession... and satisfaction... are matters of becoming. They mark our existence from sadness, sense of truth and labor, but they are no essential components of being penitent. However, though they are not entailed by being penitent, they are required by the sacrament of penance. Poenitentia comes as a sacrament from the other side: it is the sacramental absolution which is expressed by words. Remorse, confession and satisfaction are needed for receiving adequately the sacrament. The confession of sin must precede, and the satisfaction serves the efficiency of the sacrament." Cf. Mark of Ephesus, *Oratio Altera de Igne Purgatorio*, 19, in Petit, ed., *Patrologia Orientalis*, Vol. 15, pp. 130-1, wherein Mark posited that satisfaction is not an essential requisite in the Sacrament of Penance during the Ferraran debates concerning Purgatory. For a succinct discussion of Mark's doctrine of Purgatory, see Conostas, "Mark Eugenikos," pp. 457-9.

¹⁰¹ As will be elucidated when examining Torquemada's *Sermo Alter*, in the *Summa Theologiae* III, q. 78, a. 2, ad. 5, Aquinas referred to the Apostle Peter supposedly incorporating the term 'enim' to 'Hoc est corpus meum' within the *Canon Missae* so as to state 'Hoc enim est corpus meum.' Given that Peter was able to divide the dominical words thus, this supposed fact entailed that the Apostles were given the authority by Christ to include accidental items to the Eucharist form, but not an essential item for Sacramental validity, according to Aquinas. Cf. Kappes, *Epiclesis Debate*, pp. 239-40.

contends, that these two parties could have cooperated at Florence to conclude that each of these additional items function as signs pointing to the intended telos of God's Sacramental operation. Even if Christ Himself did not institute such items when celebrating the Last Supper, His Church, in virtue of the Apostolic authority given to it by Christ, now necessitates such items, being accidental forms, as conditions for valid Sacramental consecration.

1.3. An Analysis of the Florentine Debate concerning Eucharistic Consecration within the Wider Context of the Council.

Having delineated the Latin and Hellenophone liturgical and theological developments relating to the nature and moment(s) of Eucharistic consecration prior to Ferrara-Florence, this section will analyse where the Florentine debates concerning this question stood in the broader context of the Council: These debates followed the extensive and onerous discussions concerning the Pneumatic procession which had begun on March 8th, 1439, and which were only resolved on June 8th when Pope Eugenius formally approved the confession which the Byzantine contingent had composed professing the Spirit's dual procession *ad intra*.¹⁰²

Thereupon, on June 8th, 1439, Eugenius summoned four Byzantine Fathers, Isidore of Kiev, Bessarion, the Metropolitan of Nicaea, Dorotheos, the Bishop of Trebizond, and

¹⁰² See *Acta Graeca*, Gill, ed., p. 438 for this confession. For an overview of the public conciliar sessions concerning the Spirit's Procession, see *Acta Graeca*, Gill, ed., pp. 399-445; Syropoulos, *Les Mémoires*, 8.3-9.16, Laurent, ed., pp. 219-76; Jan Louis van Dieten, 'Zur Diskussion des Filioque auf dem Konzil von Florenz,' *Byzantina Symmeikta* 16 (2003-4): 217-82; Joseph Gill, *The Council of Florence* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1959), pp. 227-69. Cf. Gill, *Council of Florence*, pp. 131-79 for the discussions concerning the canonical validity of adding the *filioque* clause to the Niceno-Constantinopolitan Creed in Ferrara; A. Edward Sicienski, *The Filioque. History of a Doctrinal Controversy* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2010), pp. 151-72, esp. 155-69.

Dorotheos, the Bishop of Mytilene, to attend a private audience with himself and a number of other Latin Fathers. Therein, these Byzantine Fathers were asked to delineate the remaining inter-ecclesial dogmatic loci of divergence. After the Byzantine Fathers expressed that there was sufficient ecclesial agreement concerning the valid Eucharistic matter and Purgatory,¹⁰³ some of the Latin Fathers in attendance inquired why the Byzantine Rite's Eucharistic Prayers incorporated a putatively consecratory epiclesis following the dominical words, given that such Latin Fathers believed that the latter formulae had already fully consecrated the Eucharistic gifts.¹⁰⁴ The Byzantine Fathers responded that while the dominical words transmuted the Eucharistic gifts, the epiclesis 'perfected' this transformation, highlighting that the Byzantine Rite's epicleses were commensurate to the Latin Rite's *Supplices te rogamus*.¹⁰⁵ As the *Acta Graeca* described, the Byzantine Fathers invoked the precise passage from Lombard's *Sententiarum* which Kabasilas has been shown to have invoked almost verbatim to demonstrate this point.¹⁰⁶

¹⁰³ Syropoulos, *Les Mémoires*, 10.1, Laurent, ed., p. 474; *Acta Graeca concilii Florentini: quae supersunt actorum Graecorum Concilii Florentini: necnon descriptionis cuiusdam eiusdem*, ed. by Joseph Gill (Rome: Pontificium Institutum orientalium studiorum, 1953), p. 454.

¹⁰⁴ Paraphrased from Syropoulos, *Les Mémoires*, 10.2, Laurent, ed., pp. 474, 476: "Εἶτα ἐξήτησαν διορθῶσαι ἡμᾶς καὶ ἀργῆσαι τὴν ἐπὶ τῇ τελειώσει τῆς ἀναϊμάκτου θυσίας τριττὴν εὐλογίαν καὶ ἐπικλήσιν τοῦ ἁγίου Πνεύματος τὴν γινομένην παρὰ τοῦ ἱερέως· ἔφασκον γὰρ ὅτι αἱ δεσποτικαὶ φωναὶ ἀγιάζουσι ταύτην ἡγουν τό· Λάβετε φάγετε· τοῦτο ἐστὶ τὸ σῶμα μου, καὶ τό. Πίετε ἐξ αὐτοῦ πάντες. Διὸ καὶ ἐμέμοφντο οἱ Λατίνο τοὺς ἡμετέρους, ὡς ἐσφαλμένως ποιοῦντας μετὰ τὸ ἐκφωνῆσαι τὰ δεσποτικὰ ταῦτα ῥήματα ἐπεύχεσθαι καὶ εὐλογεῖν μετὰ τὸ εἰπεῖν τὰ δεσποτικὰ ταῦτα ῥήματα..." *Acta Graeca*, Gill, ed., pp. 441-2; Bouларанд, 'L'Épiclèse,' 243.

¹⁰⁵ Paraphrased from *Acta Graeca*, Gill, ed., pp. 441-2: "περὶ δὲ τῆς θείας ἱερουργίας ἐζητήθη πῶς τῶν τοῦ Χριστοῦ ῥημάτων λαληθέντων, τοῦ Λάβετε, φάγετε καὶ Πίετε ἐξ αὐτοῦ πάντες καὶ τῶν ἁγίων δώρων διὰ τούτων τῶν ῥημάτων τελειωθέντων, ὑμεῖς μετὰ ταῦτα ποιεῖτε εὐχὴν, καὶ λέγετε· Καὶ ποιήσον τὸν μὲν ἄρτον τοῦτον, τίμιον σῶμα τοῦ Χριστοῦ σου· τὸ δὲ ἐν τῷ ποτηρίῳ τούτῳ, τίμιον αἷμα τοῦ Χριστοῦ σου, μεταβαλὼν τῷ Πνεύματί σου τῷ ἁγίῳ ἐλύθη καὶ τοῦτο οὕτως. ἡμεῖς εἴπομεν ὅτι ὁλογοῦμεν διὰ τῶν ῥημάτων τούτων τελειοῦσθαι τὸν θεῖον ἄρτον καὶ γίνεσθαι σῶμα Χριστοῦ. ἀλλ' ὕστερον, καθὼς καὶ αὐτοὶ λέγετε· Κέλευσον προσενεχθῆναι τὰ δῶρα ταῦτα ἐν χειρὶ ἁγίου ἀγγέλου εἰς τὸ ὑπερουράνιον σου θυσιαστήριον, οὕτω καὶ ἡμεῖς εὐχόμεθα. λέγοντες, κατελθεῖν τὸ Πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον ἐφ' ἡμεῖς καὶ ποιῆσαι ἐν ἡμῖν τὸν ἄρτον τοῦτον, τίμιον σῶμα τοῦ Χριστοῦ, καὶ τὸ ἐν τῷ ποτηρίῳ τούτῳ, τίμιον αἷμα τοῦ Χριστοῦ, καὶ μεταβαλεῖν αὐτὰ τῷ Πνεύματι αὐτοῦ τῷ ἁγίῳ, ὥστε γενέσθαι τοῖς μεταλαμβάνουσιν εἰς νίφιν ψυχῆς, εἰς ἄφεσιν ἀμαρτιῶν· μὴ γένωνται εἰς κρίμα ἢ εἰς κατάκρεμα ἡμῶν."

¹⁰⁶ See *Acta Graeca*, Gill, ed., p. 441: "Κέλευσον προσενεχθῆναι τὰ δῶρα ταῦτα ἐν χειρὶ ἁγίου ἀγγέλου εἰς τὸ ὑπερουράνιον σου θυσιαστήριον. (My English translation:) Command that these [Eucharistic] gifts be brought

These Latin Fathers were likely incognizant of the intra-Latin theological tradition of identifying the *Supplices te rogamus* as a consecratory epiclesis. Rather, they likely believed that the Byzantine Rite's consecratory Eucharistic epicleses had been progressively interpolated following the emergence of the Latin-Byzantine Schism during the eleventh century.

Nonetheless, according to the *Ἀπομνημονεύματα (Memoirs)* of Sylvestros Syropoulos, the *μέγας ἐκκλησιάρχης* (grand ecclesiarch) and deacon of the Ecumenical Patriarchate who was also a member of the Byzantine Imperial contingent at Ferrara-Florence,¹⁰⁷ Ioannes VIII protested that over twenty thousand texts of the Byzantine Rite's *Liturgies of St Basil* and *St John Chrysostom* received by the Byzantine Church testified to a consecratory post-Institution epiclesis. Syropoulos claimed that Cardinal Cesarini consequently asked Ioannes VIII to publicly profess that the Byzantine Fathers did not edit their liturgical texts during their pre-conciliar preparations.¹⁰⁸

by Your angel's hand before Your supercelestial altar." The only difference to Kabasilas' citation is emboldened. Cf. Kabasilas, *Sacrae Liturgiae Interpretatio*, c. 30.1-2, in *Patrologia Graeca*, Vol. 150, col. 433. ¹⁰⁷ See Syropoulos, *Les Mémoires* 3.14, Laurent, ed., p. 176 for his appointment as the *μέγας ἐκκλησιάρχης*. See *Cod. Par. Univ.* 190, fol. 255^v: "Ἐτελιώθη τῷ πάρον βιβλίον διὰ χειρὸς ἐμοῦ τοῦ διδασκάλου τοῦ εὐάγγελιοῦ διακονοῦ τοῦ Σιλίβεστρου τοῦ Σιρόπουλου ἐν ἔτει ϞϞϞϞϞϞ, μῆνι ἰουλι(ί)ω ἰν(δικτιῶ)νος β^ας." Quoted in Laurent, "Introduction," in *Les Mémoires*, pp. 6-7, n. 10. My English translation: "This book was completed by my own hand, [that] of the teacher and holy deacon Sylvestros Syropoulos, in the 6932nd year of our Lord [i.e., 1424]." The *Memoirs* were likely completed in their first recension by c. 1444, approximately five years following the conclusion of the Byzantine contingent's participation at the Ferrara-Florence. This dating can be gleaned from the fact that Syropoulos made no reference to the elevation of Gregorios, who had previously functioned as the confessor to the Emperor Ioannes VIII, to the Ecumenical Patriarchate in 1445. See Laurent, "Introduction," in Laurent, ed., *Les Mémoires*, p. 24. Cf. Gill, "The 'Acta' and the Memoirs of Syropoulos as History," in *Personalities*, pp. 144-77 for an analysis of the provenance, structure and contents of the *Memoirs*.

¹⁰⁸ Paraphrased from Syropoulos, *Les Mémoires*, 10.2, Laurent, ed., p. 476: "...καὶ ἐγένετο ἔνστασις καὶ ἀπὸ τοῦ βασιλέως καὶ ἀπὸ τῶν Λατίνων μεγάλη ἐν πολλαῖς συνελεύσεσιν, ὅτε ὁ βασιλεὺς μετὰ καὶ ἄλλων πολλῶν λόγων ἔφη καὶ τοῦο, ὅτι· Εἰ θέλετε πιστωθῆναι πῶς καὶ ὁ μέγας Βασιλεῖος καὶ ὁ θεῖος Χρυσόστομος οὕτως παρέδωκαν ἀγιάζειν τὰ θεῖα δῶρα καὶ τελειοῦν εὐρήσετε ἐν πάσαις ταῖς ἐν τῇ Ἀνατολῇ Ἐκκλησίαις τὰς γεγραμμένους λειτουργίας πάσας οὕτως διαλαμβάνουσας ὑπὲρ τὰς διαχιλίας οὔσας." Ἐφη δὲ πρὸς τοῦτο ὁ Ἰουλιανός· Δύνатаι ἡ ἀγία βασιλεία σου μεθ' ὄρκου διαβεβαιῶσαι, ὅτι τὰ βιβλία ἅπερ ὀρίζεις μετεποιήθησαν ἐν τοσοῦτοις χρόνοις; εἰ δὲ τοῦτο οὐ γενήσεται, πῶς ἡμεῖς τοῖς βιβλίοις πιστεύσομεν;"

Notably, on this same day, the Ecumenical Patriarch, Joseph II, passed away. This passing significantly affected the Byzantine conciliar contingent given the considerable spiritual influence the deceased Patriarch had upon the Byzantine Fathers.¹⁰⁹ Ioannes VIII subsequently undertook many of the Patriarch's responsibilities, through which he cooperated with a small body of conciliar *periti* including Bessarion, Isidore, and Dorotheos of Mytilene, in addition to the Emperor's confessor and future Ecumenical Patriarch, Gregorios Melissenos.¹¹⁰ Given their positive disposition towards ecclesial reunion, Pope Eugenius subsequently reinvited Bessarion, Isidore, and Dorotheos to meet with him on June 12th: After offering his condolences for Joseph II, Eugenius implored these Fathers to find means of resolving the remaining sources of ecclesial division.¹¹¹ When called to explicate the Byzantine Church's doctrine regarding the epiclesis' consecratory power, Isidore and Bessarion invoked an analogy of God commanding the transformation of seeds to plants, which was likely derived from Basil the Great's *Ὁμιλία Ε' περὶ βλαστήσεως γῆς* (*Fifth Homily on the Germination of the Earth*):

Just as God's command [Gen. 1:11-2] was spoken precisely once by God, [namely,] 'Let the earth bring forth the herb of sprout grass bearing seed in accord with its

¹⁰⁹ *Acta Graeca*, Gill, ed., pp. 444-5; Syropoulos, *Memoirs*, 9.38, Laurent, ed., p. 472. According to the former source, Joseph II's final confession accepted the Latin Church's doctrines of Purgatory as well as the pope being Christ's vicar on earth. However, Joseph's confession ostensibly had little influence on the subsequent conciliar negotiations regarding ecclesial reunion, and was pertinently not referred to by Syropoulos, Mark of Ephesus, Ioannes Eugenikos, Gennadios Scholarios, or Georgios Amiroutzes refer to within their post-conciliar writings on the council and its doctrines. Thus, some scholars including Theodor Frommann in *Kritische Beitrage Zur Geschichte Der Florentiner Kircheneinigung* (Halle: Verlag der Buchhandlung des Waisenhauses, 1872), p. 82, and Elias Tantalidis also rejected it. See *Παπιστικῶν ἐλέγχων*, Vol. 2 of 3 (Istanbul: I. Lazaridou, 1850), p. 252, have rejected this confession's authenticity. According to its hierarchy of episcopal seniority, the most senior Eastern Orthodox bishop present at the Council of Florence following the Ecumenical Patriarch was the Metropolitan of Ephesus given that the second episcopate in this hierarchy, the Metropolis of Caesarea, was likely to have been vacant at this point in time. Nonetheless, as will be elucidated in Chapter Four, Mark's increased opposition towards the Ferraran-Florentine project of reunion and his declining health hindered Mark from undertaking this senior role. See Demetrius Kiminas, *The Ecumenical Patriarchate. A History of its Metropolitanates with Annotated Hierarchy Catalogs* (Rockville: Borgo Press, 2009), pp. 100-1, who highlighted that, by the fourteenth century, the Metropolitanate of Caesarea had no dioceses under its jurisdiction as a result of the Seljuk occupation of central Asia Minor.

¹¹⁰ Syropoulos, *Les Mémoires*, 10.3, Laurent, ed, p. 476.

¹¹¹ *Acta Graeca*, Gill, ed., p. 446.

kind,' and operates from the beginning to this moment and will operate through to the end, and we are convinced that God's command is to give the earth the power to produce and sprout fruit, but it also requires a cultivating operation (for we know that it is this operation that has worked in the earth to bring forth fruit), and it is in this sense that we regard the holy sacrifice, that those divine words [i.e., the dominical words] are the things which hallow it, and the [Eucharist's] perfection is also combined with the priest's prayer's and epicleses, just as the farmer's concerns himself with the earth's fruit.¹¹²

As Syropoulos highlighted, Eugenius was unsatisfied at Isidore's and Bessarion's attempts to explicate Eucharistic consecration through this ambiguous analogy.¹¹³ While the two Byzantine orators highlighted that the epiclesis perfected the Eucharistic gifts' transmutation, which had incipiently yet substantially transmuted upon the dominical words' recitation, this dissatisfaction likely resulted from the fact that this analogy insufficiently explicated the Byzantine doctrine of Eucharistic consecration *in fieri*, whereby the dominical words and the epiclesis functioned as this consecration's respective starting and ending points.¹¹⁴ Thus, some Latin Fathers in attendance at the meeting responded by

¹¹² My English translation of Syropoulos, *Les Mémoires* 10.3, Laurent, ed., p. 476, lines 17-24: "Καθάπερ τὸ θεῖον ἐκεῖνο πρόσταγμα ἅπαξ παρὰ τοῦ θεοῦ εἰρημένον τὸ βλαστησάτω ἢ γῆ βοτάνην χόρτου σπεῖρον σπέρμα κατὰ γένος, ἐξ ἀρχῆς καὶ ἐς δεῦρο ἐνεργεῖ καὶ ἕως τῆς συντελείας δὲ ἐνεργήσει, καὶ πεπίσμεθα μὲν ὡς τὸ θεῖον πρόσταγμα ἔστι τὸ ἐμποιοῦν τῇ γῆ δύναμιν ἀναφύειν καὶ καρποφορεῖν, χρεια δὲ ὁμως καὶ ἐνεργείας γεωργικῆς (ορῶμεν γὰρ αὐτὴν πλεῖστα συνεργοῦσαν τῇ γῆ πρὸς καρποφορίαν) οὕτω καὶ ἐπὶ τῆς ἱερᾶς ταύτης θυσίας φαμέν, ὅτι τὰ μὲν θεῖα ἐκεῖνα ῥήματά εἰσι τὰ ἀγιάζοντα ταύτην, συνζάλλονται δὲ πρὸς αὐτὸ καὶ αἱ εὐκαὶ καὶ αἱ ἐπικλήσεις τοῦ ἱερέως πρὸς τὴν τελείωσιν, ὡσπερ ἡ ἐπιμέλεια τοῦ γεωργοῦ πρὸς τὴν φορὰν τῆς γῆς." One should compare Bessarion's arguments here with Basil the Great's *Ὁμιλία Ε' περὶ βλαστήσεως γῆς*, who exegeted Gen. 1:11 thus: "Let the earth bring forth... Even now, this command [acts] on the earth, and throughout every season of the year, it necessarily exhibits the full extent of its power to generate herbs and seeds and trees... and so nature, following this first command from the beginning, continues throughout the ages until all things are consummated..." My English translation of Basil the Great, *Homilia V in Hexaemeron. De germinatione terrae*, sec. 10, *Patrologia Graeca*, Vol. 29, cols. 116c-7a: "Βλαστησάτω ἢ γῆ. [Gen. 1:11]... Ἐκεῖνο ἔτι καὶ νῦν ἐνυπάρχον τῇ γῆ τὸ πρόσταγμα, ἐπέιγει αὐτὴν καθ' ἐκάστην ἔτους περίοδον ἐξάγειν τὴν δύναμιν ἑαυτῆς ὅσην ἔχει πρὸς τε βοτανῶν καὶ σπερμάτων καὶ δένδρων γένεσιν... οὕτω καὶ ἡ τῆς φύσεως ἀκολουθία, ἐκ τοῦ πρώτου προστάγματος τὴν ἀρχὴν δεξαμένη πρὸς πάντα τὸν ἐφεξῆς διεξέρχεται χρόνον, μέχρις ἂν πρὸς τὴν κοινὴν συντέλειαν τοῦ παντὸς καταστήσῃ...." This will be explored further in 4.4.4.

¹¹³ Syropoulos, *Les Mémoires*, 10.3, Laurent, ed., p. 476.

¹¹⁴ Cf. Andreas Chrysoberges, *Dialogue against Mark Eugenikos*, ed. by Martin Hinterberger and Chris Schabel, in *Essays in Renaissance Thought and Letters in Honor of John Monfasani*, Alison Frazier and Patrick Fold, eds., (Leiden: Brill, 2015), pp. 492-545 (519), who critically yet accurately apprehended this Byzantine doctrine.

denouncing the inclusion of putatively consecratory epicleses within the Byzantine Rite's Eucharistic Prayers and called for their excision.¹¹⁵

Eugenius thereby appointed Juan de Torquemada to compose a *cedula* delineating the Latin Church's doctrine of Eucharistic consecration and to be the principal Latin orator within the subsequent public disquisitions on this doctrine.¹¹⁶ As Chapter Three will elucidate, Torquemada functioned as the *Magister Sacri Palatii Apostolici* which, amongst other things, entailed that he was the *de facto* Papal theologian. Pertinently, neither the conciliar *Acta* nor Syropoulos recorded Torquemada explicitly intervening in these initial Latin-Byzantine discussions between June 8th and June 11th, which, as will be pointed out in Chapter Three, likely resulted from Torquemada's late entry into the proceedings of the Council. This absence would also explicate why Torquemada's awareness of the Byzantine Fathers' dual-moment doctrine was relatively limited within his *Sermo Prior*. As will be elucidated, Torquemada likely inaccurately perceived the Byzantine doctrine to postulate that the epiclesis' recitation functioned as the sole transmutative moment, identifying the latter's doctrine with that which Pope Benedict XII had condemned the Armenian Christians for allegedly advocating in August 1341.¹¹⁷

¹¹⁵ Andreas of Santacroce, *Acta Latina Concilii Florentini*, ed. by Georg Hofmann (Rome: Pontificium Institutum Orientalium Studiorum, 1955), pp. 238-9.

¹¹⁶ See *Acta Latina*, Hofmann, ed., p. 236, wherein Torquemada referred to this commission: "De iussu et ordinatione sanctitatis vestre, pater beatissime [i.e., Eugenius IV], dicam aliqua cum benedictione sanctitatis vestre de duabus particularis loquurutus, que respiciunt sacratissime eucaristiae, paucissimis agam, quia omnia, que dicturus sum, ita puto clarissima omnibus catholicis christianis, ut non expediat abundare sermone..."

¹¹⁷ Martin Jugie, *De forma eucharistiae de epiclesibus eucharisticis* (Rome: Officium Libri Catholici, 1943), pp. 59-60. Torquemada's conciliar secretary, John Lei describes how Torquemada studied Pope Benedict XII's decrees in *Tractatus Ioannis Lei O.P.: "De visione beata" Nunc primum in lucem editus: Introductione-notis-indicibus auctus*, Candal, ed., *Studi e testi* 228 (Vatican City: Bibliotheca Apostolica Vaticana, 1963), pp. 83-4, 193. Cf. Juan de Torquemada, *Apparatus super decretum Florentinum unionis Graecorum*, ed. by Manuel Candal (Rome: Pontificium Institutum Orientalium Studiorum, 1942), p. 86, for Torquemada's evocation of Benedict's doctrine regarding the Beatific Vision within his 1336 bull, *Benedictus Deus*.

Torquemada's conclusion here was also potentially informed by his recognition that Isidore's and Bessarion's principal theological authority was Kabasilas, who could be interpreted to have claimed that it was *only* after the epiclesis were the Eucharistic gifts were substantially transformed into Christ's Body and Blood. This awareness elucidates why many of the *Sermo Prior's* arguments evoked those passages and authorities cited within Lombard's *Libri Sententiarum* which Kabasilas himself had utilized, given that, unlike Isidore and Bessarion, Torquemada likely distinguished the Latin provenance underpinning some of Kabasilas' conclusions.

Torquemada possibly acknowledged that the Byzantine Fathers implicitly evoked Kabasilas given the antecedent sharing of literary material between the Latin and Byzantine contingents. The *Acta Graeca* recorded how, during the semi-private discussions within Ferrara, the Latin and Byzantine Fathers daily met in the sacristy of the city's Franciscan church to consult the texts each contingent would employ.¹¹⁸ While Torquemada had only actively begun to participate within the Latin-Byzantine conciliar debates in May 1439, in light of this sharing of texts, some of Torquemada's Latin colleagues who were more familiar with the Greek language possibly alerted Torquemada to Bessarion's and Isidore's implicit recourse to Kabasilas' *Ἐρμηνεία*. However, as Torquemada did not at any point explicitly evoke Kabasilas' text within his two *Sermones*, this hypothesis remains purely speculative.

However, Torquemada undertook Pope Eugenius' commission between June 12th and 16th, 1439 by composing a *Cedula* which began by treating the fittingness of unleavened bread as the Eucharistic matter, before moving on to examine the nature and moment(s) of Eucharistic consecration in the Latin and Byzantine Churches' respective Eucharistic Prayers.

¹¹⁸ *Acta Graeca*, Gill, ed., p. 90.

The *Cedula* was likely composed after Torquemada provided Pope Eugenius with a proposed outline of the work on June 12th.¹¹⁹ Ioannes VIII became discontent after being informed of the additional material to debate as many of the Byzantine Fathers were relatively unprepared to engage with this topic as well as being fatigued by the already onerous conciliar sessions, leading Ioannes to object to their inclusion and threatening to depart for Constantinople.¹²⁰ The extremity of such threats indicates that the Latin and Byzantine Fathers acknowledged this topic's pertinence to the extent that it could impede the imminent ecclesial reunion. Following a heated exchange, on June 13th, Ioannes VIII accepted the incorporation of some written definition concerning Eucharistic consecration before the formal signing of the Papal bull which would effectuate ecclesial reunion. However, Ioannes VIII accepted this only on the condition that the Byzantine Fathers could publicly debate the Latin Church's *de facto* doctrine.¹²¹

Against this background, Torquemada publicly addressed the Byzantine conciliar Fathers on June 16th. Therein, Torquemada encapsulated the contents of his *Cedula* he had shared with his conciliar colleagues and counterparts regarding unleavened bread alongside the epiclesis. The arguments and conclusions of Torquemada's public address were recorded by the Papal Stenographer, Andreas of Santacroce, in the *Acta Latina*, under the title, the *Sermo Prior de Materia et Forma Ss. Eucharistiae*.¹²²

As will be elucidated in Chapter Three, for Torquemada, the principal source of dispute concerned whether regarded whether the dominical words, 'Hoc est corpus meum/Hic est sanguis meus' perfectly transmuted the Eucharistic gifts. Subsequently,

¹¹⁹ Candal, "Introductione," in Candal, ed., *Apparatus*, xxvii.

¹²⁰ Boularand, 'L'Épiclèse,' 247-8.

¹²¹ Boularand, 'L'Épiclèse,' 247-8.

¹²² See *Acta Latina*, Hofmann, ed., pp. 237, line 18-239, line 16.

contrary to Pope Eugenius' intention behind the inclusion of the doctrine of Eucharistic consecration as a topic requiring resolution at the Council, Syropoulos recorded how Ioannes VIII requested that the Byzantine Fathers be given additional time to formulate their response to Torquemada's assertions. During this time, Ioannes covertly commissioned Mark of Ephesus to compose an apologetical treatise explicating the Byzantine Church's doctrine.¹²³ Mark's *Λίβελλος* must thereby be interpreted to a significant extent as a literary response to Torquemada's *Cedula*, wherein the latter challenged the Byzantine Church's de facto dual moment doctrine of Eucharistic consecration, to a significant extent through recourse to the principles underlying Aquinas' Sacramentology. Nonetheless, it is again important to reemphasise that the Latin Church had not dogmatically defined its stance vis-à-vis the precise moment of Eucharistic transubstantiation prior to the Council of Florence. Resultingly, when analysing Torquemada's *Sermones Prior* and *Alter* in Chapters Three and Five, it will be shown that Torquemada overemphasized the doctrinally binding nature of his argumentation by evoking several axioms such as a single-form doctrine of Sacramental causality and sacerdotal instrumental causality which were disputed questions within the late medieval Latin theological tradition.

¹²³ Paraphrased from Syropoulos, *Les Mémoires*, 10.3, Laurent, ed., p. 478: "Ὁ δὲ βασιλεὺς μετακαλεσάμενος τὸν Ἐφέσου ἤξιωσεν ἵνα γράψῃ τι περὶ τοῦδε τοῦ ζητήματος· ὁ δὲ ἐπέισθη καὶ ἔγραψε καὶ ἀπέδειξεν ὅτι οὕτω παρέδωκαν οἱ ἅγιοι τῆς Ἐκκλησίας διδάσκαλοι τελειοῦσθαι τὰ θεῖς δῶρα, καθὼς ἀγιάζουσι ταῦτα ἡμέτεροι ἱερεῖς."

Chapter Two: The Post-Florentine *Status Quaestionis* of the Doctrine of Eucharistic Consecration.

Having examined the proximate background to the Florentine Eucharistic debates in Chapter One, this Chapter will provide an overview of the dogmatic statements concerning the nature and moment(s) of Eucharistic consecration issued by the Eastern Orthodox and Latin Churches following Ferrara-Florence. Doing so will allow the author to assess the dogmatic weight of both Torquemada's and Mark of Ephesus' doctrines of Eucharistic consecration articulated at Florence. This overview will also enable an assessment of to what extent their respective doctrines could be fittingly employed within any modern-day attempt to establish some form of consensus regarding this question.

2.1. The Doctrine of Eucharistic Consecration within Eastern Orthodoxy following Ferrara-Florence.

To begin by addressing the post-Florentine dogmatic statements concerning this question within the Eastern Orthodox Churches, this section will exemplify that Mark of Ephesus' *in fieri* doctrine has received consistent support within a series of Eastern Orthodox synods and canonical documentation issued through to the twenty-first century. Moreover, it will be shown that there was in fact the potential for some form of consensus concerning Eucharistic consecration with the Roman Catholic Church prevailed within these documents as a number of these utilised certain Latin Christian theological-philosophical axioms and methods of argumentation to articulate their doctrines of Eucharistic consecration.

Following the formal repudiation of the Florentine Reunion within the Pan-Orthodox council in Constantinople in 1484, the various Eastern Orthodox Churches continued to acknowledge that the nature and moment(s) of Eucharistic consecration was a Church-dividing issue. Thus understood, the *in fieri* doctrine of Eucharistic transmutation upheld by Kabasilas and later by Mark of Ephesus continued to be substantially upheld by several Eastern Orthodox synods and theologians. While these authors were not necessarily explicitly evoked, their affirmation of the epiclesis' consecratory nature was postulated by, for example, the Ecumenical Patriarch Jeremias II Tranos.¹²⁴ Tranos upheld the *in fieri* doctrine of Eucharistic transmutation within his first epistolary response to the two Lutheran Professors at the University of Tübingen, Jacob Andreæ and Martin Crusius. This response aimed to counteract the Eucharistic theology articulated in the 1530 *Augsburg Confession* given Andreæ's and Crusius' mission to cultivate the Eastern Orthodox Church's endorsement of this *Confession*.¹²⁵

This *in fieri* doctrine of Eucharistic consecration was subsequently defended within Meletios Syrigos' Greek edition and translation of the Latin text of the Eastern Orthodox Metropolitan of Kiev, Galicia and all Ruthenia from 1633 to 1647, Peter Moghila's *Orthodoxa Confessio Fidei et Apostolicae Ecclesiae Orientalis*. This confession of faith was initially composed with the support of Isaia Kozlovsky-Trofymovych and Sylwester Kossów in

¹²⁴ For an overview of Patriarch Jeremias' life and work, see Christian Hannick and Klaus-Peter Todt, "Jérémie II Tranos," in Carmelo Giuseppe Conticello and Vassa Conticello, eds., *La théologie byzantine et sa tradition*, Vol. 2 (Turnhout: Brepols, 2002), pp. 551-612.

¹²⁵ Jeremias II Tranos, Ecumenical Patriarch of Constantinople, *Primum Patriarchæ Constantinopolitani, D. Hieremia ad Augustanum Confessionem Responsum: a Martino Curiso Tybing. Academia Professore. c. 10*, in *Acta Et Scripta Theologorum VVirttembergensium, Et Patriarchæ Constantinopolitani D. Hieremiae* (Württemberg: John Tranos, 1584), p. 86. Cf. Georges Florovsky, "An Early Ecumenical Correspondence. Patriarch Jeremiah II and the Lutheran Divines," in *Collected Works of Georges Florovsky*, Vol. 2: *Christianity and Culture* (Belmont: Nordland, 1974) pp. 143-55; George Mastrantonis, *Augsburg and Constantinople: The Correspondence Between the Tübingen Theologians and Patriarch Jeremiah II of Constantinople on the Augsburg Confession* (Brookline: Holy Cross Orthodox Press, 1982).

advance of the local Eastern Orthodox Council of Kiev in 1640.¹²⁶ Nonetheless, in the lead up to the Synod of Iași, convoked in 1642 by the Ecumenical Patriarch Parthenios I and comprised both Greek and Slavic Orthodox clerics, Syrigos was commissioned on the synod's behalf to produce a Greek translation of Moghila's Latin text and amend it where necessary.¹²⁷ Pertinently, Syrigos' edition and translation upheld the epiclesis' consecratory function.¹²⁸ This revised confession was subsequently ratified at Iași, and on March 11th, 1643, and approved within a meeting of the *Ἐνδημούσα Σύνοδος* convoked by the

¹²⁶ Antoine Malvy and Marcel Viller, eds., *La Confession Orthodoxe de Pierre Moghila* (Rome: Pontificium Institutum Orientalium Studiorum, 1927), xliii-xlv. For an overview and analysis of Moghila's life and work, see Gerhard Podskalsky, *Griechische Theologie in der Zeit der Türkenherrschaft (1453-1821): die Orthodoxie im Spannungsfeld der nachreformatorischen Konfessionen des Westens* (Münich: C. H. Beck, 1982), pp. 229-36. Ihor Ševčenko, 'The Many Worlds of Peter Mohyla,' *Harvard Ukrainian Studies* 8(1/2): *The Kiev Mohyla Academy: Commemorating the 350th Anniversary of its Founding (1632)* (1984): 9-44. Cf. with caution Martin Jugie, *Theologia dogmatica christianorum orientalium ab Ecclesia catholica dissidentium*, Vol. 3: *Theologiae dogmaticae Graeco-Russorum expositio de sacramentis seu mysteriis* (Paris: Letouzey et Ané, 1930), pp. 288-301; Panteleimon Rodopoulos, *Ὁ Καθαγιασμος τῶν δώρων τῆς θεῆας εὐχαριστίας, Λειτουργικά Βλατάδων 3* (Thessalonica: Το Πατριαρχικό Ἰδρυμα Πατερικῶν Μελετῶν, 2000), pp. 34-9, for an overview of Eastern Orthodox theology vis-à-vis the epiclesis during the early modern period. Moghila's confession intended to systematically define Eastern Orthodox doctrine amidst the controversies associated with Cyril Loukaris, who was suspected of erroneously attempting to incorporate Reformed tenets within his Eucharistic theology. For example, within his own *Confessio Fidei*, initially published in Latin in Geneva in 1629 before being issued in Greek in 1633, Loukaris had expounded a doctrine of Eucharistic transmutation which could be interpreted to have upheld a merely spiritual rather than physical transformation. My English translation of *Cyrilli Confessio*, c. 16, in Ernst Julius Kimmel, ed., *Monumenta Fidei Ecclesiae Orientalis*, Vol. 1, (Jena: F. Mauke, 1850), pp. 36: "Πιστεύομεν γὰρ τοὺς πιστοὺς μεταλαμβάνοντας ἐν τῷ δεῖπνῳ τὸ σῶμα τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ ἐσθιῖν... ἀλλὰ τῇ τῆς ψυχῆς αἰσθήσει κοινωνοῦντας. Το γὰρ σῶμα τοῦ κυρίου οὐκ ἔστιν ὅπερ ἐν τῷ μυστηρίῳ τοῖς ὀφθαλμοῖς ὄραταί τε καὶ λαμβάνεται, ἀλλ' ὅπερ πνευματικῶς ἢ πίστις λαβοῦσα ἡμῖν παριστάνει τε καὶ χαρίζεται... (My English translation:) For we believe that the faithful partake and receive Our Lord Jesus Christ's Body in the [Lord's] Supper... but by perceiving communion in the soul. For the Lord's Body is not present because the Sacrament is seen and beheld by the eyes, but is presented and gifted to us spiritually or by faith..." For an analysis of the extent to which this suspicion was true, see Stephanie Falkowski, *Not Quite Calvinist: Cyril Lucaris a Reconsideration of His Life and Beliefs*, M. Th. Dissertation (Saint John's University, Collegeville, Minnesota 2018), esp. pp. 75-81.

¹²⁷ Malvy and Viller, eds., *La Confession Orthodoxe de Pierre Moghila*, l.

¹²⁸ My English translation of Peter Moghila, *Ὁρθόδοξος Ὁμολογία τῆς Καθολικῆς καὶ Ἀποστολικῆς Ανατολικῆς Ἐκκλησίας*, q. 107, ed. by Georgios Constantinou (Venice, Demetrios Theodosiou, 1764), p. 125: "Τέταρτον πρέπει, νὰ ἔχη ὁ ἱερεὺς τοιαύτην γνώμην εἰς τὸν καιρὸν, ὅπου ἀγιάζει τὰ δῶρα, πῶς αὐτὴ ἢ οὐσία τοῦ ἄρτου καὶ ἢ οὐσία τοῦ οἴνου μεταβάλλεται εἰς τὴν οὐσίαν τοῦ ἀληθινοῦ σώματος καὶ αἵματος τοῦ Χριστοῦ διὰ τῆς ἐνεργείας τοῦ ἁγίου Πνεύματος, οὗ τὴν ἐπίκλησιν κάμει τὴν ὥραν ἐκείνην, διανατελῶς τὸ μυστήριον τοῦτο, ἐπευχόμενος καὶ λέγων· Κατάμεψσον τὸ Πνεῦμά σου τὸ ἅγιον ἐφ' ἡμᾶς καὶ ἐπὶ τα προκείμενα δῶρα ταῦτα· καὶ ποιήσον τὸν μὲν ἄρτον τοῦτον τίμιον σῶμα τοῦ Χριστοῦ σου, τὸ δὲ ἐν τῷ ποτηρίῳ τούτῳ τίμιον αἷμα τοῦ Χριστοῦ σου, μεταβαλὼν τῷ Πνεύματί σου τῷ ἁγίῳ... (My English translation:) ...the priest must intend [to consecrate] in the moments when he consecrates the holy gifts, that the bread's substance and the wine's substance are transmuted into the true substance of Christ's Body and Blood through the Holy Spirit's operation, whom the priest invokes for this Sacrament's perfection, boastfully proclaiming... [the *Liturgy of St John Chrysostom's* epiclesis]."

Ecumenical Patriarch Parthenios I, while also being signed by the Eastern Orthodox Patriarchs of Jerusalem, Antioch, and Alexandria.¹²⁹

Moving on to the late nineteenth century, in response to Pope Leo XIII's 1894 apostolic letter, *Praeclara gratulationis publicae*,¹³⁰ the Ecumenical Patriarchate under Anthimos VII issued an encyclical proclaiming that the Eastern Orthodox Churches upheld that Eucharistic consecration occurs following the epiclesis. This doctrine, according to this encyclical, was that of the universal Church of the first seven ecumenical councils and was attested to within the early Latin Church. Indeed, the encyclical claimed that the Latin Church had progressively departed from this doctrine by formulating the doctrine that the dominical words solely consecrated these gifts.¹³¹

¹²⁹ Kallinikos Delikanis, ed., *Τα εν τοις κώδιξι του Πατριαρχικού Αρχαιοφυλακείου σωζόμενα επίσημα εκκλησιαστικά έγγραφα*, Vol. 3 (Istanbul: Εκ του Πατριαρχικού Τυπογραφείου, 1904), pp. 31-2; Antoine Malvy and Marcel Viller, eds., "Introduction," in *La confessione orthodoxe de Pierre Moghila* (Rome: Pontificium Institutum Orientalium Studiorum, 1927), li-lilii, lxii; This doctrine was reiterated in the doctrinal statement issued by the Synod of Constantinople, which assembled in January 1672 and was presided over by Ecumenical Patriarch Dionysios IV. See *Dionysii Patriarchae Constantinopolitani Super Calvinistarum Erroribus ac Reali Imprimis Praesentia Responsio*, in Mansi, *Sacrorum Conciliorum Nova et Amplissima Collectio*, Vol. 34 (Paris: Hubert Welter, 1902), cols. 1780-1.

¹³⁰ Cf. Leo XIII, *Epistola Apostolica, SSmi. D. N. Leonis XIII ad Principes populosque universos, occasione sui iubilaei episcopalis*, in Victor Piazzesi, ed., *Acta Sanctae Sedis in Compendium Opportune Redacta et Illustrata*, Vol. 26 (Rome: Ex Typographia Polyglotta a S. Congr. De Propaganda Fide, 1893-4), pp. 705-17.

¹³¹ *Εγκύκλιος πατριαρχική και συνοδική επιστολή προς τους Ιερωτάτους και Θεοφιλεστάτους εν Χριστώ αδελφούς μητροπολίτας και επισκόπους και τον περί αυτούς ιερόν και ευαγή κλήρον και άπαν το ευσεβές και ορθόδοξον πλήρωμα του αγιωτάτου αποστολικού και πατριαρχικού θρόνου Κωνσταντινουπόλεως* (Istanbul: Εκ του Πατριαρχ. Τυπογραφείου, 1895), p. 9: "Η μία άγια καθολική και άποστολική Έκκλησία τών έπτά Οίκουμενικών Συνόδων παρεδέχετο, ότι τά τίμια δώρα καθαγιαζονται μετά τήν εύχήν τής έπικλήσεως του Άγίου Πνεύματος διά τής εύλογίας του ιερέως, ως μαρτυροϋσι τά άρχαία τυπικά τής Ρώμης και τών Γαλλιών, ύστερον όμως έκαινοτόμησε και έν τούτω ή παπική Έκκλησία, άποδεξαμένη άύθαιρέτως τήν καθαγιασιν τών τιμίων δώρων ως γιγομένην συν τή έκφωνήσει τών Κυριακών λογίων: «λάβετε φάψετε τοϋτο έστι τὸ σῶμά μου» και «Πίετε έξ αυτού πάντες· τοϋτο γάρ έστι τὸ αίμα μου»... (My English translation:) The one holy, Catholic and Apostolic Church of the Seven Ecumenical Councils held that the sacred gifts are consecrated following the prayer of the epiclesis to the Holy Spirit through the priest's blessing, as witnessed in the primitive rites of Rome and Gaul, later however the Papal Church also innovated by accepting arbitrarily that the sacred gifts' consecration is done with the recitation of the Lord's words..." Additionally, in 1839, the Most Holy Governing Synod formally adopted a revised version of the *Longer Catechism of the Orthodox Church of the East*, first formulated by the Metropolitan of Moscow, Philaret Drozdov, in 1823, which also expounded an *in fieri* doctrine of Eucharistic consecration which affirmed the epiclesis' consecratory function. Cf. *The Longer Catechism of the Orthodox Catholic Church of the East*, ed. and trans. by Richard White Blackmore, *The Doctrine of the Russian Church* (Aberdeen: A. Brown, 1845), pp. 91-2.

Given this analysis, any attempt to reconcile the Eastern Orthodox Churches with the Latin Church must evidently consider the former communion's magisterial emphasis on the epiclesis' consecratory function. However, there is also a precedent for a positive receptivity to some of the intra-Latin theological and philosophical developments vis-à-vis Eucharistic consecration. Consequently, one can reiterate the above claim that, had the Latin Church alternatively attempted to reconcile the Eastern Orthodox Churches through recourse to some of the Franciscan Sacramentological principles explicated in Chapter One, a more enduring consensus on this source of dispute could have been established.

2.2 The Doctrine of Eucharistic Consecration within the Roman Catholic Church following Ferrara-Florence.

Having detailed the post-Florentine magisterial developments within the Eastern Orthodox Churches concerning Eucharistic consecration, this section will similarly analyse how the Roman Catholic Church has officially responded to this question from Ferrara-Florence through to the twenty-first century. While Roman Catholic dogmatic theologians began to formulate a precise doctrine concerning the nature of Eucharistic consecration following Ferrara-Florence, unlike other controverted doctrines such as the Immaculate Conception or Papal Infallibility, the Roman Catholic Magisterium has to this day proclaimed any infallible dogmatic definition with regards to this doctrine.¹³²

Following the Byzantine Fathers' departure from Ferrara-Florence, the Roman Catholic Church affirmed that the dominical words function as the Eucharistic form when effectuating ecclesial reunion with representatives of the Armenian Apostolic Church in the

¹³² Cf. Patrick Reagan, 'Quenching the Spirit: The Epiclesis in Recent Roman Documents,' *Worship* 79 (2005): 386-404 for an overview of the most recent Roman Catholic Magisterial treatments of the epiclesis.

Decretum pro Armenis, issued in November 1439.¹³³ This doctrine was again affirmed in its bull of reunion with the Coptic and Ethiopian Oriental Orthodox Churches in *Cantate Domino*, issued in February 1442.¹³⁴ Neither of the teachings of these bulls were, however, universally binding upon the Churches in communion with Rome. Nonetheless, the thirteenth session of the Council of Trent published its dogmatic *Decretum de ss. Eucharistia* in October 1551, which some scholars such as Sévérien Salaville have assessed to have declared that the dominical words strictly consecrate the Eucharistic gifts.¹³⁵ However, this decree merely posited that the Eucharistic gifts had been fully transmuted into Christ's Body and Blood following the unspecified 'consecration'.¹³⁶

In conjunction with this Tridentine decree, given that three of the four *periti* appointed by Pope Pius IV to compose the *Catechismus ex decreto Concilii Tridentini ad Parochos*, which was published in 1566, were Dominican brethren, this catechism naturally interpreted this Tridentine decree according to the orthodox Thomistic theology which

¹³³ Eugenius IV, *Exaltate Deo*, in Denzinger, ed., *Enchiridion*, p. 240.

¹³⁴ Eugenius IV, *Cantate Domino*, in Denzinger, ed., *Enchiridion*, p. 249.

¹³⁵ Salaville, "Épiclèse eucharistique," in *Dictionnaire de Théologie Catholique*, Vol. 5, col. 231.

¹³⁶ *Conc. Trid. (Oec. XIX) 1545-1563, Sess. XIII (11 Oct. 1551). Canones de Ss. Eucharistia*, can. 4, in Denzinger, ed., *Enchiridion*, p. 290: "Si quis dixerit, peracta consecratione in admirabili Eucharistiae sacramento non esse corpus et sanguinem Domini nostri Iesu Christi, sed tantum in usu, dum sumitur, non autem ante vel post, et in hostiis seu particulis consecratis, quae post communionem reservantur vel supersunt, non remanere verum corpus Domini: anathema sit." Theodore Alois Buckley, trans., *Canons and Decrees of the Council of Trent* (London: George Routledge and Co., 1851), p. 78: "If any one shall say, that, after the consecration is completed, the body and blood of our Lord Jesus Christ are not in the admirable sacrament of the Eucharist, but [are there] only during the use, whilst it is being taken, and not either before or after; and that, in the hosts, or consecrated particles, which after communion are reserved or remain, the true body of the Lord remaineth not; let him be anathema." The fact that Trent did not explicitly denounce the doctrine that the epiclesis could function as a consecratory Eucharistic component is pertinent given that, in 1552, the Dominican theologian and Tridentine peritus, Lancelot Periti, writing under the pseudonym Ambrosius Catharinus, produced two treatises entitled *Quaesto quibusnam verbis Christus divinum Eucharistiae sacramentum confecerit* and *Tractatus secunda illius quaestionis quibus verbis Christus sacramentum confecerit*, wherein he postulated that the epiclesis, conditioned by the dominical words, was the 'consecration rite' within the Eastern Christian Churches, whereas within the Latin Church, the rite of transubstantiation was the dominical words determined by the *Quam oblationem*. In 1596, Politi's works were subsequently listed on the *Index Librorum Prohibitorum*. Salaville, "Épiclèse eucharistique," in *Dictionnaire de Théologie Catholique*, Vol. 5, col. 231; Edward Schillebeeckx, *De sacramentele Heilseconomie* (Antwerp: T. Groeit, 1952), pp. 332-4.

prevailed within the early modern Dominican Order. Thus, the ‘form’ for Eucharistic consecration was delineated as *Hoc est corpus meum/Hic est sanguis meus*, in addition to the *mysterium fidei*.¹³⁷

Moving on to the twentieth century,¹³⁸ within an epistle sent to several of his Near Eastern apostolic delegates in December 1910, Pope Pius X repudiated the doctrine of the epiclesis’ perfective consecratory function, maintaining that to add a putatively consecratory accidental item to the Eucharistic form, i.e., the dominical words, would change the Sacrament’s ‘substance.’¹³⁹

Within his apostolic constitution, *Sacramentum Ordinis*, issued on November 30th, 1947, Pius XII addressed the issue which the Florentine *Decretum pro Armenis* aimed to resolve in affirming that the matter and form for the validity of Sacerdotal Ordination was the *traditio instrumentorum* and its accompanying verbal formula. This doctrine had in fact

¹³⁷ *Catechismus ex decreto Concilii Tridentini ad Parochos* (Rome: In aedibus Populi Romani, 1574), pp. 224-9. These three Dominican theologians were Leonardo Marino, Archbishop of Lanciano, Egidio Foscherari, Bishop of Modena, and Francisco Fureiro. Eugène Mangenot, “Catechisme,” in *Dictionnaire de théologie catholique* Vol. 2 (Paris: Letouzey et Ané, 1908), cols. 1895-1968 (1918). Subsequently, several post-Tridentine Roman Catholic scholars between the sixteenth and nineteenth centuries asserted that the dominical words were a ubiquitous element of the oldest Eucharistic Prayers. See, e.g., Eusebius Renaudot, *Liturgiarum orientalium collectio*, Vol. 2 of 2, repr. (Frankfurt/London: J. Baer, 1847), p. 573, who stated that a Eucharistic Prayer which did not include the dominical words was “inauditum prorsus antiquitus, et contra omnium Ecclesiarum... disciplinam.”

¹³⁸ Cf. Benedict XIII, *Decreta Sacrae Congregationis de Propaganda Fide super ritibus Melchitarum Syriae et Palaestinae, a Sanctissimo D. N. Benedicto XIII approbata, et ex praescripto Sanctitatis Suae omnimoda executioni demandanda*. in *Acta et Decreta sacrorum conciliorum recentiorum*, Collectio Iacensis, Vol. 2 (Freiburg: Herder, 1886), cols. 438-42 (439-40); Pius VII, *Adorabile Eucharistiae*, in *Bullarium pontificium sacrae congregationis de propaganda fide*, Vol. 4 (Rome: Typis Collegii Urbani, 1841), pp. 388-93 (389), for two pertinent examples of the Papal affirmation of the dominical words’ sole consecratory power prior to the twentieth century. Due to word limitations, I am unable to exposit their contents.

¹³⁹ Pius X, *Ex Quo, Nono*, in *La Civiltà Cattolica* 62, Vol. 1 (Rome: Direzione e Amministrazione, 1911), pp. 131-4 (132-3). Pius X particularly sought to counteract the Roman Catholic theologian, Maximilian of Saxony, who published an article within the journal *Roma e l’Oriente* earlier that year. Maximilian’s article conjured several topoi which he lamentably believed divided the Latin and Eastern Christian Churches, including the nature and moment of Eucharistic consecration. Maximilian of Saxony, ‘Pensées sur la question de l’union des Églises,’ *Roma e l’Oriente* 1 (1910): 13-29. According to Maximilian, as the Latin Rite’s rubrics implied the dominical words’ immediate consecratory operation, many Latin Christian theologians overlooked the prevalent Eastern Christian doctrine that the epiclesis completes the transmutative process. See Maximilian of Saxony, ‘Pensées sur la question de l’union des Églises,’ 25. Cf. Kappes, *Epiclesis Debate*, pp. 247-50.

been later incorporated into the *Pontificale Romanum's* rubrics under Pope Clement VIII in 1595.¹⁴⁰ Pius XII countered this doctrine by arguing that, because Christ Himself bestowed His Church with a sevenfold order of Sacraments, whose Sacramental signs He ordained His Churches to preserve, given that each of the Universal Church's liturgical Rites have historically maintained that the imposition of hands and its verbal formula have signified this Sacrament, these items must function as Ordination's 'substance.'¹⁴¹ Through this method, Pius XII exemplified that the *traditio instrumentorum* was not necessary for the validity of Sacramental ordination as the Byzantine Church, which had re-established full communion with the Latin Church, was authorised at Florence to continue administering Holy Orders simply through the imposition of hands.¹⁴²

According to Pius XII, the Latin Church at Florence did not aim to teach that the *traditio instrumentorum* pertained to Ordination's 'substance.' Rather, this council added a further condition for the Sacrament's valid celebration within the Latin Rite, which the Church could equally remove, and which Pius XII used to alter the conditions for valid Ordination.¹⁴³ This conclusion thereby undermined Pius X's qualms concerning the addition of accidental items added to the Sacramental 'substance.' Pertinently, given that Pius XII's pronouncement was addressed to the universal Church, compared to Pius X's epistle which was simply addressed to a number of Papal delegates, one can conclude that the former holds relatively greater magisterial weight. Indeed, following the First Vatican Council's

¹⁴⁰ See Eugenius IV, *Exaltate Deo*, in Denzinger, ed., *Enchiridion*, p. 242; *Pontificale Romanum* (Rome: Leonardi Parasoli [e] Sociorum, 1595), pp. 53-75.

¹⁴¹ Pius XII, *Constitutio Apostolica de Sacris Ordinibus Diaconatus, Presbyteratus et Episcopatus*, in *Acta Apostolicae Sedis. Commentarium Officiale*, Vol. 40 (Vatican City: Typis Polyglottis Vaticanis, 1948), pp. 5-7 (5-6).

¹⁴² Pius XII, *Constitutio Apostolica de Sacris Ordinibus*, in *Acta Apostolicae Sedis*, Vol. 40, p. 6. Cf. Kappes, *Epiclesis Debate*, pp. 250-1. Pertinently, in Chapter Five, Torquemada will be shown utilised a similar inductive method which Pius XII employed here to establish what the Latin and Eastern Orthodox Churches mutually shared and thereby determine the Eucharist's Dominical and Apostolic substance.

¹⁴³ Pius XII, *Constitutio Apostolica de Sacris Ordinibus*, in *Acta Apostolicae Sedis*, Vol. 40, p. 6.

definition of Papal Infallibility in 1870, for a given doctrine to possess infallibility as such, the Pope needed to decree this doctrine universally by exercising his office as the pastor and doctor over all Christians on a matter *de fide vel moribus*.¹⁴⁴ Through this definition, Roman Catholic theologians were in effect facilitated to bypass the doctrines elucidated in both *Exaltate Deo* and the *Catechismus ex decreto Concilii Tridentini*, which came to be regarded as teachings with varying degrees of magisterial weight as these documents' doctrines were not universally instructed, with *Exaltate Deo* being strictly addressed to the Armenian Church and the *Catechismus ex decreto Concilii Tridentini* being addressed to Roman Catholic clergy.¹⁴⁵

¹⁴⁴ *Conc. Vaticanum, Sessio IV (18 Iulii 1870) Constitutio dogmatica I de Ecclesia Christi, Cap. 4. De Romani Pontificis infallibili magisterio*, in Denzinger, ed., *Enchiridion*, p. 490.

¹⁴⁵ Kappes, *Epiclesis Debate*, pp. 252-7. See e.g., G. M. van Rossum, *De essentia sacramenti ordinis: Disquisitio historico-theologica*, 1st ed. (Freiburg im Breisgau: B. Herder, 1914), pp. 162-175 (169), where van Rossum argued that, because *Exaltate Deo* was strictly addressed to one particular Church, and not to the entire Roman Catholic episcopate or faithful, in addition to the lack of reception of this document's doctrine of Ordination's form and matter by subsequent generations of Christians in communion with Rome, this doctrine was thus merely instructed "ab ordinaria ac fallibili Ecclesiae auctoritate," and a Catholic could thereby, if they had sufficient reasons, withhold assent thereto. See also Ioannes Baptista Franzelin, *Tractatus de divina traditione et scriptura*, sec. 1, c. 2, th. 12, sch. 1, princ. 1, cor. 5, 2nd ed. (Rome: S. Congr. de Propaganda Fide, 1875), p. 119, who remarked of *Exaltate Deo*: "... utrum quae ibi docentur nominatim de materia et forma sacramentorum, sint definitiones dogmaticae, an solum instructiones in praxi observandae... (My English translation:) what is taught there [in this decree] specifically about the Sacraments' matter and form are either dogmatic definitions or instructions to be practically observed." Roman Catholic theologians from the fifteenth through to the early twentieth centuries diverged over *Exaltate Deo*'s dogmatic weight. For example, some sixteenth and seventeenth century theologians argued that *Exaltate Deo*, including its Sacramental teachings, is a true, infallible ecumenical conciliar definition which was instructed by the Church's extraordinary Magisterium. See, e.g., Ruard Tapper, *De sacramento ordinis*, a. 17, in *Opera Omnia*, Vol. 2 of 2 (Cologne: In Officina Birckmannica, 1582), p. 268; Gabriel Vásquez, *Commentariorum ac disputationum in Tertiam partem S. Thomae*, Vol. 3 of 3, disp. 139, c. 6 (Alcalá de Henares: Andreas Sanchez de Ezpeleta, 1613), p. 869ff. During the early twentieth century, this interpretation of *Exaltate Deo* was upheld by Louis Billot, *De Ecclesiae Sacramentis: Commentarius in Tertiam Partem S. Thomae*, q. 72, thes. 31, a. 1 (Rome: Typographia Pontificia in Instituto Pii IX, 1914), p. 294. Nonetheless, a number of Roman Catholic theologians during this period, acknowledging the variance in the praxis of Holy Orders, particularly with regards to the Byzantine and Armenian Rites, subsequently asserted that *Exaltate Deo* sought to provide disciplinary instruction to the Armenians regarding the Latin Rite's praxis, rather than dogmatically define the Sacrament form and matter of Holy Orders. See Pietro Gasparri, *Tractatus canonicus de sacra ordinatione*, Vol. 2, n. 1007 (Paris/Lyon: Delhomme et Brigue, 1894), pp. 213-4. See also Denzinger, *Enchiridion*, p. 242, n. 1, who stated with regards to *Exaltate Deo*'s statements on Holy Orders: "Notandum est agi hic de instructione Armenorum circa ea, quae, erant diversa ab eorum ritibus, non vero de definienda materia et forma sensu stricto accepta tanquam partibus sacramento essentialibus... (My English translation:) One must note that we are dealing here [i.e., *Exaltate Deo*, c. 6] with the instruction of the Armenians concerning those things which were different in their Rites [from the Latin Rite], but are not [dealing] with the definition of the acceptable matter and form in the

Thus, during the late twentieth century, the Roman Catholic Magisterium has explicitly acknowledged that, through its divinely instituted authority, a given Church could add extra forms for the Eucharist's validity. Thus, the Roman Catholic Magisterial receptivity towards an *in fieri* doctrine of Eucharistic consecration which acknowledged the epiclesis' consecratory function was elucidated within the *Catechism of the Catholic Church*, first issued in 1983:

[1333] ...the bread and wine... by the words of Christ and the invocation of the Holy Spirit, become Christ's Body and Blood...

[1353] In the epiclesis, the Church asks the Father to send his Holy Spirit (or the power of his blessing) on the bread and wine, so that by His power they may become the Body and Blood of Jesus Christ... In the institution narrative, the power of the words and the action of Christ, and the power of the Holy Spirit, make sacramentally present under the species of bread and wine Christ's Body and Blood...¹⁴⁶

These developments exemplify that the Latin Church's insistence on the dominical words' sole consecratory function at Florence lacked the proper authority to bind their Byzantine counterparts. Moreover, these developments indicate that there was a methodological basis from which the Latin and Byzantine Florentine Fathers could have arrived at consensus which recognised that additional forms including the epiclesis were necessary criteria for the Eucharist's validity within the Byzantine Rite, in virtue of Byzantine Church's Apostolic authority to 'bind and loose' the forms of their Sacramental orders.

strict sense as essential parts of the Sacrament [of Ordination]..." Cf. Manuel Quera, 'El decreto de Eugenio IV para los Armenios, y el sacramento del Orden,' *Estudios eclesiásticos: Revista de investigación e información teológica y canónica* 4(15) (1925): 237-50, who arrived at the same conclusion, but also provided an overview of the differing opinions on this question.

¹⁴⁶ *The Catechism of the Catholic Church*, nn. 1333, 1353 (New York: Doubleday, 1995), pp. 371, 377; Cf. Kappes, *Epiclesis Debate*, pp. 261-3; Gerhard Ludwig Müller, *Laßt uns mit ihm gehen: Eucharistiefeier als Weggemeinschaft* (Freiburg/Basel/Vienna: Herder, 1990), p. 189.

Chapter Three: An Analysis of Juan de Torquemada's *Sermo Prior*

3.1. Torquemada's Background.

Having detailed the *status quaestionis* concerning the nature and moment of Eucharistic consecration within the Roman Catholic and Eastern Churches from a dogmatic perspective, one must evaluate how the Latin Church, through Torquemada's Eucharistic *Cedula* and *Sermones*, attempted to defend its doctrine of the dominical words' unique consecratory function at Florence.

To begin by addressing Torquemada's background and how this informed his treatment of the nature and moment(s) Eucharistic consecration at Florence, having been born as Alvaro in 1388 in Torquemada, Palencia in the Crown of Castille to the *regidor* of Valladolid, Álvaro Fernández de Torquemada,¹⁴⁷ in 1403, Torquemada made his profession within the Order of Preachers in Valladolid, joining the order's priory of San Pablo.¹⁴⁸ Therein, he began his formation before being sent to the University of Salamanca to undertake studies in Philosophy.¹⁴⁹ In virtue of Torquemada's intellectual capacities, Torquemada came to the attention of the order's Castilian provincial, Luis de Valladolid.¹⁵⁰ Subsequently, Torquemada was appointed to accompany Luis as part of the Castilian

¹⁴⁷ Hernando de Castillo, *Primera parte de la Historia General de Santo Domingo y de su Orden de Predicadores*, III, c. 12 (Valladolid, Francisco Fernández de Córdoba, 1612), p. 571. Cf. Thomas M. Izbicki, *Protector of the Faith: Cardinal Johannes de Turrecremata and the Defense of the Institutional Church* (Washington, D.C.: Catholic University of America Press, 1981); Stephan Lederer, *Der spanische Cardinal Johann von Torquemada: Sein Leben und seine Schriften* (Freiburg im Breisgau: Herder, 1879), for more extensive treatments of Torquemada's life and work.

¹⁴⁸ Castillo, *Historia General de Santo Domingo*, III, c. 12, p. 572.

¹⁴⁹ Thomas Izbicki, *Protector of the Faith: Cardinal Johannes de Turrecremata and the Defense of the Institutional Church* (Washington, D.C.: Catholic University of America, 1981), p. 1

¹⁵⁰ Luis also served as the confessor to the King of Castille, Juan II. Izbicki, *Protector of the Faith*, p. 1; Lederer, *Der spanische Cardinal*, pp. 14-5. Cf. Jacques Quetif and Jacques Echard, *Scriptores ordinis praedicatorum recensiti notis historicis et criticis illustrati auctoribus*, Vol. 1 of 2 (Paris: J. B. C. Ballard and Nicholas Simart, 1719), pp. 789-90 for an overview of Luis' life and work.

contingent to the Council of Constance in October 1416.¹⁵¹ Upon his arrival at Constance, in June 1417, Torquemada was formally appointed as a junior representative of Castille.¹⁵² Following these conciliar engagements, Torquemada was sent to study Theology at the University of Paris, gaining his licentiate on March 3rd, 1424,¹⁵³ before being awarded with a Doctorate on February 16th, 1425.¹⁵⁴

Pertinently, throughout his academic formation, Torquemada's capacity to engage in the forensic style of debates that later took place at Ferrara-Florence would have been enhanced through participating in *quaestiones disputatae* within both the Dominican Order's own *studia* as well as the medieval Latin Christian university network.¹⁵⁵ This factor helps to explicate why Torquemada was able to secure his Byzantine counterparts' assent to his single moment doctrine of Eucharistic consecration, as detailed in Chapters Five and Six. Additionally, given that, from the thirteenth century, the medieval Latin Christian university network made it a requirement to comment upon Lombard's *Libri Sententiarum* to be elevated as a *Theologiae Magister*,¹⁵⁶ Torquemada's engagement with this *florilegium* of Patristic excerpts at Paris, as well as with earlier *Sentences* commentaries including Aquinas', accounts for the restricted nature and exegesis of his Sacramentological source material within his *Sermones Prior* and *Alter*, as this Chapter and Chapter Five will detail.

¹⁵¹ Quetif and Echard, *Scriptores ordinis praedicatorum*, Vol. 1, p. 837.

¹⁵² Quetif and Echard, *Scriptores ordinis praedicatorum*, Vol. 1, p. 837.

¹⁵³ Heinrich Denifle, ed., *Chartularium Universitatis Parisiensis*, 2234, Vol. 4 (Paris: Delalain, 1897), p. 428.

¹⁵⁴ Denifle, ed., *Chartularium Universitatis Parisiensis*, Vol. 4, p. 428, n. 5; Izbicki, *Protector of the Faith*, pp. 1-2; Kappes, *The Epiclesis Debate*, pp. 70-1.

¹⁵⁵ See Anthony Kenny and Jan Pinborg, "Medieval Philosophical Literature," in Norman Kretzmann, Kenny, Pinborg, eds., *Cambridge History of Later Medieval Philosophy* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1982), pp. 12-42 (esp. 20-5); Alex J. Novikoff, 'Toward a Cultural History of Scholastic Disputation,' *American Historical Review* 117(2) (2012): 331-64; Novikoff, *The Medieval Culture of Disputation: Pedagogy, Practice, and Disputation* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2013) for more extensive treatments of the origin and role of the *disputatio* within the Latin Scholastic educational network.

¹⁵⁶ Giulio Silano, ed. and trans., "Introduction," in *Peter Lombard. The Sentences: Book I: The Mystery of the Trinity* (Toronto: Pontifical Institute of Mediaeval Studies, 2007), vi-I (xxx).

In 1431, Torquemada was appointed as a delegate for the Dominican Province of Castille at the Order's General Chapter at Lyon. As a result of his support for the Master of the Order, Bartholomaeus Texier, and the latter's agenda for instilling a stricter observance within the Order,¹⁵⁷ Texier subsequently appointed Torquemada as one of the six Dominican representatives to participate within the Council of Basel, which formally convened on July 23rd, 1431.¹⁵⁸ Juan II likewise appointed Torquemada as one of his conciliar observers. Torquemada subsequently arrived at Basel on August 22nd, 1432, before being formally received on August 30th.¹⁵⁹ Given the support Torquemada provided to the Papacy at the Council,¹⁶⁰ on March 4th, 1435, Pope Eugenius appointed Torquemada as *Magister Sacri Palatii Apostolici*, entailing that Torquemada functioned as the Pope's *de facto* theologian.¹⁶¹

¹⁵⁷ Cf. Karl Binder, 'El cardenal Juan de Torquemada y el movimiento de reforma eclesiastica en el siglo XV,' *Revista de teologia* 3 (1953): 42-66, Petra Weigel, "Reform als Paradigma – Konzilien und Betteordenen," in Heribert Müller and Johannes Helmuth, eds., *Die Konzilien von Pisa (1409), Konstanz (1414-1418) und Basel (1431-1449). Institution und Personen*. Ostfildern: Jan Thorbecke, 2007), pp. 289-335, esp. 316, 320-2.

¹⁵⁸ Izbicki, *Protector of the Faith*, pp. 2-3. Cf. Alfonso Maierù, "Dominican Studia in Spain," in Kent Emery, Jr., William J. Courtenay, and Stephen M. Metzger, eds., *Philosophy and Theology in the 'Studia' of the Religious Orders and at Papal and Royal Courts: Acts of the XVth Annual Colloquium of the Société Internationale pour l'Étude de la Philosophie Médiévale, University of Notre Dame, 8-10 October 2008* (Turnhout: Brepols, 2012), pp. 3-32 for an historical analysis of the state of the Iberian *studia* Torquemada was formed under.

¹⁵⁹ Candal, "Introductione," in Candal, ed., *Apparatus*, viii; Stephan Lederer, *Der Spanische Cardinal Johann Von Torquemada. Sein Leben Und Seine Schriften* (Freiburg im Breisgau: Herder, 1879), p. 16.

¹⁶⁰ For example, Torquemada upheld the papal prerogative to appoint the president of the council while also advocating the reform of ecclesiastical corruption, including the papal curia. See Giovanni Domenico Mansi, ed., *Solemnis Tractatus Fr Jn. De Turrecremata Ord. Praedicatorum in favorem Eugenii IV contra Conc. Constant. & contra gesta in conc. Basil adversus Eugenium*, in *Sacrorum conciliorum nova et amplissima collectio*, Vol. 30 (Venice: Antonio Zatta, 1792), cols. 550-89, esp. 581-2; Izbicki, "The Revival of Papalism at the Council of Basel," in Michiel Decaluwé, Thomas M. Izbicki, Gerald Christianson, eds., *A Companion to the Council of Basel* (Leiden: Brill, 2017), pp. 137-63 (143-52). Likewise, Torquemada was commissioned by Cesarini to formulate a dissertation upholding papal supremacy, which was subsequently published as the treatise, *Oratio synodalis de primatu*. Torquemada, *Oratio synodalis de primatu*, Candal, ed. (Rome: Pontificium Institutum Orientalium Studiorum: 1954).

¹⁶¹ Candal, "Introduction," in Candal, ed., *Apparatus*, ix. In particular, Torquemada would have had oversight over the formation of students and prelates within the Roman Curia and represented the Papacy at theological conferences. Cf. Raymond Creytens, 'Le Studium Romanae Curiae et le maître du Sacré Palais,' *Archivum Fratrum Praedicatorum* 12 (1942): 5-83 for an overview of the functions of the *Magister Sacri Palatii Apostolici* and how these developed over time.

Notably, one can glean that Torquemada's Eucharistic theology was likely significantly informed by the *Corpus Thomisticum* and *florilegia* including the *Decretum Gratiani* when examining the Eucharistic *opera* Torquemada produced to counter the doctrine of *utraquism* upheld by the Hussites at the Council of Basel. This dependence can be especially exhibited by Torquemada's *Tractatus De Sacramento Eucharistiae*, which was composed between August and September 1437 at Texier's behest for the purpose of supporting the Roman Catholic orator, Johannes Palomar, within his disputation with Prokop of Pilsen and Jan of Píbram.¹⁶² Therein, Torquemada utilised Aquinas' arguments within the *Summa Theologiae* to uphold the priest(s)' consecration of both the host and chalice as, while Christ is fully present in both of the consecrated gifts, the priest(s) must consecrate and receive communion under both kinds to accurately commemorate the separation of Christ's Blood from his Body at His Passion.¹⁶³ Nonetheless, Torquemada also made recourse to Aquinas' mode of reasoning within the *Summa Theologiae*, III, q. 80, a. 12, to assert that the Church validly withheld the consecrated chalice for the pragmatic reason that its mass reception risked Christ's Blood being spilt.¹⁶⁴

In addition, to establish that the historical Church councils did not firmly establish the practice of *utraquism* to the laity, Torquemada evoked the canons of the Twelfth Council of Toledo of 681 and Pope Gelasius I's epistle to Bishops Majoricus, Serenus, and John, the relevant extracts of which were compiled adjacently within the *Tertia Pars* of the

¹⁶² This treatise has been preserved within manuscripts under two titles: *De sacramento Eucharistie*, in *Vat. lat.* 976, fols. 136^v-161^r; *De corpore Christi*, in *Vat. lat.* 2973, fols. 170^r-222^v. See Candal, "Introductione," in Candal, ed., *Apparatus*, x. Cf. Jules Félix Stockmann, *Joannis de Turrecremata O.P. vitam ejusque doctrinam De corpore Christi mystico scholasticorum Medicaevalium traditione illustratam et explicatam*, Ph. D. Dissertation (University of Freiburg: 1952) for a more extensive analysis of this treatise.

¹⁶³ See Torquemada, *Tractatus de Sacramento Eucharistiae*, in *Vat. lat.* 976, fols. 136^v-161^r (146^v); Cf. Aquinas, *Summa Theologiae*, III, q. 80, a. 12, ad. 3, in *n Opera Omnia*, Vol. 12. *Editio Leonina*, p. 244.

¹⁶⁴ See Torquemada, *De Sacramento Eucharistiae*, in *Vat. lat.* 976, fols. 144^r-5^v; Cf. Aquinas, *Summa Theologiae*, III, q. 80, a. 12, resp., in *Opera Omnia*, Vol. 12. *Editio Leonina*, p. 244.

Decretum Gratiani.¹⁶⁵ Based upon these canonical documents, Torquemada went on to counter the Hussite claim that *utraquism* was an essential dominically-instituted practice by positing that their references to *utraquism* pertained strictly to the celebrant priests. Moreover, any reference to *utraquism* with regards to the laity, according to Torquemada, was to be understood symbolically, whereby the laity make a spiritual communion with Christ's Mystical Body and Blood, i.e., to be unified in His Church.¹⁶⁶

Pertinent to this dissertation's purposes, throughout his participation at Basel, Torquemada also betrayed the strong partisanship to the theological and philosophical frameworks of certain Latin school of thoughts which he would later manifest within the Florentine Eucharistic debates. For example, in 1436, the Immaculate Conception became a source of contention at the Council of Basel.¹⁶⁷ To put this contention into context, the Dominican Order began to instill a more uniform adherence to an orthodox Thomistic intellectual paradigm during the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries by formalizing the instruction and defence of Aquinas' teachings and person within a number of general chapters between the late thirteenth and fifteenth centuries.¹⁶⁸ Thus, Dominicans

¹⁶⁵ Cf. *Decretum Gratiani, Pars Tertia*, d. 2, cc. 11 and 12, Friedberg, ed., cols. 1317-8 for these two decrees.

¹⁶⁶ Torquemada, *De Sacramento Eucharistiae*, in *Vat. lat.* 936, fols. fol. 146^{r-v}; 149^{r-v}. Cf. Kappes, *Epiclesis Debate*, pp. 71-2; Ondřej Matys, 'Juan de Torquemada v polemice s husitským pojetím eucharistie,' *Theatrum Historiae* 20 (2017): 9-29 (esp. 20-6).

¹⁶⁷ Thomas M. Imbicki, 'The Immaculate Conception and Ecclesiastical Politics from the Council of Basel to the Council of Trent: The Dominicans and Their Foes,' *Archiv für Reformationsgeschichte* 96(1) (2005): 145-70 (152-4).

¹⁶⁸ See e.g., B. M. Reichert, ed., *Acta Capitulum Generalium Ordinis Praedicatorum*, Vol. 1 (Rome: S. C. de Propaganda Fide, 1898), p. 204; Vol. 2 (Rome: S. C. de Propaganda Fide, 1899), pp. 38, 64, 81, 191, 194, 262, 280, 297, 308, 313, 341, 347, 357-8, 367, for various instances of the Dominican Order's endorsement of Aquinas' teaching and person at its general chapters during the late thirteenth and fourteenth centuries. Initially, the Dominican Order initially regarded eclectic, self-proclaimed followers of Aquinas including Hervaeus Natalis with high esteem, such that Dominican authors were given a degree of license to reverentially eschew from adhering to Aquinas' stances on theologoumena such that they were merely instructed to respectfully acknowledge Aquinas' position on a given question. See Fabrizio Amerini, "The Reception of Thomas Aquinas' Philosophy in the Dominican *Studia* of the Roman Province in the Fourteenth Century," in Kent Emery, William J. Courtenay, and Stephen M. Metzger, eds., *Philosophy and Theology in the "Studia" of the Religious Orders and at Papal and Royal Courts* (Turnhout: Brepols, 2012), pp. 139-64 (139,

heightened their apologetical attempts on behalf of Aquinas' intellectual framework, particularly given the criticisms posed by theologians and philosophers associated with the Franciscan Order during the late thirteenth and fourteenth centuries. These thinkers specifically invoked Étienne Tempier, the Bishop of Paris', list of condemned propositions published on March 7th, 1277.¹⁶⁹ Interpreting this list to have targeted Aquinas as one of its principal objects, a number of these thinkers thence produced their own lists exposing the perceived doctrinal errors within Aquinas' oeuvres.¹⁷⁰ Thus, by making recourse to Aquinas' canonization in 1323,¹⁷¹ Étienne Bourret, Bishop of Paris' revocation of the 1277 condemned propositions in 1325,¹⁷² alongside subsequent Papal affirmations of Aquinas'

142-3, 161-3); Isabel Iribarren, *Durandus of St. Pourçain: A Dominican Theologian in the Shadow of Aquinas* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005), p. 4 highlighted that the term *opinio communis*, which had been adopted by the Dominical Order in 1313 during its General Chapter in Metz, simply required Dominican brethren to maintain an 'expositio reverenter' of Aquinas' *Super Sententiarum*, which does not entail that the Dominican Order instilled the more monolithic adherence to a particular interpretative tradition of Thomism which was more evident following the late fourteenth and fifteenth centuries. To exemplify Hervaeus' positive intra-Dominican, the fifteenth- and sixteenth-century Dominican theologian and philosopher, Silvestro Mazzolini da Prierio, conceived Hervaeus to be one of the foremost interpreters of Aquinas' thought, alongside John Capreolus. See Michael M. Tavuzzi, *Prierias: The Life and Works of Silvestro Mazzolini Da Prierio (1456-1527)* (Durham: Duke University Press, 1997), pp. 38ff; Cf. Tavuzzi, 'Hervaeus Natalis and the Philosophical Logic of the Thomism of the Renaissance,' *Doctor Communis* 45 (1992): 132-52.

¹⁶⁹ See David Piché, ed., *La condamnation parisienne de 1277. Texte latin, traduction, introduction et commentaire* (Paris: J. Vrin, 1999). Cf. Luca Bianchi, 'New Perspectives on the Condemnation of 1277 and its Aftermath,' *Recherches de théologie et philosophie médiévales* 70 (2003): 206-29.

¹⁷⁰ Perhaps the archetype for these anti-Thomistic lists was the English Franciscan of the University of Paris, William de la Mare's *Declarationes de Variis Sententiis S. Thomae Aquinatis*, composed in two redactions between 1277 and 1282. Therein, William highlighted sixty putatively heterodox conclusions derived from Aquinas' *Summa Theologiae* as well as Aquinas' *Quaestiones de Quodlibet I-XII*, *Quaestiones disputatae de Spiritualis Creaturis*, *Quaestiones disputatae de Veritate*, and *Quaestiones disputatae de Virtutibus*. See *Declarationes magistri Guilelmi de la Mare O.F.M. de variis sententiis S. Thomae Aquinatis*, ed. by Franciscus Pelster (Münster: Aschendorff, 1956); Adriano Oliva, 'La deuxième rédaction du *Correctorium* de Guillaume de la Mare: les questions concernant la *la Pars*,' *Archivum Historicum Franciscanum* 98 (2005): 423-64; Frederick J. Roensch, *Early Thomistic School* (Dubuque: Priory Press, 1964), esp. pp. 14-5.

¹⁷¹ Cf. Leonardas V. Gerulaitis, 'The Canonization of Saint Thomas Aquinas,' *Vivarium* 5(1) (1967): 25-46 for an analysis of the background and proceedings of Aquinas' canonization.

¹⁷² Cf. Heinrich Denifle and Émile Chatelain, eds., *Chartularium Universitatis Pariensis*, n. 838, in Vol. 2(1) (Paris: Delalain, 1891), pp. 280-2 for this revocation, dated to February 14th, 1325.

intellectual framework,¹⁷³ several fourteenth and fifteenth century Dominican authors, most notably including Jean Capréolus, made literary endeavours to defend Aquinas' thought.¹⁷⁴

Concerning the Immaculate Conception, the intra-Dominican adherence to Aquinas' Maculism was bolstered by the University of Paris removing several of its Dominican academics in a series of charters issued between 1389 and 1403.¹⁷⁵ Such anti-Dominican measures emerged following the excommunication of the Dominican Parisian Master of Theology, Juan de Monzón, who had been excommunicated by Bishop Pierre Orgement in 1387 for maintaining that the Immaculate Conception was heterodox.¹⁷⁶ As the Parisian rector, Pierre d'Ailly recorded in his *Tractatus ex parte universitatis*, composed in 1388 to vindicate Juan's denunciation on the university's behalf, the Dominican Order attempted to defend Juan on the basis that Aquinas, whom the Church had canonised, maintained the

¹⁷³ See e.g., Pope Urban V's epistle, *Laudabilis Deus*, to the University of Toulouse and Geoffroy de Veyrols, the Archbishop of Toulouse, dated to 1368. Therein, Urban asserted that Aquinas' doctrines concurred with ecclesial tradition and were to be unreservedly accepted. Jean Bolland, Godefridus Henschenius, Daniel Papebrochius, eds., *Acta sanctorum* 7 (March, T. 1) (Paris/Rome: V. Palmé, 1865), pp. 731c-2b. Cf. J. J. Berthier, *Sanctus Thomas Aquinas Doctor Communis Ecclesiae* (Rome: Editrice Nazionale, 1914), pp. 44-68, for an overview of the fourteenth century Papal approval of Aquinas' thought and person.

¹⁷⁴ See esp. Capréolus' four volume *Defensiones Theologiae Divi Thomae Aquinatis*, composed between 1411 and 1433. Jean Capréolus, *Defensiones Theologiae Divi Thomae Aquinatis, I-VII*, ed. by Ceslaus Paban and Thomas Pègues, repr. (Frankfurt am Main: Minerva, 1967). Cf. Martin Grabmann, "Johannes Capreolus O.P., der Princeps Thomistarum (†1444), und seine Stellung in der Geschichte der Thomistenschule," in *Mittelalterliches Geistesleben: Abhandlungen zur Geschichte der Scholastik und Mystik*, Vol. 3 of 3 (München, M. Hueber, 1956), pp. 370-410 for an overview of Capréolus' career. However, be attentive to Grabmann's own predilection towards Thomistic theology and philosophy. For examples of the intra-Dominican lists produced to counter such anti-Thomistic literature, see the four *correctorium corruptorii*, ed. by Jean-Pierre Müller in *Le Correctorium Corruptorii «Circa» de Jean Quidort de Paris* (Rome: Herder, 1941), and Richard Knapwell's *Correctorium Corruptorii «Quare»*, ed. by Palémon Glorieux in *Les premières polémiques thomistes. I: Le Correctorium Corruptorii «Quare»* (Kain: Le Saulchoir, 1927), all of which were composed during the late thirteenth century to counter William de la Mare's *Declarationes*. Cf. Glorieux, 'La Littérature des Correctoires: Simples notes,' *Revue thomiste* 33 (1928): 69-96; Glorieux, 'Les Correctoires: Essai de mise au point,' *Recherches de théologie ancienne et médiévale* 14 (1947): 287-304; Andrew Vella, 'Early Thomistic Controversies,' *Melita Theologica* 3(2) (1950): 57-74.

¹⁷⁵ See Denifle and Chatelain, eds., *Chartularium Universitatis Parisiensis*, nn. 1557-70, in Vol. 3 (Paris: Delalain, 1894), pp. 486-515 for the series of acts issued by the university during this period against the Dominican academics, especially Juan de Monzón, therein. See *Chartularium Universitatis Parisiensis*, n. 1781, in Vol. 4 (Paris: Delalain, 1897), pp. 56-8 for the charter formally reintegrating the Dominicans to the university, dated to August 21st, 1403. Cf. Pawel Krupa, *Une grave querelle. L'Université de Paris, les mendiants et la Immaculée de la Vierge (1387-1390)* (Warsaw: Instytut Tomistyczny, 2013) for an extensive analysis of this intra-Parisian controversy and its consequences for the Dominican brethren therein.

¹⁷⁶ Quetif and Echard, *Scriptores ordinis praedicatorum*, Vol. 1, p. 691.

same doctrine. Against this claim, Pierre argued that one could not deduce from Aquinas' canonisation that he was completely non-erroneous in his doctrines, which Pierre justified by maintaining that Aquinas too crudely applied Aristotelian principles within the domain of Theology. Invoking Augustine's *De Civitate Dei*,¹⁷⁷ Pierre concluded that this method was improper for theologians.¹⁷⁸

Given this background, alongside a number of other Dominican Baselean *periti* including Giovanni Montenero,¹⁷⁹ in 1437, Torquemada produced a treatise repudiating the Immaculate Conception that was published following its formal affirmation at Basel on September 17th, 1439.¹⁸⁰ Therein, Torquemada advocated formal condemnation of the

¹⁷⁷ Cf. Augustine, *De Civitate Dei Libri I-X*. X, c. 23, ed. by Bernard Dombart and Alphonsus Kalb (Turnhout: Brepols, 1955), p. 297, lines 21-6: "Liberis enim uerbis loquuntur philosophi, nec in rebus ad intellegendum difficillimis offensionem religiosarum aurium pertimescunt. Nobis autem ad certam regulam loqui fas est, ne uerborum licentia etiam de rebus, quae his significantur, impiam gignat opinionem." Augustine, *The City of God Against the Pagans*, Vol. 3 of 7: *Books 8-11*, trans. by David S. Wiesen. Book X, XXIII (Cambridge, M.A.: Harvard University Press, 1968), p. 353: "For philosophers use words loosely, and in matters that are most difficult to understand they are not over careful to avoid giving offence to pious ears. But religion requires me to follow a fixed rule in my use of language, for fear that some verbal licence may give rise to a mistaken view, contrary to religious truth, of the matters to which the words refer."

¹⁷⁸ See Pierre d'Ailly, *Tractatus ex parte Universitatis Parisiensis*, ed. by Charles du Plessis d'Argentré, in *Collectio iudiciorum de novis erroribus* Vol. 1(2) of 3, repr. (Paris: Andræm Cailleau, 1728; Brussels: Culture et civilisation, 1963, fol. 128a. See also fol. 117b: See esp. Louis B. Pascoe, "Bishops: Status, Office, Authority," in *Church and Reform. Bishops, Theologians, and Canon Lawyers in the Thought of Pierre d'Ailly (1351-1420)* (Leiden: Brill 2005), pp. 53-91 (84-91) for an overview of the controversy concerning Juan de Monzón.

¹⁷⁹ Gilles Meersseman, *Giovanni di Montenero O.P. difensore dei mendicanti* (Rome: Angelicum University Press, 1938), pp. 64, 161-2. However, some Dominican Baselean *periti* such as Juan de Segovia, supported the doctrine of the Immaculate Conception. For Segovia's conciliar treatise on this doctrine, see *Septem allegationes et totidem Avisamenta pro informatione Patrum Concilii Basiliensis circa Sacratissimae V. Mariae Immaculatam Conceptionem*, repr. (Brussels: Culture et Civilisation, 1965). John evoked the fact that the Feast of the Immaculate Conception had been historically celebrated within the Latin Church to support this doctrine. Wenceslaus Sebastian, "The Controversy Over the Immaculate Conception from after Scotus to the End of the Eighteenth Century," ed. by Edward D. O'Connor in *The Dogma of the Immaculate Conception: History and Significance* (Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 1958), pp. 213-70 (228-32). See Luca Basilio Ricossa, *Jean de Ségovie: Son Office de la Conception, 1439: Étude historique, théologique, littéraire et musicale* (Bern: Verlag Peter Lang, 1994) for Segovia's own impact upon the development of this feast.

¹⁸⁰ See Hyacinth Ameri, *Doctrina theologorum de immaculatae B.V.M. Mariae tempore Concilii Basileensis* (Rome: Academia Mariana Internationalis, 1954) for an overview of the debates of this doctrine at Basel. Cf. Johannes Helmuth, *Das Basler Konzil 1431-1449: Forschungsstand und Probleme* (Cologne: Böhlau, 1987), p. 127ff for an overview of the Franciscan Order's engagement within this Baselean debate. See Mansi, ed., *Sacrorum Conciliorum Nova et Amplissima Collectio*, Vol. 29. *Basileense. Sess. XXXVI* (Venice: Antonio Zatta, 1788), cols. 182-3, for the council's endorsement of this doctrine. Cf. Joachim Stieber, *Pope Eugenius IV, the Council of Basel and the Secular and Ecclesiastical Authorities in the Empire* (Leiden: Brill, 1978), p. 111. See Remigius Bäumer, "Die Entscheidung des Basler Konzils über die Unbefleckte Empfängnis Mariens und ihre

Franciscan advocates of the Immaculate Conception as heretics.¹⁸¹ As will be elucidated, such partisan divisions significantly informed the methodology underlying Torquemada's Eucharistic *Cedula* and two *Sermones*. Indeed, Torquemada's postulations regarding the Latin Church's Eucharistic theology was at times highly partisan given his attempt to align with the Eucharistic theology of Aquinas, rather than attempt to formulate a framework which resonated with the Byzantine Fathers' doctrinal concerns or which the Latin Church, broadly speaking, officially posited.

Torquemada was also commissioned by Pope Eugenius to be his delegate at the Holy Roman Imperial Diets in Nuremberg in October 1438 and in Mainz in March 1439,¹⁸²

Nachwirkungen in der Theologie des 15. und 16. Jahrhunderts" in Heribert Müller and Johannes Helmrath, eds., *Studien zum 15. Jahrhundert Festschrift für Erich Meuthen*, Vol. 1 of 2 (Münich: Oldenbourg Wissenschaftsverlag, 1994), pp. 193-206; Helmrath, *Das Basler Konzil 1431-1449*, pp. 383-94 for the controversies surrounding this doctrine's proclamation.

¹⁸¹ See esp. Torquemada, *Tractatus de veritate Conceptionis B.V. Mariae pro faciendis coram Patribus Concilii Basileae anno Domini 1437 mense julio*, Edward B. Pusey, ed. (London: Jacob Parker, 1869), pp. 5-9; 780-1 for Torquemada's accusations of heresy. Moreover, see Torquemada, *Tractatus*, Pusey, ed., pp. 91-4, 113-41, 356-7 for Torquemada's rejection of the Virgin's co-redemptive role with Christ's, whereby Torquemada maintained that the Virgin, like all mankind, was subject to original sin which she contracted original sin within her mother's womb. Likewise, the Papacy intervened within such Dominican-Franciscan debates in support of the Franciscan preacher and future conciliar Father, Bernardino of Siena, who had been denounced and summoned to be canonically three times in 1426, 1431, and at Basel in 1438, for putatively postulating superstition and idolatry through his promotion of the devotion to the trigram of the 'Holy Name of Jesus.' See Morimichi Watanabe, "Pope Eugene IV, the Conciliar Movement and the Primacy of Rome," in Gerald Christianson, Thomas Izbicki, Christopher M. Bellitto, eds., *The Church, the Councils, and Reform - The Legacy of the Fifteenth Century* (Washington, D.C.: Catholic University of America Press, 2008), pp. 177-93 (180-1); See Surius, *Vita Sancti Bernardini Senensis Ordinis Seraphici Minorum*, in *Sancti Bernardini Senensis Ordinis Seraphici Minorum opera omnia*, Vol. 1 (Venice: Jean de La Hayre, 1745), pp. xvii-xxxiii (xxvi). See also Baptist Spagnoli of Mantua, "Opus auream in thomistas," in Paul Oskar Kristeller, ed., *Le thomisme et la pensée italienne de la Renaissance* (Montreal: J. Vrin, 1967), pp. 137-84 (139, lines 4-18), wherein the late fifteenth and early sixteenth century Carmelite humanist author, Baptist Spagnoli of Mantua, referred to the myopic methodologies, particularly amongst a number of self-proclaimed Thomists throughout the Italian Peninsula. See also Cf. Izbicki, "Tarring Conciliarism with the Brush of Heresy: Juan de Torquemada's *Summa de Ecclesia*," in Karen Bollermann, Izbicki, Cary J. Nederman, eds., *Religion, Power, and Resistance from the Eleventh to the Sixteenth Centuries: Playing the Heresy Card* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2014), pp. 139-51, who elucidated that such accusations of heresy often functioned as rhetorical attempts to undermine an interlocutor instead of a formal advocacy for their ecclesiastical condemnation.

¹⁸² Torquemada was especially charged with persuading the Imperial Estates to endorse the Council's transference from Basel to Ferrara. Towards this end, Torquemada again refuted the conciliarist ecclesiology upheld by many Baselean Fathers and advocated Papal supremacy over and above ecumenical councils. Torquemada posited that the Papal relocation of the Council to Ferrara was not intended to avoid ecclesial reform. Rather, Torquemada argued, Eugenius sought to amend the schism with the Byzantine Imperial Church, the representatives of whom desired that the Council be held within the Italian Peninsula. See Thomas

following which Torquemada returned to the Italian Peninsula, by which point Eugenius had again transferred the Council to Florence to evade the plague which ravaged Ferrara during the summer of 1438.¹⁸³

Given the lack of testimony in the conciliar *Acta* to any intervention on Torquemada's part within the initial discussions concerning the dogmatic topics requiring resolution between June 8th and 11th, Torquemada was evidently indisposed to fully address this doctrine in light of his earlier preoccupation with his diplomatic engagements.¹⁸⁴ Nonetheless, it is evident that, by June 12th, Torquemada had likely provided Pope Eugenius with a proposed outline of his *Cedula* concerning the Latin doctrine of Eucharistic consecration given that Pope Eugenius subsequently announced that additional material regarding this topic would be debated that day.¹⁸⁵

Kaeppli and Emilio Panella, *Scriptores Ordinis Praedicatorum medii aevi*, Vol. 3, nn. 2717-8 (Rome: Ist. Storico Domenicano, 1980), pp. 332-3. For a more extensive treatment of Torquemada's ecclesiology, cf. Izbicki, "Infallibility and the Erring Pope: Guido Terreni and Johannes de Turrecremata," in Kenneth Pennington and Robert Somerville, eds., *Law, Church, and Society: Essays in Honor of Stephan Kuttner* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1977), pp. 97-111; William E. Maguire, *John of Torquemada O.P.: The Antiquity of the Church* (Washington, D.C.: Catholic University of America Press, 1957); Pacifico Massi, *Magistero infallibile del papa nella teologia di Giovanni da Torquemada* (Turin: Marietti, 1957). See also Juan de Segovia, *Historia Gestorum Generalis Synodi Basiliensis*, X, c. 1, in František Palacký, Ernst Ritter von Birk, Karl Stehlin, Konrad Wilhelm Hieronimus, eds., *Monumenta conciliorum generalium seculi decimi quinti: Concilium Basileense*, Vol. 2 of 4 (Vienna: Typis C.R. Officinae Typographicae Aulæ et Status, 1873), p. 859, wherein Segovia referred to how, after being raised as a point of contention in April 1431, the disputes between the Latin and Byzantine negotiatory contingents over the venue for an ecumenical council engendered further disputes between them. See Ivan Mariano, "The Council and Negotiations with the Greeks," in Michiel Decaluwé, Thomas M. Izbicki, Gerald Christianson, eds., *A Companion to the Council of Basel* (Leiden: Brill, 2017), pp. 321-6, for an overview of the debates concerning the choice of venue.

¹⁸³ Joseph Gill, *The History of the Council of Florence*, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1959), p. 119.

¹⁸⁴ Candal, "Introductione," in Candal, ed., *Apparatus*, xxvii; Georg Hoffman, *De praeparatione definitionis Concilii Florentini de Ss. Eucharistia. Acta Academiae Valehradensis* 14 (Rome: Aedes Pont. Universitatis Gregoriana, 1936), p. 48, claimed that June 10th must have been the earliest date Torquemada was appointed by Eugenius to compose his Eucharistic *Cedula*.

¹⁸⁵ Éphrem Boularand, 'L'épiscopat au concile de Florence,' *Bulletin de littérature ecclésiastique* 60 (1959): 241-73 (247-8).

3.2. Torquemada's Method of Research and His Use of Literary Sources.

Moving on to examine how Torquemada prepared his *Cedula* delineating the Latin Church's *de facto* doctrine of Eucharistic consecration at Florence, one should first highlight that this *Cedula*, which was completed by June 16th, 1439, is non-extant. However, it is possible to make recourse to Torquemada's *Sermones Prior* and *Alter*, which were respectively delivered on June 16th and June 20th, 1439, to glean the *Cedula*'s doctrinal content and source material given that these *Sermones* were delivered as oral recapitulations of this *Cedula*. Their commensurability to the *Cedula*'s content is supported by the fact that they were contemporaneously transcribed and edited by the Papal stenographer, Andreas of Santacroce within the *Acta Latina Concilii Florentini*.¹⁸⁶ The nature of this office entailed that Andreas likely intended to recount the essence, if not the *ipsissima verba*, of Torquemada's argumentation. Indeed, as Torquemada's *Sermones* were formulated to articulate the Latin Church's official stance concerning Eucharistic consecration at the Council, Santacroce was behooved to accurately delineate Torquemada's arguments within these *Sermones* partly in order to allow subsequent Latin canonists and theologians to make recourse to these arguments within their own research and apologetics.

¹⁸⁶ Hofmann, "Introduction," in Hofmann, ed., *Acta Latina*, xi; See Gattista Battista Picotti, 'L'Effimerium curiale di Andrea da Santa Croce,' *Rivista delle Biblioteche e degli Archivi* 24 (1913): 149-57 for an overview of Andreas' life and work.

3.2.1. The *Status Quaestionis* Concerning Torquemada's Contribution to the Florentine Eucharistic Debates.

Moving on to examine the nature and conclusions of the scholarship relating to Torquemada's contribution to the Florentine Eucharistic debates, this sub-section will aim to exhibit that a number of scholarly analyses of these debates and their resolution have paid insufficient attention to the degree to which Torquemada made fitting use of his theological and liturgical authorities within his two *Sermones*. Given this lacuna within the preceding scholarship concerning Torquemada's doctrine of Eucharistic consecration, as will be detailed below, a number of Roman Catholic scholars during the twentieth century in particular were prone to exaggerating the degree to which Torquemada's single moment doctrine of Eucharistic consecration and his application, and his rejection towards the consecratory nature of the Eucharistic epiclesis, was representative of the wider medieval and early modern Latin Christian liturgiological tradition.

One should begin by highlighting that some late nineteenth and early twentieth century liturgists such as Girolamo Zattoni alongside Edward Godfrey Cuthbert Frederick Atchley questioned that the *Canon Missae* lacked a proper epiclesis through textually comparing several early Latin Christian Eucharistic Prayers with those which prevailed within other coetaneous liturgical traditions.¹⁸⁷ Given the increased scholarly recognition of the

¹⁸⁷ See Girolamo Zattoni, 'L'epiclesi nell'antica liturgia romana e il suo valore consecratorio,' *Rivista Storico-Critica delle Scienze Teologiche* 1 (1905): 241-54; Edward Godfrey Cuthbert Frederick Atchley, *On the Epiclesis of the Eucharistic Liturgy and in the Consecration of the Font* (London: Oxford University Press, 1935), pp. 174-91. For a more recent liturgiological analysis and comparison of such early Latin Eucharistic Prayers with their contemporaneous linguistic counterparts, see Joseph Crehen, 'Eucharistic Epiclesis: New Evidence and a New Theory,' *Theological Studies* 41 (1980): 698-712. Evidence for an epiclesis following the dominical words within the Western Christian liturgies is explicitly attested to in the late fifth century by Pope Gelasius I within an epistle to Elpidius, Bishop of Volterra. See Gelasius I, "Epistolarum Fragmenta, 7," in Andreas Thiel, ed., *Epistolae Romanorum pontificum genuinae et quae ad eos scriptae sunt A.S. Hilario usque ad Pelagium II*, Vol. 1 (Brunsberg: E. Peter, 1868), p. 486. However, Camille Callewaert, 'Histoire positive du Canon romain. Une épiclese à Rome?' *Sacris erudiri* 2 (1949): 95-110 (95-8) exemplified that it is not conclusive that Pope Gelasius was describing the *Canon Missae*.

plurality of historical Christian liturgical source material and commentarial traditions thereupon through to the mid-twentieth century, particularly within the context of the burgeoning liturgical movement,¹⁸⁸ liturgiologists including Josef Andreas Jungmann became increasingly aware of the historical Latin liturgical scholastic tradition of interpreting its Eucharistic Prayers to have incorporated a proper epiclesis which held a consecratory function.¹⁸⁹

However, following the publication of Pope Leo XIII's encyclical, *Aeterni Patris*, on August 4th, 1879, many Roman Catholic higher educational institutions began to instill a Neo-Thomistic theological and philosophical scholarly hermeneutic which prevailed through to the mid-twentieth century.¹⁹⁰ Given this background, several Roman Catholic liturgiologists who were instructed according to such curricula remained skeptical towards those historical-critical liturgical analyses which threatened to contravene the prevailing Neo-Thomistic Sacramentology. This objective to defend the prevailing Neo-Thomistic framework commonly restricted the accuracy of this liturgical scholarship insofar as these authors often presupposed that Aquinas' doctrine of Eucharistic consecration authentically represented the position of the Latin Church as a whole and should function as the basis from which other historical liturgical source material is exegeted.

For example, in 1911, the Assumptionist scholar, Séverien Salaville, produced an extensive article for the fifth volume of the *Dictionnaire de théologie catholique*, within

¹⁸⁸ Cf. Alcuin Reid, *The Organic Development of the Liturgy* (San Francisco: Ignatius Press, 2005), pp. 73-144 for an analysis of the liturgical movement within the Roman Catholic Church during this period.

¹⁸⁹ See esp. Jungmann, *The Mass of the Roman Rite. Missarum sollemnia*, Vol. 2 of 2, trans. by Francis A. Brunner (New York: Benziger Brothers, 1955), pp. 232-5.

¹⁹⁰ For *Aeterni Patris*, See *Acta Sanctae Sedis*, Vol. 12 (Rome: Typis Polyglotta e Officinae S. C. de Propaganda Fide, 1879), pp. 97-115. Cf. Jörg Ernesti, Leo XIII, *Papst und Staatsmann* (Freiburg: Herder, 2019), pp. 267-81, for an overview of the background of *Aeterni Patris*' publication and the institutional reforms which emerged therefrom. Cf. also Thomas Marschler, "Nineteenth Century Catholic Reception of Aquinas," in Matthew Levering and Marcus Plested, eds., *The Oxford Handbook of the Reception of Aquinas* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2021), pp. 359-74 (esp. 366-7).

which Salaville adroitly exposted several Latin Christian liturgical and theological documents which accentuated the epiclesis' consecratory function and essential inclusion within the Eucharistic Prayer.¹⁹¹ However, when examining the Florentine Eucharistic debates,¹⁹²

Salaville asserted that:

It was evidently thanks to the illuminative theological precision of Torquemada that the Greeks had to realize that Catholic doctrine was in conformity with tradition...¹⁹³

In this sense, Salaville overlooked the fact that Torquemada's single-form Sacramentology alongside his sacerdotal instrumental causality were both intra-Latin theologoumena. Likewise, Salaville failed to address how Torquemada's removal of the *mysterium fidei* from the Eucharistic form diverged from Aquinas' affirmation that this clause was included within the formula for the host's transmutation. Moreover, Salaville's article did not go into any extensive detail into the coherence of Torquemada's use of his theological source material. It is partly given such lacunae that this dissertation aims to tackle this precise question and counteract the conclusion that Torquemada's doctrine of the nature and moment(s) of Eucharistic consecration provides an 'illuminative' exposition of the broader Roman Catholic theological tradition on this question.

¹⁹¹ See Sévérien Salaville, "Épiclèse Eucharistique," in *Dictionnaire de théologie catholique* (Paris: Letouzey et Ané, 1911), cols. 194-300.

¹⁹² Cf. esp. Salaville, "Épiclèse Eucharistique," in *Dictionnaire de théologie catholique*, Vol. 5, cols. 258-60.

¹⁹³ My English translation from Salaville, "Épiclèse Eucharistique," in *Dictionnaire de théologie catholique*, Vol. 5, cols. 259: "Il semble bien que c'est à la lumineuse précision théologique de Torquemada que les grecs durent de se rendre compte que la doctrine catholique était conforme à la tradition..."

3.2.2. An Analysis of Torquemada's Use of His Literary Sources within the *Sermo Prior*.

Moving on to analyse the contents of the first of Torquemada's two *Sermones* concerning Eucharistic consecration, after beginning to compose his Eucharistic *Cedula* on June 12th, 1439, it will be evinced in this sub-section that, within his *Sermo Prior*, Torquemada likely believed that his argumentation and conclusions within this sermon had such a strong grounding in the Tradition of the universal Church that his Byzantine counterparts would have quickly accepted them. This conclusion is exhibited by the fact that, within its introduction, Torquemada proclaimed that any wise person, acting with sincere faith, could not overlook that his theological authorities ubiquitously upheld the dominical words' sole consecratory function.¹⁹⁴

Nonetheless, as alluded to above, after having received Torquemada's *Cedula*, Ioannes VIII continued to uphold the Byzantine Fathers' right to publicly respond to the *Cedula*'s argumentation and source material in the context of a conciliar debate.¹⁹⁵ The Emperor's insistence was likely intended to acquiesce the Byzantine Fathers in light of their increased skepticism towards the authenticity of their Latin counterparts' source material.¹⁹⁶ As Chapter Four will elucidate, this scepticism was cultivated by Cardinal Cesarini and the Hellenophone Dominican Father, Andreas Chrysoberges' assertion that the Second Council of Nicaea's authentic *Acta* incorporated the *filioque* clause within its Symbol of Faith. When the Byzantine Fathers examined their evidence and discovered that these Fathers evoked a Latin rather than a Greek manuscript, they responded to his claims with

¹⁹⁴ *Acta Latina*, Hofmann, ed., p. 237, lines 37-9.

¹⁹⁵ Syropoulos, *Les Mémoires*, 10.4, Laurent, ed., p. 478.

¹⁹⁶ *Acta Graeca*, Gill, ed., pp. 85-8; Alexis Alexakis, 'The Greek Patristic Testimonia Presented at the Council of Florence (1439) in Support of the Filioque Reconsidered,' *Revue des études byzantines* 58 (2000): 149-65 (164-5).

mockery, leading Chrysoberges' authority to have diminished within the subsequent conciliar sessions. Examples such as this will be shown in Chapter Four to have exacerbated Mark of Ephesus' scepticism towards the veracity of Latin theological literature which had not been translated into Greek and entrenched his opposition towards the *filioque*.¹⁹⁷

Torquemada's optimism regarding the Byzantine reception of his *Cedula* did not preclude a subsequent conciliar debate, which possibly derived from the nature of his literary source material. While the *Acta Latina's* apparatus for the *Sermones Prior* and *Alter* suggest that Torquemada evoked a plethora of Latin and Hellenophone Patristic authorities to support his doctrine of Eucharistic consecration, the following chapter will elucidate that Torquemada's argumentation and Patristic citations principally derived from *florilegia* included within the *Corpus Thomisticum*, Lombard's *Sententiarum*, and the *Decretum Gratiani*. As Chapter Four will explore in further detail, the resultant cursory and at times decontextualized exegesis of the theological source material which Torquemada likely extracted from the works described above was responded to and countered quite potently by Mark of Ephesus within the latter's Eucharistic *Λίβελλος*.

However, the five-day timetable under which Torquemada worked entailed that he lacked the capacity to make any extensive consultations beyond the Patristic florilegia within these texts. Indeed, while Torquemada ostensibly evoked a highly ecumenical range

¹⁹⁷ *Acta Graeca*, Gill, ed., pp. 85-8; *Acta Latina*, Hofmann, ed., p. 226; Syropoulos, *Les Mémoires*, 6.31, Laurent, ed., 330, 332. Alexakis, 'Greek Patristic Testimonia,' 164-5; Tsirpanlis, *Mark Eugenicus and the Council of Florence: A Historical Re-Evaluation of His Personality*, 2nd ed. (New York: Κέντρο Βυζαντινών Ερευνών, 1979), p. 49. Likewise, as Bessarion recounted within a post-conciliar epistle he addressed to the governor of the Despotate of Morea, Alexios Laskaris Philanthropenos, concerning the *filioque*, that his fellow Byzantine Fathers' confidence in the Latin conciliar Fathers' scholarship was diminished by Cesarini's arguments supporting the *filioque* clause's valid inclusion based upon the putative authority of Pope Liberius I, whereby a pseudepigraphal *Letter to Athanasius* posited that because the First Council of Nicaea had forbade any credal additions, the First Council of Constantinople thereby violated this principle analogously to the *filioque* clause's addition into the Latin Creed. See Bessarion, *Epistula ad Alexius Lascaris de Processione Spiritus Sancti*, in *Patrologia Graeca*, Vol. 161 (Paris: Typis J.-P. Migne, 1866), cols. 321-406 (340).

of theological authorities to support his doctrine, as the second subsection of this section will detail, Torquemada incorrectly attribute the provenance of some of these sources and also failed to address how several of his cited theological authorities, including those within the Latin tradition such as Ambrose, Augustine and Paschasius Radbertus, could plausibly be interpreted to have upheld a consecratory function for the Eucharistic epiclesis within their broader *opera*.

3.2.2.1 Torquemada's Perception of His Opponents Contextualised: Pope Benedict XII and the Armenians.

Nonetheless, before exposing the limitations in Torquemada's use of his theological authorities within the *Sermo Prior*, one should examine precisely how Torquemada conceived his Byzantine counterparts' doctrine of Eucharistic consecration. Doing so is important for this dissertation's purposes as Torquemada will be shown to have optimistically believed that his own doctrine could not but secure his Byzantine counterparts' acceptance, despite the medieval Latin precedent of affirming the *Supplices te rogamus*' consecratory power discussed above. The author will aim to demonstrate that Torquemada's doctrine of the dominical words' unique consecratory power was reflective of the intra-Dominican theological consensus which emerged following the mid-fourteenth century in the context of the Order being called to respond to the doctrinal diversity concerning Eucharistic transubstantiation within its Near Eastern missionary activity, particularly amongst the Armenian Christian population in this case.

In particular, Torquemada likely collocated his Byzantine counterparts' doctrine of Eucharistic consecration with that which Pope Benedict XII had condemned the 'Armenian Christians' for putatively upholding within his bull, *Libellus Cum Dudum ad Armenios*,

promulgated on August 1st, 1341. To support this hypothesis, one should consider that Torquemada is known to have employed Benedict XII's decretals through the mediation of the Dominican theologian, John Lei, who acted as Torquemada's secretary and privately cooperated with Torquemada when the latter was appointed by Pope Eugenius as one of six Latin orators for the Ferraran Purgatory debates in summer 1438 and at Florence in November 1438.¹⁹⁸ In this context, Lei utilised Pope Benedict XII's 1336 bull, *Benedictus Deus*, which had denounced a doctrine concerning the beatific vision which closely resonated with that doctrine which the Byzantine Imperial Church formally upheld following the Palamite Councils of Constantinople between 1341 and 1351, namely, that the saints do not behold the divine essence *per se*.¹⁹⁹ Given his prior reading of these Papal decretals, Torquemada likely interlinked his reading of the Eucharistic theology condemned by Pope Benedict XII in *Cum Dudum* with the doctrine which was later articulated by Bessarion and Isidore in their aforementioned audience with Pope Eugenius.

Such inaccurate interconnections on the part of the Latin Church were not uncommon within the wider context of the council: For example, during the Latin-Byzantine negotiations concerning the venue for an ecumenical council in summer 1434, the Baselean embassy headed by Cristoforo Garatoni arrived in Constantinople with the decree, *Sicut pia mater*, establishing that the council would take place in the Italian Peninsula. According to Syropoulos, the decree's prologue caused significant consternation for both Ioannes VIII and the Ecumenical Patriarch, Joseph II, by equivocating the Eastern Orthodox Church with the

¹⁹⁸ Cf. Candal, "Introductione," in Candal, ed., *Apparatus*, xvii.

¹⁹⁹ See Benedict XII, *Benedictus Deus*, in Denzinger, ed., *Enchiridion*, pp. 216-7, esp. 217. Cf. *Concilium Constantinopolitanum 1341*, *Concilium Constantinopolitanum 1347*, and *Concilium Constantinopolitanum 1351*, ed. by Frederick Lauritzen in Alberto Melloni, general ed., *The Great Councils of the Orthodox Churches: From Constantinople 861 to Moscow 2000*. Corpus Christianorum, Conciliorum Oecumenicorum Generaliumque Decreta 4.1 (Turnhout: Brepols, 2016), pp. 139-52, 159-70, 179-218 respectively for the declarations of the Palamite Councils overall, esp. pp. 139-47, 160, 166-7, 206-12, for these Councils' statements concerning whether the divine essence *per se* could be apprehended.

Hussites insofar as both were in ‘heresy’ for rupturing communion with the Latin Church.²⁰⁰

While accounting for Syropoulos’ potential hyperbole, given that the Latin text transcribed by Juan de Segovia employed the term *dissidium*, which signifies separation or schism, rather than *haeresis*, this example nonetheless suggests that a number of Latin representatives at the Councils of Basel and later at Ferrara-Florence insufficiently understood the nuances of their Byzantine counterparts’ doctrinal framework and ecclesiological status.²⁰¹

Regarding the context and content of Benedict XII’s condemnation, as well as the degree to which Torquemada was correct in collocating his Byzantine counterparts’ doctrine of Eucharistic consecration with that condemned in *Cum Dudum*, during the ninth and tenth centuries, the Byzantine Empire expanded eastward and Armenia fell under Byzantine political and ecclesial influence:²⁰² Pertinently, with regards to the Armenian Rite’s Eucharistic epicleses, as Feulner highlighted, it is clear that the Byzantine Rite influenced the Armenian *Anaphora of St Athanasios*, which had become the Armenian Rite’s standard Eucharistic Prayer by the late tenth century.²⁰³ This is exemplified by the fact that this

²⁰⁰ Syropoulos, *Les Mémoires*, 2.37, Laurent, ed., p. 142: “Ἐν τῷ προοιμίῳ λέγετε περὶ ἡμῶν, ὅτι ἔχομεν αἵρεσιν· λέγετε γὰρ τὴν νέαν αἵρεσιν τῶν Ποεμίων καὶ τὴν παλαιὰν τῶν Γραικῶν. Καὶ πάνυ θαυμάζομεν πῶς λέγετε τοῦτο· τίς γὰρ εἶπέ ποτε τοῦτο περὶ ἡμῶν, ἢ ποῖαν αἵρεσιν ἔχομεν ἡμεῖς οἱ μηδὲν ὄλως παρεκθάντες ἢ παρασαλεύσαντές τι ἀπὸ τῶν ἀποστολικῶν καὶ συνοδικῶν καὶ πατρικῶν παραδόσεων; Σκάνδαλον οὖν μέγα προξενεῖ τὸ τοιοῦτον ἡμῖν, καὶ ζητοῦμεν πρὸ παντὸς ἄλλου θεραπείαν εἰς αὐτό... (My English translation:) You say of us in the beginning [of this decree] that we have heresy; for you say the new heresy of the Bohemians and the old heresy of the Greeks. And we all marvel that you say this; for what you say of us, what heresy we have, [we] who have not completely transgressed or violated any of the apostolic or conciliar or Patristic traditions? This is a great scandal, and we seek a solution for it above all other matters.”

²⁰¹ See Segovia, *Historia Gestorum Generalis Synodi Basiliensis*, IX, c. 6, in Palacký, von Birk, Stehlin, Hieronimus, eds., *Monumenta conciliorum generalium seculi decimi quinti. Concilium Basiliense. Scriptores*, Vol. 2, p. 752: “Quamobrem huius sancte synodi ab inicio sue congregacionis precipua cura fuit recens illud Bohemorum antiquumque Grecorum dissidium prorsus extinguer...”

²⁰² Cf. Simon Payaslian, “The Bagratuni Kingdom and Disintegration,” in *The History of Armenia. From the Origins to the Present* (New York/Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2007), pp. 53-75, for an overview of Armenia’s gradual subjugation to Byzantine Imperial influence during this period.

²⁰³ See Robert F. Taft, “The Armenian ‘Holy Sacrifice (Surb Patarg)’ as a Mirror of Armenian Liturgical History,” in Taft, ed., *The Armenian Christian Tradition: Scholarly Symposium in Honor of the Visit to the Pontifical*

Eucharistic Prayer's epiclesis petitions for the sending of the Spirit upon the congregation for the Spirit's operation in the Eucharistic gifts to 'make' these gifts Christ's Body and Blood through 'changing' them. Such terminology parallels with the vocabulary employed within the *Liturgy of St John Chrysostom's* epiclesis.²⁰⁴ Evidence of the Hellenophone liturgical tradition's influence upon Armenian liturgical commentators can be found in the mid-tenth century *Commentary on the Divine Liturgy* by Xosrov Anjewac'i, who invoked the same analogy of the Spirit operating during Christ's incarnation in the Virgin's womb and the Eucharistic epiclesis as authors including John of Damascus.²⁰⁵

From the late eleventh and twelfth centuries, the foundation of Latin and Armenian Christian states within the Near East naturally engendered dialogue between these two theological traditions, particularly vis-à-vis liturgical praxis.²⁰⁶ Against this background, the Armenian Dominican, Nersēs Palienc', who, having been in regular contact with the Papal

Oriental Institute, Rome, of His Holiness Karekin I, Supreme Patriarch and Catholicos of All Armenians, December 12, 1996 (Rome: Pontificium Institutum Orientalium Studiorum, 1997), pp. 175-97, for an overview of this development.

²⁰⁴ See F. E. Brightmann, ed. and trans., "The Liturgy of the Armenians," in *Liturgies Eastern and Western*, Vol. 1: *Eastern Liturgies* (London: Henry Frowde, 1896), p. 439: "We adore and we beseech and ask thee, O good God, send upon us and upon these gifts here set forth thy coeternal and consubstantial Holy Spirit by whom blessing this bread thou wilt make it truly the body of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ thrice repeated, and blessing this cup thou wilt make it really the blood of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ thrice repeated: by whom blessing this bread and this wine thou wilt make them truly the body and blood of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, changing them by thine Holy Spirit."

²⁰⁵ S. Peter Cowe, ed. and trans., *Commentary on the Divine Liturgy by Xosrov Anjewac'i*, pp. 177-9: "The Holy Spirit sent by the Father took flesh from Mary's womb and mingled and united it to God the Word who was revealed as one Son and God, born from her. The Holy Spirit acts in the same way in church at the holy altar. Taking the bread He unites it to the Son of God and likewise the cup to become truly Christ's body and blood... He also effects such prodigious miracles, transforming the mere bread and wine into the incorruption of the body and blood of the Son of God." See also Isaac Kéchichian, ed. and trans., *Nerses de Lambron (1153-1192), Explication de la Divine Liturgie* (Beirut: Dar El-Machreq, 2000), p. 222, wherein Nerses applied the principle of the Spirit's life-giving operation in Christ's Body to the process of Eucharistic consecration.

²⁰⁶ See Peter Halfter, *Das Papsttum und die Armenier im frühen und hohen Mittelalter. Von der ersten Kontakten bis zur Fixierung der Kirchenunion im Jahre 1198* (Köln-Weimar-Wien: Böhlau, 1996) for an overview of the initial communications between the Latin Church and the Armenian Kingdom of Cilicia. Cf. Peter S. Cowe, 'The Role of Correspondence in Elucidating the Intensification of Latin-Armenian Ecclesiastical Interchange in the First Quarter of the Fourteenth Century,' *Journal of the Society for Armenian Studies* 13 (2003): 47-68 (49); Jean Richard, 'Les Arméniens à Avignon au XIV^e siècle,' *Revue des études arméniennes* 23 (1992): 253-64, who detailed how the continuous presence of Armenian Christians were frequently present within the Papal Court in Avignon during the fourteenth century.

Court at Avignon, provided Pope Benedict XII with a list of one hundred and seventeen putative errors ascribed to the Armenian Apostolic Church in 1341 after extensively investigating this Church's doctrine and praxis.²⁰⁷ Nersēs had previously governed as the Bishop of Urmia before his deposition by Catholicos Yakob II. Nonetheless, during his presence within Avignon, Nersēs claimed to have been the Archbishop of Manazkert before being deposed from his see. While this episcopal ordination was likely fabricated by Nersēs, in 1338, Pope John XXII nonetheless formally appointed Nersēs to this same archiepiscopal see.²⁰⁸ Thus, Nersēs' list must be interpreted to some extent as hyperbolic in light of his discontent with the Armenian Apostolic ecclesial hierarchy. Nonetheless, based upon reading this list, within *Cum dudum*, Benedict XII condemned the Armenian Christians for putatively postulating the following Eucharistic doctrines:

[LXVI]: ...all the Armenians state and hold in common... when the priest recites [the institution narrative]... [these words] do not confect nor are intended to confected Christ's Body and Blood, but these words are merely stated as a recitation, of course reciting what the Lord did when instituting the Sacrament. And following these words, the priest states various other prayers which are included in their canon, following which he comes to [the epiclesis]... and by these words they believe that Christ's Body and Blood are confected.²⁰⁹

²⁰⁷ François Tournebize, 'Les cent dix-sept accusations présentées à Benoît XII contre les Arméniens,' *Revue de l'Orient Chrétien* 11 (1906): 163-81.

²⁰⁸ Richard, *La papauté et les missions d'Orient*, pp. 210-4; Richard, 'Les Arméniens à Avignon au XIV^e siècle,' *Revue des études arméniennes* 23 (1992): 253-64 (257-9).

²⁰⁹ My English translation of Benedict XII, *Cum dudum*, in Aloysius L. Täutu, ed., *Acta Benedicti XII (1334-1342)* (Rome: Typis Polyglottis Vaticanis, 1958), pp. 119-55. Transcribed in <<https://www.vatican.va/content/benedictus-xii/la/documents/epistula-cum-dudum-1-aug-1341.html>> [Accessed August 13th, 2022]: "LXVI. Item, omnes Armeni communiter dicunt et tenent, quod per haec verba posita in eorum Canone Missae, quando dicuntur per sacerdotem; 'Accepit panem et gratias agens, fregit, dedit suis sanctis electis et recumbentibus discipulis, dicens: Accipite et manducate ex hoc omnes: Hoc est Corpus meum, quod pro vobis et multis distribuitur, in remissionem peccatorum. Similiter et calicem accipiens, benedixit et fregit, gratias egit, bibit, dedit suis electis sanctis et recumbentibus discipulis dicens: Accipite, bibite ex hoc omnes: Hic est Sanguis meus novi testamenti, qui pro vobis et multis effunditur, in remissionem peccatorum, non conficiatur nec ipsi conficere intendunt Corpus et Sanguinem Christi, sed solum dicunt dicta verba recitativa, recitando scilicet quod Dominus fecit, quando Sacramentum instituit. Et post dicta verba dicit sacerdos multas orationes positas in eorum Canone et post dictas orationes venit ad locum, ubi sic in eorum Canone dicitur: 'Adoramus, supplicamus et petimus a te, benigne Deus, mitte in nobis et in hoc propositum donum coëssentialem tibi Spiritum Sanctum, per quem panem benedictum Corpus veraciter efficies domini nostri et salvatoris Jesu Christi'. Et dicta verba dicit sacerdos ter. Deinde dicit sacerdos super calicem et vinum benedictum: 'Sanguinem veraciter efficies domini nostri salvatoris Jesu Christi'; et per haec verba credunt, quod conficiantur Corpus Christi et Sanguis."

[LXVII]: Moreover, the Armenians do not say that, following the previously stated words of the bread and wine's consecration are stated, the bread and wine's transubstantiation into Christ's true Body and Blood, which was born of the Virgin Mary, [and which] suffered and rose again [occurs], but they hold that this Sacrament is an exemplar, similitude, or type of the Lord's true Body and Blood; for which reason they do not denote the Sacrament of the Altar [as] the Lord's Body and Blood, but a victim, sacrifice, or communion...²¹⁰

Based upon Nersēs' list, Benedict XII's bull propagated the notion within Latin Christendom that the Armenian Christians broadly refused to worship the corporeal Christ as though, following the dominical words' recitation, Christ was not really present within the Eucharistic elements. Nonetheless, the doctrine of Eucharistic change ascribed to the Armenians herein did not parallel that postulated by the Byzantine Florentine Fathers. According to *Cum Dudum*, the Armenians supposedly claimed that the dominical words do not nor are intended to 'confect' the Eucharistic gifts. However, Bessarion, Isidore of Kiev, and, as Chapter Four will show, Mark of Ephesus, all affirmed the dominical words' consecratory function, albeit in a non-perfective manner whereby Christ's Body and Blood are in some sense present substantially and are due worship, despite the lack of some final reality to Christ's substantial presence before the epiclesis.²¹¹

Notably, the sixty-seventh error in *Cum Dudum* evoked a terminological issue which significantly informed the historical Hellenophone debates concerning Sacramentology,

²¹⁰ My English translation of Benedict XII, *Cum dudum*, in Tăutu, ed., *Acta Benedicti XII*, pp. 119-55. Transcribed in <<https://www.vatican.va/content/benedictus-xii/la/documents/epistula-cum-dudum-1-aug-1341.html>> [Accessed August 13th, 2022]: "LXVII. Item, quod Armeni non dicunt, quod post dicta verba consecrationis panis et vini sit facta transubstantiatio panis et vini in verum Corpus Christi et Sanguinem, quod natum fuit de Virgine Maria et passum et resurrexit, sed tenent, quod illud sacramentum sit exemplar vel similitudo aut figura veri Corporis et Sanguinis Domini; et hoc specialiter aliqui magistri Armenorum dixerunt, videlicet quod non erat ibi Corpus Christi verum et Sanguis, sed exemplar et similitudo eius. Dicunt etiam, quod quando Christus Sacramentum instituit, non transubstantiavit panem et vinum in corpus suum et sanguinem, sed solummodo instituit exemplar et similitudinem corporis et sanguinis sui; propter quod ipsi Sacramentum altaris non vocant corpus et sanguinem Domini, sed *hostiam* vel *sacrificium* vel *communione*..."

²¹¹ Mark of Ephesus, *Marci Ephesii Epistola ad Georgium Presbyterum Methonensem contra Ritus Ecclesiae Romanae*, 2, ed. by Louis Petit in *Patrologia Orientalis*, Vol. 17 (Paris: Firmin-Didot, 1907), pp. 470-4.

namely, the tradition of denoting the consecrated Eucharistic elements as ‘types’ or ‘antitypes’ of Christ’s Body and Blood.²¹²

Given the hermeneutical precedence given to a literal rather than typological liturgical exegesis which emerged within the early medieval Latin and Eastern Christian theological traditions, many liturgical commentators within the Hellenophone tradition began to reformulate the terms ‘type’ and ‘antitype.’ In particular, these commentators gradually began to refrain from employing these terms in a Eucharistic context as a reaction to the use of such terminology by Iconoclastic theologians during the eighth and ninth centuries. For example, when treating the consecrated host’s relationship to Christ’s Real Body, the Ecumenical Patriarch, Nikephoros I’s *Ἀντίρρησις Πρώτη* and *Δευτέρα* (*First and Second Antirrhetics*), composed c. 815-20,²¹³ quoted and countered Emperor Konstantinos V Kopronymos’ *Πεύσεις* (*Inquiries*), a pro-Iconoclastic treatise composed prior to the 754 Council of Hieria. This Council had been convoked by Konstantinos V and assembled for the purpose of formally denouncing Icon veneration within the Byzantine Imperial Church.²¹⁴ Therein, Konstantinos supposedly upheld that the Eucharistic gifts are legitimate images given their consubstantiality with Christ’s Body and Blood; however, upon being

²¹² Kappes, *Epiclesis Debate*, pp. 81-3. See Enrico Mazza, “Due differenti concezioni del racconto istitutivo: ‘consecrazione’ o ‘trasmissione’ del typos dell’eucharistia,” in Cesare Giraudo, ed., *The Anaphoral Genesis of the Institution Narrative in Light of the Anaphora of Addai and Mari: Acts of the International Liturgy Congress, Rome, 25-26 October 2011* (Rome: Edizioni Orientalia Christiana, 2013), pp. 335-62 (348-52), for an overview of the multi-ritual use of the term ‘type.’

²¹³ Patrick O’Connell, *The Ecclesiology of St. Nicephorus I (758-828), Patriarch of Constantinople: Pentarchy and Primacy* (Rome: Pontificium Institutum Studiorum Orientalium, 1972), p. 58. According to O’Connell, this range is presupposed by Nikephoros’ reference to the Iconoclastic Council of Constantinople which assembled in 815 within the *Ἀντίρρησις Πρώτη* (See Nikephoros I, *Antirrheticus tres adversus Constantinum Copronymum. Antirrheticus Primus*, in *Patrologia Graeca*, Vol. 100 (Paris: Typis J.-P. Migne, 1863), cols. 204-328 (206)), and Nikephoros’ failure to reference Leo V’s deposition in 820. For an analysis of Nikephoros I’s life and work, see O’Connell, *Ecclesiology of St. Nicephorus I*, pp. 37-67.

²¹⁴ For analyses of this council and its declarations, see Milton V. Anastos, ‘The Argument for Iconoclasm as Presented by the Iconoclasts,’ *Dumbarton Oaks Papers* 7 (1953): 35-54; Stephen Gero, ‘The Eucharistic Doctrine of the Byzantine Iconoclasts and its Sources,’ *Byzantinische Zeitschrift* 68(1) (1975): 4-22; Gero, *Byzantine Iconoclasm during the Reign of Constantine V, with Particular Attention to the Oriental Sources* (Louvain: Corpus Scriptorum Christianorum Orientalium, 1977).

consecrated, the Eucharistic gifts are transmuted into *ἀχειροποίητα*, or ‘not-made-by-[human]-hands’.²¹⁵ Nonetheless, as Konstantinos V was quoted as denoting the consecrated Eucharistic gifts as *τύποι* rather than His Body and Blood *per se*, this distinction was perceived by Iconophiles to indicate that the consecrated Eucharistic gifts were different to Christ’s Body and Blood in some manner. As Vladimir Baranov highlighted, the term *τύποι* was likely employed to refer to how the Eucharistic gifts are circumscribable and ‘coarse’ in composition, both prior to and following their consecration. This was in contradistinction to Christ’s Post-Resurrection Body, which, being a hypostatic unity of a human and a divine nature, is, according to the Council of Hieria’s *Ὁρος, Θεειδεστέρον*, or ‘Godlike,’ and *ἔξω παχύτητος*, or ‘without coarseness,’ in virtue of the fact that the divine essence is *per se* non-circumscribable.²¹⁶

To uphold the identity of the consecrated gifts with Christ’s Body and Blood, several Hellenophone Iconodule theologians began to restrict the term ‘antitype’ to these gifts’ pre-consecratory state.²¹⁷ Moreover, the term ‘type’ was employed to anagogically signify the consecrated Eucharistic gifts’ celestial referents, namely, the full communion of believers with Christ following the Second Coming.²¹⁸ For example, within his *Ἀντίρρησις Δευτέρα*, Nikephoros I interpreted the term ‘antitype’ thus:

²¹⁵ See Nikephoros I, *Antirrheticus Primus*, in *Patrologia Graeca*, Vol. 100, col. 225a; *Antirrheticus Secundus*, *Patrologia Graeca*, Vol. 100, col. 337c.

²¹⁶ See Mansi, ed., *Sacrorum Conciliorum Nova et Amplissima Collectio*, Vol. 13 (Venice: Antonio Zatta, 1767), col. 336d. See also Nikephoros I, *Antirrheticus Tertius*, in *Patrologia Graeca*, Vol. 100, col. 437b, who cited a passage from Konstantinos V’s *Πεύσεις*, wherein Konstantinos similarly employed the term *ἔξω παχύτητος* to describe Christ’s Post-Resurrection Body in this fashion by evoking John 20:19-23. Vladimir Baranov, ‘The Doctrine of the Icon-Eucharist for the Byzantine Iconoclasts,’ *Studia Patristica* 44 (2010): 41-8 (45-6).

²¹⁷ Cf. Euthymios Zigabenos, *Expositio in Matthaem*, 26.5, c. 64, in *Patrologia Graeca*, Vol. 129 (Paris: Typis J.-P. Migne, 1864), cols. 107-764 (665b); Theodore Meliteniotes, *Ethica sermonum in Evangelia*, in *Patrologia Graeca*, Vol. 149 (Paris: Typis J.-P. Migne, 1865), cols. 883-988 (952c) for similar Hellenophone interpretations of the term ‘antitype’ in the *Liturgy of St Basil* following the Triumph of Orthodoxy.

²¹⁸ While this dissertation will more lucidly address John of Damascus’ use of the term ‘antitype’ when treating Mark of Ephesus’ *Λίβελλος*, one should highlight that his interpretation of the term within the *Ἐκδοσις* was invoked by the Second Council of Nicaea in 787 when expounding the Iconodule definition of the term. See

...and these [Eucharistic gifts] are supernaturally transmuted by the invocation of the priest, through the Holy Spirit's descending upon them, into Christ's Body and Blood... And we do not mean that they [the Eucharistic gifts and Christ's Body and Blood] are two [distinct] things, but we believe that they [have] become one and the same [viz., Christ's true Body and Blood]. And if [the Eucharistic gifts] are spoken of as 'antitypes,' these [gifts] are not [called as such] after the hallowing, but they are called this before their hallowing.²¹⁹

While scholars such as Christiaan Kappes have claimed that the debates concerning Eucharistic consecration at Florence was not significantly interlinked with the contemporaneous Latin-Byzantine disputes concerning Palamite theology,²²⁰ which will be addressed more explicitly in Chapter Four, the controversy concerning Eucharistic typology did notably function as a locus of divergence between the supporters and opponents of the Byzantine Church's canonised theology of the Palamite divine essence-energies distinction: According to its opponents, this distinction, amongst other consequences, implied that the faithful did not partake of the substance of Christ's Body and Blood in the Eucharist.²²¹

Mansi, ed., *Sacrorum Conciliorum Nova et Amplissima Collectio*, Vol. 13, col. 265. Likewise, within his post-conciliar treatise, *De Sacramento Eucharistiae*, Bessarion defined John of Damascus' Eucharistic application of the term 'type,' or in Latin, *figura*, within the latter's "Ἐκδοσις ἀκριβῆς τῆς ὀρθοδόξου πίστεως, IV, 13, to refer its temporal form, given that, before the Second Coming, believers are not able to fully and perfectly participate within the reality of the Godhead and thereby behold Christ as He truly is. See Bessarion, *De Sacramento Eucharistiae*, in *Patrologia Graeca*, Vol. 161 (Paris: Typis J.-P. Migne, 1866), cols. 493-526 (497d-8a): "Post hæc iliud quoque tertio loco addendum est, quod verbum Domini corpus et veritas est et **figura**. Siquidem ostensum est, quemadmodum panis et vini visibilis species; figura seu signum est veri et in eis contenti Domini corporis et etiam mystici corporis, ita corpus verum figuram mystici et ecclesiastici corporis esse. Ad hæc verum Domini corpus quod in altari con secratur, futurorum figuram dici, Damascenus eo quo supra memoravimus loco, testatur. Significa tiva, inquit, futurorum dicuntur, non quia verum sint corpus sanguisque Christi verus sed quia nunc quidem per illa divinitatis participes efficimur tunc vero per intellectum sola visione fruemur divinitatis."

²¹⁹ My English translation of Nikephoros I, *Antirrheticus Secundus*, in *Patrologiae Graeca*, Vol. 100, cols. 329-74 (336): "...οὕτω δὴ καὶ ταῦτα ὑπερφυῶς ἐπικλήσει τοῦ ἱερέοντος, ἐπιφοιτήσει τε τοῦ ἁγίου Πνεύματος, εἰς σῶμα καὶ αἷμα τοῦ Χριστοῦ μεταβάλλεται. Τοῦτο γὰρ καὶ ἡ τοῦ ἱερέως αἴτησις ἔχει. Καὶ οὐ δύο ταῦτα νοοῦμεν, ἀλλ' ἐν καὶ τὸ αὐτὸ πιστεύομεν γίνεσθαι· Ἀντίτυπα δὲ εἶ που λεχθείη, οὐ μετὰ τὸν ἁγιασμόν τοῦτο, ἀλλὰ πρὸ τοῦ ἁγιασθῆναι ἐκλήθησαν."

²²⁰ See Kappes, *Epiclesis Debate*, pp. 25-6.

²²¹ Further evidence of this Palamite struggle concerning Eucharistic typology is exemplified by Ioannes Kantakouzenos' epistle to John, Bishop of Karpasia, composed during his monastic vocation c. 1369-71, in 'Lettre inédite de Jean Cantacuzène relative à la controverse palamite,' Jean Darrouzès, ed., in *Revue des études Byzantines* 17 (1959): 7-27 (19-20, 25-6), wherein he undermined the claim that Palamites denied the Real Eucharistic Presence. For dating, see 'Lettre inédite,' Darrouzès, ed., 10-1. Cf. Andrew Louth, "The

Nonetheless, Palamas himself unambiguously identified the consecrated gifts with the historical Body and Blood within his undated *Ὁμιλία Νζ (Homily 56)*, stating:

For it is taught to us that this is the same crucified Body of Christ present before us as food... And in this way is the very Body and Blood of Christ present in truth.²²²

However, when relating a dispute between himself and Neilos Kabasilas in 1351 within his *Ῥωμαϊκῆς Ἱστορίας (History of the Romans [i.e., the Byzantines])*, the anti-Palamite Nikephoros Gregoras claimed to quote Palamas and Philotheos Kokkinos, then the Metropolitan of Heraclea, both of whom posited that the consecrated Eucharistic gifts are only *τύποι* of Christ's Body and Blood.²²³

Thus, through likely employing the Eucharistic errors imputed to the Armenians within *Cum dudum*, Torquemada not only inaccurately collocated his Byzantine counterparts' Eucharistic theology with such errors, but invoked the highly contentious theme of Eucharistic typology which Mark of Ephesus will be shown to have laboriously attempted to resolve within his *Λίβελλος* given the use of 'typological' terminology in the *Byzantine Rite's Liturgy of St Basil*.

Nonetheless, given that Latin Fathers such as Torquemada and Cesarini had invoked the *Liturgy of St Basil* to uphold the Latin Church's doctrine of Purgatory when debating this

Eucharist and Hesychasm, with Special Reference to Theophanes III, Metropolitan of Nicaea," in Réka Forrai, György György, István Perczel, eds., *The Eucharist in Theology and Philosophy. Issues of Doctrinal History in East and West from the Patristic Age to the Reformation* (Leuven: Leuven University Press, 2005), 2005, pp. 199-206 for an analysis of how late fourteenth century Palamite theologians such as Theophanes of Nicaea attempted to juxtapose the Palamite divine essence-energies doctrine with Eucharistic theology.

²²² My English translation of Gregory Palamas, *Ὁμιλία Νζ', Δ*, in Sophocles Oikonomos, ed., *Τοῦ ἐν ἀγίοις πατρὸς ἡμῶν Γρηγορίου ἀρχιεπισκόπου Θεσσαλονίκης τοῦ Παλαμᾶ ὁμιλίαι κβ'* (Athens: Lien, 1861), p. 211: "Ταῦτα γὰρ ἡμᾶς αὐτὸ διδάσκει τὸ σταυρωθὲν Χριστοῦ σῶμα εἰς τροφήν προκειμένον ἡμῖν... Καὶ ὡς ἀληθῶς αὐτὸ τὸ σῶμα καὶ τὸ αἷμα τοῦ Χριστοῦ προκειμένον..."

²²³ See Gregoras, *Byzantinae Historiae*, 24.1.10, in *Patrologia Graeca*, Vol. 148 (Paris: Typis J.-P. Migne, 1865), col. 1425b, who quoted Palamas and Philotheos as stating: "...αἷμα καὶ σῶμα τὸν τ' οἶνον γίνεσθαι καὶ τὸν ἄρτον ποτὲ τοῦ Χριστοῦ· τύπον γὰρ ταῦτ' εἶναι ἐκείνου, καὶ οὐκ ἐκεῖνον αὐτόχρημα... (My English translation:) the wine and bread do not become the Blood and Body of Christ, for these are types of Him, and not truly Him."

doctrine in Ferrara,²²⁴ Torquemada's misidentification exemplifies the limited extent to which Torquemada accurately exegeted his available liturgical source material within his *Cedula* given that he either did not recognise, or intentionally chose to overlook, that his Latin edition of the *Liturgy of Saint Basil* incorporated a consecratory epiclesis as well as an application of the term 'antitype' to the post-Institutional Eucharistic gifts. Pertinently, these earlier debates concerning purgatory framed the milieu within which Torquemada evidently became cognizant of Benedict XII's condemnation, contextualising why Torquemada likely believed the Byzantine Church maintained the putatively 'Armenian doctrine' regarding the dominical words' non-consecratory nature. As the conciliar *Acta* do not explicitly recount Torquemada's presence within the papal audience during which Bessarion and Isidore postulated a much more nuanced doctrine of Eucharistic transmutation,²²⁵ Eugenius or Cesarini likely detailed the prior discussions for Torquemada, relating the Byzantine Church's putatively erroneous 'Armenian' doctrine of Eucharistic consecration, from which Torquemada postulated that it is impossible for any other words apart from those of 'the Saviour' to transubstantiate.²²⁶

Conversely, the Byzantine Fathers acknowledged that the Eucharistic gifts had been transmuted upon the dominical words' recitation, while elaborating that additional items including the epiclesis, a manual blessing of the Eucharistic gifts and three signs of the Cross, must be performed to perfect this transformation. Given this misperception, Torquemada

²²⁴ See *Deputatorum Latinorum Cedula de Purgatorio*, VI, in *Patrologia Orientalis*, Vol. 15, ed. by Louis Petit (Paris: Firmin-Didot, 1927), pp. 25-38 (33-4). See Petit, "Introduction," in *Patrologia Orientalis*, Vol. 15, pp. 5-24 (9ff) for an overview of Traversari's Greek translation of this Latin treatise concerning Purgatory. Cf. André de Halleux, "Problèmes de méthode dans les discussions sur l'eschatologies de Ferrare et Florence," in Giuseppe Alberigo, ed., *Christian Unity: The Council of Ferrara-Florence: 1438/39-1989* (Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1991), pp. 251-99 (251).

²²⁵ Boularand, 'L'Épiclèse,' 344-5.

²²⁶ Paraphrased from *Acta Latina*, Hofmann, ed., p. 238, lines 23-4: "...[I]gitur impossibile est, quod ex aliis verbis quam salvatoris fiat transubstantio."

was limited in his capacity to effectively counteract their claims regarding the nature and function of their Eucharistic epicleses. As the following section will exemplify, Torquemada's misperception resulted in a significantly inaccurate exegesis of his liturgical source material. This, it will be argued, helps to explain why Torquemada's *Sermo Prior* failed to secure his Byzantine interlocutors' acceptance of his Sacramentology.

3.2.2.2. Patristic References

3.2.2.2.1 John Chrysostom

The first text Torquemada evoked to evince that the dominical words wholly transmuted the Eucharistic gifts within his *Sermo Prior* was John Chrysostom's *Εἰς τὴν προδοσίαν τοῦ Ἰουδα*:

Torquemada, <i>Sermo Prior</i>.	John Chrysostom, <i>Εἰς τὴν προδοσίαν τοῦ Ἰουδα</i>, 1.6.
Chrysostom... stated, 'No man [can] make [their] body a gift ²²⁷ provided [for us] but Christ [who] was Crucified for us. A priest [might] represent [Him], standing and uttering [His] words, but the power and the grace is [from] Christ. [Concerning Matt. 26:26:] 'This is My Body...' He says, This formula transmutes the [Eucharistic] offerings, like that [divine] expression which stated [Gen. 1:28], 'Grow and multiply and replenish the earth,' which was stated once and for all and operates throughout all time to strengthen our nature for the procreation of children... and	For it is not man who makes the items [viz., the Eucharistic gifts] becomes Christ's Body ad Blood, but Christ Himself who was Crucified for us. The priest is [His] representative when he proclaims those words; but the power and grace is from God. 'This is My Body...' He says. This discourse transmutes the items and just as that expression, 'Increase, and multiply, and fill the earth,' was spoken once, [and] operates throughout all time [and] empowers [human] nature to this day for child-production. So also the expression [viz., the dominical words] once stated [functions in this manner] on each altar in the Churches from that time [the Last

²²⁷ I rendered 'munera' in the singular to provide a more accurate sense of Torquemada's citation.

the expression [i.e., the dominical words, functions] in this manner... ²²⁸	Supper] to today and to the Second Coming, effectuate the Sacrifice. ²²⁹
--	---

To put Torquemada's citation into context, while Chrysostom's homily had been translated into Latin during the first millennium, none of Torquemada's principal Latin Christian authorities within the *Sermo Prior*, such as Lombard's *Sententiarum*, the *Decretum Gratiani*, and Aquinas' *Summa Theologiae*, evoked this homily when addressing Eucharistic consecration.²³⁰ However, this homily was invoked by several Latin Christian liturgical commentators following its translation. For example, the late eleventh and early twelfth century theologian, Alger of Liège's *De Sacramentis corporis et sanguinis Domini* invoked this homily when postulating the *Supplices te rogamus*' epicletic and consecratory function.²³¹ Given that Alger pertinently functioned as an authority in Lombard's *Libri*

²²⁸ My English translation of *Acta Latina*, Hofmann, ed., pp. 237, line 39-238, line 5: "Prima auctoritas est beatissimi Grisostomi... dicit: 'Non est homo, qui proposita munera facit corpus, sed qui pro nobis crucifixus est Christus; figurans adstans sacerdos verba proferens, sed virtus et gratia Christus est. Hoc est corpus meum, inquit; hoc verbum proposita transmutat, et sicut vox illa, que dicit: Crescite et multiplicamini et replete terram etc. semel quidem dicta per omne tempus sit opera nostram naturam corroborans ad procreationem filiorum etc., ita et vox...'"

²²⁹ My English translation of Chrysostom, *De proditione Judae* 1.6, in *Patrologia Graeca*, Vol. 49 (Paris: Typis J.-P. Migne, 1862), col. 380: "Οὐδὲ γὰρ ἄνθρωπος ἐστὶν ὁ ποιῶν τα προκείμενα γενέσθαι σῶμα καὶ αἷμα Χριστοῦ, ἀλλ' αὐτός ὁ σταυρωθεὶς ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν Χριστός. Σχῆμα πληρῶν ἔστηκεν ὁ ἱερεὺς, τα ῥήματα φθεγγόμενος ἐκεῖνα· ἡ δε δύναμις καὶ ἡ χάρις τοῦ Θεοῦ ἐστί. Τοῦτο μου ἐστί το σῶμα, φησί. Τοῦτο το ῥῆμα μεταρρυθμίζει τα προκείμενα καὶ καθάπερ ἡ φωνὴ ἐκεῖνη ἡ λέγουσα: Αὐξάνεσθε, καὶ πληθύνεσθε, καὶ πληρώσατε τὴν γῆν, ἐρρέθη μεν ἅπαξ, διὰ παντός δε τοῦ χρόνου γίνεται ἔργω ἐνδυναμούσα τὴν φύσιν τὴν ἡμετέραν πρὸς παιδοποιίαν· οὕτω καὶ ἡ φωνὴ αὕτη ἅπαξ λεχθεῖσα καθ' ἐκάστην τράπεζαν ἐν ταῖς Ἐκκλησίαις ἐξ ἐκεῖνου μέχρι σήμερον καὶ μέχρι τῆς παρουσίας, τὴν θυσίαν ἀπτηρτισμένην ἐργάζεται." Cf. Boularand, 'L'Épiclèse,' 254-5; Kappes, *Epiclesis Debate*, pp. 90-1.

²³⁰ For example, Rosalind Love, 'Bede and John Chrysostom,' *Journal of Medieval Latin* 17 (2007): 72-86 (84) exemplified how the Venerable Bede drew upon a Latin translation of Chrysostom's *Εἰς τὴν προδοσίαν τοῦ Ἰουδα* when exegeting Luke 22:9 within his *In Lucae Evangelium expositio*, 6.22.489-95, ed. by David Hurst in *Corpus Christianorum Series Latina*, Vol. 120 (Turnhout: Brepols, 2001), p. 375. See Sever J. Voicu, "Le prime traduzioni latine di Crisostomo," in *Cristianesimo Latino ecultura Greca sino al sec. IV. XXI Incontro di studiosi dell'antichità cristiana, Roma, 7-9 maggio 1992* (Rome: Augustinianum 1993), pp. 397-415 for a discussion of this translation's background and its subsequent influence.

²³¹ Alger of Liège, *De sacramentis corporis et sanguinis Domini*, in *Patrologia Latina*, Vol. 180 (Paris: Typis J.-P. Migne, 1855), cols. 727-852 (777d, 781c). Cf. Nicholas M. Haring, 'A Study in the Sacramentology of Alger of Liege,' *Medieval Studies* 20 (1958): 41-78 for an overview of Alger's Sacramentology.

Sententiarum,²³² Torquemada potentially utilized Alger's *De Sacramentis* to derive his citation of *Εἰς τὴν προδοσίαν τοῦ Ἰούδα* in virtue of Torquemada's plausible recognition of the influence of *De Sacramentis* upon Lombard. If this hypothesis is true, the extent to which Torquemada was sincere in relating his literary authorities' doctrines of Eucharistic consecration must be questioned given that Torquemada would have failed to articulate to his Byzantine interlocutors that there was a Latin heritage of affirming the *Supplices te rogamus*' consecratory function. While Christiaan Kappes hypothesized that Torquemada utilized a Latin translation of Kalekas' *Περὶ Πίστεως καὶ περὶ τῶν Ἄρχων τῆς Καθολικῆς Πίστεως* (*On Faith and on the Principles of the Catholic Faith*),²³³ the original Greek text of which did cite a corrupted version of Chrysostom's homily,²³⁴ Kappes mistook the fact that Traversari was commissioned by Pope Martin V to translate Kalekas' *Adversus errores Graecorum de Processione Spiritus Sancti*, not *Περὶ Πίστεως καὶ περὶ τῶν Ἄρχων τῆς Καθολικῆς Πίστεως*.²³⁵ Overall, despite the possibility that Torquemada did make recourse

²³² For an example of Lombard's dependence on Alger, see Lombard's misattributed citation of a passage from Paschasius Radbertus' *De Corpore et Sanguine Domini* concerning whether excommunicated clergy could validly consecrate the Sacraments, to Augustine, in *Sententiarum* IV, dist. 13, c. 1, in *Libri IV Sententiarum*, Vol. 2 (Quaracchi: Collegii S. Bonaventurae, 1916), p. 815, likely derived in part from Alger's misattribution of this same text in *De Sacramento*, III, c. 8, in *Patrologia Latina*, Vol. 180 (Paris: Typis J.-P. Migne, 1855), cols. 840-1.

²³³ See Kappes, *Epiclesis Debate*, p. 91.

²³⁴ For example, Kalekas, *De principiis fidei Catholicae*, c. 6, in *Patrologia Graeca*, Vol. 152 (Paris: Typis J.-P. Migne, 1865), cols. 429-662 (600d-1a) states "...σκήμα **μόνον** πληρῶν..." with this emboldened term not being included within the afore-cited critical Greek edition of Chrysostom's homily. Despite his mistake regarding Traversari's translation, Kappes, *Epiclesis Debate*, p. 91, accurately highlighted that Kalekas' citation was limited its omission of the opening line of the aforementioned passage which stated "Οὐδὲ γὰρ ἄνθρωπος ἐστὶν ὁ ποιῶν τα προκείμενα γενέσθαι σῶμα καὶ αἷμα Χριστοῦ, ἀλλ' αὐτός ὁ σταυρωθεὶς ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν Χριστός." This sentence provided the pertinent theological context for Chrysostom's overall argumentation, and which would have posed a significant hindrance to Torquemada's doctrine of sacramental causality. In particular, because the above passage explicated that it is Christ, not man, who is the cause of Christ's Body and Blood being made present before Chrysostom asserted that the priest fulfills the sacramental form, Chrysostom's passage would have undermined the Aristotelian-Thomistic four causal sacramental paradigm Torquemada sought to uphold whereby the celebrant functions as the Eucharist's 'efficient/instrumental cause.'

²³⁵ For Traversari's translation of Kalekas' treatise, see *Manuelis Calecae. Viri doctissimi, Contra Graecorum errores, libri quatuor. Olim Latine versi, ab Ambrosio Camaldulensi* (Ingolstadt: Ex typographia Ederiana, apud Andream Angermarium, 1608), pp. 11-400. Traversari's translation was based upon a Greek manuscript provided by the Franciscan pre-conciliar negotiator, Antonio da Massa. See Stinger, *Humanism and the Church Fathers: Ambrogio Traversari (1386-1439)*, p. 112.

to Alger's *De Sacramentis*, one cannot draw any definitive conclusions concerning the provenance of Torquemada's citation of *Εἰς τὴν προδοσίαν τοῦ Ἰούδα*.

Nonetheless, to evaluate the cogency of Torquemada's citation of Chrysostom, the latter's homily should be exegeted in light of his broader theology of Eucharistic change. Some scholars including Jugie have cited Chrysostom as a Patristic advocate of the Eucharistic form being the Institution narrative. To support this conclusion, Jugie interpreted the passages within Chrysostom's oeuvres which describe the Spirit's intra-Eucharistic operation to denote the faithful being sanctified rather than the gifts' transmutation.²³⁶ Moreover, scholars like Salaville interpreted Chrysostom as affirming the dominical words' consecratory power, while also claiming that Chrysostom upheld the Spirit's transmutative agency.²³⁷ Alternately, authors such as Gregory Dix have claimed that one need not impute contradiction onto Chrysostom when interpreting his references to the essentiality of the dominical words and of the epiclesis at different points within his *opera omnia* given that, according to Dix, Chrysostom viewed each element as a fundamental facet of the Eucharistic Prayer which is consecratory when considered holistically.²³⁸ Thus, scholars such as Taft exhibited that John believed that both a Pneumatic invocation and the dominical words were required for Eucharistic transmutation, such that Chrysostom perceived the Eucharistic Prayer to be the context whereby, through His demiurgic intervention, God makes the dominical words operative.²³⁹ Conversely, to establish their interpretation of Chrysostom, authors such as Torquemada would be required to chronologically arrange Chrysostom's

²³⁶ Jugie, *De forma*, pp. 98-100; *Theologia dogmatica*, Vol. 3, p. 261.

²³⁷ Sévérien Salaville, 'L'épiclesse d'après saint Jean Chrysostome et la tradition occidentale,' *Échos d'Orient* 11(69) (1908): 101-12; Francisque Varaine, *L'épiclesse eucharistique. Étude de théologie positive et d'histoire liturgique* (Brignais: Imprimerie de Sacuny, 1910), pp. 45-8.

²³⁸ Gregory Dix, *The Shape of the Liturgy*, repr. (London: Dacre Press, 1970), pp. 281-2.

²³⁹ See e.g., Taft, 'Problems in Anaphoral Theology,' 61; Taft, "The Epiclesis Question in Light of the Orthodox and Catholic *Lex Orandi* Traditions," in Bradley Nassif, ed., *New Perspectives in Historical Theology: Essays in Memory of John Meyendorff* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1996), pp. 210-37 (223-4).

opera with the aim of exemplifying that Chrysostom's Sacramentology progressively departed from affirming a consecratory Spirit-epiclesis and instead upheld the dominical words' unique consecratory function. While one cannot draw any definitive conclusions concerning how to reconcile the ostensibly varied arguments and judgements concerning Eucharistic consecration within Chrysostom's body of work, Torquemada's citation of Chrysostom's homily in this context did not accurately challenge the Byzantine dual-moment doctrine articulated by Bessarion and Isidore of Kiev given that the latter have been shown to have acknowledged the Eucharistic gifts' immediate transmutation upon the dominical words' recitation, while also positing the necessary inclusion of the epiclesis and a manual blessing to 'perfect' this transmutation.

Notably, although many modern-day scholarly analyses of Chrysostom's Sacramentology commonly exegete his *opera omnia* as though his writings were systematically and thematically unified, such analyses often overlook the *Liturgy of St John Chrysostom*. Despite the fact that the *Liturgy of St John Chrysostom* underwent quite a substantive textual development,²⁴⁰ which limits the overall value of their analyses given that, as Taft highlighted, Chrysostom himself plausibly influenced this liturgy and its redaction history.²⁴¹ If this Eucharistic Prayer was juxtaposed with Chrysostom's other theological oeuvres, this harmonisation which would help to counteract Torquemada's reduction of Chrysostom's Sacramentology into the fourfold Aristotelian causal paradigm.²⁴² Unlike Torquemada, in Chapter Four, Mark of Ephesus will be shown to have more neatly interwoven the *Liturgy of St John Chrysostom* with Chrysostom's other *opera* to conclude

²⁴⁰ On which, cf. Taft, *A History of the Liturgy of St. John Chrysostom*, 6 Vols. (Rome: Pontificium Institutum Studiorum Orientalium, 1975-2008).

²⁴¹ Taft, "The Authenticity of the Chrysostom Anaphora Revisited: Determining the Authorship of Liturgical Texts by Computer," in *Liturgy in Byzantium and Beyond* (Brookfield: Ashgate, 1995), pp. 5-51, esp. 21-51.

²⁴² Cf. Kappes, *Epiclesis Debate*, pp. 92-4.

that Chrysostom consistently asserted the necessity to invoke the Spirit for Eucharistic consecration. When considering the phrasing of the *Liturgy of St John Chrysostom's* anaphora, it will be shown in Chapter Four that Mark of Ephesus' hermeneutic of this Eucharistic Prayer held greater coherence in light of modern-day Patristic scholarship in that a Pneumatic invocation described in Chrysostom's oeuvres would naturally be identified with the anaphoral epiclesis which Chrysostom himself helped to compose.

3.2.2.2.2. John of Damascus and Pseudo-Dionysius

Having examined Torquemada's recourse to Chrysostom, this subsection will similarly analyse the cogency of his use of both John of Damascus' and Pseudo-Dionysius' literary oeuvres within the *Sermo Prior*. While the *Acta Latina's* apparatus suggests that Torquemada evoked Burgundio of Pisa's Latin translation of *De fide Orthodoxa*, Torquemada instead utilized Aquinas' reformulated employment of this work within the *Tertia Pars*. Torquemada claimed that, because Christ's Body is made present through the Spirit's 'operation,' if the Sacraments' forms are also strictly 'operative' through this 'operation,' one could conclude that God's 'word' alone could effectively fulfil this transmutation. As the following comparison indicates, Torquemada's argumentation and citation was highly commensurate with Aquinas' doctrine of Sacramental causality in the *Summa Theologiae III*, q. 78, a. 4. For this dissertation's purposes, it would also be fitting to locate Torquemada's and Aquinas' arguments in the context of the Latin translation of John of Damascus' *De fide orthodoxa*:

<p>Torquemada, <i>Sermo Prior</i>:²⁴³</p>	<p>Aquinas, <i>Summa Theologiae</i> III, q. 78, a. 4, arg. 1; s.c.; ad. 1:</p>	<p>Burgundio of Pisa's Latin Translation of John of Damascus, <i>De fide orthodoxa</i> 4:13:²⁴⁴</p>
<p>Damascene... stated thus, it is solely through the Holy Spirit's operation that the Christ's Blood is made from the bread. Thus, if the Holy Spirit's operation alone [is what makes] operative the Sacramental forms, then strictly God's word can do this (<i>quod sola operatione spiritus sancti ex pane fit caro Christi. Si ergo sola operatione spiritus sancti et forme sunt sacramentales operative, ergo solius verbum Dei potest hoc facere</i>).</p>	<p>[Arg. 1:] ...in the aforesaid words of the [Sacramental] forms there is no created power which causes the consecration. Because Damascene says... 'The change of the bread into Christ's body is caused solely by the power of the Holy Ghost.' But the power of the Holy Ghost is uncreated. Therefore this sacrament is not caused by any created power of those words (<i>sola virtute spiritus sancti fit conversio panis in corpus Christi. Sed virtus spiritus sancti est virtus increata. Ergo nulla virtute creata horum verborum conficitur sacramentum hoc</i>).²⁴⁵</p> <p>[Ad. 1:] ...When the bread is said to be changed into Christ's</p>	<p>Dixit in principio: "Educat terra herbam feni," et usque nunc pluvial fiente educit propria germina, divino coacta et fortificata praecepto. Dixit Deus: "Hoc meum est corpus" et "Hic meus est sanguis" et "hoc facite"; et omnipotenti eius praecepto donec veniat fit... Et fit pluvial novae huic agriculturae per invocationem Sancti Spiritus superobumbrans virtus. Quemadmodum enim omnia quaecumque fecit Deus, Sancti Spiritus actione fecit, ita et nunc Spiritus action quae super naturam operatur...</p>

²⁴³ My English translation of *Acta Latina*, Hofmann, ed., p. 238, lines 5-8: "...est auctoritas Damasceni Greci sapientis viri, qui in IIII Sententiarum ita dicit, quod sola operatione spiritus sancti ex pane fit caro Christi. Si ergo sola operatione spiritus sancti et forme sunt sacramentales operative, ergo solius verbum Dei potest hoc facere."

²⁴⁴ John of Damascus, *De fide orthodoxa: Versions of Burgundio and Cerbanus* 4:13, ed. by Eligius M. Buytaert (St Bonaventure, N.Y.: Franciscan Institute, 1955), pp. 310-1. My English translation: "In the beginning, [God] said, [Gen. 1:11] 'Let the earth bring forth grass,' and when it rains, even now the earth brings forth its own seeds, in obedience to and strengthened by the divine precept. God stated, 'This is my body,' 'This is my blood,' and 'Do this [in memory of Me]...' and it [i.e., Eucharistic transmutation] is done through His omnipotent precept until He comes [again]... And through the invocation of the Holy Spirit, this new cultivation is brought about [by this Pneumatic] overshadowing power. For God has done all things through the Holy Spirit's action, so also the Spirit is now operating in nature..."

²⁴⁵ Aquinas *Summa Theologiae* III, q. 78, a. 4, arg. 1, in *Opera Omnia*, Vol. 12. *Editio Leonina*, p. 211: "Ad quartum sic proceditur. Videtur quod praedictis verbis formarum non insit aliqua vis creata effectiva consecrationis. Dicit enim Damascenus, in IV libro, *sola virtute spiritus sancti fit conversio panis in corpus Christi*. Sed virtus spiritus sancti est virtus increata. Ergo nulla virtute creata horum verborum conficitur sacramentum hoc..."

	<p>body solely by the power of the Holy Ghost, the instrumental power which lies in the form of this sacrament is not excluded (cum dicitur sola virtute spiritus sancti panem in corpus Christi converti, non excluditur virtus instrumentalis quae est in forma huius sacramenti)...²⁴⁶</p> <p>[Resp:] Some have maintained that neither in the... [dominical] words is there any created power for causing the transubstantiation, nor in the other forms of the sacraments, or even in the sacraments themselves, for producing the sacramental effects (quidam dixerunt nullam virtutem creatam esse nec in praedictis verbis ad transubstantiationem faciendam, nec etiam in aliis sacramentorum formis, vel etiam in ipsis sacramentis ad inducendos sacramentorum effectus)... [However,] in the words of the form of this sacrament a created power (<i>virtus creata</i>) which causes the change to be wrought in it: instrumental, however, as in the other sacraments... For since these words are uttered in the person of Christ, it is from His command that they receive their instrumental power from Him...²⁴⁷</p>	
--	---	--

²⁴⁶ Aquinas, *Summa Theologiae* III, q. 78, a. 4, ad. 1, in *Opera Omnia*, Vol. 12. *Editio Leonina*, p. 211: "...cum dicitur sola virtute spiritus sancti panem in corpus Christi converti, non excluditur virtus instrumentalis quae est in forma huius sacramenti, sicut, cum dicitur quod solus faber facit cultellum, non excluditur virtus martelli."

²⁴⁷ Aquinas, *Summa Theologiae* III, q. 78, a. 4, conc.: "Respondeo dicendum quod quidam dixerunt nullam virtutem creatam esse nec in praedictis verbis ad transubstantiationem faciendam, nec etiam in aliis

Having exemplified through this comparison how Torquemada's exegesis of John of Damascus was likely principally informed by Aquinas' own exegesis given its high terminological concordance with the latter, Torquemada nonetheless diverged from Aquinas insofar as he utilized the term *operatio Spiritus Sancti*, or 'operation of the Holy Spirit,' instead of Aquinas' own vocabulary of the *virtus Spiritus Sancti*, or 'power of the Holy Spirit' in this context. By comparing Torquemada's terminology here with Burgundio's translation, Torquemada did not likely compare Aquinas' citation with the same passage recorded in Burgundio's translation given that Torquemada's rendering of *operatio* as a substantive adjective within the *Sermo Prior* discorded with how Burgundio merely employed the term *operatur* as an active indicative verb.²⁴⁸

To understand the significance of Torquemada's terminological divergence from Aquinas here, within Aquinas' philosophical framework, *virtus* denoted a capacity which involved either the subject or the object moving from a state of potency to actuality depending on whether this power was passive or active;²⁴⁹ however, *operatio* was understood to designate something actualised.²⁵⁰ When one thereby applied these terms in a Sacramental context, considering the implied actuality undergirding the term *operatio*, the

sacramentorum formis, vel etiam in ipsis sacramentis ad inducendos sacramentorum effectus. Quod, sicut supra dictum est, et dictis sanctorum repugnat, et derogat dignitati sacramentorum novae legis. Unde, cum hoc sacramentum sit prae ceteris dignius, sicut supra dictum est, consequens est quod in verbis formalibus huius sacramenti sit quaedam virtus creata ad conversionem huius sacramenti faciendam, instrumentalis tamen, sicut et in aliis sacramentis, sicut supra dictum est. Cum enim haec verba ex persona Christi proferantur, ex eius mandato consequuntur virtutem instrumentalem a Christo, sicut et cetera eius facta vel dicta habent instrumentaliter salutiferam virtutem, ut supra habitum est."

²⁴⁸ Cf. Boularand, 'L'Épiclese,' 255; Kappes, *Epiclesis Debate*, pp. 96-7.

²⁴⁹ See e.g., Aquinas, *Summa Theologiae* I, q. 25, a. 1, conc.: "...Nam potentia activa est principium agendi in aliud, potentia vero passiva est principium patiendi ab alio..."

²⁵⁰ See e.g., Aquinas, *Sententia Metaphysicae*, IX, l. 8, n. 6: "...Propter quod, nomen **actus** dicitur ab **operatione**, ut supra dictum est. Et inde derivatum est ad formam, quae dicitur endelechia sive perfectio..." where Aquinas notes the lexical link between 'actuality' and 'operation'. Cf. Bernard Lonergan, "St Thomas's Theory of Operation," in Frederick Crowe and Robert Doran, eds., *Grace and Freedom: Operative Grace in the Thought of St. Thomas Aquinas* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2000), pp. 66-93 for an extensive analysis of Aquinas' various applications of the term 'operatio.'

Spirit's operation would transubstantiate the Eucharistic gifts *immediately* when the formulae of the dominical words are stated by the celebrant.²⁵¹ This axiom thus sidelined any possibility for the Eucharistic gifts to be subject to any post-dominical transmutative activity as their transubstantiation, according to this paradigm, would be fully in act.

In this sense, Torquemada's exegesis of John of Damascus, as mediated by Aquinas' *Summa Theologiae*, led Torquemada to anachronistically misapply an Aristotelian-Thomistic philosophical framework to *De fide orthodoxa*. As a result, one should highlight that Torquemada also misconceived the authentic sense of what Burgundio had rendered into Latin as *invocatio* within his translation of *De fide orthodoxa*. Within his *Sermo Alter*, Torquemada, acknowledging that his Byzantine conciliar interlocutors understood that *invocatio* functioned as a technical term given the status of its Greek equivalent *ἐπίκλησις* within the Byzantine Rite's Eucharistic Prayers, postulated:

The Damascene's statement also does not proceed thus [viz., to posit the epiclesis' consecratory nature] as it [the Eucharist] is confected through the invocation of the Holy Spirit's power (*per invocationem virtutis Spiritus Sancti*), but 'through the invocation' is not comprehended by the Damascene to [refer to] another prayer, that succeeds Christ's [viz., dominical] words in [the process of] confection, but 'invocation' (*invocationem*) is comprehended in accord with [Pseudo-]Dionysius' conclusion that the Sacrament's form comprises Christ's words.²⁵²

Torquemada's recourse to Pseudo-Dionysius here was not completely unfitting insofar as John of Damascus explicitly recognized the latter's theological authority and often invoked Pseudo-Dionysius' *opera* in other contexts within his own oeuvres.²⁵³ Nonetheless,

²⁵¹ Cf. Kappes, *Epiclesis Debate*, pp. 95-8.

²⁵² My English translation of *Acta Latina*, Hofmann, ed., p. 249, lines 10-3: "Nec dictum Damasceni procedit, quod per invocationem virtutis Spiritus Sancti conficiatur, quoniam per invocationem non intelligit Damascenus aliam orationem, que sequatur verba Christi in confectione, sed invocationem intelligit secundum sententiam Dyonisii formam sacramenti, que consistit in verbis Christi." Cf. Boularand, 'L'Épiclèse,' 255.

²⁵³ For example, within his *Contra imaginum calumniatores orationes tres*, l.30 and 32, Kotter, ed., *Die Schriften*, Vol. 3, pp. 144-5, John of Damascus invoked Pseudo-Dionysius' *De divinis nominibus* 1.4 and *De ecclesiastica hierarchia* 1.2 respectively, to support the orthodoxy of Icon veneration on the basis that, just as

neither the original Greek nor the Latin translations of Pseudo-Dionysius' *opera* employed the terms *ἐπίκλησις* or *invocatio* within the specific context of asserting that the Sacramental consecration occurs *per invocationem... Spiritus Sancti* when reciting the dominical words. Rather, when Pseudo-Dionysius employed the vocabulary of *ἐπίκλησις* in a Sacramental context within *De ecclesiastica hierarchia*, he conceived the term to refer to a broader prayerful petition to God. For example, Pseudo-Dionysius employed the term to describe how, with regards to chrismation, the priests purify the water to be mixed in the holy oil of anointment 'through the holy epicleses,' which is then 'perfected' by being three effusions of Myron in the form of the Cross.²⁵⁴ Likewise, Pseudo-Dionysius utilised the same term within the context of monastic profession by describing how the priest pronounces the 'monastic epiclesis' upon the monastic ordinand before the altar.²⁵⁵

As will be exemplified in Chapter Four, given his awareness of Torquemada's failure to fully elucidate Pseudo-Dionysius' and John of Damascus' senses of *invocatio/ἐπίκλησις* when exegeting *De fide orthodoxa*, within his *Λίβελλος*, Mark attempted to amend Torquemada's interpretation by recognising that John of Damascus' use of the term 'invocation' in a Eucharistic context was grounded in an extensive Hellenophone liturgiological tradition which analogized Eucharistic transmutation with the Annunciation

the Incarnation functioned as the perfect expression of God's self-revelation to His Creation, as an εἰκών of the Creator, so too can icons participate in this same eternal image of the divine Word. See Andrew Louth, *St. John Damascene: Tradition and Originality in Byzantine Theology* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2002), esp. pp. 213-7. Cf. Eric Perl, *Theophany: The Neoplatonic Philosophy of Dionysius the Areopagite* (Albany: State University of New York Press, 2007) for a lucid analysis of Pseudo-Dionysius' conception of Creation as a perceivable 'vestige' of God's own ineffable *ad intra* reality.

²⁵⁴ Paraphrased from Pseudo-Dionysius, *De Ecclesiastica Hierarchia* 2.7, in Günter Heil and Adolf Martin Ritter, eds., *Corpus Dionysiacum*. II, *Pseudo-Dionysius Areopagita de Coelesti Hierarchia de Ecclesiastica Hierarchia de Mystica Theologia Epistulae* (Berlin: De Gruyter, 2012), p. 72: "...ὑδωρ ἱεραῖς ἐπικλήσει καθαγιασας καὶ τρισὶ τοῦ παναγεστάτου μύρου σταυροειδέσι χύσει τελειώσας αὐτό..."

²⁵⁵ Paraphrased from Pseudo-Dionysius, *De Ecclesiastica Hierarchia* 6.3, in Heil and Ritter, eds., *Corpus Dionysiacum*. II, p. 117: "Ὁ μὲν ἱερεὺς ἔστηκεν ἐπίπροσθεν τοῦ θείου θυσιαστηρίου τὴν μοναχικὴν ἐπίκλησιν ἱερολογῶν. Ὁ δὲ τελούμενος ὀπίσω τοῦ ἱερέως ἔστηκεν... ἱερολογοῦντι τὴν ἐπ' αὐτῷ μουσικὴν ἐπίκλησιν." Cf. Kappes, *Epiclesis Debate*, pp. 98-100.

narrative in Luke 1:35, and which was embodied in the epiclesis of the Byzantine Rite's *Liturgy of St James*. Torquemada's misinterpretation will be shown to have led Mark to counterclaim that Pseudo-Dionysius described the consecratory nature of the dominical words' recitation, which, according to Pseudo-Dionysius, were perfected by the Spirit in the form of a verbal utterance.²⁵⁶

For this dissertation's purposes, Torquemada's hastiness in completing his conciliar *Cedula* was also exemplified by his inability to utilise the Latin translations of the Pseudo-Dionysian *Corpus* produced by Ambrogio Traversari, published in Florence in early 1437.²⁵⁷ Traversari's translation of the *Corpus Dionysiacum* was praised by a number of fifteenth century Latinophone humanists including Pope Nicholas V and utilised by Nicholas of Cusa given its more accurate and comprehensible rendering of the sense of Pseudo-Dionysius' argumentation and vocabulary.²⁵⁸ Traversari's translation stood in contradistinction to the more literalistic Latin translation-commentaries produced by John Scotus Eriugena and John the Saracen in the ninth and twelfth centuries respectively, which were principally utilised by Aquinas to derive his excerpts from *De ecclesiastica hierarchia* throughout his literary

²⁵⁶ Pseudo-Dionysius, *De Ecclesia Hierarchia*, 3.12, in Heil and Ritter, eds., *Corpus Dionysiacum*. II, p. 92: "Τὰς εἰρημένας ἱεράς Θεουργίας... ἄς... ἐν πνεύματι ἀγίῳ κατὰ τὸ λόγιον ἐτελείωσαν." Kappes, *Epiclesis Debate*, pp. 98-9.

²⁵⁷ Marzia Pontone, *Ambrogio Traversari monaco e umanista: Fra scrittura latina e scrittura greca* (Turin: Nino Aragno, 2010), p. 31.

²⁵⁸ See Vespasiano da Bisticci, *La vita di Nicolao P.P. V*, in *Le Vite*, ed. by Aulo Greco, Vol. 1 of 2 (Florence: Istituto Palazzo Strozzi, 1970), pp. 35-81 (68), wherein Vespasiano recounted Pope Nicholas' laudatory comments on the translation. Cf. Stinger, *Humanism and the Church Fathers*, pp. 158-62. As Stinger, *Humanism and the Church Fathers*, p. 44 highlighted, Cusa received a copy of Traversari's translation of *De Theologica Mystica* in 1443 he obtained from the Florentine scholar, Paolo Toscanelli, before obtaining Traversari's edition of the entire *Corpus Dionysiacum*. For Cusa's copy of the Traversari's translation of the entire *Corpus*, transcribed by Peter Erkelenz, who was Cusa's secretary, see *MS Bernkastel-Kues, St. Nikolaus-Hospital, Cod. 43*. Cf. Edmund Vansteenberghe, *Le Cardinal Nicolas de Cues (1401-64)*, repr. (Frankfurt am Main: Minerva, 1963), pp. 410-6 for an overview of Cusa's recourse to Pseudo-Dionysius within his body of work.

oeuvres.²⁵⁹ Despite having hypothetical access to Traversari's translations, Torquemada evidently lacked a sufficient amount of time to utilise it and potentially verify Aquinas' employment of Pseudo-Dionysius. Thus, given that Torquemada's exegesis of Pseudo-Dionysius was restrictively grounded in these latter Latin translations of the *Corpus Dionysiaca* and Aquinas' commentaries thereupon, Torquemada's exegesis bore limited doctrinal weight as he was unable to exposit the authentic Pseudo-Dionysian sense of the terms *invocatio/ἐπίκλησις* vis-à-vis Eucharistic consecration. As Chapter Four will detail, Mark of Ephesus pinpointed this limitation within Torquemada's analysis and more coherently posited that the *Corpus Dionysiaca* should be interpreted to have affirmed the epiclesis' consecratory nature.

3.2.2.2.3. Ambrose

Moving on to examine Torquemada's recourse to Ambrose within his *Sermo Prior*, Torquemada claimed to evoke Ambrose's *De Sacramentis* to justify his doctrine that the dominical words wholly transmuted the Eucharistic gifts. In accord with the nature of Torquemada's methodology highlighted hitherto, Torquemada's citation was likely

²⁵⁹ See Brendan Thomas Sammon, *The God Who Is Beauty: Beauty as a Divine Name in Thomas Aquinas and Dionysius the Areopagite* (Cambridge: Lutterworth Press, 2013), pp. 259-88, for an analysis of Aquinas' use of the various available translations and commentaries on the *Corpus Dionysiaca* available at the thirteenth-century University of Paris. For an overview of these translations and their limitations, see Jean LeClercq, "Influence and Noninfluence of Dionysius in the Western Middle Ages," in Colm Luibheid, ed. and trans., *Pseudo-Dionysius: The Complete Works* (New York: Paulist Press, 1987), pp. 25-32, esp. 26-7, 29; Gabriel Théry, "Jean Sarrazin, Traducteur de Scot Erigène," *Studia Mediaevalia in Honor of R.J. Martin* (Bruges: Tempel, 1948), pp. 359-81, esp. 372-7, wherein the author delineated various instances of John the Saracen's Latin renditions of Pseudo-Dionysius' Greek vocabulary, which Théry posited obscured the original sense of the texts. Cf. Théry 'Documents concernant Jean Sarrazin, reviseur de la traduction érigénienne du Corpus Dionysiaca,' *Archives d'histoire doctrinale et littéraire du moyen âge* 18 (1951): 45-87. See also Craig Tichelkamp, 'Mystical Theology and Translation: Re-veiling the Latin *Corpus Dionysiaca*,' *Medieval Mystical Theology* 29 (2020): 41-53, for a similar focus on John the Saracen's translation.

extracted from Aquinas' *Summa Theologiae*, as indicated by the terminological concordance and thematic context of the reference to Ambrose in the latter:

Torquemada, <i>Sermo prior</i> : ²⁶⁰	Aquinas, <i>Summa Theologiae</i> , III, q. 78, a. 1, s.c.: ²⁶¹
<p>[Ambrose stated]: 'The Bread is usually [placed] upon the altar before the sacramental words. Wherever [the bread] is made into a Sacrament, it becomes Christ's flesh, and below he inquired, 'Through whose words and discourses does consecration take place[?] (<i>cujus verbis et sermonibus fit consecratio</i>)' He responded that [this consecration takes place by those] of our Lord Jesus Christ... [Moreover, Ambrose stated] concerning the Mass: "God is offered praise, [He is] petitioned for the people, for rulers, and for the rest; but when the sacrament is confected, the priest does not use his own words, but [uses] the words of Jesus Christ. Thus, Christ's discourse [i.e., the dominical words] perfects the sacrament (<i>laus deo offertur, oratione petitur pro populo, pro regibus, pro ceteris; ubi autem sacramentum conficitur, non suis sermonibus utitur</i></p>	<p>...Ambrosius dicit, in <i>libro de sacramentis</i>, consecratio fit verbis et sermonibus domini Iesu. Nam per reliqua omnia quae dicuntur, laus Deo defertur, oratione petitur pro populo, pro regibus, pro ceteris. Ubi autem sacramentum conficitur, iam non suis sermonibus sacerdos utitur, sed utitur sermonibus Christi. Ergo sermo Christi hoc conficit sacramentum.</p>

²⁶⁰ My English translation of *Acta Latina*, Hofmann, ed., p. 238, lines 11-4: "...Panis in altari usitatus est ante verba sacramentorum. Ubi accedit cum sacramento, ex pane fit caro Christi', et infra querit, cuius **verbis et sermonibus fit consecratio**. Respondit, quod **domini nostri Ihesu Christi**; '**per reliqua autem, que hic dicuntur**'... scilicet in missa, '**laus deo offertur, oratione petitur pro populo, pro regibus, pro ceteris; ubi autem sacramentum conficitur, non suis sermonibus utitur sacerdos, sed sermonibus Ihesu Christi. Ergo sermo Christi perficit sacramentum.**'"

²⁶¹ English trans. by the English Dominican Fathers: "Ambrose says... 'The consecration is accomplished by the words and expressions of the Lord Jesus. Because, by all the other words spoken, praise is rendered to God, prayer is put up for the people, for kings, and others; but when the time comes for perfecting the sacrament, the priest uses no longer his own words, but the words of Christ. Therefore, it is Christ's words that perfect this sacrament.'" Cf. Aquinas, *Summa Theologiae*, III, q. 78, a. 4, s.c.: "...Ambrosius dicit, in *libro de sacramentis*, si tanta est vis in sermone domini Iesu ut inciperet esse quod non erat, quanto magis operativus est ut sint quae erant, et in aliud commutentur? Et sic quod erat panis ante consecrationem, iam corpus Christi est post consecrationem, quia sermo Christi creaturam mutat/Ambrose says... 'If there be such might in the word of the Lord Jesus that things non-existent came into being, how much more efficacious is it to make things existing to continue, and to be changed into something else? And so, what was bread before consecration is now the body of Christ after consecration, because Christ's word changes a creature into something different.'" From this excerpt, Torquemada possibly gleaned the sense from which he believed *De Sacramentiis* should be interpreted. However, given that Aquinas' reading differs from that of Torquemada, one cannot make a strong case that this passage directly influenced Aquinas' argumentation above.

<i>sacerdos, sed sermonibus Yhesu Christi. Ergo sermo Christi perficit sacramentum).</i> '	
--	--

Based upon this comparison, Aquinas' citation of *De Sacramentis* evidently provided Torquemada with a somewhat accurate representation of Ambrose's doctrine of Eucharistic consecration within his *Sermo Prior* insofar as Torquemada was able to correctly apprehend that, for Ambrose, Eucharistic consecration occurs upon the recitation of Christ's words, namely, the dominical words.²⁶² However, Torquemada did not definitively establish that Ambrose believed that other elements of the Eucharistic Prayer could validly be excluded so as to still guarantee the Father's Sacramental activity. Aquinas for his part likely derived his extracts of *De Sacramentis* from Lombard's *Sententiarum*²⁶³ and/or the *Decretum Gratiani*,²⁶⁴ both of which failed to exposit pertinent passages from the broader Ambrosian Corpus, including from *De Spiritu Sancto*. Indeed, within *De Spiritu Sancto*, Ambrose could be plausibly interpreted to have upheld a consecratory function for the Pneumatic Eucharistic invocation, or epiclesis.²⁶⁵ Based upon this lacuna within his principal source material, it is evident that Torquemada overlooked Ambrose's more nuanced Sacramentology. In particular, within *De Spiritu Sancto*, III, c. 16, Ambrose stated:

Thus, how does He [i.e., the Holy Spirit] not have all that is of God, who is named with the Father and the Son in Baptism by the priests and invoked in the oblations [i.e., the Eucharist] with the Father and the Son (*qui cum Patre et Filio a sacerdotibus in baptisate nominatur et in oblationibus invocatur cum Patre et Filio*), [and is]

²⁶² Cf. Boularand, 'L'Épiclèse,' 255; Kappes, *Epiclesis Debate*, pp. 111-3.

²⁶³ Lombard, *Sententiarum*, IV, dist. 10, c. 2, in *Libri IV Sententiarum* (Quaracchi: Collegii S. Bonaventurae, 1916), p. 801. Lombard likely derived his citation from Pseudo-Ivo of Chartres, *Panormia*, c. 125, in *Patrologia Latina*, Vol. 161 (Paris: Typis J.-P. Migne, 1855), col. 1071, which partly contextualises why the *Libri Sententiarum* made few citations to Ambrose's *De Sacramentis* in its entirety.

²⁶⁴ *Decretum Gratiani, Pars Tertia*, dist. 2, c. 55, in Friedburg, ed., *Corpus iuris canonici*, Vol. 1, cols. 1334-5.

²⁶⁵ See Kappes, *Epiclesis Debate*, p. 102. Nonetheless, Lombard was evidently aware of *De Spiritu Sancto* more broadly, as exemplified by the fact that he quoted *De Spiritu Sancto*, I, c. 3, 54, in Otto Faller, ed., *Sancti Ambrosii Opera*, Vol. 8 (Vienna: Hoelder-Pichler-Tempsky, 1964), pp. 37-8, in *Sententiarum* II, dist. 43, c. 1, in *Libri IV Sententiarum*, Vol. 1 (Quaracchi: Collegii: S. Bonaventurae, 1916), pp. 536-7 within the context of treating sins against the Holy Spirit.

proclaimed by the Seraphim in heaven with the Father and the Son, [and] dwells in the saints, is infused into the just, and inspired the prophets...²⁶⁶

In light of Ambrose's use and distinction of the term *nominatur* from *invocatur*, one should clearly not conflate the dominical words with Ambrose's notion of the Spirit's invocation given Ambrose's insistence that, both within Baptism and the Eucharist, the Spirit is 'named.' In contradistinction, the *Canon Missae's* formulae for the dominical words do not properly 'name' the Spirit thus. Taking into consideration Ambrose's claim that his Sacramental praxis broadly accorded with the Church of Rome's, one must thereby locate where the Spirit's 'invocation' would have occurred within his own Eucharistic Prayer in order to glean where this 'invocation' might have occurred in the version of the Roman *Canon Missae* contemporaneous to Ambrose's time of writing.²⁶⁷ Based upon Ambrose's assertion that one could discern the Spirit's compresence with the Father and the Son through being named and invoked in Baptism and the Eucharist, one should take into consideration Ambrose's *De Sacramentis* given that, within this work, Ambrose provided

²⁶⁶ My English translation of Ambrose, *De Spiritu Sancto*, III, c. 16, 112, in Faller, ed., *Sancti Ambrosii Opera*, Vol. 8, pp. 197-8: "Quomodo igitur non omnia habet quae Dei sunt, qui cum Patre et Filio a sacerdotibus in baptisate **nominatur** et in oblationibus [i.e., the Eucharist] **invocatur** cum Patre et Filio a Seraphim in coelestibus praedicatur cum Patre et Filio, habitat in sanctis, infunditur justis, inspiratur prophetis?"

²⁶⁷ See, e.g., Ambrose, *De Sacramentis* III, c. 1, 5, in Faller, ed., *Sancti Ambrosii Opera*, Vol. 7 (Vienna: Hoelder-Pichler-Tempsky, 1955), p. 40: "Non ignoramus quod ecclesia romana hanc consuetudinem non habeat cuius typum in omnibus sequimur et formam. Hanc tanem consuetudinem non habet ut pedes lavet." Claudio Moreschini, "Introduzione," in Moreschini, ed. and trans., *Sancti Ambrosii episcopi mediolanensis opera*, Vol. 16. *Opere dogmatiche, 2. De Spiritu Sancto libri tres* (Milan: Bibliotheca Ambrosiana Roma, 1979), pp. 25-7. Cf. Kappes, *Epiclesis Debate*, pp. 102-3. By making this inquiry, I am not necessarily suggesting that, from the late antique Church of Rome's perspective, their Eucharistic Prayer incorporated a consecratory Pneumatic epiclesis. As scholars such as Enrico Mazza, *The Celebration of the Eucharist: The Origin of the Rite and the Development of Its Interpretation*, trans. by Matthew J. O'Connell (Collegeville: Liturgical Press, 1999), p. 271, n. 34, while one may be lead to conclude that Pope Gelasius I affirmed the Church of Rome's Eucharistic use of a consecratory Pneumatic invocation in his epistle to Elpidius, the Bishop of Volterra, Mazza highlighted that Gelasius was referring to the Eucharistic Prayer more broadly, which concludes with the divine blessing being sent down from Heaven, which could have been interpreted by this Pope to refer to a Pneumatic descent. For this passage of this epistle in question, cf. *Patrologia Latina*, Vol. 59, col. 143.

some of his most lucid expositions of his doctrines of Baptism and the Eucharist. Ambrose stated:

[John 5:4] says an angel descended into the pool at a certain season, and the water was moved whenever the angel descended; and he who first descended was healed of all those sicknesses he had. That [angel] signifies the type (*figura*) of Our Lord Jesus Christ. Why an angel? For He is the angel of great counsel [*Ipse est enim magni consilii Angelus...*]²⁶⁸

Given the broader influence of Hellenophone Patristic authors such as Origen of Alexandria and Didymus the Blind upon Ambrose's theological framework,²⁶⁹ Ambrose likely evoked Origen's angelomorphic Christology and Pneumatology within this passage. For example, within his *In Evangelium Ioannis*, Origen stated:

...and clearly [Christ] became a man to men, and an angel to the angels. And none of the faithful hesitate about Him becoming a man; but about Him [becoming] an angel, we are convinced [of this fact] by observing the angels' words and manifestations, when some of the angelic powers are seen to be His in certain places of Scripture [wherein] the angels speak thus... Isaiah [9:6]... states, 'He is called by the name the angel of great counsel (*Καλεῖται τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ μεγάλης βουλῆς ἄγγελος*)' ...²⁷⁰

Moreover, Raniero Cantalamessa notably highlighted how Origen likely utilized a variant rendition of Luke 1:35 which stated *πνεῦμα κυρίου ἐπελεύσεται* rather than *πνεῦμα*

²⁶⁸ My English translation of Ambrose, *De Sacramentis*, 2.2.3, in in Faller, ed., *Sancti Ambrosii Opera*, Vol. 7, p. 26: "...Angelus, inquit, secundum tempus descendebat in piscinam, et quotiescunque descendisset angelus, movebatur aqua; et qui prior descendisset, sanabatur ab omni languore quocunque tenebatur [John 5:4]. Quod significat figuram venturam Domini nostri Jesu Christi. Angelus quare? Ipse est enim **magni consilii Angelus...**"

²⁶⁹ See Jerome, *Epistula LXXXIV Ad Pammachium et Oceanum*, in *Patrologia Latina*, Vol. 22 (Paris: Typis J.-P. Migne, 1845), cols. 743-52 (749): "Nuper Sanctus Ambrosius sic [Origen's] *Hexaemeron* illius compilavit, ut magis Hippolyti sententias Basilique sequeretur..." who testified to Ambrose's influence in this regard within this epistle written c. 400. Given that one cannot fully exemplify such influences due to word constraints, cf. Hervé Savon, "Ambroise lecteur d'Origène," in Luigi F. Pizzolato and Marco Rizzi, eds., *Nec Timeo Mori: Atti del Congresso internazionale di studi ambrosiani nel XVI centenario della morte di sant' Ambrogio* (Milan: Pubblicazioni dell'Università Cattolica del Sacro Cuore, 1998), pp. 221-34.

²⁷⁰ My English translation of Origen, *In Evangelium Ioannis*, I, 31, in A. E. Brooke, ed., *The Commentary of Origen on S. John's Gospel: The Text Revised with a Critical Introduction and Indices* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1896), pp. 40-1: "...καὶ σαφῶς γέγονεν ἄνθρωπος ἀνθρώπος καὶ ἄγγελοι ἄγγελος. Καὶ περὶ μὲν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου αὐτὸν γεγονέναι οὐδεὶς τῶν πεπιστευκότων διστάξει· περὶ δὲ τοῦ ἄγγελου πειθώμεθα τηροῦντες τὰς τῶν ἀγγέλων ἐπιφανείας καὶ λόγους, ὅτε τῆς τῶν ἀγγέλων ἐξουσίας φαίνεται ἐν τισὶ τόποις τῆς γραφῆς ἀγγέλων λεγόντων... Ἄλλὰ καὶ ὁ Ἡσαΐας φησὶ· Καλεῖται τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ **μεγάλης βουλῆς ἄγγελος.**"

ἄγιον ἐπελεύσεται...²⁷¹ Given this variant, within his *Περὶ ἀρχῶν* (*On First Principles*), Origen collocated the term ‘spirit of the Lord’ with the Septuagint version of Lamentations 4:20, which stated **πνεῦμα προσώπου ἡμῶν χριστός κυρίου**,²⁷² alongside 1 Corinthians 1:24 which stated that *Χριστὸν θεοῦ δύναμιν καὶ θεοῦ σοφίαν...*²⁷³ This variant reading of Luke enabled Origen to conceive God’s activity at the Annunciation in a manner whereby Christ, the angelomorphic ‘power of God,’ descended upon and ‘overshadowed’ the Virgin with His Spirit being concomitantly present.²⁷⁴

This doctrine of the Divine Persons’ activity manifested itself liturgically. For example, the early third century Eucharistic Prayer ascribed to Hippolytus of Rome, whose preaching Jerome described as being significantly influential upon Origen during his youthful visit to Rome within his *De Viris Illustribus*,²⁷⁵ stated:

We thank you, God, through your beloved son Jesus Christ who, in the last times, you sent to us as a saviour and a redeemer and an angel of your will (*et **angelum voluntatis tuae***), who is your inseparable Word... [and who] you sent from Heaven into the Virgin’s womb, who, having inhabited her womb, was made incarnate, and... [was] born of the Holy Spirit and the virgin...²⁷⁶

²⁷¹ Raniero Cantalamessa, ‘La primitiva esegesi cristologica di ‘Romani’ I, 3-4 e ‘Luca’ I, 35,’ *Rivista di storia e letteratura religiosa* 2 (1966): 69-80 (73).

²⁷² See esp. Origen, *De principiis*, II, c. 6, 7, Rufinus, Latin trans., in *Patrologia Graeca*, Vol. 11, cols. 214-5.

²⁷³ See esp. Origen, *De principiis*, I, c. 2, 1, Rufinus, Latin trans., in *Patrologia Graeca*, Vol. 11, col. 130.

²⁷⁴ See, e.g., Origen, *In Canticum Canticorum* III, 2, v. 3, in *Patrologia Graeca*, Vol. 13, cols. 152-3; Emmanuel Hirschauer, ‘Origen’s Interpretation of Luke 1:35: “The Power of the Most High will Overshadow You”,’ *Scrinium. Revue de patrologie* 4 (2008): 32-44 (33-4, 36). Cf. An ante-Nicene example of this angelomorphic Christology was detailed within Justin Martyr’s *Apologia Prima Pro Christianis*, 33.6, in *Patrologia Graeca*, Vol. 6 (Paris: Typis J.-P. Migne, 1857), cols. 327-440 (381), for an ante-Nicene example of this angelomorphic Christology within the context of Justin exegeting Luke 1:25. Cf. Kappes, *Epiclesis Debate*, pp. 103-4.

²⁷⁵ See Jerome, *De Viris Illustribus* c. 61, in *Patrologia Latina*, Vol. 23 (Paris: Typis J.-P. Migne, 1883), col. 707.

²⁷⁶ My English translation of Hippolytus of Rome, *Prex Eucharistica in ‘Traditione Apostolica,’* in Hänggi and Pahl, eds., *Prex Eucharistica*, pp. 80-1 (81): “Gratias tibi referimus, Deus, per dilectum puerum tuum Iesum Christum, quem in ultimis temporibus misisti nobis salvatorem et redemptorem et **angelum voluntatis tuae**, qui est **Verbum tuum** inseparabile, per quem omnia fecisti, et (cum) beneplacitum tibi fuit, misisti de caelo **in matricem virginis; quique, in utero habitus, incarnatus est... ex Spiritu Sancto et virgine natus.**”

Given this background, Ambrose likely evoked such liturgical texts as loci for developing his doctrine that Christ, the *magni consilii angelus*, is first sent upon an item before He sends His spirit to be co-present with Him.

Additionally, it is possible that Ambrose invoked Origen's *De Oratione*, wherein Origen exegeted the Genesis Creation Narrative in a manner whereby God employed His eternal imperative, or *ῥῆμα*, which Origen had identified as the divine *Λόγος*, i.e., Christ, within his *In Evangelium Ioannis*,²⁷⁷ to create *ex nihilo* and efficiently cause the coming into being of creatures.²⁷⁸ As will be exemplified, this eternal divine imperative functioned as a locus for both John Chrysostom's *Εἰς τὴν προδοσίαν τοῦ Ἰούδα* and John of Damascus' *Ἐκδοσις*, both of whom Mark of Ephesus invoked to uphold his *in fieri* doctrine of Eucharistic consecration.²⁷⁹ In particular, Chrysostom and the Damascene will be shown to have postulated that, in accord with His imperative at Creation, God also first 'sent' His eternally-effective imperative, identified with the Son, upon the Virgin, before the Son sends His concomitant Spirit. For these theologians, God operates analogously upon the Eucharistic gifts. Liturgically, this angelomorphic Christology and its implied concomitance of the Spirit is exemplified within the Eucharistic epiclesis of the *Sacramentary* ascribed to the fourth-century Bishop of Thmuis, Serapion, which stated:

²⁷⁷ See, e.g., Origen, *In Evangelium Ioannis*, I, 37, Brooke, ed., *The Commentary of Origen on S. John's Gospel*, p. 51. My English translation: "But believe that all men partake of Him, according to [the fact that He is] the Word (*Ἐπίστησον δὲ εἰ μετέχουσί πως αὐτοῦ πάντες ἄνθρωποι, καθ' ὃ λόγος ἐστί*)... [as] the Apostle [Paul] states, 'Do not say in your heart, what ascends into heaven? That is, to bring down Christ, or, who descends into the abyss? That is to raise Christ from the dead. But what does Scripture say? The **word** is very close to you in your mouth and in your heart (*Ἐγγύς σου τὸ ῥῆμά ἐστι σφόδρα ἐν τῷ στόματί σου καὶ ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ σου*)' [Rom. 10:6-8. Cf. Deut. 30:14 for Paul's quotation] as if this Christ is the **word** of the thing which is sought (ὡς τοῦ αὐτοῦ ὄντος **Χριστοῦ** καὶ **ῥήματος** τοῦ ζητουμένου)."

²⁷⁸ See Origen, *On Prayer* 24.1-25.3, in Tertullian, Cyprian of Carthage, Origen, *On the Lord's Prayer*, ed. by John Behr, trans. by Alistair Stewart-Sykes (Crestwood: St Vladimir's Seminary Press, 2004), pp. 111-214 (169-71).

²⁷⁹ Cf. Chrysostom, *De prodicione Judae* 1.6, in *Patrologia Graeca*, Vol. 49, col. 380. John of Damascus, *Ἐκδοσις* 4.13, in Kotter, ed., *Die Schriften*, Vol. 2, pp. 191-8.

God of Truth, let Your Holy Λόγος come down (ἐπιδημησάτω) on this bread, so that the bread may become the Word's Body (σῶμα τοῦ λόγου), and on this chalice, so that this chalice may become the Blood of Truth.²⁸⁰

Assuming that the *Sacramentary* was principally influenced by the direction of Serapion, based upon Athanasios of Alexandria's *Epistles* to Serapion, it is evident that the relationship between the Λόγος and the Spirit was a pertinent theological question within the fourth century Coptic theological tradition, which was reflected within the *Sacramentary* ascribed to Serapion's name. Within his first *Epistle*, Athanasios admonished his theological opponents who separate the Λόγος and the Spirit as the Spirit is "of God... the Almighty and is ministered to by an angel, and is indivisible from the Godhead, and of the Word Himself (καὶ ἴδιον τοῦ λόγου)."²⁸¹ Thus, Athanasios emphasized that these two divine Hypostases are concomitantly present upon being invoked, arguing that when the Father is called, the Λόγος is included thereto, as well as the Spirit in the Son. Likewise, if one names the Son, according to Athanasios, so also is the Father in the Son, alongside the Spirit who cannot be separated from the Λόγος as the Father does all things through the Λόγος in the Spirit.²⁸² Consequently, Athanasios emphasized the mutual activity of the Λόγος and the Spirit in Christ's Incarnation:

²⁸⁰ English trans. from John Wordsworth, trans., *Bishop Sarapion's prayerbook: An Egyptian Sacramentary Dated Probably about A.D. 350-356* (London: SPCK, 1923), p. 63 with slight emendations. For the Greek, see *Præx Eucharistica. Textus e Variis Liturgiis Antiquioribus Selecti*, ed. by Anton Hänggi and Irmgard Pahl (Fribourg: University of Fribourg Press, 1968), p. 130: "Ἐπιδημησάτω θεὸς τῆς ἀληθείας ὁ ἅγιός σου λόγος ἐπὶ τὸν ἄρτον τοῦτον, ἵνα γένηται ὁ ἄρτος σῶμα τοῦ λόγου, καὶ ἐπὶ τὸ ποτήριον τοῦτο, ἵνα γένηται τὸ ποτήριον αἷμα τῆς ἀληθείας."

²⁸¹ My English translation of Athanasios of Alexandria, *Epistola I ad Serapionem*, 11, in *Patrologia Graeca*, Vol. 26 (Paris: Typis J.-P. Migne, 1857), cols. 529-608 (537): "τοῦ Θεοῦ... τοῦ παντοκράτορος καὶ διακονεῖται μεν παρ' ἀγγέλου, ἀδιαίρετον δε τῆς θεότητός ἐστι, καὶ ἴδιον τοῦ λόγου."

²⁸² Paraphrased from Athanasios, *Epistola I ad Serapionem*, 14, in *Patrologia Graeca*, Vol. 26, col. 565: "λεγομένου τοῦ Πατρὸς, πρόσσεσι καὶ ὁ τούτου Λόγος καὶ τὸ ἐν τῷ Υἱῷ Πνεῦμα. Ἐὰν δε καὶ ὁ Υἱὸς ὀνομάζεται, ἐν τῷ Υἱῷ ἐστὶν ὁ Πατήρ, καὶ τὸ Πνεῦμα οὐκ ἐστὶν ἐκτός τοῦ Λόγου."

...the holy Virgin Mary was come upon by the Word, accompanied by the Spirit, and the Word in the Spirit formed and took upon himself the Body...²⁸³

By locating Ambrose's attribution of Baptismal and Eucharistic consecratory operations to this angelomorphic Christ within the context of this Coptic Trinitarian theology, one can thereby more lucidly interpret Ambrose's Sacramentology as a whole. As the above passage from *De Sacramentis* exemplified, Christ was explicitly identified by Ambrose as the angel who descended upon the waters of Bethesda, whose descent thereupon is an analogate to His descent upon the Baptismal font. Thus, Ambrose upheld a doctrine with a strong ante-Nicene Patristic foundation of the Triune Persons' *ad extra* activity which presumed the Spirit's compresence in Sacramental consecration with the angelomorphic Christ.

For example, within *De Sacramentis*, Ambrose declared his belief in this *ad extra* Pneumatic compresence with the angelomorphic Christ, stating:

Christ descended into the water, and the Holy Spirit descended like a dove.²⁸⁴ God the Father also spoke from heaven. You have the Trinity's presence.²⁸⁵

Pertinently, within *De Spiritu Sancto*, Ambrose also upheld this concomitance of the Son and the Spirit in the context of the Annunciation and Incarnation:

But of which creature can one state that the whole universe is replete[?]. One cannot state this of an angel. Lastly Gabriel himself was sent to Marian, 'Hail,' he said, 'full of grace,' certainly declaring that the Spirit's grace was in her, as the Holy Spirit had come upon her, and that her womb would be full of grace with the dwelling of the heavenly Word... [Luke 1:28]... You see that the Holy Spirit gives fullness and faith; whose operation the archangel announced to Mary, stating 'the

²⁸³ My English translation of Athanasios, *Epistola I ad Serapionem*, 32, in *Patrologia Graeca*, Vol. 26, col. 605: "Οὕτω καὶ ἐπὶ τὴν ἁγίαν Παρθένον Μαρίαν ἐπιδημοῦντος τοῦ Λόγου, συνεισήρχετο τὸ Πνεῦμα, καὶ Λόγος ἐν τῷ Πνεύματι ἔπλαττε καὶ ἡρμोजεν εαυτῷ τὸ σῶμα..." Kappes, *Epiclesis Debate*, pp. 102-4.

²⁸⁴ Cf. Matt. 3:16

²⁸⁵ My English translation of Ambrose, *De Sacramentis* 1.5.19, in Faller, ed., *Sancti Ambrosii Opera*, Vol. 7, p. 23: "Ergo descendit in aquam Christus, et Spiritus sanctus sicut columba descendit (Matt. 3:16). Pater quoque Deus e coelo locutus est. Habes presentiam Trinitatis."

Holy Spirit shall come upon you.’ [Luke 1:35] You also read in the Gospel [John 5:4] that, at the accordant time, the angel descended on the pool, and moved the water, and he who first descended on the pool, was made clean. Therefore, the Spirit has those same ministers as God the Father and Christ... He fills all things, thus He possesses all things, works all things and in all things, in the same mode as God the Father and the Son operate.²⁸⁶

This doctrine of the Triune Persons’ *ad extra* activity, the author argues, acts as the hermeneutic for understanding the role of the angel who carries the Eucharistic gifts up to the celestial altar within the *Supplices te rogamus* of the *Canon Missae’s textus receptus*. In particular, it is likely that, within Ambrose’s Eucharistic Prayer, the prayer analogous to the *Supplices te rogamus*, the *petimus te procamur*, would have functioned as the occasion when the angelic Christ sends His Spirit to concomitantly operate upon the Eucharistic gifts by ‘taking them up’ to the Father.

To assess this hypothesis, one should first highlight that, within *De Sacramentis*, Ambrose employed this dual-Person imagery concerning the Baptismal invocation:

The priest comes before the [Baptismal] font and states a prayer, invokes the Father’s name, [with] the presence of the Son and the Holy Spirit: [The priest] utilizes celestial words... [which] are Christ’s, [namely], that we baptize in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit (*baptizemus in nomine Patris, et Filii, et Spiritus sancti*). Therefore, if the Trinity was present at the human word, [and] at the holy invocation, how much more is [the Trinity] present there, where the eternal word operates?²⁸⁷

²⁸⁶ My English translation of Ambrose, *De Spiritu Sancto*, I, c. 7, 85, 87, 88, in Faller, ed., *Sancti Ambrosii Opera*, Vol. 8, pp. 51, 52: “De qua autem creatura dici potest quia reple verit universa... Non hoc de angelo dici potest. Denique Gabriel ipse missus ad Mariam: Ave, inquit, gratia plena; spiritalem utique in ea declarans gratiam, quod in eam **Spiritus sanctus** supervenisset, et plenum gratiae uterum **Verbo** esset habitura coelesti... [Luke 1:28]... Vides quia et plenitudinem et fiduciam dat Spiritus sanctus; cujus operationem archangelus nuntiat Mariæ, dicens: Spiritus sanctus superveniet in te [Luke 1:35]. Habes etiam in Evangelio quia angelus secundum tempus descendebat in natatoriam, et movebatur aqua et qui prior descendisset in natatoriam, sanus fiebat [John 5:4]... Eisdem ergo et **Spiritus** habet, quos Deus Pater et Christus ministros. Sic omnia replete, sic omnia possidet, sic omnia operatur et in omnibus, quemadmodum **et Deus Pater operatur et Filius.**”

²⁸⁷ My English translation of Ambrose, *De Sacramentis* 2.5.14, in Faller, ed., *Sancti Ambrosii Opera*, Vol. 7, p. 31: “Venit sacerdos **precem** dicit ad fontem, **invocat** Patris nomen, **praesentiam** Filii et Spiritus sancti: utitur verbis coelestibus. Coelestia verba quae? Christi sunt, quod baptizemus in nomine Patris, et Filii, et Spiritus sancti. Si ergo ad hominum sermonem, ad **invocationem** sancti aderat praesentia Trinitatis, quanto magis ibi adest, ubi sermo operatur aeternus?”

Here, Ambrose acknowledged two forms of Baptismal invocation: that composed by man, namely, the priest's prayer; and the celestial 'discourse,' i.e., *baptizemus in nomine Patris, et Filii, et Spiritus sancti*. Given that Ambrose had paralleled his Sacramentologies of Baptism and the Eucharist, when addressing the *Canon Missae*, it would appear that Ambrose's edition of the Roman liturgy would seem to be unable to function as the basis for upholding the Spirit's co-present consecratory Eucharistic activity with the Son upon invoking the Father, as he had postulated with regards to Baptism above.²⁸⁸ This would ostensibly be the case given that one might believe they could not directly collocate the multiple 'angels' described within Ambrose's Eucharistic Prayer with the *Canon Missae's* single *angelus magni consilii*:

Ambrose, <i>De Sacramentis</i>, 4.6.27:²⁸⁹	<i>Canon Missae's Textus Receptus:</i>²⁹⁰
Petimus et precamur ut <i>hanc oblationem suscipias in sublime altare tuum per manus angelorum tuorum</i> , sicut suscipere dignatus es munera pueri tui justi Abel et sacrificium patriarchae nostri Abrahae et quod tibi obtulit summus sacerdos Melchisedech.	...Supplices te rogamus, omnipotens Deus, <i>iube haec perferri per manus angeli tui in sublime altare tuum</i> in conspectu divinae maiestatis tuae, ut quotquot ex hac altaris participatione sacrosanctum Filii tui corpus et sanguinem sumpserimus, <i>omni benedictione caelesti et gratia repleamur...</i> ²⁹¹ ...Supra quae propitio ac sereno vultu respicere digneris et accepta haberi, sicuti accepta habere dignatus es munera pueri

²⁸⁸ Cf. Kappes, *Epiclesis Debate*, pp. 105-6.

²⁸⁹ Ambrose, *De Sacramentis*, 4.6.27, in Faller, ed., *Sancti Ambrosii Opera*, Vol. 7, p. 57. My English translation: "We ask and pray that you will receive this oblation on your altar on high by your angels' hands, just as you were deigned to receive your just son Abel's gifts and our patriarch Abraham's sacrifice and the high priest Melchisedech's offering to you." Cf. Charles Kannengiesser, *Handbook of Patristic Exegesis: The Bible in Ancient Christianity*, Vol. 1 of 2 (Boston: Brill, 2006), pp. 230-1 for an overview of Ambrose's interpretation of Melchisedech throughout his *Opera Omnia*.

²⁹⁰ Hänggi and Pahl, eds., *Prex Eucharistica*, p. 435. The *Canon Missae's textus receptus'* order has been inverted here to elucidate the comparison between these two texts.

²⁹¹ Nikolaus Gaur, ed. and trans., *The Holy Sacrifice of the Mass: Dogmatically, Liturgically And Ascetically Explained* (St Louis: Herder, 1902), p. 647: "We humbly beseech Thee, Almighty God, command these to be carried by the hands of Thy holy Angel to Thine Altar on high, in the presence of Thy divine Majesty, that as many of us as shall, by partaking at this Altar, receive the most sacred Body and Blood of Thy Son, may be filled with all heavenly blessing and grace. Through the same Christ our Lord. Amen."

	tui iusti Abel et sacrificium patriarchae nostri Abrahae et quod tibi obtulit summus sacerdos Melchisedech, sanctum sacrificium, immaculatum hostiam... ²⁹²
--	--

However, Ambrose could collocate his dual ‘angels’ with the single ‘angel’ based upon his conclusion in *De Spiritu Sancto* that the Spirit is ‘named’ and ‘invoked’ with the Father and the Son during the Eucharistic sacrifice, and proclaimed by the Seraphim in Heaven.²⁹³ Ambrose thus likely regarded the *petimus te procamur* as the entrance into the ‘heavenly celebrations,’ wherein one could assume the Son’s and Spirit’s compresence even though, like Baptism, only the Father is explicitly petitioned.²⁹⁴

One might be led to conclude that Ambrose was making reference to the *Sanctus* here given that liturgical scholars have historically ascribed the recitation of the *Sanctus* in the Eucharistic Prayer to the ante- and post-Nicene Coptic liturgy. In particular, some scholars such as Dix have argued that the thematic closeness between Origen’s exegesis of the *Sanctus* in the Prophecy of Isaiah and Serapion’s Sacramentary, especially concerning how the two Seraphim are characterised are interlinked with the concomitant activity of the Son and Spirit *ad extra*,²⁹⁵ indicating that Origen must have been witness to the *Sanctus*

²⁹² Gaur, ed. and trans., *Holy Sacrifice of the Mass*, p. 647: “Upon which do Thou vouchsafe to look with favorable and gracious countenance, and accept them, as Thou didst vouchsafe to accept the gifts of Thy just servant Abel, and the sacrifice of our Patriarch Abraham, and that which Thy High Priest Melchisedech offered unto Thee, a holy Sacrifice, an unspotted Victim.”

²⁹³ Ambrose, *De Spiritu Sancto*, III, c. 16, 112, in Faller, ed., *Sancti Ambrosii Opera*, Vol. 8, pp. 197-8.

²⁹⁴ Kappes, *Epiclesis Debate*, pp. 106-7.

²⁹⁵ For example, within his *Περί ἀρχῶν*, Origen pertinently identified the Son and the Spirit with the two Seraphim referred to in the Septuagint version of Isaiah 6:3, stating: “And the Hebrews referred to the two seraphim in Isaiah, who said, “Holy, Holy, Holy Lord of Sabaoth...” as the only-begotten [Son] of God, and the Holy Spirit, and we know that in the song of Habakkuk [where it says], “In the midst of the two living things it is known,” (Habakkuk 3:2 in the *Septuagint*) [this statement] concerns Christ and the Holy Spirit. For it is through the Holy Spirit that we are made known of all the knowledge of the Father as revealed by the Son, so that both of these [Persons], according to the Prophet, are called life-giving or life, [and] are the source of our knowledge of God the Father. For as it is said of the Son, “no one knows the Father but [through] the Son, or to whom the Son wills to reveal Him” (Matt. 11:27), so also does the Apostle [Paul] describe the Holy Spirit, “God has revealed these things to us by His Spirit, for the Spirit searches all things, even the depths of God.” (1

being recited in the third-century Eucharistic liturgy of the Coptic Church before being disseminated throughout the other Churches and their liturgical rites.²⁹⁶ Other scholars such as Georg Kretschmar argued that Origen's exegesis of Isaiah in this context was what led to the introduction of the *Sanctus* within the Coptic Eucharistic praxis in the mid-to-late third century.²⁹⁷ However, according to these two paradigms, the *Sanctus* would have been a

Cor. 2:10). My English trans. of Origen, *De principiis* I.3.4, Rufinus, trans., in *Patrologia Graeca*, Vol. 11 (Paris: Typis J.-P. Migne, 1857), cols. 148-9: “Ἐλεγε δὲ ὁ Ἐβραῖος τὰ ἐν τῷ Ἡσαΐα δύο σεραφίμ ἐξαπτέρυγα κεκραγότα ἕτερον, καὶ λέγοντα: «Ἅγιος, ἅγιος, ἅγιος, Κύριος Σαβαώθ,» τὸν Μονογενῆ εἶναι τοῦ Θεοῦ καὶ τὸ Πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον ἡμεῖς οἰόμεθα ὅτι καὶ ἐν τῇ ὥδῃ Ἀμβρακούμ· «Ἐν μέσῳ δύο ζώων γνωσθήσῃ,» περὶ Χριστοῦ καὶ ἁγίου Πνεύματης... Omnis enim scientia de Patre revelante Filio in Spiritu sancto cognoscitur, ut ambo haec quae secundum prophetam vel animantia, vel vitae dicuntur, causa scientiae Dei Patris existant. Sicut enim de Filio dicitur, quia «nemo novit Patrem nisi Filius, et cui voluerit Filius revelare;» haec eadem etiam de Spiritu sancto dicit Apostolus cum ait: «Nobis autem revelavit Deus per Spiritum suam; Spiritus enim omnia scrutatur etiam aita Dei»” Later within the same work, Origen wrote: “For my Hebrew teacher also maintained that because [neither] the beginning or the end of all things cannot be comprehended by anyone, except strictly by the Lord Jesus Christ and by the Holy Spirit, he said that Isaiah had said that in the vision [he received] that there appeared only two seraphim who indeed covered God’s face with two wings, with two cover His feet and with two they fly, crying out to each other and saying: ‘Holy, holy, holy, Lord God of Sabaoth, the whole earth is full of your glory.’” My English trans. of Origen, *De principiis* IV.26, in *Patrologia Graeca*, Vol. 11, col. 400. Latin trans. by Rufinus: “Nam et Hebraeus doctor ita tradebat: pro eo quod initium omnium vel finis non possit ab ullo comprehendi, nisi tantummodo a Domino Jesu Christo, et a Spiritu sancto, aiebat per figuram visionis Isaiam dixisse, duos seraphim solos esse qui duabus quidem alis operiunt faciem Dei, duabus vero pedes, et duabus volant clamantes ad invicem sibi et dicentes: «Sanctus, sanctus, sanctus, Dominus Deus Sabaoth, plena est universa terra gloria tua.»” One should compare these two statements to the *Preface* and *Sanctus* of Serapion’s *Sacramentary*, which states: “We beseech thee to make us living men. Give us a spirit of light, that “we may know thee the true [God] and him whom thou didst send, (even) Jesus Christ.” Give us thy Holy Spirit, that we may be able to tell forth and to enunciate thy unspeakable mysteries. May the Lord Jesus speak in us and holy Spirit and hymn thee through us. For thou art “far above all rule and authority and power and dominion, and every name that is named, not only in this world but also in that which is to come.” Beside thee stand thousands and myriad angels, archangels, thrones, dominions, principalities, powers: by thee stand the two most honourable six-winged seraphim, with two wings covering the face, and with two the feet, and with two flying and crying holy, with whom receive also our cry of “holy” as we say: Holy, holy, holy, Lord of Sabaoth, full is the heaven and the earth of thy glory.” English trans. from John Wordsworth, trans., *Bishop Sarapion’s prayerbook: An Egyptian Sacramentary Dated Probably about A.D. 350-356* (London: SPCK, 1923), pp. 60-1 with slight emendations. For the Greek, see Hänggi and Pahl, eds., *Prex Eucharistica*, pp. 129-30: Δεόμεθα, ποιήσον ἡμᾶς ζώντας ἀνθρώπους· δὸς ἡμῖν πνεῦμα φωτός, ἵνα γνῶμεν σὲ τὸν ἀληθινὸν καὶ ὄν ἀπέστειλας Ἰησοῦν Χριστόν. δὸς ἡμῖν πνεῦμα ἅγιον, ἵνα δυνηθῶμεν καὶ ἐξειπεῖν καὶ διηγῆσασθαι τὰ ἄρρητὰ σου μυστήρια λαλησάτω ἐν ἡμῖν ὁ κύριος Ἰησοῦς καὶ ἅγιον πνεῦμα καὶ ὑμνησάτω σὲ δι’ ἡμῶν. σὺ γὰρ ὁ υπεράνω πάσης ἀρχῆς καὶ ἐξουσίας καὶ δυ[νά]μεως καὶ κυριότητος καὶ παντὸς ὀνόματος ὀνομαζομένου οὐ μόνου ἐν τῷ αἰῶνι τούτῳ, ἀλλὰ καὶ ἐν τῷ μέλλοντι. σοὶ παραστήκουσι χίλια χιλιάδες καὶ μύρια μυριάδες ἀγγέλων, ἀρχαγγέλων θρόνων, κυριοτήτων, ἀρχῶν, ἐξουσιῶν. σοὶ παραστήκουσιν τὰ δύο τιμώτατα Σεραφεῖμ ἐξαπτέρυγα, δυσὶν μὲν πτέρυξιν καλύπτοντα τὸ πρόσωπον, δυσὶ δὲ τοὺς πόδας, δυσὶ δὲ πετόμενα καὶ ἀγιάζοντα. μεθ’ ὧν δέξαι καὶ τὸν ἡμέτερον ἁγιασμόν λεγόντων Ἅγιος ἅγιος ἅγιος κύριος σαβαώθ, πλήρης ὁ οὐρανὸς καὶ ἡ γῆ τῆς δόξης σου πλήρης ἐστὶν ὁ οὐρανός...”

²⁹⁶ Dix, *Shape of the Liturgy*, p. 165. Cf. Dix, ‘Primitive Consecration Prayers,’ *Theology* 37(221) (1938): 261-83 (271-6).

²⁹⁷ Georg Kretschmar, *Studien zum frühchristlichen Trinitätstheologie* (Tubingen: Mohr, 1956), p. 164.

component of the Coptic Liturgy by Ambrose's time of writing during the latter fourth century.²⁹⁸ Thus, one could plausibly infer that Ambrose appropriated Origen's mode of exegeting Isaiah, recognising its Eucharistic connotations, and equated the two angels in his own Eucharistic Prayer with the two Seraphim whom Origen identified as Christ and the Spirit.

However, as scholars such as Pierre-Marie Gy and Enrico Mazza have exemplified that the *Sanctus* had likely only become an established component within the *Canon Missae* during the early-to-mid fifth century.²⁹⁹ According to Mazza:

...we have two prefaces with a Sanctus that are attributed to St. Leo the Great (440-61) and since there is still no evidence of the Sanctus as late as 430, we may conclude that it was introduced [in the Roman Rite] not long before the pontificate of St Leo.³⁰⁰

Thus, it is likely that Ambrose was not referring to the *Sanctus* within the passage quoted above from *De Sacramentis*, and more plausibly referred instead to what became the *Supplices te rogamus* in the *Canon Missae*. This conclusion is bolstered by the fact that, assuming Ambrose did uphold a consistent Sacramentology with regards to Baptism and the Eucharist, by conceiving Christ as the angel Who descends upon and hallows the Baptismal

²⁹⁸ See Maxwell Johnson, "Eucharistic Liturgy and Anaphora," in *Liturgy in Early Christian Egypt* (Piscataway: Gorgias Press, 2010), pp. 24-5; Taft, 'The Interpolation of the Sanctus into the Anaphora: When and Where? A Review of the Dossier, Part II,' *Orientalia Christiana Periodica* 58 (1992): 83-121 (94-5) who maintain that the presence of the *Sanctus* within the early Coptic Liturgy can in some way be interlinked to Origen regardless of the precise dating. Cf. Bryan D. Spinks, *The Sanctus in the Eucharistic Prayer* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991), pp. 87-93; Thomas J. Talley, "Eucharistic Prayers, Past, Present, and Future," ed. by David Holeton in *Revising the Eucharist: Groundwork for the Anglican Communion* (Nottingham: Grove, 1994), pp. 6-19; Talley, 'The Literary Structure of the Eucharistic Prayer' *Worship* 58 (1984): 404-19 (414).

1994), pp.6-19. who conversely claimed that the Sanctus derived from the early Syriac liturgical tradition

²⁹⁹ Cf. Pierre-Marie Gy, "Le Sanctus romain et les anaphores orientales" in *Mélanges liturgiques offerts au R. P. dom Bernard Botte à l'occasion du cinquantième anniversaire de son ordination sacerdotale (4 juin 1972)* (Louvain: Abbaye du Mont César, 1972), pp. 167-74; Mazza, *The Eucharistic Prayers of the Roman Rite*, trans. by Matthew J. O'Connell (Collegeville: Liturgical Press, 2004), pp. 47-8; *The Origins of the Eucharistic Prayers*, trans. by Ronald Lane (Collegeville: Liturgical Press, 1995), pp. 253-4.

³⁰⁰ Mazza, *Eucharistic Prayers of the Roman Rite*, O'Connell, trans., p. 47.

waters with His concomitant Spirit at the *prex*, Ambrose's application of the term *precamur* concerning the Eucharist indicates a parallel mode of divine Sacrament activity.³⁰¹

Furthermore, when considering that Ambrose's phrase, *per manus angelorum tuorum*, did not directly derive from Scripture, alongside the fact that early Christian authors such as Irenaeus set a Patristic precedent in characterising Christ and the Spirit as the *manus Patris*,³⁰² the 'hands of the Father's angels' were likely identified by Ambrose with the Son and Spirit, Who celebrate the celestial Eucharistic sacrifice before the Father. This likelihood further suggests Ambrose's use of an ante-Nicene liturgical conception of Christ and the Spirit.³⁰³

Concerning why the *Canon Missae's textus receptus* described a single angel, i.e., Christ, who elevates the Eucharistic gifts for the Father to accept rather than to two angels, this anaphora's redactor(s) likely continued to uphold the aforementioned Christological Sacramentology developed by Hippolytus and Origen. Conversely, while Ambrose likely acknowledged the tradition of identifying the one *angelus magni consilii* with Christ based upon his reading of Origen, Ambrose likely synthesized such angelological conceptions of Christ and the Spirit to the dual-Person Sacramentology which prevailed within the Coptic liturgical tradition, as exemplified by Serapion's *Sacramentary*.

Torquemada's conclusion that Ambrose upheld the unique consecratory function of the dominical words could thereby be undermined having exemplified how Ambrose had directly interlinked the Sacraments of Baptism and the Eucharist, such that each Sacrament included a manmade invocation to the Father which entails the Son's and the Spirit's

³⁰¹ Kappes, *Epiclesis Debate*, p. 107.

³⁰² See e.g., Irenaeus, *Adversus haereses* V, c. 6, 1, in *Patrologia Graeca*, Vol. 7 (Paris: Typis J.-P. Migne, 1857), cols. 433-1226 (1136-7). Crehen, "Eucharistic Epiclesis," 698.

³⁰³ Kappes, *Epiclesis Debate*, p. 107.

compresence. While Ambrose clearly defined the consecratory Baptismal ‘celestial words’ as *...baptizemus in nomine Patris, et Filii, et Spiritus sancti* within *De Sacramentis* 4.5.21, Ambrose more ambiguously began his definition of the Eucharistic ‘celestial words’ with the *Fac nobis*, commensurate to the pre-consecratory *Quam oblationem* within the *Canon Missae’s textus receptus*.³⁰⁴

Concerning the consecratory role of the Eucharistic invocation, while Ambrose did not fully explicate the manmade invocation’s causal function, this petition seems to function as a *sine qua non* for guaranteeing the Father’s Sacramental operation with the Son’s and Spirit’s implied compresence. Thus, the limitation of Torquemada’s recourse to Ambrose within his two *Sermones* derived from the fact that he denied that the epiclesis could function as a necessary context for guaranteeing that the Son and Spirit will be sent by the Father to operate within the Eucharistic sacrifice. Conversely, with regards to Baptism, Ambrose affirmed the necessary function of ‘invoking the Father’ to incite God’s Sacramental activity, and this affirmation must also be interlinked with Ambrose’s assumption that his Baptismal theology harmonized with his Eucharistic theology.

This dissertation’s exposition of Ambrose’s Sacramentology and Torquemada’s limited exegesis thereupon must be kept in mind when examining how Torquemada sought to bolster his exegesis of Ambrose’s doctrine of the dominical words’ consecratory function through recourse to Paschasius’ *De corpore et sanguine Domini*, which Torquemada misattributed to Augustine, in the next sub-section. Indeed, when the author examines Paschasius’ work more broadly, it will be shown that Paschasius actually explicated an *in fieri* doctrine of Eucharistic consecration which begins at the dominical words and culminates at

³⁰⁴ See Ambrose, *De Sacramentis*, 4.5.21, in Faller, ed., *Sancti Ambrosii Opera*, Vol. 7, p. 55; Jungmann, *Mass of the Roman Rite*, Brunner, trans., p. 414; Kappes, *Epiclesis Debate*, pp. 107-8.

the epicletic *Supplices te rogamus*. This doctrine thereby provided Mark of Ephesus with a Latin basis from which he could counter the *de facto* Latin doctrine of Eucharistic consecration articulated by Torquemada. Nonetheless, for a number of reasons including his lack of fluency in Latin, Mark will be shown to have been unable to exploit Torquemada's contentious exegesis of Ambrose here.

3.2.2.2.4 Augustine

This section will now examine Torquemada's putative references to Augustine's oeuvres within both his *Sermones Prior* and *Alter*. This analysis will be shown to juxtapose with the previous section's demonstration of Torquemada's restricted use of Ambrose to support his doctrine of the dominical words' sole consecratory function.

3.2.2.2.4.1. Paschasius Radbertus, *De Corpore et Sanguine Domini*

Firstly, within his *Sermo Alter*, Torquemada limited the overall cogency of his arguments on behalf of the dominical words' sole consecratory power by misattributing the Carolingian theologian, Paschasius' *De Corpore et Sanguine Domini* to Augustine of Hippo. *De corpore* was initially produced c. 831-3 for Warinus, the Abbot of Corbie Abbey, as a didactic text for Warinus' monastic community.³⁰⁵

Returning to Torquemada's citation, his misattribution of this work likely derived from his reading of the *Tertia Pars* of Aquinas' *Summa Theologiae*, which itself likely derived

³⁰⁵ A second redaction was produced for the King of West Francia, Charles the Bald, by either Christmas 843 or Easter 844. Bede Paulus, "Einleitung," in Paschasius Radbertus, *De corpore et sanguine Domini*, Paulus, ed. (Turnhout: Brepols, 1969), i-xl (ix-x); Rosamond McKitterick, 'Charles the Bald (823-877) and His Library: The Patronage of Learning,' *The English Historical Review* 95(374) (1980): 28-47 (33).

its attribution from the *Decretum Gratiani*, given their highly concordant phraseology.³⁰⁶

This is reflected by the following comparison:

Torquemada, <i>Sermo Alter</i>:	Aquinas, <i>Summa Theologiae</i> III, q. 82, a. 5, S.C.:
<p>“[Pseudo-Augustine states in] <i>De corpore et sanguine Christi</i>: “Nothing is [confect] more greatly within the Catholic Church by a good priest, [and] nothing is confection less [greatly] by an evil priest, as this [confection] is not [based upon] the consecrator’s merit, but is confectioned by the Saviour’s word (intra Catholicam ecclesiam nil majus a bono sacerdote, nil minus a malo sacerdote confectitur, quia non in merito consecrantis, sed in verbo confectitur salvatoris.)³⁰⁷</p>	<p>“Within the Catholic Church, in the mystery of the Lord's body and blood, nothing greater is done by a good priest, nothing less by an evil priest, because it is not by the merits of the consecrator that the sacrament is accomplished, but by the Creator's word, and by the power of the Holy Spirit (Intra catholicam ecclesiam in mysterio corporis et sanguinis Domini nihil a bono majus, nihil a malo minus perficitur sacerdote, quia non in merito consecrantis, sed in verbo perficitur creatoris et virtute Spiritus sancti.)³⁰⁸</p>

Based upon such *florilegia*, Torquemada was only evidently able to evoke a few myopic excerpts from Paschasius’ work. As alluded to above, this is significant for this dissertation’s purposes given that, when examining *De corpore et sanguine Domini* more holistically, Paschasius will be shown to have strongly accorded with Ambrose’s doctrine of Eucharistic transmutation:³⁰⁹ For example, Paschasius affirmed the dominical words’ transmutative function by identifying this formula with the eternally effective divine

³⁰⁶ Cf. Kappes, *Epiclesis Debate*, p. 118.

³⁰⁷ *Acta Latina*, Hofmann, ed., p. 248, lines 20-1. My English translation. The emboldened words are mine and are intended to highlight the differences with Aquinas’ excerpt.

³⁰⁸ Aquinas, *Summa Theologiae* III, q. 82, a. 5, s.c., in *Opera Omnia*, Vol. 12. *Editio Leonina*, pp. 264-5: “...est quod Augustinus dicit, in *libro de corpore Domini*... Intra catholicam ecclesiam in mysterio corporis et sanguinis Domini nihil a bono majus, nihil a malo minus perficitur sacerdote, quia non in merito consecrantis, sed in verbo perficitur creatoris et virtute Spiritus sancti.” Cf. *Decretum Gratiani, Secunda Pars*, Causa 1, q. 1, c. lxxvii, in Friedberg, ed., *Corpus Iuris Canonici*, Vol. 1, cols. 385-6.

³⁰⁹ Cf. Mazza, ‘La doctrine médiévale de l’eucharistie et les pères de l’église: Continuité ou rupture?’, *Revue du Droit Canonique* 62 (2012): 53-76 (53-64) for a more extensive analysis of Paschasius’ concordance with the Patristic Eucharistic theological traditions.

creative imperative.³¹⁰ Additionally, Paschasius maintained that Eucharistic consecration nonetheless necessitated the Spirit's intervention, and employed the Marian Annunciation motif to explicate Eucharistic transmutation analogously to how the Spirit wrought Christ's Incarnation from the Virgin's flesh.³¹¹ Indeed, Paschasius also posited that, when the celebrant references the Eucharistic gifts being offered *in sublime altare* at the *Supplices te rogamus*, the celestial Christ effectively transposes the gifts from the temporal altar and consecrates them upon the heavenly altar.³¹² In this sense, Paschasius' doctrine of

³¹⁰ See Paschasius, *De corpore*, c. 15, Paulus, ed., pp. 92-3: "Sic itaque et hoc sacramentum non meritis, non uerbis humanis, sed procul dubio diuinis efficitur et consecratur mandatis. Creatur enim ibidem ex aliquo, non qualiscunecumque, sed noua salutis creatura, caro et sanguis Christi, ueluti in baptismo homines noua efficiuntur creatura, et corpus Christi. Idcirco non aestimandum est quod alterius uerbis, quod ullius alterius meritis, quod potestate alicuius ista fiant, sed Uerbo Creatoria, quo cuncta creata sunt uisibilia et inuisibilia... Reliqua uero omnia quae sacerdos dicit, aut clerus canit, nihil aliud quam laudes et gratiarum actiones sunt, aut certe obsecrationes fidelium, postulationes, petitiones. Uerba augem Christi sicut diuina sunt, ita efficacia, ut nihil aliud proveniat quam quod iubent, quia aeterna sunt... (My English translation:) In the same way, indeed, this Sacrament [i.e., the Eucharist] is effected and consecrated not by merits, not by human words, but undoubtedly by divine command. For there He is created from something, not from any kind, but a new creature of salvation, the flesh and blood of Christ, just as in baptism men are made a new creature, namely, the Body of Christ. For this reason, it is not to be estimated that that these things are done by someone's power, the words of another, or the words of another person's merit, but by the Creator's Word, by which all things, visible and invisible, were created... The rest of all that the priest says [in the Eucharistic Prayer], or the clergy sing, are nothing but praises and thanksgiving, or at least the intercessions, demands, petitions of the faithful. [But] Christ's words, as they are divine, are so efficacious, that nothing else comes out of them than what they command, because they are eternal." Cf. Ambrose, *De Mysteriis*, c. 9, 52-3, in Faller, ed., *Sancti Ambrosii Opera*, Vol. 7, pp. 111-2.

³¹¹ See, e.g., Paschasius, *De corpore*, c. 3, Paulus, ed., pp. 26-7: "Caeterum in Christo idem cooperatur Spiritus, quia conceptus creditur de ipso et Maria Uirgine. Simili quoque modo et in baptismo per aquam ex illo omnes regeneramur, deinde uirtute ipsius Christi corpore quotidie pascimur et potamur sanguine. Vnde nec mirum Spiritus qui hominem Christum in utero uirginis sine semine creati, etiamsi ipse panis ac uini substantia carnem Christi et sanguinem inuisibili potentia quotidie per sacramenti sui sanctificationem operatur ... (My English translation:) Moreover, the Spirit cooperates in the same way in Christ, because His Conception is believed to be of Him and of Mary Ever-Virgin. Similarly, in Baptism by water, we are all regenerated by him, then by the power of Christ's own Body of which we feed and nourished by His Blood each day. Thus, it is no wonder that the Spirit who created the Man Christ in the Virgin's womb without seed, even though He Himself is the substance of the bread and wine, Christ's Flesh and Blood operates through an invisible power through sanctifying His Sacrament each day..." Cf. Ambrose, *De Mysteriis*, c. 9, 53, in Faller, ed., *Sancti Ambrosii Opera*, Vol. 7, p. 112.

³¹² Paschasius, *De corpore*, c. 8, Paulus, ed., p. 41: "Vnde sacerdos cum haec incipit immolare, inter caetera: *lube*, inquit, *haec perferri per manus sancti angeli tui in sublime altare tuum, in conspectu divinae maiestatis tuae*. Et cogitas, o homo, aliunde illud accipere quam de altari, ubi sublimus transpositum consecratur?... (My English translation:) Wherefore when the priest begins to sacrifice these things [i.e., the host and chalice], among other things: He says, 'Command these things to be carried by the hands of Your holy angel to Your high altar, in the presence of Your divine majesty.' And, from where, O man, do you think that you can receive [the consecrated Eucharistic gifts] than from the high altar, where the transposed [gifts] are consecrated?"

Eucharistic transmutation also strongly accorded with Kabasilas' analysis of the *Canon Missae*, as alluded to when analysing Torquemada's exegesis of Ambrose, such that Paschasius effectively postulated an *in fieri* doctrine of Eucharistic transmutation which begins with the dominical words before culminating in the *Supplices te rogamus*, which perfects this transmutation, as illustrated by its description of the Eucharistic gifts' transmutation upon the heavenly altar following their ratification by the Father.³¹³

At this point, one should keep in mind that, following the thirteenth century, the precise moment of Eucharistic consecration had been practically determined as Latin Rite celebrants were mandated to elevate the Eucharistic gifts immediately following the dominical words for adoration. Conversely, during the ninth century, the elevation had not been formally established and there was thus no opportunity for the congregation to adore the consecrated gifts adoration given that the celebrant's body blocked the host and chalice from their view,³¹⁴ and, during this period, the priest recited the *Canon Missae* in a whisper.³¹⁵

³¹³ See esp. Paschasius, *De corpore*, c. 12, Paulus, ed., p. 77: "Sic itaque in hoc mysterio credendum est, quod eadem uirtute Spiritus sancti per Uerbum care ipsius et sanguis efficiatur invisibili operatione. Vnde et sacerdos: *lube haec perferri per manus angeli tui in sublime altare tuum in conspectu divinae majestatis tuae; ut quid perferri illuc ea desposcit, nisi ut intelligatur quod in eius sacerdotio ista fiant. Ipse enim factus est pontifex in aeternum ordinem Melchisedech, teste Apostolo, ad interpellandum pro nobis, offerens semetipsum Deo Patri...* (My English translation:) Thus, in this way, we must believe in this Mystery, that by the same power of the Holy Spirit, through the Word, His [Christ's] Flesh and Blood are effected by an invisible operation. Thus, the priest says: 'Command these things to be carried by the hands of Your holy angel to Your high altar, in the presence of Your divine majesty,' so that they do not order anything to be carried there, unless it is understood that these things are to be done through His priesthood. For He Himself became a High Priest in the eternal order of Melchizedek, as the Apostle [Paul] testifies to [Cf. Heb. 4:14-6], to intercede for us, offering Himself to God the Father." Cf. Kappes, *Epiclesis Debate*, pp. 118-9; Mazza, *Celebration of the Eucharist*, O'Connell, trans., pp. 183-5.

³¹⁴ John Baldovin, "Accipit panem: The Gesture of the Priest at the Institution Narrative of the Eucharist," in Nathan Mitchell and John Baldovin, eds., *Rule of Prayer, Rule of Faith. Essays in Honor of Aidan Kavanaugh, O.S.B.* (Collegeville: Liturgical Press 1996), pp. 123-8.

³¹⁵ See Jungmann, *Mass of the Roman Rite*, Vol. 2, Brunner, trans., pp. 104-9, 138-40; Kappes, *Epiclesis Debate*, p. 119.

Paschasius' transmutative interpretation of the angel referred to within the *Supplices te rogamus* was bolstered the *Verba Seniorum*, the Latin translation of the *Apophthegmata Patrum* produced by Pelagius the Deacon during the sixth century.³¹⁶ In particular, this collection related how the late fourth and fifth century anchorite of Sketis, Arsenios, witnessed a child appear on the altar as the priest placed the host thereupon, who was subsequently sacrificed by the angel of the Lord who descended from Heaven.³¹⁷ As Paschasius typologised the Virgin's supernatural conception of Christ via the Pneumatic overshadowing with Eucharistic consecration, Paschasius' doctrine was bolstered by this hagiography's description of the Eucharistic bread being transformed into an infant, who could be identified with Christ Incarnate in the Virgin's womb.

To uphold this doctrine, within the second redaction of his work, Paschasius evoked a Latin translation of the legendary Greek *Vita Basilii*,³¹⁸ which detailed an infant appearing

³¹⁶ Heribert Rosweyde, *Prolegomenon*, in *Patrologia Latina*, Vol. 73, cols. 49d-50b; 851b; 853c. Pelagius the Deacon was likely Pope Pelagius I, who, prior to being elected as Pope in 555, possibly undertook this translation. This possibility is supported by the fact that Pope Pelagius gained fluency in Greek and could plausibly have accessed the *Apophthegmata Patrum* through having functioned as an ambassador for the Roman See to Constantinople while serving as a deacon.

³¹⁷ See Paschasius, *De Corpore*, c. 14, Paulus, ed., pp. 88-9: "...et quando positi sunt panes in altare, uidebatur illis tantummodo tribus tanquam puerulus iacens super altare, et cum extendisset presbyter manum, ut frangeret panem, descendit angelus Domini de coelo habens cultrum in manu, et sacrificauit puerulum illum, sanguinem uero eius excipiebat in calice... (My English translation:) ...and when the [Eucharistic] bread was placed on the altar, it appeared to them [Arsenius and the other monks accompanying him] as a small boy lying thereupon. When the priest stretched out his hand to break the bread, the angel of the Lord descended from Heaven with a knife in his hand, and sacrificed that little boy, and poured his blood into a cup." Cf. *Verba Seniores*, c. 18, Latin trans. by Pelagius the Deacon in *Patrologia Latina*, Vol. 73, cols. 978a-80a.

³¹⁸ Cf. Robert Joseph Barringer, 'The Pseudo-Amphilochian *Life of St. Basil*: Ecclesiastical Penance and Byzantine Hagiography,' *Theologia* 51 (1980), 49-61 (56), who argued that this *vita* was originally produced in Greek within "the region bounded by Caesarea, Iconium, Antioch," between the sixth and seventh centuries. Conversely, John Wortley, 'The Pseudo-Amphilochian *Vita Basilii*: An Apocryphal Life of Saint Basil the Great,' *Florilegium* 2 (1980): 217-39, esp. 219-22, who argued that the original Greek edition of this *vita* was produced during the late eighth century by Hellenophone monks who had fled to Rome amidst the onset of the first stage of Byzantine Imperial Iconoclasm. It is possible that Paschasius utilised the Latin translation of the *Vita* undertaken by an unidentified Euphemius, referred to by Aeneas of Paris, writing during the mid-ninth century, in *Liber adversos Graecos*, 146-7, in *Patrologia Latina*, Vol. 121 (Paris: Typis J.-P. Migne, 1852), cols. 683-762 (738-9): "In vita beati Basilii caesariensis archiepiscopi, quae de Graeco in Latinum a quodam Graeco vocabulo Euphemio est veraciter de verbo ad verbum translata."

on the altar concurrently with the priest first taking the Eucharistic gifts into his hands.³¹⁹ As the *Vita Basilii* did not describe any angel descending and sacrificing the infant thereto, Paschasius plausibly conceived this omission to derive from the fact that the Eucharistic sacrifice was perfected by the *Supplices te rogamus*. Paschasius was able to cogently uphold this conception given that he also detailed a miracle whereby an Anglo-Saxon priest named Peggils saw the host transform into an infant just as the priest beheld the host,³²⁰ which, within the context of the ninth-century Carolingian liturgical praxis, would have been collocated with the *benedixit* preceding the dominical words.³²¹ In this regard, Paschasius likely believed that the Eucharistic sacrifice, collocated with Arsenios' description of the infant's sacrifice, must occur upon the celestial altar referred to in the *Supplices te rogamus*.³²²

To conclude, Paschasius evidently acknowledged the *Supplices te rogamus*' consecratory function in perfecting the transmutation which had begun at the dominical words through the Spirit's operation, despite the fact that Paschasius did not explicitly evoke Ambrose's *De Spiritu Sancto* to justify his analysis of this prayer. Moreover, it has been shown that Paschasius accorded with Ambrose in postulating a Mariological doctrine of Eucharistic consecration, according to which the Virgin was physically and psychologically elevated by the Spirit, and a parcel of her flesh was transmuted into the Incarnate Christ.

³¹⁹ Paschasius, *De corpore*, c. 14, Paulus, ed., pp. 86-7; Baldovin, "Accepit panem," p. 126.

³²⁰ Paschasius, *De corpore*, c. 14, Paulus, ed., p. 90 "...Uenerat ergo die ut idem celebrans pie solemnita missarum more solito pro cubuit genibus: *Te deprecor*, inquit, *Omnipotens, pande mihi exiguo in hoc mysterio naturam corporis Christi, ut mihi liceat eum prospicere praesentem corporeo uisu, et formam pueri, quem olim sinus e matris tulit uagientem, nunc manibus contrectare...* (My English translation:) Then a day came when, celebrating the same pious solemnity of the Mass as was custom, he [Basil] knelt down on his knees, saying, 'I beseech You, Almighty, reveal to me the nature of Christ's Body in this mystery, so that I may be able to behold Him present with bodily sight,' and the form of the child, just as one who was wailing when he was taken from His mother's bosom, now embraced him with his hands..."

³²¹ Baldovin, "Accepit panem," p. 126.

³²² Kappes, *Epiclesis Debate*, pp. 119-20.

3.2.2.2.4.2. *De Trinitate*

Torquemada also invoked an excerpt from Augustine's *De Trinitate*, which stated: "Not all bread, but that which receives Christ's blessing, becomes the Body of Christ."³²³ The fact that Torquemada invoked this passage is notable given that Augustine's reference to the form of Christ's Last Supper blessing could, from the perspective of the Byzantine Rite, also describe other actions undertaken by Christ at the Last Supper such as His prayer. Given that there is no explicit citation of this passage within the *quaestiones* concerning the Eucharist in Aquinas' *Summa Theologiae*, Torquemada possibly garnered this excerpt from the *Decretum Gratiani*.³²⁴ However, the *Decretum* cites this passage in a manner whereby this citation is preceded by another excerpt from *De Trinitate*, which Torquemada must have referred to in order to ascribe his citation to Augustine as only the first explicitly attributed authorship to Augustine, while the second simply stated 'item.'³²⁵ Taking this factor into consideration, within the first of these two passages from *De Trinitate*, Augustine commented on his version of the Eucharistic prayer thus:

When we speak of the Body and Blood of Christ, we are speaking only of that we receive from the fruits of the earth and **consecrate through mystical prayer**, and [which we] duly receive for our spiritual health in memory of Our Lord's Passion. Although [the Eucharist] is brought to that visible form by human hands, yet **it is not sanctified** to be made into such a great sacrament **but by the invisible operating of the spirit of God**. For God works everything that is done in that work through corporeal movements...³²⁶

³²³ My English translation of *Acta Latina*, Hofmann, ed., p. 238, lines 18-9: "Augustinus in *Libro de Trinitate*: 'non omnis panis, sed accipiens benedictionem Christi, fit corpus Christi.'" Boularand, 'L'Épiclèse,' 255.

³²⁴ Cf. *Decretum Gratiani, Pars Tertia*, dist. 2, c. 61, in Friedberg, ed., *Corpus iuris canonici*, Vol. 1, col. 1337: "non omnis panis, sed accipiens benedictionem Christi, fit corpus Christi." Torquemada did not derive this extract from Lombard, *Sententiarum IV*, dist. 11, c. 2, in *Libri IV Sententiarum*, Vol. 2 (Quaracchi: Collegii S. Bonaventurae, 1916), p. 803, given that, while Lombard made reference to *De Trinitate*, he did not quote this particular quotation.

³²⁵ Cf. Kappes, *Epiclesis Debate*, p. 121.

³²⁶ My English translation of Augustine, *De Trinitate*, III.IV.10, in W. J. Mountain, ed., *Sancti Aurelii Augustini. De Trinitate Libri XV (Libri I-XII)* (Turnhout: Brepols, 1968), p. 136: "Corpus et sanguinem Christi dicimus illud, quod ex fructibus terrae acceptum, et **prece mistica consecratum**, recte sumimus ad salutem spiritualem in

Presuming Torquemada did derive his citation from the *Decretum Gratiani*, Torquemada thus refrained from explicitly analysing Augustine's broader understanding of Eucharistic consecration, whereby Augustine could be interpreted to have upheld a consecratory epiclesis.³²⁷ If this was the case, this would indicate that Torquemada did not honestly elucidate the nature of his investigation into the supposed Patristic consensus regarding the dominical words' unique consecratory function and the epiclesis' non-consecratory nature. This indication thereby undermines the dogmatic weight the broader doctrine of Eucharistic consecration, as articulated within Torquemada's two *Sermones*, could be said to possess.

As Chapter Four will detail, within his *Λίβελλος*, Mark of Ephesus did not respond to Torquemada's recourse to either Ambrose or Augustine. Concerning Ambrose, this lack of response naturally derived from the fact that no Greek translation of *De sacramentis* evidently prevailed within the late medieval Hellenophone world. Regarding Augustine, given that a Greek translation of *De Trinitate* had been available via Maximos Planoudes, Mark thereby overlooked a propitious point of departure to counteract Torquemada's exegesis of Augustine. Mark will be shown to have evoked several Augustinian oeuvres, including *De Trinitate*, during the Ferraran Conciliar debates concerning Purgatory in Chapter Four. Given this background, it is possible that Mark had not sufficiently familiarized

memoriam dominicae passionis. Quod cum per manus hominis ad illam visibilem speciem perducatur, non **sanctificatur**, ut sit tam magnum sacramentum, nisi **operante invisibiliter spiritu Dei**, cum hec omnia, que per corporales motus in illo opere fiunt, Deus operetur..."

³²⁷ For example, Salaville, in "Épiclèse eucharistique," in *Dictionnaire de théologie Catholique*, Vol. 5, col. 241, argued that this passage could be interpreted in a manner whereby Augustine conceived the anaphora holistically to be consecrated, while in his later article, 'L'Épiclèse africaine,' *Échos d'Orient* 39 (1941): 268-82 (272-4), Salaville argued that this passage facilitated the interpretation that Augustine conceived the epiclesis to possess a consecratory function. Cf. McKenna, *The Eucharistic Epiclesis*, pp. 61-5, for an overview of the diverging scholarship on Augustine's doctrine of Eucharistic consecration.

himself with *De Trinitate's* contents as a whole. Additionally, the restricted capacities under which Mark worked entailed that he was likely led to sideline providing a more extensive counterpoise towards Torquemada's various assertions, even if Mark did hypothetically recall those passages which could support his *in fieri* doctrine of Eucharistic consecration within *De Trinitate*. Nonetheless, one cannot draw any definitive conclusions concerning Mark's failure to evoke *De Trinitate* within his Eucharistic *Λίβελλος*.³²⁸

3.2.2.3. Torquemada's Concluding Arguments.

Torquemada then transitioned from evoking Patristic authorities to support his Eucharistic doctrine by instead directly appealing to Aristotelian-Thomistic principles of causality. Within the context of the Florentine Eucharistic disputes, the Byzantine Fathers involved in these debates, including Mark of Ephesus, Isidore of Kiev and Bessarion likely would have been able to discern the nature of Torquemada's argumentation based upon the fact that these Fathers are known to have read Demetrios and Prochoros Kydones' fourteenth-century Greek translations of excerpts from the *Corpus Thomisticum* and these works' recourse to Aristotelian philosophical axioms.³²⁹ While the *Acta Latina* ascribed the citation within Torquemada's first argument in the concluding section of the *Sermo Prior* to

³²⁸ Cf. Kappes, *Epiclesis Debate*, pp. 122-3.

³²⁹ With regards to Mark's knowledge of this framework, see the next chapter. For an overview of Bessarion's knowledge and use of Aristotle within his body of work, see Eva Del Soldato, "Bessarion as an Aristotelian, Bessarion among the Aristotelians," in Sergei Mariev, ed., *Bessarion's Treasure: Editing, Translating and Interpreting Bessarion's Literary Heritage* (Berlin/Boston: De Gruyter, 2021), pp. 169-84; Kappes, *Epiclesis Debate*, p. 123. See also Gill, *Personalities*, p. 66 who highlighted that, through likely receiving some form of instruction under Pletho, Isidore came to develop a "Platonic tendency and an antagonism to Aristotle" within his literary work. For Isidore's instruction under Pletho, cf. James Hankins, 'Cosimo de' Medici and the 'Platonic Academy',' *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes* 53 (1990): 144-62 (156-7); Philippides and Hanak, *Cardinal Isidore, c. 1390-1462*, p. 11ff.

Pseudo-Dionysius' *De Ecclesiastica Hierarchica*,³³⁰ in line with the nature of Torquemada's broader method of research detailed at various points throughout this chapter, Torquemada likely derived his citation from Aquinas' *Super IV Sententiarum*. This hypothesis can be supported both by the fact that this original Greek Pseudo-Dionysian text could not be accurately translated to have posited *in verbis sacramentorum sunt virtutes operative*, as quoted by Torquemada in the *Sermo Prior*,³³¹ alongside the fact that, within his *Sentences* commentary, Aquinas had argued:

At the end of *De ecclesiastica hierarchia*, [Pseudo-]Dionysius states, *in the once-completed invocations*, that is, the Sacraments' forms, *there are powers operative from God*. But the aforesaid words [i.e., the dominical words] are the form of this most dignified of the Sacraments. Therefore, in them, there is the power to transubstantiate.³³²

Based upon Aquinas conceiving the term *invocationes* in this context to strictly denote the dominical words, Torquemada was led to reject the notion that, through the Spirit, the epiclesis subsequently perfected what was effectuated by Christ's words.³³³ However, Mark will be exemplified in Chapter Four to have evoked this point to counter Torquemada's exegesis by rejecting the claim that Pseudo-Dionysius strictly identified the Eucharist's 'form' with the dominical words.

Hypothetically, if Mark sought to directly address Torquemada's exegesis in the context of the public conciliar debates, Mark likely would have evoked the difference

³³⁰ *Acta Latina*, Hofmann, ed., p. 238, lines 19-22: "Nunc venio ad aliquas rationes, que videntur dare convenientiam cedulae nostre. Illius verbis sacramentum conficitur, cuius virtute panis (tran)substantiatur in corpus Christi. Ista propositio est manifesta verbis beatissimi Dionysii, qui, ut supra iam tetigi, dicit, quod in verbis sacramentorum sunt virtutes operative."

³³¹ *Acta Latina*, Hofmann, ed., p. 238, lines 21-2.

³³² My English translation of Aquinas, *In IV Sententiarum*, dist. 8, q. 2, a. 3, s.c. 1: "Dionysius dicit in fine *Eccl. Hier.*, *in ipsis*, scilicet *consummatis invocationibus*, idest formis sacramentorum,³³² *esse virtutes operativas ex Deo*. Sed verba praedicta sunt forma dignissimi sacramenti. Ergo est in ipsis aliqua virtus ad transubstantiandum."

³³³ Kappes, *Epiclesis Debate*, pp. 123-4.

between supernatural and natural causality. In this regard, within the *Prima Pars*, Aquinas had asserted that there is a divinely ordained causal order such that, while God is the principal agent of all motion and causation within His creation, He has nonetheless established natural agents which immediately cause their given objects. This principle entails that it would be superfluous, for example, to state that heat is directly caused by God rather than fire.³³⁴ Nonetheless, as discussed, Aquinas' doctrine of causality was disputed by Byzantine Fathers such as Mark as well as by adherents to alternative late medieval Latin theological schools including the Franciscan tradition, because the Eucharist's effects of Christ's Body and Blood exceed all natural causes in perfection in virtue of their hypostatic divine-human nature, then only the highest supernatural cause, God, could effectuate this end.

However, Torquemada also employed Aquinas' axiom that creatures such as the celebrant and verbal formulae could function as divinely-ordained instrumental and formal causes which could effectuate the Sacraments' supernatural effects, even though these effects exceed each natural agent's intrinsic causal power.³³⁵ While Mark of Ephesus will be shown to have not explicitly evoked this premise as a source of Latin-Byzantine divergence

³³⁴ Paraphrased from Aquinas, *Summa Theologiae* I, q. 105, a. 5, conc., in *Opera Omnia*, Vol. 5. *Editio Leonina*, pp. 475-6: "Respondeo dicendum quod Deum operari in quolibet operante aliqui sic intellexerunt, quod nulla virtus creata aliquid operaretur in rebus, sed solus Deus immediate omnia operaretur; puta quod ignis non calefaceret, sed Deus in igne, et similiter de omnibus aliis. Hoc autem est impossibile. Primo quidem, quia sic subtraheretur ordo causae et causati a rebus creatis. Quod pertinet ad impotentiam creatis, ex virtute enim agentis est, quod suo effectui det virtutem agendi. Secundo, quia virtutes operativae quae in rebus inveniuntur, frustra essent rebus attributae, si per eas nihil operarentur. Quinimmo omnes res creatae viderentur quodammodo esse frustra, si propria operatione destituerentur, cum omnis res sit propter suam operationem. Semper enim imperfectum est propter perfectius, sicut igitur materia est propter formam, ita forma, quae est actus primus, est propter suam operationem, quae est actus secundus; et sic operatio est finis rei creatae. Sic igitur intelligendum est Deum operari in rebus, quod tamen ipsae res propriam habeant operationem. Ad cuius evidentiam, considerandum est quod, cum sint causarum quatuor genera, materia quidem non est principium actionis, sed se habet ut subiectum recipiens actionis effectum. Finis vero et agens et forma se habent ut actionis principium, sed ordine quodam. Nam primo quidem, principium actionis est finis, qui movet agentem; secundo vero, agens; tertio autem, forma eius quod ab agente applicatur ad agendum (quamvis et ipsum agens per formam suam agat)..."

³³⁵ Aquinas, *Summa Theologiae* III, q. 78, a. 4, ad. 1, in *Opera Omnia*, Vol. 12. *Editio Leonina*, p. 211.

in the area of Sacramentology within his *Λίβελλος*, there was nonetheless the potential for Mark to have done so given that one of his principal literary authorities, Nicholas Kabasilas, as discussed above, had essentially postulated the aforementioned Sacramentological occasionalism upheld by late medieval Latin theologians such as Scotus by arguing that prayer is the *sine qua non* to guarantee God's Sacramental operation.³³⁶

Returning to Torquemada's concluding arguments, by evoking Deuteronomy, Torquemada posited that Christ perfectly instituted the Eucharist vis-à-vis its form and matter. Pertinently, this Scriptural citation evinces the inaccuracies resulting from the constraints under which Torquemada worked as well as Torquemada's principal dependence upon Aquinas for his conciliar argumentation. In particular, while Torquemada cited Deuteronomy 17 so as to claim that God's, i.e., Christ's 'perfecta sunt opera,'³³⁷ this citation instead derived from Deuteronomy 32:4. This misattribution likely resulted from a *lapsus oculi* on Torquemada's part given that, when Aquinas cited this same verse in his *Super IV Sententiarum* when addressing the Sacrament of the Eucharist, he accurately attributed this verse to Deuteronomy 32:4.³³⁸ However, even if Torquemada had accurately cited this passage from Deuteronomy, his edition of the *Biblica Vulgata* did not facilitate any

³³⁶ See esp. Kabasilas, *Liturgiae Expositio*, 29, in *Patrologia Graeca*, Vol. 150, cols. 429d-32a; Kappes, *Epiclesis Debate*, pp. 123-4.

³³⁷ *Acta Latina*, Hofmann, ed., p. 238, line 26.

³³⁸ Aquinas, *In IV Sententiarum*, dist. 10, q. 1, a. 1, s.c. 3: "Praeterea, Deuter. 32, 4 dicitur: *Dei perfecta sunt opera*. Sed non perfecte conjungeremur Deo per sacramenta quae nobis tradit, nisi sub aliquo eorum ipse vere contineretur. Ergo in hoc sacramento verum corpus Christi continetur: quia non est aliud assignare sacramentum in quo Christus realiter contineatur." My English translation: "Moreover, Deuteronomy 32:4 states, the works of God are perfect. But we would not be perfectly conjoined with God through the sacraments He passes on to us, unless He were truly contained within one of them. Therefore, in this sacrament [of the Eucharist], Christ's Body is truly contained as there is no other Sacrament to designate wherein Christ is really contained."

impetus for Latin-Byzantine theological discussion given that the Greek Septuagint edition of Deuteronomy 32:4 simply stated that God's works are 'true.'³³⁹

Based upon this reference to Deuteronomy, Torquemada claimed that one could analogise Eucharistic transformation with a substance being created from form and matter whereby Christ either instituted the Sacrament's 'substance' perfectly or imperfectly. This principle entailed that the Sacrament's form was either fully actualized or was in potency. By analogizing the Eucharistic gifts to prime matter, both gifts would thereby possess the disposition to be actualized into their Eucharistic forms as Christ's Body and Blood, both of which receive their form through the dominical words' recitation.³⁴⁰ However, it is again important to emphasise that Torquemada overlooked that these principles of causality were contemporaneously disputed in Latin Christendom in light of Chapter One, wherein the author detailed the late medieval Franciscan tradition of positing multiple forms to comprise a subject. As a result, one can conclude that Torquemada's arguments here lacked the doctrinal authority to secure either his Byzantine interlocutors' or his own Latin conciliar confrères' submission.

However, Torquemada concluded that, whatever items were necessary for valid Eucharistic consecration must be ubiquitous amongst the Apostolic Churches to function as the Eucharistic matter and form as neither the Latin nor Byzantine Fathers disputed that the Apostles instituted liturgical practices which the Church must preserve. However, as the Last Supper comprised various items including a thanksgiving, a table, and Christ's divine

³³⁹ See e.g., the Septuagint version of Deuteronomy 32:4, in *The Septuagint with Apocrypha: Greek and English*, Lancelot C. L. Brenton, ed. (Peabody: Hendrickson, 1986), p. 275: "Θεός, ἀληθινὰ τὰ ἔργα αὐτοῦ..." All Septuagint quotations herein derive from this edition. Cf. Kappes, *Epiclesis Debate*, pp. 124-5.

During the Ferraran conciliar sessions concerning Purgatory in 1438, Mark of Ephesus had cautioned the Latin Fathers regarding the incommensurability between the Latin and Greek renditions of the Old Testament. See *Responsio Graecorum ad Positionem Latinorum*, in *Patrologia Orientalis*, Vol. 15, Petit, ed., p. 67.

³⁴⁰ *Acta Latina*, Hofmann, ed., p. 238, lines 24-7. Cf. Aquinas, *Summa Theologiae* I, q. 105, a. 5, resp., in *Opera Omnia*, Vol. 5. *Editio Leonina*, pp. 475-6.

imperative to repeat His actions therein, such items comprised alternative contenders for realizing the Eucharist's 'substance.' Indeed, before Torquemada composed his *Cedula*, Bessarion and Isidore of Kiev had highlighted that the priest's manual blessing over the Eucharistic gifts alongside the Pneumatic epiclesis were examples of these necessary items. Subsequently, Torquemada's claim that, regarding the necessary items for the realisation of the Eucharistic substance, the Church only required the dominical words' recitation on the basis of Christ's perfect institution of this Sacrament, was considerably restricted when considering how the New Testament described additional actions and items undertaken and utilised by Christ at the Last Supper which both the Latin and Byzantine Churches upheld that could plausibly be denoted as the Eucharist's 'accidental form(s).'³⁴¹

Nonetheless, Torquemada continued by evoking Aristotle's *Physics* to justify a relationship between matter and form within the Eucharist,³⁴² invoking the principle that *forma verborum accredit ad elementum et perficitur sacramentum*, which Torquemada derived from Augustine's *Tractatus 80 in Ioannem*.³⁴³ Given that Augustine was referring to the relationship between a Sacrament – in this case, Baptism – and Christ's words, and rhetorically suggested that if Christ's words were removed from Baptism, the Sacrament would lack efficacy, Torquemada accurately reproduced Aquinas' argument in favour of retaining those Sacramental formulae instituted by Christ Himself for the consecration of a given Sacrament to be realised.³⁴⁴

³⁴¹ Cf. Kappes, *Epiclesis Debate*, pp. 126-7.

³⁴² Cf. Aristotle, *Physics*, II, c. 3, Wicksteed and Cornford, eds. and trans., pp. 126-7.

³⁴³ *Acta Latina*, Hofmann, ed., p. 238, lines 30-1. Cf. Augustine, *In Ioannis Evangelium Tractatus CXXIV*, 80, c. 3, in *Patrologia Latina*, Vol. 35 (Paris: Typis J.-P. Migne, 1844), cols. 1379-1978 (1840). Boularand, 'L'Épiclèse,' 256.

³⁴⁴ See Aquinas, *Summa Theologiae* III, q. 64, a. 3, in *Opera Omnia*, Vol. 12. *Editio Leonina*, pp. 147-9. See also Aquinas, *Summa Theologiae* III, q. 66, a. 6, conc., in *Opera Omnia*, Vol. 12. *Editio Leonina*, pp. 186-7, for Aquinas' application of this axiom vis-à-vis Baptism. Cf. Kappes, *Epiclesis Debate*, pp. 127-8.

However, this dissertation has already addressed the problems in employing this principle within the context of affirming the dominical words' unique consecratory function given that the Byzantine Fathers could also have plausibly invoked other passages within Augustine's *opera* to advocate the Spirit's consecratory activity via the epiclesis. Moreover, one cannot definitively exegete the terminological sense of this verse from the *Tractatus 80 in Joannem*³⁴⁵ as the phrase *perficitur sacramentum* could be understood to refer to an essential criterion rather than a formal cause. Subsequently, Torquemada's citation of Augustine here did not provide a definitive means through which he could uphold his Thomistic analogization between Eucharistic transformation and the relationship of matter and form.

Torquemada's subsequent argument within his *Sermo Prior*, which evoked the primitive Eucharistic Prayer that Christ Himself would have celebrated at the Last Supper, functioned as one of the most potent rebuttals against his Byzantine interlocutors.³⁴⁶ As Christ's mode of consecrating the Eucharistic gifts is the archetype for how the Church should subsequently celebrate this Sacrament, then it is only necessary to reflect His activity during the Last Supper to accord with His salvific imperative to celebrate the Eucharist in His memory, a fundamental part of which were the dominical words. However, in accord with Kabasilas, the Byzantine Florentine Fathers, including Mark of Ephesus, will be shown to have consistently asserted the importance of contextualizing Christ's activity of prayer when instituting the Eucharist: Thus understood, if Christ's statements, 'This is My Body/Blood,'

³⁴⁵ See Aquinas, *Summa Theologiae* III, q. 60, a. 7, ad. 1, in *Opera Omnia*, Vol. 12. *Editio Leonina*, p. 10. for Aquinas' citation of this verse from Augustine, from which Torquemada likely derived his reference in light of the nature of Torquemada's method of research exemplified throughout this Chapter.

³⁴⁶ *Acta Latina*, Hofmann, ed., p. 238, lines 32-5: "Quarto ita arguo. Christus et apostoli, qua forma usi sunt in hoc sacramento? Clarum est, quod non verbis Basilii, sed verbis suis; et hanc limitationem et exemplum reliquit, ergo sollus salvatoris verbis nos debemus uti."

are not components of His petition to the Father to fulfil the supernatural transmutation that no man could accomplish in virtue of their natural capacities, then these formulae do not effectuate the Eucharistic transmutation. Alongside the fact that Torquemada's arguments did not fully address the qualms of some of his own Latin contemporaries, such as those aligned to the Franciscan tradition, concerning the formal efficacy of the two Eucharistic gifts' respective consecrations and the mechanics of sacerdotal instrumentality, Torquemada's conclusions also did not effectively respond to the Byzantine Fathers' insistence that the combination of petitionary and canonical prayer with an act of blessing the Eucharistic gifts was essential to ensure God's Sacramental operation.³⁴⁷

Within the *Sermo Prior's* concluding argument, Torquemada postulated that inter-ecclesial unity in belief would be evinced by their mutual accordance with Apostolic liturgical practices.³⁴⁸ When juxtaposed with Torquemada's interpretation that Pseudo-Dionysius conceived the dominical words as Sacramentally necessary and perfective, on the basis of his Sacramental hylomorphism, Torquemada did not facilitate the addition of further items to the two Churches' mutual Sacramental forms, believing that a plurality of forms could not coexist within a single subject. Thus, by putatively adding an epiclesis which was intended to act as the Eucharistic form alongside the dominical words, according to Torquemada, the Byzantine Church had in fact established a completely new Eucharistic form, discordant with the form instituted by Christ and His Apostles.³⁴⁹ However, given that Torquemada's hylomorphic Sacramentology has been shown to have been a disputed

³⁴⁷ Cf. Kappes, *Epiclesis Debate*, p. 128.

³⁴⁸ Paraphrased from *Acta Latina*, Hofmann, ed., p. 238, line 35, 239, line 1: "Unitas ecclesie necessario fundatur in unitate fidei et unitate sacramentorum in his, que sunt de substantia sacramenti; hanc mutare non posset ecclesia nec totus mundus, nisi dominus mandaret, ergo necesse est, ut omnes fideles conveniant in hoc sacramento, quod est consummativum omnium sacramentorum..."

³⁴⁹ Cf. Kappes, *Epiclesis Debate*, p. 129ff.

theological opinion within late medieval Latin Christendom, alongside the fact that the Byzantine conciliar Fathers likewise upheld significantly divergent metaphysical frameworks to his own, Torquemada's conclusion again lacked the doctrinal authority to secure the obedience of either his Byzantine interlocutors or his own Latin colleagues.

Nonetheless, before examining Mark's *Λίβελλος*, one must emphasise that, within his *Sermo Prior*, Torquemada could have predicted that the Byzantine Fathers would have also evoked the Byzantine Rite's *Liturgies of St James* and *St Basil* given that Gratian testified to his awareness of these two liturgies' authenticity and authority through invoking the *Decretum Gratiani* within the *Tertia Pars*. Gratian putatively evoked the sixth ecumenical council, the Third Council of Constantinople, held between 680 and 681, to validate their authorship, although he actually referenced the intra-Byzantine Synod of Trullo as held in 692.³⁵⁰

However, as many fifteenth-century Latin theologians would have presumed that Eucharistic transmutation was completed following the dominical words, it has been described above how some of the Latin Florentine Fathers had denounced these Eucharistic Prayers' supposedly consecratory epicleses as interpolations on the part of the Byzantine Church. Given this background, Chapter Five will demonstrate that Torquemada naturally attempted to undermine the *Liturgy of St John Chrysostom's* authenticity, having likely become aware that its Eucharistic Prayer had been cited by Bessarion and Isidore of Kiev in their initial audience with Pope Eugenius either through Pope Eugenius himself or through Cardinal Cesarini.³⁵¹ While restricted in his capacity to extensively examine this Eucharistic Prayer and its provenance, Torquemada nonetheless worked with certain Latin translations

³⁵⁰ *Decretum Gratiani, Tertia Pars*, dist. 1, c. XLVII, in Friedburg, ed., *Corpus Iuris Canonici*, Vol. 1, col. 1306. Cf. Kappes, *Epiclesis Debate*, pp. 130-1.

³⁵¹ Syropoulos, *Les Mémoires*, 10.3, Laurent, ed., p. 476.

of the Byzantine Rite's Eucharistic Prayers which testified to a consecratory epiclesis before the emergence of the Latin-Byzantine debate during the late fourteenth century.³⁵² This fact indicates that Torquemada lacked the nuanced awareness of the Latin or Byzantine liturgical traditions which Mark of Ephesus will be shown to have exhibited within his *Λίβελλος* in Chapter Four. Indeed, it will be exemplified that after the arguments of Mark's *Λίβελλος* were put forward by Ioannes VIII in an audience with Cardinal Cesarini, Torquemada was behoved to employ an alternative hermeneutic within his *Sermo Alter*: As Chapter Five will exhibit, Torquemada utilised Latin editions of the Byzantine Rite's Eucharistic Prayers and employed a more irenic tone when expositing his argumentation to his Byzantine counterparts.

³⁵² Cf. Andre Jacob, ed., 'La traduction de la *Liturgie de saint Basile* par Nicolas d'Otrante,' *Bulletin de l'Institut historique belge de Rome* 38 (1967): 49-107; Jacob, ed., 'La traduction de la *Liturgie de saint Jean Chrysostome* par Léon Toscan,' *Orientalia Christiana Periodica* 32 (1996): 111-67; Anselm Strittmatter, 'Missa Grecorum, Missa Sancti Iohannis Crisostomi: The Oldest Latin Version Known of the Byzantine *Liturgies of St. Basil* and *St. John Chrysostom*,' *Traditio* 1 (1943): 79-137; Strittmatter, "Notes on Leo Tuscus's Translation of the *Liturgy of St John Chrysostom*," in Sesto Prete, ed., *Didascaliae: Studies in Honor of Anselm M. Albareda, Prefect of the Vatican Library* (New York: Bernard M. Rosenthal, 1961), pp. 409-24, for analyses of these extant Latin translation.

Chapter Four: An Analysis of Mark of Ephesus' *Λίβελλος*.

4.1. The *Status Quaestionis* of Mark's Life, Writings, and Theological Framework.

Having analysed the first of Torquemada's two Eucharistic *Sermones*, the author will move on to analyse Mark of Ephesus' contribution to this Florentine debate through his Eucharistic *Λίβελλος*. To do so, this section will begin by providing an overview of the *status quaestionis* of Mark's literary oeuvres and contribution to the Ferraran-Florentine debates more broadly during the twentieth and twenty-first centuries. This overview will help to elucidate how this dissertation's narrative offers an interpretative counterpoise particularly to Mark's broadly negative reputation within Roman Catholic scholarship during this period.

Through the early-to-mid twentieth century, several Western ecclesiastical historians and theologians concerned with late medieval Byzantium negatively assessed Mark's personal capacities and his intellectual framework. For example, the French Assumptionist theologian, Louis Petit, who, in 1923, published a critical edition of Mark's anti-unionist oeuvres, posited that Mark was simply inspired by an anti-Latin antipathy when producing these same writings.³⁵³ Likewise, within his 1926 article addressing Mark's life, work and thought, Petit's fellow French Assumptionist, Venance Grumel, adjudicated Mark as being overly myopic vis-à-vis the Pneumatology he upheld within the debates concerning the addition of the *filioque* clause and the Spirit's *ad intra* procession at Ferrara-Florence.³⁵⁴ Another French Assumptionist theologian contemporaneous to Grumel and Petit, Martin Jugie, broadly accorded with Grumel's interpretation of Mark within the second of his five-volume *Theologia dogmatica christianorum orientalium ab Ecclesia catholica dissidentium*,

³⁵³ Louis Petit, "Introduction," in Petit, ed., *Patrologia Orientalis*, Vol. 17, pp. 309-35 (309).

³⁵⁴ Venance Grumel, 'Marc d'Éphèse - Vie – Ecrits – Doctrine,' *Estudis Franciscans* 36 (1926): 425-48, esp. 448.

published in 1933. While Jugie acknowledged that Mark's oeuvres could potentially act as a textual interlocutor to the Latin Church concerning the divisive question of the divine essence-energies distinction,³⁵⁵ according to Jugie, throughout Ferrara-Florence, Mark, as well as his Byzantine conciliar colleagues, were either incognizant of the Latin Patristic tradition, or they pusillanimously denounced such Latin literature as having been corrupted.³⁵⁶

Building upon these earlier Roman Catholic studies, in 1959, the Jesuit Byzantinist, Joseph Gill, published what could be argued to be his magnum opus, *The History of the Council of Florence*. One of Gill's principal intentions was to provide a new narrative of the history of Ferrara-Florence based upon the recent publication of critical editions of key source material for the Council, including the *Acta Graeca*, the *Acta Latina*, and Sylvestros Syropoulos' *Memoirs*.³⁵⁷ While primarily an historical rather than theological endeavour, Gill paid considerable attention to expositing the doctrines articulated by the various contingents and to the contributions of the individual participants. Nonetheless, throughout the work, Gill, negatively evaluated the cogency of Mark's overall theological framework.³⁵⁸ For example, concerning Mark's contribution to the Florentine debates concerning the *filioque* held in winter 1438, Gill concluded, "Mark... was unpersuaded [by the Latins]... [he was] more than ever confirmed in his belief of the unassailability of the Greek position [regarding the *filioque*], convinced by his own eloquence."³⁵⁹ Gill also broadly undermined

³⁵⁵ Jugie, *Theologia dogmatica*, Vol. 2 (Paris: Letouzey et Ané, 1933), p. 141.

³⁵⁶ Jugie, *Theologia dogmatica*, Vol. 2, p. 402.

³⁵⁷ See Gill, *Council of Florence*, viii-xv.

³⁵⁸ Nonetheless, see Gill, *Council of Florence*, pp. 223-4, 410, where Gill acknowledged Mark's metaphysical capacities during the conciliar debates concerning the *filioque*.

³⁵⁹ Quoted from Gill, *Council of Florence*, p. 166. See also Gill, *Personalities of the Council of Florence*, p. 64, wherein Gill remarked of Mark's post-conciliar activity thus: "In all these various circumstances, he [Mark] was active with voice and pen persuading the hesitant, confirming the persuaded and exciting the convinced to open and undying opposition to union. It was not a very difficult task, because the Greeks at large had long

doctrinal significance of Mark's contributions to the council: Within his treatment of the Florentine Eucharistic debates, Gill evoked the fact that Ioannes VIII commissioned Mark to produce his Eucharistic *Λίβελλος* amidst Bessarion and Isidore of Kiev's initial audience before Pope Eugenius. However, Gill failed to provide any detail of its interior contents and the degree to which the arguments and conclusions of this *Λίβελλος* influenced the argumentation and methodology of Torquemada's *Sermo Alter* following Ioannes VIII's use of this work within the conciliar sessions.³⁶⁰

Following Gill, some Roman Catholic scholars who have treated the question of Eucharistic consecration at Florence have failed to extensively address the contents of Mark's *Λίβελλος*, its influence upon Torquemada's methodology within his *Sermo Alter*, and the extent to which it could be harmonized with Roman Catholic Sacramentology. These lacunae are exemplified within John H. McKenna's 2009 monograph, *The Eucharistic Epiclesis: A Detailed History from the Patristic to the Modern Era*. While McKenna accurately apprehended that Mark "concerned himself mainly with demonstrating that the [Eucharistic] gifts are sanctified *not only* by the words of institution but also, and especially, by the invocation of the priest and the power of the Holy Spirit,"³⁶¹ his laconic treatment of Mark's doctrine overlooked the coherent recourse to liturgical and Patristic source material within Mark's *Λίβελλος* and its commensurability with Latin Sacramentological frameworks

believed that the Latins were heretics. But Mark performed his task well. He wrote an encyclical letter 'to all orthodox Christians everywhere and in the islands'; he composed an account of his action in the Council; he corresponded with various people. In the compositions he mingled deep reverence for tradition with scorn for the 'innovators', ardent love of his Church and vulgar invective against the Latins and their Greek supporters (he never, however, wrote a disrespectful word about the Emperor), serious theological reasoning with the most blatant *argumenta ad hominem*. He was writing primarily, not for theologians, but for the mass of the Greeks, and he was clever enough to adapt his style and method to the educational level of the ignorant monks and the amorphous populace—very successfully." Italics not mine.

³⁶⁰ See Gill, *Council of Florence*, p. 272. Cf. Kappes, *The Epiclesis Debate*, pp. 51-6.

³⁶¹ Quoted from John H. McKenna, *The Eucharistic Epiclesis: A Detailed History from the Patristic to the Modern Era*, 2nd ed. (Chicago: Liturgy Training Publications, 2009), p. 81.

such as those associated with the medieval Franciscan tradition. Further, while McKenna acknowledged the Latin Fathers' imposition of Sacramental hylomorphism concerning Holy Orders within *Exaltate Deo*,³⁶² McKenna overlooked Torquemada's own use of a similar causal framework within his two Eucharistic *Sermones*. McKenna also failed to assess what this author will argue was a comparatively inaccurate exegesis of liturgical and Patristic source material on Torquemada's part within these two *Sermones* relative to Mark's interpretation of his own material within the *Λίβελλος*.

Within the last decade, scholars such as the American Byzantine Catholic scholar, Christiaan Kappes, have helped to rehabilitate Mark's reputation as a scholar and participant at Ferrara-Florence, particularly through his 2019 work, *The Epiclesis Debate at the Council of Florence*.³⁶³ Therein, Kaapes propitiously helped to analyse and evaluate some of the liturgical and theological source material which those Latin and Byzantine Fathers directly involved in the debates concerning Eucharistic including Mark, Torquemada, Bessarion and Isidore of Kiev made recourse to.³⁶⁴ In addition, Kaapes also helped to address to what extent the doctrines articulated by the divergent parties in the debate were commensurate with the magisterial offices of both the Eastern Orthodox and Roman Catholic Churches historically and presently.³⁶⁵ Nonetheless, the author will highlight a number of aspects where Kaapes' analysis fell short, particularly the fact that he overlooked certain limitations within Mark's *Λίβελλος* vis-à-vis the provenance of Mark's liturgical

³⁶² McKenna, *Eucharistic Epiclesis*, p. 81.

³⁶³³⁶³ Kappes, *The Epiclesis Debate at the Council of Florence* (Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 2019). Cf. esp. Kappes, 'A Latin Defense of Mark of Ephesus at the Council of Ferrara-Florence (1438-9),' *The Greek Orthodox Theological Review* 59 (2014): 161-230; "Mark of Ephesus, the Council of Florence, and the Roman Papacy," in John Chryssavgis, ed., *Primacy in the Church: The Office of Primate and the Authority of Councils* (New York: St Vladimir's Seminary Press, 2016), pp. 109-50.

³⁶⁴ Kappes, *Epiclesis Debate*, esp. 70-219.

³⁶⁵ Kappes, *Epiclesis Debate*, esp. 220-65.

source material, while also failing to directly interlink Mark's concern with Eucharistic 'typology' with the broader intra-Byzantine debates regarding Palamite theology.

4.1.1. An Overview of Mark of Ephesus' Influence within Eastern Orthodox Theology and His Status in Eastern Orthodox Scholarship

Moving on to examine Mark's influence within Eastern Orthodox theology following the Council of Florence, this section will demonstrate how the consistent liturgical veneration of Mark and his status as one of the foremost Eastern Orthodox literary authorities for Eastern Orthodox authors entail that any modern-day attempt between the Roman Catholic and Eastern Orthodox Churches to arrive at some form of reconciliation vis-à-vis the nature and moment(s) of Eucharistic consecration must take Mark's doctrine into consideration as a *locus theologicus*.

To put Mark's intra-Orthodox authority into context, one must begin by taking into consideration the nature of Mark's post-conciliar activity and how this informed his subsequent incorporation into the Eastern Orthodox liturgy in the immediate aftermath of his passing: Having secured Ioannes VIII's assurance that he could return safely to the Imperial capital despite his refusal to sign *Laetentur Caeli* while in Florence,³⁶⁶ Mark arrived thereto with Ioannes VIII in February 1440.³⁶⁷ Within his *Περὶ τῆς διαφορᾶς τῆς οὔσης μέσον Γραικῶν καὶ Λατίνων* (*On the Differences of Worship between the Greeks and the Latins*), likely composed during the 1460s,³⁶⁸ the pro-Florentine Hellenophone priest and

³⁶⁶ Cf. Syropoulos, *Les Mémoires*, 10.18, Laurent, ed., p. 504.

³⁶⁷ Syropoulos, *Les Mémoires*, 12.10, Laurent, ed., p. 556.

³⁶⁸ See Zacharias N. Tzirpanlis, *Τὸ κληροδότημα τοῦ καρδινάλιου Βησσαρίωνος γιὰ τοὺς φιλενωτικούς τῆς βενετοκρατούμενης Κρήτης (1439-17^{ος} αἰ.)*. Ph. D. Thesis (Aristotle University of Thessaloniki, 1967), pp. 89-102; Eleutherios Despotakis, "Some Observations on the *Διάλεξις* of John Plousiadenos (1426?-1500)," *Byzantion* 86 (2016): 129-37 (133-4) for the provenance of the work.

scribe of the Latin Kingdom of Candia, Ioannes Plousiadenos,³⁶⁹ detailed how a crowd of Constantinopolitans glorified Mark upon his return to the city because of his refusal to sign *Laetentur Caeli* and prostrated before him as though he were a new Moses and Aaron, proclaiming him to be blessed and holy.³⁷⁰

One should recall how coeval Hellenophone chroniclers including Doukas described how many other Byzantine Imperial bishops quickly renounced the Florentine reunion upon their return.³⁷¹ Thus, partly through his desire to eschew cultivating an intra-Byzantine ecclesial schism, Syropoulos detailed how Ioannes VIII commissioned several officials to persuade Mark to accept being elevated to the Ecumenical Patriarchate. Mark nonetheless declined as he naturally would have been obliged to effectuate *Laetentur Caeli* in accord with the Emperor's program.³⁷² When Ioannes VIII appointed the pro-unionist, Metrophanes, Bishop of Cyzicus, to the Patriarchate, who was formally installed on May 4th, 1440,³⁷³ according to Syropoulos, Mark departed the Imperial Capital that same day under pressure from Metrophanes, ultimately arriving in his Ottoman-occupied³⁷⁴ Metropolitanate

³⁶⁹ Cf. Manoussos Manoussacas, 'Recherches sur la vie de Jean Plousiadéno (Joseph de Méthone) (1429?-1500),' *Revue des études byzantines* 17 (1959): 28-51 for a more extensive analysis of Ioannes' life.

³⁷⁰ Paraphrased from Ioannes Plousiadenos, *De Differentiis Inter Grecos et Latinos, et de Sacrosancta Synodo Florentina*, in *Patrologia Graeca*, Vol. 159, col. 992: "Ὁ Ἐφέσου [i.e., Mark] εἶδε τὸ πλῆθος δοξάζον αὐτὸν, ὡς μὴ ὑπογράψαντα, καὶ προσεκύουν αὐτῷ οἱ ὄχλοι καθάπερ Μωϋσεῖ καὶ Ἄαρων, καὶ εὐφήμουν αὐτὸν καὶ ἅγιον ἀπεκάλουν."

³⁷¹ See Doukas, *Decline and Fall of Byzantium to the Ottoman Turks*, c. 31, Magoulias, ed. and trans., pp. 180-1.

³⁷² Syropoulos, *Les Mémoires*, 12.4, Laurent, ed., p. 548.

³⁷³ Syropoulos, *Les Mémoires*, 12.6, Laurent, ed., pp. 552-5. For an overview of those who governed the Ecumenical Patriarchate following the Council of Ferrara-Florence through to the Fall of 1453, cf. Jonathan Harris, "The Patriarch of Constantinople and the Last Days of Byzantium," in Christian Gastgeber, Katerini Mitsiou, Johannes Preiser-Kapeller, Vratislav Zervan, eds., *The Patriarchate of Constantinople in Context and Comparison* (Vienna: Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, 2017), pp. 9-16.

³⁷⁴ Having become a vassal to the Ottoman Empire in 1390, Tamerlane captured Ephesus in December 1402 and gave the Aydin Dynasty control over the city. See Alexandrescu-Dersca, *La campagne*, repr., p. 88ff. However, after a prolonged conflict between the Aydin Dynasty and the Ottomans, when the Ottoman Sultan Murad II had the final Aydinid Bey, İzmiroğlu Cüneyd, executed in 1435, the Ottomans ultimately subjugated Ephesus. See Doukas, *Decline and Fall of Byzantium to the Ottoman Turks*, Magoulias, ed., and trans., esp. pp. 167-9 for a description of İzmiroğlu Cüneyd's demise.

of Ephesus.³⁷⁵ According to Ioannes Eugenikos, Mark endeavoured to fulfil his episcopal vocation to the best of his ability.³⁷⁶ Likewise, Mark continued to lead the Hellenophone opposition towards the Florentine Reunion: Within a contemporaneous epistle, Mark criticised his former student, Scholarios, for his pro-unionism, putatively for the purpose of Imperial honours. Mark reminded his former student that there was no room for vacillation regarding ecclesial matters, and also undermined the claim that the Florentine Reunion was established for the Empire's politico-military benefit: Mark likely maintained this belief through recalling the Ottoman capture of Thessalonica in 1430, which had previously been occupied by the Republic of Venice since 1422.³⁷⁷ Ultimately, Mark implored his correspondent to resign from his prestigious Imperial offices as a member of the Byzantine Senate and *καθολικός κριτής*,³⁷⁸ and support him in the authentic Christian cause against the Florentine reunion.³⁷⁹

Given his declining health, the increasing suspicion of the Ottoman authorities towards his activities in Ephesus, and the lack of a commission from Metrophanes II,³⁸⁰ Mark departed for Mount Athos. However, Mark was apprehended by Byzantine Imperial authorities on Lemnos during the journey thereto and placed under house arrest, probably

³⁷⁵ Syropoulos, *Les Mémoires*, 12.10, Laurent, ed., p. 556, detailed how Mark first journeyed to Prousa before arriving in Ephesus. Cf. Mark of Ephesus, *Marci Ephesii Epistola ad Theophanem Sacerdotem in Euboea Insula*, Petit, ed., in *Patrologia Orientalis*, Vol. 17, p. 480, wherein Mark elucidated the reasoning behind his departure from Constantinople.

³⁷⁶ For example, according to Ioannes Eugenikos, *Synaxarion*, Petrides, ed., p. 106, Mark visited many of the churches, ordained a number of priests, and provided aid to those in need within his diocese.

³⁷⁷ Cf. Paul Lemerle, 'La domination vénitienne à Thessalonique,' *Miscellanea Giovanni Galbiati* 3 (1951): 219-25 for an overview of the Republic of Venice's governance of Thessalonica during this period.

³⁷⁸ See Doukas, *Decline and Fall of Byzantium to the Ottoman Turks*, c. 31, Magoulias, ed. and trans., p. 180; *Patriarchica Constantinopoleos Historia*, ed. by Immanuel Bekker (Bonn: Weber, 1849), p. 80; Konstantinos Sathas, *Νεοελληνική Φιλολογία: Βιογραφία των εν τοις γράμμασι διαλαμπάντων Ελλήνων, από της καταλύσεως της Βυζαντινής Αυτοκρατορίας μέχρι της Ελληνικής εθνεγερσίας (1453-1821)* (Athens: Τυπογραφείο των τέκνων Ανδρέου Κορομηλά, 1868), pp. 12-3. Cf. Blanchet, *Georges-Gennadios Scholarios*, pp. 316-8 for the dating and circumstances of Scholarios' appointment to this position.

³⁷⁹ See Mark of Ephesus, *Marci Ephesii ad Georgium Scholarium Epistola, qua in eum invenitur quod aliquam cum Latinis Concordiam Fieri Posse Existimasset*, Petit, ed., in *Patrologia Orientalis*, Vol. 17, pp. 460-4.

³⁸⁰ Mark of Ephesus, *Epistola ad Theophanem*, Petit, ed., in *Patrologia Orientalis*, Vol. 17, p. 480.

in virtue of his anti-unionist activities in Ephesus.³⁸¹ Pertinently, during this period on Lemnos, Mark composed his *Epistola Encyclica*, which he universally addressed to the Orthodox Christian populace.

Therein, Mark confronted the unionist movement by describing the pro-unionists as “monstrous men just as the mythical horse-centaurs (*Οὔτοι τοίνυν οἱ μιζόθηρες ἄνθρωποι κατὰ τοὺς ἐν μύθοις ἵπποκενταύρους*)...” who expressly follow the Latin Church by professing the dual Procession of the Spirit *ad intra* as well as the validity of the use of azymes in the Eucharist.³⁸² Undergirding Mark’s criticisms here was a broader concern that, like the Florentine Reunion itself, the unionist movement could not facilitate an authentic Latin-Orthodox ecclesial reconciliation, which two Churches, in Mark’s view, continued to be estranged with one another. In particular, although they proclaim these (supposedly erroneous) doctrines, when in the company of Byzantine Rite Christians, the pro-unionists act as though matters have remained the same within the post-Florentine Eastern Orthodox Churches, despite the fact that both the Latin and Eastern Orthodox Churches have retained their unique liturgical rites, including with regards to Baptism and the Eucharist. Through highlighting the differences in liturgical practice as a threat to authentic ecclesiastical reunion, one can glean that, for Mark, ecclesiastical reunion could only genuinely be put into effect if there was unity in liturgical rite.³⁸³

³⁸¹ Ioannes Eugenikos, *Synaxarion*, Petrides, ed., p. 106.

³⁸² Paraphrased from *Marci Ephesii Epistula Encyclica*, Petit, ed., in *Patrologia Orientalis*, Vol. 17, pp. 499-59 (450): “...καὶ διὰ τοῦτ’ ἂν δικαίως κληθέντες Γραικολατῖνοι, καλούμενοι δ’ οὔν ὑπὸ τῶν πολλῶν Λατινόφρονες. Οὔτοι τοίνυν οἱ μιζόθηρες ἄνθρωποι κατὰ τοὺς ἐν μύθοις ἵπποκενταύρους μετὰ τῶν Λατίνων μὲν ὁμολογοῦσι τὸ ἐκ τοῦ Υἱοῦ τὸ Πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον ἐκπορεύεσθαι... μεθ’ ἡμῶν δὲ τὸ ἐκ τοῦ Πατρὸς ἐκπορεύεσθαι λέγουσι... καὶ μετ’ ἐκείνων μὲν τὸ ἄζυμον σῶμα τοῦ Χριστοῦ λέγουσι, μεθ’ ἡμῶν δὲ αὐτοῦ μεταλαμβάνειν οὐκ ἂν τολμήσαιεν.”

³⁸³ Paraphrased from *Marci Ephesii Epistula Encyclica*, Petit, ed., in *Patrologia Orientalis*, Vol. 17, pp. 453-5. Cf. Charles Yost, ‘Neither Greek nor Latin, but Catholic: Aspects of the Theology of Union of John Plousiadenos,’ *Journal of Orthodox Christian Studies* 1(1) (2018): 43-59 (46-7).

This epistle's broader significance for the trajectory of the post-Florentine Eastern Orthodox Churches was highlighted by Ioannes Plousiadenos within his *Canon in Octavum Synodum Florentiae Habitam*. Therein, Plousiadenos described how Mark's post-conciliar activities were highly influential in engendering the rejection of the Florentine Reunion within the Kingdom of Candia.³⁸⁴

Mark remained on Lemnos through to August 4th, 1443,³⁸⁵ whereupon he returned to the Imperial Capital. According to Ioannes Eugenikos, Mark was warmly received by the populace as a *νέος όμολογητής*, or 'new confessor.'³⁸⁶ While there is a lack of definitive evidence concerning Mark's prosopography following his return to Constantinople, Mark apparently continued to bolster the anti-Florentine cause as the movement's *de facto* leader. Ioannes Plousiadenos detailed how Mark engaged in several discussions with Pope Eugenius' Byzantine Imperial delegate, Cristoforo Garatoni, the Bishop of Corone.³⁸⁷ However, given his increasingly deteriorating health, Mark summoned several of his disciples, including Scholarios and Theodoros Agallianos, to his bedside, and provided his final will and testament, which Agallianos recorded. Therein, Mark delineated his stance towards ecclesial reunion:³⁸⁸ Mark claimed that he did not receive the doctrinal definitions of *Laetentur Caeli* given his intention to remain in harmony with those Church Fathers who

³⁸⁴ Ioannes Plousiadenos, *Canon in Octavum Synodum Florentiae Habitam*, in *Patrologia Graeca*, Vol. 159, col. 1105b. Additionally, the *Epistola Encyclica's* broader pertinence for Eastern Orthodox theology was noted by Kallistos Ware within his *The Orthodox Church*, wherein Ware regarded the epistle as an archetypal delineation of Eastern Orthodox doctrine following the canons of the first seven ecumenical councils. See Ware, *The Orthodox Church* (London: Penguin, 1983), p. 211.

³⁸⁵ Cf. Louis Petit, 'Note sur l'exil de Marc d'Éphèse à Lemnos,' *Revue de l'Orient Chrétien* 23 (1922-3): 414-5.

³⁸⁶ Ioannes Eugenikos, *Synaxarion*, Petrides, ed., p. 106.

³⁸⁷ See Ioannes Plousiadenos, *Canon in Octavum Synodum Florentiae Habitam*, in *Patrologia Graeca*, Vol. 159, col. 1105b.

³⁸⁸ Mark of Ephesus, *Marci Ephesii Oratio ad Amicorum Coetum ac Nominatum ad Georgium Scholarium*, Petit, ed., in *Patrologia Orientalis*, Vol. 17, pp. 484-9.

had historically upheld orthodox Christian doctrine.³⁸⁹ Resultingly, Mark refused to allow any pro-unionists to concelebrate at his funeral given that they were, in Mark's view, no longer unified to the truth. For Mark, the pro-unionists were outside of communion with himself and his supporters until God could establish *διόρθωσις* or 'reformation' and *εἰρήνη*, or 'peace,' within His Church.³⁹⁰ Based upon Mark's admonitions, his disciples, under Scholarios' leadership,³⁹¹ subsequently formed the *Ἱερά Σύναξις* to continue opposing the terms of the Florentine Reunion.³⁹²

The venerated status which Mark garnered within Eastern Orthodoxy shortly following his death, which most likely took place on June 23rd, 1445,³⁹³ is reflected in the oration which Scholarios delivered at Mark's funeral at the Monastery of Saint George in Mangana. As Marie-Hélène Blanchet highlighted, Scholarios' oration bore a number of hagiographical elements including characterising Mark as having apprehended and upheld the *δογμάτων ἀλήθειαν*, the true doctrines, given the perceived affront to Eastern Orthodox Tradition following the Florentine Reunion.³⁹⁴

³⁸⁹ Paraphrased from Mark of Ephesus, *Marci Ephesii Oratio ad Amicorum Coetum ac Nominatum ad Georgium Scholarium*, Petit, ed., in *Patrologia Orientalis*, Vol. 17, p. 485, lines 22-31.

³⁹⁰ Paraphrased from Mark of Ephesus, *Marci Ephesii Oratio ad Amicorum Coetum ac Nominatum ad Georgium Scholarium*, Petit, ed., in *Patrologia Orientalis*, Vol. 17, p. 486, lines 1-5, 9-11.

³⁹¹ See Mark of Ephesus, *Marci Ephesii Oratio ad Amicorum Coetum ac Nominatum ad Georgium Scholarium*, Petit, ed., in *Patrologia Orientalis*, Vol. 17, pp. 486, line 14-489, line 10, for Mark's appointment of Scholarios as his successor.

³⁹² Patrinely, *Ο Θεόδωρος Αγαλλιανός*, p. 97.

³⁹³ Whether Mark passed away in 1444 or 1445 has been a point of dispute amongst scholars given that as Ioannes Eugenikos, *Synaxarion*, Petrides, ed., p. 106 simply stated that Mark passed away in his fifty-second year. For the details of this controversy, see Joseph Gill, "The Year of the Death of Mark Eugenikos," in *Personalities*, pp. 222-32; Blanchet, *Scholarios*, pp. 384-90. The author is broadly inclined to agree with the reasoning put forward by both Gill and Blanchet that Mark likely passed away in 1445.

³⁹⁴ See Scholarios, *Éloge de Marc Eugénikos, archevêque d'Éphèse*, in Jugie, Sidéridès, Petit, eds., *Oeuvres complètes*, Vol. 1, pp. 247-54 (251); Alexander Sideras, *Die byzantinischen Grabreden: Prosopographie, Datierung, Überlieferung, 142 Epitaphien und Monodien aus dem byzantinischen Jahrtausend* (Vienna: Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, 1994), pp. 367-70. Cf. Marie-Hélène Blanchet, *Georges-Gennadios Scholarios (Vers 1400-Vers 1472): Un Intellectuel Orthodoxe Face à la Disparition de l'Empire Byzantin* (Paris: Institut Français d'Études Byzantines, 2008), pp. 396ff.

Shortly following Mark's funeral, Ioannes Eugenikos composed his *Συναξάριον* to commemorate Mark's personal piety and adherence to Byzantine Orthodox doctrine.³⁹⁵ Moreover, the Ecumenical Patriarch Maximos III, who governed between 1476 and 1482, commissioned Manuel of Corinth, the *μέγας ρήτωρ* of the Ecumenical Patriarchate, to produce a new *Ἀκολουθία* in Mark's honour to be sung on the Fifth Sunday of Lent.³⁹⁶ Furthermore, in 1499, Mark was added to the list of saints to be commemorated in the *Synodikon of Orthodoxy*.³⁹⁷

³⁹⁵ Within his *Expositio pro sancta et œcumenica synodo Florentina*, in *Patrologia Graeca*, Vol. 159 (Paris: Typis J.-P. Migne, 1866), cols. 1199-1394 (1357b), Ioannes Plousiadenos described how his contemporaneous Eastern Orthodox venerated Mark as well as Palamas, having written icons of them both. The significance of liturgical reception within Eastern Orthodox theology was highlighted by Alexander Schmemmann, *Celebration of Faith*, Vol. 3 of 3 (Crestwood, N.Y.: St Vladimir's Seminary Press, 2001), p. 53, who stated: "One speaks, for example, of liturgical theology, or a liturgical "ressourcement" of theology. For some, this implies an almost radical rethinking of the very concept of theology, a complete change in its structure. The *leitourgia* - being the unique expression of the Church, of its faith and of its life - must become the basic source of theological thinking, a kind of *locus theologicus* par excellence." While Athanasios Papadopoulos-Kerameus, 'Μάρκος ὁ Εὐγενικός ὡς πατήρ ἅγιος τῆς Ὀρθοδόξου Καθολικῆς Ἐκκλησίας,' *Byzantinische Zeitschrift* 11 (1902): 50-69 (56), putatively exemplified how, as Ecumenical Patriarch, Scholarios upheld his former instructor's intra-Orthodox legacy by declaring Mark to be an Orthodox saint within a synodical decree of 1456 which demarcated Mark's day of commemoration as January 19th, and ratified an *Ἀκολουθία* in Mark's honour, K. G. Mamoní exemplified that such documents were forgeries produced by the Kefalonian hieromonk, Sylvestros the Byzantine, in 1731, who endeavoured to introduce the celebration of Mark's feast day onto the island against the background of the island, which was governed by the Republic of Venice, being subject to an influx of Latin Christian missionary activity. See Mamoní, 'Περὶ τινῶν ἀνέκδοτων ἀκολουθιῶν εἰς Μᾶρκον Εὐγενικόν,' *Ἐπετηρίς Ἐταιρείας Βυζαντινῶν Σπουδῶν*, 27 (1957): 369-86. Cf. Marie-Hélène Blanchet, 'Un plaidoyer inédit pour la canonisation de Marc d'Éphèse au 18e siècle: L'Apologie de Sylvestre le Byzantine (1731),' *Revue des Études Byzantines* 70 (2012): 95-131.

³⁹⁶ See Manuel of Corinth, *Manuelis Magni Rhetoris Liber de Marco Ephesio Deque Rebus in Synodo Florentina Gestis*, Petit, ed., in *Patrologia Orientalis*, Vol. 17, pp. 491-522. Papadopoulos-Kerameus, 'Μανουήλ ὁ Κορίνθιος καὶ ἐν ὑμνογραφικῶν αὐτοῦ πονημάτων,' *Ἐπετηρίς Φιλολογικοῦ Συλλόγου Παρνασσός* 6 (1902): 71-102 (90-102); Christos G. Patrinelis, 'Οἱ Μεγάλοι Ῥήτορες Μανουήλ Κορίνθιος, Ἀντώνιος, Μανουήλ Γαλησιώτης καὶ ὁ χρόνος τῆς ἀκμῆς των,' *Δέλτιον τῆς Ἱστορικῆς καὶ Ἐθνολογικῆς Ἐταιρείας* 16 (1962): 17-38 (17-25). The critical edition of the *Ἀκολουθία* specifies when it was to be sung when it stated: "ψαλλόμενα τῇ πέμπτῃ Κυριακῇ τῶν ἁγίων νηστειῶν..." Quoted from Papadopoulos-Kerameus, ed., 'Μανουήλ ὁ Κορίνθιος καὶ ἐν ὑμνογραφικῶν αὐτοῦ πονημάτων,' 90. See Thomas Marderas, 'Μανουήλ ὁ Κορίνθιος: Μέγας Ῥήτωρ καὶ Λογοθέτης τῆς Μεγάλῃς τοῦ Χριστοῦ Ἐκκλησίας,' *Archive* 17(2) (2021): 34-44, for an overview of Manuel's life and work. Cf. Steven Runciman, *The Great Church in Captivity: A Study of the Patriarchate of Constantinople from the Eve of the Turkish Conquest to the Greek War of Independence* (London: Cambridge University Press, 1968), p. 176, who highlighted that the office of *μέγας ρήτωρ*, or official rhetor, had been established following the reconstitution of the Ecumenical Patriarchate under the Ottoman Empire and was usually reserved for laymen.

³⁹⁷ Papadopoulos-Kerameus, 'Μᾶρκος ὁ Εὐγενικός,' 60; Blanchet, 'Un plaidoyer inédit,' 106.

These attempts to bolster Mark's *cultus* within Eastern Orthodox confines continued through to the seventeenth, eighteenth and nineteenth centuries: Within his 1698 work,³⁹⁸ the *Τόμος αγάπης* (*Tome of Love*), Dositheos II Notaras, the Greek Orthodox Patriarch of Jerusalem, defended Mark's intra-Orthodox venerated status.³⁹⁹ Dositheos sought to counteract the Jesuit François Richard who, in 1658, published his Demotic Greek opus, *Τάργα τῆς πίστεως τῆς Ρωμαϊκῆς Ἐκκλησίας εἰς τὴν διαφένδευσιν τῆς ὀρθοδοξίας* (*Shield of the Faith of the Roman Church for the Instruction of the Orthodox*), to support Roman Catholic missionaries working within Hellenophone regions.⁴⁰⁰ Therein, Richard evoked Ioannes Plousiadenos' *Ἀπολογία εἰς τὸ γραμμάτιον κῦρ Μάρκου τοῦ Εὐγενικοῦ μητροπολίτου Ἐφέσου* (*Apologia against the [Encyclical] Epistle of Mark Eugenikos, Metropolitan of Ephesus*) to claim that Mark's painful death resulted from his opposition to the Florentine reunion.⁴⁰¹

³⁹⁸ Dositheos II Notaras, Patriarch of Jerusalem, *Τόμος αγάπης* (Iasi: Boeboda, 1698); See Aurelio Palmieri, *Dositeo, patriarca greco di Gerusalemme (1641-1707): contributo alla storia della teologia greco-ortodossa nel secolo XVII* (Florence: Libreria Editrice Fiorentina, 1909), pp. 56-7 for an overview of the provenance of the work.

³⁹⁹ See esp. Dositheos II, *Τόμος αγάπης, Προλεγόμενα*, p. 28, lines 36-40: "...ἔχοντες οὖν τοσοῦτον νέφος μαρτύρων διὰ τὴν ζωὴν καὶ τὴν αἰδίμον κοίμησιν τοῦ μακαρίου Μάρκου, περιφρονοῦμεν τῆς Τάργας τῆς βλασφημοῦσης τὸν ἅγιον καὶ προσφερούσης τῶν βλασφημιῶν μάρτυρα Ἰωσήφ τὸν Μεθώνης ἄγνωστον ἄνθρωπον τῇ Ἐκκλησίᾳ καὶ ἀνατεθραμμένον εἰς τὸ σχίσμα, εἰς τοὺς νεωτερισμοὺς καὶ εἰς τὰς αἰρέσεις τῶν Λατίνων..." (My English translation:) "...having seen a multitude of witnesses to the life and glorious repose of the blessed Mark, we despise the *Targa* of he who blasphemes the saint and puts forward the blasphemous witness, Joseph of Methone, an ignorant man in the Church and who ruptured into schism, to the Latins' novelties and heresies..."

⁴⁰⁰ Cf. François Richard, *Epistola*, in *Τάργα τῆς πίστεως τῆς Ρωμαϊκῆς Ἐκκλησίας εἰς τὴν διαφένδευσιν τῆς ὀρθοδοξίας, συνθεῖσα παρὰ τοῦ αἰδεσίμου πατρὸς Φραγκίσκου Ριχάρδου τοῦ ἐκ τῆς Ἰησοῦ εταιρίας θεολόγου*, Vol. 1 of 2 (Paris: Claudius Cramosius, 1658), i-viii, esp. vii-viii.

⁴⁰¹ See Richard, *Τάργα τῆς πίστεως τῆς Ρωμαϊκῆς Ἐκκλησίας εἰς τὴν διαφένδευσιν τῆς ὀρθοδοξίας*, Vol. 2, p. 313, which invoked Ioannes Plousiadenos, *Responsio ad libellum Marci Eugenici, Ephesi metropolitae*, in *Patrologia Graeca*, Vol. 159, cols. 1023-1106 (1088b): "εἰς τὴν ἐν Φλωρεντίᾳ ἀντιστάθη τῇ συνόδῳ ἕνας καὶ μόνος Μᾶρκος ὁ τῆς Ἐφέσου· ἀμὴ δὲν ἐπέρασε πολὺς καιρὸς, καὶ ἐπῆγε τοῦ κακοῦ, καὶ ἐχάθηκεν ὁ ταλαίπωρος. Ἄκουε τὸν θεοφιλέστατον ἐπίσκοπον τῆς Μεθώνης Ἰωσήφ, ὅπου κατ' ὄνομα, καὶ κατὰ πρόσωπον, καὶ κατὰ ταῖς αἵρεσεις ἐγνώρισε καλὰ τὸν Μᾶρκον ἐκεῖνον τὸν Ἐφέσιον· διὰ τοῦτο εἰς τὴν ἀπολογία του μιλῶντας μετ' αὐτὸν λέγει· «Μαρτυρεῖ τοῦτο πᾶσα ἡ πόλις...» (My English translation:) During the Council of Florence, [it was] the one and only Mark of Ephesus [who] opposed [it]; but not much time passed, and bad things came upon him, and the poor man was lost. Listen to the most holy Bishop of Methone, Joseph, who was well familiar with Mark of Ephesus' name, person, and heresies; for this reason, in his *apologia*, [Joseph] addressed him saying, "The whole city [i.e., Constantinople] bears witness to this [story]..."

Ultimately, in February 1734, the Ecumenical Patriarch, Seraphim I, presided over a meeting of the *Ἐνδημοῦσα Σύνοδος* and promulgated a decree which ratified Mark's canonisation.⁴⁰² This canonisation inspired Nikodemos the Hagiorite, to produce his own *Ἀκολουθία* for Mark's veneration,⁴⁰³ likely completed by the late 1780s.⁴⁰⁴ This *Ἀκολουθία* was formally published in 1834, exemplifying the high degree of spiritual and theological authority which Mark continued to wield within the Eastern Orthodox Churches by the nineteenth century.

One notable example of an attempt to systematically analyse Mark's biography and his theological and philosophical framework during the twentieth century was K. G. Mamoni's *Μάρκος ο Ευγενικός: Βίος και έργον (Markos Eugenikos: Life and Work)*, published in 1954.⁴⁰⁵ While Mamoni's work propitiously helped to formulate a cogent biographical narrative of her subject and reconstruct the chronological order of Mark's literary oeuvres, her work was limited insofar as she only briefly addressed Mark's participation at Ferrara-Florence and thereby overlooked the importance of this Council for informing Mark's doctrines of Eucharistic consecration, in addition to the *filioque* and Purgatory. Moreover, her work failed to make recourse to several pertinent near-contemporary sources such as Ioannes Eugenikos' *Συναξάριον* and the *Acta Graeca*, limiting herself primarily to Syropoulos and Louis Petit's critical editions of Mark's own body of

⁴⁰² Papadopoulos-Kerameus, 'Μάρκος ὁ Εὐγενικός,' 56.

⁴⁰³ See Nikodemos the Hagiorite, *Ἀκολουθία τοῦ ἁγίου Πατρὸς ἡμῶν Μάρκου Ἐυγενικοῦ Ἀρχιεπισκόπου Ἐφέσου* (Thessalonica: Orthodoxos Kipseli, 2010), pp. 5-35.

⁴⁰⁴ For this edition, see Nikodemos the Hagiorite, *Ἀκολουθία τοῦ ἐν ἁγίοις πατρὸς ἡμῶν Μάρκου ἀρχιεπισκόπου Ἐφέσου τοῦ Εὐγενικοῦ* (Constantinople: Πατριαρχικόν Τυπογραφεῖον, 1834). Cf. K. A. Manarhis and Christos Arampatzis, 'Περὶ τὴν ἀκολουθίαν τοῦ ἁγίου Μάρκου τοῦ Εὐγενικοῦ. Δύο ἀνέκδοτοι ἐπιστολαὶ Ἀθανασίου τοῦ Παρίου καὶ Νικοδήμου τοῦ Ἀγιορείτου,' *Ἐπετηρὶς Ἑταιρείας Βυζαντινῶν Σπουδῶν NB'* (2006): 529-44 for an overview of the background to Nikodemos' production of this *ἀκολουθία* and its redaction history.

⁴⁰⁵ K. G. Mamoni, *Μάρκος ο Ευγενικός: Βίος και έργον* (Athens: Αθήναι Φιλοσοφική σχολή του Πανεπιστημίου, 1954).

work. These lacunae entailed that Mamoni insufficiently drew out much of the context undergirding Mark's intellectual framework and his activities before, during and after Ferrara-Florence.

Building upon Mamoni's work, scholars such as the Serbian Orthodox author, Hieromonk Irinej Bulović, in his 1983 work *Τὸ μυστήριον τῆς ἐν τῇ ἁγίᾳ Τριάδι διακρίσεως τῆς θείας οὐσίας καὶ ἐνεργείας κατὰ τὸν ἅγιον Μάρκον Ἐφέσου τὸν Εὐγενικόν* (*The Mystery of the Distinction of the Divine Essence and Energies in the Holy Trinity According to Mark Eugenikos of Ephesus*), as well as the American Greek Orthodox scholar, Nicholas (now Archimandrite Maximos) Conostas, in his 2002 biographical article "Mark Eugenikos" have catalogued, albeit incompletely, Mark's published and unpublished literary oeuvres.⁴⁰⁶ These efforts have greatly facilitated this author's own attempt to make recourse to a number of Mark's non-conciliar works in order to analyse his doctrine of the nature and moments of Eucharistic consecration.

Within his *Ὁ Καθαγιασμος τῶν δώρων τῆς θεΐας εὐχαριστίας* (*The Consecration of the Holy Eucharistic Gifts*), first published in 1968, the Greek Orthodox theologian, Panteleimon Rodopoulos, attempted to provide a holistic historical exposition of the Eucharistic epiclesis' role within the Eastern and Western Christian liturgical and Patristic traditions. Rodopoulos worked under the assumption that Mark's doctrine of the epiclesis acted as the hermeneutical basis for interpreting the preceding liturgical advocates of the epiclesis' consecratory nature.⁴⁰⁷ Alongside being methodologically anachronistic in the

⁴⁰⁶ See Irinej Bulović, *Τὸ μυστήριον τῆς ἐν τῇ ἁγίᾳ Τριάδι διακρίσεως τῆς θείας οὐσίας καὶ ἐνεργείας κατὰ τὸν ἅγιον Μάρκον Ἐφέσου τὸν Εὐγενικόν*, (Thessalonica: Πατριαρχικὸν Ἰδρυμα Πατερικῶν Μελετῶν, 1983), pp. 499-508; Nicholas Conostas, "Mark Eugenikos," in Carmelo Giuseppe Conticello and Vassa Conticello, eds., *La théologie byzantine et sa tradition*, Vol. 2 of 2 (Turnhout: Brepols, 2002), pp. 411-75 (423-40). Cf. also Daniel Stiernon, "Marc Eugénikos," in Marcel Viller Ferdinand Cavallera, Joseph de Guibert, André Rayez, André Derville and Aimé Solignac, eds., *Dictionnaire de spiritualité ascétique et mystique, doctrine et histoire*, Vol. 10 (Paris: Beauchesne, 1980), cols. 267-72 (268-72) for another attempt to catalogue Mark's literary oeuvres.

⁴⁰⁷ Rodopoulos, *Ὁ Καθαγιασμος τῶν δώρων τῆς θεΐας εὐχαριστίας*, esp. pp. 18-24, 40-5.

sense that Rodopoulos failed to accurately situate his earlier Hellenophone liturgical source material within its proper context, Rodopoulos also overlooked some of Mark's own writings, including Mark's post-conciliar *Ἐπιστολή πρὸς τινὰ Πρεσβύτερον Γεώργιον τῆς Μεθώνης* (*Epistle to George the Priest in Methoni*). These lacunae limited Rodopoulos' capacity to provide a more nuanced and historically informed exposition of Mark's doctrine of Eucharistic consecration.

Moreover, within his 1972 work, *Ὁ Ἅγιος Μάρκος ὁ Εὐγενικός καὶ ἡ ἔνωσις τῶν Ἐκκλησιῶν* (*Saint Markos Eugenikos and the Union of Churches*), Nikolaos P. Vasiliadis characterised Mark as one of the foremost post-Florentine defenders of Eastern Orthodox doctrine, especially through his polemical activity against the Imperial program of ecclesial reunion. Nonetheless, Vasiliadis' work was hindered by his apologetic attempt to truncate Mark's opposition to the Florentine Reunion by comparing coeval pro-unionists such as Bessarion and Isidore of Kiev to twentieth-century Eastern Orthodox ecumenists, whom Vasiliadis admonished as being preoccupied with non-doctrinal concerns.⁴⁰⁸

Subsequently, Constantine N. Tsirpanlis, a scholar of Hellenophone theology, attempted to revise the negative scholarly assessments of Mark's intellectual framework and his stance towards ecclesial reunion in Western European scholarship within his opus, *Mark Eugenikos and the Council of Florence: A Historical Re-evaluation of His Personality, 1391-1445*, originally published in 1974. Through analysing the various conciliar *Acta*, the extant testimonies provided by authors such as Syropoulos, Ioannes Eugenikos, and Scholarios, and Mark's own oeuvres. Tsirpanlis pertinently highlighted Mark's irenic stance towards his Latin interlocutors, particularly Pope Eugenius, throughout Ferrara-Florence.⁴⁰⁹

⁴⁰⁸ Nikolaos P. Vasiliadis, *Ὁ Ἅγιος Μάρκος ὁ Εὐγενικός καὶ ἡ ἔνωσις τῶν Ἐκκλησιῶν* (Athens: "Ἐκδοσις «Σωτήρ», 1972).

⁴⁰⁹ See esp. Tsirpanlis, *Eugenikos and the Council of Florence*, pp. 48-50.

Nonetheless, Tsirplanis emphasised that Mark's desire for ecclesial reunion was tempered by his intention to ensure that Eastern Orthodox doctrine, especially vis-à-vis the opposition towards the *filioque*, was not compromised for the sake of political expediency, given the Byzantine objective to secure Latin Christian military and financial aid against the imminent Ottoman threat.⁴¹⁰ However, Tsirplanis crucially overlooked Mark's role within the Florentine disputes concerning Eucharistic consecration. Moreover, Tsirplanis failed to elucidate Mark's intellectual receptivity towards Latin Christian theological and philosophical authorities both within and beyond the Council. For example, Tsirplanis overlooked how Mark evoked Augustine of Hippo's *De Trinitate*, *Soliloquiorum*, and *Epistulae 82 and 148* when analysing the nature of Mark's contribution to the Ferraran Purgatory debates.⁴¹¹

In addition, the Greek Orthodox scholar, Kyriakos G. Tselekidis, attempted to address the question of Mark's doctrine of the nature and moment(s) of Eucharistic consecration at Florence within his 2012 Doctoral Dissertation at the Aristotle University of Thessaloniki, *Ο Άγιος Μάρκος ο Ευγενικός και το λειτουργικό του έργο (Saint Markos Eugenikos and His Liturgical Work)*.⁴¹² However, his analysis was limited by the fact that he failed to sufficiently address the question of to what extent Mark effectively analysed his Patristic and liturgical source material. Moreover, Tselekidis' work was hindered by his use of Jacques-Paul Migne's dated edition of Mark's *Λίβελλος* in the *Patrologia Graeca*, alongside the fact that, like Rodopoulos, Tselekidis did not make recourse to Mark's *Έπιστολή προς τινα*

⁴¹⁰ See esp. Tsirplanis, *Eugenicus and the Council of Florence*, pp. 85-94.

⁴¹¹ See Mark of Ephesus, *Marci Ephesii Responsio ad Quaestiones Latinorum*, Petit, ed., in *Patrologia Orientalis*, Vol. 15, pp. 152-68 (161); *Responsio ad Quaestiones Latinorum*, Petit, ed., in *Patrologia Orientalis*, Vol. 15, p. 157; *Oratio Altera*, Petit, ed., in *Patrologia Orientalis*, Vol. 15, pp. 124-5, or Mark's evocation of these Augustinian works respectively. In *Responsio ad Quaestiones Latinorum*, Petit, ed., in *Patrologia Orientalis*, Vol. 15, p. 161, Mark exemplified his reverence for Augustine by denoting the latter as *ὁ μάκαριος Αύγουστῖνος*.

⁴¹² See Kyriakos G. Tselekidis *Ο Άγιος Μάρκος ο Ευγενικός και το λειτουργικό του έργο*. Ph. D. Dissertation (Aristotle University of Thessaloniki, 2012), esp. pp. 138-48.

Πρεσβύτερον Γεώργιον to provide the broader context of Mark's doctrine of Eucharistic consecration.

It is against this scholarly background that this dissertation aims to fill these scholarly lacunae within its analysis of the argumentation and proficiency in use of liturgical and Patristic source material within Mark of Ephesus' Eucharistic *Λίβελλος* and Torquemada's two *Sermones* and to put into broader historical context the principal doctrinal concerns of each author, especially with regards to Eucharistic typology.

4.2. Mark's Background.

Before analysing Mark's *Λίβελλος*, one must elucidate how Mark's background informed his treatment of Eucharistic consecration within the work. Concerning Mark's pre-conciliar background, the principal source from which such information can be gleaned is the aforementioned *Συναξάριον* which his younger brother, the deacon and *νομοφύλαξ*,⁴¹³ Ioannes Eugenikos, composed shortly following Mark's death.⁴¹⁴ As Ioannes recounted, Mark was born as Manuel Eugenikos in Constantinople, most likely between 1392 and 1394,⁴¹⁵ to the Trapuzentine⁴¹⁶ deacon and *σακελλάριος* to the Byzantine Imperial treasury,

⁴¹³ For Ioannes' background, see Eleni Rossidou-Koutsou, "Introduction," in *An Annotated Critical Edition of John Eugenikos' Antirrhetic of the Decree of the Council of Ferrara-Florence* (Nicosia: Research Centre of Kykkos Monastery, 2006), xxiii-lxxxvii (xxiii-xxxi). Cf. Louis Bréhier, *Les Institutions de l'Empire byzantine* (Paris: Albin Michel, 1970), pp. 119-20, 122, 188, for an overview of the function of the *νομοφύλαξ*.

⁴¹⁴ There are two principal published editions of Ioannes Eugenikos' hagiography: Sophronios Petrides, ed., 'Le synaxaire de Marc d'Ephese,' *Revue d'Orient chretien*, 2nd series, 5(15) (1910): 97-107; Louis Petit, ed., *Acolouthie de Marc Eugenicos archeveque d'Ephese*, in *Rivista di studi bizantini e neoellenici* Vol. 2 (Rome: Istituto per l'Europa orientale, 1927), pp. 195-235. Herein, I primarily rely on the former due to ease of access. Cf. Petrides, ed., 'Le synaxaire de Marc d'Ephese,' 97 for dating.

⁴¹⁵ This dating is based on Ioannes Eugenikos' aforementioned claim (see 4.1.1.) that Mark passed away in his fifty-second year. Cf. Ioannes Eugenikos, *Synaxarion*, Petrides, ed., p. 106.

⁴¹⁶ Cf. Ioannes Eugenikos, *Τοῦ αὐτοῦ νομοφύλακος τοῦ Εὐγενικοῦ τῆς Τραπεζουντίων πόλει ἐγκωμιαστικὴ ἔκφρασις*, 18, in T. L. F. Tafel, ed., *Eustathii metropolitae Thessalonicensis opuscula: accederunt Trapezuntinae historiae scriptores Panaretus et Eugenicos* (Frankfurt: Sigismund Schmerber, 1832), pp. 370-3 (373). For an analysis of this *ἔκφρασις*' contents, see Aslihan Akışık, 'Praising A City: Nicaea, Trebizond, and Thessalonike,' *Journal of Turkish Studies* 36 (2011): 1-25 (9-10).

Georgios Eugenikos, and his wife, Maria Loukas.⁴¹⁷ Georgios also operated his own school within the Imperial capital, wherein Mark received his initial instruction.⁴¹⁸ As Mark himself recalled within his *Confesso Fidei*, dated to between May and June 1439,⁴¹⁹ his family's piety instilled in him his preoccupation with studying the Byzantine Church's doctrine as well as fulfilling a religious vocation.⁴²⁰

Following Georgios' death in 1405, Mark undertook studies with two renowned Constantinopolitan instructors, Ioannes Chortasmenos and Georgios-Gemistos Pletho.⁴²¹ One should keep in mind that the Palaiologan Byzantine curriculum, broadly understood, comprised studies grammar, logic, and rhetoric, as well as mathematics, natural philosophy, and metaphysics. There was a particular emphasis on the instruction of rhetoric given the Imperial Court's need to employ highly equipped individuals for their bureaucracy, especially in the context of engaging in foreign diplomacy.⁴²² The versatile nature of the

⁴¹⁷ Ioannes Eugenikos, *Synaxarion*, Petrides, ed., pp. 99-100; Marios Pilavakis, "Introduction," in Pilavakis, ed., *Markos Eugenikos's First Antirrhetic against Manuel Calecas's On Essence and Energy*. Ph. D. Diss. (King's College, University of London, 1987), pp. 22-156 (24). See Tsirpanlis, *Mark Eugenikos and the Council of Florence*, pp. 38-9 for an overview of George's ecclesial offices.

⁴¹⁸ Ioannes Eugenikos, *Synaxarion*, Petrides, ed., p. 100.

⁴¹⁹ See Petit, ed., *Patrologia Orientalis*, Vol. 17, p. 316.

⁴²⁰ See, esp., *Marci Ephesii Confesso Fidei Florentiae Scripta, sed Post Absolutam Synodum in Lucem Edita*, ed. by Louis Petit in *Patrologia Orientalis*, E. W. Brooks, Louis Petit, René Basset, Sylvain Grébaud, eds., Vol. 17 (Paris: Firmin-Didot, 1907), pp. 435-42 (435). Georgios' piety is exemplified within his hymnography. Cf. George Eugenikos, *Ἀκολουθία ψαλλομένη εἰς τὸν ἐν ἀγίοις Σπυρίδωνα: Ποίημα τοῦ τιμιωτάτου σακελλίου τῆς Μεγάλης Ἐκκλησίας διακόνου κύρ Γεωργίου τοῦ Εὐγενικοῦ*, ed. by Marios Pilavakis (London: Ἑλληνική Ὁρθόδοξος Χριστιανική Ἀδερφότητα Μέγας Ἀθανάσιος, 1984).

⁴²¹ Ioannes Eugenikos, *Synaxarion*, Petrides, ed., p. 100. Venance Grumel, 'Marc d'Éphèse – Vie – Ecrits – Doctrine,' *Estudis Franciscans* 36 (1926): 425-48 (425) also included the future μέγας σακελλάριος of Patriarch Joseph II, Manuel Chrysokokkes, as one of Mark's tutors. Mark's studies under Pletho likely undergirded Mark's humanistic capabilities, as can be gleaned in his *Μονωδία ἐπὶ τῇ ἀλώσει τῆς Θεσσαλονίκης (Monody on the Fall of Thessalonica)*, which Mark composed in the aftermath of the Ottoman capture of Thessalonica in 1430, and wherein Mark employed the epithetic style characteristic of Homer when characterising the Ottomans. See Mark of Ephesus, *Ἐάλω Θεσσαλονίκη: Θρήνος γιὰ τὴν ἀλωση τοῦ 1430*, ed. by Marios Pilavakis (Athens: Papadimitriou, 1997), p. 66: "οἱ ἀπηνεῖς καὶ αἰμοβόροι καὶ δόλιοι τῆς δουλίδος Ἄγαρ οἱ ἀπόγονοι..." (My English translation: the harsh and bloodthirsty and deceitful descendants of the slave Hagar...) Mark's humanism in this sense would prove instrumental in enabling Mark to accurately exposit and exegete liturgical texts such as the *Apostolic Constitutions* and the *Liturgy of St James*, which were not predominantly celebrated within the fifteenth-century Byzantine Rite.

⁴²² Deno J. Geanakoplos, *Constantinople and the West: Essays on the Late Byzantine (Palaeologan) and Italian Renaissances and the Byzantine and Roman Churches* (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1989), pp. 6-7.

Palaiologan curriculum was oriented towards the ultimate study of Theology, designed so as to begin by using natural knowledge to understand God *ad extra* through His Creation, before transitioning towards God *ad intra*, which was known strictly through divine revelation in Scripture and Apostolic tradition.⁴²³ While the extant sources are broadly silent on which of Mark's tutors (if any) instructed him in philosophy, it is likely that it would have been in this context that Mark first came into contact with John of Damascus' *Ἐκδοσις*, given that, as scholars such as Vassilis Adrahtas have highlighted, "from the tenth century onwards this work... became the dogmatic handbook of Byzantine theologians," and would thereby have likely been at the forefront of Mark's formative theological instruction.⁴²⁴

Chortasmenos, in addition to serving as a *νοτάριος* in the Ecumenical Patriarchate's chancery between c. 1391 and 1415, functioned as a *διδάσκαλος* in the Byzantine Imperial Capital prior to undertaking a vocation within the Monastery of the Prodromos in Petra in Constantinople.⁴²⁵ Given that Chortasmenos possessed several manuscripts of *scholia* upon the *Corpus Aristotelicum*, and also produced his own commentaries thereupon,⁴²⁶ under

⁴²³ Cf. Friedrich Fuchs, *Die Höheren Schulen von Konstantinopel im Mittelalter*, repr. (Amsterdam: A.M. Hakkert, 1964), pp. 41-5; Geanakoplos, *Constantinople and the West*, p. 7; Theodore G. Zervas and Isaias Rivera, "'Turning the Soul': An Investigation of Georgios Gemistos Plethon's Teaching Methods and Educational Philosophy," *Athens Journal of Humanities & Arts* 5(1): 119-30 (120).

⁴²⁴ See Vassilis Adrahtas, "John of Damascus," in Ken Parry, ed., *The Wiley Blackwell Companion to Patristics*, pp. 264-77 (267).

⁴²⁵ See Herbert Hunger, "Einleitung," in Hunger, ed., *Johannes Chortasmenos (ca. 1370-ca. 1436/37): Briefe, Gedichte und kleine Schriften, Einleitung, Regesten, Prosopographie, Text*, Wiener Byzantinischen Studien 7 (Vienna: Institut für Byzantinistik der Universität Wien, 1969), pp. 14, 17.

⁴²⁶ Cf. Ernst Gamillscheg, 'Die Handschriftenliste des Johannes Chortasmenos im *Oxon. Aed. Chr. 56*,' *Codices manuscripti & impressi* 2 (1981): 52-7, who highlighted that, in 1981, thirty-two extant manuscripts were known to have contained Chortasmenos' autograph. In particular, as Sofia Kotsabassi, 'Aristotle's *Organon* and Its Byzantine Commentators,' *The Princeton University Library Chronicle*, 64(1) (2002): 51-62 (58), highlighted, Chortasmenos produced a substantial portion of the scholia on the Aristotelian Corpus within *Princeton MS. 173*, in addition to providing the attributions of the scholiasts which had already been copied therein. His association with this manuscript is exemplified by the following note below the title of Aristotle's *Posterior Analytics* on fol. 78^r which Chortasmenos himself likely wrote contemporaneously to his instruction over Mark: "...δι' ἐμοῦ ἰωάννου τοῦ χορτασμένου πατριρχικοῦ νοταρίου... ἐπὶ τῆς βασιλείας τοῦ εὐσεβεστάτου βασιλέως κυροῦ **μανουὴλ του παλιολόγου** καὶ... πατριαρχείας τοῦ ἀγιωτάτου πατριάρχου κυροῦ **ματθαίου** ἔτους ἑωεστωτος τῆς μετὰ **τῶν τούπκων μάχης**..." Transcribed and trans. into English in Kotsabassi, 'Aristotle's *Organon* and Its Byzantine Commentators,' 58: "...by myself John Chostamenos, patriarchal notary... during the

Chortasmenos, Mark likely developed his capacity to interweave syllogistic reasoning within his theological oeuvres, particularly in the context of the forensic debates which characterised Ferrara-Florence. For example, during the discussions concerning Purgatory at Ferrara in June 1438, Mark concluded his response to Cesarini's assertion that the truly penitent who died before undertaking satisfaction for their sins underwent post-mortem purification, the *Ἀντίρρησις τῶν λατινικῶν κεφαλαίων, ὅπερ αὐτοῦ προέτεινον περὶ τοῦ περκατορίου πυρός* (*Antirrhetic of the Latin Chapters, which [Mark] Presented Concerning Purgatorial Fire*) by providing eleven syllogisms countering the logical foundation of this doctrine.⁴²⁷

Around 1410, Mark assumed leadership over his deceased father's school, which produced several prominent Byzantine scholars and clerics, including Theodoros Agallianos,⁴²⁸ who was subsequently appointed as an *ἱερομνήμων* within the Imperial Church during the 1430s,⁴²⁹ Scholarios, and Ioannes Eugenikos. Notably, each of these

reign of the most pious emperor Manuel Palaiologos and the patriarchate of the most holy patriarch Matthew in the year after the battle with the Turks..." Given that Chortasmenos dated his writing to Manuel II's reign and to Mattheos I's Ecumenical Patriarchate, Chortasmenos must have produced this note between 1397 and 1410. Moreover, as Kostabassi, 'Aristotle's *Organon* and its Byzantine Commentators,' 58, highlighted, the reference to the 'battle with the Turks' could either refer to the Battle of Ankara or to the end of Bayezid I's siege of Constantinople, both of which occurred in 1402, entailing that the work was plausibly produced c. 1402-3.

⁴²⁷ Cf. Mark of Ephesus, *Marci Archiepiscopi Ephesii Oratio Prima De Igne Purgatorio*, Petit, ed., in *Patrologia Orientalis*, Vol. 15, pp. 39-60 (56-60) for Mark's eleven syllogisms. See Demetrios Bathrellos, "Ferrara-Florence on Purgatory and the Forgiveness of Sins," in Theresia Hainthaler, Franz Mali, Gregor Emmenegger, and Mante Lenkaityte Ostermann, eds., *Pro Oriente Band XXXVII* (Innsbruck/Vienna: Tyrolia Verlag, 2014), pp. 355-75 (368-9) for an analysis of such syllogisms. See *Oratio Latina a Cardinali Cesarini Habita cum Versione Graeca Traversariana*, in *De Purgatorio disputationes in Concilio Florentino habitae*, ed. by Georg Hofmann and Louis Petit (Rome: Pontificium Institutum Orientalium Studiorum, 1969), pp. 1-12, for the Latin edition and Greek translation undertaken by Traversari of Cesarini's speech. Cf. André de Halleux, "Problèmes de méthode dans les discussions sur l'eschatologie au Concile de Ferrare et de Florence," in Giuseppe Alberigo, ed., *Christian Unity. The Council of Ferrara-Florence 1438/39-1989* (Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1991), pp. 251-301.

⁴²⁸ See Patrinelis, *Ὁ Θεόδωρος Ἀγαλλιανός ταυτιζόμενος πρὸς τὸν Θεοφάνη Μηδείας καὶ οἱ ἀνέκδοτοι λόγοι του*, pp. 14-42 for an overview of Theodoros' life and work.

⁴²⁹ This office entailed that Theodoros was responsible for admitting candidates to Holy Orders and the consecration of churches within the Imperial capital. Cf. Jean Darrouzès, *Recherches sur les ὀφφικια de l'Église byzantine* (Paris: Peeters, 1970), pp. 368-73.

students would later participate at Ferrara-Florence.⁴³⁰ Mark's spiritual development during this stage within his career was noted by Ioannes Eugenikos, who recorded how Mark's life and practices closely resembled that of a monk, despite still being a layman.⁴³¹ Taking this development into consideration, it was this early sense of piety that predisposed Mark towards studying the writings of Gregorios Palamas at this stage in his career.⁴³² Pertinent to this dissertation's purposes, Mark's doctrine of the nature and moment(s) of Eucharistic consecration was likely to a notable extent informed by Mark's attentiveness to the fourteenth and fifteenth century controversies relating to Palamite theology. In particular, section four of this Chapter will show that Mark was plausibly inspired to defend the use of the term 'antitype' within the Byzantine Rite's *Liturgy of St Basil* against the background of the previously discussed assertions of anti-Palamites such as Nikephoros Gregoras that the Palamites failed to acknowledge the Real Presence of Christ's Body and Blood following the consecration of the Eucharistic gifts, merely regarding them instead as 'types.'

This research into Palamas' oeuvres would notably inspire Mark to later defend the Byzantine Church's canonised Palamite theology in the face of both Latin and Hellenophone opposition, particularly from the two Hellenophone Dominicans, Manuel Kalekas and his close correspondent, Andreas Chrysoberges.⁴³³

⁴³⁰ Ioannes Eugenikos, *Synaxarion*, Petrides, ed., pp. 100-1, Gregorios Melissenos, *Apologia contra Ephesii Confessionem*, in *Patrologia Graeca*, Vol. 160 (Paris: Typis J.-P. Migne, 1866), cols. 13-204 (16a); *Scholarios, Lettre d'envoi de l'ouvrage précédent à Marc d'Ephèse*, in Jugie, Petit, Sidéridés, eds., *Oeuvres Complètes*, Vol. 4, pp. 116-8 (117); Pilavakis, "Introduction," *First Antirrhetic*, p. 24.

⁴³¹ Ioannes Eugenikos, *Synaxarion*, Petrides, ed., p. 100.

⁴³² Pilavakis, "Introduction," *First Antirrhetic*, p. 24.

⁴³³ See esp. Schmemmann, "Ο Άγιος Μάρκος ὁ Εὐγενικός," *Γρηγόριος Παλαμάς* 34 (1951): 230-41 (230-3, 237); Demetracopoulos, "Palamas Transformed. Palamite Interpretations of the Distinction between God's 'Essence' and 'Energies' in Late Byzantium," in Martin Hinterberger and Chris Schabel, eds., *Greeks, Latins, and Intellectual History 1204-1500* (Leuven/Paris/Walpole, M.A.: Peeters, 2011), pp. 342-68, for overviews of Mark's adherence to Palamism

To provide some context to this opposition, Kalekas⁴³⁴ helped to prolong the intra-Byzantine anti-Palamite movement, for example, within his *De fide deque principiis catholicæ fidei*. Therein, Kalekas provided a systematic exposition of Christian doctrine based upon Patristic literary material alongside the Greek translations of Aquinas' *opera* undertaken by the two prominent anti-Palamite brothers, Demetrios and Prochoros Kydones, during the 1350s and 1360s, especially the *Summa contra Gentiles* and *De rationibus fidei*.⁴³⁵ Pertinent to this dissertation's purposes, using such translations, Kalekas subsequently upheld that Eucharistic transmutation was effectuated solely through the dominical words' recitation as this formula is made operative in virtue of the divinity of He who initially spoke these words, i.e., Christ.⁴³⁶ For Kalekas, this formula paralleled God's imperative at Creation, which produces its effect once and for all.⁴³⁷ Notably, Kalekas evoked an excerpt from Chrysostom's *Εἰς τὴν προδοσίαν τοῦ Ἰούδα* to affirm his conclusion,

⁴³⁴ See Loenertz, *Correspondance de Manuel Calecas*, pp. 16-46, for an overview of Kalekas' life and work.

⁴³⁵ See Manuel Kalekas, *De principiis fidei catholicæ*, in *Patrologia Graeca*, Vol. 152 (Paris: Typis J.-P. Migne, 1865), cols. 429-661 for the overall treatise. See esp. Kalekas, *De principiis fidei*, 3, in *Patrologia Graeca*, Vol. 152, cols. 477a, 508a-c, wherein Kalekas evoked the *Summa Contra Gentiles* IV to postulate that the Father is both the Son's and the Spirit's cause but that the Spirit also proceeds through the Son. Cf. Jean Gouillard, 'Les influences latines dans l'œuvre théologique de Manuel Calécas,' *Revue des études byzantines* 189-190 (1938): 36-52 (44). See Demetracopoulos, "Aquinas in Byzantium: 'Modus Sciendi' and 'Dignitas Hominis,'" in Andreas Speer and Philipp Steinkrüger, eds., *Knotenpunkt Byzanz: Wissensformen und kulturelle Wechselbeziehungen. Miscellanea Mediaevalia* 36 (Berlin: De Gruyter, 2012), pp. 333-410 (355-9), who highlighted how, with regards to the question of the reasonableness of divinely revealed truths, Kalekas interpreted Hellenophone Church Fathers such as Gregory of Nyssa according to a Thomistic hermeneutic. The Kydones brothers translated a significant portion of Aquinas' *Summa Theologiae*, *De rationibus fidei contra Saracenos, Graecos et Armenos ad cantorem Antiochenum* and *De articulis fidei et ecclesiae sacramentis ad archiepiscopum Panormitanum*. See Δημητρίου Κυδώνη, *Θωμά Ἀκρινάτου, Σούμμα Θεολογική ἐξελληνισθεῖσα*. *Corpus Philosophorum Graecorum Recentiorum* II, Vols. 15-19, ed. by George Leontsinis and Athanasia Glycophrydi-Leontsini (Vol. 15), Photios Demetracopoulos (Vol. 16), Demetracopoulos and Margarita Brentanou (Vol. 17a), Stauroulas I. Sideri and Panagiotas Photopoulou (Vol. 17b) Eleni Kalokairinou (Vol. 18), Glykofrydi-Leontsini and I. D. Spyralatos (Vol. 19) (Athens: Ακαδημία Αθηνών-Κέντρο Ερεύνης της Ελληνικής Φιλοσοφίας, 1976-2019), for critical editions of Demetrios' translation of the *Summa Theologiae* II-II, qq. 1-122. Cf. Tinnfeld, *Demetrios Kydones: Briefe*, Vol. 1(1), pp. 68-72, who provided a catalogue of Demetrios' translations of Latin texts.

⁴³⁶ Paraphrased from Kalekas, *De principiis fidei catholicæ*, 6, in *Patrologia Graeca*, Vol. 152, col. 601a: "...καὶ τοῦτο ὑπηρετοῦντος τοῦ ἱερέως πιστεύομεν γίνεσθαι ὥστε τὸν ἄρτον εἰς σῶμα αὐτοῦ καὶ τὸν οἶνον εἰς αἷμα αὐτοῦ μεταβάλλεσθαι διὰ τὴν τοῦ εἰπόντος δύναμιν."

⁴³⁷ Paraphrased from Kalekas, *De principiis fidei catholicæ*, 6, in *Patrologia Graeca*, Vol. 152, cols. 600d-1a: "Ἄλλ' ἐπειδὴ ὁ δεσπότης τῆς κτίσεως τοῦτο εἶπεν οὕτως ἔχειν, ὥσπερ πιστεύομεν ὅτι τῷ ῥήματι αὐτοῦ ὁ κόσμος ἐκ τοῦ μὴ ὄντος συνέστη καὶ ἅπαξ μὲν ἐν ἀρχῇ εἴρηκεν, «'Εξαγαγέτω ἡ γῆ βοτάνην χόρτου»..."

according to which Chrysostom putatively stated that the Eucharist is solely informed through the priest reciting those words which possess transmutative power through their divine proclamation.⁴³⁸ Granting the aforementioned availability of the Latin translation of *Εἰς τὴν προδοσίαν τοῦ Ἰουδα* to the late medieval Dominican Order, Kalekas likely became aware of this source through corresponding with his Latin Dominican brethren operating in the Province of Greece.⁴³⁹ Thus understood, Kalekas' citation provides an illuminative instantiation of Kabasilas' previously described claim that 'certain Latins' evoked this text within their missionary activities.⁴⁴⁰

Pertinently, Kalekas evoked these Greek translations of Aquinas' oeuvres to articulate his doctrine of Eucharistic transmutation, as exemplified by his analogization of Eucharistic transmutation with air possessing the potency to be transformed into fire in accord with Aquinas' *In Sententiarum*.⁴⁴¹ Given that Torquemada also utilized Aquinas' *opera* to support his own doctrine of Eucharistic consecration at Florence, alongside the fact that Mark of Ephesus was familiar with Kalekas' oeuvres and the Kydones brothers' translations of the *Corpus Thomisticum*, had the Byzantine contingent been informed that this topic required treatment at an earlier stage within the preparatory proceedings, through these literary sources, Mark plausibly could have provided a more elaborate defence of the Byzantine Church's position and facilitated a firmer consensus between the

⁴³⁸ Paraphrased from Kalekas, *De principiis fidei catholicae*, 6, in *Patrologia Graeca*, Vol. 152, col. 601a: "...Καὶ ὡς φησὶν ὁ θεῖος Χρυσόστομος, Σχῆμα μόνον πληρῶν ἔστηκεν ὁ ἱερεὺς: ἡ δὲ δύναμις πᾶσα τῶν λόγων [i.e., the dominical words] ἐστίν."

⁴³⁹ Cf. J. T. Muckle, 'Greek Works Translated Directly Into Latin Before 1350. Part I - Before 1000,' *Mediaeval Studies* 4(1) (1942), 33-42 (37-8).

⁴⁴⁰ See Kabasilas, *Liturgiae Expositio*, 29.1-4, in *Patrologia Graeca*, Vol. 150, col. 428; Cf. Chrysostom, *De Proditione Judae*, in *Patrologia Graeca*, Vol. 49, col. 380.

⁴⁴¹ Paraphrased from Kalekas, *De principiis fidei catholicae*, 6, in *Patrologia Graeca*, Vol. 152, col. 601c: "Εἰ γὰρ κατὰ δύναμιν φυσικὴν καὶ ὑποκειμένη τοῦ ἀέρος ὕλη δύναται κατὰ τὸ εἶδος μεταβάλλειν εἰς πῦρ, πολλῶ μάλλον τοῦ Θεοῦ δύναμις, ὡς ὄλην τὴν οὐσίαν τῶν πραγμάτων παρήγαγεν, οὐ κατ' εἶδος μόνον μεταβαλεῖ ἀλλὰ τὸ ὑποκείμενον ὅλον τοῦ ἄρτου καὶ τοῦ οἴνου εἰς ὑποκείμενον σὰρκα καὶ αἷμα μεταποιήσει." Cf. Aquinas, *In Sent.*, IV, dist. 11, q. 1, a. 2, arg. 1.

two Churches within the conciliar definition by counteracting Torquemada's use of a number of Aquinas' arguments and modes of reasoning in the *Sermo Prior*.

Returning to the broader context, Kalekas nonetheless encountered resistance from the coeval pro-Palamite Byzantine secular and ecclesial authorities principally given his affiliation with Byzantine anti-Palamites and Latinophiles such as Demetrios Kydones. Kalekas was compelled to accept the Palamite theology canonised within the *Tome of the 1351 Council of Constantinople*.⁴⁴² Refusing to do so, Kalekas subsequently departed for Pera, which provided Kalekas with the room and the facilities to bolster his opposition towards this *Tome* within his treatise, *De essentia et operatione*. This transfer also facilitated Kalekas' conversion to the Latin Church and his improved fluency in the Latin language.⁴⁴³ In 1404, Kalekas subsequently undertook his vocation in the Dominican Order through the convent of St George in Mytilene, Lesbos.⁴⁴⁴ Resultingly, Kalekas' polemical works, particularly those concerning the Palamite theology of God *ad intra*, were broadly diffused within both Hellenophone and Latin theological circles. This is exemplified by the fact that Kalekas' treatise, the *Adversus errores Graecorum de Processione Spiritus Sancti*, composed in 1410, was translated into Latin by the future Latin Florentine Father, Ambrogio Traversari, at Pope Martin V's request, in mid-to-late 1424 for the purpose of defending the Latin Church's position vis-à-vis the *filioque* in its negotiations within the Byzantine Church for convoking an ecumenical council.⁴⁴⁵

⁴⁴² Cf. *Concilium Constantinopolitanum 1351*, in Alberto Melloni, ed., *The Great Councils of the Orthodox Churches: From Constantinople 861 to Moscow 2000*. Corpus Christianorum, Conciliorum Oecumenicorum Generaliumque Decreta 4.1 (Turnhout: Brepols, 2016), pp. 179-218.

⁴⁴³ Kalekas also translated other Latin texts such as Boethius' *De Trinitate*. Cf. John A. Demetrapoulos, ed., 'Manuel Calecas' Translation of Boethius' *De Trinitate* – Introduction, new critical edition, *Index Latinograecitatis*, *Synthesis Philosophica* 20(1) (2005): 85-118.

⁴⁴⁴ Loenertz, 'Manuel Calécas, sa vie et ses oeuvres d'après ses lettres et ses apologies inédites,' *Archivum Fratrum Praedicatorum* 17 (1947): 194-207 (206-7).

⁴⁴⁵ Stinger, *Humanism and the Church Fathers*, p. 112.

Kalekas' life and work testifies to how the late medieval Dominican Order was subject to a synthesis of more monolithic adherence to the orthodox Thomistic interpretative framework with a burgeoning anti-Palamism. As a result, one can conclude that a key factor underlying the conversions of Hellenophone Orthodox to Latin Christianity was the emergence of a Hellenophone Thomistic tradition, which naturally engendered a doctrinal animosity between several Dominicans and Hellenophone adherents to Palamite theology.⁴⁴⁶ Within the context of Ferrara-Florence, such partisanship entailed that Palamite theology simply marked another putatively erroneous 'school' for many fifteenth-century orthodox Thomists, whose fundamental error derived largely from its discordance with their own framework regarding God *ad intra*.⁴⁴⁷

As will be further explored below, Pope Eugenius invited Andreas Chrysoberges to Ferrara-Florence on April 20th, 1437, who had experienced a highly illustrious ecclesiastical and academic career: Having converted to Roman Catholicism, likely through Demetrios Kydones' influence, around 1370, Andreas followed his brothers Maximus and Theodore in taking refuge and consequently undertaking a religious vocation within the Dominican priory at Pera amidst the coeval Byzantine Imperial suppression of anti-Palamism.⁴⁴⁸ Subsequently, between 1410 and 1418, Chrysoberges lectured in philosophy at the University of Padua, before being appointed as one of the Dominican Order's Masters of

⁴⁴⁶ Cf. Demetracopoulos, "Palamas Transformed," esp. pp. 292-341 for an overview of the Hellenophone exceptions, such as Ioannes VI Kantakouzenos, Theophanes of Nicaea, and Manuel II, to this rule.

⁴⁴⁷ Cf. Demetrios Kydones, *Apologia I*, Mercati, ed., *Notizie*, p. 364, line 3, who exemplified how the Dominican Order came to be regarded by many late medieval Hellenophone Christians as 'the company of Thomas.'

⁴⁴⁸ Delacroix-Besnier, *Les Dominicains et la Chrétienté grecque aux XIV^e et XV^e siècles* (Rome: École française de Rome, 1997), pp. 287-8, 431, 444-5; Thierry Ganchou, "Dèmètrios Kydônès, les frères Chrysobergès et la Crète (1397-1401) de nouveaux documents," in Chryssa A. Maltezou and Peter Schreiner, eds., *Bisanzio, Venezia e il mondo franco-greco (XIII-XV secolo): atti del colloquio internazionale organizzato nel centenario della nascita di Raymond-Joseph Loenertz O. P., Venezia, 1-2 dicembre 2000* (Venice: Istituto Ellenico di Studi Bizantini e Postbizantini, Centro Tedesco di studi Veneziani, 2002), pp. 435-93, esp. 457-9; Loenertz, 'Les Dominicains Byzantins Theodore et Andre Chrysoberges et les negociations pour l'union des eglises grecque et latine de 1415 a 1430,' *Archivum Fratrum Praedicatorum* 9 (1939): 5-61 (5-8).

Theology therein in 1418.⁴⁴⁹ Subsequently, Pope Martin V appointed Chrysoberges as the *Magister Sacri Palatii Apostolici* in 1426, and also undertook several significant missions on the Papacy's and the Dominican Order's behalf. For example, Martin V appointed Chrysoberges to act as his representative before Ioannes VIII and Patriarch Joseph II within the pre-conciliar negotiations in 1426, and again by Pope Eugenius IV on May 21st, 1432, alongside being appointed as the Dominican Vicar-General over the Province of Greece in 1431.⁴⁵⁰ Moreover, Chrysoberges had been incardinated as the Latin Archbishop of Rhodes on May 2nd, 1432, where Chrysoberges presided before being translated to the Archdiocese of Nicosia on April 19th, 1447 by Pope Nicholas V, within which diocese Chrysoberges presided before his passing in 1451.⁴⁵¹ Having directly engaged with Demetrios Kydones and Kalekas and their oeuvres in the Dominican convent at Pera,⁴⁵² Andreas participated in the broader Thomistic-Palamite controversy, particularly within his *Epistula ad Bessarionem de divina essentia et operatione*, dated to 1436. Therein, Andreas explicitly maintained that the Palamite divine essence-energies doctrine was irreconcilable with orthodox Thomistic theology, and also upheld Aquinas as a quasi-dogmatic theological authority.⁴⁵³

Returning to the trajectory of Mark's life and career, Mark nonetheless recognised the potential for Latin-Byzantine ecclesial reunion despite this doctrinal divergence. For

⁴⁴⁹ Loenertz, 'Les Dominicains Byzantins Theodore et Andre Chrysoberges,' 8-11.

⁴⁵⁰ See Eugenius IV, *Epistula 33*, in Hofmann, ed., *Epistolae Pontificiae ad Concilium Florentinum spectantes*, (Rome: Pontificium Institutum Orientalium Studiorum, 1940), pp. 26-7 for Chrysoberges' appointment as Eugenius' representative within the pre-conciliar negotiations; See André De Halleux, ed., 'L'activité d'André Chrysobergès, O.P. sous le pontificat de Martin V (1418-1431),' *Échos d'Orient* 34 (1935): 414-38 (429-30, 436-8), for Chrysoberges' appointment as Martin V's representative within the pre-conciliar negotiations and as Dominican Vicar General respectively.

⁴⁵¹ Jean Darrouzès, 'La date de la mort d'André Chrysobergès O.P., archevêque de Nicosie et légat apostolique en Chypre,' *Archivum fratrum praedicatorum* 21 (1951): 301-5 (302-4).

⁴⁵² See Delacroix-Besnier, "Manuel Calécas et les Frères Chrysobergès, grecs et prêcheurs," 155-63, for an analysis of Demetrios' and Kalekas' literary activity at Pera and Andreas Chrysoberges' access thereto.

⁴⁵³ Candal, ed., 'Andreae Rhodiensis, OP, inedita ad Bessarionem epistula', esp. 348, 360. Cf. Kappes, *Epiclesis Debate*, pp. 34-41.

example, in 1416, Mark, who had also been appointed as a *νοτάριος τῶν ῥητόρων*, composed a laudatory hymn mourning the death of the Ecumenical Patriarch, Euthymios II, who had also ordained Mark as an *ἀναγνώστης*.⁴⁵⁴ In spring 1385, Euthymios was commissioned by the future Emperor Manuel II Palaiologos, who between 1382 and 1387 reigned as an independent governor in Thessalonica, to function as his ambassador to Pope Urban VI and effectuate ecclesial reunion with the Latin Church for the purpose of securing Western European military aid for Thessalonica given the imminent Ottoman threat to the city.⁴⁵⁵ Concurrently, Mark praised Euthymios for countering those whom Mark described as following one of Palamas' principal opponents, Gregorios Akindynos.⁴⁵⁶

During an unspecified period within his intellectual formation, it is also likely that Mark corresponded with Makarios Makres in addressing theological questions.⁴⁵⁷ Alongside serving as a pre-conciliar Byzantine negotiator with the Latin Church, the intellectual and literary methodology which Makres employed within his written work provides a plausible framework for interpreting Mark's own theological paradigm: On this point, one should consider that, as highlighted by Argyriou, within his anti-Islamic polemical work, the *Συνηγορία τῆς Ἱερᾶς Παρθενίας (Advocacy of Holy Virginity)* composed between 1426 and 1429, Makres synthesised various literary sources including Scripture, Hellenophone Patristic texts, and the Kydones brothers' Greek

⁴⁵⁴ See Adamantios A. Diamantopoulos, ed., 'Μάρκου του ευγενικού εις Ευθύμιον Πατριάρχην Κως Κανών,' *Εκκλησιαστικός Φάρος* 9(50) (1912): 124-47 (127, 132); Jean Darrouzès, ed., *Les registes des actes du patriarcat de Constantinople. I. Les actes des patriarches*, Vol. 6 of 7: *Les registes de 1377 à 1410*, (Paris: Peeters, 1979), p. 134; Patrinelis, *Ο Θεόδωρος Αγαλλιανός ταυτιζόμενος προς τον Θεοφάνη Μηδεΐας και οι ανέκδοτοι λόγοι του*, p. 93.

⁴⁵⁵ Demetrios Kydones alluded to Euthymios' mission in his *Lettre 314*, in Raymond-Joseph Loenertz, ed., *Démétrius Cydonès: Correspondance*, Vol. 2 of 2 (Rome: Bibliotheca Apostolica Vaticana, 1960), pp. 241-2. Cf. Giovanni Mercati, *Notizie Di Procoro E Demetrio Cidone Manuele Caleca e Teodoro Meliteniota* (Vatican City: Bibliotheca Apostolica Vaticana, 1931), pp. 516-7; George T. Dennis, *The Reign of Manuel II Palaeologus in Thessalonica, 1382-1387* (Rome: Pontificium Institutum Orientalium Studiorum, 1960), pp. 136-40.

⁴⁵⁶ Diamantopoulos, 'Κανών,' 129.

⁴⁵⁷ Pilavakis, "Introduction," *First Antirrhetic* p. 30.

translations of the *Corpus Thomisticum*, to bolster his own argumentation in favour of the naturality of celibacy.⁴⁵⁸ Thus, Mark's own knowledge and interpretation of these literary sources was plausibly to a significant extent informed by his engagements within Makres.

Notably, Mark's relationship with Patriarch Euthymios and his high reputation as an instructor was positively noticed by Manuel II, who closely associated with Mark and provided the latter with manuscripts of his own writings to amend.⁴⁵⁹ The significance of this relationship is exemplified by the fact that Manuel II likely informed Mark about the broader late medieval Dominican-Franciscan doctrinal disputes, which, as will be discussed, informed Mark's positive reception of Franciscan authors such as Scotus when preparing for Ferrara-Florence.⁴⁶⁰ Manuel II articulated his awareness of these schools' doctrinal divergences concerning the Immaculate Conception within his treatise, *Σύγγραμμα περὶ τῆς τοῦ ἁγίου Πνεύματος ἐκπορεύσεως* (*Syngramma Concerning the Procession of the Holy Spirit*), a substantial portion of which Manuel composed during his visit to Paris between 1400 and 1402:

...and what lit up the adversity even more which prevailed between those called the Minor brethren towards those called the Preachers... is the most holy Virgin's conception...⁴⁶¹

⁴⁵⁸ See e.g., Makres, *Défense de la Virginité*, in Argyriou, ed., *Macaire Makrès et la polémique contre l'Islam*. Studi e Testi 314 (Vatican City: Bibliotheca Apostolica Vaticana, 1986), p. 313. Herein, the "Ἐνοσασίς Β' and its Λύσις methodologically and thematically accorded with Aquinas' *Summa contra Gentiles* III, c. 136 as Makres followed Aquinas in posing the objection that virginity is opposed to divine providence on the basis that the divine order has established that humans bear organs and concomitant concupiscible powers designed for the purpose of procreation. To this objection, like Aquinas, Makres responded that while divine providence has established that humans possess items for the whole species, every human person does not necessarily have to employ each and every such item. See Argyriou, "Les écrits anti-islamiques," in Argyriou ed., *Macaire Makrès et la polémique contre l'Islam*, pp. 86-94 for a more holistic examination of Makres' use of the *Summa contra Gentiles* III, cc. 136-7 within his *Défense de la Virginité*. Cf. Argyriou, "Les écrits anti-islamiques," pp. 79-86 for the dating of this *apologia*.

⁴⁵⁹ Ioannes Eugenikos, *Synaxarion*, Petrides, ed., p. 100.

⁴⁶⁰ Tsirpanlis, *Mark Eugenikos and the Council of Florence*, p. 48.

⁴⁶¹ My English translation of Manuel II Palaiologos, *An annotated critical edition (editio princeps) of Emperor Manuel II Palaeologus' treatise 'On the Procession of the Holy Spirit'*, 16, ed. by Charalamabos Dendrinis, Ph. D

Mark's relationships with the Imperial Court, the Ecumenical Patriarchate, and highly reputed intellectuals including Chortasmenos and Makres,⁴⁶² adumbrated an illustrious career within the Imperial capital. However, aged twenty-six, Mark ultimately undertook the eremitic form of monasticism he long aspired to: Mark settled in the Monastery of the Holy Transfiguration on the Isle of Antigone in the Sea of Marmara under the spiritual instruction of a renowned hesychastic monk named Symeon.⁴⁶³ Mark's monastic vocation was interrupted approximately two years following this point because of the Ottoman incursions into the island,⁴⁶⁴ leading Mark to transfer to the Monastery of St George in Mangana, Constantinople, in 1422.⁴⁶⁵ Therein, Mark most likely utilised the monastery's extensive library and more attentively engaged with theology *per se*.⁴⁶⁶ Mark pertinently produced

Dissertation (Royal Holloway, University of London, 1996), p. 21: "...καὶ τὸ τὴν ἔχθραν ἀνάψαν ἐπὶ πλέον, ἢ προυπῆρχε τοῖς Ἐλαχίστοις ἀδελφοῖς καλουμένοις πρὸς τοὺς Πρεδικάτορας προσηγορευμένους... Πλην τοσοῦτον ἂν εἴπομιμ' ὅτιπερ διὰ τὴν σύλληψιν τῆς ὑπεράγου Παρθένου τούτοις ἐστὶν ἡ διαφορά." Italics mine. See Tsirpanlis, *Mark Eugenikos and the Council of Florence*, p. 48; Charalambos Dendrinos, "Manuel II Paleologus in Paris (1400-1402): Theology, Diplomacy, and Politics," in Martin Hinterberger and Chris Schabel, eds., *Greeks, Latins, and Intellectual History 1204-1500* (Leuven-Paris-Walpole: Peeters, 2011), pp. 397-422 (404). Cf. Ignatius Brady, 'The development of the doctrine on the Immaculate Conception in the fourteenth century after Aureoli,' *Franciscan Studies* 15 (1955): 175-202 for an overview of the fourteenth and fifteenth century intra-Latin debates on this doctrine.

⁴⁶² I have deliberately excluded referring to Pletho here given that his transfer to Mistra in the Peloponnese in c. 1407-10 at Manuel II's suggestion was likely informed by the increasing suspicion of the Constantinopolitan ecclesial hierarchy towards his philosophical framework. See C. M. Woodhouse, *George Gemistos Plethon – The Last of the Hellenes* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1986), pp. 25, 40.

⁴⁶³ Ioannes Eugenikos, *Synaxarion*, Petrides, ed., p. 101.

⁴⁶⁴ Ioannes Eugenikos, *Synaxarion*, Petrides, ed., p. 101-2. Raymond Janin, *Les églises et les monastères des grands centres byzantins* (Paris: Institut français d'études byzantines, 1975), pp. 63-4.

⁴⁶⁵ See Janin, *Les églises*, pp. 70-6 for an overview of the Monastery of Mangana.

⁴⁶⁶ Ioannes Eugenikos, *Synaxarion*, Petrides, ed., 101-2; George P. Majeska, *Russian Travellers to Constantinople in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries*. Dumbarton Oaks Studies 19 (Washington: Dumbarton Oaks Publications, 1984), pp. 366-71. Mark's writings during this time naturally bore a distinct monastic preoccupation, as exemplified by the fact that Mark composed poetry and *akolouthia* venerating historical ascetics such as Mark of Athens, Elijah, John of Damascus, and Palamas. Cf. Athanasios Papadopoulos-Kerameus, ed., *Μαυρογορδάτειος Βιβλιοθήκη. Ἀνεκδοτὰ ἑλληνικὰ* 15 (Constantinople: Σ.Ι. Βουτυρά, 1884), p. 102; part. ed. by Pilavakis, 'Στιχηρὰ εἰς τὸν μέγαν Προπφήτην Ἡλίαν,' *Ὁρθόδοξος Τύπος*, 567 (1983): 1; Georgios Eugenikos, *Ἀκολουθία ψαλλομένη εἰς τὸν ἐν ἀγίοις Σπυρίδωνα*, Pilavakis, ed., pp. 37-47; Pilavakis, ed., 'Στιχηρὰ εἰς τὸν ἅγιον Γρηγόριον ἀρχιεπίσκοπον Θεσσαλονίκης τὸν Παλαμᾶν,' *Ὁρθόδοξος Τύπος*, 580 (1984): 3 respectively.

copies of excerpts from Kabasilas' *Ἐρμηνεία*, which functioned as a principal *locus* for his doctrine of Eucharistic consecration within his Florentine *λίβελλος*.⁴⁶⁷

Considering that Ioannes Eugenikos recounted how Mark's maternal grandfather, Loukas, was a physician,⁴⁶⁸ and that Mark's initial instruction within his father's school possibly situated Mark within a context whereby he had close contact with medical practitioners, Mark naturally developed an interest in some of the authoritative medical literature within the late medieval Byzantine Empire. It was likely from this background that Mark enhanced his knowledge of Byzantine medicine through accessing the collection of medical treatises contained within Mangana's library.⁴⁶⁹ Evidence of this medical familiarity is exemplified within Mark's *Κανὼν παρακλητικός εἰς τὴν ἁγίαν Θεοδοσίαν* (*Supplicatory Canon for St Theodosia*). Therein, Mark betrayed his familiarity with the Galenic medical tradition of humorism by employing the term *χυμός*.⁴⁷⁰ This fact is pertinent for this dissertation's purposes as Mark's recourse to the doctrine of the pre-purified Virgin at the Annunciation to analogise Eucharistic consecration was developed against the background

⁴⁶⁷ B. L. Fonkič and F. B. Poljakov, 'Markos Eugenikos als Kopist. Zur Tätigkeit Eines Gelehrtenkreises an den Konstantinopolitanen Skriptorien im ersten Drittel des 15. Jahrhunderts,' *Byzantinische Zeitschrift*, Vol. 84-85(1-2) (1992): 17-23 (19-21).

⁴⁶⁸ Ioannes Eugenikos, *Synaxarion*, Petrides, ed., p. 99.

⁴⁶⁹ See esp. Miller, *Birth of the Hospital*, p. 183ff, who highlighted that the monastery produced an extensive treatment list for ailments of various internal organs which incorporated entries from physicians operating at the monastery's hospital such as Stephanos the *ἀρχίατρος* and Abram the *ἀκτουάριος*, while also evoking early medieval Byzantine physicians such as Alexandros Trallianos' *περὶ ἡμάτος φλεγμονῆς*. Cf. *Vat. gr. 299*, fols. 368-93^v (368^v, 374, 369^v) for this list's respective citations of these individuals.

⁴⁷⁰ Mark of Ephesus, *Κανὼν παρακλητικός εἰς τὴν ἁγίαν Θεοδοσίαν*, vv. 122-4, ed. by Evelina Mineva in *To Ὑμνογραφικὸ ἔργο τοῦ Μάρκου Ευγενικοῦ*, Doctoral Dissertation (Πανεπιστήμιο Ἰωαννίνων, 2000), p. 53: "...τοῦ ταλαιπώρου σώματος τοῦ **χυμοῖς** συμπεπλεγμένου ῥυπαροῖς καὶ ταῖς ἐναντίαις μαχομένου ῥοπαῖς..." Trans. by Mineva in 'Byzantine Medical Theory and Practice in the Hymnographic Works of Mark Eugenikos (First Half of the 15th Century),' *Études Balkaniques* 2 (2004): 144-9 (148): "the tortured body, locked in combat with evil fluids and struggling against unfavourable conditions..."

of an Hellenophone Patristic concern for maintaining the Virgin's purity through a lack of excess fluid.⁴⁷¹

Significantly, Mark also theologically corresponded with Joseph Bryennios.⁴⁷² After engaging within missionary activity in the Latin Kingdom of Candia,⁴⁷³ Bryennios had returned to Constantinople and served as a *διδάσκαλος*, before undertaking his vocation in the Monastery of Stoudios between c. 1401 and 1403 through to 1406.⁴⁷⁴ While the precise dating of their correspondence remains inconclusive, it was likely during Mark's period within the Monastery in St George that the two engaged with one another.⁴⁷⁵ In contrast to the claims of Venance Grumel,⁴⁷⁶ this correspondence did not likely occur during Mark's early formation or during his initial tenure as schoolmaster given that Bryennios undertook a mission on behalf of the Ecumenical Patriarch, Mattheos I, to re-establish full communion

⁴⁷¹ See esp. Galen, *In Hippocratis Epidemiarum librum III commentaria III*, III.III.77, ed. by Ernst Wenkebach in *Corpus Medicorum Graecorum*, V 10.2.1 (Leipzig/Berlin: Teubner, 1936), p. 167, lines 6-12: "...νοσώδης μὲν γὰρ καὶ ἡ τῶν καταμηνίων ἐπίσχεσις ἀλλ' οὐχ ὁμοίως βλαβερὰ τῇ μετὰ τὸν τόκον, ὅτι μὴ μόνον αὐτῇ πλήθος ἀλλὰ καὶ κακοχυμῖαν ἱκανὴν ἐργάζεται. τὸ μὲν γὰρ χρηστότερον αἷμα τὸ ἔμβρυον ἔλκον ἑαυτὸ τροφῆς ἔνεκα κατάλοιπον δὲ τὸ φαυλότερον αἷτιον γίνεταί τῆς κακοχυμῖας ταῖς κυούσαις, ἦν μετὰ τόκον ἡ φύσις ἐκκενοῖ..." Trans. by Rebecca Fleming, 'The Pathology of Pregnancy in Galen's Commentaries on the Epidemics,' *Bulletin of the Institute of Classical Studies. Supp.*, 77 (2002): 101-12 (105-6): "For it seems that the disease was engendered in the woman by the retention of the post-partum purge. For the retention of the menses tends to produce disease, but is not as damaging to the woman as [retention] after birth, since not only is [this retention] itself an excess, but it also produces considerable cacochymy (i.e., evil humours). For the embryo attracts the most useful blood to itself, as nourishment, and the poorer remainder becomes the cause of cacochymy in the pregnant, which nature evacuates after birth."

⁴⁷² Schmemmann, 'St. Mark of Ephesus and the Theological Conflicts in Byzantium,' *St. Vladimir's Theological Quarterly* 1 (1957) :11-24 (16). The influence of Bryennios can be gleaned from the epitaph which Mark wrote for the former's tomb. Therein, Mark wrote: "Πάτερ μέγιστε πατέρων κλέος μέμνησο καὶ νῦν τῶν ποθεινῶν σου τέκνων, Θεῷ παρεστῶς, τῇ μεγάλῃ Τριάδι... (My English translation: O father, most glorious of fathers, remember your beloved children in the presence of God, the Holy Trinity.)" Quoted from Mark of Ephesus, *Στίχοι εἰς τὸν τάφον τοῦ διδασκάλου κυροῦ Ἰωσήφ τοῦ Βρυεννίου*, ed. by Sophronios Eustratiades, ed., *Ἐκκλησιαστικὸς Φάρος* 1 (1908): 101.

⁴⁷³ See Nikolaos H. Ioannidis, *Ο Ἰωσήφ Βρυέννιος Βίος - Ἔργο - Διδασκαλία* (Athens: Εκδόσεις Συμμετρία, 1985), pp. 74-7 for an overview of Bryennios' activity within Candia.

⁴⁷⁴ See Ioannidis, *Βρυέννιος Βίος - Ἔργο - Διδασκαλία*, pp. 78-9; Loenertz, 'Pour la chronologie des oeuvres,' 13, who argue that Bryennios arrived in 1401. See Loenertz, ed., *Correspondance de Manuel Calecas* (Vatican City: Bibliotheca Apostolica Vaticana, 1950), pp. 98-9, who reversed his earlier opinion by arguing that Bryennios arrived between 1402 and 1403.

⁴⁷⁵ Basili Katsarou, "Ἰωσήφ Βρυεννίου" τὰ πρακτικὰ τῆς συνόδου τῆς Κύπρου (1406)," in *Byzantina: Ἀφιέρωμα στὴ μνήμη τοῦ καθηγητῆ Ἰωάννη Ἐ. Καραγιαννοπούλου* (Thessalonica: Κέντρο Βυζαντινῶν Ἐρευνῶν., 2000), pp. 21-56 (29).

⁴⁷⁶ Grumel, 'Marc d'Ephèse: Vie - Ecrits - Doctrine,' 425-39.

of the Byzantine Rite Church in the Latin Kingdom of Cyprus with the Ecumenical Patriarchate between 1406 and 1412.⁴⁷⁷

Bryennios was evidently already familiar with the Kydones brothers' translations of Aquinas when he began engaging with Mark. For example, within his *Διάλεξις Α' περὶ τῆς ἐκπορεύσεως τοῦ ἁγίου Πνεύματος* (*First Dialexis Concerning the Procession of the Holy Spirit*), which Loenertz dated to c. 1399-1401, Bryennios evoked both the *Summa contra Gentiles* and the *Summa Theologiae* to admonish Aquinas' refusal to posit a real divine essence-operation distinction *ad intra*.⁴⁷⁸ Pertinently, both Makres and Bryennios likely informed Mark's subsequent pro-Palamite apologetics during the 1430s in addition to instilling within Mark a receptivity towards Latin Christian theological and philosophical insights, insofar as these could be juxtaposed with Eastern Orthodox doctrine. This receptivity undergirded Mark's consequent synthesis of Latin Christian authors including Augustine and Scotus within his own literary oeuvres, particularly in the context of engaging within the Ferraran-Florentine debates. It was also probably through his engagement with Bryennios that Mark became more cognizant of the late medieval anti-Palamite movement

⁴⁷⁷ Pilavakis, "Introduction," in *First Antirrhetic*, p. 24. For a lucid analysis of Bryennios' activity in Cyprus, see Chrysovalantis Kyriacou, *The Orthodox Church in Frankish- and Venetian-ruled Cyprus (1191-1571): Society, Spirituality and Identity*, Vol. 1 of 2. Ph. D. Diss. (Royal Holloway and New Bedford College, University of London, 2016), pp. 229-68.

⁴⁷⁸ See Joseph Bryennios, *Διάλεξις Α' περὶ τῆς ἐκπορεύσεως τοῦ ἁγίου Πνεύματος*, ed. by Eugenios Boulgaris in *Ἰωσήφ Μαναχοῦ τοῦ Βρυεννίου τὰ εὐρεθέντα*, Vol. 1 of 3 (Leipzig: τῆς Τυπογραφίας τοῦ Βρεϊτκόπφ, 1768-84), p. 355: "Ἐγὼ τὸν Θωμᾶν [Aquinas] καὶ ἐν ἄλλοις μὲν πολλοῖς ὁρῶ τοῦ δέοντος διαπίπτοντα... καὶ ταυτὸν εἶναι ἐπὶ Θεοῦ οὐσίαν, δύναμιν καὶ ἐνέργειαν... ἀποφαίνεται [cf. Aquinas, *Summa contra Gentiles* II, cc. 8-9]... Ἐν δε τῷ κστ' τῶν αὐτοῦ [cf. Aquinas, *Summa Theologiae*, I, q. 77, a. 2, co., trans. by Demetrios Kydones in *Vat. Gr. 609*, fol. 101^r]: "ἐν τῷ Θεῷ οὐκ ἔστι τις δύναμις ἢ ἐνέργεια παρα τὴν οὐσίαν αὐτοῦ... (My English translation:) I have seen Thomas making a mistake of [what is] right on various issues... and he concluded that essence, power and energy are of the same divine being... And in [q.] 26 of his [work]: "in God there is no power nor energy apart from His essence..." Both quoted in Demetracopoulos, "Palamas Transformed," p. 289, n. 60. See Raymond Joseph Loenertz, 'Pour la chronologie des œuvres de Joseph Bryennios,' *Revue des Études Byzantines* 7 (1949): 12-32 (30), for the dating of this work. See Demetracopoulos, "Palamas Transformed," pp. 287-92, esp. 288-90, for an analysis of Bryennios' use of Aquinas' opera when defending the Palamite theology of God *ad intra*.

given Bryennios' own acute awareness of the works of anti-Palamites such as Demetrios Kydones.⁴⁷⁹

Concerning the nature of Mark's literary production during the 1420s, one can conclude that these oeuvres were primarily irenic in tenor insofar as his only direct engagement in the disputed topics between the two Churches is exemplified within an epistle written in 1422 to the Ecumenical Patriarch Joseph II. Similar to how Makres' anti-*filioquism* did not hinder his willingness to engage within his pre-conciliar negotiations with the Latin Church, Mark likewise did not in any way oppose the prospect of ecclesial reunion even when he congratulated Joseph for defending the invalidity of the addition of the *filioque* clause.⁴⁸⁰ To put this defence into context, on October 19th, 1422, amidst the Imperial proposals for a new ecumenical council, Pope Martin V sent a delegation led by Antonio da Massa to Constantinople begin negotiations with Byzantine ecclesial representatives presided over by Joseph II in Hagia Sophia.⁴⁸¹

The second broad phase within Mark's career is demarcated by Ioannes VIII's accession as sole Emperor on July 21st, 1425. Ioannes' encouragement for ecclesial reunion amplified the need for Byzantine scholars such as Mark to study the Imperial Church's doctrine given the more frequent pre-conciliar negotiations which occurred under his regime.⁴⁸² This second period was also informed by Mark's ordination to the priesthood,

⁴⁷⁹ See Bryennios, "Τῶ σοφωτάτῳ ἀνδρῶν Δημητρίῳ τῷ Κυδώνη ἐν Βενετία," in *Ἰωσήφ Μαναχοῦ τοῦ Βρυεννίου τὰ εὐρεθέντα*, Vol. 3 of 3, ed. by Eugenios Bulgaris (Leipzig: τῆ Τυπογραφία του Βρεϊτκόφ, 1784), pp. 140-1 for an example of Bryennios' epistolary correspondence with Demetrios Kydones. Cf. Conostas, "Mark Eugenikos," p. 414.

⁴⁸⁰ See Mark of Ephesus, *Marci Ephesii Epistula ad Patriarcham Constantinopolitanum*, Petit, ed., in *Patrologia Orientalis*, Vol. 17, pp. 337-8.

⁴⁸¹ See Vitalien Laurent, 'Les préliminaires du concile de Florence: Les neuf articles du pape Martin V et la réponse du patriarche Joseph II (octobre 1422),' *Revue des études byzantines* 20 (1962): 1-60, esp. 36-47.

⁴⁸² The significance of this event is exemplified by the fact that Mark a thanksgiving hymn that was likely read aloud within the ceremony of Ioannes VIII's enthronement, wherein Mark petitioned God to provide Ioannes VIII with David's mildness, Solomon's wisdom, and the virtue of justice shared by both of these Biblical kings.

which occurred at some point following 1426, which would have naturally entailed that Mark undertook a more active ministry.⁴⁸³ However, having extensively engaged with Palamas' writings, Mark probably became more attentive to certain coeval anti-Palamite literature, especially those of Kalekas, which likely inspired Mark to produce his own Palamite apologetical opera during the 1420s and 1430s.⁴⁸⁴ For example, Mark defended the Byzantine Church's canonised Palamite doctrine of God *ad intra* in a treatise composed for the purpose of being presented in a gathering before Ioannes VIII, after the latter inquired into the justice of the post-mortem punishments which sinners are subjected to. Within this work, Mark denoted those who oppose the divine essence-energies distinction as 'sycophants' and 'accusers.'⁴⁸⁵ To encapsulate, Mark's pre-conciliar activities suggest that Mark principally sought to undertake his monastic vocation before encountering Kalekas' anti-Palamite apologetics, to which Mark naturally felt inclined to respond.

While Mark's formidable educational background and his reputation for sanctity entailed that he was well suited to function as a Byzantine conciliar *peritus*, given his intention to continuing fulfilling his monastic vocation, Mark did not desire to be appointed as one of the principal Byzantine representatives, nor to be later elevated to the

See Lampros, ed., *Παλαιολόγεια καὶ Πελοποννησιακά*, Vol. 1, pp. 31-2. As the two were likely acquainted prior to Ioannes VIII's accession given Mark's closeness to Manuel II, Mark sought to bolster this acquaintance through composing an encomium to the emperor, wherein Mark implored the new emperor to ensure that his interior disposition was fitting both to govern as temporal monarch but also in advance of the Heavenly Kingdom to come. See Papadopoulos-Kerameus, *Μαυρογορδάτειος Βιβλιοθήκη*, p. 100.

⁴⁸³ According to Ioannes Eugenikos, *Synaxarion*, Petrides, ed., p. 102, Mark's ordination to the priesthood was undertaken following significant pressure, which possibly derived from the Abbot of Mangana, Makarios Koronas, who potentially regarded Mark as a natural successor to him as abbot, as well as the Ecumenical Patriarch, Joseph II, in light of his aforementioned correspondence with Mark alongside Mark's close ties to the Byzantine Imperial and clerical hierarchy.

⁴⁸⁴ See Conostas, "Mark Eugenikos," p. 414, who highlights that Mark likely began to engage more extensively with Palamite theology following his ordination to the priesthood.

⁴⁸⁵ Mark of Ephesus, 'Λόγος πρὸς τὸν βασιλέα Ἰωάννην τὸν Η', A. N. Oeconomidis, ed., in *Μικρασιαστικά Χρονικά* 8 (1958): 1-32 (13-4).

episcopate.⁴⁸⁶ However, in 1437, Mark was appointed as the procurator for Philotheos, the Greek Orthodox Patriarch of Alexandria, before being appointed by Ioannes VIII to lead a pre-conciliar preparatory commission later that year.⁴⁸⁷ Regarding the specific focusses of this commission, Ioannes VIII instructed its participants to pay particularly attention to the works of Neilos Kabasilas, especially as they concerned the *filioque*⁴⁸⁸ and the distinction between God's essence and His energies,⁴⁸⁹ alongside the question of Papal Primacy.⁴⁹⁰

Although Gill claimed that Ioannes VIII's appointment of Mark to this commission was indicative of the Emperor's concern to ensure that a spectrum of stances towards ecclesial reunion were represented,⁴⁹¹ Gill overlooked the fact that Mark was cautiously receptive towards the project for reunion and was willing to utilise Latin Scholastic axioms

⁴⁸⁶ See Mark's "Ἐκθεσις τίνι τρόπῳ ἐδέξατο τὸ τῆς ἀρχιερωσύνης ἀξίωμα, καὶ δῆλωσις τῆς συνόδου τῆς ἐν Φλωρεντίᾳ γενομένης (*Ekthesis on How He Accepted the Archiepiscopal Office and on the Synod of Florence*), ed. by Petit in *Patrologia Orientalis*, Vol. 17, pp. 443-9, which was written between June and July 1440, wherein Mark explains how he was reluctant to accept his installment to the See of Ephesus. Cf. Petit, ed., *Patrologia Orientalis*, Vol. 17, p. 316 for dating. See also Syropoulos, *Les Mémoires* 10.9, Laurent, ed., p. 482; Manuel of Corinth, *Liber de Marco Ephesio*, Petit, ed., in *Patrologia Orientalis*, Vol. 17, p. 492.

⁴⁸⁷ Syropoulos, *Les Mémoires* 3.3, 3.8, Laurent, ed., pp. 164, 168. Scholarios, *Fausse doctrine sur la Prédestination*, in Jugie, Petit, Sidéridés, eds., *Oeuvres Complètes*, Vol. 1, pp. 427-39 (428). Cf. Syropoulos, *Les Mémoires*, 3.32, 4.43, 4.44, Laurent, ed., pp. 194, 244, 248, who highlighted that Mark was subsequently appointed as the procurator for the Eastern Orthodox Patriarch of Jerusalem later this year, before being ordained as the Eastern Orthodox Patriarch of Antioch's procurator following the Byzantine contingent's arrival within the Italian Peninsula.

⁴⁸⁸ Monfasani, "The Pro-Latin Apologetics," pp. 167-8, posited that, by 1438, Mark had produced his *Capita Syllogistica adversus Latinos de Spiritu Sancti ex Solo Patre Processione* and Scholarios had produced his *Réponse aux Syllogismes de Marc d'Ephèse sur la procession de la Saint-Esprit*, in Jugie, Petit, Sidéridés, eds., *Oeuvres Complètes*, Vol. 3, pp. 476-538, as a result of their cooperation within this imperial study group, thus indicating the nature of their research material. Assuming the veracity of Monfasani's conclusion, Scholarios' references to Neilos Kabasilas' *De processione de Spiritu Sancto* within his *Réponse* suggests their use of this work within their pre-conciliar preparatory studies. See Scholarios' *Réponse aux Syllogismes*, Jugie, Petit, Sidéridés, eds., *Oeuvres Complètes*, Vol. 3, pp. 496, 497, 499, 500, 507, for Scholarios' references to this work. As Gill, 'The Sincerity of Bessarion the Unionist,' *The Journal of Theological Studies* 26(2) (1975): 377-92 (387-8) elucidated, Bessarion explicitly referred to Neilos' doctrinal authority during the council. Cf. Jugie, "Avant-Propos," in Jugie, Petit, Sidéridés, eds., *Oeuvres Complètes*, Vol. 3, xlvi, who dated Scholarios' *Réponse* to c. 1440, claiming that the work's tone suggests that it was produced in the context of Mark's refusal to sign *Laetentur Caeli*.

⁴⁸⁹ Manuel of Corinth, *Manuelis Magni Rhetoris Liber de Marco*, Petit, ed., in *Patrologia Orientalis*, Vol. 17, p. 520; Schmemmann, 'St. Mark of Ephesus,' 17. Cf. Mark of Ephesus, *Marci Ephesii Capita Syllogistica Adversus Latinos de Spiritu Sancti ex solo Patre processione*, 13, Petit, ed., in *Patrologia Orientalis*, Vol. 17, pp. 368-415 (384), for explicit evidence indicating Mark's familiarity with the *Summa Theologiae*.

⁴⁹⁰ Syropoulos, *Les Mémoires*, 3.10, Laurent, ed., p. 170 referred to this pre-conciliar research into Neilos Kabasilas' *De primatu Papae*. Pilavakis, "Introduction," *First Antirrhetic*, p. 33.

⁴⁹¹ See esp. Gill, *Personalities of the Council of Florence*, pp. 119-20.

and literary methodologies within his body of work. For example, Scholarios described how Mark impressed Ioannes VIII when his treatise concerning predestination, *Πρὸς Ἰσίδωρον ἱερομόναχον περὶ ὄρων ζωῆς* (*To Hieromonk Isidore Concerning the Limits of Life*), was publicly recited before the Emperor prior to this conciliar commission.⁴⁹² Therein, Mark exhibited this influence by formatting his treatise according to the dialectical method, reflecting the Latin Scholastic *quaestio*,⁴⁹³ by delineating the arguments and theological authorities supporting that time when a person dies is predetermined by God,⁴⁹⁴ before elaborating the opposing arguments and authorities.⁴⁹⁵ Subsequently, Mark expounded his own doctrine in accord with these counterarguments,⁴⁹⁶ before analysing the rejected doctrine's argumentation he rejected to 'resolve them,'⁴⁹⁷ making the necessary distinctions where his own doctrine's advocates did not, and demonstrated that there is concord between his opponents' authorities and his own.⁴⁹⁸

⁴⁹² Scholarios, *Fausse doctrines sur la Prédestination*, in Jugie, Petit, Sidéridès, eds., *Oeuvres Complètes*, Vol. 1, pp. 427-39 (428). See Mark of Ephesus, *Πρὸς Ἰσίδωρον ἱερομόναχον περὶ ὄρων ζωῆς*, ed. by Jean-François Boissonade in *Anecdota nova* (Paris: Dumont, 1944), pp. 349-62.

⁴⁹³ See Mark of Ephesus, *περὶ ὄρων ζωῆς*, Boissonade, ed., p. 351, lines 4-5, who described his format thus: "τὸ μὲν οὖν ζητούμενόν ἐστιν, εἰ... ἢ...". See p. 351, line 23, where Mark characterised his work as "...τὴν ζήτησιν..." For an overview of this format within the medieval Latin theological tradition, see Brian Lawn, *The Rise and Decline of the Scholastic Quaestio Disputata With Special Emphasis on its Use in the Teaching of Medicine and Science* (Leiden: Brill, 1993), esp. pp. 6-17.

⁴⁹⁴ Mark of Ephesus, *περὶ ὄρων ζωῆς*, Boissonade, ed., pp. 352, line 7-354, line 14.

⁴⁹⁵ Mark of Ephesus, *περὶ ὄρων ζωῆς*, Boissonade, ed., pp. 354, line 15-356, line 20.

⁴⁹⁶ Mark of Ephesus, *περὶ ὄρων ζωῆς*, Boissonade, ed., pp. 356, line 20-357, line 6.

⁴⁹⁷ Mark of Ephesus, *περὶ ὄρων ζωῆς*, Boissonade, ed., pp. 357, line 6-362, line 23.

⁴⁹⁸ See esp. Mark of Ephesus, *περὶ ὄρων ζωῆς*, Boissonade, ed., pp. 351, line 27-352, line 2; 357, line 7.

Likewise, the *Προθεωρία* to his *First Antirrhetic* concurred with the common Latin Scholastic custom of explicating the very production of their writings or the production of the ancient writings they commented upon according to the fourfold Aristotelian causal paradigm. See Mark of Ephesus, *First Antirrhetic*, Pilavakis, ed., p. 157, lines 2-4: "Τὸ μὲν κινητικὸν αἷτιον τοῦ συντάγματος, ἔτι δὲ καὶ τὸ τελικόν, ὅπερ ἐστὶν ὁ σκοπός... τὸ δὲ εἰδικόν τε καὶ παραδειγματικὸν νῦν λέγομεν· (My English translation:) The efficient cause of the syntagma, and also the final cause, which is the end... and we may now state the specific and exemplary cause..." Mark was possibly made attentive to this custom through reading Scholarios' translation-commentary of Radulphus Brito's *Ars Vetus*. See Scholarios, *Prolegomènes à la logique et à "l'Isagoge" de Porphyre*, leçon 5, in Jugie, Sidéridès, Petit, eds., *Oeuvres Complètes*, Vol. 7 (Paris: Maison de la Bonne, 1936), p. 31, lines 1-29: "Ποιητικὴ τοίνυν αἷτία τούτου τοῦ βιβλίου... Ὑλικὴ δὲ αἷτία ἐν τούτῳ τῷ βιβλίῳ... Ἡ δε εἰδικὴ αἷτία ἐν τούτῳ τῷ βιβλίῳ... Ἡ τελικὴ αἷτία... Τούτων τῶν τεσσάρων αἷτιων... (My English translation:) Now these are the designated causes of this book... And the material cause of this book [is]... And the specific cause of this book is... The final cause [is]... These are the four causes..." Cf. Demetracopoulos, "Palamas

Pertinently, Ioannes VIII not only commissioned some of the most highly educated contemporaneous Byzantine clerics and secular officials to this commission but also those who were more receptive towards ecclesial reunion.⁴⁹⁹ This inference can be evinced when considering that Mark's former student and colleague within this commission, Scholarios, provided Mark with Greek translations of excerpts from Latin literature which Scholarios believed could facilitate reconciliation on those issues which divided the Byzantine and Latin Churches, and likely included certain works of Duns Scotus.⁵⁰⁰ For example, within his *Συλλογιστικά Κεφάλαια πρὸς Λατίνους περὶ τῆς τοῦ ἁγίου Πνεύματος ἐκπορεύσεως* (*Syllogistic Chapters Against the Latins on the Holy Spirit's Procession*), Mark refuted the putatively Thomistic notion that individuating principles are universally applicable.⁵⁰¹ Mark likely invoked Scotus' *Ordinatio* to exemplify that distinctions amongst composite creatures are not caused by matter given that matter as such cannot be divided nor distinguished as it

Transformed," p. 368 n. 327; Demetracopoulos, "Thomas Aquinas' Impact on Late Byzantine Theology and Philosophy: The Issues of Method or 'Modus Sciendi' and 'Dignitas Hominis'," in Andreas Speer and Philipp Steinkrüger, eds., *Knotenpunkt Byzanz: Wissensformen und kulturelle Wechselbeziehungen* (Berlin: De Gruyter, 2012), pp. 333-410 (343).

⁴⁹⁹ For example, Syropoulos, *Les Mémoires*, 3.8, Laurent, ed., p. 168, highlighted that this commission also included Ioannes VIII's confessor, Gregorios Melissenos, who was subsequently appointed as Ecumenical Patriarch between 1443 and 1445 principally given his sustained adherence to the Ferraran-Florentine reunion. Syropoulos also listed Metropolitan Joasaph of Ephesus, Anthony, Bishop of Heraclea, the *μεσάζων* Kritopoulos, as well as a number of *σταυροφόροι*.

⁵⁰⁰ Monfasani, "The Pro-Latin Apologetics of the Greek Émigrés to Quattrocento Italy," in Antonio Rigo, ed., *Byzantine Theology and Its Philosophical Background* (Turnhout: Brepols, 2011), pp. 160-86 (165-8), claimed that Mark's *Capita Syllogistica adversus Latinos de Spiritus Sancti ex Solo Patre Processione* alongside Scholarios' response to this work were produced prior to their departure for the Italian Peninsula.

⁵⁰¹ I.e., the distinction *per oppositionem* between the Triune Persons within the Godhead, the distinction *per quantitatem* in separate substances, and the distinction *per materiam* within matter-form composites. For the first distinction, see e.g., Aquinas, *In I Sententiarum*, d. 34, q. 1, a. 1, ad. 5; *Summa Theologiae*, I, q. 28, a. 3, in *Opera Omnia*, Vol. 4. *Editio Leonina*, pp. 227-9. For the second, see e.g., Aquinas, *Summa contra Gentiles*, II, c. 93, in *Opera Omnia*, Vol. 13, pp. 363-6. *Editio Leonina*, pp. 363-6; *Summa Theologiae*, I, q. 50, a. 4, in *Opera Omnia*, Vol. 5. *Editio Leonina*, pp. 10-1. For the third distinction, see e.g., Aquinas, *Sententia libri Metaphysicae*, VII, lect. 10, nn. 15-9; *Summa Theologiae*, I, q. 75, a. 4, in *Opera Omnia*, Vol. 12. *Editio Leonina*, pp. 200-1. While I cannot provide a more lucid explication of these distinctions due to word constraints, I refer you to Thomas J. DePauw, 'The Principles of Distinction in Material Substances in the Philosophy of St. Thomas and St. Albert,' *American Catholic Philosophical Quarterly* 92(4) (2018): 1-43; Christopher Hughes, 'Matter and Individuation in Aquinas,' *History of Philosophy Quarterly* 13(1) (1996): 1-16; Russell L. Friedman, *Intellectual Traditions at the Medieval University. The Use of Philosophical Psychology in Trinitarian Theology among the Franciscans and Dominicans, 1250-1350*, Vol. 1 (Leiden/Boston: Brill, 2013), pp. 51-63.

does not possess quantity and quality *per se*.⁵⁰² Rather, such a distinction is a *παρακολούθημα*, or ‘accident,’ which emerges in already actualised and distinguishable beings, and is thereby only a remote cause of individuation.⁵⁰³

Scholarios notably betrayed his awareness of some of the broader late medieval Latin Christian intellectual developments within his own oeuvres, including his *Prolegomena in Logicam et in Porphyrii Isagogen*, produced between 1433 and 1435.⁵⁰⁴ Therein, Scholarios rejected the Thomistic doctrine that *materia signata* is the individuating principle in hylomorphic composites for the late thirteenth and early fourteenth century metaphysical logician, Radulphus Brito’s doctrine that this individuating principle is ‘indivisible and signate quantity.’⁵⁰⁵ Given this background, one can plausibly hypothesise

⁵⁰² Mark of Ephesus, *Capita Syllogistica*, c. 25, Petit, ed., in *Patrologia Orientalis*, Vol. 17, p. 394, lines 1-6: “Ἡ ὕλη καθ’ αὐτήν ἐστὶν ἀδιαίρετος· ὡσπερ γὰρ ἄποιος, οὕτω καὶ ἄποσος· τὸ ἄποσον δὲ ἀδιαίρετον· τὸ ἀδιαίρετον δὲ ἀδιάκριτον· ὃ δὲ καθ’ αὐτὸ μὴ διαιρεῖται καὶ διακρίνεται, πῶς ἂν ἐτέρῳ τὴν αἰτίαν παρέχοι τῆς διακρίσεως;... (My English translation:) Matter *in se* is indivisible: for that which is without quality, this is also without quantity; and quantity is indivisible; and the indivisible is indistinguishable: and that which is indivisible and indistinguishable *in se*, how if this be the cause of the distinction?” Compare this passage to Scotus, *Ordinatio* II, dist. 3, pars. 1, q. 5, n. 131, in *Opera Omnia*, Vol. 7 (Vatican City: Typis Polyglottis Vaticanis, 1973), p. 458: “Sed quod non est in se distinctum nec diversum, non potest esse prima ratio diversitatis vel distinctionis alterius; sed materia est fundamentum naturae omnino indistinctum et indeterminatum igitur non potest esse prima ratio distinctionis vel diversitatis alterius... (My English translation:) But what is not distinct or diverse in itself cannot be the principal reason for the diversity or distinction of another; but matter is the foundation of nature, completely undifferentiated and indeterminate, therefore it cannot be the principal reason for the distinction or diversity of other [things].”

⁵⁰³ Mark of Ephesus, *Capita Syllogistica*, c. 25, Petit, ed., *Patrologia Orientalis*, Vol. 17, p. 393, lines 26-36. Compare to Scotus, *Ordinatio* II, dist. 3, pars. 1, q. 4, n. 118, in *Opera Omnia*, Vol. 7, p. 451. See Panagiotis C. Athanasopoulos, “Bessarion of Nicaea vs. Mark Eugenikos On the Thomistic *principium individuationis* in Material Composites,” in Searby, ed., *Never the Twain Shall Meet*, pp. 77-91 (80-2) Cf. Timothy B. Noone, “Universals and Individuation,” *The Cambridge Companion to Duns Scotus*, ed. by Thomas Williams (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003), pp. 100-28; Allan B. Wolter, “John Duns Scotus,” *Individuation in Scholasticism. The Later Middle Ages and the Counter-Reformation, 1150-1650*, ed. by Jorge J. E. Gracia (New York: State University of New York Press, 1994), pp. 271-98, for analyses of Scotus’ rejection of Aquinas’ doctrine of the principle of individuation and the development of his own doctrine of this principle as *haecceitas*.

⁵⁰⁴ Tinnefeld “Georgios Gennadios Scholarios,” 519.

⁵⁰⁵ Scholarios, *Prolegomènes à la logique et à “l’Isagoge” de Porphyre*, leçon 12, in Jugie, Sidéridès, Petit, eds., *Oeuvres Complètes*, Vol. 7 (Paris: Maison de la Bonne Presse, 1933), pp. 7-113 (78, lines 8-11): “τὸ ἄτομον τῆς οὐσίας ἐστὶν ἄτομον τῆ ἀδιαίρετῳ καὶ σεσημειωμένῃ ποσότητι· ὅθεν ἡ αἰτία δι’ ἣν τί ἐστὶν ἐν ἀριθμῷ ὑπάρχει τὸ τοιαύτην ἔχειν ποσότητα, ἧτις οὐ δύναται ἐν ἐτέρῳ εὐρίσκεισθαι... (My English translation:) The individual [item] of a [given] nature is individual through an indivisible and signate quantity. Wherefore, the

that Scholarios rendered certain Scotistic source material into Greek for Mark during their pre-conciliar study sessions and likely detailed to Mark that one could reconcile medieval Latin Christian theology with the Byzantine Church's canonised Palamite divine essence-energies theology through the *distinctio formalis a parte rei* which Scotus applied within his intra-Trinitarian framework.⁵⁰⁶ Scholarios also likely made Mark aware of the fact that Scotus' Trinitarian theology could be juxtaposed to the prevalent Byzantine Orthodox position concerning the *filioque*, whereby Scotus rejected Aquinas' assertion of the philosophical necessity of postulating the Spirit's dual procession *ad intra*.⁵⁰⁷ This pre-conciliar recourse to Scotism on the part of Mark and Scholarios helps to explicate how

cause of which this [item] is one in number has such a quantity, which cannot be found in another [individual item]" See Radulphus Brito, *Quaestiones super Metaphysica* V.12, rendered in Sten Ebbesen, "Radulphus Brito on the *Metaphysics*," in Jan A. Aertsen, Kenneth Emery, and Andreas Speer, eds., *Nach der Verurteilung von 1277* (Berlin and New York: De Gruyter, 2001), pp. 456-92 (460, n. 16): "duo individua solum different secundum accidens..." Cf. Kappes, *The Theology of the Divine Essence and Energies in George-Gennadios Scholarios*. Ph. D. Dissertation (Aristotle University of Thessaloniki, 2018), pp. 201-2; Gerhard Podskalsky, 'Die Rezeption der thomistischen Theologie bei Gennadios II. Scholarios (ca. 1403-1472),' *Theologie und Philosophie* 49 (1974): 305-23 (317); Monfasani "Pro-Latin Apologetics," p. 165. Pertinently, within his translation-commentary of Aquinas' *Commentarium in octo libros Physicorum Aristotelis*, which, according to Franz Tinnfeld "Georgios Gennadios Scholarios," in Carmelo Giuseppe Conticello and Vassa Conticello, eds., *La théologie byzantine et sa tradition*, Vol. 2: XIII^e-XIX^e s (Turnhout: Brepols, 2002), pp. 477-549 (518), was produced at some point before 1438, Scholarios evoked the distinction *per materiam*. See Scholarios, *Traduction du commentaire de S. Thomas d'Aquin du 'De Physico audito' d'Aristote*, Livre Premier, leçon 10, in Jugie, Sidéridès, Petit, eds., *Oeuvres Complètes*, Vol. 8 (Paris: Maison de la Bonne Presse, 1936), p. 194, lines 22-5. Cf. Aquinas, *Commentaria in octo libros Physicorum*, I, lect. 11, n. 13.

⁵⁰⁶ A number of scholars have claimed that the Scotist *distinctio formalis a parte rei* could work to reconcile the Latin Christian and Palamite metaphysics of God *ad intra*. See e.g., David Coffey, 'The Palamite Doctrine of God: A New Perspective,' *St. Vladimir's Theological Quarterly* 32 (1988): 329-58 (335); Steven Runciman, *The Last Byzantine Renaissance* (London: Cambridge University Press, 1970), p. 82.

⁵⁰⁷ See *Acta Graeca*, Gill, ed., p. 33, wherein Mark advocated that the conciliar Fathers evoke Patristic sources shared by both Churches during the initial Ferraran sessions. Cf. Scotus, *Ordinatio*, I, dist. 12, q. 1, nn. 9-10, in *Opera Omnia*, Vol. 5 (Vatican City: Typis Polyglottis Vaticanis 1959), pp. 28-30, where Scotus upholds the Latin doctrine that the Spirit proceeds from both the Father and the Son, while also acknowledging that the Latin and Byzantine Churches principally differed on the whether the Spirit proceed 'from' or 'through' the Son respectively. See also Scotus, *Ordinatio*, I, dist. 11, q. 2, nn. 40, 49, in *Opera Omnia*, Vol. 5, pp. 16, 21, for Scotus' counterresponse to Aquinas, where Scotus claims that the Son and the Spirit are distinct based upon their Personal properties, and not necessarily based upon their originate relations. Cf. Aquinas, *Summa Theologiae* I, q. 36, a. 2, corpus, in *Opera Omnia*, Vol. 4. *Editio Leonina*, p. 302. See Richard Cross, *Duns Scotus on God* (Burlington: Ashgate, 2007), pp. 203-22 for an overview of Scotus' doctrine of the Spirit's procession *ad intra*.

Ioannes VIII successfully discouraged Mark from explicitly invoking the disputed topic of the Palamite theology of God *ad intra* when engaging with the Latin Fathers at Ferrara-Florence.

Perhaps the principal significance of Mark and Scholarios cooperating prior to Ferrara-Florence for this dissertation's purposes is that Scholarios had also familiarized himself with some of the medieval Latin Christian developments in Eucharistic theology. For example, within his pre-conciliar sermon, *Περὶ τοῦ μυστηριώδους σώματος τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ* (*Concerning the Sacramental Body of Our Lord Jesus Christ*), Scholarios explicated the nature of Eucharistic transmutation in a manner which upheld the permanence of accidents of bread and wine despite their instantaneous substantial transformation:

...this Sacrament contains some substance's transmutation into [another] substance, becoming [as such] instantaneously, [but] the accidents remain not transmuted...⁵⁰⁸

Although Scholarios did not treat the moment(s) of Eucharistic consecration within this sermon *per se*, given his use of the term *μεταβολή* to describe Eucharistic transmutation, Scholarios plausibly invoked Demetrios Kydones' translation and edition of Aquinas' *Summa contra Gentiles* IV, as well as Hellenophone commentators on Aristotle's *Physics* such as Simplicios, both of which Scholarios had read during the early 1430s,⁵⁰⁹ and

⁵⁰⁸ My English translation of Scholarios, *Περὶ τοῦ μυστηριώδους σώματος τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ*, in Jugie, Sidéridès, Petit, eds., *Oeuvres Complètes*, Vol. 1, pp. 126-7: "...τουτὶ γὰρ τὸ μυστήριον **μεταβολήν** τινα περιέχον οὐσίας εἰς οὐσίαν ἐν ἀκαρεῖ γενομένην, τῶν συμβεβηκότων **ἀμεταβλήτων** μενότων..."

⁵⁰⁹ See Paolo Frassinetti, "Il codice Torinese C-2-16 contenente la versione greca della *Summa contra Gentes*, ad opera di Demetrio Cidone," in *Atti dello VIII Congresso internazionale di studi bizantini (Palermo, 3-10 aprile 1951)*, Vol. 1 (Rome: Associazione nazionale per gli studi bizantini, 1953) pp. 78-85 (80-1), who argued that Scholarios had a version of Kydones' translation-edition of the *Summa contra Gentiles*, as contained in *Taur. gr. XXIII*, produced in November 1432. Cf. Demetracopoulos, "Scholarios' *On Almsgiving*," pp. 298-9 who follows Frassinetti's dating. See Irini Balcoyiannopoulou, *Το διδακτικό εγχειρίδιο λογικής του Γεωργίου Σχολαρίου: Δομή, πηγές και καινοτομίες*, Ph. D. Diss. (University of Patras, 2018), p. 18ff, for the dating of Scholarios' reading of Simplicios' and Theodoros Metochites' Commentaries on Aristotle's *Physics*.

both of whom employed similar terminology to describe ‘transmutation.’⁵¹⁰ Thus, if the Byzantine conciliar contingent were informed that this question required resolution at an earlier stage in the proceedings, Scholarios potentially could have supported the Byzantine Church’s defence of its *in fieri* doctrine by providing his colleagues with Greek editions of medieval Latin Sacramentological literature, including those passages within Scotus’ *Ordinatio* pertaining to Eucharistic consecration. This research could potentially have helped to establish a more cogent resolution to Eucharistic consecration at the Council of Florence than that upheld within *Laetentur Caeli*.

Despite his anti-Latin polemics, Mark notably exhibited considerable receptivity to his Latin counterparts. This disposition is reflected by the fact that Mark provided the Dominican Papal envoy to Constantinople, Nicholas of Cusa, with Greek manuscripts which were being studied by the Byzantine preparatory commission. Mark also highly respected Cusa’s moderate conciliarist ecclesiology, whereby Mark and Nicholas both maintained that

⁵¹⁰ See esp. Demetrios Kydones, trans., *Summa contra Gentiles*, IV, c. 64, “...δέ... ή λύσις ή προς την αντίθεσιν, την περι τής ανισότητος του σώματος τ[οῦ] Χ[ριστο]υ προς τον τόπον τ[οῦ] ἄρτ[ου]. ήμεν γάρ οὐσί[α] του ἄρτ[ου] ἀντικρυς εις την οὐσί[αν] του σώματος **μεταβάλλεται**... (My English translation:) ...But a solution [can be found]... for the antithesis concerning the disparity between Christ’s Body and the location of the [Eucharistic] bread. For it is the substance of the bread which is transmuted in contrast to the substance of the Body.” Transcribed and edited by myself from *Vat. gr. 613*, fol. 460^v, lines 8-11, <https://digi.vatlib.it/view/MSS_Vat.gr.613> [accessed August 1st, 2023]; Simplicios, *Simplicii in Aristotelis Physicorum libros quattuor posteriores commentaria*, V, 2, ed. by Hermann Diels in *Commentaria in Aristotelem Graeca*, Vol. 10 (Berlin: G. Reimer, 1895), p. 833: “...δείκνυσι δια του την μεν κίνησιν έξ εναντίου εις εναντίον εΐναι **μεταβολήν**, μηδέν δε εΐναι τῆ οὐσία εναντίον... οὐσίαν όρων έξ οὐσίας λέγει γίνεσθαι την εις οὐσίαν **μεταβολήν** και δια τουτο και κίνησιν εΐναι εν τῆ οὐσία νομίζει, οὐκ έννοεΐ ότι εκ σπέρματος ο άνθρωπος οὐ καθό οὐσία τὸ σπέρμα, αλλά καθό δυνάμει άνθρωπος, ταύτων δε ειπεΐν εκ τῆς του ανθρώπου στερήσεως και του μη όντος.” Trans. by J. O. Urmson in *On Aristotle’s Physics 5* (London: Bloomsbury, 2014), pp. 39-40 “He proves that there is not change in substance, from the fact that change is transformation from a contrary to a contrary...Transformation into a substance comes about from a substance and he thinks that therefore there is change in substance, he does not realize that man does not come from seed in so far as seed is a substance but in that it is potentially a man, i.e., from the privation of man and from not being.” Cf. Kappes, ‘The Biblical Origin and Late-Antique Invention of the Eucharistic Term and Definition ‘Transubstantiation’,’ *Богословские труды* (2020): 1-29 (17-23).

Papal Primacy entailed that the Pope still had the responsibility to obey the canons of historical ecumenical councils.⁵¹¹

However, other historical factors indicated that internecine Latin-Byzantine conflicts would naturally have emerged within Ferrara-Florence.⁵¹² One must recall that Kalekas' anti-Palamite treatise, the *Adversus errores Graecorum*, became a significant locus within the sphere of the fifteenth century Latin and Byzantine apologetical disputes, reflected by its translation into Latin in mid-to-late 1424 by Ambrogio Traversari at the request of Pope Martin V.⁵¹³ Moreover, Kalekas' work subsequently informed Andreas Chrysoberges' own anti-Palamite treatise addressed to Bessarion, composed in 1436,⁵¹⁴ to which Mark responded by composing two treatises which expressly targeted Kalekas' *Adversus errorum Graecorum*.⁵¹⁵ Therein, Mark admonished the Thomistic application of Aristotelian philosophical axioms to the theology of God *ad intra*.⁵¹⁶ Mark also denounced Aquinas'

⁵¹¹ Conostas, "Mark Eugenikos," p. 416; *Acta Graeca*, Gill, ed., p. 91. Cf. Nicholas of Cusa, *De concordantia catholica: libri tres*, II, c. 20, ed. by Gerhard Kallen (Bonn: L. Röhrscheid, 1928), fols. 33-4.

⁵¹² The conciliar *Acta* do not describe any reaction from the Franciscan Ferraran-Florentine Fathers with regards to the evocation of Palamite theology, some of whom were appointed by Pope Eugenius to prepare a formal study into the question of the divine essence-energies distinction. See Luke Wadding, *Annales Minorum seu trium ordinum a S. Francisco Institutorum*, Vol. 11 of 32, 2nd ed., ed. by Joseph Mary Fonseca (Rome: Rochi Bernabó, 1734), p. 2; Celestino Piana, *La facoltà teologica dell'università di Firenze nel quattro e cinquecento* (Rome: Collegii S. Bonaventurae, 1977), p. 224.

⁵¹³ See Charles Stinger, *Humanism and the Church Fathers* (Albany: State University of New York Press, 1977), p. 112, who highlighted how Pope Martin V tasked Traversari with translating these two works in advance of an ecumenical council.

⁵¹⁴ See Candal, ed., 'Andreae Rhodiensis, O.P., inédita ad Bessarionem epistula (*De divina essentia et operatione*).', *Orientalia Christiana Periodica* 4 (1938): 329-71 (329-43) for evidence of Chrysoberges' reliance of Kalekas' divine essence-energies doctrine; Claudine Delacroix-Besnier, "Manuel Calécas et les Frères Chrysoberges, grecs et prêcheurs," in *Actes des congrès de la Société des historiens médiévistes de l'enseignement supérieur publique, 32e Congrès*, ed. by Patrick Boucheron (Dunkirk: Société des Historiens Médiévistes de l'Enseignement Supérieur, 2001), pp. 151-64 (158).

⁵¹⁵ For these two works, see Pilavakis, ed., *First Antirrhetic*, pp. 157-234; *Τοῦ αὐτοῦ, πρὸς τὰ δεύτερα τῶν εἰρημένων Μανουὴλ τῷ Καλέκῃ κατὰ τοῦ Συνοδικοῦ τόμου, Λόγος ἀντιρρητικός β'*, in Pilavakis, and Christian Chivu, eds., *Sfântul Marcu Evghenicul: Opere*, Vol. 2 of 2 (Bucharest: Pateres, Gândul Aprins, 2014), pp. 278-455.

⁵¹⁶ See e.g., Mark of Ephesus, *First Antirrhetic*, Pilavakis, ed., p. 178: "οὐδὲ τὸν σὸν Ἀριστοτέλην αἰδούμενος." See Stylianos G. Papadopoulos, *Ἑλληνικαὶ Μεαφράσεις Θεωμιστικῶν Ἔργων - Φιλοθωμισταὶ καὶ Ἀντιθωμισταὶ ἐν Βυζαντίῳ. Συμβολὴ εἰς τὴν ἱστορίαν τῆς Βυζαντινῆς Θεολογίας* (Athens: Βιβλιοθηκὴ τῆς ἐν Ἀθηναῖς φιλεκαὶδευτικῆς εταιρείας, 1967), p. 148ff for an overview of Mark's opposition towards the application of Aquinas' theological and philosophical tenets vis-à-vis the Spirit's procession *ad intra*.

analogisation of the Spirit's gifts to created 'habits' infused within believers' souls.⁵¹⁷ It was likely through Chrysoberges informing his former Papal Curial colleagues of these earlier conflicts, that the Benedictine Latin Father and curial *penitentarius*, Andrés de Escobar, was inspired to implore Eugenius IV to formally condemn Palamite theology on December 15th, 1437 before the formal discussions with the Byzantine contingent went underway.⁵¹⁸

In 1437, as the Byzantine contingent were readying to depart for the Italian Peninsula, the Metropolitan of Ephesus, Joasaph, passed away. Subsequently, Ioannes VIII implored Mark to accept his incardination to the Metropolitanate of Ephesus, which Mark reluctantly accepted.⁵¹⁹ Thus, both Mark and Bessarion, the two primary Byzantine orators at Ferrara-Florence, were ordained to the episcopate through Ioannes' aspiration that the most talented clerical and lay Byzantine intellectuals would effectively articulate the Byzantine Church's various doctrines, by which time Mark had likely completed his anti-Kalekan *Λόγος ἀντιρρητικός Α'*.⁵²⁰ Given that Bessarion had already begun making epistolary

⁵¹⁷ See esp. Mark of Ephesus, *First Antirrhetic*, Pilavakis, ed., pp. 177-8: "...οὕτως τῷ αὐτῷ Πνεύματι τὰ αὐτοῦ χάρισματὰ συνουσίωται, οἳ δὲ οὐδ' αὐτὸ τοῦτο συνίασιν, ὅτι καὶ ἑαυτοῖς περιπίπτουσι καὶ τοῖς πρὸς οὓς ἠυτομόλησαν Λατίνοις ἐναντιοῦνται. καὶ γὰρ δὴ τὸ μετὰ τὴν ἀνάστασιν δι' ἐμφυσήματος παρὰ τοῦ Κυρίου δοθὲν οὐκ ἔτι ἡ ὑπόστασις ἔσται τοῦ Πνεύματος, ἀλλὰ τι κτίσμα... καὶ θαυμάζω πῶς οὐ φεύγουσιν ἑαυτοῦς ἐπὶ τοιαύτας ἀσεβείας ὑποφερόμενοι... (My English translation:) Indeed, by the same Spirit are the [Pneumatic] charisms substantially unified, but these men [i.e., Kalekas and his followers such as Chrysoberges] do not even agree on this [doctrine], because they counteract themselves and they also oppose the Latins, who they have defected from. For if [one upheld their doctrine of the Spirit's charisms], what was given through inspiration following the Resurrection by the Lord would not be the Spirit's hypostasis. Instead, it will be some creature... and I wonder how they do not depart from their own persisting with such impiety."

⁵¹⁸ See Andrés de Escobar, *Tractatus polemico-theologicus de Graecis errantibus*, Candal, ed., (Rome: Pontificium Institutum Orientalium Studiorum, 1952), p. 83 (par. 94). Cf. the 1438 denunciation of John Lei, *Tractatus Ioannis Lei O.P. "De visione beata" Nunc primum in lucem editus*, Candal, ed., Studi e Testi 228 (Vatican City: Bibliotheca Apostolica Vaticana, 1963), pp. 83-4, 193. See *Acta Graeca*, Gill, ed., pp. 346-50 for a description of Mark's and Montenero's debates in 1439. Cf. *Acta Latina*, Hofmann, ed., p. 177, for Santacroce's positive account of Montenero's opposition towards Palamite theology during this debate as well as Torquemada's posthumous denunciation of Palamite theology within Candal, ed., *Apparatus*, p. 86

⁵¹⁹ Syropoulos, *Les Mémoires*, 3.11, Laurent, ed., p. 172. Cf. Alexandros Koriakidis, *Ἰωάσαφ Ἐφέσου, †1437 (Ἰωάννης Βλαδύντερος), Βίος, ἔργα, διδασκαλία* (Athens: ΠΑΝΑΓΟΠΟΥΛΟΣ ΝΕΚΤΑΡΙΟΣ, 1992).

⁵²⁰ Syropoulos, *Les Mémoires*, 3.23, Laurent, ed., p. 184. Given that Bessarion noted how he was ordained as Metropolitan of Nicaea on November 11th, 1437, Mark was plausibly incardinated this same day. See Peter Schreiner, ed., *Chronik 103*, in *Die byzantinischen Kleinchroniken*, Vol. 1 (Vienna: Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, 1975). p. 659.

inquiries into Latin doctrine, reflected by his epistle to Andreas Chrysoberges, the responses he received from Andreas likely helped to verify for the Byzantine conciliar contingent that orthodox Thomistic theology and philosophy functioned to divide Eastern Orthodoxy and its canonisation of the Palamite theology of God *ad intra* with the Latin Church.⁵²¹ Given Mark's aforementioned adherence to Palamism, it is evident that Mark acknowledged the ecumenical potential of Scotistic theology on this score, as exemplified by his explicit evocation of Scotistic metaphysical axioms concerning the divine Personal distinctions *ad intra* when addressing Giovanni Montenero within the Florentine debates concerning the *filioque*.⁵²²

Pertinently, throughout Ferrara-Florence, Mark declined to formally address the issue of Palamite theology, which likely resulted from Mark's intention to establish ecclesial reunion through recourse to Scotism.⁵²³ However, Mark could reasonably have anticipated

⁵²¹ However, Bessarion and Mark were acquainted only indirectly on the basis of their mutual instruction under Pletho, whom Bessarion likely studied under between 1431 and 1433, as well as through their friendship with Scholarios. Cf. Raymond-Janin Loenertz, 'Pour la biographie du Cardinal Bessarion,' *Orientalia Christiana Periodica* 10 (1944): 129-39 (133).

⁵²² See the *Acta Graeca's* account of the Trinitarian debate which took place at Florence on March 2nd, 1439, wherein utilised Scotistic principles with regards to God *ad intra* against Giovanni Montenero. *Acta Graeca*, Gill, ed., p. 267: "...τὴν ὑπόστασιν καὶ τὴν οὐσίαν εἰ καὶ ἀπλῶς διαφέρειν ἡγοῦνται, ὡς δῆλον, ὃν τρόπον διαφέρει τοῦ κοινοῦ τὸ ἴδιον, καθὼς καὶ ὁ Μέγας Βασίλειος πρὸς τὸν ἀδελφὸν Γρηγόριον γράφει: 'καὶ ὃν τρόπον οὐσίαν διαφέρειν ἀνθρώπου τῷ κοινῷ λόγῳ' εἰπεῖν, καὶ πρόσωπον καὶ ὑπόστασις... (My English translation:) ...the [divine] essence and hypostasis differ absolutely, as is clear, in the way that a universal and a property differ, just as Basil the Great wrote to Gregory [of Nyssa] his brother, 'And in the way that the substance of man differs from person and hypostasis in the universal concept.'" Compare this passage's conclusions to Scotus, *Reportata Parisiensa I*, d. 33, q. 2, in *Joannis Duns Scoti Doctoris Subtilis, Ordinis Minorum. Opera Omnia*, Vol. 22 (Paris: L. Vivès, 1894), p. 402: "Secunda etiam opinio dicit quod relation dicit alium modum super essentiam, modus tamen non est simpliciter, sed modus talis rei. Sed non sic pono ego essentiam et relationem distingui realiter secundum quid, quia tunc esset sensus, quod distinction essentia et relationis esset distinction realitatum secundum quid, quod est inconveniens, quia essentia est res simpliciter, cum sit formaliter infinita... (My English translation:) the second opinion also states that the relation [between the divine essence and hypostases] posits a further mode over the essence, yet the mode is not absolute, but is a mode of a given *res*. But I do not think that essence and relation are really distinct *secundum quid*, because there would then be a sense in which the [divine] essence-relation distinction is a distinction of non-absolute realities, which is inappropriate, because the [divine] essence is a *res* absolutely, since it is formally infinite..." Cf. Christiaan Kappes, 'A Latin Defense of Mark of Ephesus at the Council of Ferrara-Florence (1438-9),' *The Greek Orthodox Theological Review* 59 (2014): 159-230 (174-7, 213-4, n. 132).

⁵²³ According to Syropoulos, *Les Mémoires*, 3.8, Laurent, ed., p. 168, Ioannes VIII regarded the *filioque* as the principal cause of the Latin-Eastern Orthodox schism and attempted to undermine any public conciliar discussion of Palamite theology.

that Palamism would emerge as a locus of debate within the council based upon the inference that the anti-Palamism of Andreas Chrysoberges, who, in virtue of his former office as the *Magister Sacri Palatii*, as well as the fact that he had been formally invited by Pope Eugenius to function as a conciliar Father in April 1437, could logically be interpreted to have represented the Papal Curia's own doctrinal inclinations.⁵²⁴ Given that Chrysoberges has been shown to have been close correspondent of Kalekas, Mark likely perceived Chrysoberges' writings to be a substantial revivification of Kalekas' anti-Palamism. This claim can be supported by the fact that Mark likely composed his *Λόγος ἀντιρρητικός β* (*Second Antirrhetic*) overly countering Kalekas around 1437, having likely been made aware of Pope Eugenius inviting Chrysoberges to the council based upon Bessarion's epistolary correspondence with Chrysoberges.

To summarise this section, one can glean that Mark's pre-conciliar reading of liturgiological sources such as Nicholas Kabasilas' *Ἐρμηνεία* help to account for the nature of Mark's argumentation and theological source material which section four of this Chapter will be shown to have evoked within his Eucharistic *Λίβελλος*.⁵²⁵ Nonetheless, by considering how Mark's investigations into other Church-dividing theological questions such as the *filioque*, Papal Primacy, and the divine essence-energies distinction, preoccupied so much of his research within the pre-conciliar study commission, one can partly contextualise why, alongside the factors of time and material constraints, Mark was limited in his capacity to fully substantiate his arguments supporting the Byzantine Church's *de facto* doctrine of Eucharistic consecration by addressing some of the literary source material, such as the excerpts from Augustine's oeuvres, which Torquemada had utilised in the *Sermo Prior*.

⁵²⁴ De Halleux, "L'activité d'André Chrysoberges," 423-48; Gill, *Council of Florence*, p. 76.

⁵²⁵ Fonkič and Poljakov, 'Markos Eugenikos als Kopist,' 19-21.

4.3. The Provenance of Mark's Eucharistic *Λίβελλος*.

4.3.1. Putting Into Context Mark's Pessimism towards the Council's Prospect for Reunion.

Having detailed the importance of Mark's background to analysing Mark's argumentation and methodology within his Eucharistic *Λίβελλος*, this section will now put Mark's pessimism towards ecclesial reunion into context and address how this pessimism informed the production and the contents of this *Λίβελλος*. One must emphasise that Mark's pre-conciliar openness towards ecclesial reunion, insofar as this reunion did not compromise Eastern Orthodox doctrine and practice, was also made manifest in the early stages of Ferrara-Florence, particularly in the epistle Mark composed to Pope Eugenius at Cesarini's suggestion during the opening conciliar sessions at Ferrara in April 1438.⁵²⁶ Therein, Mark lauded Eugenius' intention to establish ecclesial unity, while maintaining that true unity could not be effectuated unless the Latin Church charitably removed the *filioque* clause and refrained from using azymes in the Eucharist.⁵²⁷

By spring 1439, Mark had withdrawn from the public conciliar process, preferring to remain in isolation given his poor health.⁵²⁸ Mark was also likely overwhelmed by what he perceived to be unauthentic methods employed by some of his Latin counterparts within

⁵²⁶ Syropoulos, *Les Mémoires*, 5.3, Laurent, ed., p. 258.

⁵²⁷ See *Acta Graeca*, Gill, ed., pp. 28-34.

⁵²⁸ Mark of Ephesus, *Marci Ephesii Relatio de Rebus a Se in Synodo Florentina Gestis*, 2, Petit, ed., in *Patrologia Orientalis*, Vol. 17, 308, line 16: "...μη παρόντος έμοϋ δια την άσθένιαν..."

the preceding conciliar discussions,⁵²⁹ especially by Andreas Chrysoberges, who, as stated, was also a prominent participant in the pre-conciliar Latin Christian anti-Palamite polemics. For instance, writing following the conclusion of the Council, Ioannes Eugenikos recorded that, at the Florentine debates concerning Purgatory, Chrysoberges instigated an intense rhetorical assail against Mark, which exposed the Byzantine Fathers to the forensic sharpness which, as detailed in Chapter Three, the Dominican Order would have formed brethren such as Chrysoberges to engage in.⁵³⁰ Taking these factors into consideration, Mark had eschewed from participating within the final conciliar sessions concerning the Spirit's Procession on March 21st and 24th and thenceforth entered into seclusion.⁵³¹

As alluded to above, the inauthentic scholarship on the part of the Latin Fathers also diminished Mark's belief that the council could effectuate a mode of ecclesial reunion grounded in the ecumenically venerated Patristic and canonical authorities. For example, during the third session of the debates in Ferrara concerning the *filioque* clause's canonical validity on October 16th, 1438, likely through Chrysoberges' instigation,⁵³² Cesarini officially recited from a putatively primitive codex including the Second Council of Nicaea's *Acta*

⁵²⁹ See Syropoulos, *Les Mémoires*, 10.1-2, Laurent, ed., pp. 474, 476, who noted how Mark was absent for the initial discussions in June 1439 between the Byzantine Fathers and Pope Eugenius regarding the issues of divergence still to be resolved. As detailed in the *Acta Slavica Concilii Florentini, Narrationes et documenta*, ed. by Joannes Krajcar. *Concilium Florentinum Documenta et Scriptores*, Series B, Vol. 11 (Rome: Pontificium Institutum Orientalium Studiorum, 1976), pp. 63-5, despite recovering from his illness which had begun around March 1439, following the conclusion of the debates concerning papal primacy during late spring 1439, Mark continued to remain in seclusion through to the formal signing of *Laetentur Caeli* in July 1439.

⁵³⁰ For example, Ioannes Eugenikos elucidated the nature and intensity of Chrysoberges' method at the outset of the conciliar debates on Purgatory in *Antirrhetic of the Decree of the Council of Ferrara-Florence*, 8, Rossidou-Koutsou, ed., p. 28, stating how Chrysoberges employed "...τοῦ φρικτοῦ διαλεκτικοῦ θωμᾶ... ἐξ ἑλληνικῶν εἴτουν ἀριστοτελικῶν ἀρχῶν ὠρμημένην..."

⁵³¹ See esp. Syropoulos, *Les Mémoires* 8.5, Laurent, ed., p. 394; Cf. Joseph Gill, *The Council of Florence* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1959), p. 118.

⁵³² Cf. Scholarios, *Examen de quelques passages des Pères Latins sur la procession du Saint-Esprit*, 2, in Jugie, Sidéridès, Petit, eds., *Oeuvres Complètes*, Vol. 3, pp. 52-3. Mark of Ephesus, *Confessio Fidei*, 2, Petit, ed., *Patrologia Orientalis*, Vol. 17, p. 438.

whose *Ἦρος* stated that the Spirit proceeds from the Father *et ex filio*.⁵³³ As Syropoulos recounted, when the Byzantine delegation subsequently examined this text within their private session, they mocked Chrysoberges given that Cesarini made this claim merely on the basis of a single Latin codex with no known textual precedent in either the Latin or Hellenophone manuscripts, leading Pletho to subsequently highlight the interpolated nature of this phrase to his Latin counterparts.⁵³⁴ Likewise, during the second public session at Florence concerning the Spirit's procession on March 10th, 1439, Giovanni Montenero evoked a codex of *Adversus Eunomium* attributed to Basil the Great, which had significant textual variations to this work's Greek manuscript tradition.⁵³⁵

While Mark conceded that Constantinople contained a few codices which exposted Montenero's edition, he highlighted that many other codices, especially the most primitive, offered a different reading. Thus, Mark claimed that Montenero's edition had been

⁵³³ See *Iuliani Cesarini Cardinalis S. Angeli Epistola V*, in Laurentius Mehus, ed., *Ambrosii Traversarii generalis Camaldulensium aliorumque ad ipsum, et ad alios de eodem Ambrosio Latinae epistolae a domno Petro Canneto abbate Camaldulensi in libros 25. tributae variorum opera distinctae, et observationibus illustratae. Adcedit eiusdem Ambrosii vita in qua historia litteraria Florentina ab Anno MCXCII usque ad Annum MCCCCXL* (Florence: Ex typographio Caesareo, 1759), cols. 975-7 (976). Herein, within an epistle addressed to Traversari dated to October 17th, 1438, Cesarini described how he genuinely believed that Nicholas of Cusa imported and provided him with a codex delineating the *Acta* of the Second and Third Councils of Constantinople and the Second Council of Nicaea, wherein the phrase *et ex Filio* was included in the Creed, but which could barely be discerned given a poor attempt to erase this phrase from his edition. See Gill, *Council of Florence*, p. 150.

⁵³⁴ Syropoulos, *Les Mémoires* 6.31, Laurent, ed., pp. 330-2.

⁵³⁵ Of the most controverted passages, Mark's edition stated: "Ἀξιώματι μὲν γὰρ δευτερεύειν τοῦ υἱοῦ παραδίδωσιν ἴσως ὁ τῆς εὐσεβείας λόγος... οὕτω δηλονότι καὶ τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον, εἰ καὶ ὑποβέβηκε τὸν υἱὸν τῆ τε τάξει καὶ τῷ ἀξιώματι..." (My English translation:) For [the Spirit] is second to the Son in dignity is **possibly** handed down in blessed writ... and therefore in this way is the Holy Spirit below the Son in **both** order and in dignity..." Conversely, Montenero's edition stated: "Ἀξιώματι μὲν γὰρ δεύτερον τοῦ υἱοῦ παρ' αὐτοῦ τὸ εἶναι ἔχον καὶ παρ' αὐτοῦ λαμβάνον καὶ ἀναγγέλλον ἡμῖν, καὶ ὅλως τῆς αἰτίας ἐκείνης ἐξημμένον παραδίδωσιν ὁ τῆς εὐσεβείας λόγος... οὕτω δηλονότι καὶ τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον, εἰ καὶ ὑποβέβηκε τὸν υἱὸν τῆ τάξει καὶ τῷ ἀξιώματι..." (My English translation:) For [the Spirit] is second to the Son in dignity, **having and receiving from Him His being and declaring to us and was wholly attached to Him as cause**, [as] has been handed down in blessed writ... and therefore in this way is the Holy Spirit below the Son in order and in dignity..." Both quoted from Georges Matthieu de Durand, 'Un passage du III livre Contre Eunome de S Basile dans la tradition manuscrite,' *Irénikon Chevetogne* 54(1) (1981): 36-52 (37). See Bernard Sesboué, "Introduction," in Sesboué, Georges Matthieu de Durand, Louis Doutreleau, eds., *Basile de Césarée: Contre Eunome: suivi de Eunome Apologie*, Vol. 2 (Paris: Éditions du Cerf, 1983), p. 146, for an analysis of the of the various 'Greek' and 'Latin' editions of this text, and wherein the editors argue that the former, as upheld by Mark, was that authentically composed by Basil.

subsequently interpolated by later Latin Christian adherents of the *filioque*.⁵³⁶ Mark's suspicions towards Montenero's source material was somewhat justified as scholars including Bernard Sesboüé have highlighted that Mark accurately posited that his edition was authentically Basil's, while inaccurately attributing the source of the interpolations in Montenero's edition, whose version also circulated before the emergence of the East-West Schism during the eleventh century. According to Sesboüé, the interpolations in Montenero's edition were likely a subsequent conglomeration of literary excerpts from Eunomios and his circle added on to Basil's work.⁵³⁷

On June 16th, 1439, Mark was nonetheless commissioned to produce a written response to Torquemada's *Cedula* and *Sermo Prior* which Mark produced under a strict timeframe between June 16th and 19th, 1439, the contents of which the next section of this Chapter will analyse.⁵³⁸

4.4. An Analysis of Mark's Use of His Literary Sources within His *Λίβελλος*.

Having examined the broader background to Mark's composition of his Eucharistic *Λίβελλος*, this section will analyse how Mark utilized his liturgical and theological authorities within this conciliar treatise and to what extent his use of these authorities held greater or lesser coherence than that of Torquemada's two *Sermones*. Overall, the author aims to exemplify that the foundational motif within Mark's *Λίβελλος* was his typologisation of the

⁵³⁶ *Acta Graeca*, Gill, ed., p. 296.

⁵³⁷ Sesboüé, "Introduction," in *Basile de Césarée: Contre Eunome*, Vol. 2, pp. 146-7, n. 1. Cf. Michel Van Parys, 'Quelques remarques à propos d'un texte controversé de Saint Basile au Concile de Florence,' *Irénikon* 40 (1967): 6-14.

⁵³⁸ See Petit, ed., *Patrologia Orientalis*, Vol. 17, p. 314 for the dating of this work.

epiclesis to the Hellenophone Mariological doctrine of the ‘pre-purified’ Virgin, particularly as mediated through his reading of John of Damascus’ *Ἐκδοσις*.

Regarding the structure of the *Λίβελλος*, Mark began by delineating a threefold classification of authorities which would inform his Eucharistic theology throughout the work, namely, the Divine Liturgy itself, the Holy Apostles who authoritatively legislated and commented on the Divine Liturgy, and the Holy Fathers and Doctors of the Church, who succeeded the Holy Apostles.⁵³⁹ Significantly, Mark asserted that the Orthodox Churches continued to uphold these sets of authorities, a claim which Mark reiterated at two further points within the *Λίβελλος* in order to structurally subdivide his treatise.⁵⁴⁰ Thus, Mark aimed to exemplify that the Orthodox Church had authentically preserved those sacred customs bestowed by Christ and His Apostles themselves. Moreover, Mark’s evocation of the Sacred Liturgy and its relationship to the Church’s received Apostolic Tradition served to counterpose Torquemada’s skepticism towards the *Liturgy of St James’* purported Apostolic provenance, alongside the putative authorship of both the *Liturgies of St Basil* and *St John Chrysostom*.⁵⁴¹

Mark continued by elucidating that the *Λίβελλος* intended to exemplify that none of these authorities affirmed that Eucharistic transformation is strictly effectuated through the dominical words’ recitation; rather, the Eucharistic gifts are initially hallowed by a divine operation upon the recitation of the dominical words before this operation is perfected

⁵³⁹ Mark of Ephesus, *Libellus de consecratione*, 1, Petit, ed., in *Patrologia Orientalis*, Vol. 17, p. 426.

⁵⁴⁰ Mark of Ephesus, *Libellus de consecratione*, 6 and 7, Petit, ed., in *Patrologia Orientalis*, Vol. 17, p. 432: “Ἡμεῖς μὲν οὖν ταῦτα παρὰ τῶν ἁγίων ἀποστόλων καὶ τῶν ἐκείνους ἐκδεξαμένων παραλαβόντες καὶ κατέχομεν ἀμεταποιήτως καὶ τὸν γινόμενον ἐπ’ αὐτοῖς ἀποδίδομεν λόγον...(My English translation:) We [the Orthodox Churches] have received these things from the holy Apostles and from those who were instructed by them, and we have received these things without delay, and the teaching which was given by them.”; p. 433: “Ἡμεῖς μὲν γὰρ ἀκολουθοῦντες τοῖς ἱεροῖς ἀποστόλοις καὶ διδασκάλοις κατὰ τὰς ὑπ’ αὐτῶν παραδεδομένας ἐκθέσεις...(My English translation:) For we [the Orthodox Churches, following the holy Apostles and teachers according to the traditions which we have received from them...”

⁵⁴¹ See *Acta Latina*, Hofmann, ed., pp. 238-9.

through the petitioning of the epiclesis and its concomitant manual blessing of the Eucharistic gifts'⁵⁴²

Mark pertinently arranged the four Eucharistic Prayers which he explicated and analysed in their putatively chronological order of composition. This fact reflects the degree to which Mark's theological methodology was informed by an emphasis on the historical provenance of his liturgical and theological source material, in contradistinction to the methodology which Torquemada has been shown to have employed in the *Sermo Prior*.⁵⁴³ Subsequently, by delineating and analysing the arguments put forward by a selection of Patristic literary sources, Mark sought to provide a succinct hermeneutical guide regarding these four Eucharistic Prayers for his readership. Taking these factors into consideration, the liturgical and Patristic source material which Mark evoked within this second section included four Eucharistic Prayers of the Byzantine Rite, namely, the *Liturgies of St Basil, St James, and St John Chrysostom*, as well as the *Apostolic Constitutions* which were conventionally ascribed to Pope St Clement I, the four of which Mark explicated to establish the precedence of a consecratory epiclesis within the earliest Eucharistic Prayers celebrated by the universal Church. In addition, Mark also evoked a number of works ascribed to four Hellenophone theologians who bore considerable doctrinal authority within both the Eastern Orthodox and Roman Catholic Communion of Churches, including Basil the Great, John Chrysostom, Pseudo-Dionysius and John of Damascus.⁵⁴⁴

Mark was evidently highly concerned with fulfilling his request from Ioannes VIII to defend the Byzantine Rite's heritage against the accusation from certain Latin Fathers that,

⁵⁴² Mark of Ephesus, *Libellus de consecratione*, 1, ed. by Petit in *Patrologia Orientalis*, Vol. 17, p. 426; Kappes, *Epiclesis Debate*, p. 134.

⁵⁴³ Kappes, *Epiclesis Debate*, p. 135.

⁵⁴⁴ Cf. Kappes, *Epiclesis Debate*, p. 135.

prior to the council, the Byzantine Fathers had altered their Church's Eucharistic Prayers through interpolating consecratory epicleses. Mark also sought to defend this Byzantine liturgical tradition in response to Torquemada's dismissal of the Byzantine Rite's liturgical testimony to the consecratory epiclesis given Torquemada's belief that neither Basil nor Chrysostom, the putative authors of the Eucharistic Prayers ascribed to their name, were sufficiently weighty authorities to alter the Eucharistic form and matter. In addition, Mark sought to counteract Torquemada's skepticism concerning whether the Byzantine Rite's *Anaphora of St James* was authentically composed by the Apostle James the Less.⁵⁴⁵ As will be exemplified, Torquemada eschewed from questioning the authenticity behind the provenance of the Byzantine Rite's Eucharistic epicleses within his *Sermo Alter*, after Ioannes VIII likely postulated the arguments put forward in Mark's *Λίβελλος* during a meeting with Cesarini before the public conciliar debate on June 20th. Likely in response to the weight of Mark's extensive compilation of liturgical textual authorities, within his *Sermo Alter*, Torquemada will be shown to have altered his apologetical strategy by undermining a literal interpretation of these authorities which understood their epicleses to possess consecratory power. Nonetheless, there was a notable lacuna concerning Mark's authorial strategy within the *Λίβελλος*, namely, that he ceased to address a number of the putative Latin Patristic authorities which Torquemada had invoked within his *Cedula* and *Sermo Prior*. This lacuna likely resulted from Mark's aforementioned skepticism of the Latin Fathers' earlier recourse to literary source material which was not authentically witnessed within the Byzantine literary sphere. Moreover, the time constraints under which Mark composed the

⁵⁴⁵ *Acta Latina*, Hofmann, ed., p. 239; Kappes, *Epiclesis Debate*, pp. 135-7.

λίβελλος entailed that he was forced to prioritise and exclude source material based upon what Mark believed would optimally fulfil Ioannes VIII's request.

Returning to Mark's authorial strategy, from Mark's perspective, the Byzantine Rite's Eucharistic Prayers were most accurately interpreted according to the liturgiologies of John of Damascus, and of Basil and Chrysostom, given Mark's belief that the *Liturgies of St Basil* and *St John Chrysostom* were authentically produced by their ascribed Fathers.

Subsequently, Mark's liturgical hermeneutic evinces the Mariological undertone of the broader late medieval Byzantine interpretative tradition regarding Eucharistic transmutation, alongside the fact that such a Mariological exegesis had a basis within both the Hellenophone and the Latin Christian liturgical scholiastic inheritance and was thereby not an innovation on Mark's part.

Thereupon, Mark transitioned towards directly countering Torquemada's exegesis of Chrysostom's *Εἰς τὴν προδοσίαν τοῦ Ἰούδα* and Pseudo-Dionysius' *De Ecclesiastica Hierarchia*, in contradistinction to the more apologetic methodology hitherto. This transition was particularly informed by Mark's intention to undermine Torquemada's recourse to Chrysostom for the purpose of demonstrating the epiclesis' non-consecratory nature and that the Eucharistic form must strictly be the dominical words. Mark also sought to refute Torquemada's exegesis of Pseudo-Dionysius, whom Torquemada had invoked to undermine the claim that the epiclesis perfected Eucharistic consecration, a claim which had been advocated by Bessarion and Isidore, by locating Pseudo-Dionysius' liturgical expositions in light of the Hellenophone liturgical and Patristic traditions. Mark thereby aimed to exhibit that Pseudo-Dionysius' conception of the Eucharistic form starkly diverged from Torquemada's belief in the dominical words' unique consecratory power.

Subsequently, Mark moved towards providing a more concrete admonition of the Latin Rite's Eucharistic praxis. Through invoking Pseudo-Dionysius, Mark particularly criticized the Latin discipline of leaving the pre-consecrated host unveiled, in contradistinction to the liturgical praxes detailed within *De Ecclesiastica Hierarchia*. From this criticism, Mark sought to exemplify that the Byzantine Church inherited a liturgical patrimony more concordant with this Patristic witness.

Mark also attacked the prevalent Latin praxis of administering communion under one kind, signifying the Byzantine Fathers' awareness of the Latin Church's internecine engagement in the Hussite Controversy at Basel. As discussed in Chapter Three, the Latin Church sought to defend this practice against the mutual emphasis of the various Hussite parties on *utraquism*, which these parties evoked to cultivate resistance against the Latin Church within Bohemia.⁵⁴⁶ This awareness partly resulted from the fact that, at Basel, Ioannes VIII formally objected to the Latin Fathers collocating the Byzantine conciliar contingent with the Hussites.⁵⁴⁷ Thus understood, Mark's characterization of this practice as an innovation was likely intended to undermine his Latin counterparts' perceived

⁵⁴⁶ See John of Ragusa, *Tractatus de reductione Bohemorum*, ed. by the Delegates of the Imperial Academy of Sciences, in *Monumenta conciliorum generalium seculi decimi quinti. Concilium Basiliense. Scriptores*, Vol. 1 of 4 (Vienna: Officinae typographicae Aulæ et Status, 1857), p. 258, records how a number of Bohemian Hussites entered Basel on November 10th, 1432, waving a banner which included the phrase "veritas omnia vicit" with a depiction of a chalice. In response to the staunch adherence of Hussite theologian such as Jan Rokycana to the principle that, through *utraquism*, the believer could participate in Christ most fully, within a public session held on January 1st, 1434, the Basilean Father, Juan de Palomar maintained that those practising *utraquism* seriously violated divine law. See Aegidius Carlerius, *Liber de legationibus*, in *Monumenta conciliorum generalium seculi decimi quinti*, Vol. 1, pp. 468-9. Cf. *Postilla Jana Rokycany*, ed. by František Šimek, Vol. 2 of 2 (Prague: České Akademie Věd a Umění Bursík, 1929), pp. 703, 733-5.

⁵⁴⁷ Indeed, the extent of the intra-Byzantine awareness of the Hussite Controversy partly influenced a number of Bohemian Hussites to convert to Eastern Orthodoxy following the Byzantine Imperial contingent's return to Constantinople after the Council. See Marie-Hélène Blanchet, "La réaction byzantine à l'Union de Florence (1439): le discours antiromain de la Synaxe des orthodoxes," in Blanchet and Frédéric Gabriel, eds., *Réduire le schisme? Ecclésiologies et politiques de l'Union entre Orient et Occident (XIII^e-XVIII^e siècles)* (Paris: ACHCByz, 2013), pp. 181-96 (187-8); Cf. Mildad Paulová, 'L'empire byzantine et les Tchèques aant le chute de Constantinople,' *Byzantinoslavica* 14 (1953): 158-225 for an extensive treatment of the interactions between the Byzantine Empire and Church with Bohemian Hussite partisans.

overconfidence regarding their own liturgical theology and praxis. As will be elucidated, Mark's denunciation of communion under one kind was informed by the fact that he had previously attended the Roman Curial liturgy before of the public conciliar sessions.⁵⁴⁸

4.4.1. An Analysis of Mark's Use of Liturgical Source Material.

It has been detailed that Mark attempted to invoke liturgical literary support from texts which were acknowledged as authoritative by both the Byzantine and Latin Fathers, including the *Liturgies of St Basil* and of *St John Chrysostom*,⁵⁴⁹ the first of which was invoked by Latin Fathers including Torquemada within the Ferraran debates concerning Purgatory.⁵⁵⁰ Nonetheless, Mark also evoked the *Liturgy of St James* as a liturgical authority,⁵⁵¹ whose putative Apostolic heritage Mark upheld through recourse to the late seventh-century Synod of Trullo, particularly its thirty-second canon.⁵⁵² Mark's evocation of the *Liturgy of St James* is notable as some earlier Byzantine Rite authors including the twelfth century canonist, Theodore Balsamon, had called into question this liturgy's authenticity.⁵⁵³ Moreover, Mark evoked the *Apostolic Constitutions*, which Mark believed was also ecumenically authoritative in light of its putative composition by Pope Clement I. It is also likely that Mark believed this text possessed this level of authority after encountering how earlier Byzantine theologians such as Neilos Kabasilas, whose works Mark has been

⁵⁴⁸ Cf. Kappes, *Epiclesis Debate*, pp. 135-8 for a similar overview of the structure of Mark's *Λίβελλος*.

⁵⁴⁹ See *Marci Ephesii Oratio Prima de Igne Purgatorio*, in *Patrologia Orientalis*, Vol. 15, Petit, ed., p. 43.

⁵⁵⁰ Cf. *Deputatorium Latinorum Cedula de Purgatorio*, in *Patrologia Orientalis*, Vol. 15, Petit, ed., p. 33.

⁵⁵¹ See e.g., Mark of Ephesus, *Libellus de Consecratione*, 3, ed. by Petit in *Patrologia Orientalis*, Vol. 17, pp. 427-8.

⁵⁵² Heinz Ohme, ed., *Concilium Constantinopolitum a. 691/2 in Trullo habitum (Concilium Quinisextum)*, 32, in *Acta Conciliorum Oecumenicorum*, Vol. 4, Series 2 (Berlin: De Gruyter, 2013), p. 37.

⁵⁵³ See Theodore Balsamon, *Interrogationes Canonicae Sanctissimi Patriarchæ Alexandria Domini Marci, et Responsa ad eas Sanctissimi Patriarchæ Antiochæ, Domini Theodori Balsamonis*, in *Patrologia Graeca*, Vol. 138 (Paris: Typis J.-P. Migne, 1857), cols. 951-1012 (953d).

shown to have studied in the lead-up to Ferrara-Florence, had explicated how Pope Hadrian I affirmed Trullo's authentication of the *Apostolic Constitutions'* Apostolic heritage.⁵⁵⁴

4.4.2. The Flaws within Mark's *Λίβελλος*.

Having exemplified the various literary limitations within Torquemada's *Cedula* and *Sermo Prior* in the previous chapter, such as his use of several pseudepigrapha, which partly resulted from the highly delimiting conditions Torquemada worked under, as Mark operated under similar confines, this section will address whether similar limitations were manifest within Mark's *Λίβελλος*. Thus, it will be exemplified that, relative to Torquemada's *Cedula*, Mark's *Λίβελλος* made comparatively less errata.

As Boularand highlighted when delineating the historical development of the Latin-Byzantine epiclesis debate, Mark's ascription of the Apostolic and Patristic heritage of the Byzantine Rite's liturgical texts was overly uncritical according to modern-day scholarly criteria given that the *Apostolic Constitutions* and the *Liturgy of St James* are both broadly acknowledged by modern-day liturgical scholars to be pseudepigraphal.⁵⁵⁵ Nonetheless, Boularand evidently failed to consider that both the *Apostolic Constitutions* and the *Liturgy of St James* had a historical tradition of being acknowledged as authoritative liturgical

⁵⁵⁴ Mark of Ephesus, *Libellus de Consecratione*, 2, ed. by Petit in *Patrologia Orientalis*, Vol. 17, p. 427. See Neilos Kabasilas, *De causis dissensionum in Ecclesia et de primatu papae*, in *Patrologia Graeca*, Vol. 149 (Paris: Typis J.-P. Migne, 1865), cols. 683-730 (718). Cf. Kappes, *Epiclesis Debate*, pp. 138-9. Despite the common Latin canonical conception that Trullo was not an ecumenical council, some medieval Latin canonists such as Gratian included some of Trullo's canons within their collections. Pertinently, Gratian included a canon recognizing the authority of the *Liturgy of St James*. See *Decretum Gratiani, Pars Tertia*, dist. 1, c. 47, Friedberg, ed., in *Corpus Iuris Canonici*, Vol. 1, col. 1306. See Ester Brunet, *La ricezione del concilio quiniesecto (691-92) nelle fonti occidentalis (70-90 sec): Diritto, arte, teologia* (Paris: Bocard, 2011), pp. 17-42 for an overview of Trullo's reception history within Latin Christendom through to the fifteenth century.

⁵⁵⁵ Boularand, 'L'Épiclèse,' 260-1.

sources by both Latin and Eastern Orthodox theologians and canonists. Nonetheless, one of the major limitations within Mark's *Λίβελλος* which has been overlooked by more recent scholars who have treated the Florentine Eucharistic debate such as Christiaan Kappes is the fact that Mark claimed that the *Liturgies of St Basil* and *St John Chrysostom* were more succinct editions of the *Liturgy of St James*.⁵⁵⁶ While Mark's claim does bear some degree of accuracy given that the Byzantine Rite's *Liturgies of St James, St Basil* and *St John Chrysostom* are all within what the Anglican liturgical scholar, Bryan D. Spinks, classified as the 'Syro-Byzantine' family and were mutually influential on one another's structure and lexicon,⁵⁵⁷ this claim overlooked how the latter two Eucharistic Prayers in particular underwent quite substantive processes of redaction and interpolation in the late antique and medieval periods, independently of the *Liturgy of St James*.⁵⁵⁸

Regarding the claim that the Byzantine contingent's liturgical manuscripts had been corrupted prior to the Council, when examining the passages from the *Apostolic Constitutions* as well as the *Liturgies of St James, St Basil, and St John Chrysostom* which Mark transcribed within his *Λίβελλος* and comparing these passages to their presentation within the modern-day critical editions of these liturgies produced by Anton Hänggi and Irmgard Rahl, as explicated within this dissertation's first appendix, Mark's transcriptions

⁵⁵⁶ See Mark of Ephesus, *Libellus de consecratione*, 4, Petit, ed., in *Patrologia Orientalis*, Vol. 17, p. 428, lines 36-8: "Τούτοις ἀκολουθοῦντες καὶ οἱ μετὰ ταῦτα τὴν αὐτὴν λειτουργίαν ἐπιτεμόντες, ὃ τε μέγας Βασίλειος καὶ μετ' αὐτὸν ὁ Χρυσόστομος Ἰωάννης..."

⁵⁵⁷ Spinks, *Do This in Remembrance of Me*, p. 129. Cf. Gabriel Khouri-Sarkis, 'L'Origine syrienne de l'anaphore byzantine de saint Jean Chrysostome,' *L'Orient Syrien* 7 (1962), pp. 3-68; Mazza, *The Celebration of the Eucharist. The Origin of the Rite and the Development of Its Interpretation*, trans. by Matthew J. O'Connell (Collegeville: Liturgical Press, 1999), pp. 49-50.

⁵⁵⁸ For these developments, cf. esp. Anne Vorhes McGowan, "The Basilian Anaphoras: Rethinking the Question," in Maxwell E. Johnson, ed., *Issues in Eucharistic Praying in East and West: Essays in Liturgical and Theological Analysis* (Collegeville: Liturgical Press, 2010), pp. 219-61; Stylianos Muksuris, *The Anaphorae of the Liturgy of Sts. Addai and Mari and the Byzantine Liturgy of St. Basil the Great: A Comparative Study*. Masters Thesis (Durham University, 1999), pp. 35-85; Spinks, *Do This in Remembrance of Me*, pp. 129-36; D. R. Stuckwisch, "The Basilian Anaphoras," in Paul F. Bradshaw, ed., *Essays on Early Eucharistic Prayers* (Collegeville: Liturgical Press, 1997), pp. 109-30; Taft, 'The Authenticity of the Chrysostom Anaphora Revisited,' 5-51.

evidently betrayed no pertinent errata, excluding minute details which could be accounted for as slights of error on Mark's part as well as for the textual variants within their manuscript traditions.⁵⁵⁹

4.4.3. Mark's Use of the Analogy of the Annunciation and Incarnation with Eucharistic Transmutation

Returning to the *Λίβελλος*, Mark outlined his belief that the Annunciation and Christ's Incarnation in the Virgin's womb functioned as an analogical *topos* for Eucharistic transmutation. Mark argued that the four Eucharistic Prayers which he had previously expounded began by reciting the dominical words, which function both as an *ἀνάμνησις*, or 'commemoration,' of the Last Supper, acting as the first moment of God's intra-Eucharistic operation, while also signifying how the Spirit operated to 'hallow' and 'perfect' the bread and wine at the Last Supper.⁵⁶⁰ Hence, the priest subsequently petitions for the Spirit's gratuitous and transmutative activity through the epiclesis so that the divine activity operant upon the Eucharistic gifts through the dominical words' recitation might be 'perfected.'⁵⁶¹ According to Mark, this Pneumatic grace analogously operated upon and consummated the transmutation of the Virgin Mary's uterine flesh into Christ in accord with the Archangel Gabriel's annunciation revealed in Luke 1:35 that, 'The Holy Spirit will come

⁵⁵⁹ Cf. Kappes, *Epiclesis Debate*, pp. 140-2.

⁵⁶⁰ Paraphrased from Mark of Ephesus, *Libellus de consecratione*, 5, Petit, ed., in *Patrologia Orientalis*, Vol. 17, p. 430, lines 18-21: "Οὕτω μὲν ἅπαντες [i.e., liturgical texts] οὕτι συμφώνως προλέγουσι μὲν τὰ Δεσποτικὰ ῥήματα, καὶ δι' αὐτῶν εἰς ἀνάμνησιν ἡμᾶς ἄγουσι τοῦ τότε πραχθέντος, καὶ τὴν ἀγιαστικὴν δύναμιν ἐντᾶσι τελουμένοις..."

⁵⁶¹ Paraphrased from Mark of Ephesus, *Libellus de consecratione*, 5, Petit, ed., *Patrologia Orientalis*, Vol. 17, p. 430, lines 21-6: "ἐπεύχονται δὲ ὕστερον καὶ τὴν τοῦ ἁγίου Πνεύματος ἐπικαλοῦνται χάριν, ὥστε αὐτὴν ἐλθοῦσαν, τὰ εἰρημένα τότε τοῖς νῦν ἐφαρμόσαι καὶ τὰ προκείμενα τελειῶσαι, καὶ πρὸς τὸ δεσποτικὸν σῶμα καὶ αἷμα μεταποιῆσαι..."

upon you, and the Power of the Most High will overshadow you (*καὶ δύναμις Ὑψίστου ἐπισκιάσει σοι*).⁵⁶²

In upholding this analogy, Mark evoked John of Damascus, especially the latter's *Ἐκδοσις*. Mark thus utilised a highly venerated Byzantine and Latin theological authority, which helps to support this dissertation's conclusion that Mark's Eucharistic theology has a high degree of ecumenicity.⁵⁶³ Therein, John argued that God could 'make' the Eucharistic gifts into Christ's Body and Blood through His eternally-efficacious will, just as His Second Person became incarnate in the Virgin Mary without impregnating her through seed.⁵⁶⁴ For John, such supernatural phenomena are to be attributed to the Spirit as everything God 'made' was done through the Spirit's operation: God is revealed to have commanded plants to grow from the earth in Genesis 1:11, which, as John maintained, are cultivated through rainfall in conjunction with God's imperative.⁵⁶⁵ Likewise, when Christ commanded His Disciples to recite the dominical words 'in commemoration of' Him, when the priest petitions the Eucharistic epiclesis, this invocation functions as the context through which this Pneumatic overshadowing power dwells upon the Eucharistic gifts and cultivates their

⁵⁶² Mark of Ephesus, *Libellus de consecratione*, 5, Petit, ed., in *Patrologia Orientalis*, Vol. 17, p. 430, lines 26-30: "αὕτη γὰρ καὶ ἐν τῇ μήτρᾳ τῆς Παρθένου τὴν θεοφόρον ἐκείνην συνεστήσατο σὰρκα, κατὰ τὸ εἰρημένον πρὸς αὐτὴν ὑπὸ τοῦ ἀγγέλου· Πνεῦμα ἅγιον ἐπελεύσεται ἐπὶ σε, καὶ δύναμις Ὑψίστου ἐπισκιάσει σοι." Cf. Karpes, *Epiclesis Debate*, pp. 143-4.

⁵⁶³ See e.g., Ioannes XI Bekkos, *Ἀντιρρητικὰ τοῦ λόγου ὃν ὁ Φώτιος κατὰ Λατίνων πρὸς τινὰ φιλόσοφον Εὐσέβιον ἔγραψε, οὗ ἡ ἐπιγραφὴ Περί τῆς τοῦ Ἁγίου Πνεύματος Μυσταγωγίας*, in *Patrologia Graeca*, Vol. 141 (Paris: Typis J.-P. Migne, 1865), cols. 733, 757, wherein Bekkos regarded John of Damascus' *Ἐκδοσις* to possess an authority commensurate in weight to the Second Council of Nicaea. Cf. Christos Arampatzis, "Ἡ ερμηνεία τῆς πατερικῆς γραμματείας τὸν 14^ο καὶ τὸν 15^ο αἰῶνα. Ἡ αυθεντία καὶ τὸ κύρος τοῦ ἁγίου Ἰωάννη Δαμασκηνού," in Ioannes Asemakes ed., *Donorum commutatio: studi in onore dell'arcivescovo Iannis Spiteris* (Thessaloniki: Vicariatus Apostolicus Thessalonicensis, 2010), pp. 457-68 (esp. 461). See the examples cited in 1.2 for the nature of John of Damascus' intra-Latin reception.

⁵⁶⁴ Paraphrased from John of Damascus, *Expositio fidei*, 4:13, ed. by Bonifatius Kotter in *Johannes von Damaskos. Die Schriften*, Vol. 2 (Berlin/New York: De Gruyter, 1973), p. 193, lines 66-9: "εἰ θελήσας αὐτός ὁ θεὸς λόγος ἐγένετο ἄνθρωπος καὶ τὰ τῆς ἁγίας παρθένου καθαρὰ καὶ ἀμώμητα αἱμᾶτ' ἑαυτῷ ἀσπόρως σὰρκα ὑπεστήσατο, οὐ δύναται τὸν ἄρτον ἑαυτοῦ σῶμα ποιῆσαι καὶ τὸν οἶνον καὶ τὸ ὕδωρ αἷμα;"

⁵⁶⁵ John of Damascus, *Expositio fidei*, 4.13, Kotter, ed., *Die Schriften*, Vol. 2, pp. 193, line 69-194, line 1: "Ἐἶπεν ἐν ἀρχῇ· «'Εξαγαγέτω ἡ γῆ βοτάνην χόρτου,» καὶ μέχρι τοῦ νῦν τοῦ ὑετοῦ γινομένου ἐξάγει τὰ ἴδια βλαστήματα τῷ θείῳ συνελαυνομένη καὶ δυναμουμένη προστάγματι."

transmutation like rain to plants.⁵⁶⁶ John further supported this dual-moment doctrine of divine operation in the Eucharist by invoking the aforementioned Lukan Annunciation narrative.⁵⁶⁷ Thus, within his *Λίβελλος*, Mark will be shown to have also methodologically accorded with Kabasilas by utilizing this paradigm to ground his argumentation after first invoking Luke 1:35. Indeed, this element of Mark's Sacramentological framework was not only highly faithful towards the preceding Hellenophone liturgiological tradition, but was significantly ecumenical given Mark's use of an interpretative schema with a basis in the Hellenophone and Latin Christian theological traditions.

One should at this point situate Mark's employment of this tradition of invoking the eternally effective divine *ῥῆμα* for understanding the dominical words' consecratory function within the context of the Patristic Mariological interpretative tradition of Eucharistic consecration. Through John of Damascus, Mark apprehended a terminological resonance between the Spirit's hallowing power within the consecration of the Eucharist with the overshadowing Pneumatic power described in the Annunciation. In particular, Mark's awareness of this lexical link juxtaposed with John's employment of the term *ἀγιαστική δύναμις*, or 'hallowing power,' when exegeting the Annunciation within his *In Dormitionem Sanctae Dei Genitricis Mariae, Oratio Prima*. Therein, John argued that, just as the Spirit operated within the Old Testament Prophets, so too was the Virgin purified and cleansed through this Pneumatic operation.⁵⁶⁸

⁵⁶⁶ Paraphrased from John of Damascus, *Expositio fidei*, 4:13, Kotter, ed., *Die Schriften*, Vol. 2, p. 194, lines 74-6, 83-4: "Καὶ γίνεται ὑετός τῇ καινῇ ταύτῃ γεωργία διὰ τῆς ἐπικλήσεως ἢ τοῦ ἁγίου πνεύματος ἐπισκιάζουσα δύναμις... Πνεῦμα ἅγιον ἐπιφοιτᾷ καὶ ταῦτα ποιεῖ τὰ ὑπὲρ λόγον καὶ ἔννοιαν."

⁵⁶⁷ Paraphrased from John of Damascus, *Expositio fidei*, 4:13, Kotter, ed., *Die Schriften*, Vol. 2, p. 194, lines 79-81: "φησὶν ἡ ἅγια παρθένος, «ἐπεὶ ἄνδρα οὐ γινώσκω;» Ἀποκρίνεται Γαβριὴλ ὁ ἀρχάγγελος· «Πνεῦμα ἅγιον ἐπελεύσεται ἐπὶ σέ, καὶ δύναμις ὑψίστου ἐπισκιάσει σοι.»" Cf. Luke 1:34-5. See also Kappes, *Epiclesis Debate*, pp. 144-5.

⁵⁶⁸ John of Damascus, *In Dormitionem Sanctae Dei Genitricis Mariae, Oratio Prima*, 3, in Kotter, ed., *Die Schriften*, Vol. 5 (Berlin/New York: Walter de Gruyter, 1988), pp. 471-500 (485-6): "προφήται δὲ δι' ἁγίου

Pertinently, such terminology, which was also employed within the *Liturgy of St James'* Eucharistic epiclesis, likely derived from the influence of the Alexandrian Pneumatological tradition within late antique Palestine, especially through Origen of Alexandria: Given the previously discussed emphasis upon the 'Λόγος epiclesis' within the Coptic liturgical tradition, reflected by Serapion's *Sacramentary*,⁵⁶⁹ within a fragment of his *In evangelium Joannis (In Catenis)* exegeting John 1.4, Origen characterised Christ as the Father's theophanic λόγος, which Origen interlinked with the Λόγος κυρίου spoken to Old Testament prophets like Jeremiah, elaborating that the 'lifegiving' Word 'dwells within,' these Prophets.⁵⁷⁰ Moreover, when exegeting John 3:8,⁵⁷¹ a verse located in the broader context of Christ's dialogue with Nicodemus, Origen argued that, with regards to the Spirit's Baptismal operation, the Spirit only 'dwells within' the great, πληροῖ, or 'filling them' with faith and virtue.⁵⁷²

πνεύματος προηγόρευσαν, ἡ δὲ τοῦ πνεύματος **ἀγιαστικὴ δύναμις ἐπεφοίτησε** ἐκάθηρέ τε καὶ ἡγίασε..." Kappes, *Epiclesis Debate*, pp. 145-6

⁵⁶⁹ See Hänggi and Pahl, eds., *Prex Eucharistica*, p. 129 for the anaphora in Serapion's *Sacramentary*. In addition to this 'Logos epiclesis,' a number of other historical anaphora contain epicleses which employ this motif of the Father's theophanic Δύναμις, i.e., Christ, in accord with Luke 1:35. For example, the second epiclesis of the anaphora recounted on the seventh to eighth century British Museum Tablet, which contains Coptic texts from the *Liturgy of St Mark*, which petitions the Father to 'send Your Holy Spirit and Your Power.'" See Hans Quecke, 'Ein saidischer Zeuge der Markusliturgie,' *Orientalia Christiana Periodica* 37 (1971): 40-54 (44). Cf. Mary K. Farag, 'Δύναμις Epicleses: An Athanasian Perspective,' *Studia Liturgica* 39(1) (2009): 63-79 (73-4, 76). Scholars continue to debate whether Origen definitely acknowledged a 'Logos' Eucharistic epiclesis. Cf. Bryan D. Spinks, *Do This in Remembrance of Me: The Eucharist from the Early Church to the Present Day* (London: SCM Press, 2013), pp. 50-1. See Maxwell E. Johnson, "The Archaic Nature of the Sanctus, Institution Narrative, and Epiclesis of the Logos in the Anaphora Ascribed to Serapion of Thmuis," in *Essays on Early Eucharistic Prayers*, ed. by Paul Bradshaw (Collegeville: Liturgical Press, 1997), pp. 95-106 for an overview of the Patristic basis of this development of the epiclesis and the interpretations thereupon.

⁵⁷⁰ Origen, *Fragmenta in Evangelium Joannis (in catenis)*, fr. II, in *Origenes Werke. Der Johanneskommentar*, ed. by Erwin Preuschen, *Die griechen christlichen Schriftsteller* Band 4 (10) (Leipzig: J. C. Heinrichs, 1903), p. 486.

⁵⁷¹ See *The Greek New Testament*, 4th rev. ed., Kurt Aland, Matthew Black, Johannes Karavidopoulos, Carlo M. Martini, Bruce M. Metzger, (Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft. United Bible Societies, 1993), p. 321: "τὸ πνεῦμα ὅπου θέλει πνεῖ καὶ τὴν φωνὴν αὐτοῦ ἀκούεις, ἀλλ' οὐκ οἶδας πόθεν ἔρχεται καὶ ποῦ ὑπάγει· οὕτως ἐστὶν πᾶς ὁ γεγεννημένος ἐκ τοῦ πνεύματος." All Greek New Testament quotations herein derive from this edition. *New Revised Standard Version*: "The wind blows where it chooses, and you hear the sound of it, but you do not know where it comes from or where it goes. So it is with everyone who is born of the Spirit."

⁵⁷² Paraphrased from Origen, *in Evangelium Joannis (in catenis)*, fr. XXXVII, Preuschen, ed., *Der Johanneskommentar*, p. 513: "τό ἅγιον πνεῦμα μόνοις σπουδαίοις **ἐπιφοιτᾷ**... το πνεῦμα πληροῖ τοὺς πίστιν καὶ ἀρετὴν ἔχοντας..."

Taking into consideration the root term, *πλήθω*, within this fragment, Origen invoked other New Testament examples of etymologically similar vocabulary applied to the Spirit including *Acts 2:4*'s description of how the Apostles were 'filled' with the Spirit when being imparted with the gift of tongues,⁵⁷³ such that Origen also interlinked the term *πληροῖ* with the Septuagint's use of similar terminology to describe the Spirit of God's 'dwelling' within Moses and Joshua.⁵⁷⁴ Taking into consideration that Origen taught in Caesarea in Palestine during the early-to-mid third century,⁵⁷⁵ garnering a number of disciples including Pamphilios of Caesarea who subsequently taught Eusebius of Caesarea,⁵⁷⁶ Origen and his disciples in Palestine plausibly helped to disseminate such vocabulary and its application to the Sacraments throughout the region,⁵⁷⁷ which would subsequently be expressed within the *Liturgy of St James'* epiclesis.⁵⁷⁸ For example, the *Mystagogical Catecheses*, ascribed to the fourth century Bishop of Jerusalem, Cyril, explicitly utilized the substantive of *ἐπιφοίτησις* within its Eucharistic Prayer's epiclesis. This is pertinent as several scholars have recognised that this Eucharistic Prayer likely marks a primitive form of the *Liturgy of St James'* anaphora. According to the *Mystagogical Catecheses*:

After this [i.e., the Lord's Prayer] the priest says... 'Holy are the offerings, which have received the 'indwelling' (*ἐπιφοίτησιν*) of the Holy Spirit...'⁵⁷⁹

⁵⁷³ Acts 2:4: "καὶ ἐπλήσθησαν πάντες πνεύματος ἁγίου..."

⁵⁷⁴ LXX Deut. 34:9: "καὶ Ἰησοῦς υἱὸς Ναυῆ ἐνεπλήσθη πνεύματος συνέσεως, ἐπέθηκε γὰρ Μωυσοῦς τὰς χεῖρας αὐτοῦ ἐπ' αὐτόν." Quoted from *The Septuagint with Apocrypha: Greek and English*, Lancelot C. L. Brenton, ed. (Peabody: Hendrickson, 1986), p. 279.

⁵⁷⁵ See Eusebius, *Historia Ecclesiastica*, VI, cc. XXX-XXXII, H. J. Lawlor, ed., Kirsopp Lake, trans., Vol. 2 of 2 (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1932), pp. 82-7 for Eusebius' encapsulation of Origen's activity in Caesarea.

⁵⁷⁶ See Eusebius, *Historia Ecclesiastica*, VI, c. XXXII, Lawlor, ed., Lake, trans., Vol. 2 of 2, pp. 84-7, wherein Eusebius notes that Pamphilios obtained a substantial portion of Origen's library which he bequeathed to the Caesarean Christian populace.

⁵⁷⁷ See esp. Eusebius, *Commentaria in Psalmos: 103.30*, in *Patrologia Graeca*, Vol. 23, (Paris: Typis J.-P. Migne, 1857), col. 1288, wherein Eusebius employed the term ἐπιφοιτῶν to describe the Spirit 'dwelling' in Baptism.

⁵⁷⁸ See Hänggi and Pahl, eds., *Prex Eucharistica*, pp. 246, 250, for the Eucharistic application of these angelomorphic theophanies within the Greek *Liturgy of St James'* post-Sanctus and epiclesis.

⁵⁷⁹ My translation of Cyril of Jerusalem, *Catecheses Mystagogiae Quinque*, 5.19, in *Patrologia Graeca*, Vol. 33 (Paris: Typis J.-P. Migne, 1857), cols. 1059-1133 (1124): "Μετὰ ταῦτα λέγει ὁ ἱερεὺς τοῖς ἁγίοις. Ἅγια τὰ

Significantly, when John of Damascus interlinked his reference to the root term *ἐπιφοιτάω*, as employed within the *Liturgy of St James'* epiclesis, with Luke 1:35, John thereby offered Mark a lexical connection between the epiclesis and the Spirit's operation within the Prophets alongside the transformation of the 'seed and waters' of the Virgin's womb into Christ, with John analogising this same transformation with Eucharistic consecration. Thus, unlike Torquemada's interpretation of the Damascene's Eucharistic theology, Mark accurately exegeted John's appropriation of the Hellenophone Patristic identification of the Pneumatic transmutative activity within both the Virgin and within the Eucharistic elements.⁵⁸⁰ Resultingly, Mark's *λίβελλος* can be assessed to bear greater

προχείμενα, **ἐπιφοίτησιν** δεξάμενα ἁγίου Πνεύματος...” John R. K. Fenwick, *Anaphoras of St Basil and St James: An Investigation Into Their Common Origin* (Rome: Pontificium Institutum Orientale, 1992), p. 303 posited that the *Liturgy of St James* amalgamated elements from the *Mystagogical Catecheses* with the Coptic edition of the *Liturgy of St Basil*. See also Kent J. Bureson, “The Anaphora of the *Mystagogical Catecheses* of Cyril of Jerusalem,” in Bradshaw, ed., *Essays on Early Eastern Eucharistic Prayers*, pp. 131-51 (150-1). Nonetheless, as highlighted by John D. Witvliet, “The Anaphora of St James,” in Bradshaw, ed., *Essays on Eastern Eucharistic Prayers*, pp. 153-72 (156), and Paul F. Bradshaw and Maxwell E. Johnson, *The Eucharistic Liturgies: Their Evolution and Interpretation* (Collegeville: Liturgical Press, 2012), p. 76, given that scholars continue to remain divided over how the various linguistic traditions and extant manuscripts of the *Liturgy of St James* are interrelated with one another, this fact entails that one cannot definitively make any conclusions concerning this liturgy's origins. Moreover, Hesychios of Jerusalem's festal sermon on Mary, the Mother of God, renders Luke 1:35's term ἐπισκιάσει as ἐπιφοιτήσεως with regards to the Spirit's activity at the Annunciation, indicating the influence of this liturgical and anaphoral terminology within late antique Palestine. See Hesychios of Jerusalem, *Homélie V: de Sainte Marie, la Mère de Dieu*, 4.24, ed. by Michel Aubineau in *Les homélies festales d'Hésychius de Jérusalem*, Vol. 1 of 2 (Brussels: Société des Bollandistes, 1978), p. 166: “Οὐδαμῶς, ἀλλ' ἐξ ἐνεργείας θεοῦ, ἐξ ἐπιφοιτήσεως ὑψίστου, ἐκ παρουσίας Πνεύματος.” Cf. Leena Peltoma, *The Image of the Virgin Mary in the Akathistos Hymn* (Leiden, Brill, 2001), p. 51, who dated Hesychius' homily to c. 434.

⁵⁸⁰ Kappes, *Epiclesis Debate*, pp. 146-8. While this section has delineated how the liturgical application of the non-Scriptural term *ἐπιφοιτάω* likely derived from Origen and his catechetical school, within the Hellenophone theological tradition, this semantic interconnection also flourished against the background of the Council of Ephesus and its emphasis on the doctrine of the Virgin as the *Θεοτόκος*. In particular, Cyril of Alexandria, being a highly regarded Patristic authority, had asserted that the Eucharist re-effectuated the Word's Incarnation, a notion that juxtaposed with the Coptic liturgical tradition which had utilised both terms to refer to the consecration of the Eucharistic within the *Liturgy of St Mark*. For example, Cyril interlinked the Virgin's flesh as used at the Incarnation with the dominical words at the Last Supper in *The Second Letter of Cyril to Nestorius* in *Decrees of the Ecumenical Councils*, Vol. 1 of 2, ed. by Norman P. Tanner, Giuseppe Alberigo, et al. (Washington D.C.: Georgetown University Press, 1990), p. 48. Cf. Cyril of Alexandria, *The Third Letter of Cyril to Nestorius*, in Tanner, ed., *Decrees of the Ecumenical Councils*, Vol. 1, pp. 54-5. Compare Cyril's descriptions of the Eucharistic anaphora within these works with that of the *Liturgy of St Mark's* first epiclesis in Hänggi and Pahl, eds., *Prex Eucharistica*, p. 112.

doctrinal weight given this firm Patristic foundation, unlike the more myopic and decontextualized nature of Torquemada's use of his Patristic and liturgical authorities addressed above.

4.4.3.1. Mark's Application of this Analogy to the Dual-Moment Doctrine of Eucharistic Consecration

Like John of Damascus, Mark exemplified an acute interest within the Hellenophone theological tradition of conceiving the Virgin as *προκαθαρθεῖσα*, or 'pre-purified,' preceding his conciliar participation, exhibited in his aforementioned *Λόγος Ἀντιρρήτικὸς Α'* against Kalekas. This tradition had an extensive intra-Byzantine history of interpretation beginning with Gregory of Nazianzus, who developed a doctrine of Christ and the Virgin being concomitantly 'purified', not as the bodies and souls of sinners are purified at Baptism, but equivocally through divine grace and glory by elevating their already sinless human natures.⁵⁸¹ For example, within his *Λόγος ΛΗ' εἰς τὰ Θεοφάνια* (*Eighty-Third Oration on the Theophany*), likely delivered between 380 and 381, Gregory postulated:

[Christ] has become man in all ways excluding sin; and so He was conceived from the Virgin, whose soul and body were pre-purified by the Spirit...⁵⁸²

⁵⁸¹ See Candal, 'La Virgen Santísima "prepurificada" en su Anunciación,' *Orientalia Christiana Periodica* 31 (1965): 241-76 for an overview of the development of this doctrine of 'prepurification.' Cf. Kappes, *Epiclesis Debate*, pp. 148-9; Kappes, "Gregory Nazianzen's Prepurified Virgin in Ecumenical and Patristic Tradition: A Reappraisal of Original Sin, Guilt, and Immaculate Conception," in Jared Isaac Goff, Kappes, and Edward J. Ondrako, eds., *The Spirit and the Church Peter Damian Fehlner's Franciscan Development of Vatican II on the Temes of the Holy Spirit, Mary, and the Church - Festschrift* (Eugene: Pickwick, 2018), pp. 147-98 (148-53); Kappes, *Immaculate Conception: Why Thomas Aquinas Denied, While Duns Scotus, Gregory Palamas, and Mark Eugenius Professed Absolute Immaculate Existence of Mary* (New Bedford: Academy of the Immaculate, 2014), pp. 18-28.

⁵⁸² My English translation of Gregory of Nazianzus, *Oratio XXXVIII: In Theophania*, 13, in *Patrologia Graeca*, Vol. 36, col. 325: "Καὶ πάντα γίνεταί πλην τῆς ἁμαρτίας ἄνθρωπος· κηθεῖς μὲν ἐκ τῆς Παρθένου, Ψυχὴν καὶ σάρκα προκαθαρθείσης τῷ Πνεύματι" Cf. Gregory of Nazianzus, *Sectio I: Poetica Dogmatica: Περί διαθηκῶν καὶ Ἐπιφανείας Χριστοῦ*, in *Patrologia Graeca*, Vol. 37 (Paris: Typis J.-P. Migne, 1862), cols. 456-64 (462).

Pertinently, within the interpretative history of this Marian tradition, the ‘purification’ of the Virgin’s ‘soul’ and ‘body’ were regarded as two respective moments of the Incarnate Word’s production within the Virgin’s utero. Within his *Λόγος Ἀντιρρήτικὸς Α’* against Kalekas, Mark exhibited his awareness of this motif by invoking a hymn dedicated to Basil the Great ascribed to John of Damascus which described this twofold divine operation within the Virgin’s womb:

<p>John of Damascus, <i>Κανὼν εἰς τὸν Ἅγιον Βασίλειον, ᾠδὴ Ε’</i>:⁵⁸³</p>	<p>Mark of Ephesus, <i>Λόγος Ἀντιρρήτικὸς Α’</i>:⁵⁸⁴</p>
<p>[Your] soul was hallowed, and [your] body pre-purified, when the Holy Spirit came upon you, modest [and] immaculate one, [and] the infinite power of the Most High overshadowed and subsided in you.</p>	<p>For in her [the Virgin]... God has willed to show Himself omnipotent, such that, through the Holy Spirit’s preordained abundant grace and divine power, He pre-purified her.</p>

By interweaving this motif with the doctrine of God’s eternally effective imperative within his *Λίβελλος*, for Mark, the dominical words prompt the Spirit to descend upon the Eucharistic gifts to ‘hallow’ them, which interlinks with the initial moment of God’s operation within the Virgin’s soul, such that God sent His Spirit was to ‘hallow’ the Virgin in order to physically and spiritually prepare her for Christ’s Incarnation. Likewise, following this initial hallowing, the epiclesis perfects the Eucharistic transubstantiation just as,

⁵⁸³ My English translation of John of Damascus, *Joannis Monachi Hymnus in Sanctus Basilium, Ode V. Vinculo charitatis*, in *Patrologia Graeca*, Vol. 96 (Paris: Typis J.-P. Migne, 1864), cols. 1371-8 (1373c): “Τὴν ψυχὴν **ἁγιασθεῖσα**, καὶ τὸ σῶμα προκαθαρθεῖσα, σεμνή, ἐπελθόντος τοῦ ἁγίου ἐπὶ σε, πανάμωμε, Πνεύματος, τὴν τοῦ Ὑψίστου ἄπειρον δύναμιν σοι ἐπισκιάσασαν καθυπεδέξω.” Cf. Joseph Nasrallah, *Saint Jean de Damas, son époque, sa vie, son oeuvre* (Paris: Harissa, 1930), p. 152ff for a discussion of this hymn’s authenticity.

⁵⁸⁴ My English translation of Mark of Ephesus, *Markos Eugenikos’s First Antirrhetic Against Manuel Calekas’s On Essence and Energy*, Pilavakis, ed., p. 211, lines 18-21: “ἐν αὐτῇ γὰρ... ὁ Θεὸς τὸ ἑαυτοῦ παντοδύναμου ἐπιδειξάι ἠθέλησε, πλὴν ὅτι καὶ αὐτῇ διὰ Πνεύματος ἁγίου δαψιλεστέρα χάριτι προσρυσθέντος καὶ δυνάμεως θείας προκαθαρθεῖση”

through a rational soul being infused within the *οὐσία* of the Virgin's flesh, her flesh was transmuted into the fully divine and fully human hypostasis of Christ.⁵⁸⁵

John's employment of the term *καθαίρω* to the Virgin's body was informed by some of the developments within medieval Byzantine medicine, whereby menstruation was commonly understood to be the body's mechanism for restoring internal balance by depositing 'excesses.' Thus, it would be worrisome if a woman missed her period as menstrual blood was regarded as *ἀκάθαρων*, entailing that a woman subject to menses underwent a *καθαρίσματα*. Pertinently, pregnancy was also regarded to alleviate an excess of blood given that the foetus absorbed all 'excess' fluid.⁵⁸⁶ The issue of whether the Virgin was subject to menses was thus naturally of pertinent concern for medieval Hellenophone theologians, especially given the Byzantine Church's canonical precedent of sanctioning menstruating women with ritual impurity.⁵⁸⁷

By invoking this analogy, Mark drew upon a doctrine which, while disputed within medieval Latin and Byzantine Christendom, was nonetheless endorsed within the historical canons of the first seven ecumenical councils. For example, the *Professio Fidei* issued by the Third Council of Constantinople of 680-1, presided over by Emperor Konstantinos IV, and approved by Pope Agatho's legates, stated:

And we confess... the only begotten son... who descended from Heaven and voluntarily and with humility emptied himself in Mary the immaculate Virgin and

⁵⁸⁵ John of Damascus, *Ἐκδοσις*, 3.2, in Kotter, ed., *Die Schriften*, Vol. 2, p. 109; Kappes, *Epiclesis Debate*, pp. 149-50.

⁵⁸⁶ See Eugenia Georges, *Bodies of Knowledge: The Medicalization of Reproduction in Greece* (Nashville: Vanderbilt University Press, 2008), pp. 90-2.

⁵⁸⁷ This canonical state of affairs is reflected in two canonical collections which were upheld as authoritative at the Council of Trullo. See the second canon of the *Canons* of Pope Dionysios I of Alexandria in Périclès-Pierre Joannou, ed., *Discipline Generale Antique*, Vol. 2: *Les Canons des Pères Grecs* (Grottaferrata: Tipografia Italo-Orientale 'S. Nilo,' 1963), p. 12. See also the seventh canon of Pope Timotheos I of Alexandria in Joannou, ed., *Discipline Generale Antique*, Vol. 2, p. 244. Cf. "Canones Oecumenici Concilii Trullani, can. 2," in Joannou, ed., *Discipline Generale Antique*, Vol. 1(1): *Les Canons Des Conciles Oecumeniques* (Grottaferrata: Tipografia Italo-Orientale 'S. Nilo,' 1962), pp. 121, 123, 124 for Trullo's recognition of these collections' authority.

Theotokos' womb, and indwelt within her holy and immaculate flesh [following her] soul and body [being] pre-purified by the Spirit...⁵⁸⁸

As several Roman Catholic scholars since the twentieth century have increasingly acknowledged the liturgy as a *locus theologicus*,⁵⁸⁹ one must also highlight that the version of the *Synodikon of Orthodoxy* issued in 843 upheld this doctrine of the Virgin's pre-purification:

[Christ] became a perfect and sinless man [who was] made into flesh from the holy Virgin [whose] soul and body [had been] pre-purified by the Spirit...⁵⁹⁰

Likewise, while medieval Latin theologians including Aquinas,⁵⁹¹ and posteriorly, Torquemada,⁵⁹² interpreted John of Damascus' doctrine of the twofold moment 'purification' of the Virgin to entail a cleansing from the *fomes peccati*, several Latin theologians associated with the Franciscan School such as Bonaventure acknowledged the Virgin's purification in a manner which upheld her Immaculate Conception:

⁵⁸⁸ My English translation of *Concilium universal Constantinopolitanum tertium (680-681). Concilii actiones I-XI*, ed. by Eduard Schwartz, Johannes Straub, Rudolf Riedinger. *Acta conciliorum oecumenicorum*, Ser. 2, Vol. 2, Pars 1 (Berlin: De Gruyter, 1990), p. 838: "Ὁμολογοῦμεν δὲ... τὸν μονογενῆ υἱὸν... κατελθόντα ἐκ τῶν οὐρανῶν ἦγον εἰς ἐκούσιον κενωθέντα ταπεινώσιν ἐν τῇ μήτρᾳ τῆς ἀχράντου παρθένου καὶ Θεοτόκου Μαρίας κατασκηνώσαντα προκαθαρθείσης ψυχὴν καὶ σῶμα τῷ πνεύματι καὶ ἐκ τῆς ἀγίας καὶ ἀμώμου σαρκὸς αὐτῆς..." Cf. Candal, 'La Virgen Santísima,' 261-2; Kappes, *Immaculate Conception*, pp. 37-8.

⁵⁸⁹ See esp. Cipriano Vagaggini, *Theological Dimensions of the Liturgy: A General Treatise on the Theology of the Liturgy*, ed. and trans. by Leonard J. Doyle and W. A. Jurgens (Collegeville: Liturgical Press, 1976), pp. 512-41; 547-56.

⁵⁹⁰ My English translation of *Synodikon of Orthodoxy*, I, II, 4-6, ed. by Jean Gouillard, "Le Synodikon de l'Orthodoxie: édition et commentaire," in *Travaux et Mémoires*, Vol. 2 (Paris: Éditions E. de Boccard, 1967), pp. 1-316 (293): "...ἄνθρωπος ἐγένετο τέλειος χωρὶς ἀμαρτίας σαρκωθείς ἐκ παρθένου ἀγίας ψυχὴν καὶ σῶμα προκαθαρθείσης τῷ Πνεύματι..." Cf. Kappes, *Immaculate Conception*, pp. 64-6.

⁵⁹¹ See Aquinas, *Summa Theologiae* III, q. 27, a. 3, arg. 3 and ad. 3, in *Opera Omnia*, Vol. 11. *Editio Leonina*, pp. 292, 293: "Praeterea, Damascenus dicit quod in beata virgine supervenit spiritus sanctus purgans eam, ante conceptionem filii Dei. Quod non potest intelligi nisi de purgatione a fomite, nam peccatum non fecit, ut Augustinus dicit, in *libro de natura et gratia*. Ergo per sanctificationem in utero non fuit libere mundata a fomite... Ad tertium dicendum quod spiritus sanctus in beata virgine duplicem purgationem fecit. Unam quidem quasi praeparatoriam ad Christi conceptionem, quae non fuit ab aliqua impuritate culpa vel fomitis, sed mentem eius magis in unum colligens et a multitudine sustollens. Nam et Angeli purgari dicuntur, in quibus nulla impuritas invenitur, ut Dionysius dicit, *VI cap. Eccles. Hier.* Aliam vero purgationem operatus est in ea spiritus sanctus mediante conceptione Christi, quae fuit opus spiritus sancti. Et secundum hoc potest dici quod purgavit eam totaliter a fomite."

⁵⁹² See Torquemada, *Tractatus de veritate Conceptionis*, Pusey, ed., pp. 273-5.

[Pseudo-]Dionysius stated that, ‘sanctity is pure and sincere goodness [which is] without any defilement’⁵⁹³... Thus the glorious Virgin willed to be purified, not because she was impure, or because of the strictures of the [Old] Law, but that she might be the form of sanctity and purification. That [the Virgin] was not impure is evident because she did not conceive through male seed nor was she restricted by the [Old] Law... [which] stated, ‘If a woman conceives a male child through receiving seed, she shall be impure for forty days.’ [Moses] did not add [the clause] ‘through receiving seed’ for nothing as Scripture includes nothing superfluous... It was thus necessary for [Moses] to include this [clause] to exclude the Lord’s Mother from this law...⁵⁹⁴

As alluded to when discussing Torquemada’s activity at Basel in Chapter Three, some Latin Baselean *periti* including the Dominican Juan de Segovia interpreted the Virgin’s purification in a manner which maintained her Immaculate Conception.⁵⁹⁵ Thus, while Mark’s recourse to this doctrine was not universally binding upon either his Latin counterparts or his own Byzantine Orthodox contemporaries, these examples illustrate that his doctrine possessed the conceptual groundwork from which a more enduring Latin-Eastern Orthodox consensus concerning Eucharistic consecration could have been established at Ferrara-Florence.

Returning to Mark’s *λίβελλος*, given their mutual twofold-moment doctrines of Eucharistic consecration, John of Damascus and Mark both conceived the Eucharistic gifts following the dominical words to be ‘antitypes’ of Christ’s Body and Blood in the sense that their transmutation has yet to be perfected by the epiclesis in accord with the

⁵⁹³ Cf. Pseudo-Dionysius, *De Divinis Nominibus*, c. 12, 2, in *Patrologia Graeca*, Vol. 3 (Paris: Typis J.-P. Migne, 1857), col. 969.

⁵⁹⁴ My English translation of Bonaventure, *De Purificatione B. Virginis Mariae: Sermo 2*, in *Doctoris seraphici S. Bonaventurae opera omnia*, Vol. 9 (Quaracchi: Collegii S. Bonaventurae, 1901), pp. 640-8 (641): “Dionysius dicit quod «sanctitas est ab omni contamine munda et sincera bonitas»;⁵⁹⁴ igitur non est aliud loqui de sanctificatione quam de purification... Voluit igitur Virgo gloriosa purificari, non quia esset immunda, non quia esset per Legem astricta, sed ut esset sanctificationis et *purificationis forma*. Quod non esset immunda, patet, quia non conceperat de virili semine, nec per hoc erat Legia stricta... dicens: *Mulier, si suscepto semine, pepererit masculum, immunda erit quadraginta diebus*. Non pro nihilo addidit *suscepto semine*, cum nihil superfluum sit in Scriptura... Oportet ergo, illud adderet, ut a lege illa Matrem Domini exciperet...”

⁵⁹⁵ Segovia, *Ioannes de Segovia Allegationes et totidem Avisamenta pro Immaculata Conceptione Beatissimae Virginis*, ed. by Petrus de Alva et Astorga (Brussels: Typis et Sumptibus Balthosaris Vivie, 1664), pp. 167-8.

aforementioned early medieval Hellenophone reformulations of the terms, ‘type’ and ‘antitype.’ To counteract this increased antipathy towards the term ‘antitype,’ based upon his awareness of the *Liturgy of St Basil’s* use of the term following the dominical words, John reformulated the term by positing that the dominical words, which exemplify God’s eternally-effective imperative, are analogous to the initial moment of God’s operation within the Virgin at the Annunciation, whereupon her already-Immaculate soul and flesh were hallowed in advance of the Incarnation, while the second moment paralleling the second moment of the Virgin’s conception, whereupon the Word-mediating-soul was infused into her flesh.

John analogised the twofold-moment nature of the Virgin’s conception with the process of seeds being transformed into the *οὐσία* of a plant: This analogy implied Christ’s substantial existence at the initial moment of God’s operation within the Virgin, despite a certain lack of fullness of activity. Just as the growth of seed into a plant is perfected through watering, the growth of Christ’s foetus was perfected through a metaphorical ‘watering’ of the Virgin’s womb. Based upon both analogies, prayer functions as the human element which synergistically cooperates with God’s effectuation of the Eucharist, akin to the farmer’s cultivation of the plant or the Virgin’s fiat at the Annunciation.

Nonetheless, the analogies of the Annunciation and of seeds being transformed to plants did not fully concord with one another. For example, whereas the Incarnational analogy for Eucharistic consecration indicates that Christ’s foetus is initially created from the Virgin’s flesh before being subsequently enlivened through ensoulment, the latter analogy

upheld the plant's substantial existence in the seed at the initial moment of its growth process and exists through to the process' telos of bearing fruit.⁵⁹⁶

Mark's use of this Marian analogy raises the question of whether he believed that only the *οὐσία* of Christ's flesh inhered in the Eucharist gifts following the dominical words. This question is pertinent as, if he simply maintained that Christ's non-ensouled Body was present, despite being disposed to the subsequent infusion of His soul, Mark thereby needed to eschew the conclusion that these pre-epicletic gifts were in some way not fully Christ. According to Mark:

...after the dominical words' recitation, the [Eucharistic] offerings are called antitypes of the holy Body and Blood... that is, as if they were not perfected by through those words, but bear a particular 'type' and 'icon' [of this Body and Blood]; and thus the Holy Spirit is petitioned to come and reveal the bread to be this holy Body and the chalice to be this holy Blood.⁵⁹⁷

To put Mark's concern with Eucharistic 'typology' into the broader context of his literary work, one should consider Mark's epistle, composed shortly following the conclusion of the Byzantine engagement at Ferrara-Florence between 1440 and 1441, to Georgios, a Byzantine Rite priest working within the Venetian-occupied port town, Methoni, in the Peloponnese for the purpose of counteracting the Eucharistic praxis of the contemporary Latin Rite.⁵⁹⁸ Therein, Mark overcame the problem of maintaining that Christ's Body and Blood were not truly present prior to the epiclesis by invoking John of Damascus, in accord with the doctrine Mark upheld within his Florentine *λίβελλος*. Mark

⁵⁹⁶ Kappes, *Epiclesis Debate*, pp. 151-2.

⁵⁹⁷ My English translation of Mark of Ephesus, *Libellus de Consecratione*, 5, Petit, ed., in *Patrologia Orientalis*, Vol. 17, p. 430: "Διὰ τοῦτο καὶ ὁ μέγας Βασίλειος, μετὰ τὸ εἰπεῖν τὰ Δεσποτικὰ ῥήματα διηγηματικῶς... ἔτι τοῦ ἁγίου σώματος καὶ αἵματος **ἀντίτυπα** καλεῖ τὰ προκειμένα, δῆλον ὡς μήπω τετελεσμένα διὰ τῶν ῥημάτων ἐκείνων, ἀλλ' ἔτι **τύπον** τινὰ καὶ **εἰκόνα** φέροντα· καὶ οὕτω εὐθὺς ἐφεξῆς τὸ Πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον ἐλθεῖν ἐπεύχεται καὶ ἀναδειξαι τὸν μὲν ἄρτον αὐτὸ τὸ τίμιον σῶμα, τὸ δὲ ποτήριον αὐτὸ τὸ τίμιον αἶμα." Cf. Kappes, *Epiclesis Debate*, pp. 152-3.

⁵⁹⁸ See Petit, ed., *Patrologia Orientalis*, Vol. 17, p. 319 for dating.

began by exegeting Matt. 26:29, which stated “I will not drink from this fruit of the vine until that day, when I drink it new with you in the Heavenly Kingdom.”⁵⁹⁹ Based upon this verse, Mark emphasized that Eucharistic transmutation functions analogously to the Kingship of Christ. Just as Christ is called, honoured and worshipped as ‘King of Heaven’ prior to the perfection of His Kingship with His ‘coronation,’ so also are the pre-perfected Eucharistic gifts revered as ‘types’ and ‘icons’ of Christ’s Body and Blood.⁶⁰⁰ It is according to this paradigm that Mark implored Georgios to understand the term ‘antitype’ vis-à-vis the Eucharistic gifts in the *Liturgy of St Basil*.⁶⁰¹ Thus, Mark rhetorically asked if it was really unfitting to venerate the pre-epicletic Eucharistic ‘antitypes’ as Christ’s Body and Blood before they are subsequently offered to God for the purpose of the having their transmutation perfected by the Pneumatic indwelling, given that they had already offered to God as a sacrifice.⁶⁰² Given Mark’s aforementioned engagement within Palamite theology prior to his participation at Ferrara-Florence, one can infer that Mark also likely sought to implicitly defend his dual-moment doctrine of Eucharistic consecration against the claims of fourteenth-century authors such as Nikephoros Gregoras detailed in Chapter Three that

⁵⁹⁹ Mark of Ephesus, *Epistola ad Georgium Presbyterum Methonensem contra Ritus Ecclesiae Romanae*, 2, Petit, ed., in *Patrologia Orientalis*, Vol. 17, pp. 472, lines 13-8: “«...Οὐ γὰρ μὴ πίωμαι, φησὶ πρὸς τοὺς ἑαυτοῦ μαθητὰς ὁ Θεὸς καὶ Λόγος, ἀμάρτι ἐκ τοῦ γεννήματος τῆς ἀμπέλου ἕως τῆς ἡμέρας ἐκείνης, ὅταν αὐτὸ πίνω μεθ’ ὑμῶν καινὸν ἐν τῇ βασιλείᾳ τῶν οὐρανῶν.» ...”

⁶⁰⁰ Paraphrased from Mark of Ephesus, *Epistola ad Georgium Presbyterum Methonensem contra Ritus Ecclesiae Romanae*, 2, Petit, ed., in *Patrologia Orientalis*, Vol. 17, pp. 472, lines 18-27: “...Ἀκούεις ὅπως ἅγια καὶ σεπτὰ μυστήρια καὶ πρὸ τοῦ τελειωθῆναι τὰ θεῖα δῶρα καλεῖ ὁ διδάσκαλος [i.e., the epiclesis]; Καὶ εἰκότως· Βασιλεὺς γὰρ λέγεται καὶ πρὸ τοῦ στεφθῆναι ὁ βασιλεὺς, καὶ μάλιστα ὅτε πρὸς τὸ στεφθῆναι ἀπέρχεται δορυφορούμενος καὶ τιμώμεμος βασιλεὺς λέγεται καὶ ἡ τοῦ βασιλέως εἰκὼν καὶ τιμᾶται καὶ **προσκυνεῖται**· τύπον δὲ καὶ εἰκόνα λέγομεν καὶ ἡμεῖς ἀποσώζειν τὰ θεῖα δῶρα πρὸ τοῦ **τελειωθῆναι** τοῦ δεσποτικοῦ σώματος καὶ αἵματος.”

⁶⁰¹ Paraphrased from Mark of Ephesus, *Epistola ad Georgium Presbyterum Methonensem contra Ritus Ecclesiae Romanae*, 2, Petit, ed., in *Patrologia Orientalis*, Vol. 17, pp. 472, lines 27-31: “Ὅθεν καὶ ὁ μέγας Βασιλεὺς ἐν τῇ ἱερᾷ λειτουργίᾳ ἀντίτυπα ταῦτα καλεῖ. «Προθέντες» γὰρ φησὶ «τὰ ἀντίτυπα τοῦ τιμίου σώματος καὶ αἵματος τοῦ Χριστοῦ σου.» ...”

⁶⁰² Paraphrased from Mark of Ephesus, *Epistola ad Georgium Presbyterum Methonensem contra Ritus Ecclesiae Romanae*, 2, Petit, ed., in *Patrologia Orientalis*, Vol. 17, pp. 472, lines 31-6: “Τί οὖν Ποιοῦμεν ἄτοπον, εἰ μετὰ τιμῆς προπέμπομεν καὶ ὑποδεχόμεθα ταῦτα, τὰ ἤδη τῷ Θεῷ ἀνατεθέντα καὶ ἀφιερωθέντα καὶ θυσία καὶ δῶρα γενόμενα καὶ πρὸς τὸ τελειωθῆναι διὰ τῆς τοῦ ἁγίου Πνεύματος **ἐπιφοίτησεως** προσφερόμενα;”

Palamites such as Palamas himself and Kokkinos posited that the consecrated Eucharistic gifts are only ‘types’ of Christ’s Body and Blood.

One should also keep in mind the examples cited in Chapter One, whereby a number of Byzantine Rite Eastern Orthodox were subject to the accusations of improperly venerating the Eucharistic gifts prior to their elevation, Mark cautioned his reader that, for upholding this doctrine of the Eucharistic antitypes, they would be accused by “those who have transgressed all ecclesiastical tradition,” namely, Latin Christians and Hellenophone adherents of the Florentine Reunion,⁶⁰³ of worshipping the Eucharistic gifts *in se*, rather than as true archetypes of Christ’s Body and Blood. Mark thereby compared their struggle to those supporters of Icon veneration who were historically denounced by Iconoclasts for worshipping icons *in se* as these icons were, according to the Iconoclasts, not archetypes of their divine referents.⁶⁰⁴

To put Mark’s claims into the context of this epistle, Mark evoked John of Damascus’ *Ἐκδοσις* to elucidate the structure of the Divine Liturgy for Georgios, having begun his epistle by recommending that his addressee read Maximus the Confessor’s liturgical commentary, the *Μυσταγωγία (Mystagogy)*,⁶⁰⁵ within which Maximus nonetheless failing to explicitly comment upon the anaphora.⁶⁰⁶ Thus, Mark’s liturgical exegesis began by invoking

⁶⁰³ Quotation translated from Mark of Ephesus, *Epistula ad Georgium Presbyterum Methonensen contra Ritus Ecclesiae Romanae*, 2, Petit, ed., in *Patrologia Orientalis*, Vol. 17, p. 473, lines 2-3: “Καὶ ταῦτα τίνες; **Οἱ πᾶσαν ἐκκλησιαστικὴν παράδοσιν ἀθετοῦντες...**”

⁶⁰⁴ Paraphrased from Mark of Ephesus, *Epistola ad Georgium Presbyterum Methonensem contra Ritus Ecclesiae Romanae*, 2, Petit, ed., in *Patrologia Orientalis*, Vol. 17, pp. 472, line 36-473, line 2: “Ἄλλ’ οἱ διυλίζοντες τὸν κώνωπα τὴν δὲ κάμηλον καταπίνοντες [Matt. 23:24], τάχα καὶ περὶ τῶν ἁγίων εἰκόνων ἡμῖν ἐγκαλέσουσιν [i.e., the Iconoclasts], ὅτι προσκηνοῦμεν αὐτάς, ἐπειδὴ μὴ εἰσὶν αὐτὰ τὰ πρωτότυπα, ἀλλ’ εἰκόνες ἐκείνων· εἴη γὰρ ἂν καὶ τοῦτο τῆς αὐτῶν ἀπονοίας ἄξιον.” Cf. Kappes, *Epiclesis Debate*, p. 155.

⁶⁰⁵ See Maximus the Confessor, *Mystagogy*, in *Patrologia Graeca*, Vol. 91 (Paris: Typis J.-P. Migne, 1865), cols. 657-717 for this work.

⁶⁰⁶ See Andreas Andreopoulos, “All in all’ in the Byzantine Anaphora and the Eschatological *Mystagogy* of Maximus the Confessor,’ *Studia Patristica* 54 (2012): 1-10 (7-8) for an analysis of the possible factors behind Maximus’ omission of the anaphora.

Matthew 26:29, in methodological concordance with the following passage from the

Ἐκδοσις, to fill this lacuna within Maximus' *Μυσταγωγία*. John of Damascus wrote:

We worship God the Son with the Father and the Holy Spirit, who was incorporeal prior to the Incarnation, and now the same [Person] has become incarnate and has been made man though continuing to be God. Thus, if one drew rational distinctions between what is seen and what is thought, according to its own nature, His flesh cannot be worshipped as it is created, but as [His flesh] has been united with the Word of God, it is worshipped because of Him and in Him. For in the same way is the king worshipped whether he is naked or robed, and the purple robe is trampled on and rejected when regarded merely as a purple robe... so then [Christ's] flesh is not worshipped according to its own nature, but is worshipped [as] the Word of God Incarnate... through its hypostatic union with the Word of God...⁶⁰⁷

Based upon his reading of this passage, for Mark, the *Liturgy of St Basil* employed the term 'antitype' following the dominical words to signify the Kingship of Christ, indicating the lack of an accidental item of Christ's substantial intra-Eucharistic existence preceding the epiclesis, which metaphorically functions as Christ's monarchical 'enrobing.' Nonetheless, Mark's adjusted John's motif by applying the notion of Christ being metaphorically coronated at the epiclesis, which would have juxtaposed with the coeval Byzantine practice of the Imperial coronation including the practice of the Ecumenical Patriarch chrismating the ascendant emperor to signify his divinely ordained autocracy.⁶⁰⁸

⁶⁰⁷ My English translation of John of Damascus, *Ἐκδοσις*, 4.3, Kotter, ed., *Die Schriften*, Vol. 2, pp. 173-4: "Τόν υἱόν τοῦ θεοῦ σύν τῷ πατρὶ καὶ τῷ ἁγίῳ πνεύματι προσκυνούμεν, ἀσώματο μὲν πρὸ τῆς ἐνανθρωπήσεως καὶ νῦν τόν αὐτόν σεσαρκωμένον καὶ γενόμενον ἄνθρωπον μετὰ τοῦ εἶναι θεόν. Ἡ τοίνυν σὰρξ αὐτοῦ κατὰ μὲν τὴν ἑαυτῆς φύσιν, ἂν διέλῃς ἰσχυαῖς ἐπινοίαις τὸ ὀρώμενον ἐκ τοῦ νοουμένου, ἀπροσκύνητός ἐστιν ὡς κτιστή, ἐνωθεῖς δὲ τῷ θεῷ λόγῳ δι' αὐτόν καὶ ἐν αὐτῷ προσκυνεῖται. Ὅνπερ γὰρ τρόπον ὁ βασιλεὺς καὶ γυμνός προσκυνεῖται καὶ ἐνδεδυμένος, καὶ ἡ ἄλουργις ὡς μὲν ψιλή ἄλουργις πατεῖται καὶ περιρρίπτεται, βασιλικὸν δὲ γενομένη ἔνδυμα τιμᾶται καὶ δοξάζεται καί, εἴ τις αὐτὴν παροικτρῶσειε, Θανάτῳ ὡς τὰ πολλὰ κατακρίνεται... οὕτως ἡ σὰρξ κατὰ μὲν τὴν ἑαυτῆς φύσιν οὐχ ἔστι προσκυνητή, προσκυνεῖται δὲ τῷ σεσαρκωμένῳ θεῷ λόγῳ... διὰ τὸν ἡνωμένον αὐτῇ καθ' ὑπόστασιν θεόν λόγον..."

⁶⁰⁸ See Kappes, *Epiclesis Debate*, pp. 153-5. Cf. Aristides Papadakis, *The Orthodox East and the Rise of the Papacy* (Crestwood: St. Vladimir's Seminary Press, 1994), p. 212ff, who highlighted that, under the Laskarid Dynasty of the Empire of Nicaea, this patriarchal chrismation increasingly became regarded as a sign of the Nicaean emperor's legitimacy to rule within the context of several states such as the Empire of Trebizond and the Latin Empire claiming to be the authentic successors to the Byzantine Empire after the Sack of Constantinople in 1204. Cf. also Jugie, *Theologia dogmatica*, Vol. 3, pp. 151-62 for an historical and doctrinal analysis of this Imperial practice.

Additionally, Mark's recourse to John's imagery within the *Ἐκδοσις* harmonized with the *Liturgy of St James'* epiclesis, within which the Spirit's 'dwelling' on the Eucharistic gifts thematically invokes the Spirit descending on Christ in the form of a dove during His Baptism in the Jordan to inaugurate His earthly ministry through a supernatural coronation or chrismation.⁶⁰⁹ John also conceived this Pneumatic 'dwelling' to be an antitype of the Spirit's operation upon being petitioned through the Baptismal epiclesis, such that, like King David, Christ was 'anointed' by the Father,⁶¹⁰ and similarly applied this motif to the Spirit's descent upon the Apostles at Pentecost to exemplify the same point.⁶¹¹

These factors elucidate why Mark reticently conceded that his Latin counterparts were valid to assert the Eucharistic gifts' transubstantiation upon the dominical words' recitation, while maintaining that their assertion that these formulae are the sole consecratory principle risked departing from the Patristic liturgiological heritage. To summarise, even though the epiclesis' recitation does not inherent add to or modify Christ's substantial presence in the Eucharistic gifts, Mark maintained that the Orthodox Churches' Eucharistic Prayers and the Church Fathers both historically required the epiclesis for the act of perfect Eucharistic worship, as the metaphorical 'coronation' of the Christ's substantial intra-Eucharistic presence through the Pneumatic indwelling.

⁶⁰⁹ See Hänggi and Rahl, eds., *Præx Eucharistica*, p. 250, quoted in Appendix One: "...ἵνα ἐπιφοιτῆσαν τῇ ἀγίᾳ καὶ ἀγαθῇ καὶ ἐνδόξῳ αὐτοῦ παρουσίᾳ, ἀγίασῃ, καὶ ποιῆ τὸν μὲν ἄρτον τοῦτον σῶμα ἅγιον Χριστοῦ... Cf. John 1:32.

⁶¹⁰ John of Damascus, *Ἐκδοσις*, 4.9, in Kotter, ed., *Die Schriften*, Vol. 2, pp. 182, 183: "Χριστός γὰρ ἐστὶν ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ τοῦ ζῶντος, ὃν ἔχρισεν ὁ πατήρ τῷ ἀγίῳ πνεύματι, ὡς φησὶν ὁ θεῖος Δαυὶδ· »Διὰ τοῦτο ἐχρίσε σε ὁ θεός ὁ θεός σου ἔλαιον ἀγαλλιάσεως παρά τοὺς μετόχους σου«... ἐντολὰς τε ἡμῖν δέδωκε δι' ὕδατος ἀναγεννασθαι καὶ πνεύματος δι' ἐντεύξεως καὶ ἐπικλήσεως τῷ ὕδατι ἐπιφοιτῶντος τοῦ πνεύματος..."

⁶¹¹ John of Damascus, *Ἐκδοσις*, 4.9, in Kotter, ed., *Die Schriften*, Vol. 2, p. 185: "Πυρὶ δὲ λέγεται βαπτίζειν Χριστός· ἐν εἶδει γὰρ πυρίνων γλωσσῶν ἐπὶ τοὺς ἀγίους ἀποστόλους τὴν τοῦ πνεύματος χάριν ἐξέχεεν... Σωματικῶς εἶδει ὡσεὶ περιστέρα **κατεφοίτησε** τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον ἐπὶ τὸν κύριον τὴν ἀπαρχὴν τοῦ ἡμετέρου ὑποδεικνύον βαπτίσματος καὶ τιμῶν τὸ σῶμα, ἐπεὶ καὶ τοῦτο ἦγον τὸ σῶμα τῇ Θεώσει θεός καὶ ἅμα που ἄνωθεν εἰθίσται περιστέρα λύσιν κατακλυσμοῦ εὐαγγελίζεσθαι. 'Ἐπὶ δὲ τοὺς ἀγίους ἀποστόλους πυροειδῶς κάτεισι· θεός γὰρ ἐστὶν, »ὁ δὲ θεός πῦρ καταναλίσκον ἐστὶ«."

Regarding Mark's interconnection of his own coeval disputes concerning the application of the term 'antitype' to the Eucharistic gifts with the historical controversies concerning Icon veneration, Mark likely implicitly invoked John of Damascus' *Πρὸς τοὺς Διαβάλλοντας τὰς Ἁγίας Εἰκόνας, Λόγος Γ'* (*Third Oration Against the Calumniators of Sacred Icons*) to define the term 'antitype.' Within this work, John stated:

For we do not worship the icons and the types and the images of the saints as gods... And just as the person who receives the king's sealed orders and kisses the seal does not give honour to the wax, papyrus, or lead, but reveres and pays homage to the king... when [Christians] worship the type of the Cross, [they] do not worship the wood's nature, but [they] see the seal and the ring and the image of Christ Himself, [and] embrace and worship the one who was crucified on it through Him.⁶¹²

Given that Mark possibly apprehended that Torquemada had regarded the Byzantine Church to have upheld a similar doctrine to that which Benedict XII's *Cum dudum* had condemned the Armenians for positing, Mark later countered this interpretation, which he attributed to a generic Latin interlocutor, by utilising this passage from John of Damascus in order to characterise his interlocutor as an iconoclast who erroneously denounced orthodox believers for alleged idolatry.

While Mark conceived the dominical words to effectuate a substantial, yet non-perfective, transformation within both his *Λίβελλος* and his *Ἐπιστολή πρὸς τινὰ Πρεσβύτερον Γεώργιον*, one must address why Mark continued to adhere to John of Damascus' typology of Eucharistic consecration with the dual-moment doctrine of Christ's Incarnation in the pre-purified Virgin, whereby the second moment entailed the Word-Soul

⁶¹² My English translation of John of Damascus, *Contra imaginum calumniatores orationes tres*, III.86, in Kotter, ed., *Die Schriften*, Vol. 3 (Berlin: De Gruyter, 1975), p. 179: "Οὐδὲ γὰρ παρ' ἡμῶν ὡς θεοὶ προσκυνοῦνται οἱ τῶν ἁγίων χαρακτῆρες καὶ εἰκόνας καὶ τύποι... Καὶ ὡσπερ ὁ κέλευσιν βασιλέως δεξάμενος ἐσφραγισμένην καὶ ἀσπασάμενος τὴν σφραγίδα οὐ τὸν πηλὸν ἐτίμησεν, οὐ τὸν χάρτην ἢ τὸν μόλυβδον, ἀλλὰ τῷ βασιλεῖ ἀπένειμε τὸ σέβας καὶ τὴν προσκύνησιν, οὕτω καὶ χριστιανῶν παῖδες τῷ τύπῳ τοῦ σταυροῦ προσκυνοῦντες οὐ τὴν φύσιν τοῦ ξύλου προσκυνοῦμεν, ἀλλὰ σφραγίδα καὶ δακτύλιον καὶ χαρακτῆρα Χριστοῦ αὐτοῦ βλέποντες δι' αὐτοῦ τὸν ἐν αὐτῷ σταυρωθέντα ἀσπαζόμεθα καὶ προσκυνοῦμεν."

being infused into the Virgin's flesh.⁶¹³ Indeed, given that John asserted that one cannot properly venerate an imperfect type *per se*, one must explicate how Mark resolved positing his doctrine's natural corollary that the Eucharistic antitypes initially produced a non-ensouled body, and thus an imperfect image of Christ's vivified Body. Before explicating how Mark resolved this problem by invoking Basil the Great and John Chrysostom to explicate that God infused the substance of Christ's Body and Blood into the Eucharistic gifts following the dominical words, while such substantial existence is perfected through invoking the Spirit's Sacramental activity at the epiclesis, one must highlight that within his *Ἐπιστολή πρὸς τινὰ Πρεσβύτερον Γεώργιον*, Mark acknowledged the existence of a second doctrine of Eucharistic consecration, incommensurate to that postulated by John of Damascus, which he could have plausibly evoked within his Eucharistic *Λίβελλος* at Florence.⁶¹⁴ In this epistle, Mark referred to an anonymous author who expounded an incommensurate commentary on Matthew 26:26 to John of Damascus' exegesis discussed above:

...although the bread brought [to the altar] by the priest is not perfected, namely, it is dead, after a short time, it shall be vivified and be changed into [Christ's] very vivifying body by the vivifying Spirit's operation.⁶¹⁵

This variant doctrine of Eucharistic consecration was underpinned by a Hellenophone conception of the Great Entrance which the Ecumenical Patriarch Germanos I

⁶¹³ See esp. John of Damascus, *Ἐκδοσις* 3.7, Kotter, ed., *Die Schriften*, Vol. 2, p. 123.

⁶¹⁴ Cf. Kappes, *Epiclesis Debate*, pp. 156-7.

⁶¹⁵ My English translation of *Marci Ephesii Epistola ad Georgium Presbyterum Methonensem*, 3, Petit, ed., in *Patrologia Orientalis*, Vol. 17, p. 474: "...οὕτω κάνταῦθα φερόμενος ὁ ἱερός ἄρτος **ἀτελής** ἔτι καὶ οἶον **νεκρός** μετὰ μικρὸν τῆ τοῦ ζωοποιοῦ Πνεύματος ἐνεργείᾳ **ζωοῦται** καὶ πρὸς αὐτὸ τὸ ζωοποιὸν σῶμα **μετασκευάζεται**."

notably upheld with regards to Christ's burial, denoting the host to be a type of Christ's deceased body during the *Triduum*.⁶¹⁶

Given the anonymous nature of this reference, Mark possibly evoked a non-extant Greek version of the late fourth and early fifth century Antiochene theologian, Theodore of Mopsuestia's *Liber ad Baptizandos*, as Mark potentially could have discovered a manuscript of this work during the pre-conciliar preparatory investigations within the libraries of Constantinople.⁶¹⁷ Theodore had emphasised the mortality of Christ's Body within his historical-typologisation of the Eucharistic gifts' entrance before their transformation into Christ's immortal and incorruptible post-Resurrection Body through a Pneumatic operation.⁶¹⁸ Given that the Second Council of Constantinople had posthumously

⁶¹⁶ See, esp., Germanos I, *Historia Ecclesia, et Mystica Contemplatio*, 87 (sec. 37), in *Patrologia Graeca*, Vol. 98 (Paris: Typis J.-P. Migne: 1863), cols. 385-484 (448-9) where Germanos posited that the womb of the Virgin typologised both Christ's tomb and the Eucharistic altar, entailing that the flesh of the Resurrected Christ can be identified with the flesh of the Virgin's womb and the flesh of Christ's Eucharistic Body.

⁶¹⁷ See, Syropoulos, *Les Mémoires*, App. III.10, Laurent, ed., pp. 602-4, wherein Syropoulos described how Ioannes VIII ordered the libraries of Constantinople to be scoured for literary material to be utilized at Ferrara-Florence.

⁶¹⁸ See esp. Theodore of Mopsuestia, *Commentary of Theodore on the Lord's Prayer and on the Sacraments of Baptism and the Eucharist*, ed. and trans. by Alphonse Mingana (Cambridge: W. Heffer & Sons, 1933), pp. 86-7, 104: "We must think, therefore, that the deacons who now carry the Eucharistic bread and bring it out for the sacrifice represent the image of the invisible hosts of ministry, with this difference, that, through their ministry and in these remembrances, they do not send Christ our Lord to His salvation-giving Passion. When they bring out (the Eucharistic bread) they place it on the holy altar, for the complete representation of the Passion, so that we may think of Him on the altar, as if He were placed in the sepulchre, after having received His Passion. This is the reason why those deacons who spread linens on the altar represent the figure of the linen clothes of the burial (of our Lord). Sometime after these have been spread, they stand up on both sides, and agitate all the air above the holy body with fans, thus keeping it from any defiling object. They make manifest by this ritual the greatness of the body which is lying there, as it is the habit, when the dead body of the high personages of this world is carried on a bier, that some men should fan the air above it. It is, therefore, with justice that the same thing is done here with the body which lies on the altar, and which is holy, awe-inspiring and remote from all corruption; a body which will very shortly rise to an immortal nature. It is on all sides of this body that persons, who are especially appointed to serve, stand up and fan. They offer to it an honour that is suitable, and by this ritual they make manifest to those present the greatness of the sacred body that is lying there. It is indeed clear to us from the Divine Book that angels sat upon the stone near the sepulchre and announced His resurrection to the women, and remained there all the time of His death, in honour of the One who was laid there, till they witnessed the resurrection, which was proclaimed by them to be good to all mankind, and to imply a renewal of all the creation... It is with great justice, therefore, that the priest offers, according to the rules of priesthood, prayer and supplication to God that the Holy Spirit may descend, and that grace may come therefrom upon the bread and the wine that are laid (on the altar) so that they may be seen to be truly the body and the blood of our Lord, which are the remembrance of immortality. Indeed, the body

anathematised Theodore for his Christology, Mark would thus have opted to eschew from explicitly evoking Theodore to being imputed charges of heresy.⁶¹⁹ Nonetheless, one cannot draw any definitive conclusions regarding Mark's authorial silence here.

4.4.4. Basil the Great and John Chrysostom

4.4.4.1. Basil

Having utilized John of Damascus' analogisation of God's eternally effective imperative and its corollary seed-to-plant analogy with Eucharistic consecration, Mark subsequently implicitly utilised Basil the Great's analogization within his *Ὁμιλία Ε' περὶ βλαστήσεως γῆς* to exemplify how God's imperative infallibly produces its immediate effect, and which typologises Eucharistic transmutation:

For from its initial creation, the earth received the power to sprout items from itself through the divine command, and this command [is also able to 'sprout' Christ's Body and Blood], [for] according to the same teacher [i.e., Basil], that which remains in the earth shows its own power to continuously sprout, however, it is necessary for the plants which have sprouted... to come to fruition through cultivating hands.⁶²⁰

of our Lord, which is from our own nature, was previously mortal by nature, but through the resurrection it moved to an immortal and immutable nature. When the priest, therefore, declares them to be the body and the blood of Christ, he clearly reveals that they have so become by the descent of the Holy Spirit through whom they have also become immortal, inasmuch as the body of our Lord, after it was anointed and had received the Spirit, was clearly seen so to become. In this same way, after the Holy Spirit has come here also» we believe that the elements of bread and wine have received a kind of an anointing from the grace that comes upon them, and we hold them to be henceforth immortal, incorruptible, impassible, and immutable by nature, as the body of our Lord was after the resurrection." Cf. Jugie, 'Le «Liber ad baptizandos» de Théodore de Mopsueste,' *Échos d'Orient* 34(179) (1935): 257-71 (266-70); Johannes Quaesten, *Mysterium tremendum: Vom christlichen Mysterium* (Düsseldorf: Patmos-Verlag, 1951), pp. 66-75; Francis J. Reine, *The Eucharistic Doctrine and Liturgy of the Mystagogical Catecheses of Theodore of Mopsuestia* (Washington, D.C.: Catholic University of America Press, 1942), pp. 141-5.

⁶¹⁹ See Kappes, *Epiclesis Debate*, p. 157. Cf. Milton V. Anastos, 'The Immutability of Christ and Justinian's Condemnation of Theodore of Mopsuestia,' *Dumbarton Oaks Papers*, 6 (1951): 123-60; Raphael Pavouris, *The Condemnation of the Christology of the Three Chapters in its Historical and Doctrinal Context: The Assessment and Judgement of Emperor Justinian and the Fifth Ecumenical Council (553)*. Ph. D. Thesis (University of Glasgow, 2001), esp. pp. 87-100; 214-42.

⁶²⁰ My English translation of Mark of Ephesus, *Libellus de Consecratione*, 5, Petit, ed., in *Patrologia Orientalis*, Vol. 17, pp. 426-34 (430-1): "Καθάπερ γὰρ ἐπὶ τῆς πρώτης ἐχείνης δημιουργίας ἔλαθε μὲν ἡ γῆ τὴν τοῦ βλαστάνειν τὰ ἐξ αὐτῆς δύναμιν διὰ τοῦ θεοῦ προστάγματος, καὶ τὸ πρόσταγμα ἐκεῖνο, καθὰ φήσιν ὁ αὐτὸς

According to Mark, Basil upheld the immediate efficacy of a divine imperative's discourse within the context of Christ's statements, 'This is My Body/This is My Blood,'⁶²¹ such that Christ produces the Eucharist's supernatural effect of transubstantiation 'once and for all' through this formula's recitation.⁶²² The dominical words thus function analogously to the divine command, 'Let the earth bring forth...' in Genesis 1:11, which Basil exegeted within this same homily thus:

Even now, this command [acts] on the earth, and throughout every season of the year, it necessarily exhibits the full extent of its power to generate herbs and seeds and trees... and so nature, following this first command from the beginning, continues throughout the ages until all things are consummated..."⁶²³

In this sense, Mark fittingly apprehended that, following Basil's paradigm of God's *ad extra* activity, the priest beseeches God in the epiclesis to incite His *in fieri* perfective operation upon the Eucharistic gifts in accord with His work at Creation: Exegeting this same divine command from Gen. 1:11 at a slightly earlier point in this same homily, Basil explained that God:

...did not command seed and fruit to be borne immediately from the earth but for the earth to sprout and green and to be perfected in the seed such that this initial [divine] command instructs nature how it is to come into being through to the end... And the earth, in a moment of time, [viz. the dominical words] followed the

διδάσχαλος, έναπομείναν τῆ γῆ, τὴν τοῦ βλαστάνειν αὐτῆ διηνεχῶς παρέχεται δύναμιν, χρεια δὲ ὁμως... καὶ γεωργικῶν χειρῶν εἰς τὸ τελεσιουργεῖν τὰ φυόμενα..."

⁶²¹ As Charles Gieschen, *Angelomorphic Christology: Antecedents and Early Evidence* (Leiden: Brill, 1998), pp. 74-6 highlighted, the anaphoras of the *Apostolic Constitutions* and the *Liturgies of St James and St Basil* all exemplify this ante-Nicene theophanic conception of Eucharistic transmutation through their mutual use of the terms ἀναδείξας/ἀναδείξαι. Cf. Hänggi and Rahl, eds., *Prex. Eucharistica*, pp. 88, 236, 246 for these anaphoras' respective use of such terminology.

⁶²² See Mark of Ephesus, *Libellus de Consecratione*, 5, ed. by Petit in *Patrologia Orientalis*, Vol. 17, pp. 430-1.

⁶²³ My English translation of Basil the Great, *Homilia V in Hexaemeron. De germinatione terrae*, sec. 10, in *Patrologia Graeca*, Vol. 29, cols. 116c-7a: "Βλαστησάτω ἡ γῆ. [Gen. 1:11]... Ἐκεῖνο ἔτι καὶ νῦν ἐνυπάρχον τῆ γῆ το πρόσταγμα, ἐπιείγει αὐτὴν καθ' ἐκάστην ἔτους περίοδον ἐξάγειν τὴν δύναμιν ἑαυτῆς ὅσην ἔχει πρὸς τε βοτανῶν καὶ σπερμάτων καὶ δένδρων γένεσιν... οὕτω καὶ ἡ τῆς φύσεως ἀκολουθία, ἐκ τοῦ πρώτου προστάγματος τὴν ἀρχὴν δεξαμένη πρὸς πάντα τὸν ἐφεξῆς διεξέρχεται χρόνον, μέχρις ἂν πρὸς τὴν κοινὴν συντέλειαν τοῦ παντὸς καταντήση...."

Creator's law and proceeded through each stage of sprouting in its germinative increase to the point of perfection [viz. the epiclesis].⁶²⁴

4.4.4.2. John Chrysostom

Having invoked Basil the Great's seed-to-plant analogy to support his *in fieri* doctrine of Eucharistic consecration, Mark subsequently evoked Chrysostom to exemplify how, while Christ instituted the dominical words 'once and for all' at the Last Supper, which immediately produce their supernatural effect of Christ's Body and Blood, analogously to God's eternally-effective imperative at Creation.⁶²⁵ However, according to Mark, within his *Εἰς τὴν προδοσίαν τοῦ Ἰουδα*, Chrysostom also maintained that the perfection of Eucharistic transmutation is always brought about by God actualising the priest's *δύναμις*, who synergistically cooperates with God's Sacramental agency within the necessary context of his prayer.⁶²⁶ Mark emphasized that, upon being petitioned through the epiclesis, the Spirit 'energizes' this divinely-instituted power in the priesthood and perfects the Eucharistic gifts' transmutation into Christ's Body and Blood initially wrought at the dominical words.⁶²⁷ To support this claim, Mark evoked Chrysostom's *Περὶ Ἱερωσύνης (On the Priesthood)*:

The priest stands [before the altar], not to bring down fire, but the Holy Spirit, and [the priest] makes a lengthy supplication, not so that some illumined flame from above may consume the offerings, but so that grace may descend on the sacrifice

⁶²⁴ My English translation of Basil the Great, *Homilia V in Hexaemeron. De germinatione terrae*, sec. 5, in *Patrologia Graeca*, Vol. 29, cols. 104a, 104d-5a: *Βλαστησάτω ἡ γῆ βοτάνην χόρτου... Οὐκ εὐθύς ἐκέλευσε σπέρμα καὶ καρπὸν ἀναδοθῆναι, ἀλλὰ βλαστῆσαι καὶ χλοάσαι τὴν γῆν, καὶ τότε εἰς σπέρμα τελειωθῆναι, ἵνα πρῶτον ἐκεῖνο πρόσταγμα διδασκάλιον τῆ φύσει γενῆται πρὸς τὴν ἐξῆς ἀκολουθίαν... Καὶ ἐν ἀκαριαίᾳ χρόνου ῥοπῇ ἀπὸ τῆς βλαστήσεως ἀρξαμένη ἡ γῆ, ἵνα φυλάξῃ τοὺς νόμους τοῦ κτίσαντος, πᾶσαν ἰδίαν αὐξήσεως διεξελοῦσα εὐθύς πρὸς τὸ τέλειον ἤγαγε τὰ βλαστήματα.*" Cf. Kappes, *Epiclesis Debate*, pp. 157-8.

⁶²⁵ Mark of Ephesus, *Libellus de Consecratione*, 5, Petit, ed., in *Patrologia Orientalis*, Vol. 17, p. 431: "...τὸν αὐτὸν τρόπον καὶ ὁ λόγος οὗτος, ἅπαξ ῥηθεὶς ὑπὸ τοῦ Σωτῆρος..."

⁶²⁶ Mark of Ephesus, *Libellus de Consecratione*, 5, Petit, ed., in *Patrologia Orientalis*, Vol. 17, p. 431: "...ὡς καὶ ὁ θεὸς φησι Χρυσόστομος, διὰ παντὸς ἐνεργεῖ· συνεργεῖ δὲ ὁμοῦ καὶ ἡ τῆς θείας ἱερωσύνης δύναμις διὰ τῆς εὐχῆς καὶ τῆς εὐλογίας εἰς τὴν τῶν προχειμένων τελείωσιν..."

⁶²⁷ Mark of Ephesus, *Libellus de Consecratione*, 5, Petit, ed., in *Patrologia Orientalis*, Vol. 17, p. 431: "...καὶ τὴν τῆς θείας ἱερωσύνης ἐπιδείκνυμεν δύναμιν, τελειωτικὴν οὖσαν παντὸς μυστηρίου τῆ ἐπικλήσει τοῦ δι' αὐτῆς ἐνεργοῦντος ἀγίου Πνεύματος..." See Boularand, 'L'Épiclèse,' 260; Kappes, *Epiclesis Debate*, p. 159.

through this supplication and illumine all souls and make them brighter than silver purified by fire.⁶²⁸

Thereupon, Mark also emphasized that because Christ had ordered Christians to invoke the Spirit in prayer and ordered His Apostles to continue celebrating the Eucharist to commemorate Him, in contrast to the ascribing efficient causality to the priest as an ‘instrumental cause,’ for Mark, one can only guarantee Eucharistic transmutation through trusting that God will always send His Spirit to consecrate upon being petitioned.

Concerning the accuracy of Mark’s exegesis of Chrysostom, given that Mark’s transcription of *Εἰς τὴν προδοσίαν τοῦ Ἰουδα* discorded with the critical edition of this homily within the *Patrologia Graeca*,⁶²⁹ as the following comparison elucidates, it is possible that Mark invoked Nicholas Kabasilas’ citation of the homily within the *Ἑρμηνεία* based upon their terminological similarity:

Kabasilas, Ἑρμηνεία, c. 29:	Mark, Λίβελλος, 5:
[The Latins state]... that the blessed Chrysostom testifies that these [dominical] words perfect the [Eucharistic] gifts] just as the Creator’s words, ‘Be fruitful and multiply,’ spoken once and for all by God, are always operative, so that the words once spoken by the Saviour are also always operative (καὶ λόγος οὗτος ἅπαξ ῥηθεῖς	...also in this way, the words once spoken by the Saviour (καὶ ὁ λόγος οὗτος, ἅπαξ ῥηθεῖς ὑπὸ τοῦ Σωτῆρος), as the divine Chrysostom states, are always operative (διὰ παντὸς ἐνεργεῖ); but the power of the divine priesthood likewise synergises [with this divine command] through prayer and the blessing for the intended

⁶²⁸ My English translation of Mark of Ephesus, *Libellus de Consecratione*, 5, Petit, ed., in *Patrologia Orientalis*, Vol. 17, p. 431: “Ἔστηκεν ὁ ἱερεὺς, οὐ πῦρ καταφέρων, ἀλλὰ τὸ Πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον, καὶ τὴν ἱκετηρίαν ἐπὶ πολὺ ποιεῖται, οὐχ ἵνα τις λαμπὰς ἄνωθεν ἀφεθεῖσα καταναλώσῃ τὰ προκείμενα ἀλλ’ ἵνα ἡ χάρις ἐπιπεσοῦσα τῇ θυσίᾳ δι’ ἐκείνης τὰς ἀπάντων ἀνάψῃ ψυχὰς καὶ ἀργυρίου λαμπροτέρας ἀποδείξῃ πεπυρωμένου.” Cf. Chrysostom, *De Sacerdotio Libri VI*, III, c. 4, in *Patrologia Graeca*, Vol. 48, cols. 623-94 (642): “Ἔστηκε γὰρ ὁ ἱερεὺς, οὐ πῦρ καταφέρων, ἀλλὰ τὸ Πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον· καὶ τὴν ἱκετηρίαν ἐπὶ πολὺ ποιεῖται, οὐχ ἵνα τις λαμπὰς ἄνωθεν ἀφεθεῖσα καταναλώσῃ τὰ προκείμενα, ἀλλ’ ἵνα ἡ χάρις ἐπιπεσοῦσα τῇ θυσίᾳ δι’ ἐκείνης τὰς ἀπάντων ἀνάψῃ ψυχὰς, καὶ ἀργυρίου λαμπροτέρας ἀποδείξῃ πεπυρωμένου.” Thus, Mark evidently accurately rendered Chrysostom’s passage, the only evident difference being Mark’s “Ἔστηκεν” in contrast to Chrysostom’s “Ἔστηκε.” Cf. Boularand, ‘L’Épiclese,’ 260.

⁶²⁹ See *infra* section 3.3.2.1 for my translation and the Greek transcription of Chrysostom’s homily which did not include, amongst other things, the phrases highlighted above.

ὑπό τοῦ Σωτήρος, διὰ παντός ἐνεργεῖ)...⁶³⁰	perfection [of Eucharistic transmutation]... ⁶³¹
--	---

However, one can conclude that Mark had accurately apprehended that Chrysostom had interconnected associated God's eternally effective imperative with the dominical words.⁶³² Moreover, Kabasilas' citation of this homily also accurately paralleled Eucharistic transmutation with childbearing, which thematically juxtaposed with the above passage from Chrysostom's homily,⁶³³ and consequently provided a firm basis from which Mark could uphold his *in fieri* Marian analogization of Eucharistic consecration. Mark thereby acknowledged that Torquemada's *Sermo Prior* was accurate insofar as Chrysostom conceived the dominical words to be consecratory. However, through providing a more holistic analysis of Chrysostom's Sacramentological oeuvres, Mark effectively counterpoised Torquemada's assertion that the priest functioned as an instrumental cause of Eucharistic transmutation and eschew anachronistically applying Aristotelian principles of causality onto Chrysostom's theological framework by exemplifying that Chrysostom clearly demarcated the Spirit, whose agency could only be guaranteed through prayer, to be the

⁶³⁰ My English translation of Kabasilas, *Liturgiae Expositio*, 29, in *Patrologia Graeca*, Vol. 150, cols. 428-9: "Ὅτι δε οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ λόγος [i.e., the dominical words], καὶ τα δῶρα τελειῶν, ὁ μακάριος, φασί, Χρυσόστομος μαρτυρεῖ λέγων ὅτι καθάπερ ὁ δημιουργικός λόγος, το Αὐξάνεσθε καὶ πληθύνεσθε, καὶ εἴρηται μεν ἅπαξ ὑπό τοῦ Θεοῦ, ἐνεργεῖται δε ἀεί· οὕτω **καὶ λόγος οὗτος ἅπαξ ῥηθεις ὑπό τοῦ Σωτήρος, διὰ παντός ἐνεργεῖ...**"

⁶³¹ My English translation of Mark of Ephesus, *Libellus de Consecratione*, 5, Petit, ed., in *Patrologia Orientalis*, Vol. 17, p. 431: "...τὸν αὐτὸν τρόπον **καὶ ὁ λόγος οὗτος, ἅπαξ ῥηθεις ὑπό τοῦ Σωτήρος**, ὡς καὶ ὁ θεῖος φησι Χρυσόστομος, **διὰ παντός ἐνεργεῖ**· συνεργεῖ δὲ ὁμως καὶ ἡ τῆς θείας ιερωσύνης δύναμις διὰ τῆς εὐχῆς καὶ τῆς εὐλογίας εἰς τὴν τῶν προχειμένων τελείωσιν..."

⁶³² Cf. Bouларанд, 'L'Épiclèse,' 260; Kappes, *Epiclisis Debate*, pp. 159-60.

⁶³³ Kabasilas, *Liturgiae Expositio*, 29, in *Patrologia Graeca*, Vol. 150, col. 429: "Μετὰ τὸν λόγον ἐκεῖνον, οὐδενὸς πρὸς τοῦτο δεόμεθα, καὶ χρεια ἡμῖν εὐδενὸς ἄλλου πρὸς τὴν αὔξησιν οὐδεμία; ἢ καὶ γάμου καὶ συναφείας δεῖ, καὶ τῆς ἄλλης ἐπιμελείας καὶ τούτων χωρὶς, οὐ δυνατὸν συτεστάναι τὸ γένος καὶ προχωρεῖν; Οὐκοῦν καθάπερ ἐκεῖ πρὸς παιδοποιίαν ἀναγκαῖον ἡγοῦμεθα τὸν γάμον καὶ μετὰ τὸν γάμον ὑπὲρ αὐτοῦ τούτου πάλιν εὐχόμεθα, καὶ οὐ δοκοῦμεν ἀτιμάζειν τὸν δημιουργικὸν λόγον, εἰς δότες αἴτιον αὐτὸν τῆς γενέσεως, ἀλλὰ τὸν τρόπον τοῦτον διὰ γάμου, διὰ τροφῆς, διὰ τῶν ἄλλων· οὕτω καὶ ἐνταῦθα πιστεύομεν αὐτὸν εἶναι τὸν ἐνεργοῦντα τὸ μυστήριον, τὸν τοῦ Κυρίου λόγον· ἀλλ' οὕτω, διὰ ιερέως, δι' ἐντεύξεω; αὐτοῦ καὶ εὐχῆς. Οὐ γὰρ διὰ πάντων ἐνεργεῖν ἀπλῶς, οὐδὲ ἐπωσδήποτε· ἀλλὰ πολλὰ τὰ ζητούμενα, ὧν χωρὶς οὐ ποιήσει τὰ ἑαυτοῦ."

sole 'efficient cause' of Eucharistic transmutation. Thus, Mark's reduction of efficient Sacramental causality to God alone, while upholding the various components of the Eucharistic Prayer as the necessary context for securing this divine agency, juxtaposed with the aforementioned Franciscan framework of Sacramental causality and thereby supports this dissertation's conclusion that Mark's doctrine provides a means to overcome the historical Roman Catholic-Eastern Orthodox divergence concerning Eucharistic consecration.⁶³⁴

4.4.5. Pseudo-Dionysius

Moving on to examine Mark's use of Pseudo-Dionysius within his *Λίβελλος*, one should recall that Chapter Three detailed how, likely via Aquinas, Torquemada indirectly invoked Pseudo-Dionysius as a theological authority within his *Sermo prior*. However, given that Aquinas did not evidently intend to address the Latin-Hellenophone debates over the epiclesis' consecratory power, for Torquemada, Aquinas' utility primarily derived from the fact that Aquinas had identified the term *invocatio* as employed by Pseudo-Dionysius to denote the dominical words.⁶³⁵

Against this background, Mark invoked Pseudo-Dionysius' *De ecclesiastica hierarchia* and located the precise passage within this work which Torquemada had evoked, and exhibited how Pseudo-Dionysius did not identify the term *ἐπίκλησις*, or *invocatio*, with the dominical words, by instead characterizing Christ's statements at the Last Supper as 'sacred discourse.'⁶³⁶ Assuming that Pseudo-Dionysius very clearly differentiated the dominical

⁶³⁴ Cf. Kappes, *Epiclesis Debate*, pp. 160-2.

⁶³⁵ Cf. Boularand, 'L'Épiclèse,' 261; Kappes, *Epiclesis Debate*, p. 162.

⁶³⁶ See Pseudo-Dionysius, *De Ecclesiastica Hierarchia*, 3.12, in Heil and Ritter, eds., *Corpus Dionysiacum*. II, p. 92. Cf. Kappes, *Epiclesis Debate*, p. 163.

words from the term *ἐπίκλησις*, Mark did not offer any additional commentary thereupon and instead began to focus upon the ritual inconsistencies between those ceremonies described by Pseudo-Dionysius and those of the Latin Church:

For since we [the Byzantine Orthodox] are following the holy apostles and teachers in accord with the expositions they handed down, we celebrate the rites of the holy sacraments [in line with Pseudo-Dionysius' *De ecclesiastica hierarchia*]... [which] states: "...we repeat the Lord's own words which He once stated [and which] we also recite also because He commanded 'Do this to commemorate me'..."⁶³⁷ We [the Byzantine Orthodox] celebrate [i.e., consecrate] the most holy things by prayer and the blessing and the Spirit of God's manifestation... after we have unveiled the veiled and undivided bread and divided it into many parts, and we [subsequently] distribute the undivided chalice...⁶³⁸

However, the Latin priest also recites the Lord's words in his narrative because He [i.e., Christ] commanded [as such]... but [the Latin priest] does not subsequently consecrate any more, but makes his narrative of the [Lord's] words [which] sufficiently for the hallowing and consecration... [The Latin priest then] takes the previously unveiled unleavened bread, breaks a piece from it and drops [this piece] into the chalice... after consuming the whole chalice... [while] the [Latin] priest turns to give the kiss of peace to his concelebrating deacons, but does not communicate [the chalice] to them at all, despite exhorting them to 'Take, eat, all of you,' and 'drink from this, all of you'... Do these things not manifestly oppose both the admitted expositions and exegeses [viz., Pseudo-Dionysius' *De ecclesiastica hierarchia*], and to the Lord's words, and to these term's very [sense]?⁶³⁹

⁶³⁷ See Pseudo-Dionysius, *De Ecclesiastica Hierarchia*, 3.12, in Heil and Ritter, eds., *Corpus Dionysiacum*. II, p. 92.

⁶³⁸ My English translation of Mark of Ephesus, *Libellus de consecratione*, 7, Petit, ed., in *Patrologia Orientalis*, Vol. 17, p. 433: "Ταῦτα συνορθῶν ἕξεισι τῷ βουλομένῳ παντὶ τίσιν ἐστὶ σύμφωνα, τοῖς παρ' ἡμῶν τελουμένοις ἢ τοῖς παρὰ Λατίνων. Ἡμεῖς μὲν γὰρ ἀκολουθοῦντες τοῖς ἱεροῖς ἀποστόλοις καὶ διδασκάλοις κατὰ τὰς ὑπ' αὐτῶν παραδεδομένας ἐκθέσεις καὶ τούτῳ δὴ τῷ ἱεροφάντορι, τὰς ἱεράς θεουργίας ὑμνοῦμεν... φησι... καὶ ἀναβοῶμεν αὐτὰ τὰ δεσποτικά ῥήματα, ἃ τότε εἶπε, καὶ ἐπιλέγομεν ὅτι αὐτὸς προσέταξε· Τοῦτο ποιεῖτε εἰς τὴν ἐμὴν ἀνάμνησιν... ἱεουργοῦμεν τὰ θεϊότατα διὰ τῆς εὐχῆς καὶ τῆς εὐλογίας καὶ τῆς τοῦ Θεοῦ Πνεύματος ἐπιφοιτήσεως καὶ τὸν ἐγκεκαλυμμένον τέως καὶ ἀδιχίρετον ἄρτον ἀναχολύψαντες, εἰς πολλὰ διαιροῦμεν, καὶ τὸ ἐνιαῖον τοῦ ποτηρίου πᾶσι καταμερίζομεν."

⁶³⁹ My English translation of Mark of Ephesus, *Libellus de consecratione*, 7, Petit, ed., in *Patrologia Orientalis*, Vol. 17, pp. 433-4: "Ὁ δὲ παρὰ Λατίνους ἱερεὺς ψέμνηται μὲν καὶ αὐτὸς διηγηματικῶς τῶν δεσποτικῶν ῥημάτων, ὅτι αὐτὸς προσέταξε, φάγετε, καὶ πίετε πάντες, καὶ τοῦτο ποιεῖτε εἰς τὴν ἐμὴν ἀνάμνησιν· ἱεουργεῖ δὲ οὐδὲν μᾶλλον, ἀλλ' οἶεται τὴν διήγησιν αὐτῆν τῶν ῥημάτων πρὸς τὸν ἁγιασμόν καὶ τὴν ἱεουργίαν ἄρκειν· εἶτα τὸν ἄζυμον ἄρτον ἐκεῖνον οὐκ ἐγκεκαλυμμένον τέως, ἀλλ' ὅθεν ἔτυχεν οὕτω λαβὼν καὶ ὑψώσας, μέρος μὲν ἀπορρήγνυσι καὶ τῷ ποτηρίῳ ἐμβάλλει, τὸ δὲ λοιπὸν καθίσιν εἰς τὸ στόμα, καὶ τὸ ποτήριον ἐκπιὼν ὅλον ὁμοίως, ἀσπάζεσθαι αὐτὸν προτρέπεται τοὺς συλλειτουργοῦντας αὐτῷ διακόνους. μηδενὶ μηδὲν μεταδούς, ὁ τὸ λάβετε φάγετε πάντες καὶ Πίετε ἐξ αὐτοῦ πάντες μεγαλαυχῶν. Ταῦτα οὐ πρόδηλον φέρει τὴν ἐναντίωσιν καὶ πρὸς τὰς παραδεδομένας ἐκθέσεις καὶ ἐξηγήσεις καὶ πρὸς τὰ δεσποτικά ῥήματα καὶ πρὸς αὐτὰς τὰς ἐκείνων φωνάς;"

Mark's remarks concerning the Latin Rite within the *Λίβελλος* were likely informed by the fact that he attended the celebration of the Eucharist according to the praxis of the Roman Curia on March 3rd, 1439.⁶⁴⁰ Before analysing Mark's comparison of the Pseudo-Dionysian liturgy with the Roman Church's Eucharistic praxis, one must highlight that Mark significantly overlooked a pertinent locus within Kabasilas' *Ἐρμηνεία* which claimed that the *Supplices te rogamus* functioned as a consecratory epiclesis, unlike Bessarion and Isidore of Kiev, who had made recourse to Kabasilas' excerpt of the *Canon Missae* from the *Sententiarum* shortly before the *Λίβελλος* was composed. To explicate Mark's failure to invoke Kabasilas here, while there are evincible references to Greek translations of passages from the *Sententiarum* amongst Hellenophone authors including Kabasilas and Symeon of Thessalonica, given the destruction which ensued upon the 1430 Ottoman capture of Thessalonica, it is likely that the manuscript which incorporated this Greek translation of the *Sententiarum* was likely destroyed or lost.

Given that Byzantine Orthodox interpreters of Kabasilas' *Ἐρμηνεία* could only have accurately exegeted his claims regarding the *Supplices te rogamus'* epicletic nature by comparing Kabasilas' argumentation to those made by Peter Lombard. When considering that Mark's extant oeuvres made no detectable citation to the *Sententiarum* at any point, Mark likely eschewed from following Isidore of Kiev and Bessarion in making recourse to Kabasilas' treatment of the *Canon Missae* here given that he was unable to precisely locate the Latin provenance of Kabasilas' claims and was thereby cautious in employing arguments which could not be authentically sourced on his part. This was likely particularly the case

⁶⁴⁰ Miguel Arranz, "Circonstance et conséquences liturgiques du Concile de Ferrare-Florence," in Giuseppe Alberigo, ed., *Christian Unity. The Council of Ferrara-Florence 1438/39-1989* (Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1991), pp. 407-27 (415); Cf. Kappes, *Epiclesis Debate*, p. 163.

given that Mark acknowledged that Isidore's and Bessarion's argumentation had dissatisfied Pope Eugenius and the Latin Fathers present within such discussions.⁶⁴¹

In likely contrast to Kabasilas, through personally witnessing the celebration of the Eucharist according to the fifteenth century Church of Rome's praxis, Mark highlighted what he perceived to be the Latin celebrant's professed intention not to consecrate any of the Eucharistic elements following the dominical words. This, for Mark, reflected these Priests' insufficient understanding of proper intention, and resulted in their denial of the necessity to explicitly petition the Spirit, whose divine operation Mark understood to function as the efficient cause of Eucharistic transformation.⁶⁴²

Mark also countered Torquemada's evocation of Pseudo-Dionysius to criticize the Byzantine Fathers' doctrine of Eucharistic consecration by highlighting how the Latin Eucharistic praxis discorded with that Pseudo-Dionysius' exposition of the liturgy in several respects: Mark highlighted that Pseudo-Dionysius had described how the Eucharistic gifts were veiled prior to their consecration, unlike the Latin Offertory Rite which kept the pre-consecrated gifts unveiled.⁶⁴³ Thus, Mark emphasized that this Pseudo-Dionysian practice harmonized with the Eucharistic gifts' veiling at the Great Entrance in the *Liturgies of St Basil* and *St John Chrysostom*. Mark was to a significant extent accurate in interlinking the Pseudo-Dionysian liturgy to the fifteenth-century Byzantine Rite: One would naturally suspect Pseudo-Dionysius' liturgical rituals to reflect the late antique West Syriac Rite rather than the Byzantine Rite given that a number of scholars since the nineteenth century have

⁶⁴¹ Cf. Boularand, 'L'Épiclèse,' 245-7; Kappes, *Epiclesis Debate*, pp. 163-4.

⁶⁴² Mark of Ephesus, *Libellus de Consecratione*, Petit, ed., in *Patrologia Orientalis*, Vol. 17, p. 434. Cf. Kappes, *Epiclesis Debate*, pp. 164-5.

⁶⁴³ See Jungmann, *Mass of the Roman Rite*, Vol. 2, Brunner, trans., 59-61 for a description of Mark's reference to the Latin Offertory ritual whereby the subdeacon transfers an unveiled host to the altar from the Credence table. Cf. Boularand, 'L'Épiclèse,' 261; Kappes, *Epiclesis Debate*, pp. 165-6.

identified Pseudo-Dionysius as a non-Chalcedonian operating within northern Syria, whose body of work was produced between the late fifth century and early sixth century.⁶⁴⁴ Nonetheless, as Paul L. Gavrilyuk highlighted, some of Pseudo-Dionysius' Baptismal practices, such as his formula for renunciation and the character of his pre-Baptismal anointment, concurred with the distinct Baptismal rubrics described within the *Euchologion Barberini gr. 336*.⁶⁴⁵ This euchologion's provenance has been situated by scholars such as Thomas Finn and Antoine Wenger to Constantinople during the time between John Chrysostom's death in 407 and the Ecumenical Patriarchate of Proklos between 434 and 446, and is illustrative of the fifth-century Byzantine Rite's liturgical praxis.⁶⁴⁶ When juxtaposed with the fact that subsequent liturgical scholiasts such as Patriarch Germanos I, who could be more directly interlinked to the *Liturgies of St Basil and St John Chrysostom* in their Eucharistic praxis,⁶⁴⁷ had also invoked Pseudo-Dionysius' *De ecclesiastica hierarchia* to explicate the Byzantine Rite, Mark's recourse to Pseudo-Dionysius to support the greater

⁶⁴⁴ See Thomas L. Campbell, *Dionysius the Pseudo-Areopagite: The Ecclesiastical Hierarchy* (Lanham: University Press of America, 1981), p. 139; Spinks, *Do This in Memory of Me*, pp. 123-4. Cf. Hänggi and Rahl, eds., *Præx Eucharistica*, pp. 210-3 for Pseudo-Dionysius' anaphora. Cf. Josef Stiglmayr, 'Der Neuplatoniker Proclus als Vorlage des sogenannten Dionysius Areopagita in der Lehre vom Übel,' *Historisches Jahrbuch* 16 (1895): 253-73, 721-48; Hugo Koch, *Pseudo-Dionysius Areopagita in seinen Beziehungen zum Neuplatonismus und Mysterienweisen. Eine litteraturhistorische Untersuchung* (Mainz: Franz Kirchheim, 1900), for two of the initial scholars who highlighted that Pseudo-Dionysius relied upon Proclus, and who postulated that the Pseudo-Dionysian Corpus was produced by followers of the Severus, the Miaphysite Patriarch of Antioch. For more recent advocates of this position, see Paul Rorem and John C. Lamoreaux, *John of Scythopolis and the Dionysian Corpus: Annotating the Areopagite* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1998), pp. 11-5. Nonetheless, see István Perczel, "Dionysius the Areopagite," in Parry, ed., *The Wiley Blackwell Companion to Patristics*, pp. 211-25 (221-3), for a criticism of the view that Pseudo-Dionysius could definitively be identified as non-Chalcedonian.

⁶⁴⁵ See Paul L. Gavrilyuk, 'Did Pseudo-Dionysius Live in Constantinople?,' *Vigiliae Christianae* 62(5) (2008): 505-14 (506-11).

⁶⁴⁶ Thomas M. Finn, *Early Christian Baptism and the Catechumenate: West and East Syria* (Collegeville: Liturgical Press, 1992), p. 98; Antoine Wenger, *Jean Chrysostome: Huit Catéchèses baptismales* (Paris: Éditions du Cerf, 1970), pp. 84-5.

⁶⁴⁷ Cf. Robert F. Taft, 'The Liturgy of the Great Church: An Initial Synthesis of Structure and Interpretation on the Eve of Iconoclasm,' *Dumbarton Oaks Papers* 34-35 (1980-1): 45-75 (47-59) for an analysis of Germanos' exegesis of the liturgy and its interconnection to the Byzantine Rite's praxis during the seventh and eighth centuries.

harmony between the Byzantine Rite and the Pseudo-Dionysian liturgy in contrast to the Latin Rite could in this respect be vindicated.

Mark also rhetorically challenged his Latin counterparts by evoking the Latin practice of the consecrated chalice being strictly consumed by the celebrant priests, even being withheld from the concelebrating deacons, which Mark perceived to counteract Christ's ordinance, 'Drink from it, all of you.'⁶⁴⁸ Resultingly, Mark inquired how Torquemada's Pseudo-Dionysian liturgical exegesis could thereby be applicable to the Latin Rite given that such practices were, as Mark claimed in the above passage, contrary to the liturgical exposition given by Pseudo-Dionysius.⁶⁴⁹

The potency of Mark's criticisms of is suggested by the fact that, within his *Sermo Alter*, Torquemada made no attempt to counteract Mark's arguments after being related by Ioannes VIII to Cesarini. Finally, one must highlight the forceful nature of Mark's invocation of the contemporaneous debates regarding *utraquism*. In particular, the Latin ecclesiastical hierarchy had recently engaged within an extensive campaign to undermine the Hussite movement, having attempted to canonically denounce the Hussite doctrine of *utraquism* at the Council of Constance.⁶⁵⁰ Moreover, the Latin Church had financed a series of rather unsuccessful anti-Hussite military campaigns within Central Europe to combat this movement.⁶⁵¹ Thus, one of the Latin Church's principal agendas at Basel was to make a

⁶⁴⁸ Cf. Matt. 26:27.

⁶⁴⁹ Mark of Ephesus, *Libellus de Consecratione*, 7, Petit, ed., in *Patrologia Orientalis*, Vol. 17, p. 434. Cf. Boularand, 'L'Épiclèse,' 261; Kappes, *Epiclesis Debate*, p. 166.

⁶⁵⁰ On June 15th, 1415, the Council of Constance formally ratified communion under one kind to the laity. While the Constantian Fathers acknowledged that Christ administered the Eucharist under both kinds to His Apostles, and that the early Church offered communion under both kinds to the faithful. However, the Church had developed a valid custom whereby the celebrant who confected the Eucharistic gifts was to receive under both kinds, whereas the congregation would strictly receive the consecrated Body. See Denzinger, ed., "Sessio XV (6 Julii 1415)," in *Enchiridion*, pp. 228-31.

⁶⁵¹ See Thomas A. Fudge, ed. and trans., *The Crusade against Heretics in Bohemia, 1418-1437: Sources and Documents for the Hussite Crusades* (Aldershot: Routledge, 2002), pp. 314-7, 319-22, for various documents

number of compromises with the Hussites regarding communion under both kinds to reestablish ecclesial and political harmony. Based upon what he witnessed at the Papal Curial liturgy, Mark intended to culminate the *λίβελλος* with a highly potent counterpoise to Torquemada's doctrine of Eucharistic change given his knowledge that the Latin Church struggled to establish an internal consensus regarding the legitimacy of its liturgical praxis, let alone that such praxis was Apostolic in origin.

4.4.6. The Conclusion of the *λίβελλος*

To conclude his *λίβελλος*, Mark evoked the passage from Chrysostom's *Εἰς τὴν προδοσίαν τοῦ Ἰούδα* affirming the perpetual efficacy of God's discourse,⁶⁵² from which Torquemada asserted that, once the priest recites the dominical words, the Eucharistic gifts are perfectly transmuted. Against Torquemada's interpretation, while accepting that a divine creative command always effectuates its end, for Mark, the celebrant does not function as an efficient Eucharistic cause. Instead, Mark, like Bonaventure and Scotus, affirmed that creatures could not possess an inherent capacity to produce new substances through, for example, reciting formulae. Eucharistic change could only emerge through the priest's prayer, which functions as a *sine qua non* for the necessary supernatural operation of the Spirit in producing the Eucharist's supernatural effect by obeying Christ's divine command to recite this prayer to faithfully commemorate Him.⁶⁵³ In this regard, Mark's doctrine provided a coherent basis from which the Latin and Byzantine Churches could have

relating to the lack of success of the Fifth Hussite Crusade which took place in August 1431 with Cesarini acting as the Papal legate. Cf. Fudge, ed. and trans., *Crusade against Heretics*, pp. 341-4 for the formal invitation of Hussite representatives to Basel on October 15th, 1431. Kappes, *Epiclesis Debate*, pp. 167-8.

⁶⁵² Cf. Chrysostom, *De Proditione Judae*, in *Patrologia Graeca*, Vol. 49, col. 380c.

⁶⁵³ Mark of Ephesus, *Libellus de consecratione*, 7, Petit, ed., in *Patrologia Orientalis*, Vol. 17, p. 434.

established a more enduring consensus concerning Eucharistic consecration at Florence. By emphasizing this analogization of Eucharistic transmutation with the Annunciation Narrative in conjunction with his reading of John of Damascus' framework of the temporal operations of the Triune Persons, Mark posited that the Son must first, descend before sending His Spirit to consummate His transmutative action:

[When] Chrysostom states 'The Lord's once spoken command actualises the perfect sacrifice,' he was not stating 'once spoken' as iterated by the priest, but 'once spoken' by the Saviour, who infuses [His] eternally-effective power into the [Eucharistic] offerings, despite the lack of [another] operation to perfect these [offerings], the Holy Spirit's indwelling which operates through the priest's prayer, as seen by [what was stated] by this golden tongue [i.e., Chrysostom], as quoted above, who stated following the dominical words... [Mark then delineated the *Liturgy of St John Chrysostom's* epiclesis]...⁶⁵⁴

Thus, in Mark's view, given that Torquemada's Sacramentology did not accurately uphold the proper order of the Son and Spirit with regards to their *ad extra* activity, his doctrine of Eucharistic change was of limited effect in binding the consciences of his Byzantine interlocutors or his own Latin colleagues. Comparatively, Mark's doctrine of Eucharistic transformation significantly concurred with an enduring Hellenophone and Latin Christian hermeneutic of this doctrine firmly rooted within the Patristic traditions of Scriptural exegesis.⁶⁵⁵

⁶⁵⁴ My English translation of Mark of Ephesus, *Libellus de consecratione*, 7, Petit, ed., in *Patrologia Orientalis*, Vol. 17, p. 434: "Ἄλλ' ὁ Χρυσόστομος φησι «τὸν δεσποτικὸν λόγον ἅπαξ ῥηθέντα τὴν θυσίαν ἀπηρτισμένην ἐργαζέσθαι» ἅπαξ ῥηθέντα φησὶν οὐ νῦν ὑπὸ τοῦ ἱερέως λεγόμενον, ἀλλ' ἅπαξ ὑπὸ τοῦ Σωτῆρος ῥηθέντα, τὴν τελειωτικὴν αἰεὶ δύναμιν ἐνιέναι τοῖς προκειμένοις, οὐκ ἤδη καὶ ἐνεργεῖα τελειοῦν αὐτὰ γὰρ ἢ τοῦ ἁγίου Πνεύματος ἐπιφοίτησις ἐργάζεται δια τῆς τοῦ ἱερέως εὐχῆς, καὶ δῆλον ἐξ ὧν αὐτός ὁ χρυσοῦς τὴν γλῶτταν, ὡς πρότερον ἐξεθέμεθα, μετὰ το εἰπεῖν τα δεσποτικά ῥήματα, «Κατάπεμψον φησί, το Πνεῦμα σου το ἅγιον, καὶ ποιήσον τὸν μεν ἄρτον τοῦτον τίμιον σῶμα τοῦ Χριστοῦ σου, το δε ἐν τῷ ποτηρίῳ τοῦτω τίμιον αἷμα τοῦ Χριστοῦ σου μεταβαλῶν το Πνεύματί σου τῷ ἁγίῳ.»"

⁶⁵⁵ Cf. Bouларанд, 'L'Épiclèse,' 261; Kappes, *Epiclesis Debate*, pp. 166-70.

Chapter Five: An Analysis of Torquemada's *Sermo Alter*

5.1. An Analysis of the *Sermo Alter*'s Structure and Source Material

After Mark of Ephesus completed his *Λίβελλος*, Ioannes VIII put forward a number of Mark's therein during a private meeting with Cardinal Cesarini and a number of other Latin Fathers which was held on June 19th, of which no extant minutes have survived.⁶⁵⁶ Ioannes VIII apparently refrained from explicitly attributing Mark as the author of the work to avoid conjuring any intra-Latin scepticism given Mark's increased antipathy towards the papal-imperial terms of ecclesial reunion, particularly following the earlier Latin claims regarding the interpolation of supposedly consecratory epicleses within the Byzantine Rite's Eucharistic Prayers.⁶⁵⁷

Following this meeting, Cesarini commissioned Torquemada to produce a response on the Latin Church's behalf. Torquemada was given approximately a day to consider Mark's and the Emperor's argumentation.⁶⁵⁸ Nonetheless, as will be exemplified, Torquemada's self-assured articulation of his doctrine of Eucharistic consecration succeeded in convincing the Byzantine Fathers present at the subsequent public conciliar debate to accept his conclusions. As will be detailed, this acceptance on the part of these Byzantine Fathers indicates that they were to a significant extent incognizant of Mark's literary source material in light of the impromptu invocation of Eucharistic consecration as a formal topic of debate.

Within the public conciliar debates concerning the Eucharist which were held on June 20th, Torquemada took the floor in the morning, and began by alluding to the previous

⁶⁵⁶ Gill, *Council of Florence*, pp. 276-7.

⁶⁵⁷ Syropoulos, *Les Mémoires*, 10.2, Hofmann, ed., p. 474, 476; Gill, *Council of Florence*, p. 272.

⁶⁵⁸ Boularand, 'L'Épiclèse,' 251, 265; Gill, *Council of Florence*, pp. 274-5; Kappes, *Epiclesis Debate*, p. 171.

day's discussion between Ioannes VIII and Cardinal Cesarini.⁶⁵⁹ As will be elucidated in this chapter, it is evident that, in light of Torquemada's apparent failure to convince his Byzantine counterparts to accept his single moment doctrine of Eucharistic consecration within the *Sermo Prior* and building upon the information related to him by Cesarini concerning the arguments and material of Mark of Ephesus' Eucharistic *Λίβελλος*, Torquemada made recourse to several additional theological and liturgical documents in addition to a number of those authors whom he had previously invoked in the *Sermo Prior*.

As will be elucidated in the fourth subsection of this first section, while Torquemada claimed to evoke a Latin edition of the *Liturgy of St Basil*, he instead utilized Leo the Tuscan's Latin translation of the *Liturgy of St John Chrysostom*. This example will be shown to exhibit not only the significant limitations in Torquemada's use of liturgical source material within his two *Sermones*, but that Mark's aforementioned transcription of four anaphoras testifying to the authenticity of a consecratory epiclesis within his *Λίβελλος* significantly impacted Torquemada's methodology within his *Sermo Alter*. This will be shown to be the case given that Torquemada ceased to reiterate the initial Latin claims that the Byzantine Fathers had edited their liturgical texts preceding Ferrara-Florence, and also refrained from questioning the *Liturgy of St James'* putatively Apostolic provenance. As will be detailed, within the *Sermo Alter*, Torquemada instead opted to exemplify that the (Pseudo-) *Liturgy of St Basil's* epiclesis was not intended to function as a consecratory

⁶⁵⁹ *Acta Latina*, Hofmann, ed., p. 248, lines 2-5: "De mandato sanctissimi domini nostri sermonem brevem facturum paucissimis utar, et rescindendo multa breviter tngam, que ad propositum faciunt. Imperator respondens ad preposita per reverendum dominum cardinalem dixit inter alia, quod illa particula, quod sacramentum conficiebatur e[x] solis verbis salvatoris, non poterat ibi poni."

element following the dominical words' recitation. Rather, it was intended to purify the celebrant.⁶⁶⁰

5.1.1. Aquinas

In terms of the theological source material which Torquemada evoked within the *Sermo Alter*, after making recourse to a number of texts attributed (correctly and incorrectly) to Augustine discussed in Chapter Three, Torquemada invoked an axiom derived from Aquinas' *Summa Theologiae* III, q. 78, a. 2. Therein, Aquinas accepted that there are historical additions to the Church's Eucharistic Prayers which were incorporated by several Popes and venerated authors. Nonetheless, Aquinas contentiously claimed that the *Canon Missae's* primitive form was composed by St Peter himself,⁶⁶¹ based upon which Torquemada posited that only the Eucharistic Prayer's core, within which the Eucharistic gifts' consecration reaches its 'perfection,' is Apostolic in origin. Thus, Torquemada asserted that Eucharistic transubstantiation could not occur through the priest's recitation of the epiclesis on the basis of this formula's subsequent interpolation into the liturgy. Rather, only through the dominical words could effectuate Eucharistic transubstantiation given that

⁶⁶⁰ Torquemada took advantage of Mark's *Libellus de Consecratione*, 6, Petit, ed., in *Patrologia Orientalis*, Vol. 17, pp. 432-3, within which Mark quoted a passage from Pseudo-Dionysius' *De ecclesiastica hierarchia*, wherein the celebrant petitions for purification following the recitation of the dominical words. See *De ecclesiastica hierarchia*, III, 12, Heil and Ritter, eds., *Corpus Dionysiacum*, II, pp. 92-3. Of the liturgies cited in Mark's *Libellus*, Ioannes VIII was only familiar with the *Liturgies of St Basil* and *St John Chrysostom*. Following the eleventh century, given that the latter enjoyed predominance in celebration, Torquemada was likely aware that he should focus upon these two liturgies, especially the latter, based upon Ioannes VIII's argumentation from the previous day's debates. Cf. Stefano Parenti, "La 'vittoria' nella Chiesa di Constantinopoli della Liturgia di Crisostomo sulla Liturgia di Basilio," in Robert F. Taft and Gabriele Winkler, eds., *Comparative Liturgy Fifty Years after Anton Bumstark: Acts of the International Congress. Orientalia Christiana Analecta* 265 (Roma: Pontificio Istituto Orientale, 2001), pp. 907-28, for an overview of this intra-Orthodox transition towards the *Liturgy of St John Chrysostom*.

⁶⁶¹ Aquinas, *Summa Theologiae* III, q. 78, a. 2, ad. 5, in *Opera Omnia*, Vol. 12. *Editio Leonina*, p. 208: "Ad quintum dicendum quod haec coniunctio enim apponitur in hac forma secundum consuetudinem Romanae Ecclesiae a beato Petro apostolo derivatam. Et hoc propter continuationem ad verba praecedentia. Et ideo non est de forma, sicut nec praecedentia formam." Cf. Aquinas, *Summa Theologiae* III, q. 78, a. 2, arg. 5, in *Opera Omnia*, Vol. 12. *Editio Leonina*, pp. 207-8: "Praeterea, in verbis formae non debet poni aliquid quod non sit de substantia eius. Inconvenienter ergo additur in quibusdam libris haec coniunctio enim, quae non est de substantia formae." Cf. Jungmann, *Mass of the Roman Rite*, Vol. 2, Brunner, trans., pp. 421-2.

Torquemada believed that only these could claim to have been incorporated within the various Apostolic rites' Eucharistic Prayers throughout the textual history of these prayers.⁶⁶²

Torquemada's methodology was potent in this context given that none of the Byzantine Fathers at the forefront of the debate concerning Eucharistic consecration such as Isidore of Kiev, Bessarion, nor Mark of Ephesus had an extensive mastery of Latin during this time, nor did they apparently have access to Greek editions of either Lombard's *Sententiarum* or to the *Canon Missae*. These lacunae entailed that these Byzantine Fathers were primarily restricted to evoking Kabasilas' claim concerning the *Supplices te rogamus*' epiclesis nature. On this point, as Christiaan Kappes highlighted, Torquemada was fortunate that none of the Byzantine Fathers were evidently prepared to respond to his claim by highlighting that, alongside the dominical words, the Latin and Byzantine Rites actually shared a post-dominical epiclesis, a concomitant Sign of the Cross, and a concluding doxology.⁶⁶³ Nonetheless, Torquemada maintained that the only mutual elements between the two Churches' Eucharistic Prayers were 'This is My Body/Blood,' which must thereby function as the sole liturgical formulae to possess consecratory power.

While many liturgiologists from the nineteenth century have methodologically paralleled Torquemada's recourse to an Apostolic liturgical core,⁶⁶⁴ a number of such

⁶⁶² Paraphrased from *Acta Latina*, Hofmann, ed., pp. 248, line 24-249, line 1: "Ecce, quod isti clarissimi et sanctissimi doctores de isto sacramento tractantes in solis verbis salvatoris dicunt confici sacramentum. Et una ratio vulgaris ponitur a sancto Thoma, per quam et vulgaribus debeat esse nota apud omnes: Quia idem canon <non> fuit in perpetuum apud omnes, sed per diversa tempora per pontifices additu[s]. Unde missa nostra dicitur habuisse principium a beato Petro, qui solum in canone dicitur posuisse brevissimam orationem. Postea per sanctos doctores facte sunt additiones orationum, ex quibus manifeste arguitur, quod consecratio huius dignissimi sacramenti non fit perfecta verbis sanctorum que varietatem receperunt ex tempore, sed verbis dei, que semper uniformiter manserunt."

⁶⁶³ Kappes, *Epiclesis Debate*, pp. 175-6.

⁶⁶⁴ Cf. Spinks, "In Search of the Meals behind the Last Supper: Cultural Background and Eucharistic Origins," in *Do This in Remembrance of Me*, pp. 1-29, for a succinct overview of the textual basis for this assertion as well as the scholarly debate regarding the Apostolic provenance of the various liturgical rites.

scholars have ironically exhibited that the dominical words themselves were not necessarily incorporated within the earliest anaphoras given their non-inclusion within chapters nine and ten of the *Διδαχή (Didache)*,⁶⁶⁵ following its rediscovery by Philotheos Bryennios, the Greek Orthodox Metropolitan of Nicomedia, in 1873,⁶⁶⁶ and was likely composed during the late first century.⁶⁶⁷ Such discoveries helped to instigate the Roman Catholic Church to officially promulgate the *Common Christological Declaration Between the Catholic Church and the Assyrian Church of the East* in 1994 acknowledging the *Liturgy of Addai and Mari's* validity, despite its Eucharistic Prayer lacking the dominical words as the putative Eucharistic form and also including a consecratory epiclesis.⁶⁶⁸ Torquemada's claims, while evidently being potent within their fifteenth-century conciliar context, would thereby lack any doctrinal authority if posited by a modern-day liturgist.

⁶⁶⁵ See Hänggi and Rahl, eds., *Prex Eucharistica*, p. 66. For general examples of such scholarship, cf. G. H. Cuming, 'The Shape of the Anaphora,' *Studia Patristica* 20 (1989): 333-45; Edward J. Kilmartin, 'Sacrificium laudis: Content and Function of Early Eucharistic Prayers,' *Theological Studies* (1974): 268-87, esp. 277-80; Louis Ligier, 'The Origins of the Eucharistic Prayer: From the Last Supper to the Eucharist,' *Studia Liturgica* 9 (1973): 161-85 (179ff). Conversely, scholars such as the Syro-Malabar Catholic theologian, Thomas Elavanal, *The Memorial Celebration: A Theological Study of the Anaphora of the Apostles Mar Addai and Mari* (Kerala: M. C. B. S. Publications, 1988), pp. 123-4, offered a more nuanced response to this claim, arguing that: "A very probable opinion is that the liturgical texts in the book of Revelation and the Didache contain a schema of eucharistic celebration in which the Institution Narrative does not form part of the eucharistic prayers but is inserted just before communion... Accordingly, the words, 'This is my body' and 'This is my blood' are words of communion and not words of consecration."

⁶⁶⁶ Philotheos Bryennios, ed., *Διδαχή τῶν Δώδεκα Ἀποστόλων* (Istanbul: S. I. Boutura, 1883). See Jonathan A. Draper, "The Didache in Modern Research: An Overview," in Draper, ed., *The Didache in Modern Research* (Leiden/New York/Cologne: Brill, 1996), pp. 1-42 (1ff).

⁶⁶⁷ See Aaron Milavec, *The Didache: Text, Translation, Analysis, and Commentary* (Collegeville: Liturgical Press, 2003), esp. ix-xi.

⁶⁶⁸ For this Eucharistic Prayer, see Hänggi and Rahl, eds., *Prex Eucharistica*, pp. 375-80. Some liturgical scholars such as Bernard Botte have posited that the *Anaphora of Addai and Mari* historically included the dominical words. See, e.g., Botte, 'L'Anaphore Chaldéenne des Apôtres,' *Orientalia Christiana Periodica* 15 (1949): 259-76; 'Problèmes de l'anaphore syrienne des Apôtres Addai et Mari,' *L'Orient syrien* 10 (1965): 89-106. However, many modern-day liturgical scholars maintain that this anaphora did not historically include the dominical words. See, e.g., E. J. Cutrone, 'The Anaphora of the Apostles: Implications of the Mar Eša'ya Text,' *Theological Studies* 43 (1973): 624-42; Elavanal, *The Memorial Celebration*, p. 124; William Marston, 'A Solution to the Enigma of 'Addai and Mari',' *Ephemerides Liturgicae* 103 (1989): 79-91. This conclusion had previously been argued by E. C. Ratcliff, 'The Original Form of the Anaphora of Addai and Mari: A Suggestion,' *Journal of Theological Studies* 30 (1928-9): 23-32. S. B. Wilson, "The Anaphora of the Apostles Addai and Mari," in Bradshaw, ed., *Essays on Early Eastern Eucharistic Prayers*, pp. 19-37, did not offer any definitive judgement on this issue.

An additional problem concerning Torquemada's a posteriori argumentation was that he was forced to depart from the orthodox Thomistic tradition regarding the precise Eucharistic 'form.' For Aquinas, valid Eucharistic consecration required that the celebrant state, *hic est calix sanguinis mei, novi et aeterni testamenti, mysterium fidei, qui pro vobis et pro multis effundetur in remissionem peccatorum*.⁶⁶⁹ While Aquinas' conclusion was a disputed theological opinion amongst high medieval Latin Scholastic theologians, it is evident that Aquinas made recourse to a venerable body of Latin theological authorities to justify his doctrine. For example, within an epistle addressed to John, the Archbishop of Lyons, dated to November 29th, 1202, Pope Innocent III significantly augmented Aquinas' argument by positing that this phrase was incorporated into the Words of Institution to combat errors commensurate to those which would later be ascribed to both the Armenian Christians by Pope Benedict XII and later the Byzantine Church by Torquemada within his earlier *Sermo Prior*:

In the *Canon Missae*, this formula, the *mysterium fidei*, is found interposed in His words... Of course, we find many such things from the Lord's words and deeds omitted by the Evangelists, which were supplied through word in expressed in action as described by the Apostles... And from the formula... some have thought to draw a bulwark to counter error, [with some] teaching that in the Sacrament of the altar Christ's Body and Blood does not truly come to be, but merely the image, species, or type (*figuram*) for Scripture sometimes mentions that what is taken up on the altar is sacrament and mystery and example. But these fall into the trap of error because they do not properly understand Scripture's authority, nor do they receive God's sacraments reverently...⁶⁷⁰

⁶⁶⁹ Aquinas, *Summa Theologiae*, III, q. 78, a. 3, in *Opera Omnia*, Vol. 12. *Editio Leonina*, pp. 209-11.

⁶⁷⁰ My English translation of Pope Innocent III, *Epistola 'Cum Marthae circa' ad Iohannem quondam archiepiscopum Lugdunensem*, 29. Nov. 1202, in Denzinger, ed., *Enchiridion*, pp. 182-3 (182): "In canone Missae sermo iste videlicet 'mysterium fidei' verbis ipsi(u)s interpositus invenitur... Sane multa tam de verbis quam de factis dominicis invenimus ab Evangelistis ommissa, quae Apostoli vel supplevisse verbo vel facto expressisse leguntur... Ex eo autem verbo... munimentum erroris quidam trahere putaverunt, dicentes in sacramento altaris non esse corporis Christi et sanguinis veritatem, sed imaginem tantum, et speciem et figuram, pro eo, quod Scriptura interdum commemorat, id, quod in altari suscipitur, esse sacramentum et mysterium et exemplum. Sed tales ex eo laqueum erroris incurrunt, quod nec auctoritates Scripturae convenienter intelligunt, nec sacramenta Dei suscipiunt reverenter..." Cf. Kappes, *Epiclesis Debate*, pp. 177-9.

While accepting Pope Innocent's conclusion concerning the *mysterium fidei's* Apostolic provenance, within Aquinas' and Torquemada's thirteenth and fifteenth century contexts, both theologians nonetheless would have been behooved to address why Ambrose, who claimed to accord with his coeval Roman Church's liturgical praxis, expounded a version of the Eucharistic Prayer without the *mysterium fidei* in its institution narrative.⁶⁷¹

Thus understood, elaborating upon Aquinas as his principal foundation, slightly later in the *Sermo Alter*, Torquemada asserted that *Hoc est corpus meum* strictly comprised the Eucharistic form for the host.⁶⁷² This conclusion entailed that Torquemada departed from his principal literary authority, Aquinas' affirmation of the *mysterium fidei's* Apostolicity. Indeed, Aquinas utilised this doctrine more forcefully to exegete Pseudo-Dionysius' *De Ecclesiastica Hierchia*. For example, within one of the objections to the *mysterium fidei* being a ubiquitous constituent of the primitive Eucharistic Prayers delineated in the *Tertia Pars*, Aquinas' interlocutor asserted that Scripture lacked any reference to this phrase within its Last Supper narratives.⁶⁷³ Conversely, Aquinas replied that the Evangelists did not intend to disseminate the details concerning the Sacramental forms as the early Church sought to keep these details secret, a conclusion which Aquinas invoked the putatively Apostolic *De ecclesiastica hierarchia* of Pseudo-Dionysius to support.⁶⁷⁴

⁶⁷¹ See Ambrose, *De Sacramentis*, 3.1.4, 4.5.21-5, in *Patrologia Latina*, Vol. 16, cols. 432, 443-5. Cf. Kappes, *Epiclesis Debate*, pp. 178-9.

⁶⁷² *Acta Latina*, Hofmann, ed., p. 249, line 24: "...ita cum dixit, *hoc est corpus meum*, factum est sacramentum."

⁶⁷³ Paraphrased from Aquinas, *Summa Theologiae* III, q. 78, a. 3, arg. 9, in *Opera Omnia*, Vol. 12. *Editio Leonina*, p. 209: "Praeterea, verba quibus hoc sacramentum conficitur, efficaciam habent ex institutione Christi. Sed nullus Evangelista recitat Christum haec omnia verba dixisse [viz., the *mysterium fidei*]. Ergo non est conveniens forma consecrationis vini."

⁶⁷⁴ Paraphrased from Aquinas, *Summa Theologiae* III, q. 78, a. 3, ad. 9, in *Opera Omnia*, Vol. 12. *Editio Leonina*, pp. 210-1 "...Evangelistae non intendebant tradere formas sacramentorum, quas in primitiva Ecclesia oportebat esse occultas, ut dicit Dionysius, in fine *ecclesiasticae hierarchiae*." Cf. Pseudo-Dionysius, *De Ecclesiastica Hierarchia* 7.10, in Heil and Ritter, eds., *Corpus Dionysiacum*. II, p. 130, as quoted below.

Aquinas continued by positing that, while he refrained from employing this phrase when describing the Last Supper within 1 Corinthians 11:25, St Paul employed the phrase when describing altar worship within other epistles ascribed to him, such as within 1 Timothy 2:9, entailing that the *mysterium fidei* was of Apostolic provenance, albeit implicitly. Torquemada strikingly refrained from invoking Aquinas' arguments within his conciliar *Sermones*. Furthermore, Torquemada likely lacked sufficient time to study Pope Innocent's oeuvres, which Aquinas referenced, given that Torquemada would have also propitiously encountered Pope Innocent's conclusion that the *mysterium fidei* was incorporated to counter the heresy of denoting the Eucharistic gifts as 'types' following the dominical words' recitation. By not obliging the Byzantine Church to incorporate the *mysterium fidei* within its anaphoras, Torquemada subsequently undermined the putative Apostolicity of the *mysterium fidei* and failed to uphold what Aquinas regarded as a resolution to those typological errors Torquemada intended to undermine. To summarise, the *Sermo Alter*'s doctrine of the Eucharist's form ceased to harmonise with Aquinas or with his Latin decretal source material, in addition to the Eucharistic theologies sustained by many of Torquemada's contemporaneous Latin Fathers such as those of the Franciscan School.⁶⁷⁵

5.1.2. Pseudo-Dionysius and John of Damascus

When reevoking both Pseudo-Dionysius and John of Damascus within his *Sermo Alter*, Torquemada principally addressed the objections which Ioannes VIII had posed based upon Mark's *λίβελλος*. Pertinently, when exegeting Pseudo-Dionysius' *De ecclesiastica*

⁶⁷⁵ Cf. Boularand, 'L'Épiclèse,' 265-6; Kappes, *Epiclesis Debate*, pp. 179-81.

hierarchia, Torquemada eschewed from responding to Mark's claims that the Latin Church's liturgical praxis discorded with Pseudo-Dionysius'. This omission possibly resulted from the fact that Ioannes VIII did not relate Mark's argument on this point given his apparent lack of extensive familiarity with the Pseudo-Dionysian liturgy. Instead, the Emperor likely simply put forward Mark's argument that Pseudo-Dionysius' employment of the term *ἐπίκλησις/invocatio* in a Eucharistic context was not identifiable with the dominical words. Subsequently, Torquemada addressed this latter claim by maintaining that because Pseudo-Dionysius strictly described the celebrant's self-purification following the dominical words when employing this term and made no reference to an epiclesis, one could conclude that Pseudo-Dionysius did not believe that this petition was necessary for valid Eucharistic consecration.⁶⁷⁶

Given that Mark believed that the Pseudo-Dionysian liturgy more closely harmonized with the Byzantine Rite in terms of its content, had he participated within these public conciliar debates, he likely would have responded to Torquemada's *argumentum ex silentio* by referring to how subsequent Hellenophone liturgical scholiasts including Maximos the Confessor, who had indeed evoked Pseudo-Dionysius within their own commentaries,⁶⁷⁷ also failed to comment on the anaphora. Thus, Mark would likely have concluded that such

⁶⁷⁶ Paraphrased from *Acta Latina*, Hofmann, ed., p. 249, lines 3-10: "...Dionysius dicit, quod sacerdos sacrificatarus sacramentum excusat se a dignitate ministerii, quod non est dignus, dicens: 'Domine tu iussisti: *hoc facite in mea commemorationem*'; hoc non arguit quicquam, ut aliis verbis conficatur, quia qui sic arguit, quod ex illis verbis *hoc facite* sequitur, quod alii sacerdotes hoc facere possint; cum se excusat dicitur, quod hec consequentia non valet. Alium ordinem tenent hec verba *quocienscumque* in evangeliiis [cf. Matt. 28:20] quam verba sacerdotis in excusando se, et sic patet, quod ex verbis Dionysii nulla sequatur consequentia, quod aliis verbis quam Christi confici possit." Cf. Boularand, 'L'Épiclèse,' 266; Kappes, *Epiclesis Debate*, p. 182.

⁶⁷⁷ See, e.g., Maximos the Confessor, *Mystagogia*, cc. 1, 23, in *Patrologia Graeca*, Vol. 91, cols. 660d-1a; 701c, for Maximos' explicit recourse to Pseudo-Dionysius' *De Ecclesiastica Hierarchia*, whereby Maximos first highlights Pseudo-Dionysius's work for highlighting the symbolic significance of the parts of the Divine Liturgy holistically, before again evoking Pseudo-Dionysius to explicate the ritual significance of the first entrance of the Holy Synaxis.

silence does not deduce that these Fathers did not conceive the epiclesis to possess a consecratory function. Rather, it is plausible that Mark would have explicated Pseudo-Dionysius' silence with regards to the epiclesis in light of Pseudo-Dionysius' conclusion of *De ecclesiastica hierarchia*:

But it would not be legitimate to interpret the [meaning of] the consecratory epicleses (τελεστικάς ἐπικλήσεις), nor to bring forth [either] their mystery or God's powers operating within them to publicity from secrecy, but as our sacred traditions maintain, through thoroughly learning these [matters] by silent initiation, and through the most holy habits, and through reduction to the love of God and to holy activities, you will be perfected by the illumination of these ceremonies and elevated to their highest knowledge.⁶⁷⁸

As Torquemada sought to accord with Aquinas' Pseudo-Dionysian Sacramentological exegesis, whereby *invocationes* denoted the perfective Sacramental forms, Torquemada was unable to provide a consistent exegesis of Pseudo-Dionysius' Sacramentology more holistically.⁶⁷⁹ For example, whereas Aquinas posited that the Holy Order of the Priesthood was validly conferred by the imposition of hands and porrection,⁶⁸⁰ Pseudo-Dionysius described this same Holy Order as being conferred through the 'epiclesis' and its concomitant imposition of hands.⁶⁸¹ Thus, given that Torquemada interpreted the Pseudo-Dionysian sense of *invocationes* to strictly denote the Sacramental forms which Christ

⁶⁷⁸ My English translation of Pseudo-Dionysius, *De Ecclesiastica Hierarchia*, 7.10, in Heil and Ritter, eds., *Corpus Dionysiacum*. II, p. 130: "Τάς δέ τελεστικάς ἐπικλήσεις οὐ θεμιτόν ἐν γραφαῖς ἀφερμηνεύειν οὐδέ τό μυστικόν αὐτῶν ἢ τάς ἐπ' αὐταῖς ἐνεργουμένας ἐκ Θεοῦ δυνάμεις ἐκ τοῦ κρυφίου πρὸς τό κοινόν ἐξάγειν, ἀλλ' ὡς ἡ καθ' ἡμᾶς ἱερά παράδοσις ἔχει, ταῖς ἀνεκπομπεύτοις μύησεσιν αὐτάς ἐκμαθῶν καί πρὸς θειότεραν ἐξιν καί ἀναγωγὴν ἐρωτι θείῳ καί ἐνεργείαις ἱεραῖς ἀποτελεσθεῖς ὑπό τῆς τελεταρχικῆς ἐλλάμψεως ἀναχθήσῃ πρὸς τὴν ὑπερτάτην αὐτῶν ἐπιστήμην." Cf. Kappes, *Epiclesis Debate*, pp. 182-3.

⁶⁷⁹ See e.g., Pseudo-Dionysius, *De ecclesiastica hierarchia*, 2.6-7, 5.7, 6.3, in Heil and Ritter, eds., *Corpus Dionysiacum*. II, pp. 71-2, 111, 117: Cf. Aquinas, *In IV Sententiarum*, dist. 8, q. 2, a. 3, s.c. 1.

⁶⁸⁰ See Aquinas, *Summa Theologiae. Supplementum*, q. 37, a. 5, conc., in *Opera Omnia*, Vol. 12. *Editio Leonina*. (Rome; Tyrographia Polyglottia, 1906), p. 71, esp: "...Sed potestatis collatio fit per hoc quod datur eis aliquid quod ad proprium actum pertinet. Et quia principalis actus sacerdotis est consecrare corpus et sanguinem Christi, ideo in ipsa datione calicis, sub forma verborum determinata, character sacerdotalis imprimitur."

⁶⁸¹ See esp. Pseudo-Dionysius, *De Ecclesiastica Hierarchia*, 5.7, in Heil and Ritter, eds., *Corpus Dionysiacum*. II, p. 110: "Ὁ δὲ λειτουργὸς ἓνα τοῖν ποδοῖν κλίνας ἐπίπροσθεν τοῦ Θεοῦ θυσιαστηρίου ἐπὶ κεφαλῆς ἔχει τὴν τοῦ τελούντος αὐτὸν ἱεράρχου δεξιὰν τελειούμενος ὑπ' αὐτοῦ ταῖς τῶν λειτουργῶν τελεστικαῖς ἐπικλήσεσιν."

instituted, if he were to accept the authority of such passages within Pseudo-Dionysius' *opera*, Torquemada would have been logically forced to concede that the Latin Rite's form and matter for Holy Orders were also invalid.⁶⁸² Hence, Torquemada claimed that while John of Damascus ostensibly argued that a Pneumatic *invocatio* confects the Eucharist, the Damascene did not understand this term to refer to a post-consecratory epicletic prayer.⁶⁸³ Rather, John supposedly accorded with Pseudo-Dionysius' *De ecclesiastica hierarchia* in identifying this *invocatio* with the sole Eucharistic form: the dominical words.⁶⁸⁴

At this point, one should recall that Mark of Ephesus had utilized John of Damascus' analogization of the Annunciation-Incarnation with Eucharistic transmutation within his *Λίβελλος*. Indeed, it has been exemplified that the *Liturgy of St James'* epiclesis could be harmonized with the Annunciation Narrative such that, for both John and Mark, the Eucharistic epiclesis or *invocatio* functioned as an occasion whereby the Spirit 'overshadows' the Eucharistic gifts and perfects their consecration, just as the Virgin was overshadowed by the Spirit when conceiving the infant Christ.⁶⁸⁵

Taking these factors into consideration, based upon the fact that Torquemada evidently composed his conciliar *Cedula* and *Sermones* through recourse to Latin editions of his theological and liturgical authorities, he pertinently overlooked the Greek *Anaphora of St*

⁶⁸² Cf. Angelo Lameri, *La "Traditio Instrumentorum" e delle insegne nei riti di ordinazione: Studio storico-liturgico* (Rome: Edizioni Liturgiche, 1998), pp. 179-95 for an overview of the history of the Latin Church's praxis for this ritual.

⁶⁸³ Paraphrased from *Acta Latina*, Hofmann, ed., p. 249, lines 10-2: "Nec dictum Damasceni procedit, quod per invocationem virtutis Spiritus Sancti conficiatur, quoniam per invocationem non intelligit Damascenus aliam orationem, que sequatur verba Christi in confectione..."

⁶⁸⁴ Paraphrased from *Acta Latina*, Hofmann, ed., p. 249, lines 12-5: "...sed invocationem intelligit [Damascenus] secundum sententiam Dyonisii formam sacramenti, que consistit in verbis Christi. Unde ultimo sic *De ecclesiastica hierarchia* formam Sacramentorum vocat verba Christi, que conficiant sacramentum, et hanc putant formam invocationis."

⁶⁸⁵ Mark of Ephesus, *Libellus de Consecratione*, 7, Petit, ed., in *Patrologia Orientalis*, Vol. 17, p. 434: "ἡ τοῦ θεοῦ πνεύματος ἐπιφοίτησις." See esp. John of Damascus, "Ἐκδόσις 4:13, in Kotter ed., *Die Schriften*, Vol. 2, p. 195; *Contra Nestorianos* 1, in Kotter, ed., *Die Schriften*. Vol. 4: *Liber de haeresibus. Opera polemica* (Berlin; De Gruyter, 1981), p. 264. Kappes, *Epiclesis Debate*, p. 184.

James, which Mark of Ephesus had explicated and interwove with John of Damascus' Sacramentology, and failed to make any reference to the Marian mode of Eucharistic consecration which John of Damascus and Mark both upheld. Consequently, Torquemada's exegesis of both Pseudo-Dionysius' and the Damascene's senses of the term *invocatio* was highly decontextualized relative to Mark's *λίβελλος*, particularly given that Torquemada ceased to interpret the Marian liturgical motifs which undergirded these two authorities' Sacramentologies.⁶⁸⁶

5.1.3. Basil

Torquemada's concluding arguments within the *Sermo Alter* moved on to directly treat the difficulties concerning the putatively consecratory Pneumatic invocations following the dominical words within the Byzantine Rite's Eucharistic Prayers. With regards to the *Liturgy of St Basil*, Torquemada argued:

While this prayer was composed by Basil, he did not assert that, through those words [therein], consecration would come to be, and one should not believe that this saintly man thought that such a wonderful, incredible sacrament would come to be by his own words...⁶⁸⁷

Having explicated how Torquemada solely employed textual evidence in Latin, this fact explicates Torquemada's incapacity to explicitly address the *Liturgy of St James* or the *Apostolic Constitutions* like Mark. While there was the potential for such Greek liturgical texts to have been translated into Latin by Florentine *periti* including Traversari, given the time constraints Torquemada composed both his *Cedula* and his two *Sermones* under,

⁶⁸⁶ Cf. Kappes, *Epiclesis Debate*, pp. 183-4.

⁶⁸⁷ My English translation of *Acta Latina*, Hofmann, ed., p. 249, lines 17-9: "[L]icet Basilium fecerit illam orationem, nunquam asseruit, quod illis verbis esset consecration, nec est credendum tam sanctum virum putavisse, quod in verbis suis fieri tam mirandum et incredibile sacramentum..."

Torquemada was restricted to utilising translations of the Byzantine Fathers' public speeches recorded by conciliar stenographers and had minimal opportunity to directly analyse the arguments put forward in Mark's *Λίβελλος* and its exposition of these particular Eucharistic Prayers.⁶⁸⁸

Given this lack of availability of such Hellenophone liturgical documentation, one must address why Torquemada evidently remained so confident in asserting that Basil the Great, the putative author of the Eucharistic Prayer ascribed to him, did not at any point postulate that its epiclesis was consecratory. Torquemada's confidence likely derived from Torquemada interweaving his (erroneously ascribed) Latin edition of the *Liturgy of St Basil* with the aforementioned Latin translation of the Greek *Vita Basilii*. This latter work would have been particularly auspicious to Torquemada given that it described how:

...one night, the Lord was standing in a vision before him [i.e., Basil], making an offering of bread on the holy altar, [and] he woke Basil up [and] said to him, 'In accord with your prayer, "Let your mouth be filled with praise,"⁶⁸⁹ through your own words, may you offer a bloodless sacrifice.'⁶⁹⁰

Such passages would thus have provided Torquemada with a means to conceive the context under which the *Liturgy of St Basil* was formulated and also to visualize the manner through which this liturgy was celebrated in practice, particularly given that, within Basil's vision, Christ expressed the opening lines of the Divine Liturgy's post-Communion hymn.⁶⁹¹ Having countered the Byzantine contingent's arguments in favour of the epiclesis'

⁶⁸⁸ Cf. Kappes, *Epiclesis Debate*, p. 185.

⁶⁸⁹ Cf. the Septuagint Version of Psalm 70:8, in Alfred Rahlfs, ed., *Septuaginta. Id est, Vetus Testamentum graece iuxta LXX interpretes*, Vol. 2 of 2 (Stuttgart, Privilegierte Württembergische Bibelanstalt), p. 73.

⁶⁹⁰ My English translation of Pseudo-Amphilochios of Iconium, *In Vitam S. Basilii*, 6.67-8, in *Ss. Patrum Amphilochii Iconiensis Methodii Patarensis et Andreae Cretensis opera graeco-latina*, ed. by François Combefis (Paris: Simeon Piget, 1644), p. 175: "Et quadam nocte astans ei Dominus in visu cum apostolis propositionem panis faciens in sancto altari, erexit Basilium, dicens ei: 'Secundum petitionem tuam repleatur os tuum laude, ut per propria verba tua incruentum offeras sacrificium.'"

⁶⁹¹ Kappes, *Epiclesis Debate*, pp. 185-6.

consecratory function which Basil, rather than Christ, had putatively composed,

Torquemada asserted:

Basil's words follow Christ's words. Are not Christ's words complete...? One should not say that [these words] are not perfect as Christ's word has the highest perfection, and does not need the inclusion of a human word.⁶⁹²

Based upon Torquemada's argument here, it is evident that his comprehension of his Byzantine counterparts' Eucharistic theology had not significantly advanced when delivering his *Sermo Alter* given that, as the previous chapters have shown, neither Mark of Ephesus nor Kabasilas, as Mark's principal Sacramentological authority, regarded the dominical words to be 'imperfect' as such. Rather, Mark's doctrine encapsulated the antecedent Byzantine liturgical tradition which had developed the notion that a creature cannot undertake what the Creator, *qua* efficient cause, could do by immediately transubstantiating beings through His eternally effective imperatives.⁶⁹³

Torquemada continued to counteract the arguments put forward in Mark's *Λίβελλος* by claiming to cite a Latin edition of the *Liturgy of St Basil's* epiclesis which Torquemada quoted as stating, "We pray and ask and beseech You to send the Holy Spirit upon us and these Gifts."⁶⁹⁴ However, as alluded to at the beginning of this chapter, Torquemada likely misattributed this Eucharistic prayer and its epiclesis to St Basil and instead utilised an

⁶⁹² My English translation of *Acta Latina*, Hofmann, ed., p. 249, lines 19-22: "Secundo arguitur ex ordine verborum. Verba Basilii sequuntur verba Christi. An verba sunt Christ verba complete vel non? Non est dicendum, quod non sint perfecta, cum verbum Christi sit perfectissimum, nec eget additione verbi humani..."

⁶⁹³ Kappes, *Epiclesis Debate*, pp. 186-7. Given this lack of advancement in his understanding of his counterparts' Eucharistic theology, it is not necessary to address what essentially comprised Torquemada's earlier analysis of John of Damascus within his *Sermo Prior*. See *Acta Latina*, Hofmann, ed., p. 249, lines 22-4.

⁶⁹⁴ My English translation of *Acta Latina*, Hofmann, ed., p. 249, lines 39-40: "Rogamus et precamur te et supplicamus: mitte spiritum sanctum super nos et hec apposita munera."

edition of Leo the Tuscan's late twelfth century Latin translation of the *Liturgy of St John*

Chrysostom.⁶⁹⁵ Torquemada exegeted this epiclesis by asserting that its formula includes:

...supplicant words for God to do something supernatural... [include] no form of making [viz. consecration]. That [this conclusion] may be better understood, take Scripture's example: By supplicating for her daughter to be freed [from her illness], the Canaanite woman stated, 'Have mercy on me, Son of David (*miserere mei, filii David*).' Christ replied, 'Let it be done as you wish.' I ask by what words was the healing effected. It is clear that by these words, 'Let it be done,' 'I ask for absolution, Father,' he should respond, 'I absolve you...' I am not freed by supplicant words [in the Sacrament of Penance]. [Pseudo-]Basil's prayer is deprecativ, [namely,] that God may send the Holy Spirit upon us and these gifts, and make the [Eucharistic] bread His venerable body (*ut deus mittat spiritum sanctum super nos et hec apposita munera, et faciat panem venerabile corpus suum*). [Thus] who would say the [Eucharist's] confection occurs through these words, particularly when the blessed [Pseudo-]Dionysius stated, 'the words of consecration have active powers'? Deprecative words cannot have active powers; [thereby,] no one can state that the confection occurs through [Pseudo-]Basil's words, but [instead through] Christ's words [viz. the dominical words].⁶⁹⁶

As Christiaan Kappes highlighted, for the Byzantine Fathers, Torquemada's grammatical analysis of their Eucharistic Prayers was likely regarded as superfluous as their Greek *Liturgy of St Basil*, which Torquemada claimed to cite in Latin, employed the indicative verb, *παρακαλούμεν*, when petitioning for God to send His spirit to hallow the Eucharistic gifts.⁶⁹⁷ Thus, the Byzantine Fathers could have easily counteracted Torquemada

⁶⁹⁵ Compare the quote from the *Acta Latina*, Hofmann, ed., p. 249, lines 39-40 above to 'La traduction de la Liturgie de saint Jean Chrysostome par Léon Toscan,' ed. by André Jacob, *Orientalia Christiana Periodica* 32(1) (1966): 111-62 (154): "*Precamur et supplicamus et deprecimus ut mittas spiritum sanctum tuum super nos et super hec apposita munera.*" Cf. Boularand, 'L'Épiclèse,' 267; Kappes, *Epiclesis Debate*, pp. 187-8.

⁶⁹⁶ My English translation of *Acta Latina*, Hofmann, ed., p. 249, lines 24-36: "...ostendo ex forma verborum. Hec sunt verba Basilii: 'Rogamus et precamur te et supplicamus: mitte spiritum sanctum super nos et hec apposite munera,' etc. Hec verba sunt supplicatoria, quod deus quid faciat supernatural; clarum est quod in illis verbis supplicationis non sit forma factionis; ut melius intelligatur, suscipite exemplum ex scriptura. Mulier Cananea supplicando, ut filia liberaretur, dixit: 'miserere mei, filii David.' Christus respondit, 'fiat sicut tu vis.' Peto, quibus verbis facta est sanitas. Clarum est, quod verbis illis: fiat etc. Peto absolutionem, pater. Respondetur: absolvo te. Non liberor verbis supplicatoriis. Oratio Basilii est deprecativ, ut deus mittat spiritum sanctum super nos et hec apposita munera, et faciat panem venerabile corpus suum. Quis diceret, quod his verbis fiat confectio, maxime cum beatus Dyonisius dicat: verba consecrationis habeant virtutes activas? Verba deprecationis non possunt habere operationes activas; nemo potest dicere, quod verbis Basilii conficiatur, sed verbis Christi." Cf. Boularand, 'L'Épiclèse,' 267; Kappes, *Epiclesis Debate*, p. 187.

⁶⁹⁷ See Hänggi and Rahl, eds., *Prex Eucharistica*, p. 236 quoted in Appendix One: "καὶ σε παρακαλούμεν, Ἁγίε ἀγίων εὐδοκία τῆς σῆς ἀγαθότητος ἐλθεῖν το Πνεῦμα σου το πανάγιον ἐφ' ἡμᾶς καὶ ἐπὶ τα προκείμενα δῶρα

by arguing that the formulae of their Eucharistic epicleses do in fact work to confect the Eucharist in virtue of their inclusion of indicative verbs.

Torquemada postulated that indicative Sacramental formulae, which operate as active transitive verbs whose objects are consecration, function analogously to how forms operate upon matter whereby forms must be completely in act to be an active power, and because subjunctive formulae possess a degree of potentiality and/or passivity in the sense that they signify wishes, they could not function as Sacramental agents. In this sense, Torquemada distinguished God's creative command, *fiat lux...*, as well as Christ's *fiat, sicut tu vis...* to the Canaanite woman who sought His mercy, with the (Pseudo-) *Liturgy of St Basil's* deprecatory epiclesis.⁶⁹⁸ Given that this epiclesis first besought the Lord before specifying this petition with the verb 'send,' according to Torquemada, this formula functioned analogously to the Canaanite woman beseeching Christ, *miserere mei...* This miracle, in Torquemada's view, thereby illustrated how a petition's fulfilment is only established when it is followed by an active divine fiat, as reflected by indicative formulae.⁶⁹⁹

Torquemada's conclusion concerning the sole consecratory efficacy of indicative formulae in the Sacrament of Penance does possess a certain degree of doctrinal weight

ταῦτα καὶ εὐλογῆσαι αὐτὰ καὶ ἀγιάσαι καὶ ἀναδεῖξαι τον μεν ἄρτον τοῦτον αὐτό το τίμιον σῶμα τοῦ Κυρίου καὶ Σωτήρος ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ..." Boularand, 'L'Épiclèse,' 267; Kappes, *Epiclesis Debate*, p. 188.

⁶⁹⁸ *Acta Latina*, Hofmann, ed., p. 249, lines 23-4, 30.

⁶⁹⁹ Paraphrased from *Acta Latina*, Hofmann, ed., p. 249, lines 26-36: "Hec verba sunt supplicatoris, quod deus quid faciat supernaturale; clarum est, quod <in> illis verbis supplicationis <non> sit forma factionis; ut melius intelligatur, suscipite exemplum ex scriptura. Mulier Cananea supplicando, ut filia liberaretur, dixit: 'miserere mei, fili David.' Christus respondit: 'fiat, sicut tu vis'. Peto, quibus verbis facta est sanitas. Clarum est, quod verbis illis: fiat etc. Peto absolutionem, pater. Respondetur, absolvo te. Non liberor verbis supplicatoriis. Oratio Basilii est deprecatoria, ut deus mittat spiritum sanctum super nos et hec pposi munera, et faciat panem venerabile corpus suum. Quis diceret, quod his verbis fiat confectio, maxime cum beatus Dyonisius dicat: verba consecrationis habeant virtutes activas? Verba deprecationis non possunt habere operationes activas; nemo potest dicere, quod verbis Basilii conficiatur, sed verbis Christi. Restat, ut sciamus, quia fuit sensus Basilii." Kappes, *Epiclesis Debate*, pp. 191-2.

given that the *Decretum pro Armenis* issued at the Council of Florence as well as the Council of Trent would later declare that the form of absolution was to be the indicative, *Ego te absolvo*.⁷⁰⁰ However, it is important to note that, in both of these cases, the Councils sought to specify what constituted valid Absolution in the Latin Rite and not necessary to dogmatically define the form of absolution in all cases, in line with what has been discussed in Chapter Two vis-à-vis valid Holy Orders. Indeed, as exemplified by the *Pontificale Romano-Germanorum*, produced c. 880-960 in the Abbey of Saint-Alban in Mainz, there was an historical intra-Latin tradition of using the subjunctive within the Sacrament of Penance, as indicated by this pontifical's use of the phrase *Misereatur tui Deus...*⁷⁰¹ Torquemada's claim with regards to the sole consecratory efficacy of indicative formulae here was thus significantly undermined in terms of its capacity to bind his Byzantine interlocutors given that these historical precedents would have called into question whether the historical Sacramental formulae of the Latin Church itself were invalid.

Unlike Mark's interpretation of the Byzantine Rite's Eucharistic epicleses discussed in Chapter Four, for Torquemada, the (Pseudo-)Liturgy of *St Basil's* epiclesis:

...is not for the confection as [the Eucharist] is [already] confectioned, but [this prayer] is for us to follow the Sacrament's effect, [namely,] to be united and incorporated [in Christ], and let us say with the Apostle [Gal. 2:20], 'I do not live, Christ lives in me.' [Thus, Pseudo-]Basil[us] states, 'We beseech and supplicate you to send the Holy Spirit upon us and these gifts before us,' that they become this salvific bread for us, that is, the body of the faithful.⁷⁰²

⁷⁰⁰ See *Exaltate Deo*, in Denzinger, *Enchiridion*, p. 241: "Forma huius sacramenti sunt verba absolutionis, quae sacerdos profert, cum dicit: Ego te absolvo etc, et minister huius sacramenti est sacerdos habens auctoritatem absolvendi vel ordinariam vel ex commissione superioris. Effectus huius sacramenti est absolutio a peccatis." *Conc. Trid. (Oec. XIX) 1545-1563, (25. Nov. 1551), cap. 3, p. 291*: "Docet praeterea s. Synodus, sacramenti poenitentiae formam, in qua praecipue ipsius vis sita est, in illis ministri verbis positam esse: Ego te absolvo,"

⁷⁰¹ See Cyrille Vogel and Reinhard Elze, eds., *Le Pontifical romano-germanique du dixième siècle*, Vol. 2 (Vatican City: Bibliotheca Apostolica Vaticana, 1963), pp. 16-7.

⁷⁰² My English translation of *Acta Latina*, Hofmann, ed., p. 249, lines 36-40: "Oratio illa non est, ut conficiatur, quia confectum est, sed ut sequamur effectum sacramentum, uniri et incorporari, et dicamus cum apostolo: 'non vivo ego, vivit in me Christus.' [Gal. 2:20]⁷⁰² Dicit [Pseudo-]Basilius: 'rogamus et supplicamus mitte spiritum sanctum super nos et hec apposita munera, ut nobis sint salutaria et faciatis panem hunc,' id est cetum fidelium." Boularand, 'L'Épiclèse,' 267-8.

In this sense, Torquemada again inaccurately interpreted his Byzantine counterparts' doctrine of Eucharistic transmutation by interpreting the term *confectio* to denote an item's non-existence immediately preceding the emergence of a new matter-form relationship, from which a new substance is effectuated.⁷⁰³

Moreover, to support his above-mentioned claim concerning the meaning of the epicletic petition to "send the Holy Spirit upon us and these gifts," Torquemada likely utilized the *Tertia Pars* of Aquinas' *Summa Theologiae*. In article four of the eighty-third question, the ninth objector posited that it was unfitting for the celebrant to invoke the *iube haec perferri* as its reference to the translocation of the Eucharistic gifts to the celestial altar violated the notion that Christ's Body is not effectuated in the Eucharist through change of place.⁷⁰⁴ Against this objection, Aquinas argued that this petition does not intend to physically translocate the Eucharistic gifts to the celestial altar or to effectuate Christ's real Body thereat. Rather, the priest makes this petition on behalf of Christ's Mystical Body, i.e.,

⁷⁰³ Despite Torquemada's inaccurate interpretation, one must highlight that Latin Fathers such as Andreas Chrysoberges accurately interpreted Mark's doctrine of Eucharistic transmutation within his post-conciliar polemical dialogue countering Mark's doctrine which Chrysoberges composed between 1443 and 1444: In particular, Chrysoberges cited Mark as postulating the dominical words as the starting point initiating the *in fieri* nature of the consecratory prayer which is completed with the epiclesis as its telos. See Andreas Chrysoberges, *Dialogue Against Mark Eugenikos*, ed. by Chris Schabel in Alison Frazier and Patrick Nold, eds., *Essays in Renaissance Thought and Letters in Honor of John Monfasani* (Leiden/Boston: Brill, 2015), pp. 520-1. Against this doctrine, Chrysoberges maintained that Eucharistic consecration immediately occurs when the final syllable of 'Hoc est corpus meum' is recited, in accord with the orthodox Thomistic tradition. See Chrysoberges, *Dialogue Against Mark Eugenikos*, Schabel, ed., p. 526.

⁷⁰⁴ Paraphrased from Aquinas, *Summa Theologiae* III, q. 83, a. 4, arg. 9, in *Opera Omnia*, Vol. 12. *Editio Leonina*, p. 277: "Praeterea, corpus Christi, sicut non incoepit esse in hoc sacramento per loci mutationem, ut supra dictum est, ita etiam nec esse desinit. Inconvenienter ergo sacerdos petit, *iube haec perferri per manus sancti Angeli tui in sublime altare tuum.*" Cf. *Summa Theologiae*, III, q. 75, a. 2, *Opera Omnia*, Vol. 12. *Editio Leonina*, pp. 172-3, for Aquinas' doctrine that the effectuation of Christ's Body in the Eucharistic does not entail change of place.

the Church, so that the angel referred to therein would present the celebrant(s)' and congregation's prayers before God.⁷⁰⁵

Aquinas' exegesis of the *Iube haec perferri* likely provided a foundation for Torquemada to interpret the *Liturgy of St Basil's* and *St John Chrysostom's* epicleses in a manner whereby this epiclesis does not petition for the Eucharistic gifts to be transferred to the celestial altar and their transmutation perfected.⁷⁰⁶ Thus, when exegeting the (Pseudo-) *Liturgy of St Basil's* epiclesis, Torquemada accorded with Aquinas' conclusion that, following the dominical words, no other prayer effectuates Eucharistic transmutation, and argued that the petition to 'pray and ask and beseech' God 'to send the Holy Spirit upon us and these Gifts' rather besought God for the Sacramental effect of the whole of the faithful being united with Christ through the Spirit.⁷⁰⁷ While Torquemada's interpretation significantly discorded with the antecedent Hellenophone theological exegeses of this epiclesis, as addressed above, it is nonetheless striking that, given the restrictions under which the *Sermo Alter* was composed, Torquemada effectively interwove Aquinas' exegesis

⁷⁰⁵ Paraphrased from Aquinas, *Summa Theologiae* III, q. 83, a. 4, ad. 9, in *Opera Omnia*, Vol. 12. *Editio Leonina*, p. 279: "Ad nonum dicendum quod sacerdos non petit quod species sacramentales deferantur in caelum; neque corpus Christi verum, quod ibi esse non desinit. Sed petit hoc pro corpore mystico, quod scilicet in hoc sacramento significatur, ut scilicet orationes et populi et sacerdotis Angelus assistens divinis mysteriis Deo repraesentet; secundum illud Apoc. VIII, ascendit fumus incensurum de oblationibus sanctorum de manu Angeli. Sublime autem altare Dei dicitur vel ipsa Ecclesia triumphans, in quam transferri petimus, vel ipse Deus, cuius participationem petimus; de hoc enim altari dicitur Exod. XX, non ascendes ad altare meum per gradus, idest, in Trinitate gradus non facies. Vel per Angelum intelligitur ipse Christus, qui est magni consilii Angelus, qui corpus suum mysticum Deo patri coniungit et Ecclesiae triumphanti. Et propter hoc etiam Missa nominatur. Quia per Angelum sacerdos preces ad Deum mittit, sicut populus per sacerdotem. Vel quia Christus est hostia nobis missa. Unde et in fine Missae diaconus in festis diebus populum licentiat, dicens, ite, Missa est, scilicet hostia ad Deum per Angelum, ut scilicet sit Deo accepta."

⁷⁰⁶ Cf. Boularand, 'L'Épiclèse,' 267-8; Kappes, *Epiclesis Debate*, pp. 192-3.

⁷⁰⁷ Cf. Aquinas, *De articulis Fidei et Ecclesiae sacramentis ad archiepiscopum Panormitanum, Pars 2* (Turin: Marietti, 1954), <<https://www.corpusthomicum.org/oss.html>> [accessed August 1st, 2023]: "Alius vero effectus huius sacramenti, quem in anima digne sumentis facit, est adunatio hominis ad Christum, sicut ipse dicit Ioan. VI, 57: qui manducat meam carnem et bibit meum sanguinem, in me manet, et ego in eo... (My English translation:) But another effect of this Sacrament [i.e., the Eucharist], which, when worthily received, is done in the soul, is the union of man to Christ, as [Christ] Himself stated in John 6:57: 'he that eats My flesh and drinks My blood abides in Me, and I in him'" Cf. Aquinas, *Summa Theologiae* III, q. 79, a. 3, corpus, in *Opera Omnia*, Vol. 12. *Editio Leonina*, p. 222. Cf. Boularand, 'L'Épiclèse,' 268; Kappes, *Epiclesis Debate*, pp. 194-5; Zheltov, "The Moment of Eucharistic Consecration in Byzantine Thought," p. 268.

of the *Supplice te rogamus* to establish a consensus, albeit temporary, with his Byzantine counterparts and facilitate ecclesial reunion.

5.2. The Subsequent Debates Between Torquemada and the Byzantine Contingent

Having exemplified how Torquemada's *Cedula*, *Sermo Prior*, and *Sermo Alter* were demarcated by a number of textual misattributions and misinterpretation of his Byzantine counterparts' Sacramentology, according to the standards and subsequent discoveries which have shaped modern-day liturgical studies, these conciliar oeuvres would bear limited doctrinal weight if modern-day Roman Catholic theologians and/or clerics attempted to employ its arguments and conclusions within ecumenical dialogue with the Eastern Orthodox Churches concerning Eucharistic consecration. This limited efficacy was exacerbated by the fact that a number of Torquemada's Sacramentological principles and conclusions were disputed theological and philosophical opinions within the late medieval Latin Church and thereby did not possess the dogmatic authority to engender the submission of either the Byzantine conciliar contingent or his Latin conciliar confrères who were aligned to alternative theological frameworks such as the Franciscan tradition.

Based upon these conclusions, one must consider how the Byzantine contingent received the arguments put forward in Torquemada's *Sermo Alter*. The *Acta Latina* recounted that when Torquemada presented this speech before the Byzantine Fathers on June 20th, 1439, the Bishop of Arathia,⁷⁰⁸ Bessarion, and Isidore of Kiev, were evidently discontent with a number of its claims.⁷⁰⁹ Indeed, Bessarion and the Bishop of Arathia

⁷⁰⁸ This conciliar father's precise identity remains unknown.

⁷⁰⁹ *Acta Latina*, Hofmann, ed., pp. 250, line 1-251, line 42.

sought to get Torquemada to explain how his innovative hermeneutic was compatible with the phrasing of the Greek *Liturgy of St John Chrysostom's* epiclesis.⁷¹⁰

In particular, within his misattributed Latin edition of this Eucharistic Prayer, Torquemada was not presented with the passage within the Greek liturgical rubrics which stated that the object of the epiclesis' petition is to bless the Eucharistic gifts, entailing that Torquemada's exegesis of this text was significantly decontextualized from how God's consecratory operation was widely perceived to take place throughout this Eucharistic Prayer by the fifteenth century Byzantine Church.⁷¹¹ Indeed, if Torquemada had attended the initial conciliar debates concerning Eucharistic consecration, he would have been exposed to the Byzantine arguments in favour of the consecratory role of other actions such as the Signs of the Cross throughout the Eucharistic Prayer,⁷¹² which Mark of Ephesus pertinently maintained were necessary elements for the Sacrament's validity within his Eucharistic *Λίβελλος*. However, in response to the Bishop of Arathia and Bessarion, Torquemada elaborated that the *Liturgies of St Basil's* and *St John Chrysostom's* epicleses were formulated so:

...that by Your mystical body partaking of Your true body, we might obtain the remission of our sins, the Holy Spirit's grace, and eternal beatitude; this is the viewpoint of Basil's and Chrysostom's words, and in this sense there is no difficulty between you and us.⁷¹³

⁷¹⁰ See esp. *Acta Latina*, Hofmann, ed., p. 250, lines 1-2, 17-18, 21-22, 24-5; Boularand, 'L'Épiclèse,' 269; Kappes, *Epiclesis Debate*, pp. 196-7.

⁷¹¹ Cf. *L'Euologio Barberini gr. 336*, ed. by Parenti and Velkovska, p. 78, cited in O.1. Cf. also Kappes, *Epiclesis Debate*, p. 197; Zheltov, "Moment of Eucharistic Consecration in Byzantine Thought," p. 277.

⁷¹² Cf. Syropoulos, *Les Mémoires*, 10.2, Laurent, ed., pp. 474, 476.

⁷¹³ My English translation of *Acta Latina*, Hofmann, ed., p. 250, lines 26-9: "...ut corpus tuum mysticum participatione corporis veri tui consequamur remissionem peccatorum, gratiam Spiritus sancti et eternam beatitudinem; hec est sententia verborum Basilii et Grisostomi, et hoc sensu nulla est difficultas inter vos et nos."

Having offered what has been shown to be a novel interpretation of the role of these Eucharistic epicleses in this passage, Torquemada postulated that the four Aristotelian causes must be invoked to distinguish the necessary items for the Eucharist's valid celebration. In particular, the Eucharistic matter could be either unleavened or leavened bread; the Eucharistic form was strictly the Words of Institution; the efficient cause was (in addition to God's consecratory operation) the celebrant priest; and the final cause was the objective on the part of the celebrant priest to consecrate the Eucharistic gifts.⁷¹⁴

Following Torquemada's claims, Pope Eugenius interjected and assured the Byzantine Fathers that Torquemada was addressing the epiclesis simply to respond to Emperor Ioannes VIII's arguments put forward concerning this issue within his discussion with Cardinal Cesarini the previous day.⁷¹⁵ The nature of this interjection likely indicates that the Pope implicitly did not wish to undermine the impending ecclesial reunion given his awareness of the Byzantine Fathers' dissatisfaction with Torquemada's liturgical exegesis. To alleviate any potential intra-Byzantine qualms relating to the Latin Church imposing a definition of the Byzantine liturgical epicleses, the Pope claimed that Torquemada's exegesis of the (Pseudo-) *Liturgy of St Basil's* epiclesis was not essential given that a formal delineation of the liturgical role of the Eucharistic epiclesis would be proclaimed publicly at a later date.⁷¹⁶ Nonetheless, Eugenius emphasized that the Byzantine contingent could not but acknowledge that the dominical words function as the sole Eucharistic form for

⁷¹⁴ This is summarised from *Acta Latina*, Hofmann, ed., p. 250, lines 33-5: "que occurrunt ad perfectionem sacramenti, et hec sunt quattuor: Primo, materia, quia panis azimus vel fermentatus; Secundo, forma, scilicet verba; Tertius, minister, scilicet sacerdos; Quatus, recta intentio, ut intendat conficere." Cf. Boularand, 'L'Épiclèse,' 270; Kappes, *Epiclesis Debate*, p. 197.

⁷¹⁵ *Acta Latina*, Hofmann, ed., pp. 250, line 41-251, line 10.

⁷¹⁶ *Acta Latina*, Hofmann, ed., p. 251, lines 1-2: "...doctor [Torquemada] dixit, licet non fuisset necesse tractare de Verbis Basilii quia alias declarabuntur..."

consecration.⁷¹⁷ The Pope made explicit that he was not grounding his conclusion based solely upon the Latin Patristic tradition. Rather, he asked the Byzantine contingent to recognize that, if the epiclesis was in fact consecratory, then in the time before the putative composition of Basil the Great and John Chrysostom composed the Eucharistic Prayers attributed to their name with their supposedly consecratory epicleses, one would absurdly have to conclude that there was no Eucharistic consecration.⁷¹⁸ Thus, Eugenius likely sought to interweave Mark's assertion, reiterated by Ioannes VIII to Cesarini, that the dominical words are a *sine qua non* for Eucharistic consecration, with Torquemada's ostensible demonstration that the *Iube haec perferri* was non-consecratory, entailing that the dominical words must function as the sole consecratory item mutually acknowledged by the Latin and Byzantine Fathers. Eugenius subsequently concluded his interjection by exhorting the Byzantine contingent to discuss his claims with Ioannes VIII and hasten ecclesial reunion.⁷¹⁹

To assess Pope Eugenius' conclusion regarding the consecratory nature of the dominical words and the epiclesis, one should begin by considering that neither the Latin nor Byzantine Fathers sufficiently possessed the textual critical methodologies to have arrived at an accurate understanding of what the Greek Eucharistic Prayers would have presented before the *Liturgies of St Basil* and *St John Chrysostom* were composed. Nonetheless, given that the *Liturgy of St James*, the authenticity of which had been

⁷¹⁷ *Acta Latina*, Hofmann, ed., p. 251, lines 2-4: "...tamen non puto, quod aliquis sit ita parum intelligens, quod credat, quod confici corpus Christi aliter quam ex verbis salvatoris nostri..."

⁷¹⁸ *Acta Latina*, Hofmann, ed., p. 251, lines 4-5: "...non dico rationibus Ambrosii et Ieronimii; videant consequentiam, quod ante istos doctores non fuisset confectum corpus Christi, et nullus hoc diceret."

⁷¹⁹ *Acta Latina*, Hofmann, ed., p. 251, lines 6-10: "Hortor caritate nostras, ut cogitetis et videatis has rationes, et conferre cum imperatore et dare conclusionem huius sancta unionis, et Gaudium commune plenum fiat, ut possimus vacare ad expeditionem imperatoris et rerum, que sequuntur, et quanto cicius fiet, patebit bonus exitus toti Christianitati." See also Kappes, *Epiclesis Debate*, pp. 197-8; Salaville, "Épiclèse Eucharistique," cols. 258-9.

acknowledged by medieval Latin theologians such as Aquinas, incorporated an epiclesis, this fact should plausibly have forced the Latin Fathers to recognize the epiclesis' ostensibly Apostolic heritage within the Hellenophone liturgical tradition, even though there was an intra-Byzantine tradition of questioning this liturgy's canonicity as discussed above.⁷²⁰

Nonetheless, it is likely that Torquemada's Byzantine interlocutors were not broadly attentive to these liturgiological factors which could have strengthened their initial position. This is exhibited by the fact that, following Pope Eugenius' interjection, Isidore of Kiev attempted to establish a mutual basis upon which Torquemada's and the Byzantine Church's doctrines of Eucharistic change could be established. Isidore addressed Torquemada by elaborating upon the liturgical hermeneutic he posited within the initial Eucharistic discussions. Isidore argued that the Byzantine Church celebrated the *Liturgies of St Basil and St John Chrysostom*, whose origins were pre-Schismatic and whose texts were unaltered by the Byzantine contingent. Indeed, Isidore highlighted that the Latin Church communed with Hellenophone Christians who celebrated these Eucharistic Prayers before the Schism.⁷²¹ Isidore then transitioned towards delineating his conception of the Eucharistic form by arguing that the Byzantine Church acknowledged the necessity for the four Aristotelian causes to confect the Eucharist, such that the dominical words function as God's eternally effective imperative which is always operative within the Eucharist when recited by the celebrant. However, Isidore also asserted that the celebrant invokes the

⁷²⁰ See the twelfth-century Byzantine canonist, Theodore Balsamon's conclusions in this regard in *Interrogationes et Responsa*, in *Patrologia Graeca*, Vol. 138, col. 953d. Cf. Kappes, *Epiclesis Debate*, p. 199.

⁷²¹ Paraphrased from *Acta Latina*, Hofmann, ed., p. 251, lines 16-23: "Et primo dico ex tempore; nam hoc missale, quo utimur, est traditum a Basilio et beato Grisostomo, utebatur ante tempus scimatis, nec aliqua facta est mutatio; tamen Occidentalis ecclesia numquam de hoc verbum fecit, ut cum fuerimus concordantes et ad eundem finem tendentes, quemadmodum nostri considerantes, quod nostri videntes, quod ecclesia Romana semper permisit, ideo videtur, quod tempore sumus concordantes, secundum rem dicimus idem et dico, quod credimus, quod is quod conficit ministerium, esse sermonem domini et taliter per orationem sacerdotis dicimus sacrum effici hoc modo."

Spirit, Whose grace can be incited so as to ‘complete’ and ‘consummate’ the eternally-effective dominical words in conjunction with other ‘instruments’ such as the presence of the priest and the altar.⁷²²

Isidore argued that he did not intend to directly counterpose Torquemada’s doctrine, but to maintain that, if the council was to establish a definition regarding Eucharistic consecration, then Torquemada’s list of the essential criteria for Eucharistic consecration should also incorporate items such as the epiclesis to exemplify the Byzantine Fathers’ contribution to this mutually accepted definition. However, Isidore insisted that because the two Churches also had many other Sacramental points of departure which were unresolved, it was not necessary for the conciliar *Definition* to formally define the nature and moment(s) of Eucharistic consecration.⁷²³

Torquemada positively received Isidore’s oblique reference to the dominical words’ ‘principal’ necessity as evidence that the Byzantine Church accepted his own doctrine that the dominical words function as the sole Eucharistic form,⁷²⁴ from which Torquemada claimed that the *Liturgy of St Basil’s* epiclesis functioned not as an active power in the

⁷²² Paraphrased from *Acta Latina*, Hofmann, ed., p. 251, lines 23-9: “Et quoniam credimus dominicam vocem esse effectricem divinorum munerum et semel a deo, cuius causa semper operatur illa vox semper replicatur a sacerdote et suscipit sacerdos, quod illa vox replicata aptetur, ut sit eadem vox cum voce domini et ut ita aptetur, invocatur spiritus sanctus et supplicat sacerdos, ut per virtutem spiritus sancti concedatur gratia, ut vox repetita efficatur ita effectiva, ut verbum dei fuit, et ita credimus consummativam fieri per illam orationem sacerdotis, et probo, quod dominice voces habent operationem ut semina, quia sine semine non potest effici fructus, ita in hac dominica voce; tamen ubi cadit semen, eget aliis instrumentis, ut sacerdotis, altaris et orationem. Unde credimus per hoc esse vobiscum concordēs.” See Kappes, *Epiclesis Debate*, pp. 199-200.

⁷²³ Paraphrased from *Acta Latina*, Hofmann, ed., p. 251, lines 29-42: “Quod autem additur in diffinitione propter rationes vestras dixit paternitas vestra, quod est necesse propter discordiam, et dico, quod esset, sic hec difficultas esset contraria, sed non est mota, ut fuerint disputationes, et ideo, cum non fuerint controversie, quare debet deduci in dubium? De ali particula, in quibus considerantur quattuor ad confectionem sacramenti, nos id[em] sentimus, quod vos, quod requiritur panis tritici et vinum de vite et sacerdos et quod per altare et principaliter per verba dominica. Et quoniam in omnibus his sumus concordēs, vos dicitis, quod debet, poni propter declarationem rudium. Rudes ita clare tenuerunt, et ita tenebunt, unde non est necessarium hoc poni in diffinitione; nam multe questiones sunt et de baptisatee; si de omnibus vellemus providere, tempus non sufficeret. Cum autem, hec dixerim ex me, supplico sanctissimum dominum nostrum et reverendos patres, ut non exigat[ur] alia diffinitio.”

⁷²⁴ *Acta Latina*, Hofmann, ed., pp. 251, line 43-252, line 21.

transmutative process, but as a prayer, which was accidental to Sacramental causality and did not pertain to the Eucharist's substance.⁷²⁵

Torquemada also countered Isidore's exegesis of the *Liturgy of St Basil* by assuming that this anaphora followed the order of the *Canon Missae*, which, according to Torquemada, invoked the Spirit at the *Quam oblationem* before culminating in the consecratory dominical words. Torquemada's exegesis thus sidelined earlier Latin liturgical commentators including Paschasius Radbertus, whose works could have bolstered Kabasilas' claim regarding the *Supplices te rogamus'* epicletic and consecratory nature, as Isidore had reiterated, by conceiving the *Supplices te rogamus* to function simply as a petition for mystical communion amongst believers. Thus, Torquemada also applied this interpretation of the *Quam oblationem* to his Latin edition of the *Liturgy of St John Chrysostom*: Torquemada concluded that, following the recitation of the final syllables of each of the dominical words' formulae, Christ's Body and Blood are fully and substantially present. As a result, the *Liturgy of St John Chrysostom'* epiclesis must thereby also simply a petition for such union amongst the members of Christ's mystical body with its Head, and not in any sense for the consecration of the Eucharistic gifts.

Moreover, in his counterresponse to Isidore and Bessarion's seed-to-plant analogization of the Eucharist, Torquemada claimed that the dominical words, in contrast to seeds, do not require an operant to actualize their incomplete power given that these

⁷²⁵ Paraphrased from *Acta Latina*, Hofmann, ed., p. 252, lines 1-6: "Secundo videbatur dicere, quod verba Basilii faciunt per modum orationis, non per modum virtutis active. 'Orat', inquit, 'sacerdos, ut sermo ille prolatus p[er] me habeat virtutem illam transubstantiandi panem in corpus Christi et ut hoc sacramentum consummetur, dicitur operari verba Basilii; posuit exemplum de seminibus, que licet habeant virtutem activam, tamen egent aliis operantibus sicut orationis et altaris."

formulae are 'living' and produce their transmutative effect through divine operation.⁷²⁶

Nonetheless, Torquemada evidently did not correctly interpret this analogy given that, based upon the Genesis Creation narrative wherein the divine command immediately produces its effects, the Byzantine conciliar Fathers conceived the term 'seed' not to denote the dominical words as such but rather to the product of God's perpetual and immediately effective command, namely, the initial stage of Eucharistic transmutation wrought by the priest's recitation of the dominical words. However, this transmutation still required perfection through the Spirit's operation as incited by the post-Institutional epiclesis.⁷²⁷

Torquemada's misinterpretation of this analogy likely resulted from his hermeneutic of an Aristotelian-Thomistic causal paradigm whereby the Eucharist's single formal cause, the dominical words, function akin to an energetic power with its intrinsic operation that actualises the Eucharistic matter's inherent potency.

Finally, addressing Isidore's description of the additional Latin-Byzantine liturgical differences, Torquemada maintained that, if the Byzantine Fathers accepted that Eucharistic transmutation could be interpreted according to the fourfold Aristotelian causal paradigm, given that the Eucharist is the principal of the Seven Sacraments, then all other Sacramentological differences could be resolved by applying such a causal paradigm to the other six Sacraments and no subsequent conciliar definitions on these questions would be necessary.⁷²⁸

⁷²⁶ Paraphrased from *Acta Latina*, Hofmann, ed., p. 252, lines 13-5: "Secundo ratio est, quia argumentum non facit ad propositum, quia verba Christi non habent virtutem incompletam ut semina, sed est sermo [vividus] nec eget operatore, et ideo illud argumentum non videtur favere intentioni suae." Cf. Boularand, 'L'Épiclèse,' 269-70; Kappes, *Epiclesis Debate*, pp. 201-2.

⁷²⁷ Boularand, 'L'Épiclèse,' 269-70; Kappes, *Epiclesis Debate*, p. 203.

⁷²⁸ Paraphrased from *Acta Latina*, Hofmann, ed., p. 252, line 16-21: "...videtur necessarium, quia ut dictum est, inductum est in medium, et contradictum, ut non ponatur, cum hoc sit de principalioribus sacramentis nostre fidei, et de professione huius fidei sit orta tanta contentio, videtur necesse, ut adveniant de illis quattuor, que dico quod sunt necessaria, minister, materia, verba et intentio, sed sine altari et sine vestibis sacris fit, licet

5.3. The Conclusion of the Byzantine Participation at Ferrara-Florence: The Signing of *Laetentur Caeli*

Having detailed how the Latin conciliar Fathers were able to garner their Byzantine counterparts' acceptance of their framework for Eucharistic causality in Chapter Five, this Chapter's first section will provide an overview of the Latin-Byzantine negotiations, particularly vis-à-vis the role of the doctrine of the nature and moment(s) of Eucharistic consecration prior to and including the formal signing and proclamation of *Laetentur Caeli* between July 5th and 6th, 1439.

Following the conclusion of the public conciliar Eucharistic debates on June 20th, the *Acta Latina* detailed how, between June 27th and 28th, the Latin and Byzantine contingents continued to privately discuss the conditions of ecclesial reunion. Torquemada likely concluded his participation within the conciliar Eucharistic debates under the belief that the Byzantine Fathers were willing to apply the Aristotelian paradigm of fourfold causality within their Sacramentology. This presumption ultimately proved to be the case given that, as the *Acta Graeca* recounted, on June 27th, the Latin and Byzantine Fathers had mutually agreed that the latter party would proclaim their acceptance of this Sacramental causal framework to eschew being bound to accept the promulgation of a written definition concerning the Eucharistic epiclesis' liturgical status.⁷²⁹

Subsequently, a written document concerning the resolved areas of dispute was formulated on July 5th, 1439, which pertinently omitted referencing the epiclesis, thereby enabling the subsequent solemn proclamation of union and signatory procession of

peccaret, qui sic consecraret, et ideo non potest esse perfecta confectio, nisi hec quattuor concurrant." Cf. Boularand, 'L'Épiclèse,' 269-70; Kappes, *Epiclesis Debate*, pp. 203-4.

⁷²⁹ *Acta Graeca*, Gill, ed., pp. 448-9; Boularand, 'L'Épiclèse,' 252-3; Kappes, *Epiclesis Debate*, pp. 205-6.

Laetentur Caeli within Santa Maria del Fiore on July 6th, during which Cesarini and Bessarion read the Latin and Greek editions of the decree respectively.⁷³⁰ While most of the Latin and Byzantine Fathers signed the definition, Mark of Ephesus, who continued to suffer from poor health, refrained from signing and remained seated.⁷³¹ After Pope Eugenius demanded an explanation for Mark's refusal to sign from the Byzantine contingent,⁷³² before potentially being ordered by Ioannes VIII to sign *Laetentur Caeli* or face canonical adjudication, Mark preemptively asked the Imperial secretary to plead to Ioannes VIII to refrain from such an order and ensure that he could return safely to Constantinople given his prior fidelity, as exhibited by his acceptance to be ordained as Metropolitan of Ephesus.⁷³³ Thereupon, Ioannes VIII assumed oversight of Mark while the Byzantine Fathers concurrently ensured the pope that they would address Mark over his refusal to sign this document.⁷³⁴ The consequences of Mark's refusal to sign *Laetentur Caeli* following Ferrara-Florence have of course been noted above.

⁷³⁰ Syropoulos, *Les Mémoires*, 10.16, Laurent, ed., p. 496, 498; Boularand, 'L'Épiclese,' 271-3; Kappes, *Epiclesis Debate*, p. 206.

⁷³¹ Syropoulos, *Les Mémoires*, 10.9, Laurent, ed., pp. 482, 484.

⁷³² *Acta Graeca*, Gill, ed., pp. 468-70.

⁷³³ Syropoulos, *Les Mémoires*, 10.9, Laurent, ed., 482, 484.

⁷³⁴ Syropoulos, *Les Mémoires*, 10.15, Laurent, ed., p. 496, remarked how, after discovering this refusal, when Eugenius arrived to sign the document, he exclaimed "Λοιπὸν ἐποιήσαμεν οὐδέν." Cf. Kappes, *Epiclesis Debate*, pp. 206-7.

Chapter Six: A Summation of This Dissertation's Findings and Conclusions.

Having analysed the Florentine conciliar Eucharistic debates, this section will encapsulate this dissertation's discoveries and make some remarks concerning how such discoveries could be utilized and/or elaborated upon by ecclesiastical historians and by Roman Catholic and Eastern Orthodox dogmatic theologians who are contemporaneously working to resolve the various causes of ecclesial division.

This dissertation's first Chapter detailed the pre-conciliar Latin-Eastern Orthodox debates on this issue to frame the nature of the debate which emerged at Florence. Subsequently, to enable a dogmatic assessment of Torquemada's and Mark of Ephesus' doctrines of Eucharistic consecration from the perspective of the modern-day Roman Catholic and Eastern Orthodox magisterial offices, this dissertation's second chapter provided an overview of the post-Florentine magisterial statements issued by both ecclesial communions regarding this doctrine.

Thereupon, this dissertation's third and fourth Chapters examined how both Torquemada and Mark of Ephesus made their respective cases for their Churches' de facto doctrines of the nature and moment of Eucharistic consecration, having been respectively commissioned by Eugenius IV and Ioannes VIII. Within both chapters, the author began by considering the factors within each of these individuals' backgrounds which informed the tenor of their literary and oral contributions to this Florentine debate and the nature of the source material they evoked to support their respective doctrines.

Chapter Three elucidated that Torquemada's attempt to assert that the Eucharistic gifts are strictly transmuted upon the recitation of the dominical words, in his *Sermo Prior*,

which was delivered on June 16th, 1439, failed to secure the acceptance of his Byzantine interlocutors. This failure was largely informed by the florilegal and/or pseudepigraphal nature of some of the Patristic material which Torquemada evoked to support his doctrine. As was detailed, Torquemada was heavily reliant upon the *Corpus Thomisticum*, Lombard's *Sententiarum*, and the *Decretum Gratiani* as his bases for such material. Resultingly, Torquemada overemphasised the degree to which his doctrine could find support within both the antecedent Latin and Hellenophone theological traditions. Moreover, such material disabled Torquemada from considering that some of his own Latinophone authorities including Ambrose of Milan and Augustine of Hippo could be interpreted to have upheld the invocation's consecratory function within their oeuvres.

In contradistinction, this dissertation's fourth chapter exhibited that Mark's *Λίβελλος*, which was composed between June 16th and 19th, 1439, provided a broadly more contextualised and accurate analysis of his liturgical and Patristic source material compared to Torquemada's *Sermo Prior*. Mark's project was similarly hindered by both time and material restrictions insofar as he was ostensibly unable to address some of the Latin Patristic authorities such as Ambrose and Paschasius Radbertus which Torquemada had utilised. Nonetheless, Mark evoked ecumenically venerated authorities, including Basil the Great, John Chrysostom, Pseudo-Dionysius, and John of Damascus, to exposit that, alongside the dominical words, the epiclesis and Signs of the Cross function as essential items for the Eucharist's validity. Additionally, through reading Nicholas Kabasilas, whose liturgical commentary likely evoked Lombard's *Libri Sententiarum*, Mark exhibited that the Byzantine Church had accurately interpreted the *Liturgies of St Basil and St John Chrysostom*. Mark acknowledged that these authorities conceived Eucharistic transmutation

to function as an *in fieri* process, akin to God's dual-moment operation upon the Virgin Mary at the Annunciation.

Chapter Five detailed how, after Ioannes VIII likely related some of the arguments from Mark's *Λίβελλος* to a body of Latin Fathers led by Cardinal Cesarini, Torquemada was commissioned to orally refute these arguments within another public debate on June 20th. When analysing the contents of Torquemada's *Sermo Alter*, Torquemada secured the Byzantine contingent's acceptance of his single-moment doctrine of Eucharistic consecration and his application of the four Aristotelian causes to explicate this mystery by employing an *a posteriori* argument supporting the dominical words' unique consecratory function. Nonetheless, Torquemada's *Sermo Alter* bore similar limitations concerning the use of pseudepigrapha and florilegia which would hinder the applicability of its contents within the context of modern-day ecumenical dialogue. Additionally, while Torquemada evoked Leo the Tuscan's Latin edition of the *Liturgy of St John Chrysostom* to support his claim regarding the epiclesis' non-consecratory nature therein, not only did Torquemada misattribute this Eucharistic Prayer to Basil the Great but offered an interpretation of its epiclesis which significantly discorded with the Hellenophone liturgiological tradition regarding this epiclesis' function. Thus, while Torquemada persuaded most of his Byzantine conciliar counterparts to accept his conception of the Latin Church's Eucharistic form, he over-emphasised his Sacramentology's authority by rendering what was a disputed theologoumenon into a doctrine with quasi-dogmatic status.⁷³⁵ The author concluded this

⁷³⁵ Resultingly, Torquemada's liturgiological limitations thereby raise doubts concerning the conclusions drawn by several subsequent Latin theologians who evoked Torquemada in this regard including Robert Bellarmine and Francisco Suarez. Cf. Robert Bellarmine, *De controversiis christianae fidei adversus huius temporis haereticos, De Sacramento Eucharistiae*, IV, c. 14, in Justin Fèvre, ed., *Opera Omnia*, Vol. 4 of 12 (Paris: L. Vivès, 1873), pp. 1-434 (240-4); Francisco Suarez, *De Sacramentis, Pars Prima*, disp. 58, sec. 3, in *Opera Omnia*, Vol. 14 of 23 (Venice: Balleoniana, 1747), p. 604.

chapter by encapsulating the conciliar proceedings preceding the promulgation of the bull of union, *Laetentur Caeli* on July 6th. This allowed the author to provide some context relating to the subsequent divisions between the Roman Catholic and Eastern Orthodox Churches concerning Eucharistic consecration, alongside the other matters of doctrine and praxis, which have been discussed in this dissertation's introductory Chapter.

Having addressed the Roman Catholic Magisterium's post-Florentine decrees relating to the epiclesis in Chapter One, the author has demonstrated that the modern-day Roman Catholic Magisterium can be juxtaposed with the Eastern Orthodox doctrine elucidated in Mark's Florentine *λίβελλος*, even though Mark did not formally enter communion with the Latin Church either during and subsequent to Ferrara-Florence. The status of the modern-day Catholic Magisterium was facilitated by liturgical advancements alongside a greater receptivity towards a plurality of Sacramentologies, as exemplified by the *Catechism of the Catholic Church*, which emphasised that the Eucharistic gifts are consecrated by the Words of Institution *and* the epiclesis. Given the great dogmatic weight the *Catechism* in virtue of being directly addressed to the universal Church, a dogmatic theologian employing a hermeneutic of continuity would need to adapt the preceding teachings directed merely to local bodies of Churches, including those within *Laetentur Caeli* and *Exaltate Deo*, with the *Catechism's* relatively weightier doctrine.

Based upon this conclusion, subsequent scholars could attempt to examine similar contributions made by Mark during Ferrara-Florence on other Church-dividing issues such as Purgatory or the Eucharistic matter and assess to what extent Mark's theological framework *in toto* is commensurate to twenty-first century Roman Catholic dogma and discipline.

Bibliography

Primary Sources

Acta et Decreta Sacrorum Conciliorum Recentiorum: Collectio Lacensis, 7 Vols. (Freiburg im Breisgau: Herder, 1870-90).

Acta Et Scripta Theologorum VVirttembergensium, Et Patriarchae Constantinopolitani D. Hieremiae (Württemberg: John Tranos, 1584).

Acta Graeca concilii Florentini: quae supersunt actorum Graecorum Concilii Florentini: necnon descriptionis cuiusdam eiusdem, ed. by Joseph Gill (Rome: Pontificium Institutum orientalium studiorum, 1953).

Acta Slavica Concilii Florentini. Narrationes et documenta, ed. by Joannes Krajcar (Rome: Pontificium Institutum orientalium studiorum, 1976).

Akindynos, Gregorios, *Letters of Gregory Akindynos*, Angela Constantinides Hero, ed. and trans. Dumbarton Oaks Texts 7 (Harvard: Harvard University Press, 1983).

Akropolites, Georgios, *The Histories*, ed. and trans. by Ruth Macrides (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007).

Alberigo, Giuseppe, Joannou, P. P., Leonardi, Claudio, Prodi, Paulo, eds., *Conciliorum oecumenicorum decreta* (Freiburg im Breisgau: Herder, 1962).

Alexander of Hales, *Alexandri Alensis Angli Summae Theologiae*, 4 Vols. (Cologne: Sumptibus Ioannis Gymnici, sub Monoerote, 1622).

Alger of Liège, *De sacramentis corporis et sanguinis Domini*, in *Patrologia Latina*, Vol. 180 (Paris: Typis J.-P. Migne, 1855), cols. 727-852.

- *De sacrificio missae*, in Migne ed., *Patrologia Latina*, Vol. 180 (Paris: Typis J.-P. Migne, 1855), cols. 853-56.

Ambrose of Milan, *Sancti Ambrosii episcopi mediolanensis opera*, Vol. 16. *Opere dogmatiche*, 2. *De Spiritu Sancto libri tres*, Claudio Moreschini, ed. and trans. (Milan: Bibliotheca Ambrosiana Roma, 1979).

- *Sancti Ambrosii Opera*, 10 Vols., Karl Schenkl, Otto Faller, Michaela Zelzer, Ludmilla Krestan, eds. (Vienna: Hoelder-Pichler-Tempsky, 1897-).

Andreas of Santacroce, *Acta Latina Concilii Florentini*, ed. by Georg Hoffman (Rome: Pontificium Institutum Orientalium Studiorum, 1955).

Les Apophthegmes des Pères, 3 vols., ed. by Jean-Claude Guy. Sources chrétiennes 387, 474, 498 (Paris: Éditions du Cerf, 1993-2005).

Aquinas, Thomas, *Sancti Thomae de Aquino Opera omnia iussu Leonis XIII P. M. edita*, 50 Vols. (Rome: Commissio Leonina, 1882-).

- English Dominican Fathers, trans., *The Summa contra gentiles of Saint Thomas Aquinas, The Fourth Book* (New York: Benzinger, 1929).
- *The Summa Theologiae of St. Thomas Aquinas*, 3 Vols. trans. by the English Dominican Fathers (New York: Benzinger Bros., 1947).

Aristotle, *Categories. On Interpretation. Prior Analytics*, ed. and trans. by H. P. Cooke and Hugh Tredennick (Cambridge, M.A.: Harvard University Press, 1938).

- *Metaphysics*, Vol. 1: Books 1-9, ed. and trans. by Hugh Tredennick (Cambridge, M.A.: Harvard University Press, 1933).
- *Physics*, Vol. 1: Books 1-4, ed. and trans. by P. H. Wicksteed and F. M. Cornford (Cambridge, M.A.: Harvard University Press, 1957).

Athanasios of Alexandria, *Epistola I ad Serapionem*, in *Patrologia Graeca*, Vol. 26 (Paris: Typis J.-P. Migne, 1857), cols. 529-608.

Augustine of Hippo, *The City of God Against the Pagans*, 7 Vols., trans. by George E. McCracken, William M. Green, David S. Wiesen, Philip Levine, Eva Matthews Sanford and William Chase Greene (Cambridge, M.A.: Harvard University Press, 1957-72).

- *De Civitate Dei Libri I-X*. ed. by Bernard Dombart and Alphonsus Kalb (Turnhout: Brepols, 1955).
- *Sermo 84 de verbis evangelii Lucae*, in *Patrologia Latina*, Vol. 39 (Paris: Typis J.-P. Migne, 1863), cols. 1907-9.
- *In Ioannis Evangelium Tractatus CXXIV*, in *Patrologia Latina*, Vol. 35 (Paris: Typis J.-P. Migne, 1844), cols. 1379-1978.
- *De Trinitate libri XV*, in *Patrologia Latina*, Vol. 42 (Paris: Typis J.-P. Migne, 1865), cols. 819-1098.
- *Sancti Aurelii Augustini. De Trinitate Libri XV*, 2 Vols., W. J. Mountain, ed. (Turnhout: Brepols, 1968).
- *Αυγουστίνου περί Τριάδος βιβλία πεντεκαίδεκα, ἅπερ ἐκ τῆς Λατίνων διαλέκτου εἰς τὴν Ἑλλάδα μετένεγκε*, 2 vols., ed. by Manoles Papathomopoulos, Isabella Tsavari, and Gianpaolo Rigotti, trans. by Maximus Planoudes (Athens: Κέντρον Ἐκδόσεως Ἑργων Ἑλλήνων Συγγραφέων, 1995).

Balsamon, Theodore, *Interrogationes Canonicae Sanctissimi Patriarchæ Alexandriæ Domini Marci, et Responsa ad eas Sanctissimi Patriarchæ Antiochæ, Domini Theodori Balsamonis*, in *Patrologia Graeca*, Vol. 138 (Paris: Typis J.-P. Migne, 1857), cols. 951-1012.

Barlaam the Calabrian, *Barlaam Calabro opere contro i latini*, ed. by Antonis Fyrigos. Studi et Testi 348 (Vatican City: Bibliotheca Apostolica Vaticana, 1998).

- *Barlaami Oratio pro unione. Avenione habita coram Benedicto XII Pontifice Maximo*, in *Patrologia Graeca*, Vol. 151 (Paris: Typis J.-P. Migne, 1857), cols. 1331-42.

Basil the Great, *Basile de Césarée: Contre Eunome*, 2 Vols., Bernard Sesboüé, Georges-Matthieu de Durand, Louis Doutreleau, eds. (Paris: Éditions du Cerf, 1982-3).

- *Homilia V in Hexaemeron. De germinatione terrae*, in *Patrologia Latina*, Vol. 29 (Paris: Typis J.-P. Migne, 1857), cols. 93-117.
- 'La traduction de la Liturgie de saint Basile par Nicolas d'Otrante,' trans. by Nicholas of Otranto, ed. by André Jacob in *Bulletin de l'Institut historique belge de Rome* 38 (1967): 49-107.
- 'Missa Grecorum, Missa Sancti Iohannis Crisostomi: The Oldest Latin Version Known of the Byzantine Liturgies of St. Basil and St. John Chrysostom,' ed. by Anselm Strittmatter in *Traditio* 1 (1943), 79-137.

Bede, *In Lucae Evangelium expositio*, ed. by David Hurst in *Corpus Christianorum Series Latina*, Vol. 120 (Turnhout: Brepols, 2001).

Bekkos, Ioannes XI, *Ἀντιρρητικὰ τοῦ λόγου ὃν ὁ Φώτιος κατὰ Λατίνων πρὸς τινὰ φιλόσοφον Εὐσέβιον ἔγραψε, οὐ ἡ ἐπιγραφή Περί τῆς τοῦ Ἁγίου Πνεύματος Μυσταγωγίας*, in *Patrologia Graeca*, Vol. 141 (Paris: Typis J.-P. Migne, 1865), cols. 725-864.

Bellarmino, Robert, *Opera Omnia*, 12 Vols., ed. by Justin Fèvre (Paris: L. Vivès, 1870-4).

Bessarion, *Kardinal Bessarion als Theologe, Humanist und Staatsman*, 3 Vols., ed. by Ludwig Mohler. *Quellen und Forschungen aus dem Gebiete der Geschichte* 20, 22, 24 (Paderborn: Scientia Verlag Aalen, 1967).

Da Bisticci, Vespasiano, *Le Vite*, ed. by Aulo Greco, 2 Vols. 1 of 2 (Florence: Istituto Palazzo Strozzi, 1970-6).

Bonaventure, *Doctoris seraphici S. Bonaventurae Opera Omnia*, 10 Vols. (Quaracchi: Collegii S. Bonaventurae, 1882-1902).

Bryennios, Joseph, *Ἰωσήφ Μαναχοῦ τοῦ Βρυεννίου τὰ εὐρεθέντα*, 3 Vols., ed. by Eugenios Bulgaris (Leipzig: τη Τυπογραφία του Βρεϊτκόπφ, 1768-84).

(Pseudo-)Caesarius of Arles (Eusebius Gallicanus), *Homilia V de Paschate*, in *Patrologia Latina*, Vol. 67 (Paris: Typis J.-P. Migne, 1865), cols. 1052-6.

Capréolus, Jean, *Defensiones Theologiae Divi Thomae Aquinatis, I-VII*, ed. by Ceslaus Paban and Thomas Pègues, repr. (Frankfurt am Main: Minerva, 1967).

De Castillo, Hernando, *Primera parte de la Historia General de Santo Domingo y de su Orden de Predicadores* (Valladolid, Francisco Fernández de Córdoba, 1612).

Catechismus ex decreto Concilii Tridentini ad Parochos (Rome: In aedibus Populi Romani, 1574).

Chartularium Universitatis Parisiensis, ed. by Heinrich Denifle and Emile Chatelain, 4 Vols. (Paris: Delalain, 1889-97).

Chiappini, Aniceto, ed., *Reliquie letterarue caestranesi: storia, codici, carte, documenti* (Aquila: Officina grafiche Vecchioni, 1927).

Chortasmenos, Ioannes, *Johannes Chortasmenos (ca. 1370-ca. 1436/37): Briefe, Gedichte und kleine Schriften, Einleitung, Regesten, Prosopographie, Text*, ed. by Herbert Hunger (Vienna: Institut für Byzantinistik der Universität Wien, 1969).

Chrysoberges, Andreas, 'Andreae Rhodiensis, O.P., inedita ad Bessarionem epistula (*De divina essentia et operatione*).,' ed. by Emmanuel Candal in *Orientalia Christiana Periodica* 4 (1938): 329-71.

- *Dialogue against Mark Eugenikos*, ed. by Martin Hinterberger and Chris Schabel in *Essays in Renaissance Thought and Letters in Honor of John Monfasani*, Alison Frazier and Patrick Fold, eds. (Leiden: Brill, 2015), pp. 492-545.

Chrysostom, John, *De Sacerdotio libri VI*, in *Patrologia Graeca*, Vol. 48 (Paris: Typis J.-P. Migne, 1862), cols. 623-94.

- 'La traduction de la *Liturgie de saint Jean Chrysostome* par Léon Toscan,' ed. by André Jacob in *Orientalia Christiana Periodica* 32 (1966): 111-62.

Ss. Patrum Amphilocheii Iconiensis Methodii Patarensis et Andreae Cretensis opera graeco-latina, ed. by François Combefis (Paris: Simeon Piget, 1644).

Concilium Constantinopolitanum 1351, in Alberto Melloni, ed., *The Great Councils of the Orthodox Churches: From Constantinople 861 to Moscow 2000*. Corpus Christianorum, Conciliorum Oecumenicorum Generaliumque Decreta 4.1 (Turnhout: Brepols, 2016), pp. 179-218.

Connolly, Richard Hugh, ed., *Didascalia Apostolorum: The Syriac Version Translated and Accompanied by the Verona Latin Fragments*, 2nd print (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1969).

Cyril of Jerusalem, *Catecheses Mystagogiae Quinque*, in *Patrologia Graeca*, Vol. 33 (Paris: Typis J.-P. Migne, 1857), cols. 1059-1133.

Darrouzès, Jean, ed., *Les registres des actes du patriarcat de Constantinople. I. Les actes des patriarches*, Vol. 6 of 7: *Les registres de 1377 à 1410* (Paris: Peeters, 1979).

- ed. and trans., 'Trois documents de la controverse gréco-arménienne,' *Revue des Études Byzantines* 48 (1990): 89-153.

Decretum magistri Gratiani, ed. by Emil Friedberg in *Corpus Iuris Canonici*, Vol. 1 (Leipzig: Bernhard Tauchnitz, 1879).

Delikanis, Kallinikos, ed., *Τα εν τοις κώδιξι του Πατριαρχικού Αρχαιοφυλακείου σωζόμενα επίσημα εκκλησιαστικά έγγραφα*, 3 Vols. (Istanbul: Εκ του Πατριαρχικού Τυπογραφείου, 1902-4).

Demetrakopoulos, Andronikos K., ed., *Ὁρθόδοξος Ἑλλάς, ἥτοι περὶ τῶν Ἑλλήνων τῶν γραψάντων κατὰ Λατίνων καὶ περὶ τῶν συγγραμμάτων αὐτῶν* (Leipzig: Metzger & Wittig, 1872).

Deputatorum Latinorum Cedula de Purgatorio, in *Patrologia Orientalis*, Vol. 15, ed. by Louis Petit (Paris: Firmin-Didot, 1927), pp. 25-38.

Doukas, *Decline and fall of Byzantium to the Ottoman Turks*, ed. by Harry J. Magoulias (Detroit: Wayne State University Press, 1975).

Εγκύκλιος πατριαρχική και συνοδική επιστολή προς τους Ιερωτάτους και Θεοφιλεστάτους εν Χριστῷ αδελφούς μητροπολίτας και επισκόπους και τον περί αυτούς ιερόν και ευαγή κλήρον και άπαν το ευσεβές και ορθόδοξον πλήρωμα του αγιωτάτου αποστολικού και πατριαρχικού θρόνου Κωνσταντινουπόλεως (Istanbul: Εκ του Πατριαρχ. Τυπογραφείου, 1895).

De Escobar, Andrés, *Tractatus polemico-theologicus de Graecis errantibus*, ed. by Emmanuel Candal (Rome: Pontificium Institutum Orientalium Studiorum, 1952).

L'Euclologio Barberini gr. 336, ed. by Stefano Parenti and Elena Velkovska (Rome: C.L.V.-Edizioni Liturgiche, 1995).

Eugenikos, George, *Άκολουθία ψαλλομένη εἰς τὸν ἐν ἀγίοις Σπυρίδωνα: Ποίημα τοῦ τιμιωτάτου σακελλίου τῆς Μεγάλης Ἐκκλησίας διακόνου κύρ Γεωργίου τοῦ Εὐγενικοῦ*, ed. by Marios Pilavakis (London: Ἑλληνική Ὁρθόδοξος Χριστιανική Ἀδερφότητα Μέγας Ἀθανάσιος, 1984).

Eugenikos, Ioannes, *An Annotated Critical Edition of John Eugenikos' Antirrhetic of the Decree of the Council of Ferrara-Florence*, ed. by Eleni Rossidou-Koutsou (Nicosia: Research Centre of Kykkos Monastery, 2006).

- Τοῦ αὐτοῦ νομοφύλακος τοῦ Εὐγενικοῦ τῆς Τραπεζουντίων πόλει ἐγκωμιαστικῆ ἔκφρασις, in *Eustathii metropolitae Thessalonicensis opuscula: accederunt Trapezuntinae historiae scriptores Panaretus et Eugenicus* (Frankfurt: Sigismund Schmerber, 1832), pp. 370-3.
- Petrides, Sophron, ed., 'Le synaxaire de Marc d'Epheze,' *Revue d'Orient chretien*, 2nd series, 5(15) (1910): 97-107.

Pope Eugenius IV, *Doctoris gentium*, in Hofmann, ed., *Epistolae pontificiae ad Concilium Florentinum spectantes*. Pars 1 (Rome: Pontificium Institutum Orientalium Studiorum, 1940), pp. 91-9.

Eusebius of Caesarea, *Commentaria in Psalmos*, in *Patrologia Graeca*, Vol. 23 (Paris: Typis J.-P. Migne, 1857).

Fudge, Thomas A., ed. and trans., *The Crusade against Heretics in Bohemia, 1418-1437: Sources and Documents for the Hussite Crusades* (Aldershot: Routledge, 2002).

Gasparri, Pietro, *Tractatus canonicus de sacra ordinatione*, 2 Vols. (Paris/Lyon: Delhomme et Briguet, 1893-4).

Germanos I, Ecumenical Patriarch of Constantinople, *Historia Ecclesia, et Mystica Contemplatio*, in *Patrologia Graeca*, Vol. 98 (Paris: Typis J.-P. Migne, 1863), cols. 385-484.

The Greek New Testament, 4th rev. ed., Kurt Aland, Matthew Black, Johannes

Karavidopoulos, Carlo M. Martini, Bruce M. Metzger, (Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft. United Bible Societies, 1993).

Gregory of Nazianzus, *Oratio XXXVIII: In Theophania*, in *Patrologia Graeca*, Vol. 36 (Paris: Typis J.-P. Migne, 1857), cols. 309-34.

- *Poetica Dogmatica: Περί διαθηκῶν καὶ Ἐπιφανείας Χριστοῦ*, in *Patrologia Graeca*, Vol. 37 (Paris: Typis J.-P. Migne, 1862), cols. 456-64.

Gregory Thaumaturgus, *Remerciement à Origène suivi de la lettre d'Origène à Grégoire*, ed. by Henri Courzel. *Sources Chrétiennes* 148 (Paris: Éditions du Cerf, 1969).

Hennepf, Herman, ed., *Textus Byzantinos ad Iconomachiam Pertinentes* (Leiden: Brill, 1969).

Hesychios of Jerusalem, *Les homélies festales d'Hésychius de Jérusalem*, Michel Aubineau, ed., 2 Vols. (Brussels: Société des Bollandistes, 1978-80).

Hofmann, Georg, ed., *Concilium Florentinum Documenta et Scriptorum*, Series A-B (Rome: Pontificium Institutum orientalium studiorum, 1940-77).

- *Fragmenta protocolli, diaria privata, sermones*, 3(1-2), Hoffman, ed. *Concilium Florentinum Documenta et Scriptorum*, Series B (Rome: Pontificium Institutum orientalium studiorum, 1951).

Pope Innocent III, *De sacro altaris mysterio*, in *Patrologia Latina*, Vol. 217 (Paris: Typis J.-P. Migne, 1855), cols. 773b-916a.

Irenaeus of Lyons, *Irénée de Lyons, Contre les hérésies: Livre I*, ed. by Adelin Rousseau and Louis Doutreleau. *Sources chrétiennes*, Vol. 263 (Paris: Éditions du Cerf, 1979).

Isidore of Kiev, *Ad Papam Nicolaum V*, in Agostino Pertusi, ed., *La Caduta di Costantinopoli*, Vol. 1 of 2 (Rome: Fondazione L. Valla, 1976), pp. 92-101.

Jasper, R. C. D., and Cuming, G. J., eds., *Prayers of the Eucharist: Early and Reformed*, 3rd ed. (Collegeville: Liturgical Press, 1987).

John of Damascus, *De fide orthodoxa*, in *Patrologia Graeca*, Vol. 94 (Paris: Typis J.-P. Migne, 1864), cols. 794-1228.

- *De fide orthodoxa: Versions of Burgundio and Cerbanus*, ed. by Eligius M. Buytaert (St Bonaventure, N.Y.: Franciscan Institute, 1955).

- (Pseudo-)John of Damascus, *De immaculato corpore*, in *Patrologia Graeca*, Vol. 95 (Paris: Typis J.-P. Migne, 1864), cols. 402-18.
- *Die Schriften Des Johannes Von Damaskos*, 7 Vols., Bonifatius Kotter, Robert Volk, eds. (Berlin: De Gruyter, 1969-2013).
- *Joannis Monachi Hymni Sex*, in *Patrologia Graeca* Vol. 96 (Paris: Typis J.-P. Migne, 1864), cols. 1371-1408.
- *Sacra Parallela*, in *Patrologia Graeca*, Vol. 95 (Paris: Typis J.-P. Migne, 1864), cols. 1070-1586.

Ioannes Plousiadenos, *Expositio pro sancta et œcumenica synodo Florentina*, in *Patrologia Graeca*, Vol. 159 (Paris: Typis J.-P. Migne, 1866), cols. 1199-1394.

- *Synaxarium synodi Florentina, sive brevis narratio eorum que in ea gesta sunt*, in *Patrologia Graeca*, Vol. 159 (Paris: Typis J.-P. Migne, 1866), cols. 1101-8.

Juan de Segovia, *Septem allegationes et totidem Avisamenta pro informatione Patrum Concilii Basilënsis circa Sacratissimae V. Mariae Immaculatam Conceptionem*, reprint (Brussels: Culture et Civilisation, 1965).

Justin Martyr, *Apologia Prima Pro Christianis*, in *Patrologia Graeca*, Vol. 6 (Paris: Typis J.-P. Migne, 1857), cols. 327-440.

Kabasilas, Neilos, *Nilus Cabasilas et theologia S. Thomae. De Processione Spiritus sancti*, ed. by Emmanuel Candal (Rome: Bibliotheca Apostolica Vaticana, 1945).

- *De causis dissensionum in Ecclesia et de primatu papae*, in *Patrologia Graeca*, Vol. 149 (Paris: Typis J.-P. Migne, 1865), cols. 683-730.

Kabasilas, Nicholas, *Correspondence de Nicholas Cabasilas: Bilingue*, ed. and trans. by Marie-Hélène Congourdeau (Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 2010).

- *Ἐἰς τὴν ὑπερένδοξον τῆς ὑπεραγίας Δεσποίνης ἡμῶν Θεοτόκου γέννησιν*, Martin Jugie, ed., in *Patrologia Orientalis*, Vol. 19(2) (Turnhout: Brepols, 1990), pp. 41-112.
- *Explication de la divine liturgie*, ed. and trans. by Séverien Salaville. *Sources Chrétiennes* 4b (Paris: Éditions du Cerf, 1967).
- Guiland, Rodolphe, ed., “La traite inédit “Sur l’usure” de Nicolas Cabasilas,” in *Mélanges Sp. Lampros* (Athens: ΕΠΙΤΡΟΠΗ ΕΚΔΟΣΕΩΣ ΚΑΤΑΛΟΙΠΩΝ, 1935), pp. 269-77.
- Ševčenko, Ihor, ed., ‘Nicolas Cabasilas’ “Anti-Zealot” Discourse: A Reinterpretation,’ *Dumbarton Oaks Papers* 11 (1957): 81-171.
- Congourdeau, ed. and trans., *Nicolas Cabasilas. La vie en Christ*, 2 Vols. *Sources Chrétiennes* 355 and 361 (Paris: Éditions du Cerf, 1989-90).
- *Νικόλαου Καβάσιλα ἡ Θεομήτωρ*, ed. by Panagiotès Nellis, 5th ed. (Athens: Apostoliki Diakonia, 2010).
- *Sacrae Liturgiae Interpretatio*, in *Patrologia Graeca*, Vol. 150 (Paris: Typis J.-P. Migne, 1865), cols. 367-492.

Kalekas, Manuel, *Ἡ Ἑλληνικὴ μετάφραση τοῦ συμβόλου τῆς Α΄ Συνόδου τοῦ Τολέδου ἀπὸ τὸν Δημήτριον Κηδόνη ἢ Μανουὴλ Καλέκα*, ed. by Christos Arampatzis in *Byzantina* 21 (2000): 385-98.

- *Manuelis Calecae. Viri doctissimi, Contra Graecorum errores, libri quatuor. Olim Latine versi, ab Ambrosio Camaldulensi* (Ingolstadt: Ex typographia Ederiana, apud Andream Angermarium, 1608), pp. 11-400.
- *De principiis fidei catholicae*, in *Patrologia Graeca*, Vol. 152 (Paris: Typis J.-P. Migne, 1865), cols. 429-662.

- 'La terza messa ambrosiana di Natale tradotta in greco e commentata da Manuele Caleca,' ed. by Andrea Cuomo in *Ricerche Storiche sulla Chiesa Ambrosiana* 18 (2011): 9-99.
- Demetracopoulos, John A., ed., 'Manuel Calecas' Translation of Boethius' *De Trinitate* – Introduction, new critical edition, Index Latinograecitatis,' *Synthesis Philosophica* 20(1) (2005): 85-118.

Knapwell, Richard, *Les premières polémiques thomistes. I: Le Correctorium Corruptorii "Quare"*, Palémon Glorieux, ed. (Kain: Le Saulchoir, 1927).

Kydones, Demetrios, *Démétrius Cydonès. Correspondance*, 2 Vols., ed. by Raymond-Joseph Loenertz (Vatican City: Bibliotheca Apostolica Vaticana, 1956-60).

- "Erste Abteilung: Texte und Uebersetzungen: 'Liturgia S. Gregorii Magni,' eine grieschische Uebersetzung der römischen Messe," ed. by Anton Baumstark in, *Oriens Christianus (1901-1941): Essays on Eastern Christianity* (Piscataway: Gorgias Press, 1904), pp. 1-27.

Lampros, Spyridon, *Παλαιολόγια καὶ Πελοποννησιακά*, 4 Vols. (Athens: Επιτροπή εκδόσεως των καταλοίπων Σπυρίδωνος Λάμπρου, 1912-30).

Latinorum Responsio ad Libellum Graecorum, in *Patrologia Orientalis*, Vol. 15, Petit, ed., pp. 80-107.

Lei, John, *Tractatus Ioannis Lei O.P. "De visione beata" Nunc primum in lucem editus: Introductione-notis-indicibus auctus*, ed. by Emmanuel Candal (Vatican: Bibliotheca Apostolica Vaticana, 1963).

Leib, Bernard, ed., *Deux inédits byzantins sur les azymes au début du XIIe siècle, contribution à l'histoire des discussions théologiques entre Grecs et Latins* (Rome: Pontificio Istituto Orientale, 1924).

Leonardo of Chios, *Historia Constantinopolitanae urbis a Mahumete II captae*, in *Patrologia Graeca*, Vol. 159 (Paris: Typis J.-P. Migne, 1857), cols. 923-52.

Liber diurnus Romanorum pontificum ex unico codice Vaticano, ed. by Theodor Sickel (Vienna: C. Geroldi Filium Bibliopalam, 1889).

Liturgiae, sive missae sanctorum partum: Iacobi Apostoli et fratris Domini: Basilii Magni, e vetusto codice Latinae translationis: Ioannis Chrysostomi, ed. by Claude de Sainctes, trans. by Leo the Tuscan (Paris: John Stelsius, 1562).

Lombard, Peter, *Libri IV Sententiarum*, ed. by the Fathers of the Collegium S. Bonaventurae, 2 Vols. (Florence: Ex Typographia Collegii S. Bonaventurae, 1916).

- Giulio Silano, ed. and trans., *Peter Lombard. The Sentences: Book I: The Mystery of the Trinity* (Toronto: Pontifical Institute of Mediaeval Studies, 2007).

Makres, Makarios, *Macaire Macrès et la polémique contre l'Islam*, Asterios Argyriou, ed. (Vatican City: Bibliotheca Apostolica Vaticana, 1986).

Manuel of Corinth, *Manuelis Magni Rhetoris Liber de Marco Ephesio Deque Rebus in Synodo Florentina Gestis*, Petit, ed., in *Patrologia Orientalis*, Vol. 17, pp. 491-522.

Emperor Manuel II Palaiologos, *An annotated critical edition (editio princeps) of Emperor Manuel II Palaeologus' treatise 'On the Procession of the Holy Spirit'*, ed. by Charalamabos Dendrinios, Ph. D Dissertation (Royal Holloway, University of London, 1996).

- George T. Dennis, ed. and trans., *The Letters of Manuel II Palaeologus*. Dumbarton Oaks texts 4 (Harvard: Harvard University Press, 1977).

Mansi, Giovanni Domenico, ed., *Sacrorum conciliorum nova et amplissima collectio*, 31 Vols. (Venice: Antonius Zatta, 1758-98).

De La Mare, William, *Declarationes magistri Guilelmi de la Mare O.F.M. de variis sententiis S. Thomae Aquinatis*, ed. by Franciscus Pelster (Münster: Aschendorff, 1956).

Mark of Ephesus, *De resurrectione*, ed. by Alexander Schmemmann in 'Une oeuvre inédite de St. Marc d'Éphèse, ΠΕΡΙ ΑΝΑΣΤΑΣΕΩΣ,' *Θεολογία* 22 (1951): 51-64 (53-60).

- *Ἐάλω Θεσσαλονίκη: Θρῆνος γιὰ τὴν ἄλωση τοῦ 1430*, ed. by Marios Pilavakis (Athens: Papadimitriou, 1997).
- *Ἐἰς τὴν Ὑπεραγίαν Θεοτόκον τὴν Οδηγήτριαν Ὀκτω Παρακλήτικοι Κανόνες*, ed. by Marios Pilavakis (Methoni-Pierias: The Orthodox Centre for Patristic Studies Markos Eugenikos, 2010).
- *Λατίνων ἔνστασις μετὰ ρωμαϊκῶν λύσεων*, in *Mount Athos, Iviron Monastery 388 (4508)*, fols. 707^r-19^v.
- 'Λόγος πρὸς τὸν βασιλέα Ἰωάννην τὸν Η', A. N. Oeconomidis, ed., in *Μικρασιαστικὰ Χρονικά* 8 (1958): 1-32.
- *Marci Ephesii Capita Syllogistica Adversus Latinos de Spiritus Sancti ex solo Patre processione*, ed. by Louis Petit in *Patrologia Orientalis*, E. W. Brooks, Louis Petit, René Basset, Sylvain Grébaut, eds., Vol. 17 (Paris: Firmin-Didot, 1907), pp. 368-415.
- *Marci Ephesii Confessio Fidei Florentiae Scripta, sed Post Absolutam Synodum in Lucem Edita*, ed. by Petit in *Patrologia Orientalis*, Vol. 17, pp. 435-42.
- *Marci Ephesii Epistola ad Georgium Presbyterum Methonensem contra Ritus Ecclesiae Romanae*, Petit, ed., in *Patrologia Orientalis*, Vol. 17, pp. 470-4.
- *Marci Ephesii Epistula ad Patriarcham Constantinopolitanum*, Petit, ed., in *Patrologia Orientalis*, pp. 475-6.
- *Marci Ephesii Epistola ad Theophanem Sacerdotum in Euboea Insula*, Petit, ed., in *Patrologia Orientalis*, Vol. 17, pp. 480-2.
- *Marci Ephesii Epistola Encyclica contra Graeco-Latinos ad Decretum Synodi Florentinae*, Petit, ed., in *Patrologia Orientalis*, Vol. 17, pp. 449-59.

- *Marci Ephesii Libellus de Consecratione Eucharistica*, Petit, ed., in *Patrologia Orientalis*, Vol. 17, pp. 426-34.
- *Marci Ephesii Morientis Oratio ad Amicorum Coetum ac Nominatim ad Georgium Scholarium*, Petit, ed., in *Patrologia Orientalis*, Vol. 17, pp. 484-91.
- *Marci Ephesii Oratio ad Eugenium Papam Quartum*, Petit, ed., in *Patrologia Orientalis*, Vol. 17, pp. 336-41.
- *Marci Ephesii Oratio Altera de Igne Purgatorio*, in *Patrologia Orientalis*, Vol. 15, Petit, ed., pp. 108-51.
- *Marci Ephesii Oratio Prima de Igne Purgatorio*, in *Patrologia Orientalis*, Vol. 15, Petit, ed., pp. 39-60.
- *Marci Ephesii Relatio de Rebus a se Gestis*, Petit, ed., in *Patrologia Orientalis*, Vol. 17, pp. 443-49.
- *Marci Ephesii Responsio ad Quaestiones Latinorum*, Petit, ed., in *Patrologia Orientalis*, Vol. 15, pp. 152-68.
- Diamantopoulos, Adamantios A., ed., 'Μάρκου του ευγενικού εις Ευθύμιον Πατριάρχην Κως Κανών,' *Εκκλησιαστικός Φάρος* 9(50) (1912): 124-47.
- *Quod non solum a Voce Dominicorum Verborum Sanctificantur Divina Dona, Verum a Consequente Oratione et Benedictione Sacerdotis, Virtute Sancti Spiritus*, in *Patrologia Graeca*, Vol. 160 (Paris: Typis J.-P. Migne, 1864), cols. 1079-90.
- *Πρὸς Ἰσίδωρον ἱερομόναχον περὶ ὄρων ζωῆς*, ed. by Jean-François Boissonade in *Anecdota nova* (Paris: Dumont, 1944), pp. 349-62.
- *Sfântul Marcu Evghenicul (ὁ ἅγιος Μάρκος ὁ Εὐγενικός) – Opere (Τὰ Εὐπισκόμμενα)*, 2 Vols., ed. by Christian Chivu, W. Gass, Marios Pilavakis (Bucharest: Pateres, Gândul Aprins, 2009-14).

- Pilavakis, ed., 'Στιχηρὰ εἰς τὸν ἅγιον Γρηγόριον ἀρχιεπίσκοπον Θεσσαλονίκης τὸν Παλαμᾶν,' *Ὁρθόδοξος Τύπος*, 580 (1984): 3.
- Pilavakis, ed., 'Στιχηρὰ εἰς τὸν μέγαν Προφήτην Ἡλίαν,' *Ὁρθόδοξος Τύπος*, 567 (1983): 1.

Gregorios III Melissenos, Ecumenical Patriarch, *Apologia contra Ephesii Confessionem*, in *Patrologia Graeca*, Vol. 160 (Paris: Typis J.-P. Migne, 1866), cols. 13-204.

Meliteniotes, Theodore, *Ethica sermonum in Evangelia*, in *Patrologia Graeca*, Vol. 149 (Paris: Typis J.-P. Migne, 1865), cols. 883-988.

Mercati, Giovanni, ed., *Notizie di Procoro e Demetrio Cidone, Manuele Caleca e Teodoro Meliteniota ed altri appunti per la storia della teologia e della letteratura bizantina del secolo XIV* (Vatican City: Bibliotheca Apostolica Vaticana, 1931).

Moghila, Peter, *Ὁρθόδοξος Ὁμολογία τῆς Καθολικῆς καὶ Ἀποστολικῆς Ἀνατολικῆς Ἐκκλησίας*, ed. by Georgios Constantinou (Venice, Demetrios Theodosiou, 1764).

- Antoine Malvy and Marcel Viller, eds., *La confessione orthodoxe de Pierre Moghila* (Rome: Pontificium Institutum Orientalium Studiorum, 1927).

Müller, Jean-Pierre, ed., *Le Correctorium Corruptorii «Circa» de Jean Quidort de Paris* (Rome: Herder, 1941).

Nicholas of Cusa, *De concordantia catholica: libri tres*, ed. by Gerhard Kallen (Bonn: L. Röhrscheid, 1928).

Ecumenical Patriarch Nikephoros I of Constantinople, *Antirrhетиci tres adversus Constantinum Copronymum*, in *Patrologiae Graeca*, Vol. 100 (Paris: Typis J.-P. Migne, 1863), cols. 206-533.

Nikodemos the Hagiorite, *Ἀκολουθία τοῦ ἁγίου Πατρὸς ἡμῶν Μάρκοῦ Εὐγενικοῦ Ἀρχιεπισκόπου Ἐφέσου* (Thessalonica: Orthodoxos Kipseli, 2010).

Notaras, Dositheos II, Patriarch of Jerusalem, *Τόμος Αγάπης κατά Λατίνων* (Iasi: Boeboda, 1698).

Origen of Alexandria, *On Prayer*, in Tertullian, Cyprian of Carthage, Origen, *On the Lord's Prayer*, ed. by John Behr, trans. by Alistair Stewart-Sykes (Crestwood: St Vladimir's Seminary Press, 2004), pp. 111-214.

- 'Origen on I Corinthians, III,' Claude Jenkins, ed., *Journal of Theological Studies* 9 (1908): 500-14.

Panagiotae cum azymita disputatio, in Afanasiï Vasil'ev, ed., *Anecdota graeco-byzantina. Pars prior* (Moscow: Imperial University, 1893), pp. 179-88.

Papadopoulos-Kerameus, Athanasios, ed., *Μαυρογορδάτειος Βιβλιοθήκη* (Istanbul: Σ.Ι. Βουτυρά, 1884).

Peter of Candia, *Commentary on the Sentences*, ed. by Chris Schabel and Paul J. J. M. Bakker, <<http://candia.ucy.ac.cy/>> [accessed August 1st, 2023].

Piché, David, ed., *La condamnation parisienne de 1277. Texte latin, traduction, introduction et commentaire* (Paris: J. Vrin, 1999).

Prex Eucharistica. Textus e Variis Liturgiis Antiquioribus Selecti, ed. by Anton Hänggi and Irmgard Pahl (Fribourg: University of Fribourg Press, 1968).

Quétif, Jacques, and Echard, Jacques, *Scriptores ordinis praedicatorum recensiti notis historicis et criticis illustrati auctoribus*, 2 Vols. (Paris: J. B. C. Ballard and Nicholas Simart, 1719-21).

Quinque compilationes antiquae nec non Collectio canonum Lipsiensis, ed. by Emil Friedberg (Leipzig: Tauchnitz, 1882).

Radbertus, Paschasius, *De corpore et sanguine Domini*, ed. by Bede Paulus (Turnhout: Brepols, 1969).

- *Liber de corpore et sanguine Domini*, in *Patrologia Latina*, Vol. 120 (Paris: Typis J.-P. Migne, 1852), cols. 1267-1352.

Rahlfs, Alfred, and Hanhart, Robert, eds., *Septuaginta id est vetus testamentum graece iuxta LXX interpretes*, 2 vols. (Stuttgart: Privilegierte Württembergische Bibelanstalt, 2006).

Responsio Graecorum ad Positionem Latinorum, in *Patrologia Orientalis*, Vol. 15, Petit, ed., pp. 61-79.

Reichert, B. M., ed., *Acta Capitulum Generalium Ordinis Praedicatorum*, 2 Vols. (Rome: S. C. de Propaganda Fide, 1898).

Richard, François, *Τάργα τῆς πίστεως τῆς Ρωμαϊκῆς Ἐκκλησίας εἰς τὴν διαφένδευσιν τῆς ὀρθοδοξίας, συνθεῖσα παρὰ τοῦ αἰδεσίμου πατρὸς Φραγκίσκου Ριχάρδου τοῦ ἐκ τῆς Ἰησοῦ ἐταιρίας θεολόγου*, 2 Vols. (Paris: Claudius Cramosius, 1658).

Rokycana, Jan, *Postilla Jana Rokycany*, ed. by František Šimek, 2 Vols. (Prague: České Akademie Věd a Umění Bursík, 1928-9).

Schabel, Chris, ed. and trans. in *The Synodicum Nicosiense and other documents of the Latin Church of Cyprus, 1196-1373* (Nicosia: Cyprus Research Center, Nicosia, 2001).

Scholarios, Georgios-Gennadios, *Oeuvres Complètes de Georges Scholarios*, 8 vols., ed. by Louis Petit, Xenophon Sidéridès, and Martin Jugie (Paris: Maison de la Bonne Presse, 1929-35).

Schreiner, Peter, ed., *Chronik 103*, in *Die byzantinischen Kleinchroniken*, Vol. 1 (Vienna: Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, 1975).

Scotus, John Duns, *Doctoris Subtilis et Mariani Ioannis Duns Scoti Ordinis Fratrum Minorum opera omnia*, 21 vols., ed. by Charles Balić, Barnaba Hechich, and Josip Percan (Vatican City: Polyglott, 1950-2013).

The Septuagint with Apocrypha: Greek and English, Lancelot C. L. Brenton, ed. (Peabody: Hendrickson, 1986).

Sphrantzes, Georgios, *Georgios Sphrantzes Memorii 1401-77 in anexa Pseudo-Phrantzes: Macarie Melissenos Cronica 1258-1481*, ed. by Vasile Grecu (Bucharest: Ed. Academiei Republicii Socialiste Romania, 1966).

Suarez, Francisco, *Opera Omnia*, 23 Vols. (Venice: Balleoniana, 1740-51).

Symeon of Thessalonica, *Expositio de divino templo et de sacerdotibus ac diaconis episcopisque, ac de sacris stolis quibus horum quilibet induitur; necnon de divina missa, ubi singulorum quæ in illa divino ritu peraguntur, ratio redditur. Transmissa viris piis Cretensibus*, in *Patrologia Graeca*, Vol. 155 (Paris: Typis J.-P. Migne, 1866), cols. 697-50.

- *De Sacramentis*, in *Patrologia Graeca*, Vol. 155, cols. 173-238.

Syropoulos, Sylvestros, *Les "Mémoires" du Grand Ecclésiarque de l'Église de Constantinople Sylvestre Syropoulos sur le concile de Florence (1438-1439)*, ed. by Vitalien Laurent (Rome: Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique, 1971).

Tafur, Pero, *Travels and Adventures, 1435-1439*, trans. by Malcolm Letts (London: Routledge, 1926).

Tapper, Ruard, *Opera Omnia*, 2 Vols. (Cologne: In Officina Birckmannica, 1582).

Tăutu, Aloysius L., ed., *Acta Urbani IV, Clementis IV, Gregorii X (1261-1276)* (Rome: Typis Polyglottis Vaticanis, 1953).

Theodore of Mopsuestia, *Commentary of Theodore of Mopsuestia on the Lord's Prayer and on the Sacraments of Baptism and the Eucharist*, ed. and trans. by Alphonse Mingana (Cambridge: W. Heffer & Sons, 1933).

Theophilus of Antioch, *Libri Tres ad Autolyicum*, in *Patrologia Graeca*, Vol. 6, cols. 1023-1177.

Thiel, Andreas, ed., *Epistolae Romanorum pontificum genuinae et quae ad eos scriptae sunt A.S. Hilario usque ad Pelagium II*, Vol. 1 (Brunsberg: E. Peter, 1868).

Torquemada, Juan de, *Apparatus super decretum Florentinum unionis Graecorum*, ed. by Emmanuel Candal (Rome: Pontificium Institutum Orientalium Studiorum, 1942).

- *Oratio synodalis de primatu*, Candal, ed. (Rome: Pontificium Institutum Orientalium Studiorum: 1954).
- *Tractatus de Sacramento Eucharistiae*, in *Vat. lat. 976*, fols. 136^v-161^r.
- *Tractatus de veritate Conceptionis B. V. Mariae pro facienda coram Patribus Concilii Basileae anno Domini 1437 mense julio*, ed. by Edward B. Pusey (London: Jacob Parker, 1869).

Traversari, Ambrogio, *Ambrosii Traversarii generalis Camaldulensium aliorumque ad ipsum, et ad alios de eodem Ambrosio Latinae epistolae a domno Petro Canneto abbate Camaldulensi in libros 25. tributae variorum opera distinctae, et observationibus illustratae. Adcedit eiusdem Ambrosii vita in qua historia litteraria Florentina ab Anno MCXCII usque ad Annum MCCCCXL*, ed. by Laurentius Mehus (Florence: Ex typographio Caesareo, 1759).

Valla, Lorenzo, *De falso credita et ementita Constantini donatione*, ed. by Wolfram Setz (Weimar: Hermann Böhlau Nachfolger, 1976).

William of Auxerre, *Gulielmus de Alvernia. Opera Omnia* (Venice: Ex Officina Damiani Zenari, 1591).

Zigabenos, Euthymios, *Expositio in Matthaeum*, in *Patrologia Graeca*, Vol. 129 (Paris: Typis J.-P. Migne, 1864), cols. 107-764.

Secondary Literature

Adams, Marilyn McCord, *Some Later Medieval Theories of Eucharist: Thomas Aquinas, Giles of Rome, Duns Scotus, and William Ockham* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2010).

Adrahtas, Vassilis, "John of Damascus," in *The Wiley Blackwell Companion to Patristics*, ed. by Ken Parry (Chichester: Blackwell, 2015), pp. 264-77.

Akışık, Aslıhan, 'Praising A City: Nicaea, Trebizond, and Thessalonike,' *Journal of Turkish Studies* 36 (2011): 1-25.

Alexakis, Alexis, 'The Greek Patristic Testimonia Presented at the Council of Florence (1439) in Support of the Filioque Reconsidered,' *Revue des études byzantines* 58 (2000): 149-65.

Alexopoulos, Stefanos, "The Influence of Iconoclasm on Liturgy: A Case Study," in R. R. Ervine, ed., *Worship Traditions in Armenia and the Neighbouring Christian East* (Crestwood: St. Vladimir's Seminary Press, 2006), pp. 127-37.

- *The Presanctified Liturgy in the Byzantine Rite: A Comparative Analysis of its Origins, Evolution, and Structural Components*. Liturgia condenda 21 (Leuven: Peeters, 2009).

Ameri, Hyacinth, *Doctrina theologorum de immaculatae B.V.M. Mariae tempore Concilii Basileensis* (Rome: Academia Mariana Internationalis, 1954).

Ameri, Fabrizio, "The Reception of Thomas Aquinas' Philosophy in the Dominican *studia* of the Roman Province in the Fourteenth Century," in Kent Emery, William Courtenay, and Stephen M. Metzger, eds., *Philosophy and Theology in the Studia of the Religious Orders and at Papal and Royal Courts* (Turnhout: Brepols, 2012), pp. 139-64.

Anastos, Milton V., 'The Argument for Iconoclasm as Presented by the Iconoclasts,' *Dumbarton Oaks Papers* 7 (1953): 35-54.

- 'The Immutability of Christ and Justinian's Condemnation of Theodore of Mopsuestia,' *Dumbarton Oaks Papers*, 6 (1951): 123-60.

Andreopoulos, Andreas, "All in all' in the Byzantine Anaphora and the Eschatological Mystagogy of Maximos the Confessor,' *Studia Patristica* 54 (2012): 1-10.

Angelopoulos, Athanasios, Athanasios Angelopoulos, 'Τό γενεαλογικόν δένδρον τῆς οἰκογενείας τῶν Καβασιλῶν,' *Μακεδονικά* 17 (1977): 367-96.

- *Νικόλαος Καβάσιλας Χαμάετος Ἡ ζωὴ καὶ τὸ ἔργον αὐτοῦ* (Thessaloniki: Το Πατριαρχικὸ Ἰδρυμα Πατερικῶν Μελετῶν, 1970).

Angold, Michael, "Thomas Morosini, First Latin Patriarch of Constantinople (1205-1211). A Reappraisal," in *Crusading and Trading between West and East. Studies in Honour of David Jacoby*, ed. by Sophia Menache, Benjamin Z. Kedar and Michel Balard (London: Routledge, 2019), pp. 17-34.

Arampatzis, Christos, "Ἡ ἐρμηνεῖα τῆς πατερικῆς γραμματείας τῶν 14^ο καὶ τῶν 15^ο αἰῶνων. Ἡ αὐθεντία καὶ τὸ κύρος τοῦ ἀγίου Ἰωάννη Δαμασκηνοῦ," in Ioannes Asemakes ed., *Donorum commutatio: studi in onore dell'arcivescovo Iannis Spiteris* (Thessaloniki: Vicariatus Apostolicus Thessalonicensis, 2010), pp. 457-68.

Arranz, Miguel, 'Le 'sancta sanctis' dans la tradition liturgique des églises,' *Archiv für Liturgiewissenschaft* 15 (1973): 31-67.

Atchley, Edward Godfrey Cuthbert Frederick, *On the Epiclesis of the Eucharistic Liturgy and in the Consecration of the Font* (London: Oxford University Press, 1935).

Bailey, Lisa Kaaren, *Christianity's Quiet Success: The Eusebius Gallicanus Sermon Collection and the Power of the Church in Late Antique Gaul* (Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 2010).

Balgy, Alexander, *Historia Doctrinae Catholicae inter Armenos Unionisque Eorum cum Ecclesia Romana in Concilio Florentino* (Vienna: Typis Congr. Mechitharisticae, 1878).

Baranov, Vladimir, 'The Doctrine of the Icon-Eucharist for the Byzantine Iconoclasts,' *Studia Patristica* 44 (2010): 41-8.

Barbour, Hugh C., *The Byzantine Thomism of Gennadios Scholarios and His Translation of the Commentary of Armandus de Bellovisu on the "De Ente Ed Essentia" of Thomas Aquinas.*

Studi Tomistici 53 (Vatican City: Libreria Editrice Vaticana, 1993).

Bathrellos, Demetrios, "Love and Forgiveness versus Justice and Punishment? Purgatory and the Question of the Forgiveness of Sins at the Council of Ferrara-Florence," in *Für uns und für unser heil Soteriologie in Ost und West*, ed. by Theresa Hainthaler, Franz Mali, Gregor Emmenegger, and Manté Lenkaitytė Ostermann. Wiener Patristische Tagungen 6: Pro Oriente 37 (Vienna: Verlag, 2014), pp. 355-74.

Baümer, Remigius, "Die Entscheidung des Basler Konzils über die Unbefleckte Empfängnis Mariens und ihre Nachwirkungen in der Theologie des 15. und 16. Jahrhunderts" in Heribert Müller and Johannes Helmrath, eds., *Studien zum 15. Jahrhundert Festschrift für Erich Meuthen*, Vol. 1 of 2 (München: Oldenbourg Wissenschaftsverlag, 1994), pp. 193-206.

Beck, Hans-Georg, 'Der Kampf den Thomistischen Theologie begriff in Byzanz,' *Divus Thomas* 13 (1935): 1-22.

Beckmann, Matthew, "Bonaventure and Alexander: Friend or Foe?" in Michael F. Cusato, Steven J. McMichael, eds., *"Non enim fuerat Evangelii surdus auditor..." (1 Celano 22): Essays in Honor of Michael W. Blastis, O.F.M. on the Occasion of his 70th Birthday* (Leiden: Brill, 2020), pp. 382-95.

Betz, Johannes, *Die Eucharistie in der Zeit der griechischen Väter* (Freiburg: Herder, 1955).

Billot, Louis, *De Ecclesiae Sacramentis: Commentarius in Tertiam Partem S. Thomae* (Rome: Typographia Pontificia in Instituto Pii IX, 1914).

Bianchi, Luca, 'New Perspectives on the Condemnation of 1277 and its Aftermath,' *Recherches de théologie et philosophie médiévales* 70 (2003): 206-29.

Blanchet, Marie-Hélène, *Georges Gennadios Scholarios (vers 1400-vers 1472): Un intellectuel orthodoxe face à la disparition de L'Empire byzantine* (Paris: Institut Français d'Études Byzantines, 2008).

- 'La question de l'Union des Églises (XIII^e-XV^e siècles): Historiographie et perspectives,' *Revue des études byzantines* 61 (2003): 5-48.
- "La réaction byzantine à l'Union de Florence (1439): le discours antiromain de la Synaxe des orthodoxes," in Blanchet and Frédéric Gabriel, eds., *Réduire le schisme? Ecclésiologies et politiques de l'Union entre Orient et Occident (XIII^e-XVIII^e siècles)* (Paris: ACHCByz, 2013), pp. 181-96.
- "Les divisions de l'Église byzantine après le concile de Florence (1439) d'après un passage des Antirrhétiques de Jean Eugénikos," in *Hommage à Alain Ducellier. Byzance 400 et ses périphéries*, Bernard Doumerc and Christophe Picard, eds. (Toulouse: CNRS, Université de Toulouse-le Mirail.
- 'Un plaidoyer inédit pour la canonization de Marc d'Éphèse au 18^e siècle: L'Apologie de Sylvestre le Byzantine (1731),' *Revue des Études Byzantines* 70 (2012): 95-131.

Blankenhorn, Bernard, 'The Instrumental Causality of the Sacraments: Thomas Aquinas and Louis-Marie Chauvet,' *Nova et Vetera* 4 (2006): 255-94.

Bornert, René, *Les commentaires byzantins de la Divine Liturgie du VII^e au XV^e siècle*. Archives de l'Orient chrétien 9 (Paris: Institut Français d'études byzantines, 1966).

Boschetto, Luca, *Società e cultura a Firenze al tempo del concilio: Eugenio IV tra curiali mercanti e unaministi (1434–1443)*. Libri, Carte, Immagini 4 (Rome: Edizioni di Storia e Letteratura, 2012).

Bougerol, Jacques-Guy, “The Church Fathers and the *Sentences* of Peter Lombard,” in Irena Backus, ed., *The Reception of the Church Fathers in the West. From the Carolingians to the Maurists* Vol. 1 of 2 (Leiden: Brill, 1997), pp. 113-64.

Boularand, Éphrem, ‘L’épîclèse au concile de Florence,’ *Bulletin de littérature ecclésiastique* 60 (1959): 241-73.

Brady, Ignatius, ‘The Development of the Doctrine on the Immaculate Conception in the Fourteenth Century after Aureoli,’ *Franciscan Studies* 15 (1955): 175-202.

- ‘The Distinctions of Lombard’s *Book of Sentences* and Alexander of Hales,’ *Franciscan Studies* 25 (1965): 90-116.

Bréhier, Louis, *Les Institutions de l’Empire byzantine* (Paris: Albin Michel, 1970).

Brunet, Ester, *La ricezione del concilio quiniesimo (691-92) nelle fonti occidentali (7o-9o sec): Diritto, arte, teologia* (Paris: Boccard, 2011).

Buchinger, Harald, “Early Eucharist in Transition? A Fresh Look at Origen,” ed. by Albert Gerhards and Clemens Leonhard in *Jewish and Christian Liturgy and Worship: New Insights into Its History and Interaction* (Leiden: Brill, 2007), pp. 207-27.

Bucur, Bogdan, *Angelomorphic Pneumatology: Clement of Alexandria and Other Early Christian Witnesses* (Leiden: Brill, 2009).

- ‘I Saw the Lord’: Observations on the Christian Reception History of Isaiah 6,’ *Pro Ecclesia* 23 (2014): 309-30.

Burreson, Kent J., "The Anaphora of the *Mystagogical Catecheses* of Cyril of Jerusalem," in Paul F. Bradshaw, ed., *Essays on Early Eastern Eucharistic Prayers* (Collegeville: Liturgical Press, 1997), pp. 131-51.

Buytaert, Eligius M., 'St. John of Damascus, Peter Lombard, and Gerhoh of Reichersberg,' *Franciscan Studies* 10 (1950): 323-43.

Callewaert, Camille, 'Histoire positive du Canon romain. Une épiclese à Rome?' *Sacris erudiri* 2 (1949): 95-110.

Campbell, Thomas L., *Dionysius the Pseudo-Areopagite: The Ecclesiastical Hierarchy* (Lanham: University Press of America, 1981).

Candal, Emmanuel, 'La Virgen Santísima "prepurificada" en su Anunciación,' *Orientalia Christiana Periodica* 31 (1965): 241-76.

Casel, Odo, 'Neue Beiträge zur Epiklese-Frage,' *Jahrbuch für Liturgiewissenschaft* 4 (1924): 169-77.

- 'Zur Epiklese,' *Jahrbuch für Liturgiewissenschaft* 3 (1923): 100-1.

Coffey, David, 'The Palamite Doctrine of God: A New Perspective,' *St. Vladimir's Theological Quarterly* 32 (1988): 329-58.

Constas, Nicholas, "Mark Eugenikos," in Carmello Conticello and Vassa Conticello, eds., *La théologie byzantine et sa tradition*, Vol. 2 (Turnhout: Brepols, 2002), pp. 411-75.

Cormier, Hyacinthe-Marie, *Il Beato Raimondo da Capua, XXIII Maestro Generale dell'Ordine dei Frati Predicatori, sua vita, sue virtu, sua azione nella chiesa e nell'ordine di San Domenico* (Rome: Casa Generalizia, 1900).

Coureas, Nicholas, *The Latin Church in Cyprus, 1313-1378* (Nicosia: Cyprus Research Centre, 2010).

Coureas, Nicholas, Grivaud, Gilles, Schabel, Chris, "Frankish & Venetian Nicosia, 1191-1570," ed. by Demetres Michaelides in *Historic Nicosia* (Nicosia: Rimal Publications, 2012), pp. 111-229.

Cowe, Peter S., 'The Role of Correspondence in Elucidating the Intensification of Latin-Armenian Ecclesiastical Interchange in the First Quarter of the Fourteenth Century,' *Journal of the Society for Armenian Studies* 13 (2003): 47-68.

Crehen, Joseph, 'Eucharistic Epiklesis: New Evidence and a New Theory,' *Theological Studies* 41 (1980): 698-712.

Creytens, Raymond, 'Le *Studium Romanae Curiae* et le maître du Sacré Palais,' *Archivum Fratrum Praedicatorum* 12 (1942): 5-83.

Cross, Richard, *Duns Scotus* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1999).

- *Duns Scotus on God* (Burlington: Ashgate, 2007).
- *The Physics of Duns Scotus: The Scientific Context of a Theological Vision* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1998).

Cutrone, Emmanuel Joseph, 'Cyril's *Mystagogical Catecheses* and the Evolution of the Jerusalem Anaphora,' *Orientalia Christiana* 44 (1978): 52-64.

Darrouzès, Jean, 'La date de la mort d'André Chrysobergès O.P., archevêque de Nicosie et légat apostolique en Chypre,' *Archivum fratrum praedicatorum* 21 (1951): 301-5.

- 'Nicolas d'Andida et les azymes,' *Revue des études byzantines* 32 (1974): 199-203.
- 'Notes: Un faux *Περὶ τῶν ἀζύμων* de Michel Cérulaire,' *Revue des études byzantines* 25 (1967): 288-90.
- 'Textes Synodaux Chypriotes,' *Revue des études byzantines* 37 (1979): 5-122.

Décarreaux, Jean, *Les grecs au concile de l'union Ferrare-Florence 1438-1439* (Paris: Éditions A. et J. Picard, 1969).

Deferrari, Roy, Barry, M. Inviolata, McGuinness, Ignatius, eds., *A Lexicon of St. Thomas Based on the "Summa Theologica" and Selected Passages of His Other Works* (Washington, D.C.: Catholic University of America Press, 1948).

De Halleux, André, 'Bessarion et le palamisme au concile de Florence,' *Irénikon* 62 (1989): 307-32.

- 'L'activité d'André Chrysobergès, O.P., sous le pontificat de Martin V (1418-1431),' *Échos d'Orient* 34 (1935): 415-38.
- "Problèmes de méthode dans les discussions sur l'eschatologies de Ferrare et Florence," in Giuseppe Alberigo, ed., *Christian Unity: The Council of Ferrara-Florence: 1438/39-1989* (Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1991), pp. 251-99.

Delacroix-Besnier, Claudine, *Les Dominicains et la chrétienté grecque aux XIV^e et XV^e siècles*. Collection de L'École Française de Rome 237 (Rome: École Française de Rome, 1997).

- "Manuel Calécas et les Frères Chrysobergès, grecs et prêcheurs," in *Actes des congrès de la Société des historiens médiévistes de l'enseignement supérieur public, 32e congrès*, ed. by Patrick Boucheron (Dunkirk: Société des Historiens Médiévistes de l'Enseignement Supérieur, 2001), pp. 151-64.

Delmas, Sophie, "Alexandre de Halès et le studium franciscain de Paris: Aux origines de la question des chaires franciscaines et de l'exercice quodlibétique," in Andreas Sohn and Jacques Verger, eds., *Die reulierten Kollegien im Europa des Mittelalters und der Renaissance: Les colleges réguliers en Europe au Moyen Âge et à la Renaissance* (Bochum: D. Winkler, 2012), pp. 17-47.

- "Odo Rigaldi, Alexander of Hales and the *Summa Halensis*," in Lydia Schumacher, ed., *The Summa Halensis* (Berlin: De Gruyter, 2020), pp. 267-83.

Demacopoulos, George E., "Augustine and the Orthodox: The West in the East," in Demacopoulos and Aristotle Papanikolaou, eds., *Orthodox Readings of Augustine* (Crestwood, N.Y.: St Vladimir's Seminary Press, 2008), pp. 11-40.

Demetracopoulos, John A., "Aquinas in Byzantium: 'Modus Sciendi' and 'Dignitas Hominis,'" in Andreas Speer and Philipp Steinkrüger, eds., *Knotenpunkt Byzanz: Wissensformen und kulturelle Wechselbeziehungen* (Berlin: De Gruyter, 2012), pp. 333-410.

- "Palamas Transformed: Palamite Interpretations of the Distinction between God's 'Essence' and 'Energies' in Late Byzantium," in Martin Hinterberger and Chris Schabel, eds., *Greeks, Latins, and Intellectual History 1204–1500* (Leuven/Paris/Walpole, M.A.: Peeters, 2011), pp. 263-372.

Dendrinios, Charalambos, "Manuel II Paleologus in Paris (1400-1402): Theology, Diplomacy, and Politics," in Martin Hinterberger and Chris Schabel, eds., *Greeks, Latins, and Intellectual History 1204-1500* (Leuven-Paris-Walpole: Peeters, 2011), pp. 397-422.

Dennis, George T., *The Reign of Manuel II Palaeologus in Thessalonica, 1382-1387* (Rome: Pontificium Institutum Orientalium Studiorum, 1960).

DePauw, Thomas J., 'The Principles of Distinction in Material Substances in the Philosophy of St. Thomas and St. Albert,' *American Catholic Philosophical Quarterly* 92(4) (2018): 1-43.

Despotakis, Eleutherios, "Some Observations on the *Διάλεξις* of John Plousiadenos (1426?-1500)," *Byzantion* 86 (2016): 129-37.

Diamantopoulos, Adamantios A., 'Μάρκου του Ευγενικού εις Ευθύμιον Πατριάρχην Κως Κανών,' *Εκκλησιαστικός Φάρος* 9(50) (1912): 124-47.

Van Dieten, Jan, 'Zur Diskussion des Filioque auf dem Konzil von Florenz,' *Byzantina Symmeikta* 16 (2008): 217-82.

Dinesen, Palle, 'Die Epiklese im Rahmen altkirchlicher Liturgien: Eine studie über die eucharistische Epiklese,' *Studia Theologica: Nordic Journal of Theology* 16 (1962): 42-107.

Dix, Gregory, 'Primitive Consecration Prayers,' *Theology* 37(221) (1938): 261-83.

- *The Shape of the Liturgy*, repr. (London: Dacre Press, 1970).

Đurić, Ivan, *Le Crépuscule de Byzance* (Paris: Maisonneuve et Larose, 1966).

Draper, Jonathan A., ed., *The Didache in Modern Research. Arbeiten zur Geschichte des Antiken Judentums und des Urchristentums* 37 (Leiden: Brill, 1996).

Duba, William, "The Souls after Vienne: Franciscan Theologians' Views on the Plurality of Forms and the Plurality of Souls, ca. 1315-1330," in Paul J. J. M. Bakker, Sandra W. de Boer, and Cees Leijenhorst, eds., *Psychology and the Other Disciplines: A Case of Cross-Disciplinary Interaction (1250-1750)* (Leiden: Brill, 2012), pp. 171-272.

De Durand, Georges Matthieu, 'Un passage du III livre Contre Eunome de S Basile dans la tradition manuscrite,' *Irénikon Chevetogne* 54(1) (1981): 36-52.

Dvornik, Francis, *Byzantium and the Roman Primacy*, trans. by Edwin A. Quain (New York: Fordham University Press, 1966).

Ebbesen, Sten "Radulphus Brito on the *Metaphysics*," in Jan A. Aertsen, Kenneth Emery, and Andreas Speer, eds., *Nach der Verurteilung von 1277* (Berlin and New York: De Gruyter, 2001), pp. 456-92.

Elavanal, Thomas, *The Memorial Celebration: A Theological Study of the Anaphora of the Apostles Mar Addai and Mari* (Kerala: M. C. B. S. Publications, 1988).

Emery, Gilles, 'Reconciliation with the Church and Interior Penance: The Contribution of Thomas Aquinas on the Question of the *Res et Sacramentum* of Penance,' *Nova et Vetera* 1(2) (2003): 283-302.

Erickson, John H., 'Leavened and Unleavened: Some Theological Implications of the Schism of 1054,' *St. Vladimir's Theological Quarterly* 14(3) (1970): 155-76.

Evdokimov, Pavel, 'Eucharistie – Mystère de l'église,' *La pensée orthodoxe* 2 (1968): 53-69.

Farag, Mary K., 'Δύναμις Epicleses: An Athanasian Perspective,' *Studia Liturgica* 39(1) (2009): 63-79.

Fenwick, John R. K., *The Anaphoras of St. Basil and St. James: An Investigation into Their Common Origin* (Rome: Pontificium Institutum Orientale, 1992).

Finn, Thomas M., *Early Christian Baptism and the Catechumenate: West and East Syria* (Collegeville: Liturgical Press, 1992).

Florovsky, Georges, "An Early Ecumenical Correspondence. Patriarch Jeremiah II and the Lutheran Divines," in *Collected Works of Georges Florovsky, Vol. 2: Christianity and Culture* (Belmont: Nordland, 1974) pp. 143-55.

Folsom, Cassian, 'Mysterium Fidei and St. Leo the Great (440-61),' *Ecclesia Orans* 15 (1998): 289-302.

Fonkič, B. L., and Poljakov, F. B., 'Markos Eugenikos als Kopist. Zur Tätigkeit Eines Gelehrtenkreises an den Konstantinopolitaner Skriptorien im ersten Drittel des 15. Jahrhunderts,' *Byzantinische Zeitschrift*, Vol. 84-5(1-2) (1992): 17-23.

Frassinetti, Paolo, "Il codice Torinese C-2-16 contenente la versione greca della *Summa contra Gentes*, ad opera di Demetrio Cidone," in *Atti dello VIII Congresso internazionale di studi bizantini (Palermo, 3-10 aprile 1951)*, Vol. 1 (Rome: Associazione nazionale per gli studi bizantini, 1953) pp. 78-85.

Franzelin, Ioannes Baptista, *Tractatus de divina traditione et scriptura*, 2nd ed. (Rome: S. Congr. de Propaganda Fide, 1875).

Fried, Johannes, ed., *“Donation of Constantine” and “Constitutum Constantini”* (New York: De Gruyter, 2007).

Friedman, Russell L., “Dominican Quodlibetal Literature c. 1260–1330,” in *Theological Quodlibeta in the Middle Ages*, Vol. 2, *The Fourteenth Century: Theological Quodlibeta in the Middle Age*, ed. by Chris Schabel (Leiden: Brill, 2007), pp. 401-92.

- Russell L. Friedman, *Intellectual Traditions at the Medieval University. The Use of Philosophical Psychology in Trinitarian Theology among the Franciscans and Dominicans, 1250-1350*, Vol. 1 (Leiden/Boston: Brill, 2013).

Frommann, Theodor, *Kritische Beiträge zur Geschichte der Florentiner Kircheneinigung* (Halle: Verlag der Buchhandlung des Waisenhauses, 1872).

Fuchs, Friedrich, *Die Höheren Schulen Von Konstantinopel Im Mittelalter*, repr. (Amsterdam: A.M. Hakkert, 1964).

Fyrigos, Antonis, ‘Quando Barlaam Calabro conobbe il Concilio di Lione II (1274)?,’ *Rivista di studi bizantini e neoellenici* 17-19 (1980-82): 247-65.

Gamillscheg, Ernst, ‘Die Handschriftenliste des Johannes Chortasmenos im Oxon. Aed. Chr. 56,’ *Codices manuscripti & impressi* 2 (1981): 52-7.

Ganchou, Thierry, “Dèmètrios Kydônès, les frères Chrysobergès et la Crète (1397-1401) de nouveaux documents,” in Chryssa A. Maltezou and Peter Schreiner, eds., *Bisanzio, Venezia e il mondo franco-greco (XIII-XV secolo): atti del colloquio internazionale organizzato nel centenario della nascita di Raymond-Joseph Loenertz O. P., Venezia, 1-2 dicembre 2000* (Venice: Istituto Ellenico di Studi Bizantini e Postbizantini, Centro Tedesco di studi Veneziani, 2002), pp. 435-93.

Garrigou-Lagrange, Réginald, *Commentarium in Summa theologicam S. Thomae. De Eucharistia* (Paris: Desclée de Brouwer & Co., 1943).

Gavrilyuk, Paul L., 'Did Pseudo-Dionysius Live in Constantinople?,' *Vigiliae Christianae* 62(5) (2008): 505-14.

Geanakopulos, Deno, *Byzantium: Church, Society, and Civilization Seen through Contemporary Eyes* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1984).

- *Constantinople and the West: Essays on the Late Byzantine (Palaeologan) and Italian Renaissances and the Byzantine and Roman Churches* (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1989).
- 'The Council of Florence (1438-1439) and the Problem of Union between the Greek and Latin Church,' *Church History* 24 (1955): 324-46.
- *Emperor Michael Palaeologus and the West, 1258-1282* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1959).
- 'Michael VIII Palaeologus and the Union of Lyons,' *Harvard Theological Review* 46 (1953): 79-89.

Georges, Eugenia, *Bodies of Knowledge: The Medicalization of Reproduction in Greece* (Nashville: Vanderbilt University Press, 2008).

Gero, Stephen, *Byzantine Iconoclasm during the Reign of Constantine V, with Particular Attention to the Oriental Sources* (Louvain: Corpus Scriptorum Christianorum Orientalium, 1977).

- 'The Eucharistic Doctrine of the Byzantine Iconoclasts and its Sources,' *Byzantinische Zeitschrift* 68(1) (1975): 4-22.

Gieschen, Charles, *Angelomorphic Christology: Antecedents and Early Evidence* (Leiden: Brill, 1998).

- 'The Divine Name in Ante-Nicene Christology,' *Vigiliae Christianae* 57 (2003): 115-58.

Gill, Joseph, *The Council of Florence* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1959).

- *Personalities of the Council of Florence and other Essays* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1964).
- 'The Sincerity of Bessarion the Unionist,' *The Journal of Theological Studies* 26(2) (1975): 377-92.

Gierens, M., *De Causalitate sacramentorum, seu De Modo explicandi efficientiam sacramentorum novae legis* (Rome: Pontifical Gregorian University, 1935).

Glorieux, Palémon, 'La Littérature des *Correctoires*: Simples notes,' *Revue thomiste* 33 (1928): 69-96.

- 'Les *Correctoires*: Essai de mise au point,' *Recherches de théologie ancienne et médiévale* 14 (1947): 287-304.

Goff, Jared Isaac, *Caritas in Primo: A Historical-Theological Study of Bonaventure's "Quaestiones disputatae de mysterio Ss. Trinitatis"* (New Bedford: Academy of the Immaculate, 2015).

Golubovich, Girolamo, *Biblioteca bio-bibliografica della Terra Santa e dell'Oriente francescano*, 3 Vols. (Quaracchi: Collegio di s. Bonaventura, 1906).

Gouillard, Jean, 'Les influences latines dans l'œuvre théologique de Manuel Calécas,' *Revue des études byzantines* 189-190 (1938): 36-52.

Grabmann, Martin, "Johannes Capreolus O.P., der Princeps Thomistarum (†1444), und seine Stellung in der Geschichte der Thomistenschule," in *Mittelalterliches Geistesleben: Abhandlungen zur Geschichte der Scholastik und Mystik*, Vol. 3 of 3 (München, M. Hueber, 1956), pp. 370-410.

Grumel, Venance, 'Marc d'Éphèse – Vie – Ecrits – Doctrine,' *Estudis Franciscans* 36 (1926): 425-48.

Gy, Pierre-Marie, "Le Sanctus romain et les anaphores orientales" in *Mélanges liturgiques offerts au R. P. dom Bernard Botte à l'occasion du cinquantième anniversaire de son ordination sacerdotale (4 juin 1972)* (Louvain: Abbaye du Mont César, 1972), pp. 167-74.

Harris, Jonathan, "The Patriarch of Constantinople and the Last Days of Byzantium," in Christian Gastgeber, Katerini Mitsiou, Johannes Preiser-Kapeller, Vratislav Zervan, eds., *The Patriarchate of Constantinople in Context and Comparison* (Vienna: Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, 2017), pp. 9-16.

Helmrath, Johannes, *Das Basler Konzil 1431-1449: Forschungsstand und Probleme* (Cologne: Böhlau, 1987).

Hofmann, Georg, *De praeparatione definitionis Concilii Florentini de Ss. Eucharistia*. Acta Academiae Valehradensis 14 (Rome: Aedes Pont. Universitatis Gregoriana, 1936).

Höllner, Joseph, *Die Epiklese der griechisch-orientalischen Liturgien* (Vienna: Mayer & Co., 1912).

Hughes, Christopher, 'Matter and Individuation in Aquinas,' *History of Philosophy Quarterly* 13(1) (1996): 1-16.

Hunger, Herbert, *Johannes Chortasmenos (ca. 1370-ca. 1436/37): Briefe, Gedichte und kleine Schriften: Einleitung, Regesten, Prosopographie, Text*. Wiener Byzantinistische Studien, Vol. 7 (Vienna: Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften, 1969).

Hussey, J. M., *The Orthodox Church in the Byzantine Empire* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1986).

İnalçık, Halil, *The Ottoman Empire: The Classical Age, 1300-1600*, trans. by Norman Itzkowitz and Colin Imber (New York: Praeger, 1973).

Ioannidis, Nikolaos H., *Ο Ιωσήφ Βρυέννιος Βίος - Έργο – Διδασκαλία* (Athens: Εκδόσεις Συμμετρία, 1985).

Izbicki, Thomas, *The Eucharist in Medieval Canon Law* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2015).

- 'The Immaculate Conception and Ecclesiastical Politics from the Council of Basel to the Council of Trent: The Dominicans and Their Foes,' *Archiv für Reformationsgeschichte* 96(1) (2005): 145-70.
- "Infallibility and the Erring Pope: Guido Terreni and Johannes de Turrecremata," in Kenneth Pennington and Robert Somerville, eds., *Law, Church, and Society: Essays in Honor of Stephan Kuttner* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1977), pp. 97-111.
- *Protector of the Faith: Cardinal Johannes de Turrecremata and the Defense of the Institutional Church* (Washington, D.C.: Catholic University of America, 1981).
- "The Revival of Papalism at the Council of Basel," in Michiel Decaluwé, Izbicki, Gerald Christianson, eds., *A Companion to the Council of Basel* (Leiden: Brill, 2017), pp. 137-63.
- "Tarring Conciliarism with the Brush of Heresy: Juan de Torquemada's *Summa de Ecclesia*," in Karen Bollermann, Izbicki, Cary J. Nederman, eds., *Religion, Power, and Resistance from the Eleventh to the Sixteenth Centuries: Playing the Heresy Card* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2014), pp. 139-51.

Janin, Raymond, *Les églises et les monastères des grands centres byzantins* (Paris: Institut français d'études byzantines, 1975).

- 'Les sanctuaires de byzance sous la domination latine (1204-1261),' *Études byzantines* 2 (1944): 134-84.

Johnson, Maxwell E., "The Archaic Nature of the Sanctus, Institution Narrative, and Epiclesis of the Logos in the Anaphora Ascribed to Serapion of Thmuis," in Bradshaw, ed., *Essays on Early Eucharistic Prayers*, pp. 95-106.

- *The Prayers of Sarapion of Thmuis: A Literary, Liturgical and Theological Analysis* (Rome: Pontificio Istituto Orientale, 1995).

Jugie, Martin, 'De epiclesi Eucharistica secundum Basilium Magnum,' *Acta Academiae Velehradensis* 19 (1948): 202-7.

- *De forma Eucharistiae, de epiclesibus ecclesiasticis* (Rome: Officium Libri Catholici, 1943).
- 'Démétrius Cydonès et la théologie latine a Byzance' *Échos d'Orient* 27 (1928): 385-402.
- 'La forme de l'Eucharistie d'après Georges Scholarios,' *Échos d'Orient* 33 (1934): 289-97.
- 'L'épiclèse et le mot antitype de la Messe de Saint Basile,' *Échos d'Orient* 9 (1906): 193-8.
- 'Le «Liber ad baptizandos» de Théodore de Mopsueste,' *Échos d'Orient* 34(179) (1935): 257-71.
- *Le schisme byzantin: aperçu historique et doctrinal* (Paris: Lethielleux, 1941).
- *Theologia Dogmatica Christianorum Orientalum ab Ecclesia Catholica Dissidentium*, 5 Vols. (Paris: Letouzey et Ané, 1926-35).

Jungmann, Josef A., *The Early Liturgy To the Time of Gregory the Great*, rev. ed., trans. by Francis A. Brunner (London: Darton, Longman & Todd, 1976).

- *The Mass of the Roman Rite. Missarum sollemnia*, 2 vols., trans. by Francis A. Brunner (New York: Benziger Brothers, 1951-55).

Kannengiesser, Charles, *Handbook of Patristic Exegesis: The Bible in Ancient Christianity*, 2 Vols. (Boston: Brill, 2006).

Kappes, Christiaan, 'The Biblical Origin and Late-Antique Invention of the Eucharistic Term and Definition 'Transubstantiation',' *Богословские труды* (2020): 1-29.

- *The Eiclesis Debate at the Council of Florence* (Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 2019).
- "Gregory Nazianzen's Prepurified Virgin in Ecumenical and Patristic Tradition: A Reappraisal of Original Sin, Guilt, and Immaculate Conception," in Jared Isaac Goff, Kappes, and Edward J. Ondrako, eds., *The Spirit and the Church Peter Damian Fehlner's Franciscan Development of Vatican II on the Temes of the Holy Spirit, Mary, and the Church - Festschrift* (Eugene: Pickwick, 2018), pp. 147-98.
- *Immaculate Conception: Why Thomas Aquinas Denied, While Duns Scotus, Gregory Palamas, and Mark Eugenicus Professed Absolute Immaculate Existence of Mary* (New Bedford: Academy of the Immaculate, 2014).
- 'A Latin Defense of Mark of Ephesus at the Council of Ferrara-Florence (1438-9),' *The Greek Orthodox Theological Review* 59 (2014): 161-230.
- 'The Latin Sources of the Palamite Theology of George-Gennadius Scholarius,' *Nicolaus* 40 (2013): 71-114.
- "Mark of Ephesus, the Council of Florence, and the Roman Papacy," in John Chryssavgis, ed., *Primacy in the Church: The Office of Primate and the Authority of Councils* (New York: St Vladimir's Seminary Press, 2016), pp. 109-50.
- 'A New Narrative for the Reception of Seven Sacraments into Orthodoxy: Peter Lombard's Sentences in Nicholas Cabasilas and Symeon of Thessalonica and the Holy Synaxis's Utilization of John Duns Scotus,' *Nova et Vetera* 15(2) (2017): 465-501.

- Kenny, Anthony, and Pinborg, Jan, "Medieval Philosophical Literature," in Norman Kretzmann, Kenny, Pinborg, eds., *Cambridge History of Later Medieval Philosophy* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1982), pp. 12-42.
- Kern, Cyprian, *Εὐχαριστία* (Paris: YMCA Press, 1947).
- Kianka, Frances, 'Demetrius Cydones and Thomas Aquinas,' *Byzantion* 52 (1982): 264-86.
- Kilmartin, Edward J., 'Sacrificium laudis: Content and Function of Early Eucharistic Prayers,' *Theological Studies* (1974): 268-87.
- Kiminas, Demetrius, *The Ecumenical Patriarchate. A History of its Metropolitanates with Annotated Hierarch Catalogs* (Rockville: Borgo Press, 2009).
- Koch, Hugo, *Pseudo-Dionysius Areopagita in seinen Beziehungen zum Neuplatonismus und Mysterienweisen. Eine litteraturhistorische Untersuchung* (Mainz: Franz Kirchheim, 1900).
- Koriakidis, Alexandros, *Ἰωάννα Ἐφέσου, †1437 (Ἰωάννης Βλαδύντερος), Βίος, ἔργα, διδασκαλία* (Athens: ΠΑΝΑΓΟΠΟΥΛΟΣ ΝΕΚΤΑΡΙΟΣ, 1992).
- Kotsabassi, Sofia, 'Aristotle's *Organon* and Its Byzantine Commentators,' *The Princeton University Library Chronicle*, 64(1) (2002): 51-62.
- Kretschmar, Georg, *Studien zum frühchristlichen Trinitätstheologie* (Tubingen: Mohr, 1956).
- Kristeller, Paul, "Le Thomisme et la pensée italienne de la Renaissance," in *Conférence Albert-Le-Grand 1965* (Montreal: J. Vrin, 1967), pp. 13-124.
- Lameri, Angelo, *La "Traditio Instrumentorum" e delle insegne nei riti di ordinazione: Studio storico-liturgico* (Rome: Edizioni Liturgiche, 1998).
- Laurent, Vitalien, 'Les dates du patriarcat d'Euthyme II de Constantinople,' *Byzantinische Zeitschrift* 54 (1961): 329-332.

- 'Les préliminaires du concile de Florence: Les neuf articles du pape Martin V et la réponse du patriarche Joseph II (octobre 1422),' *Revue des études byzantines* 20 (1962): 1-60.

Leaney, Robert, 'The Lucan Text of the Lord's Prayer (Lk 11:2-4),' *Novum Testamentum* 1 (1956): 103-11.

Lécuyer, Joseph, 'Le sacerdoce chrétien et le sacrifice eucharistique selon Théodore de Mopsueste,' *Recherches de Science Religieuse* 36(1) (1949): 481-516.

Lederer, Stephan, *Der Spanische Cardinal Johann Von Torquemada. Sein Leben Und Seine Schriften* (Freiburg im Breisgau: Herder, 1879).

Levy, Ian Christopher, Macy, Gary, and Van Ausdall, Kristen, eds., *A Companion to the Eucharist in the Middle Ages* (Leiden: Brill, 2012).

Ligier, Louis, 'The Origins of the Eucharistic Prayer: From the Last Supper to the Eucharist,' *Studia Liturgica* 9 (1973): 161-85.

Livanos, Christopher, *Greek Tradition and Latin Influence in the Work of George Scholarios: Alone Against All of Europe* (Piscataway: Gorgias Press, 2006).

The Lives of the Pillars of Orthodoxy (Buena Vista: Holy Apostles Convent, 1990).

Loenertz, Raymond-Joseph, 'Le chancelier impérial à Byzance au XIV^e et au XIII^e siècle,' *Orientalia christiana periodica* 26 (1960): 275-300.

- 'Chronologie de Nicolas Cabasilas 1345-1354,' *Orientalia Christiana Periodica* 21 (1955): 205-31.
- 'Démétrius Cydonès I: de la naissance à l'année 1373,' *Orientalia christiana periodica* 36 (1970): 47-72.
- 'Démétrius Cydonès II: de 1373 à 1375,' *Orientalia christiana periodica* 37 (1971): 5-39.

- 'Les Dominicains Byzantins Theodore et Andre Chrysoberges et les negociations pour l'union des eglises grecque et latine de 1415 a 1430,' *Archivum Fratrum Praedicatorum* 9 (1939): 5-61.
- "Fr Philippe de Bindo Incontri, O.P. du convent de Pera, Inquisiteur en Orient (1948)," in Loenertz, ed., *Byzantina et Franco-Graeca. Series altera: articles parus de 1935 à 1969* (Rome: Edizioni di storia e letteratura, 1978), pp. 19-38.
- 'Manuel Calécas, sa vie et ses oeuvres d'apres ses letters et ses apologies inedites,' *Archivum Fratrum Praedicatorum* 17 (1947): 194-207.
- 'Pour la biographie du Cardinal Bessarion,' *Orientalia christiana periodica* 10 (1944): 129-39.
- *La Société des frères pérégrinants: étude sur l'Orient dominicain*, Vol. 1 (Rome: Institutum Historicum FF. Praedicatorum, 1937).

Lot-Borodine, Myrrha, *Nicolas Cabasilas. Un maître de la spiritualité byzantine au XIV^e Siècle* (Paris: Éditions de l'Orante, 1958).

Louth, Andrew, *St. John Damascene: Tradition and Originality in Byzantine Theology* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2002).

Love, Rosalind, 'Bede and John Chrysostom,' *Journal of Medieval Latin* 17 (2007): 72-86.

Lur'e, Vadim, 'L'attitude de S. Marc d'Ephèse aux débats sur la procession du Saint-Esprit à Florence: Ses fondements dans la théologie post-palamite,' *Annuario Historiae Conciliorum* 21 (1989): 317-33.

Maguire, William E., *John of Torquemada O.P.: The Antiquity of the Church* (Washington, D.C.: Catholic University of America Press, 1957).

Maierù, Alfonso, "Dominican Studia in Spain," in Kent Emery, Jr., William J. Courtenay, and Stephen M. Metzger, eds., *Philosophy and Theology in the 'Studia' of the Religious Orders*

and at Papal and Royal Courts: Acts of the XVth Annual Colloquium of the Société Internationale pour l'Étude de la Philosophie Médiévale, University of Notre Dame, 8-10 October 2008 (Turnhout: Brepols, 2012), pp. 3-32.

Majeska, George P., *Russian Travellers to Constantinople in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries*. Dumbarton Oaks Studies 19 (Washington: Dumbarton Oaks Publications, 1984).

Mamoni, K. G., *Μάρκος ὁ Ἐυγενικός: Βίος καὶ ἔργον* (Athens: Αθήναι Φιλοσοφική σχολή του Πανεπιστημίου, 1954).

- 'Περί τινα ἀνέκδοτον ἀκολουθίαν εἰς Μᾶρκον Εὐγενικόν,' *Ἐπετηρίς Ἑταιρείας Βυζαντινῶν Σπουδῶν* 27 (1957): 369-86.

Marderas, Thomas, 'Μανουήλ ο Κορίνθιος: Μέγας Ρήτωρ και Λογοθέτης της Μεγάλης του Χριστού Εκκλησίας,' *Archive* 17(2) (2021): 34-44.

Mariano, Ivan, "The Council and Negotiations with the Greeks," in Michiel Decaluwé, Thomas M. Izbicki, Gerald Christianson, eds., *A Companion to the Council of Basel* (Leiden: Brill, 2017), pp. 310-39.

Marschler, Thomas, "Nineteenth Century Catholic Reception of Aquinas," in Matthew Levering and Marcus Plested, eds., *The Oxford Handbook of the Reception of Aquinas* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2021), pp. 359-74.

Mastrantonis, George, *Augsburg and Constantinople: The Correspondence Between the Tubingen Theologians and Patriarch Jeremiah II of Constantinople on the Augsburg Confession* (Brookline: Holy Cross Orthodox Press, 1982).

Mazza, Enrico, *L'anafora eucaristica. Studi sulle origini* (Rome: Bibliotheca Ephemerides liturgicae, 1992).

- *The Celebration of the Eucharist. The Origin of the Rite and the Development of Its Interpretation*, trans. by Matthew J. O'Connell (Collegeville: Pueblo, 1999).

- “Due differenti concezioni del racconto istitutivo: ‘Consacrazione’ o ‘Trasmissione’ del typos dell’eucaristia,” in Cesare Giraudo, ed., *The Genesis of the Anaphoral Institution Narrative in Light of the Anaphora of Addai and Mari, International Congress, Rome 25-26 October 2011* (Rome: Edizioni Orientalia Christiana, 2013), pp. 335-62.
- ‘La doctrine médiévale de l’eucharistie et les pères de l’église: Continuité ou rupture?’, *Revue du Droit Canonique* 62 (2012): 53-76.
- *The Eucharistic Prayers of the Roman Rite*, trans. by Matthew J. O’Connell (New York: Pueblo, 1975).
- *The Origins of the Eucharistic Prayer*, trans. by Ronald E. Lane (Collegeville: Liturgical Press, 2005).
- ‘De la Última Cena al siglo XXI: Comprension e incomprensiones sobre la Eucaristia y su celebración,’ *Phase* 268 (2005): 237-61.

McGann, M. J., ‘*Haeresis castigata, Troia vindicata: The Fall of Constantinople in Quattrocento Latin Poetry*,’ *Res publica litterarum* 7 (1984): 137-45.

McGowan, Anne Vorhes, “The Basilian Anaphoras: Rethinking the Question,” in Maxwell E. Johnson, ed., *Issues in Eucharistic Praying in East and West: Essays in Liturgical and Theological Analysis* (Collegeville: Liturgical Press, 2010), pp. 219-61.

McKenna, John H., *The Eucharistic Epiclesis. A Detailed History from the Patristic to the Modern Era*, 2nd ed. (Chicago: Liturgy Training Publications, 2009).

McKitterick, Rosamond, ‘Charles the Bald (823-877) and His Library: The Patronage of Learning,’ *The English Historical Review* 95(374) (1980): 28-47.

McLynn, Neil, *Ambrose of Milan: Church and Court in a Christian Capital* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2014).

Meersseman, Gilles, *Giovanni di Montenero O.P. difensore dei mendicanti* (Rome: Angelicum University Press, 1938).

Mercati, Giovanni, *Notizie di Procoro e Demetrio Cidone, Manuele Caleca e Teodoro Meliteniota ed altri appunti per la storia della teologia e della letteratura bizantina del secolo xiv* (Vatican City: Bibliotheca Apostolica Vaticana, 1931).

Meßner, Reinhard, "Zur Eucharistie in den Thomasakten: Zugleich ein Beitrag zur Frühgeschichte der eucharistischen Epilkese," in Robert F. Taft, ed., *Crossroad of Cultures: Studies in Liturgy and Patristics in Honor of Gabriele Winkler*. *Orientalia Christiana Analecta* 260 (Roma: Pontificio Istituto Orientale, 2000), pp. 493-513.

Monfasani, John, *Bessarion Scholasticus: A Study of Cardinal Bessarion's Latin Library* (Turnhout: Brepols, 2011).

- "The Pro-Latin Apologetics of the Greek Émigrés to Quattrocento Italy," in Antonio Rigo, ed., *Byzantine Theology and Its Philosophical Background* (Turnhout: Brepols, 2011), pp. 160-86.

Morton, Michael, 'Rethinking the Origin of the Roman Canon,' *Studia Patristica* 26 (1993): 63-66.

Muckle, J. T., 'Greek Works Translated Directly Into Latin Before 1350. Part I - Before 1000,' *Mediaeval Studies* 4(1) (1942), 33-42.

Müller, Gerhard Ludwig, *Laßt uns mit ihm gehen: Eucharistiefeyer als Weggemeinschaft* (Freiburg/Basel/Vienna: Herder, 1990).

Nasrallah, Joseph, *Saint Jean de Damas, son époque, sa vie, son oeuvre* (Paris: Harissa, 1930).

Neunheuser, Burkhard, "Das Eucharistische Hochgebet als Konsekrationsgebet," in Andreas Heinz and Heinrich Rennings, eds., *Gratias agamus. Studien zum eucharistischen Hochgebet: für Balthasar Fischer* (Freiburg: Herder, 1992), pp. 315-26.

Nicol, D. M., *The Last Centuries of Byzantium, 1261-1453* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993).

Niederwimmer, Kurt, *Die Didache*, Kommentar zu den Apostolischen Vätern 1 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1993).

Noone, Timothy B., "Universals and Individuation," *The Cambridge Companion to Duns Scotus*, ed. by Thomas Williams (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003), pp. 100-28.

Norwich, John Julius, *Byzantium*, Vol. 2 of 3: *The Apogee* (London: Penguin, 1993).

Novikoff, Alex J., 'Toward a Cultural History of Scholastic Disputation,' *American Historical Review* 117(2) (2012): 331-64.

- *The Medieval Culture of Disputation: Pedagogy, Practice, and Disputation* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2013).

Ochoa, Javier, *Index verborum ac locutionem Codicis Iuris Canonici* (Vatican City: Libreria Editrice Lateranense, 1984).

Ohme, Heinz, "Sources of the Greek Canon Law to the Quinisext Council (691/2): Councils and Church Fathers," in Wilfried Hartmann and Kenneth Pennington, eds., *History of Medieval Canon Law: The History of Byzantine and Eastern Canon Law to 1500* (Washington, D.C.: Catholic University of America Press, 2012), pp. 24-114.

Oliva, Adriano, 'La deuxième rédaction du *Correctorium* de Guillaume de la Mare: les questions concernant la *la Pars*,' *Archivum Historicum Franciscanum* 98 (2005): 423-64.

Palaiologos, Konstantinos, 'The Use of Latin Theological Sources in Matthaïos Blastares' *Treatise on the Error of the Latins*, *Nicolaus* 40 (2013): 49-70.

Papadakis, Aristides, *The Orthodox East and the Rise of the Papacy* (Crestwood: St. Vladimir's Seminary Press, 1994).

Papadopoulos-Kerameus, Athanasios, 'Μανουήλ ὁ Κορίνθιος καὶ ἔν ὑμνογραφικὸν αὐτοῦ πονημάτιον,' *Ἐπετηρὶς Φιλολογικοῦ Συλλόγου Παρνασσός* 6 (1902): 71-102.

- 'Μάρκος ὁ Εὐγενικὸς ὡς πατὴρ ἅγιος τῆς Ὁρθοδόξου Καθολικῆς Ἐκκλησίας,' *Byzantinische Zeitschrift* 11 (1902): 50-69.

Parenti, Stefano, "La 'vittoria' nella Chiesa di Constantinopoli della Liturgia di Crisostomo sulla Liturgia di Basilio," in Robert F. Taft and Gabriele Winkler, eds., *Comparative Liturgy Fifty Years after Anton Bumstark: Acts of the International Congress. Orientalia Christiana Analecta* 265 (Roma: Pontificio Istituto Orientale, 2001), pp. 907-28.

Van Parys, Michel, 'Quelques remarques à propos d'un texte controversé de Saint Basile au Concile de Florence,' *Irénikon* 40 (1967): 6-14.

Paschali, Maria, "Negotiating identities in fourteenth-century Famagusta: Saint George of the Greeks, the Liturgy and the Latins," ed. by Tassos Papacostas and Guillaume Saint-Guillain in *Identity/Identities in Late Medieval Cyprus. Papers given at the ICS Byzantine Colloquium, London, 13-14 June 2011, King's College London: Centre for Hellenic Studies-CRC* (Nicosia: Cyprus Research Center, 2014), pp. 281-301.

Paschos, Pantelis, *Ὁ Ματθαῖος Βλάσταρης καὶ τὸ ὑμνογραφικὸν ἔργον του* (Thessaloniki: Ἴδρυμα Μελετῶν Χερσονήσου του Αἴμου, 1978), pp. 61-76.

Pasnau, Robert, "The Latin Aristotle," in Christopher Shields, ed., *The Oxford Handbook of Aristotle* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012), pp. 665-89.

Patrinelis, Christos G., 'Οἱ Μεγάλοι Ῥήτορες Μανουήλ Κορίνθιος, Ἀντώνιος, Μανουήλ Γαλησιώτης καὶ ὁ χρόνος τῆς ἀκμῆς των,' *Δέλτιον τῆς Ἱστορικῆς καὶ Ἐθνολογικῆς Ἑταιρείας* 16 (1962): 17-38.

Paulová, Mildad, 'L'empire byzantine et les Tchèques avant le chute de Constantinople,' *Byzantinoslavica* 14 (1953): 158-225.

Peltoma, Leena, *The Image of the Virgin Mary in the Akathistos Hymn* (Leiden, Brill, 2001).

Perczel, István, "Dionysius the Areopagite," in Ken Parry, ed., *The Wiley Blackwell Companion to Patristics* (Chichester: John Wiley & Sons, 2015), pp. 211-25.

Perl, Eric, *Theophany: The Neoplatonic Philosophy of Dionysius the Areopagite* (Albany: State University of New York Press, 2007).

Peterson, Erik, "Die Bedeutung von ΑΝΑΔΕΙΚΗΥΜΙ in den griechischen Liturgien," in *Festgabe für Adolf Deissmann zum 60. Geburtstag* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1927), pp. 320-6.

Philippides, Marios, and Hanak, Walter K., *Cardinal Isidore c. 1390-1462. A Late Byzantine Scholar, Warlord, and Prelate* (Abingdon: Oxford, 2018).

Piana, Celestino, *La facoltà teologica dell'università di Firenze nel quattro e cinquecento* (Rome: Collegii S. Bonaventurae, 1977).

Pino, Tikhon Alexander, "Thomas Aquinas and Mark of Ephesos on the Body-Soul Relationship," in Denis Searby, ed., *Latins and Greeks Learning from Each Other in Byzantium* (Berlin: De Gruyter, 2018), pp. 291-307.

Plested, Marcus, *Orthodox Readings of Aquinas* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012).

Podskalsky, Gerhard, *Griechische Theologie in der Zeit der Türkenherrschaft: die Orthodoxie im Spannungsfeld der nachreformatorischen Konfessionen des Westens (1453-1821)* (München: C. H. Beck, 1988).

Pontone, Marzia, *Ambrogio Traversari monaco e umanista: Fra scrittura latina e scrittura greca* (Turin: Nino Aragno, 2010).

Prügl, Thomas, 'Dominicans and Thomism at the Council of Basel (1431-1439),' *Annuario Historiarum Conciliorum* 35(1-2) (2003): 363-80

Quaesten, Johannes, *Mysterium tremendum: Vom christlichen Mysterium* (Düsseldorf: Patmos-Verlag, 1951).

Quecke, Hans, 'Ein saidischer Zeuge der Markusliturgie,' *Orientalia Christiana Periodica* 37 (1971): 40-54.

Reagan, Patrick, 'Quenching the Spirit: The Epiclesis in Recent Roman Documents,' *Worship* 79 (2005): 386-404.

Reine, Francis J., *The Eucharistic Doctrine and Liturgy of the Mystagogical Catecheses of Theodore of Mopsuestia* (Washington, D.C.: Catholic University of America Press, 1942).

Richard, Jean, 'Les Arméniens à Avignon au XIV^e siècle,' *Revue des études arméniennes* 23 (1992): 253-64.

Rigo, Antonio, 'La canonizzazione di Gregorio Palama (1368) ed alcune altre questioni,' *Rivista di studi bizantini e neoellenici* 30 (1993): 155-202.

Rigo, Antonio, and Scarpa, Marco, "Le opere antilatine di Gregorio Palamas a Bisanzio e tra gli slavi (XIV-XV secolo)," in Marie-Hélène Blanchet and Frédéric Gabriel, eds., *Réduire le Schisme? Ecclésiologies et politiques de l'Union entre Orient et Occident (XIIIe-XVIIIe siècle)* (Paris: Centre de Recherche d'Histoire et Civilisation de Byzance, 2013), pp. 151-61.

Rigotti, Gianpaolo, "Massimo Planude traduttore del De Trinitate di S. Agostino," in Claudio Moreschini & Giovanni Menestrina, eds., *La traduzione dei testi religiosi* (Brescia: Morcelliana, 1994), pp. 185-96.

Ritter, Karl Bernhard, "Bemerkungen zur eucharistischen Epiklese," ed. by Heinz Dietrich Wendland in *Kosmos und Ekklesia: Festschrift für Wilhelm Stählin zu seinem siebzigsten Geburtstag* (Kassel: J. Stauda-Verlag, 1953), pp. 163-73.

Rodopoulos, Panteleimon, *Ὁ Καθαγιασμος τῶν δώρων τῆς θεῆας εὐχαριστίας*, Λειτουργικά Βλατάδων 3 (Thessalonica: Το Πατριαρχικό Ἴδρυμα Πατερικῶν Μελετῶν, 2000).

Roensch, Frederick, *The Early Thomistic School* (Dubuque: Priory Press, 1964).

Rolker, Christof, *Canon Law and the Letters of Ivo of Chartres* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2009).

- 'The Earliest Work of Ivo of Chartres: The Case of Ivo's Eucharistic Florilegium and the Canon Law Collection Attributed to Him,' *Zeitschrift der Savigny-Stiftung für Rechtsgeschichte: Kanonitische Abteilung* 93 (2007): 109-27.

Roemer, Paul, and Lamoreaux, John C., *John of Scythopolis and the Dionysian Corpus: Annotating the Areopagite* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1998).

Rosemann, Philipp W., *Peter Lombard* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004).

Van Rossum, G. M., *De essentia sacramenti ordinis: Disquisitio historico-theologica*, 1st ed. (Freiburg im Breisgau: B. Herder, 1914),

Runciman, Steven, *The Last Byzantine Renaissance* (London: Cambridge University Press, 1970).

Russell, Norman, "Palamism and the Circle of Demetrius Cydones," in Charalambos Dendrinos, Jonathan Harris, Judith Herrin, eds., *Porphyrogenita: Essays on the History and Literature of Byzantium and the Latin East in Honour of Julian Chrysostomides* (London: Ashgate, 2003), pp. 153-74.

Ryder, Judith R., *The Career and Writings of Demetrius Kydones* (Leiden: Brill, 2010).

- "The Career and Writings of Demetrius Kydones," in Martin Hinterberger and Chris Schabel, eds., *Greeks, Latins, and Intellectual History 1204-1500* (Leuven: Peeters, 2011), pp. 243-62.

Salaville, Séverien, “Αναδεικνύει, ἀποφαίνειν: Note de lexicologie à propos de textes eucharistiques,” in *Mémorial Louis Petit: Mélanges d’histoire et d’archéologie byzantines* (Bucharest: Institut Français d’études byzantines, 1948), pp. 413-22.

- ‘L’épiclese d’après saint Jean Chrysostome et la tradition occidentale,’ *Échos d’Orient* 11(69) (1908): 101-12.
- “Epiclese Eucharistique,” in *Catholicisme*, Vol. 4 (Paris: Letouzey et Amé, 1956), pp. 302-7.

Sammon, Brendon, *The God Who is Beauty: Beauty as a Divine Name in Thomas Aquinas and Dionysius the Areopagite* (Eugene: Pickwick, 2013).

Van de Sandt, Huub, and Flusser, David, *The Didache: Its Jewish Sources and Its Place in Early Judaism and Christianity* (Assen: Fortress Press, 2002).

Sathas, Konstantinos, *Νεοελληνική Φιλολογία: Βιογραφίαι των εν τοις γράμμασι διαλαμπάντων Ελλήνων, από της καταλύσεως της βυζαντινής αυτοκρατορίας μέχρι της ελληνικής εθνεγερσίας (1453-1821)* (Athens: Εκ της Τυπογραφίας των τέκνων Ανδρέου Κορομηλά, 1868).

Sebastian, Wenceslaus, “The Controversy Over the Immaculate Conception from Scotus to the End of the Eighteenth Century,” ed. by Edward D. O’Connor in *The Dogma of the Immaculate Conception: History and Significance* (Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 1958), pp. 213-70.

Schabel, Chris, ‘The Greek bishops of Cyprus, 1260-1340, and the *Synodikon Kyprion*,’ *Κυπριακαὶ Σπουδαὶ* 64-65 (2000-1): 217-234.

- “The Status of the Greek Clergy in Early Frankish Cyprus,” in Julian Chrysostomides and Charalambos Dendrinis, eds., “Sweet Land...”. *Lectures on the History and Culture of Cyprus* (Camberley: Porphyrogenitus, 2006), pp. 165-207.

Schillebeeckx, Edward, *De sacramentele Heilseconomie* (Antwerp: T. Groeit, 1952).

Schmemmann, Alexander, *Celebration of Faith*, Vol. 3 of 3 (Crestwood, N.Y.: St Vladimir's Seminary Press, 2001).

- 'Ο Άγιος Μάρκος ὁ Εὐγενικός,' *Γρηγόριος Παλαμᾶς* 34 (1951): 230-41.
- 'St. Mark of Ephesus and the Theological Conflicts in Byzantium,' *St. Vladimir's Theological Quarterly* 1 (1957): 11-24.

Schmitt, Wolfgang O., 'Lateinische Literatur in Byzanz: Die Übersetzungen des Maximos Planudes und die moderne Forschung,' *Jahrbuch der österreichischen byzantinischen Gesellschaft* 17 (1968): 127-47.

Setton, Kenneth W., "The Catalans and Florentines in Greece 1380-1462," in H. W. Hazard, ed., *A History of the Crusades: The Fourteenth and Fifteenth Centuries* (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1969), pp. 225-77.

Ševčenko, Ihor, 'The Many Worlds of Peter Mohyla,' *Harvard Ukrainian Studies* 8(1/2): *The Kiev Mohyla Academy: Commemorating the 350th Anniversary of its Founding (1632)* (1984): 9-44.

Sideras, Alexander, *Die byzantinischen Grabreden: Prosopographie, Datierung, Überlieferung, 142 Epitaphien und Monodien aus dem byzantinischen Jahrtausend* (Vienna: Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, 1994).

Siecienski, Edward, *The Filioque. History of a Doctrinal Controversy* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2010).

Smith, Mahlon H., III, *And Taking Bread... Cerularius and the Azyme Controversy of 1054* (Paris: Editions Beauchesne, 1978).

Smyth, Matthew, "The Anaphora of the So-Called Apostolic Tradition and the Roman Eucharistic Prayer," in Maxwell E. Johnson, ed., *Issues in Eucharistic Praying in East and*

West: Essays in Liturgical and Theological Analysis (Collegeville: Liturgical Press, 2011), pp. 71-98.

Del Soldato, Eva, "Bessarion as an Aristotelian, Bessarion among the Aristotelians," in Sergei Mariev, ed., *Bessarion's Treasure: Editing, Translating and Interpreting Bessarion's Literary Heritage* (Berlin/Boston: De Gruyter, 2021), pp. 169-84.

Spinks, Bryan D., 'The Consecratory Epiclesis in the Anaphora of St. James,' *Studia Liturgica* 11 (1976): 19-38.

- *Do This in Memory of Me: The Eucharist from the Early Church to the Present Day* (London: SCM Press, 2013).
- *The Sanctus in the Eucharistic Prayer* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991).

Spiteris, Yannis, "Nicola Cabasilas Chamaetos," in Carmello Conticello and Vassa Conticello, eds., *La théologie byzantine et sa tradition*, Vol. 2 (Turnhout: Brepols, 2002), pp. 315-95.

Stählin, Rudolf, "Der Herr ist Geist," ed. by Heinz Dietrich Wendland in *Kosmos und Ekklesia: Festschrift für Wilhelm Stählin zu seinem siebzigsten Geburtstag* (Kassel: J. Stauda-Verlag, 1953), pp. 40-54.

Staley, Vernon, 'The Narrative of the Institution of the Eucharist, and the Accompanying External Gestures,' *The Irish Church Quarterly* 2(8) (1909): 308-15.

Stieber, Joachim, *Pope Eugenius IV, the Council of Basel and the Secular and Ecclesiastical Authorities in the Empire* (Leiden: Brill, 1978).

Stiernon, Daniel, "Marc Eugénikos," in Marcel Viller Ferdinand Cavallera, Joseph de Guibert, André Rayez, André Derville and Aimé Solignac, eds., *Dictionnaire de spiritualité ascétique et mystique, doctrine et histoire*, Vol. 10 (Paris: Beauchesne, 1980), cols. 267-72.

Stiglmayer, Josef, 'Der Neuplatoniker Proclus als Vorlage des sogenannten Dionysius Areopagita in der Lehre vom Übel,' *Historisches Jahrbuch* 16 (1895): 253-73, 721-48.

Stinger, Charles, *Humanism and the Church Fathers* (Albany: State University of New York Press, 1977).

Strittmatter, Anselm, 'Missa Grecorum, Missa Sancti Iohannis Crisostomi: The Oldest Latin Version Known of the Byzantine Liturgies of St. Basil and St. John Chrysostom,' *Traditio* 1 (1943): 79-137.

- "Notes on Leo Tuscus's Translation of the *Liturgy of St John Chrysostom*," in Sesto Prete, ed., *Didascaliae: Studies in Honor of Anselm M. Albareda, Prefect of the Vatican Library* (New York: Bernard M. Rosenthal, 1961), pp. 409-24.

Stuckwisch, D. R. "The Basilian Anaphoras," in Paul F. Bradshaw, ed., *Essays on Early Eucharistic Prayers* (Collegeville: Liturgical Press, 1997), pp. 109-30.

Taft, Robert F., "The Armenian "Holy Sacrifice (Surb Patarg)" as a Mirror of Armenian Liturgical History," in Taft, ed., *The Armenian Christian Tradition: Scholarly Symposium in Honor of the Visit to the Pontifical Oriental Institute, Rome, of His Holiness Karekin I, Supreme Patriarch and Catholicos of All Armenians, December 12, 1996* (Rome: Pontificum Institutum Orientalium Studiorum, 1997), pp. 175-97.

- "The Authenticity of the Chrysostom Anaphora Revisited: Determining the Authorship of Liturgical Texts by Computer," in *Liturgy in Byzantium and Beyond* (Brookfield: Ashgate, 1995), pp. 5-51.
- 'Ecumenical Scholarship and the Catholic-Orthodox Epiclesis Dispute,' *Ostkirchliche Studien* 45 (1996): 201-26.
- "The Epiclesis Question in the Light of the Orthodox and Catholic Lex orandi Traditions," ed. by Bradley Nassif in *New Perspectives on Historical Theology. Essays in Memory of John Meyendorff* (Grand Rapids/Cambridge: William B. Eerdmans, 1996) 210-37.

- "From Logos to Spirit: On the Early History of the Epiclesis," ed. by Balthasar Fischer in *Gratias agamus. Studien zum eucharistischen Hochgebet* (Freiburg: Herder 1992), pp. 489-502.
- *A History of the Liturgy of St. John Chrysostom*, 6 Vols. (Rome: Pontificium Institutum Studiorum Orientalium, 1975-2008).
- 'The Liturgy of the Great Church: An Initial Synthesis of Structure and Interpretation on the Eve of Iconoclasm,' *Dumbarton Oaks Papers* 34-35 (1980-1): 45-75.
- 'Problems in Anaphoral Theology: "Words of Consecration" versus "Consecratory Epiclesis,"' *St Vladimir's Theological Quarterly* 57(1) (2013) 37-65.
- 'Reconstituting the Oblation of the Chrysostom Anaphora: An Exercise in Comparative Liturgy,' *Orientalia Christiana Periodica* 59 (1993): 387-402.
- "Some Structural Problems in the Syriac Anaphora of the Twelve Apostles I," in Taft, ed., *Divine Liturgies: Human Problems in Byzantium, Armenia, Syria and Palestine* (Aldershot: Variorum, 2001), pp. 505-20.
- "Understanding the Byzantine Anaphoral Oblation," ed. by Nathan Mitchell and John Baldovin in *Rule of Prayer, Rule of Faith: Essays in Honor of Aidan Kavanagh, OSB* (Collegeville: Pueblo, 1996), pp. 32-55.

Talley, Thomas J., "Eucharistic Prayers, Past, Present, and Future," ed. by David Holeyton in *Revising the Eucharist: Groundwork for the Anglican Communion* (Nottingham: Grove, 1994), pp. 6-19.

- 'The Literary Structure of the Eucharistic Prayer' *Worship* 58 (1984): 404-19.

Tantalidis, Elias, *Παπιστικών ελέγχων*, 3 Vols. (Istanbul: I. Lazaridou, 1850-3).

Tarby, Andre, *La prière eucharistique de l'Église de Jérusalem*, Théologie Historique 17 (Paris: Beauchesne, 1972).

Tavuzzi, Michael, 'Hervaeus Natalis and the Philosophical Logic of the Thomism of the Renaissance,' *Doctor Communis* 45 (1992): 132-52.

- *Prierias: The Life and Works of Silvestro Mazzolini Da Prierio (1456-1527)* (Durham: Duke University Press, 1997).

Terrazas, Juan, *La eclesiología de Juan de Ragusa, O.P. (1390/95-1443): estudio e interpretación de su Tractatus de Ecclesia* (Madrid: Universidad Pontificia Comillas, 1995).

Théry, Gabriel, 'Documents concernant Jean Sarrazin, reviseur de la traduction érigénienne du Corpus Dionysiacum,' *Archives d'histoire doctrinale et littéraire du moyen âge* 18 (1951): 45-87.

- "Jean Sarrazin, Traducteur de Scot Erigene," *Studia Mediaevalia in Honor of R.J. Martin* (Bruges: Tempel, 1948), pp. 359-81.

Tichelkamp, Craig, 'Mystical Theology and Translation: Re-veiling the Latin *Corpus Dionysiacum*,' *Medieval Mystical Theology* 29 (2020): 41-53.

Tillard, Jean-Marie Roger, 'L'Eucharistie et le Saint-Esprit,' *Nouvelle Revue Théologie* 90(4) (1968): 363-87.

Tinnefeld, Franz, 'Intellectuals in Late Byzantine Thessalonike,' *Dumbarton Oak Papers* 57 (2003): 153-72.

Tomadakis, Nicholas V., *Ο Ιωσήφ Βρυέννιος και η Κρήτη κατά το 1400. Μελέτη φιλολογική και ιστορική* (Athens: E. G. Vagionakis, 1947).

Torrell, Jean-Pierre, *Saint Thomas Aquinas, Vol. 1: The Person and His Work*, trans. by Robert Royal (Washington, D.C.: Catholic University of America Press, 1996).

Tournebize, François, 'Les cent dix-sept accusations présentées à Benoît XII contre les Arméniens,' *Revue de l'Orient Chrétien* 11 (1906): 163-81.

Trapp, Erich, ed., *Prosopographisches Lexikon der Palaiologenzeit* (Vienna: Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, 1976-96).

Treadgold, Warren, *A History of the Byzantine State and Society* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1997).

Trigg, Joseph, 'The Angel of Great Counsel: Christ and the Angelic Hierarchy in Origen's Theology,' *The Journal of Theological Studies* 42 (1991): 35-51.

Tsirpanlis, Constantine, 'The Career and Writings of Nicolas Cabasilas,' *Byzantion* 49 (1979): 414-27.

- *Mark Eugenicus and the Council of Florence: A Historical Re-evaluation of His Personality*, 2nd ed. (New York: Κέντρο Βυζαντινών Ερευνών, 1979).

Turner, Christopher, 'The Career of George-Gennadius Scholarius,' *Byzantion* 39 (1969): 420-55.

Vagaggini, Cipriano, *Theological Dimensions of the Liturgy: A General Treatise on the Theology of the Liturgy*, ed. and trans. by Leonard J. Doyle and W. A. Jurgens (Collegeville: Liturgical Press, 1976).

Vansteenberghe, Edmund, *Le Cardinal Nicolas de Cues (1401-64)*, repr. (Frankfurt am Main: Minerva, 1963).

Vasiliadis, Nikolaos P., *Ὁ Ἅγιος Μάρκος ὁ Εὐγενικός καὶ ἡ ἔνωσις τῶν Ἐκκλησιῶν* (Athens: Ἐκδοσις «Σωτήρ», 1972).

Vella, Andrew, 'Early Thomistic Controversies,' *Melita Theologica* 3(2) (1950): 57-74.

Verbeke, Gérard, *L'évolution de la doctrine du Pneuma, du stoicism à saint Augustin* (Paris: Desclée de Brouwer, 1945).

Voicu, Sever J., "Le prime traduzioni latine di Crisostomo," in *Cristianesimo Latino ecultura Greca sino al sec. IV. XXI Incontro di studiosi dell'antichità cristiana, Roma, 7-9 maggio 1992* (Rome: Augustinianum 1993), pp. 397-415.

Völker, Walther, *Die Sakramentsmystik des Nikolaus Kabasilas* (Wiesbaden: Steiner, 1977).

Vos, Antoine, *The Theology of John Duns Scotus* (Leiden/Boston: Brill, 2018).

Ward, Thomas, *John Duns Scotus on Parts, Wholes, and Hylomorphism* (Leiden: Brill, 2014).

Wenger, Antoine, *Jean Chrysostome: Huit Catéchèses baptismales* (Paris: Éditions du Cerf, 1970).

Winn, Robert, *Eusebius of Emesa: Church and Theology in the Mid-Fourth Century* (Washington, D.C.: Catholic University of America Press, 2011).

Witvliet, John D., "The Anaphora of St. James," in Bradshaw, ed., *Essays on Early Eastern Eucharistic Prayers*, pp. 153-72.

Wolter, Allan B., "John Duns Scotus," *Individuation in Scholasticism. The Later Middle Ages and the Counter-Reformation, 1150-1650*, ed. by Jorge J. E. Gracia (New York: State University of New York Press, 1994), pp. 271-98.

Woodhouse, C. M., *George Gemistos Plethon – The Last of the Hellenes* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1986).

Wybrew, Hugh, *The Orthodox Liturgy: The Development of the Eucharistic Liturgy in the Byzantine Rite*, repr. (Crestwood: St Vladimir's Seminary Press, 2003).

Yost, Charles, 'Neither Greek nor Latin, but Catholic: Aspects of the Theology of Union of John Plousiadenos,' *Journal of Orthodox Christian Studies* 1(1) (2018): 43-59.

Zakythinos, Dionysios A., *La Grèce et les Balkans* (Athens: s.n., 1947), pp. 46-56.

Zattoni, Girolamo, 'L'epiclesi nell'antica liturgia romana e il suo valore consecratorio,' *Rivista Storico-Critica delle Scienze Teologiche* 1 (1905): 241-54.

Zavalloni, Roberto, *Richard de Mediavilla and the Controversy on the Plurality of Forms*

(Louvain: L'Institut Supérieur de Philosophie, 1951).

Zečević, Nada, *The Tocco of the Greek Realm: Nobility, Power and Migration in Latin Greece*

(14th-15th Centuries) (Belgrade: Makart, 2014).

Zervas, Theodore G., and Rivera, Isaias, "'Turning the Soul": An Investigation of Georgios

Gemistos Plethon's Teaching Methods and Educational Philosophy,' *Athens Journal of*

Humanities & Arts 5(1): 119-30.

Zheltoy, Michael, "The Moment of Consecration in Byzantine Thought," ed. by Maxwell E.

Johnson in *Issues in Eucharistic Praying in East and West. Essays in Liturgical and Theological*

Analysis (Collegeville, MN: A. Pueblo Book, 2012), pp. 263-306.

Dissertations.

Balcoyiannopoulou, Irini, *Το διδακτικό εγχειρίδιο λογικής του Γεωργίου Σχολαρίου: Δομή, πηγές και καινοτομίες*, Ph. D. Dissertation (University of Patras, 2018).

Kappes, Christiaan, *The Theology of the Divine Essence and Energies in George-Gennadios Scholarios*. Ph. D. Dissertation (Aristotle University of Thessaloniki, 2018).

Kapsalis, Athanasius G., *Matthew I, Patriarch of Constantinople (1397-1410), his life, his patriarchal acts, his written works*. M.A. Dissertation (Durham University, 1991).

Karsiotes, Nektarios, *Ἡ Σύνοδος Φερράρας - Φλωρεντίας ἀπὸ τῆς ὑπογραφῆς τοῦ ὄρου ἐνώσεως ἕως καὶ τῆς καταργήσεως αὐτοῦ. Μελέτη φιλολογικὴ καὶ ἱστορικὴ*, Ph. D. Thesis (National and Kapodistrian University of Athens, 2019).

Keskinis, Demetrios, *Ἡ πνευματολογία τοῦ ἁγίου Μάρκου ἐπισκόπου Ἐφέσου τοῦ Εὐγενικοῦ καὶ ἐπικαιρότητα τῆς*, Ph. D. Dissertation (Aristotle University of Thessaloniki, 2011).

Muksuris, Stylianos, *The Anaphorae of the Liturgy of Sts. Addai and Mari and the Byzantine Liturgy of St. Basil the Great: A Comparative Study*. Master's Thesis (Durham University, 1999).

Patrinellis, Christos G., *Ο Θεόδωρος Αγαλλιανός ταυτιζόμενος προς τον Θεοφάνην Μηδείας και οι ανέκδοτοι λόγοι του: μια νέα ιστορική πηγή περί του Πατριαρχείου Κωνσταντινουπόλεως κατά τους πρώτους μετά την άλωση χρόνους*, Ph. D. Dissertation (Aristotle University of Thessaloniki, 1966).

Pavouris, Raphael, *The Condemnation of the Christology of the Three Chapters in its Historical and Doctrinal Context: The Assessment and Judgement of Emperor Justinian and the Fifth Ecumenical Council (553)*. Ph. D. Dissertation (University of Glasgow, 2001).

Pilavakis, Marios, *Markos Eugenikos's First Antirrhetic against Manuel Calecas's On essence and energy: Editio Princeps with Introduction and Commentary*, Ph. D. Dissertation (King's College, University of London, 1987).

Stockmann, Jules Félix, *Joannis de Turrecremata O.P. vitam ejusque doctrinam De corpore Christi mystico scholasticorum Medicaevalium traditione illustratam et explicatam*, Ph. D. Dissertation (Freiburg: 1952).

Tsirpanlis, Zacharias N., *Τὸ κληροδότημα τοῦ καρδινάλιου Βησσαρίωνος γιὰ τοὺς φιλενωτικούς τῆς βενετοκρατούμενης Κρήτης (1439-17^{ος} αἰ.)*. Ph. D. Thesis (Aristotle University of Thessaloniki, 1967).

Tsougarakis, Nickiphoros I., *The Western Religious Orders in Medieval Greece*, Ph. D. Dissertation (University of Leeds, 2008).

Appendices

Appendix One: A Comparison of Mark of Ephesus' Transcriptions of His Liturgical Texts' Epicleses with their Critical Editions Published in Anton Hänggi and Irmgard Rahl, eds., *Prex Eucharistica*

Liturgical Epiclesis:	Mark's Transcriptions within the <i>Λίβελλος</i> : ⁷³⁶	Critical Editions Published in Anton Hänggi and Irmgard Rahl, eds., <i>Prex eucharistica; textus e variis liturgiis antiquioribus selecti</i> :
<i>Apostolic Constitutions</i>	καὶ ἀξιοῦμεν σε ὅπως εὐμενῶς <u>ἐπιβλέψους</u> ἐπὶ τα προκείμενα δῶρα ταῦτα ἐνώπιον σου, συ ὁ ἀνενδεής Θεός, καὶ <u>εὐδοκήσεις</u> ἐπ' αὐτούς εἰς τιμὴν τοῦ Χριστοῦ σου καὶ καταπέμψοις το ἅγιον σου Πνεῦμα ἐπὶ τὴν θυσίαν ταύτην, τον μάρτυρα <u>τα παθήματι</u> τοῦ Κυρίου Ἰησοῦ, ὅπως <u>ἀποφῆναι</u> τον ἄρτον τοῦτον σῶμα τοῦ Χριστοῦ σου, καὶ το ποτήριον τοῦτο αἷμα τοῦ Χριστοῦ σου. ⁷³⁷	καὶ ἀξιοῦμεν σε ὅπως εὐμενῶς ἐπιβλέψῃς ἐπὶ τα προκείμενα δῶρα ταῦτα ἐνώπιον σου, συ ὁ ἀνενδεής Θεός, καὶ εὐδοκήσῃς ἐπ' αὐτούς εἰς τιμὴν τοῦ Χριστοῦ σου καὶ καταπέμψοις το ἅγιον σου Πνεῦμα ἐπὶ τὴν θυσίαν ταύτην, τον μάρτυρα τῶν παθήματων τοῦ Κυρίου Ἰησοῦ, ὅπως ἀποφῆνῃ τον ἄρτον τοῦτον σῶμα τοῦ Χριστοῦ σου, καὶ το ποτήριον τοῦτο αἷμα τοῦ Χριστοῦ σου. ⁷³⁸
<i>Liturgy of St James.</i>	αὐτὸ το Πνεῦμά σου το πανάγιον κατάπεμψον, Δέσποτα, ἐφ' ἡμάς, καὶ ἐπὶ τα προκείμενα ἅγια δῶρα ταῦτα, ἵνα ἐπιφοιτῆσαν τῇ ἀγία καὶ ἀγαθῇ καὶ ἐνδόξῳ αὐτοῦ παρουσίᾳ, ἀγίασῃ, καὶ <u>ποιήσῃ</u> τον μεν ἄρτον τοῦτον σῶμα ἅγιον <u>τοῦ Χριστοῦ σου</u> , καὶ το ποτήριον τοῦτο αἷμα τίμιον <u>τοῦ Χριστοῦ σου</u> . ⁷³⁹	αὐτὸ το Πνεῦμά σου το πανάγιον κατάπεμψον, Δέσποτα, ἐφ' ἡμάς καὶ ἐπὶ τα προκείμενα ἅγια δῶρα ταῦτα, ἵνα ἐπιφοιτῆσαν τῇ ἀγία καὶ ἀγαθῇ καὶ ἐνδόξῳ αὐτοῦ παρουσίᾳ, ἀγίασῃ, καὶ ποιῇ τον μεν ἄρτον τοῦτον σῶμα ἅγιον Χριστοῦ... καὶ το ποτήριον τοῦτο αἷμα τίμιον Χριστοῦ. ⁷⁴⁰
<i>Liturgy of St Basil</i>	καὶ προσθέντες τα αντίτυπα τοῦ ἁγίου σώματος καὶ αἵματος τοῦ Χριστοῦ σου, σοῦ δεόμεθα καὶ	καὶ προσθέντες τα αντίτυπα τοῦ ἁγίου σώματος καὶ αἵματος τοῦ Χριστοῦ σου, σοῦ δεόμεθα καὶ σε

⁷³⁶ I have underlined the sections of Mark's transcriptions which do not concord with the quoted critical editions of these epicleses.

⁷³⁷ Mark of Ephesus, *Libellus de Consecratione*, 2, Petit, ed., in *Patrologia Orientalis*, Vol. 17, p. 427.

⁷³⁸ Hänggi and Rahl, eds., *Prex Eucharistica*, p. 92. The Greek text of this excerpt from the anaphora was based upon the critical edition published in Johannes Quasten, ed., *Monumenta eucharistica et liturgica vetustissima*, Pars 1 of 2 (Bonn: Peter Hanstein, 1935), pp. 212-27. See Hänggi and Rahl, eds., *Prex Eucharistica*, p. 83.

⁷³⁹ Mark of Ephesus, *Libellus de Consecratione*, 3, Petit, ed., in *Patrologia Orientalis*, Vol. 17, p. 428.

⁷⁴⁰ Hänggi and Rahl, eds., *Prex Eucharistica*, p. 250. This critical edition is derived from *Vat. gr.* 2282. See Hänggi and Rahl, eds., *Prex Eucharistica*, p. 244.

	<p>σε παρακαλούμεν, Ἅγιε ἁγίων, εὐδοκία τῆς σῆς ἀγαθότητος, ἐλθεῖν το Πνεῦμα σου <u>το ἅγιον</u> ἐφ' ἡμάς καὶ ἐπί τα προκείμενα δῶρα <u>φυί</u> ταῦτα, καὶ εὐλογήσαι αὐτά καὶ ἀγιάσαι, καὶ ἀναδεῖξαι, τον μεν ἄρτον τοῦτον αὐτό το τίμιον σῶμα τοῦ Κυρίου καὶ Σωτήρος ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, το δε ποτήριον τοῦτο αὐτό το τίμιον αἶμα τοῦ Κυρίου καὶ Θεοῦ καὶ Σωτήρος ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, το ἐκχυθέν ὑπέρ τῆς τοῦ κόσμου ζωῆς...⁷⁴¹</p>	<p>παρακαλούμεν, Ἅγιε ἁγίων εὐδοκία τῆς σῆς ἀγαθότητος ἐλθεῖν το Πνεῦμα σου το πανάγιον ἐφ' ἡμάς καὶ ἐπί τα προκείμενα δῶρα ταῦτα καὶ εὐλογήσαι αὐτά καὶ ἀγιάσαι καὶ ἀναδεῖξαι τον μεν ἄρτον τοῦτον αὐτό το τίμιον σῶμα τοῦ Κυρίου καὶ Σωτήρος ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ... το δε ποτήριον τοῦτο αὐτό το τίμιον αἶμα τοῦ Κυρίου καὶ Θεοῦ καὶ Σωτήρος ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ... το ἐκχυθέν ὑπέρ τῆς τοῦ κόσμου ζωῆς...⁷⁴²</p>
<p><i>Liturgy of St John Chrysostom</i></p>	<p>προσφέρουμέν σοι τὴν λογικὴν ταύτην καὶ ἀναίμακτον λατρείαν καὶ παρακαλοῦμεν, καὶ δεόμεθα, καὶ ἱκετεύομεν, κατάπεμψον το Πνεῦμα σου το ἅγιον ἐφ' ἡμάς καὶ ἐπί τα προκείμενα δῶρα ταῦτα, καὶ ποιήσον τον μεν ἄρτον τοῦτον τίμιον σῶμα τοῦ Χριστοῦ σου, το δε ἐν τῷ ποτηρίῳ τούτῳ τίμιον αἶμα τοῦ Χριστοῦ σου, μεταβαλῶν τῷ Πνεύματι σου τῷ ἁγίῳ.⁷⁴³</p>	<p>προσφέρουμέν σοι τὴν λογικὴν ταύτην καὶ ἀναίμακτον λατρείαν καὶ παρακαλοῦμεν, <u>σε</u> καὶ δεόμεθα, καὶ ἱκετεύομεν, κατάπεμψον το Πνεῦμα σου το ἅγιον ἐφ' ἡμάς καὶ ἐπί τα προκείμενα δῶρα ταῦτα... καὶ ποιήσον τον μεν ἄρτον τοῦτον τίμιον σῶμα τοῦ Χριστοῦ σου, το δε ἐν τῷ ποτηρίῳ τούτῳ τίμιον αἶμα τοῦ Χριστοῦ σου... μεταβαλῶν τῷ Πνεύματι σου τῷ ἁγίῳ.⁷⁴⁴</p>

⁷⁴¹ Mark of Ephesus, *Libellus de Consecratione*, 4, Petit, ed., in *Patrologia Orientalis*, Vol. 17, p. 429.

⁷⁴² Hänggi and Rahl, eds., *Prex Eucharistica*, p. 236. This critical edition is derived from *Barb. gr. 336* and *cod. Grottaferr. I'β VII*. See Hänggi and Rahl, eds., *Prex Eucharistica*, p. 230.

⁷⁴³ Mark of Ephesus, *Libellus de Consecratione*, 4, Petit, ed., in *Patrologia Orientalis*, Vol. 17, p. 430.

⁷⁴⁴ Hänggi and Rahl, eds., *Prex Eucharistica*, p. 226. This critical edition is derived from *Barb. gr. 336*. See Hänggi and Rahl, eds., *Prex Eucharistica*, p. 223. Cf. Kappes, *Epiclesis Debate*, p. 142.