

**A New Narrative for the Reception of Seven Sacraments
into Orthodoxy: Peter Lombard's *Sentences* in Nicholas
Cabasilas and Symeon of Thessalonica and the Utilization of
John Duns Scotus by the Holy Synaxis**

CHRISTIAAN KAPPES

*SS. Cyril and Methodius Byzantine Catholic Seminary
Pittsburgh, PA*

Introduction

SPECIALISTS IN BYZANTINE THEOLOGY and liturgi-
ology regularly repeat the narrative that the sevenfold enumeration and
content of the “sacraments” or “mysteries” in Orthodoxy is the result
of Roman Catholic *qua* papal imposition of the sacramental system
upon the Eastern Church per the Second Ecumenical Council of
Lyons (1274).¹ More precisely, standard narratives assume that the
numerical list of sacraments entered into Orthodoxy only following
the ill-fated profession of faith from Emperor Michael VIII at Lyons
II.² The Roman Church officially convened Lyons II as an ecumenical

¹ Martin Jugie, *Theologia dogmatica christianorum orientalium ab ecclesia catholica dissidentium* (Paris: Letouzey et Ané, 1935), 15–25; Paul Evdokimov, *Orthodoxy* (Hyde Park, NY: New City Press, 1979), 269–70; Deno Geanakoplos, *Constantinople and the West: Essays on the Late Byzantine (Palaeologan) and Italian Renaissance and the Byzantine and Roman Churches* (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1989), 202; Andrew Louth, *Introducing Eastern Orthodoxy* (Downers Grove, IL: Intervarsity Press, 2013), 103–05; Yury Avvakumov, “‘Sacramental Theology’: Between East and West,” in *The Oxford Handbook of Sacramental Theology* [hereafter, *Oxford*], ed. H. Boersma and M. Levering (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2015), 253.

In the present essay, if English translations are not attributed to a translation edition, they are my own work from the original languages.

² *Enchiridion symbolorum definitionum et declarationum de rebus fidei et morum* (*Compendium of Creeds, Definitions, and Declarations on Matters of Faith and*

council,³ the acts of which were implicitly reaffirmed as “ecumenical” during the Second Vatican Council (1962–1965).⁴ In the events leading to Lyons II, the Byzantine emperor made a profession of faith acceptable to the Latins, which included seven sacraments.⁵ Wherefore, historians of theology tend to assume that the Latin order and doctrine of the sacraments somehow entered into the Greek lexicon under emperor Michael VIII (1267) and his allied clergy (e.g., the unpopular John XI Beccus, Patriarch of Constantinople, 1275–1282). Although emperor Michael coerced ecclesial “reunion,” prompting Orthodox scrutiny of and acquaintance with theologically Latinophile sacramentology, such a narrative fails to explain how Orthodox conservatives and anti-unionists adopted the Latin sacramental economy wholesale without any real pretense of resistance.⁶

Another common assumption in contemporary scholarship is that post-Reformation Orthodox commitments to the sevenfold sacramental economy stem from Orthodox reactions to Protestantism and its rejection of a multifaceted sacramental economy,⁷ as with Peter of Moghila (d. 1646) and Dositheus of Jerusalem (d. 1707). These celebrated theologians (along with coeval Orthodox synods) made *ex professo* commitments to defend “seven sacraments” during the Renaissance and Enlightenment periods. This phenomenon prompted another historical narrative: post-Reformation Orthodox felt further beholden to the septenary system in reaction to extreme sacramental iconoclasm of the Calvinist, Cyril Lukaris, Patriarch of Constantinople (*interim* 1620–1638).⁸

Morals: Latin-English [hereafter, DZ]), ed. H. Denzinger, P. Hünermann, and R. Fastiggi (San Francisco: Ignatius Press, 2012), 860.

³ Norman Tanner, introduction to *Second Council of Lyons—1274*, in *Decrees of the Ecumenical of the Ecumenical Councils* [hereafter, DEC], ed. N. Tanner, 2 vols. (Georgetown: Sheed & Ward, 1990), 304.

⁴ Pope John XXIII, *Concilium Oecumenicum Primum et Vicesimum*, in *Acta Apostolicae Sedis* 54 (1962): 791; Fathers of Vatican II, *Nous les Pères du XXIème Concile Oecuménique*, in *Acta Apostolicae Sedis* 58 (1966): 10.

⁵ John Meyendorff, *Byzantine Theology: Historical trends and Doctrinal Themes* (New York: Fordham University Press, 1976), 191–92.

⁶ For Joasaph of Ephesus’s discordant voice in the fifteenth century, see *ibid.*, 192 and the relevant section below.

⁷ For a handy English translation of both confessions of faith, see *Creeds of Christendom with a History and Critical Notes*, ed. P. Schaff (New York: Harper, 1881), 1:55–66.

⁸ John Morris, *The Historic Church: An Orthodox View of Christian History* (Bloomington, IN: Authorhouse, 2011), 295–96; Radu Bordeianu, “(In) Voluntary Ecumenism: Dumitru Staniloae’s Interaction with the West as Open

Some general outlines of these standard narratives will prove true. Nonetheless, I will argue that learned Orthodox and *hoi polloi* alike complacently absorbed the enumeration and content of seven sacraments from more attractive sources than either Lyons II or reactions to Protestant polemics. The most developed Orthodox sacramentology prior to the fall of Constantinople actually developed out of Orthodox reflection and exposition on the mysteries occasioned by surprising source texts that predated Scholastic *Summas* and Roman creeds of Roman Catholic ecumenical councils.⁹ I conclude my investigation by challenging the standard historical narrative surrounding the adoption of the seven sacraments in the Orthodox East. As we shall see, Orthodox adoption of the sevenfold sacramental system must be reduced to cataloguing a rather limited number of individual authors who exercised a strong literary and spiritual influence on posterior generations. Although individual Orthodox authors' motives for adopting the heptad of mysteries prove, for the most part, to be idiosyncratic, they nonetheless permit me to weave a tale wherein Orthodox churchmen assess the number and genera of sacraments as something intrinsically reconcilable to the Orthodox Way. The principal persons of interest in this study betrayed neither knowledge of nor commitment to the sacramental lists or commitments of Lyons II. Instead, the authors took their inspiration from other material that predates this lightning rod for controversy between Orthodox and Catholic teaching on the *filioque*.

Septenary Latin Sacraments become a Heptad of Greek Mysteries

The aforementioned narratives infelicitously neglect a rather irenic chronicle wherein positive evaluations of the sevenfold nature of the mysteries were held among Palamites and *ex professo* anti-unionist Orthodox. This facet of historical Orthodoxy may prove to be a rich area for contemporary Orthodox reflection and reevaluation of the compatibility of the seven sacraments with the Orthodox Way.

Researchers have long known about the first quasi-enumeration of mysteries in Byzantine Christianity via the description of Theodore Studite (759–826). While Martin Jugie noted Theodore's omission

Sobornicity," in *Orthodox Constructions of the West*, ed. G. Demacopoulos and A. Papanikolaou (New York: Fordham University Press, 2013), 35.

⁹ I intend only to supplement the unsurpassable study of Jean Darrouzès, "Textes Synodaux Chypriotes," *Revue des études byzantines* 37 (1979): 5–122 [hereafter, Darr.].

of three modern sacraments—anointing, penance, and marriage—he also observed that Theodore created only a tetrad list of mysteries in spite of the fact that (according to Theodore’s hagiography) he underwent anointing of the sick, was accustomed to private confession of sins, and argued to uphold the ecclesial nature of first marriages.¹⁰ Accordingly, Theodore’s tetrad would have served little to inspire Orthodox wholesale adoption of Latins’ quasi-official hebdomad.¹¹

Centuries later, questionably Orthodox bishops adopted the seven-sacraments enumeration first at a synod of Cyprus in 1260, predating the papal profession of Michael VIII by several years. In spite of Greek locale, the synod reflected a synthesis of Orthodox and Scholastic theology following on the heels of the uncanonical usurpation of the Cypriot metropolitanate¹² by which a Latin archbishop forcibly ruled over a greatly reduced number of Greek bishops functioning as mere suffragans. The local Greek synod decreed thus:¹³ “It is necessary for one to know that seven mysteries are of the Church of Christ: (1.) Marriage (γάμος), (2.) holy order (τάξις ιερά), (3.) baptism (βάπτισμα), (4.) chrism by myron (χρῖσμα διὰ μύρου), (5.) communion, which is also called synaxis (κοινωνία, ὃ καὶ σύναξις), (6.) penance, i.e., confession (μετάνοια ἥτοι ἐξομολόγησις), (7.) and anointing of oil (χρῖσις ἐλαίου). Wherefore, only these and no more exist in number.”¹⁴

The Cypriot synodical list seems uninfluenced by Peter Lombard’s (*floruit* 1138–1160) original sacramental sequence (3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 1, and 2 from the Cypriot synod). Above, Pope Alexander IV (*scripsit* 1260) served as the synodical source (in *Instruens graecos*) for the names of the seven sacraments to be imposed on Cyprus in its upcoming synod.¹⁵ Curiously, the Cypriot synod changed Alexander’s numer-

¹⁰ Jugie, *Theologia dogmatica*, 3:15–16.

¹¹ More recently, a sixfold division of sacraments has been located in Theodore according to Yury Avvakumov, “Sacramental Theology,” in *Oxford*, 253: (1.) baptism (φώτισμα), (2.) communion (σύναξις εἴτουν κοινωνία), (3.) chrism (μύρον), (4.) holy orders (ιερατικά τελειώσεις), (5.) monastic profession (μοναχική τελειώσις), and (6.) what surrounds holy burial (τῶν ιερῶς κεκοιμημένων). This enumeration reflects the Ps.-Dionysius the Areopagite’s *On the Ecclesiastical Hierarchy* (see further below).

¹² The authentic acts of the Cypriot Synod are yoked with Scholastic commentary that professes (*inter alia*) instrumental, material, and formal causality.

¹³ George Hill, *A History of Cyprus* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2010), 3:42 and 1056–59.

¹⁴ Cypriot Synod, *Canons sur les sept sacrement* 8.0 (Darr., 97–98).

¹⁵ *Sacrororum Conciliorum Nova et amplissima collectio*, ed. J. Mansi, 53 vols. [here-

ical sequence. Alexander naturally was faithful to Peter Lombard, insofar as each named sacrament represented a really individual item, not a generic category under which other ceremonies might fall. Immediately following the decree above, the Cypriot synod surprisingly departed from Lombard's and Alexander's shared notion of the seven sacraments as *individual things*. In an explanatory paragraph or gloss, the Greek bishops *morphed* the sacramental system into seven "genera," or sets, into which various "species" or tokens fit:

- (I.) Genus of human generation: in which falls the species of marriage;
- (II.) Genus of spiritual generation, in which falls:
 - (A.) Species of "dedication of churches," and
 - (B.) Species of ordination, by which necessary and conditional sacraments are made operative; namely:
 - (i.) Absolutely necessary species for all people; namely:
 - (a.) baptism, (b.) chrism, and (c.) communion; and
 - (ii.) Conditionally necessary species for sinners: (a.) penance and (b.) anointing.

The Cypriot synod substantially abandoned Latin Scholastic distinctions between sacraments that denote a "necessity of means" (e.g., baptism) and "necessity of precept" (e.g., confirmation). Instead, the synod proposed universal sacraments (e.g., chrism) and conditional sacraments for sinners after baptism (e.g., anointing). These features will resurface in subsequent Orthodox authors. Because the Orthodoxy of the Cypriot church was called into question by Constantinople at this time, we cannot assume that Orthodox theologians everywhere would have unscrupulously adopted this catalogue during Cyprus's elongated schism.¹⁶ In effect, Orthodox bishops in

after, Mansi] (Venice, IT: Anonio Zatta, 1854–1909), 26:324C: "They should above all instruct on the ecclesiastical sacraments, showing them that there are, namely: baptism, confirmation on the forehead with chrism [*chrismate*] via a bishop, Eucharist, penance, order, and extreme unction via a priest from holy oil, and marriage. Let them too denounce, then, that someone feels otherwise about these sacraments, than the Roman Church teaches and guards."

¹⁶ For tensions between Constantinople and Cyprus, see Darr., 7–14; Basili Katsarou, "Ιωσήφ Βρυεννίου Τὰ πρακτικὰ τῆς συνόδου τῆς Κύπρου (1406)," *Byzantina* (2000): 21–31. I have chosen not to engage the more perplexing

Cyprus partially thwarted papal imposition of the seven-sacraments conceptual framework into the Cypriot church by equivocating the nature of the seven sacraments as general headings under which many individual ceremonies might fall. Greek bishops satisfied papal demand for a numerical “seven” as both limit and scriptural form of the mysteries. For example, holy order (II above) has two tokens: ordination and dedication of a temple (A and B above). Contrariwise, a Latin sacrament can have only one ceremony for every heading. Notable, too, is the fact that the synod never suggested that the dedication of a Church was a “sacramental” or lesser imitation of priesthood, as does Latin theology.

Though the distinction between species and genus was standard jargon for Greeks and Latins, the Greek solution above was, in fact, defective, for the “genus” of marriage has only one species. Classically, this undermines the need to create a genus at all (minimally composed of two species). The categorization above was asymmetric, with “holy order” as a genus while marriage is a mere species outside of any genus. Posterior Orthodox authors corrected this defect by adding species to even more sacraments. Consequently, the Cypriot synod theologially fell outside of the formal Roman concatenation of sacraments as found in papal professions of faith. In the same vein, the Cypriot synodical decree fell outside of the dogmatic definition of sacraments according to profession of faith at Lyons II and the posterior Council of Florence’s *Decretum pro Armenis* (1439).¹⁷ Following the Cypriot synod, Rome revised Alexander IV’s sacramental sequence in 1264. Departing from Lombard, Cyprus, and Pope Alexander, the new text was professed as follows:

[Unionist Michael VIII (1267) to Pope Gregory X:]¹⁸ The same Roman Church also teaches and holds: seven are the ecclesiastical sacraments; namely, (1.) one is baptism, about which it was

problem of the Latins’ theory that each sacrament signifies only one species or individual ceremony. Clearly, the sacrament of order, depending on one’s Scholastic proclivities, was composed of at least two species (diaconate and priesthood), or even three (the former two plus episcopacy). This obviously means that the sacrament of order *must* be a genus with species. For this reason, the Byzantine solution of making each sacrament into a genus actually enjoys a greater logical consistency than the common Latin position.

¹⁷ DZ, 1310–28.

¹⁸ The published edition of these professions neglected to reproduce the Greek original, which was composed under Pope Clement IV (1265–1268), as critiqued in Darr., 43.

aforementioned, (2.) another is the sacrament of confirmation (*confirmationis*), which bishops confer through imposition of hands, by anointing the reborn, (3.) another is penance, (4.) another Eucharist, (5.) another the sacrament of order, (6.) another is marriage, (7.) another is extreme unction (*extrema unctio*), which according to the doctrine of blessed James is dispensed to the sick.¹⁹

[Orthodox Andronicus II Palaiologus (1277) to Pope John XXI:] The holy apostolic Church of Rome both asserts and preaches that seven are the ecclesiastical sacraments: (1.) one, I call, baptism, about which it was aforementioned, (2.) another is the mystery of confirmation, which bishops confer through imposition of hands, chrismating the reborn, (3.) another is penance, (4.) another is Eucharist, (5.) another mystery [is] of holy ordination (χειροτονίας), (6.) another is that of marriage, (7.) another [is] last anointing, which according to the teaching of James is dispensed to the sick.²⁰

Unsurprisingly, churchmen used professions of faith to gauge one another's orthodoxy/Orthodoxy. Each above stated profession of faith contains Greek calques for sacramental names. We note that Andronicus begrudgingly accepted union because of his father, Michael VIII, but immediately repudiated it upon the latter's death. One can wonder if "Orthodox" Andronicus's profession of faith subsequently influenced admiring Orthodox contemporaries. Martin Jugie, Dimitru Staniloae, and Andrew Louth suppose this to be the case.²¹ John Meyendorff also thought this a significant point in the history of Orthodox sacramentology.²² The evidence supporting such supposition, however, is slim. Some scholars immediately allude to

¹⁹ DZ, 860.

²⁰ *Monumenta spectantia ad unionem ecclesiarum graecae et romanae*, ed. A. Theiner and F. Miklosich (Vindobonae, AT: Wilhelm Braumueller, 1872), 1:17–18. I omit John Beccus's Roman Catholic profession of faith (1277), since it imitates Andronicus's. Beccus's slight differences include: ἱεροπραξίαι (sacraments), τὸ τῆς βεβαιώσεως χρίσμα (confirmation), ἡ ἱερὰ τάξις (holy order), and τὸ ἔσχᾶτον χρίσμα. See *ibid.*, 1:28.

²¹ Bordeianu, "(In)Voluntary Ecumenism," 248–49; Bordeianu, *Dimitru Staniloae: An Ecumenical Ecclesiology* (New York: T&T Clark, 2011), 32–40; and Brian Butcher, "Orthodox Sacramental Theology: Sixteenth–Nineteenth Centuries," in *Oxford*, 336–38.

²² Meyendorff, *Byzantine Theology*, 192.

the monk Job (*floruit* 1270) as a witness to the immediate influence of this Latinophile profession of faith after 1264: “Seven are the mysteries of the Holy Church of God: (1.) firstly, baptism, (2.) secondly, chrism, (3.) thirdly, communion [μετάληψις τῶν ἁγιασμάτων], (4.) fourthly, priesthood, (5.) fifthly, honorable marriage, (6.) sixthly, monastic habit [ἅγιον σχῆμα], and (7.) seventhly, anointing, i.e., penance [εὐχέλαιον, ἑβδομον ἦτοι ἡ μετάνοια].”²³

An Orthodox believer, Job essentially repeats the Cypriot synod’s proemium: “Seven are the mysteries.” This proemium notably differs from the Roman professions of faith in Greek. Job also develops the Cypriot synodical genera: he categorized rituals as a species falling into the genus, contrary to coeval Latin Scholasticism. Job unusually rearranges the mysteries within his holy hebdomad, as partially illustrated below with the first and last sacraments in his sequence:²⁴

- (1.) Baptismal genus: (a.) baptism, and (b.) Epiphany water (μέγας ἁγιασμός);
- (2.) Chrism genus: (a.) chrismation, and (b.) dedication of a church;
- (3.) Communion genus: (a.) communing, and (b.) consecration of chrism;²⁵
- (6.) Monastic genus: (a.) three grades of habit, and (b.) virginity;
- (7.) Repentance genus: (a.) anointing, and (b.) penance.

Given his verbal dependence on the Cypriot synod and his affirmation of a sacramental genera (versus species), I see no reason to suppose that Lyons II needs to be taken into account for Job’s positive sacramentology. Job, too, is liturgically conscientious in his categorization. For example, he remarks that confession and anointing were concomitantly celebrated for the sick.²⁶ With confession and anointing forming but one sacrament, Job makes room for the inclusion of monastic habit as a mystery proper, and he considers other candidates (e.g., the *panagia* particle) for sacraments but rejects them.²⁷ Comparing all sacramental lists, one constant factor unites them: all septi-

²³ See the excerpt from Job as published in Jugie, *Theologia dogmatica*, 3:17–18.

²⁴ *Ibid.*, 3:18.

²⁵ He notes that Chrism is instituted on Holy Thursday, i.e., at the invention of the Eucharist.

²⁶ *Ibid.*, 3:18.

²⁷ For the history and nature of the ritual see John Yiannianis, “The Elevation of the Panaghia,” *Dumbarton Oaks Papers* 26 (1972): 226–36.

mal lists at least include the minimum of Peter Lombard's original number and content. Lists differ in sequence and sometimes contain additional ceremonies or widen the meaning of a sacramental species "a" into a sacramental genus "a." The Cypriot synod reordered Pope Alexander's sacraments under the major heading of two categories: generation (marriage) and salvation (the remainder). The synod also switched the relative position between orders and marriage. Job's sequence is somewhat alien to these considerations. His template is fairly obscure, but we cannot discount the universal influence of Ps.-Dionysius for considering candidates for sacramental status.²⁸ Still, Job's list and its enumeration are not at all dependent on the Roman profession of faith, contrary to the suppositions of scholars. Job did not accept the rationale whereby Cypriots divided sacraments into headings of "natural" and "salvific" production. Curiously, Job's template is somewhat closer to the sequence of Lombard's *Sentences*. Was Job privy to Lombard's traditional *taxis*?

Job's aforementioned list raises the question as to whether a Greek translation of Lombard's *Sentences* was in circulation in the late thirteenth century. Lombard's *Sentences* (*scripsit* 1150s) are indubitably the point of departure for the number and content of the sacraments in the Latin West, as follows: "Hence, let us arrive at the sacraments of the New Law, which are: (1.) baptism, (2.) confirmation, (3.) bread of blessing, i.e., Eucharist, (4.) penance, (5.) extreme unction, (6.) order (later: ecclesiastical orders/sacred ordination), and (7.) conjugal bond (later: marriage)."²⁹ When Cypriots abandoned Alexander IV's unique list and placed marriage and orders (*supra*, 7 and 6) to the head of their innovative philosophical exposition, they sequentially relocated this dyad to the beginning of their *taxis* (*supra*, 7, 6, 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5).

Diversely, Job placed sacraments of initiation at the head (*supra*, 1, 2, and 3). Can this be from the influence of the Cypriot genus-species system, which Job surely knew? To explain his rationale, I note that Job thought of penance as liturgically occurring within the rite of anointing. So, he reversed Lombard's relative order (*supra*, 5 and

²⁸ I agree that questions remain, as in the investigation of Darr., 43–44.

²⁹ Peter Lombard, *IV Sent.* d. 2.1.1. This is my own translation from *Sententiae in IV Libris Distinctae*, 4 vols., Spicilegium Bonaventuranum 5 (Rome: Ad Claras Aquas, 1981), 2:239, done because, for this passage and some others, G. Silano's translation in *The Sentences* (see note 49 below) and others are too loose to allow for word-for-word comparisons with other lists of the sacraments. Cf. *ibid.*, 2:243, 2:276, 2:280, 2:315, 2:390, 2:393, 2:416.

4). Whatever the sources upon which Job might have relied, he definitely inserted orders and marriage (*supra*, 7 and 8) after initiation (*supra*, 1, 2, and 3). Job then paired vocation (*supra*, 6 and 7) with his new sacrament, monastic habit, and grouped these into a triad. Why did he place penance-anointing (*supra*, 4 and 5) as the last sacramental genus? Though any guess can hardly be conclusive, Job was perhaps emboldened to change his arrangement because he knew of competing lists: the Cypriot synod and Lombard's *Sentences*.

Job's innovations aside, we should have noticed that Roman professions of faith between 1264 and 1277 drastically reorganized Lombard's traditional order of sacraments. Papal reordering is all the more puzzling given the fact that a pope called "the Ecumenical Council of Lateran IV" (1215), which vested Lombard's collection with authority.³⁰ Afterward, the Parisian master Alexander of Hales (d. 1245) produced the first *Summa theologica*, or commentary on the *Sentences*.³¹ The popularity of this publication eventually inspired universities to require similar dissertations on the *Sentences* as a *sine qua non* for obtaining the equivalent of a university doctorate in the thirteenth century and beyond. Why did the papal professions of faith begin to depart from the sacramental *taxis* of the *Sentences* as early as Michael VIII's profession, which was composed by 1264?

First of all, proto-Albigensian heretics had long been required to recite sacramental professions in the eleventh century.³² Albigensians famously despised the sacraments and were required to confess belief in the sacraments by name for reconciliation,³³ especially from 1177 into the first quarter of the thirteenth century.³⁴ Simultaneously, the ecclesiastical authorities in Byzantium were compiling errors of the Bogomil heretics, who mirrored Albigensians by rejecting the following mysteries: (1.) marriage, (2.) baptism, (3.) chrismation (obliquely), (4.) communion, and (5.) forgiveness of sins.³⁵ Orthodox

³⁰ DZ, 803.

³¹ See Alexander of Hales, *Summa theologica*, 4 vols. (Rome: Ad Claras Aquas, 1924–1948).

³² Robert Moore, *The Birth of Popular Heresy* (Canada: Medieval Academy of America, 1995), 16–19.

³³ Walter Wakefield and Austin Evans, *Heresies of the High Middle Ages* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1991), 204–08.

³⁴ Malcom Barber, *The Cathars: Dualist Heretics in Languedoc in the High Middle Ages* (New York: Routledge, 2014), 71–72.

³⁵ *Περὶ τῆς βλασφημίου καὶ πολυειδοῦς αἵρέσεως τῶν . . . Πογομίλων*; see *Eretici, Dissidenti, Musulmani ed Ebrei a Bisanzio: una raccolta eresologica del XII secolo*

required all penitents within sacramental confession to anathematize an entire heretical list of errors before ecclesial reconciliation.³⁶ Accordingly, papal requests for Byzantines to profess belief in sacraments were hardly something novel for anyone, excepting the fact that there had never been a fixedly sevenfold number and content to Greek professions of faith in the reconciliation of penitents.

As regards questions about Latin rearrangement of Lombard's traditional numerical sequence, there is the fact that Lombard's list was compiled in a context where a liturgical link still existed (technically) between the three sacraments of initiation (baptism, chrism, and Eucharist). Because Latin bishops alone chrismated children, confirmation was increasingly delayed as Christians multiplied in the Middle Ages.³⁷ Nonetheless, some Latin liturgical books managed to retain the custom of infant communion at baptism (with prior confirmation)³⁸ as late as the first quarter of the thirteenth century.³⁹ The definitive disappearance from liturgical books of a unified system of Christian initiation betrayed Latins' complete ignorance of the ancient order. With the delay of confirmation and, likewise, communion until post-pubescence, an adolescent naturally was required to make sacramental confession before communion. Consequently, late thirteenth-century Roman professions of faith assumed penance before every communion, reflecting the sacramental realities of the time. This explains well the interpolation of penance between Lombard's sequence of confirmation and Eucharist. Why does Lombard place anointing fifth in his ordering, while Pope Alexander places it sixth and later Roman professions of faith place it last? Lombard reflected the antecedent theology of Ivo of Chartres and Alan of Lille, who explicitly saw anointing as connected to public penance.⁴⁰ Yet, in the thirteenth century, following substantial occidental decline in public penance, no psychological association between penance and anoint-

[hereafter, *Eretici*], ed. and trans. P. Eleuteri and A. Rigo (Venice: Il Cardo, 1993), 144, 146, 148 (13.147, 17.176, 18.181, 19.192–93, 28.255–57).

³⁶ Ibid., 156 (1.17–8).

³⁷ *I sacramenti: teologia e storia della celebrazione*, ed. Salvatore Marsili, Jordi Pinell, et al. (Genoa, IT: Marietti, 2002), 1:100–01.

³⁸ *Le pontifical romain au moyen âge 2: Le pontifical de la curie romaine au XIII siècle*, ed. Michel Andrieu, Studi e testi 27 (Vatican City: Bibliotheca Apostolica Vaticana, 1940), 2:452–53 (no. 24), 2:477 (no. 54.26).

³⁹ *I sacramenti*, 1:100–01 and 111.

⁴⁰ Claude Ortemann, *Il sacramento degli infermi: storia e significato* (Turin, IT: Elle di Ci, 1971), 40–41.

ing existed any longer.⁴¹ Because, for Latins, anointing had long been considered the sacrament of dying (viz., “extreme unction”),⁴² the Roman professions of faith symbolically transferred anointing to the end, after sacraments of vocation. Because thirteenth-century theologians associated sacraments with the stages of life from cradle to grave, anointing was most fittingly at the end of life, “the sacrament of death.”⁴³

Anti-Latin Tradition of Seven Mysteries

Whether Byzantines opted for Lombard’s order, for Job’s, or for Roman professions of faith, each list had theological implications. Before passing on to the introduction of Aquinas’s works into Byzantium, I note that Jean Darrouzès located an important pro-Barlaamite Orthodox witness to the influence of the 1260 Cypriot synod. The Cypriot George Lapithes (*floruit* 1340–1349) also had access to Pope Alexander’s sacramental list.⁴⁴ Lapithes, skilled in both Latin and Greek, perhaps translated and certainly arranged two septimal lists in philosophical accord with the Cypriot synod.⁴⁵ In subsequent centuries, Lapithes’s sacramental lists were misattributed to George-Gennadius Scholarius (d. 1472), for which reason Jugie happened to include a work of Lapithes in his edition of Scholarius’ *Opera omnia*.⁴⁶ In *On What a Bishop Should Know and Teach*, formerly attributed to Scholarius, Lapithes adopts a clearly Scholastic approach to sacramental questions.⁴⁷

⁴¹ *I sacramenti*, 1:180–83.

⁴² Ortemann, *Il sacramento degli infermi*, 40–41.

⁴³ *Summa Theologiae* III, q. 65, a. 1–2. In article 1, Aquinas follows Lombard’s traditional liturgical order. Thereafter, in article 2, he appeals to Scholastic rationale for seven sacraments, placing anointing last. All references to Aquinas’s works rely on the Latin in *Opera omnia* at <http://www.corpusthomisticum.org/iopera.html>, last accessed February 24, 2017).

⁴⁴ Darr., 42.

⁴⁵ *Ibid.*, 37–42.

⁴⁶ George-Gennadius Scholarius, *Oeuvres Complètes de Georges Scholarios* [hereafter, OCGS], ed. L. Petit, X. Sidéridès and M. Jugie, 8 vols. (Paris: Maison de la Bonne Presse, 1929–1935), 4:xi. This work looks suspiciously like a translation of one of the various handbooks for priests originating from the genre of Thomas of Chobham’s “Things a Priest Should Necessarily Know.” This kind of Scholastic manual followed upon the heels of Lateran IV. What is more, it coincided with similar legislation in Latin-occupied Cyprus. See Thomas Izbicki, *The Eucharist in Medieval Canon Law* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2015), 14–15.

⁴⁷ See OCGS, 4:195, for example, where Lapithes argues that the priest is an instrumental cause (ποιητικὸν ἢ μᾶλλον ὀργανικὸν αἷτιον).

In fact, he embraces the notion of the minister of a sacrament as an instrumental cause. This means that sources common to Lapithes and Aquinas, or even Thomistic theology, were on hand. This is not the only *opusculum* of Lapithes on seven sacraments that Darrouzès has shown to mimic the Cypriot synod.

Despite his enthusiasm for Scholasticism, and though he was a correspondent of Barlaam the Calabrian (ca. 1290–1348), I have as yet found no trace of Lombard's *Sentences* in Lapithes's compositions. For his part, Barlaam is fairly certain to have had access to at least the first book of Lombard's *Sentences*.⁴⁸ Although a Greek translation of Augustine's *De trinitate* had already been produced under Maximus Planudes in the century prior, Barlaam's own references to Augustine clearly opt for a vocabulary and phraseology other than that in the well-known Greek edition of Planudes.⁴⁹ Instead, Barlaam obliquely refers to the relevant passages of Augustine within an unknown translation that he equates to the *au courant* position of Latin theologians. What is more, Barlaam's passages happen to coincide exactly with relevant Augustinian excerpts, phraseology, and vocabulary

⁴⁸ Konstantinos Palaiologos, "The Use of Latin Theological Sources in Matthaios Blastares's Treatise on the Error of the Latins," *Nicolaus* 40 (2013): 61–62, 68–69.

⁴⁹ E.g., Augustine of Hippo, *Περὶ Τριάδος Βιβλία Πεντεκαιδέκα*, vol. 2, trans. Maximos Planudes, ed. M. Papathomopoulos, I. Tsavari, and G. Rigotti (Athens: Κέντρον Ἑκδόσεων Ἑργων Ἑλλήνων Συγγραφέων, 1995), 15.17.29: "ἐκπορεύεται ἀρχοειδῶς τὸ Πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον . . . ὁ Θεὸς Πατήρ [The Father **makes proceed from himself** the Holy Spirit **as in the nature of a principle**]"; Barlaam the Calabrian, *Syntagma de processione de Spiritu sancto* 45: "Αὐγουστίνος, ἐν βιβλῳ πεντεκαιδεκάτῃ Περὶ τῆς ἁγίας Τριάδος οὐχ ἅπαξ, ἀλλὰ πολλάκις τὸ Πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον **κυρίως** καὶ ἰδίως φησὶν ἐκ τοῦ Πατρὸς **ἐκπορεύεσθαι** [Augustine, in the fifteenth book of the *De trinitate*, not only once but many times says that the Holy Spirit is **principally** and properly **made to proceed** from the Father]"; in *Barlaam Calabro: Opere contro i Latini*, Studi e Testi 348 (Vatican City: Bibliotheca Apostolica Latina, 1998), 2:664. Cf. Lombard, *I Sent.* d. 12.2.2: "Augustinus dicit spiritum sanctum **principaliter procedere** de Patre [Augustine says that the Holy Spirit **principally proceeds** from the Father]"; in *The Sentences*, trans. G. Silano, 4 vols., Medieval Sources in Translation 48 (Toronto: Pontifical Institute of Medieval Studies, 2010), 1:66–67. For an independent witness to an existing consistent translation of Augustine's work *that is foreign to that of Planudes*, see Matthaios Blastares, *Refutation of the Errors of the Latins*, ed. K. Palaiologos (PhD diss., Royal Holloway and Bedford New College, 2011), 293: "τὸ Πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον, **κυρίως ἐκπορεύεται** ἀπὸ τοῦ Πατρὸς [The Holy Spirit **principally proceeds** from the Father]."

from selections within Lombard's *Sentences*.⁵⁰ Barlaam's polemics on the Holy Spirit claim to employ popular passages among Latins, and these auspiciously coincide with pro-*filioque* arguments within Lombard. Finally, Barlaam lifts an excerpt from a letter of Ps.-Jerome that also mirrors a relevant selection, vocabulary, and phraseology of Ps.-Jerome within Lombard's *Sentences*.⁵¹ What is the net result of cataloguing all these instances that derive from unknown translations of Greek texts? When comparing each of Barlaam's citations of Augustine's *De trinitate* to Blastares's employment of the exact same vocabulary and passages, both Thessalonican professors are found to rely on the same Greek *florilegia* (of non-Planudian origin), forcing Konstantinos Palaiologos to conclude parsimoniously that both Barlaam and Blastares cited a translation of Lombard's *Sentences* that is no longer extant.

For Lapithes's part, his attraction to seven sacraments seems to coincide with Job, insofar as both found the schema and organization of the sacraments according to the Cypriot synod convenient for their purposes. Still, Lapithes was clearly enthusiastic about Scholastic distinctions and was influenced by Scholastic treatises on sacramentology. Oppositely, Job relied on only a limited conceptual framework and phraseology from the Cypriot synod, while his deviations therefrom can be conveniently explained by recourse to Lombard's *Sentences* in play with Ps.-Dionysian ceremonies enjoying attribution of apostolicity to ceremonies, such as monastic profession.

From here, Lapithes passed from history's sight about the time that an important court official of the Byzantine Empire named Demetrius Cydones finished his Greek *editio princeps* of Thomas Aquinas's *Summa*

⁵⁰ Palaiologos provides three examples that argue his thesis. For the second instance, see Augustine, *De Trinitate* 15.17.29: "Spiritus sanctus de patre **principaliter . . . procedit** [The Holy Spirit **principally proceeds** from the Father]," Augustine, *Sancti Aurelii Augustini De trinitate libri xv (libri xiii-xv)*, ed. W. J. Mountain, Corpus Christianorum 50 (*Aurelii Augustini Opera* 16.2) (Turhout, BE: Brepols, 1968), 503. Cf. Augustine, *Περὶ Τριάδος* 15.17.29: "τὸ Πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον ἐκ τοῦ πατρὸς **ἀρχικῶς . . . πρόεισιν** [The Holy Spirit **primordially processes** from the Father]"; cf. Barlaam, *Syntagma* 45: "τὸ Πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον **κυρίως** καὶ ἰδίως φησὶν ἐκ τοῦ Πατρὸς **ἐκπορεύεσθαι** [The Holy Spirit **principally** and properly **proceeds** from the Father]" (*Opere contro i Latini*, 2:664); cf. Blastares, *Refutation of the Errors of the Latins* 6.25-28: "τὸ Πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον ἐκ τοῦ πατρὸς **κυρίως ἐκπορεύεται** [The Holy Spirit **principally proceeds** from the Father]" (Palaiologos diss. edition, 293).

⁵¹ Palaiologos, "The Use of Latin Theological Sources," 60-62.

contra gentiles (hereafter, SCG) on Christmas Eve of 1354.⁵² Aquinas, once a youthful commentator on the *Sentences*, retained the septenary sacramental arrangement of “master” Lombard in his SCG: (1.) baptism, (2.) confirmation, (3.) Eucharist, (4.) penance, (5.) extreme unction, (6.) order, and (7.) marriage.⁵³ Lombard’s sequence was again retained in Aquinas’s *Summa theologiae* (hereafter, ST), whose sacramental sections became partially available in Greek by around 1360.⁵⁴ If select sacramental questions from Aquinas’s *tertia pars* of his ST are today extant in Greek,⁵⁵ his SCG enjoyed relative popularity in Byzantium, judging from the large number of manuscripts still extant.⁵⁶ At any rate, both Latinophile and anti-Latin Byzantines customarily referenced (whether positively or negatively) Aquinas.⁵⁷

Subsequent to Cydones, the fourteenth-century convert from Orthodoxy Dominican Manuel Calecas (d. 1410) expounded a Greek arrangement of the sacramental order (supplemented with Aquinas’s cradle-to-grave rationale) as follows: (1.) baptism, (2.) chrism of myron, (3.) communion of hallowed gifts, (4.) penance, (5.) the mystery of anointing (εὐχέλαιου), (6.) the mystery of orders (τάξεων), and (7.) marriage.⁵⁸ Despite the considerable headway that Thomism had made in Byzantium, Greeks showed no palpable interest in Calecas’ distribution of the sacramental *taxis*. For example, Joseph Bryennius (d. ca. 1431), a fierce anti-Latin who was Calecas’ contemporary and correspondent, wrote, “The mysteries of the Church are

⁵² Stylianos Papadopoulos, *Oi ‘Ellhnikai metaphrasedes thwomistikōn ērgōn: Philothwomistai kai antithwomistai en Byzantiō: Symbolē eis tēn istoriān tēs byzantinēs theologiās* (Athens: Bibliothēkē tēs en Athēnais Filēkpaideutikēs ētaireias, 1967), 25–32.

⁵³ Thomas Aquinas, *Summa contra gentiles* I, ch. 58.

⁵⁴ Christopher Wright, “Towards an Edition of Demetrius Kydones’s Autograph Translation of Thomas Aquinas’s *Summa Theologiae: Prima Pars*,” *Nicolaus* 40 (2013): 15–30.

⁵⁵ See “Thomas de Aquino Byzantinus,” ed. John A. Demetracopoulos (<http://www.labarts.upatras.gr/dimitr/index1.html>).

⁵⁶ Around thirty MSS have been catalogued in Linos Benakis, “Ἡ παρουσία τοῦ Θωμᾶ Ακινάτη στὸ Βυζάντιο: ἡ νεώτερη ἔρευνα γιὰ τοὺς οπαδοὺς καὶ ἀντιπάλους τῆς Σκολαστικῆς στὴν Ἑλληνικὴ Ανατολή,” in *Ἐν δὲ οὐκέτι ἐγώ, ζῇ δὲ ἐν ἐμοὶ Χριστός: Ἀφιέρωμα στὸν ἀρχιεπίσκοπο Δημήτριο* (Athens: A. Sakkoulas, 2002), 528.

⁵⁷ John A. Demetracopoulos, “Palamas Transformed: Palamite Interpretations of the Distinction between God’s *Essence* and *Energies*,” in *Greeks, Latins, and Intellectual History 1204–1500*, ed. M. Hinterberger and C. Schabel, *Recherches de Théologie et Philosophie Médiévale* 11 (Paris: Peeters Leuven, 2011), 263–72.

⁵⁸ Manuel Calecas, *De principiis fidei catholicae* (PG, 152:597–609).

seven: (1.) baptism, (2.) chrismation of myron (χρίσις μύρου), (3.) holy oil (ἅγιον ἔλαιον), (4.) marriage in the Lord, (5.) ordination (χειροτονία), (6.) confession, and (7.) communion (μετάληψις).⁵⁹

Bryennius seems familiar with the proemium of his anti-Latin forebears and clearly accepts the heptad in its traditional content, but he also finds reasons to alter sacramental terminology and order. He definitely knew Lombard's sequence through Aquinas's two *Summae*.⁶⁰ Curiously, Bryennius shows little concern for the intrinsic connection between the mysteries of initiation and no concern for typical terminology or taxonomy of the mysteries. In the context of his treatise, wherein he names all seven sacraments, his clear attraction to this categorization can be reduced to the fact that he lists innumerable things (from astronomical to spiritual phenomena) that can be divided into sacred sets of the number seven. One gets the sense that Bryennius was simply enthusiastic about any set of items that he could find to bolster his argument that seven was the perfect number. Consequently, no unifying motive among Job, Lapithes, and Bryennius manifests itself to explain Orthodox adoption of the number, the *taxis*, or the content of seven sacraments. Excepting Scholastic influence on the anti-Palamite Lapithes, there are not even signs that Lyons II (or Aquinas) played a significant role in anti-Latin adoption of the sacramental system.

Moving on, Bryennius' student George-Gennadius Scholarius and their contemporary Joasaph of Ephesus (d. 1437) employed some of Bryennius' exact phraseology.⁶¹ For his part, Joasaph seemed influenced by the 1260 Cypriot synod when subdividing the generic category of holy order into priesthood and dedication of a temple: "The sacraments of the Church are not seven . . . but more . . . the sacrament of illumination, of divine communication of the precious body and blood . . . the rite of holy myron, of priestly perfections, and the dedication of a church, marriage in the Lord, the rite of those who died in the Lord, the sacrament of anointing, the sacrament of monks, the sacrament of confession."⁶²

It is unlikely that coincidence inspires Joasaph to place dedication

⁵⁹ Joseph Bryennius, *Λόγος πρῶτος: Περὶ συντελείας*, in *Ιωσήφ Μοναχοῦ τοῦ Βρυεννίου τὰ εὐρεθέντα*, ed. E. Bulgaris (Lipsia: Breitkopf, 1768), 2:198.

⁶⁰ Demetracopoulos, "Palamas Transformed," 287–92.

⁶¹ Jugie, *Theologia dogmatica*, 3:20.

⁶² Joasaph of Ephesus, *Responsiones ad quaestiones presbyteri Georgii Drasini*, nos. 47.383–90, in *Ἰωάσαφ Ἐφέσου (d. 1437) (Ἰωάννης Βλαδύντερος)*, ed. A. Korakides (Athens: Βιβλιοπωλεῖον Νεκτᾶριος Παναγόπουλος, 1992), 1:233.

of a church next to priesthood, just as the 1260 synod had subdivided order. His sacrament of monastic habit not only coincides with his predecessor Job but also mirrors Symeon of Thessalonica, whom we shall treat momentarily.⁶³ Joasaph is unique in supplementing the sevenfold sacramental list that he knew with the addition of the funeral ritual, which is located suspiciously next to anointing. Might Joasaph accept anointing's intrinsic relation to the dying? In answer, we need to compare Joasaph's extra ceremonies to his original inspiration, Ps.-Dionysius the Areopagite.

In his *On the Ecclesiastical Hierarchy*, the Areopagite discusses the funeral ritual, monastic habit, and other ceremonies as functions bearing dignity similar to principal mysteries such as baptism. Joasaph appeals to the putatively apostolic Dionysius, though in reality, he grafts obscure sixth-century ceremonies of Syrian origin onto his own liturgical inheritance.⁶⁴ For instance, Joasaph equates fifteenth-century Byzantine funeral services—detached from Eucharist—to the liturgical rites of apostolic times. Nonetheless, the Areopagite patently clothes non-Eucharistic rituals surrounding burial in language and honor that are customarily embraced for dominical sacraments of Latin lists. When we take into account the uncontroversial and universal acknowledgement of the Areopagite's sustained and profound influence on the development and interpretation of Byzantine liturgy, we are hardly surprised to find that Joasaph's more expansive list can be easily accounted for by combining the Areopagite's "sacraments" with a septenary list of Latin origin. For Joasaph, the solution to the question of the number of sacraments is simply to synthesize two traditions into one. The presumably apostolic origin of the Areopagite's doctrine naturally urged Joasaph to view septenary enumeration with prejudice, even if the latter does not reject any individual items named in Lombard's list.⁶⁵ The listing of sacraments

⁶³ The presumably apostolic origin of monasticism was asserted from the existence of *θεραπευταί*, or apostolic monks. The term was not employed haphazardly in Ps.-Dionysius, *On the Ecclesiastical Hierarchy* 6.3; in *Corpus Dionysiacum II* [hereafter, Denys], ed. G. Heil and A. Ritter (New York: Gruyter, 1991), 116. Ps.-Dionysius garners credibility for the apostolicity of monastic profession by acknowledging that it is rooted in the well-known *therapeutai* (i.e., first-century Judaeo-Egyptian monastics) of Eusebius of Caesarea, *Histoire ecclésiastique*, ed. G. Bardy, Sources chrétiennes 31 (Paris: Éditions du Cerf, 1952), 2.17.3.

⁶⁴ Arthur Rosemary, "The Dating of the Dionysian Corpus," *Studia Patristica* 48 (2007): 171–75.

⁶⁵ Granted Louth's caution against reading Scholastic categories into the

from the Cypriot synod likely influenced Joasaph, but he departed from it by creatively synthesizing Dionysian ceremonies into his sacramental *taxis*. Furthermore, he completely departed from the Cypriot genus-species method of categorization and simply supplied his reader with a list of particular rituals that he denominated individually as sacramental.

We next investigate Archbishop Symeon of Thessalonica (ca. 1416–1429): “Seven are the gifts of the Spirit, as *Isaiah* says, and seven the mysteries of the Church, which are energized through the Spirit. Now, these are: (1.) baptism, (2.) chrism, (3.) communion (κοινωνία), (4.) ordination (χειροτονία), (5.) marriage, (6.) penance, and (7.) holy oil.”⁶⁶ Symeon’s preface develops an ingenious relation between the sevenfold charisms and sacraments. Clearly, Symeon is attracted to the sacred hebdomad for reasons that do not perfectly coincide with his predecessors either. In short, he interprets Jesus’s baptism as a moment of prophetic fulfillment: “The Spirit of the Lord is upon me, because he anointed (ἔχρισε) me” (Isa 61:1). Symeon sees this as spiritual license to connect a sevenfold Spirit (Isa 11:2), manifested at Jesus’s baptism, to a wellspring of seven charisms.⁶⁷ Accordingly, Jesus’s baptism and chrismation are connected to this first passage of *Isaiah*. Disappointingly, he fails to connect Eucharist with *Isaiah*, opting for Melchisedech, which weakens his typological argument.⁶⁸ Next, Symeon refers to ordination under the aegis of the root of Jesse (Isa 11:2), endowed with seven charisms.⁶⁹

Marriage, as Eucharist, initially receives only passing mention, devoid of any reference to *Isaiah*.⁷⁰ Nonetheless, Symeon uses the

Areopagite, the rituals that Ps.-Dionysius describes are customarily divided into six “sacraments”: (1.) baptism (or φώτισμα) (Denys, 70, 129); (2.) Eucharist (σύναξις or κοινωνία) (Denys, 80); (3.) chrism (ἡ τελετὴ τοῦ μύρου) (Denys, 95): (a.) post-baptismal chrismation (ἡ τοῦ μύρου τελειωτικὴ χρίσις) (Denys, 78), (b.) dedication of a church (μύρον ὁ ἱεράρχης λαβὼν ἐπιτίθησι τῷ θεῷ θυσιαστηρίῳ) (Denys, 95), (4.) ordination (ἱερατικαὶ τελείωσεις) (Denys, 110), (5.) monastic consecration (μοναχικὴ τελείωσις) (Denys, 117) with its implied cleansing of imperfection (Denys, 116), and (6.) funerals (with anointing) (τῶν ἱερῶς κεκοιμημένων) (Denys, 122); see Andrew Louth “Late Patristic Developments in Sacramental Theology in the East: Fifth–Ninth Centuries,” in *Oxford*, 172–74.

⁶⁶ Symeon of Thessalonica, *Περὶ τῶν ἱερῶν τελετῶν* 33 (PG, 155:177B).

⁶⁷ Ibid. 43 (PG, 155:185D).

⁶⁸ Ibid. 44 (PG, 155:189C).

⁶⁹ Ibid. 45 (PG, 155:189D).

⁷⁰ Ibid. 46 (PG, 155:192B).

mystery of marriage as a springboard to speak about the virginity of the *Theotokos*, connecting divine-virginal espousals to fruitfulness, and ultimately to Christ's own virginity.⁷¹ Not unlike Job, who sees the sacraments as generic categories, Symeon bifurcates marriage into virginal-spiritual marriage (e.g., the *Theotokos*) and fleshly marriage in the Lord.

In Symeon's sacramental treatise, the impression is given that Christ's undergoing the sacraments of initiation culminates in his virginal and sinless marriage to the Church and, consequently, to our souls. This suggests that a thematic motive inspired Symeon to displace penance-monastic habit and anointing to the last place in his ordering, since they are the only sacraments exclusively conditioned by human sin (versus Christ's sacramental vocation in the world).⁷² This point coincides somewhat with the theology of the 1260 synod. However, it also greatly surpasses it by using a Christological justification that is entirely absent from the Cypriot synod. Hence, direct dependence on the synod is possible but not demonstrable.

Penance occasions Symeon's longest discourse, which is inspired by Christ as the form of penitents in the Gospel. Therein, Symeon briefly recalls his episcopal office of forgiving sins but is mainly concerned with the monastic vocation as embracing the Lord's example, mixed with human sorrow for sin, for sin separates the monk from Christ. Here, again, a sacrament is a genus with two species.

If Latins gradually transferred anointing to the end of their sacramental lists, associating it with the last stage of life, Symeon oppositely rails against Latin association of anointing with dying. He sees anointing as a panacea for various kinds of conditions in life, and his rejection of "the death sacrament" precludes him from displacing anointing to the end of his list because of associations with grave illness.⁷³

Symeon betrays no direct dependence on the Latin professions of faith or their vocabulary, save only the opening statement: "The mysteries of the Church are seven." This makes us suspicious that he had access to a list similar to the monk Job. Stephen Hawkes-Teeple observes that, throughout his works, Symeon made strenuous efforts to imitate the language and symbolism of his Dionysian and

⁷¹ Ibid. 46–48 (PG, 155:192B–193C).

⁷² Ibid. 49–55 (PG, 155:193C–204A).

⁷³ Ibid. 56 (PG, 155:204D).

patristic sources.⁷⁴ He further notes that Symeon was often poorly informed about Latin and Armenian liturgical customs.⁷⁵ From these observations, it seems too much to expect that Symeon would have consciously entertained a newfangled lexicon interspersed with calques from Latin. Clearly, the 1260 Cypriot synod, Roman professions of faith, and Joseph Bryennius' list fail to offer themselves as potential sources for Symeon's order and terminology.

Instead, Symeon's list bears the distinct marks of Lombard's *Sentences*. If we are initially misled by Symeon's displacement of the duo of penance and holy oil to the place after marriage, it is nonetheless clear that he conserves Lombard's liturgically correct links among the sacraments of initiation. Secondly, Symeon retains Lombard's relative order between orders and marriage, as well as between penance and extreme unction. The dual sacraments of vocation and the dyad of repentance and anointing form natural pairs. Symeon relocated penance and "holy oil" at the end of the list because penance, confession, and monastic habit were part of the divine economy only after sin.⁷⁶

Moreover, Symeon's similarity to the monk Job is more than superficial. Job also considered monastic habit to be fully sacramental, even if he surpassed Symeon by making penance a postpositive synonym for anointing within the same genus (no. 7a–b of Job's work). If we assume Symeon's literary dependence upon Job because of their mutual esteem for the Dionysian "sacrament of monasticism," it is nonetheless a puzzle as to why Symeon renamed Job's sacraments. Naturally, Symeon and Job sacramentalized ceremonies such as monastic profession due to universal attribution of apostolicity to the Dionysian corpus. Be that as it may, we also must explain why Symeon inverts Job's order (anointing before penance, in 7b of Job's work) back to Lombard's (penance before anointing)! Parsimony suggests that both Symeon and Job merely apply a popular sacramental fusion between monastic and liturgical penance. In conclusion, Symeon may have independently rearranged Lombard's attractive *taxis*, even if somewhat inspired by Job's Byzantine inclu-

⁷⁴ Steven Hawkes-Teeple, introduction to *St. Symeon of Thessalonica: The Liturgical Commentaries*, Studies and Texts 168 (Toronto: Pontifical Institute of Medieval Studies, 2011), 31–39, 43–52, 63–66.

⁷⁵ Ibid., 42–47. This fact is all the more puzzling for Hawkes-Teeple, since he suspects Symeon may have had access to something like Lombard's *Sentences*.

⁷⁶ Symeon, *Περὶ τῶν ἱερῶν τελετῶν* 39 (PG, 155:180B).

sion of monastic tonsure in the sacramental economy.⁷⁷ Both Job and Symeon displace penance and anointing to the last place, but for different reasons. If Job inspired Symeon to arrange sacraments outside Lombard's original position, the latter was not impressed with Job's innovative interpolation of monastic habit into the *taxis*. Job's fusion of virginity with monastic habit may have influenced Symeon to reflect on a way to associate virginity to some sacrament. This would explain Symeon's excursus into Mary's productive virginity (childbirth) as the foundation for including virginity in the genus of marriage. Instead of accepting Job's fusion of virginity and monasticism, Symeon chose another route. Should this analysis reasonably explain Symeon's organization of his sacramental *taxis*, then where did Symeon initially get the idea of "a traditional *taxis*"?

Symeon must have read Lombard's *Sentences*, as gleaned from his doctrine on baptism and extreme unction. Hawkes-Teeple's recent research suggests that Symeon had little knowledge of Latin customs, while "the Byzantine lists"—condemning Latin practices in vivid description—knew virtually nothing about Latin confirmation.⁷⁸ Linguistically, Greeks were unable to follow Latin baptismal ceremonies, while Latin ritual itself was unique for employing a post-baptismal (non-sacramental) anointing by using chrism. From patristic times, Latin priests had performed this anointing independently of confirmation.⁷⁹ Greek onlookers at Latin baptisms would have been misled into thinking that post-baptismal anointing with chrism conferred the *signaculum* or σφραγίς of confirmation upon the child.⁸⁰ Curiously, Symeon was privileged to know otherwise.⁸¹

⁷⁷ This is likely because of the Byzantine tendency among earlier theologians to place penance next to monastic tonsure, as investigated in Meyendorff, *Byzantine Theology*, 196.

⁷⁸ There are mainly isolated complaints, of which none coincide exactly with Symeon; namely, that Latins refuse to: (1.) use correctly made oil, (2.) have chrismation at all, (3.) deviate from bishops alone chrismating, (4.) chrismate *immediately* after baptism (i.e., at the end of the ceremony); see Tia Kolbaba, *The Byzantine Lists: Errors of the Latins* (Chicago: University of Illinois Press, 2000), 130, 144, 174, 204.

⁷⁹ *I sacramenti*, 1:105.

⁸⁰ Greeks rarely complained about the unusual delay of "chrism" (non-sacramental anointing) until the end of the Latin ceremony; see Kolbaba, *The Byzantine Lists*, 204.

⁸¹ Symeon, *Περὶ τῶν ἱερῶν τελετῶν* 43 (PG, 155:183C).

Peter and John laid hands, and some received the Holy Spirit [Acts 8:17], which is the myron, for laying on of hands is to distribute the chrism, *as happened with the apostles*, and through them, to many others. . . . It is necessary that the faithful *always* be sealed through baptism, so that, after someone is baptized, the super-divine baptism should be perfect per se. For if [Jesus] took the Spirit, after he was baptized, and those who were baptized by Philip took the Spirit through laying on of hands of Peter and John, in order that those might not be imperfect and unsealed by the Spirit, the faithful baptized also have to be anointed with this myron in baptism, and not—as do the Latin rites or infants of whomever else—remain incomplete and unsealed.⁸²

Lombard writes:

That it can only be conferred by the highest priests—Pope Eusebius: that “the sacrament cannot be performed by anyone other than the highest priests”; *at the time of the Apostles we read that it was not done by any other than the Apostles themselves* [Acts 8:17], nor can or ought it to be done by any other. . . . [In another place:] They “[priests] cannot sign on the brow with chrism.”⁸³

And yet Gregory writes . . . “some have been scandalized by our having forbidden priests to touch with chrism those who have been baptized. . . . But if any are in fact saddened by this, we grant that, where there are no bishops, priests may also touch those who are baptized on their foreheads with chrism. . . . But this is adjudged only to have been granted *once* for the sake of putting scandal to rest.”⁸⁴

Clearly, Symeon was very well informed about the subtleties of Latin sacraments. His uncanny example from *Acts of the Apostles* and insistence on baptism “always” being accompanied with chrism leave his reader with the impression that Latin priests might dispense chrism on some rare occasion as mentioned in Lombard. Symeon manages to avoid making erroneous judgments about Latin sacra-

⁸² Ibid. 43 (PG, 155:187C).

⁸³ Lombard, *IV Sent.* d. 7.2.1 (*The Sentences*, 4:39).

⁸⁴ Ibid. d. 7.2.2 (*The Sentences*, 4:39).

mental praxis despite the scant and often inaccurate comments of his Byzantine forebears.

Symeon's precision surely stems from his access to Lombard's section on anointing of the sick, which distinguished the various kinds of oils and affirmed the existence of a proper oil of chrism.⁸⁵ In this vein, no traditional lists of Byzantine condemnations seem to have impugned the Latin practice of delaying confirmation.⁸⁶ Nonetheless, Symeon complains: "[Jas 5:15:] 'And prayer of faith [after anointing] will save the infirm, and the Lord will raise him. If has committed sin, he will forgive him.' Whence, yet another sentential judgment—one of their [Latin] innovations—is destroyed. Because they say (as in everything else, so also here they rationalize and manipulate the apostolic sayings) that 'holy oil is not useful to dispense to those who possess hope of life, but to the dying only, since it is productive of forgiveness of sins.'"⁸⁷

Lombard writes:

On the sacrament of extreme unction—after the ones mentioned above—there is another sacrament, namely the anointing of the sick, which is done at the end of life with oil consecrated by the bishop.⁸⁸

[After citing Jas 5:15:] In this passage it was shown that this sacrament was instituted for a double cause, namely, for the remission of sins, and for the relief of bodily infirmity. And so it is established that someone who receives this anointing with faith and devotion is relieved in body and soul, so long as it is expedient that he should be relieved in both. But if perhaps it is not expedient that he should have bodily health, he acquires in this sacrament that health which pertains to the soul.⁸⁹

In short, Symeon's treatise on the sacraments supplies obvious correctives to theological problems that he detected when reading Lombard's *Sentences*.

⁸⁵ Ibid. d. 23.2 (*The Sentences*, 4:136).

⁸⁶ There is one complaint of Latins anointing people who commit grave sins in order to administer forgiveness; see Kolbaba, *The Byzantine Lists*, 198.

⁸⁷ Symeon, *Περὶ τῶν ἱερῶν τελετῶν* 46 (PG, 155:204C).

⁸⁸ Lombard, *IV Sent.* d. 23.1 (*The Sentences*, 4:136).

⁸⁹ Lombard, *IV Sent.* d. 23.3.2 (*The Sentences*, 4:136).

Latin Sources for Seven Greek Mysteries

Symeon likely had access to the library or at least to the manuscript of his Thessalonican predecessors.⁹⁰ I have already affirmed Konstantinos Palaiologos' convincing argument for the existence of a Greek edition of the *Sentences* based upon his comparing Greek excerpts from the *Syntagma* of the Byzantine canonist, Matthew Blastares (ca. 1290–ca. 1350), to relevant sections of the *Sentences*.⁹¹ The Thessalonican pedigree of this hypothetical manuscript is reinforced by the fact that Palaiologos located a passage in Barlaam of Calabria traceable to Lombard.⁹² Furthermore, I argue that Nicholas Cabasilas also made use of the *Sentences*, which had become available in Thessalonica around 1341, as discussed earlier with respect to Barlaam.⁹³ The link between Blastares and Cabasilas is further strengthened by the fact that both often rely on the same literary sources.⁹⁴ In fact, Cabasilas lifted a direct citation of *The Sentences* for his *Commentary* from the singular excerpt of the Roman Canon (hereafter, RC) within any of Lombard's four books:⁹⁵

[Lombard (ca. 1150):] *Omnipotens Deus, iube haec perferri per manus sancti angeli tui in sublime altare tuum, etc.*⁹⁶

[Cydones (ca. 1369):] Πρόσταξον ἀπενεχθῆναι ταῦτα διὰ χειρὸς ἀγγέλου ἁγίου σου εἰς τὸ ἐπουράνιον σου θυσιαστήριον.⁹⁷

[Cabasilas1 (1391):] Κέλευσον ἀνενεχθῆναι τὰ δῶρα ταῦτα ἐν χειρὶ ἀγγέλου εἰς τὸ ὑπερουράνιον σου θυσιαστήριον.⁹⁸

⁹⁰ For Cabasilas's library, to which Symeon had access, see Marie-Hélène Congourdeau, introduction to *Correspondence de Nicholas Cabasilas: bilingue* (Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 2010), xxii–xxiii.

⁹¹ Palaiologos, "The Use of Latin Theological Sources," 60–2. Blastares cited Lombard, *I Sent.* d. 12.2 and d. 12.2.4.

⁹² *Ibid.*, 60–61.

⁹³ *Ibid.*, 52.

⁹⁴ Franz Tinnefeld, "Intellectuals in Late Byzantine Thessalonica," *Dumbarton Oaks Papers* 57 (2003): 156, 162, 171; Hélène-Marie Congourdeau, "Nil Cabasilas et les projets de concile oecuménique pour l'union des églises," in *Réduire le schisme? Ecclésiologies et politique de l'union entre orient e occident (XIIIe–XVIIIe siècles)*, ed. M.-H. Blanchet and F. Gabriel, Centre de Recherche d'Histoire et Civilisation de Byzance: Monographies 39 (Paris: ACHCByz, 2013), 79–80.

⁹⁵ For Blastares's citations of Lombard, see Palaiologos, "The Use of Latin Theological Sources," 60–63, 68.

⁹⁶ Lombard, *IV Sent.* d. 13.1.4 (*The Sentences*, 4:313–14).

⁹⁷ Demetrius Cydones, *Liturgia S. Gregorii Magni*, ed. Anton Baumstark, *Oriens Christianus* 4 (1904): 20–21.

⁹⁸ Nicholas Cabasilas, *Explication de la divine liturgie: traduction et notes* [hereafter,

[Cabasilas2 (1439):] Κέλευσον **προσενεχθῆναι** τὰ δῶρα ταῦτα ἐν χειρὶ ἀγίου ἀγγέλου εἰς τὸ ὑπερουράνιον σου θυσιαστήριον.⁹⁹

Cabasilas provides late fourteenth-century confirmation for the existence of Lombard's fourth book—on the sacraments—in Thessalonica.¹⁰⁰ Cydones' influence, from his translation of the Roman Mass, can easily be excluded as Cabasilas' textual source. In Lombard's *Sentences*, the RC is cited but once.¹⁰¹ Cabasilas just happens to pick up this singular and brief passage. The length and content of Cabasilas' passage were independently verified at the Council of Florence, where Byzantines referenced it in their arguments for the eucharistic epiclesis. If Cabasilas had possessed a more extensive translation of the RC, I can think of no reason for him to refrain from using it in his lengthy diatribe against the Latins' understanding of their own *anaphora*. Below, I first provide Cabasilas' thesis, and then I cite two of Lombard's excerpts that supplied Cabasilas with his arguments from the RC against the Latins:

What do they mean when they say: “[Almighty God, command] that these be brought up [by the hand of your holy angel before your altar in heaven], etc.” . . . They are asking that they [gifts] be raised in dignity from a humble state to the highest of all. . . . How . . . shall that which is not yet the Body of Christ, which is truly heavenly, become heavenly? Or how . . . could that which excels all . . . be carried up in the hand of an angel? Supposing . . . that the prayer of the Latins is *asking that the offerings be raised in dignity and transformed into a higher reality, then they are guilty of a monstrous blasphemy if, considering that the Body of the Lord is already present, they nevertheless believe that it can*

Explic.] 30.2, trans. and ed. S. Salaville, *Sources Chrétiennes* 4b (Paris: Cerf, 1967), 192.

⁹⁹ Theodore Xanthopoulos, Dorotheus of Mytiline, et al., *Quae supersunt Actorum Graecorum Concilii Florentini*, ed. J. Gill, *Concilium Florentinum Documenta et Scriptores Series B* (Rome: Pontificium Institutum Orientalium Studiorum, 1953), 5.2:441–42.

¹⁰⁰ See Séverien Salaville, notes complémentaires to *Explic.*, 320–23. Salaville mentioned Lombard's passage as an *obiter dictum*, among other Latin commentators, who had held a similar opinion to Cabasilas. More recently, Cabasilas' theory has been revisited in Robert Taft, “Problems in Anaphoral Theology: *Words of Consecration* versus *Consecratory Epiclesis*,” *St Vladimir's Theological Quarterly* 57 (2013): 55–57.

¹⁰¹ The *Sentences* cite the Roman Canon (*textus receptus*) verbatim.

become something higher and holier. Thus it is clear that the Latins know perfectly well that the bread and wine are not yet consecrated; that is why they pray for the offerings as elements still in need of prayer. *They pray that these which are still here below may be carried on high, that, as offerings which have not yet been sacrificed, they may be carried to the altar where they are to be immolated. For this, they have need of the hand of an angel.* . . . This prayer can have only one significance—it transforms the offerings into the Body and Blood of the Lord.¹⁰²

Also [Pope] Gregory: “*Some hold that the communion of the body is less sanctified, if it is done by the office of those whose life appears ignoble to their eyes. Alas, in what a great trap they fall in believing that the divine and secret mysteries can be made more sanctified by others, when one and the same Holy Spirit through the whole Church invisibly sanctifies those mysteries by his work and blesses by sanctifying invisibly.*”¹⁰³

[Ps.-]Augustine . . . For the Mass is so called because the heavenly messenger comes to consecrate the life-giving body, according to the words of the priest: “Almighty God, command that these be brought up by the hand of your holy angel before your altar in heaven, etc.” *And so unless the angel comes, it cannot in any way be rightly called a Mass.* If a heretic dared to usurp this mystery, would God send his angel from the heavens to consecrate his offering? No.¹⁰⁴

In Cabasilas’ chapter prior to his argument above, he explicitly speaks about his debates with Latin missionaries who argued that the Eucharist was perfected only after the priest recited: “This is my body/blood” (viz., the words of consecration within the institution narrative).¹⁰⁵ In the RC, after the priest repeats Jesus’s words, he continues praying and eventually arrives at the phrase that Cabasilas cites above. In addition to the isolated citation from the RC, Cabasilas recorded for his Orthodox reader that Scholastic missionaries in

¹⁰² Nicholas Cabasilas, *A Commentary on the Divine Liturgy*, trans. J. Hussey and P. French (Crestwood, NY: St Vladimir’s Seminary Press, 1998), 76–77. This is a translation of *Explic*.

¹⁰³ Lombard, *IV Sent.* d. 13.1.3 (*The Sentences*, 4:66).

¹⁰⁴ Ibid., d. 13.1.4 (*The Sentences*, 4:66).

¹⁰⁵ *Explic.* 29.1–21 (pp. 178–90).

Thessalonica or Constantinople had forgotten about more antique Latin authorities, ones whom Cabasilas saw as similar to Byzantines. Cabasilas correctly assessed the sermon of (Ps.-) Augustine (Paschasius Radbertus), which taught that the perfection of the Eucharist occurred only after the ancient Latin *epiclesis*, at the *Iube haec perferri*. Although this theory was popular during Lombard's time, it began to wane in the early thirteenth century.¹⁰⁶ Cabasilas capitalizes on Pope Gregory's condemnation of any theory that would elevate the holiness of the Eucharist, applying this to the uselessness of making an angelic petition-*epiclesis* after a total consecration at the words of consecration. Turning the authoritative opinion on this *quaestio disputata* within Lombard's *Sentences* against the Latins themselves, Cabasilas showed himself to be an able polemicist. Finally, Cabasilas focused on (Ps.-) Augustine's assertion that there is "no Mass" (meaning sacrifice) unless the angel of the *Iube haec perferri* makes his appearance. Again, the priest recites the passage under Cabasilas' scrutiny only *after* the institution narrative in the RC.

In light of fairly ironclad evidence for the existence of the *Sentences* around 1341, might it be the case that the monk Job possessed the first Greek translation of Lombard's *Sentences* in the late thirteenth century? This could explain how the *Sentences* arrived in fourteenth-century Thessalonica. Unfortunately, arguments on behalf of Job's true identity have not yet been settled.¹⁰⁷ Yet, if Job can eventually be identified with a known anti-Latin theologian of the late thirteenth century, he might mark the point of departure for mixing Lombard's sacramental *taxis* with some theological points of the 1260 synod, bequeathing this to Thessalonican monks and clergy.

The Mysteries in the Confession of the *Holy Synaxis*

Finally, in the last stage of reception of seven-sacraments conceptual framework in Byzantium, we confront the two greatest defenders of Orthodoxy in the fifteenth century, Mark Eugenikos, Metropolitan of Ephesus (1437–1445), and George–Gennadius Scholarius, hand-picked successor to Mark (1445–ca. 1472). Each admired Symeon of Thessalonica,¹⁰⁸ whom they read and incorporated into their theolo-

¹⁰⁶ Taft, "Problems in Anaphoral Theology," 55–57.

¹⁰⁷ Cf. R. J. Macrides, "Job," in *The Oxford Dictionary of Byzantium*, ed. A. Kazhdan, A.-M. Talbot, et al (New York: Oxford University Press, 1991), 2:1042.

¹⁰⁸ We can surmise that the Eugenikos family knew Symeon well due to the fact that Mark's younger brother, John Eugenikos, composed a liturgical office to Symeon to canonize him. In Scholarius' tutelage under Mark, he was a

gy.¹⁰⁹ Mark cited Symeon in defense of the *epiclesis* at the Council of Florence (1439).¹¹⁰ After Mark of Ephesus's disappointment with the Florentine synod, he began to cooperate with an Orthodox communion of hierarchs whose followers organized into anti-unionist body by 1447.¹¹¹ They called themselves the *Holy Synaxis* (ἱερὰ σύναξις).¹¹² Before Mark was on his deathbed (1445), his disciple Scholarius won for himself moral leadership of the incipient *Synaxis*.¹¹³ Additionally, Mark bequeathed to his beloved pupil the honor of being his scion.¹¹⁴ Marie-Hélène Blanchet has already chronicled Scholarius's consorting with the anti-Florentine party as early as 1444 or 1445.¹¹⁵ Afterward, the *Synaxis* came into contact with Hussite *utraquists*, who impugned the Latin practice of communion under one species for all besides the consecrating cleric at Roman Mass. Mark of Ephesus had previously been aware of the *utraquists* and exploited the controversy in his *libellus* on the Eucharist, commissioned by Emperor John VIII to

former pupil of Makres, who would have had likely given Scholarius access to his correspondence and (hypothetically) to other works; see Symeon's *Epistle to Makres* in *The Politico-Historical Works of Symeon Archbishop of Thessalonica (1416/7 to 1429)*, ed. D. Balfour, Wiener Byzantinische Studien 13 (Vienna, AT:Verlag, 1979), 91–3, 197, 241.

¹⁰⁹ Scholarius, *Περὶ τῶν ἀνθρωπείων ψυχῶν* 3.1 (OCSG, 1:505–06).

¹¹⁰ Michael Zheltov, "The Moment of Eucharistic Consecration in Byzantine Thought," in *Issues in Eucharistic Praying in East and West*, ed. M. Johnson (Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 2010), 280.

¹¹¹ Marie-Hélène Blanchet, "La réaction byzantine à l'union de Florence: les discours antiromains de la Synaxe des orthodoxes," in *Réduire le schisme? Eclésiologies et politique de l'union entre orient e occident (XIIIe–XVIIIe siècles)*, ed. M.-H. Blanchet and F. Gabriel, Centre de Recherche d'Histoire et Civilisation de Byzance: Monographies 39 (Paris: ACHCByz, 2013), 195. This group seems to have spontaneously rallied to Mark's cause around 1443. He was its "heart" but not necessarily an organized "president"; see Constantine Tsirpanlis, *Mark Eugenikos and the Council of Florence*, Byzantine Texts and Studies 14 (New York: Center for Byzantine Studies, 1979), 21, 57, 97.

¹¹² Blanchet, "La réaction byzantine à l'union de Florence," 92–94.

¹¹³ For the numerous problems in fleshing out the structure and leadership of the *Synaxis*, and for the inconsistencies in Scholarius' role, see Marie-Hélène Blanchet, *Georges-Gennadios Scholarios (vers 1400–vers 147): un intellectuel orthodoxe face à la disparition de l'empire byzantine* (Paris: Institut Français d'Études Byzantines), 390–96.

¹¹⁴ Mark Eugenikos, *Oratio ad amicos* 17.B, in *Marci Eugenici Metropolitae Ephesi opera anti-unionistica. Concilium Florentinum Documenta et Scriptores*, ed. L. Petit, series A, vol. 10, bk. 1 [hereafter, MEME] (Rome: Pontificale Institutum Orientalium Studiorum, 1977), 178–81.

¹¹⁵ Blanchet, *Georges-Gennadios Scholarios*, 384.

be used anonymously in a Eucharistic debate on June 19 of 1439.¹¹⁶ The Byzantines were well aware of Hussites because Emperor John VIII Palaiologus protested the Latin Synod of Basel's attempt to group Orthodox bishops with "heretics" in a projected synod of reunion.¹¹⁷ After the Council of Florence, Hussites showed interest in the Orthodox faith in their estrangement from the Roman papacy. The *Synaxis* charged Scholarius to instruct an important convert in its name.¹¹⁸ The *Synaxis* also sought Scholarius's cooperation—if not his principal authorship—in drafting an official profession of faith for converts,¹¹⁹ which begins thus:

The Holy *Synaxis*, who directs the seat of the Patriarch of Constantinople, who represents our Church in union and harmony with the patriarchs of the East . . . unto the perfection of the faith. . . .¹²⁰

Mother of all Orthodox Christians, teaches and professes, after having abolished and condemned all novelties . . . the following. . . .¹²¹

It is necessary to believe seven sacraments of the Church are true and indispensable for salvation . . . (1.) First ancestral and actual sins are forgiven through baptism . . . [then follows condemnation of Latin baptism by infusion and the formula: "I baptize you, etc."] (2.) Secondly, [it is necessary to believe] in that, which is of sacrament, in which we take up spiritual power [ἰσχύον] . . . (3.) Thirdly [to believe] in what is of the sacrifice [θυσίας] . . . [then follows condemnation of *azymes* and communion under one kind] (4.) Fourthly, [to believe] in what is of penance . . . (5.) Fifthly in what is of marriage . . . (6.) Sixthly in what is of priesthood . . . and (7.) Seventh

¹¹⁶ Mark Eugenikos, *Libellus de consecration* 6.7 (MEME, 126).

¹¹⁷ Mildad Paulová, "L'empire byzantin et les Tchèques avant la chute de Constantinople," *Byzantinoslavica* 14 (1953): 158–225.

¹¹⁸ Holy Synaxis, "Ἐκθεις B1.3–4, in *Constantinople et Prague en 1452* [hereafter, CP], trans. and ed. Antonín Salač, Ročník 68 (Prague: Řada Společenských Věd, 1958), 40, 42.

¹¹⁹ Antonín Salač, introduction to "Ἐκθεις (CP, 26–27).

¹²⁰ Holy Synaxis, "Ἐκθεις A1.1 (CP, 28).

¹²¹ Ibid. B2.2 (CP, 44).

in what is of the last anointing, which it call by us Greeks εὐχέλαιον.¹²²

Stylistically, Scholarius was responsible for the idiomatically turgid expressions and neologisms within the *Synaxis*'s common exposition of faith. Anti-Florentine tenor partially inspired inclusion of newfangled terms to compare and contrast with Latins. Nonetheless, the *Synaxis*'s profession of faith is only slightly in opposition to Florentine sacramentology. While the *Decretum pro Armenis* (November 22, 1439) strictly follows Lombard's *taxis* (employing Aquinas's sacramentology), the *Synaxis*'s ἔκθεσις (1452) provides glosses on what is essentially the content and sequence of Lombard's *Sentences* for sacraments 1 through 4 (initiation through penance). However, the profession of faith mysteriously departs from Lombard's sequence on numbers 5 through 7. Even if the Greeks had officially concluded Florence on July 6 of 1439¹²³ and left Italy by August 26 of 1439—missing the Armenian discussions—communication and travel were constant between Latindom and Byzantium.

Scholarius—often content to follow Aquinas—and the *Synaxis* opted for a sacramental sequence mostly but not completely according to Lombard's *Sentences*. Why? The *Synaxis* approved Scholarius's choice as part of its creed, though chastising Latin sacramental "errors" that Mark of Ephesus had rejected: (i.) baptism by infusion, (ii.) unleavened bread, and (iii.) communion under one kind.¹²⁴ Mark's *utraquist* concerns at Florence were *sui generis*. Still, the *Synaxis* opportunely adopted them because of the Hussite context of its creed more than anything else, for the *Synaxis* failed to mention the more important debate on the *epiclesis* at Florence.¹²⁵ If Mark and Hussites

¹²² Ibid. B3.1–4 (CP, 51–52).

¹²³ DZ, 1310.

¹²⁴ Eugenius, *Libellus de consecratione* 6.7: [Institution narrative:] "Take . . . drink all of you . . . do this in me remembrance" . . . [After describing the rite of Mass from the anaphora to communion, Mark declares:] [The Latin priest] drinks down the whole chalice, he turns to the concelebrating deacons [i.e., deacon and subdeacon] to kiss them [*pax*], having communicated to nobody anything, when boasting boldly the phrase: "Take . . . drink" (*MEME*, 126). He obviously makes these words a contradiction to both the traditional expositions and exegeses, even with respect to the dominical words and their terms.

¹²⁵ Holy Synaxis, ἔκθεσις B3.3: "We, who commune of the true body and blood of Christ, we burgeon in life according to the Spirit, not [communicating] from only one of two [kinds]—as the Roman Church has innovated for some time—

were the inspiration for polemics, might the sacramental lists being used in contemporary Prague have served for Scholarius' sacramental *taxis*? Unlike Symeon, Scholarius did not base himself completely on the Lombard. Instead, the *Synaxis*'s ἔκθεις enigmatically ordered anointing last, as did more recent Latin lists. Still, I do not find its entire rationale transparent. Curiously, as a last point of interest, the *Synaxis* went out of its way to disagree with Lombard's and Aquinas's sacramental theology in one part of the ἔκθεις: "[*Synaxis*, Ἐκθεις (1452):] Verily penance is constituted [συνίσταται] in the contrition [συντριβῇ] of heart, and especially the confession [ἐξομολογήσει] of the mouth, and in the satisfaction [ικανοποιήσει] of work, when the circumstances of death do not impede."¹²⁶

Scholarius maintains the exact doctrine of the *Synaxis* in his writings:

[Scholarius, *De differentia* (ca. 1457–1460/1464):] Penance is a medicine, if it is true [ἀληθής] and certain [βέβαια] in the contrition of the heart and confession (ἐξαγορεύσει), and has been constituted [συνισταμένη] by means of satisfaction [ικανοποιήσει], but when death comes upon one, or some other necessity impedes confession [τὴν ἐξαγόρευσιν] and satisfaction [ικανοποίησιν], whenever there is contrition of the heart, it quite suffices as true [ἀληθής] [penance].¹²⁷

Scholarius rejected absolutely necessary “integral” parts of penance of Lombard's *Sentences*:

[Lombard, *Sentences* (ca. 1150):] In three modes ought we to make satisfaction: “Perfect penance [*perfecta poenitentia*] urges the sinner to carry everything willingly: contrition [*contrition*] in the heart, confession [*confession*] in the mouth, and total humility in work [*opera*]. This is fructiferous penance.”¹²⁸

but of both together according to the tradition of the sacrament” (CP, 52).

¹²⁶ Holy *Synaxis*, Ἐκθεις B3.4 (CP, 52).

¹²⁷ George-Gennadius Scholarius, *De differentia inter peccata excusabilia et perniciosia* 7.4–7, in (OCGS, 4:281). I conjecture this date based upon: (1.) Scholarius' autograph being of the Prodomos (cf. OCGS, 4:xvi–xvii), (2.) where Scholarius was his residence at least two times (cf. Blanchet, *Georges-Gennadios Scholarios*, 482–87), and (3.) both times postdate Scholarius's first citations of Scotus around 1437, per Monfasani, “The Pro-Latin Apologetics,” 165–68.

¹²⁸ Lombard, *IV Sent.* d. 16.1.1 (*The Sentences*, 4:88).

Aquinas enthusiastically agreed with Lombard's doctrine: "[Aquinas, *ST* (ca. 1273):] Perfect penance is made integral from several items; namely, from contrition, confession and satisfaction."¹²⁹ For their part, both the *Synaxis* and Scholarius paraphrased Scotus's *Ordinatio* (*In libris IV Sententiarum*) to explain the true nature of penance:

[Scotus, *Ordinatio* (*scripsit* ca. 1302–1303):] Against: Master [Lombard], who says that these three are required. Several items are not required for the perfection of something, intrinsically speaking, unless they are in some way its parts. . . . On this score, in no way are the [three] aforementioned items [integral] parts of the power of penance. . . . Now, [1.] contrition, [2.] confession, and [3.] satisfaction are items having a kind of act in the state of becoming [*esse in fieri*]: but what is permanent does not stand from having parts [thus]. Likewise, the last two [*supra*, 2 and 3] are not in the will, as in a subject, but are exterior items [to the moral person].¹³⁰ Penance is that sacramental absolution done by words . . . and, of this, contrition has no part, which is something spiritual in the soul, nor [verbal] confession, because it has nothing of the character of the sentential judgment of the priest, but it *is* an act of the guilty person accusing oneself, and not satisfaction.¹³¹

Scotus goes on to say that forgiveness of sins can be given without 2 and 3 immediately above:

[*Ibid.*:] True penance, whether only interior, or exterior, along with the undertaking of the sacrament of penance, suffices for salvation of someone in dire straits [*in extremis*] . . . because God is always able to reward, even in the circumstance of death. Therefore, since fruitful penance is not a human work but of God, he is able to inspire it whenever he wills via his mercy. It is also obvious through reason, because whether [1.]

¹²⁹ *ST* III, q. 90, a. 1, sc.

¹³⁰ John Duns Scotus, *In IV Sent.* d. 16.1.1, d. 16.1.5, in *Opera omnia*, ed. L. Wadding (Heldesheim: Georg Olms, 1968), 9:244, 246. I employ the non-critical edition of Wadding because its interpolated text reflects the closest text to which Scholarius was exposed. I thank Dr. Garrett Smith for bringing to my attention Wadding's edition as approximately that to which nearly every theologian of Scholarius's time and place was familiar.

¹³¹ *Ibid.* d. 16.1.7 (p. 9:247).

this interior penance alone disposes toward justification—through some manner of proportionately worthy action (*meriti de congruo*)—or [2.] whether the sacrament of penance operates toward the same [justification]—through some manner of the sacrament itself—either [a.] someone has the latter penance in dire straits [*supra*, 2], or [b.] the former [*supra*, 1], the same rationale of obtainment of a grace is also possessed in some penitent: both such a grace and salvation will consequently be perceived.¹³²

Scotus held the doctrine that, without verbal confession and satisfaction, a person can still be validly forgiven in danger of death or some grave circumstance. In technical terms, verbal confessing and performing a satisfactory penitential action are not absolutely (*simpliciter*) necessary for God’s forgiveness, but necessary only under normal conditions (*secundum quid*).¹³³ In extraordinary human duress, God forgives through sincere contrition or through the penitent’s intrinsic disposition and reception of priestly absolution. While the *Synaxis* reflected the πατερικὸν φρόνημα perfectly, in the sense that it defended traditional Orthodoxy against historically Latin liturgical innovations (e.g., baptism), Scholarius nonetheless used Scotus to justify Mark of Ephesus’s conciliar arguments that satisfaction is not absolutely part of penance.¹³⁴ To promote Mark’s doctrine against aspects of thomistic interpretations of Florentine decrees,¹³⁵ the prin-

¹³² Ibid. d. 20.1.3 (p. 9:403).

¹³³ Generally, something like a necessity of acts of repentance is needed to appease God in Greco-Orthodox tradition, but absolute necessity of “satisfaction” for “valid” sacramental penance is not patristically well attested (Jugie, *Theologia Dogmatica*, 3:352–62).

¹³⁴ Mark Eugenicus, *Marci Ephesii Responsio ad Quaestiones Latinorum* 5.19, in *Documents Relatifs au Concile de Florence*, ed. L. Petit, *Patrologia Orientalis* 15 (Paris: Firmin-Didot, 1927), 130–31.

¹³⁵ Mark assiduously avoided condemning Aquinas (though implying Aquinas) in three works on the essence-energy leading up to Florence, which phenomenon is likely a product of Mark’s cautious unionism, whereby incendiary remarks against Aquinas were avoided, as opined in Marios Pilavakis, introduction to “First Antirrhetic on the Distinction between Essence and Energy: First Antirrhetic against Manuel Kalekas (Editio princeps)” (PhD diss., University of London, 1987), 53, 149. At Florence, Mark took scandal to an official rhetor, John Montenero, O.P., explicitly invoking Aquinas’s tenets, though really exaggerating a novel version of the *filioque* coupled with explicit anti-Palamism (Xanthopoulos, *Quae supersunt actorum graecorum*,

cial author—Scholarius—borrowed from this renowned opponent of Aquinas.¹³⁶ Despite his reverence for Symeon of Thessalonica, Scholarius abandoned the (by now) quasi-traditional genus-species approach to sacramental theology in Symeon and opted for the Scholastic sacramental theory: one sacrament signifies one individual item. The *Synaxis*, consisting of Palamites and anti-unionist Orthodox, followed the spiritual flagship of Mark of Ephesus and

2:346–50). Consequently, Mark inferred that Aquinas was the official doctrine of the Latins and thus condemned Thomistic theology of God in 1440; see Mark Eugenicus, *Encyclica contra graeco-latinos* 9.6 (MEME, 149). Thereafter, Scholarius openly confirmed Mark’s judgment on particular accounts of the *filioque* and essence-energies in 1445, whereupon Scholarius attacked only Aquinas’s theology of God. Therein, Scholarius introduced into his Thomistic “commentary” explicit laud for Scotus and thereupon employed Scotistic philosophy to counter Aquinas’s metaphysics of the Godhead; see Christiaan Kappes, “The Latin Sources of the Palamite Theology of George-Gennadius Scholarius,” *Nicolaus* 40 (2013): 71–114. Scholarius alludes to rekindling of Palamite controversies in the recent past (viz., Florence). Despite his general admiration and frequent imitation of Aquinas, Scholarius rejects his *ad intra* theology of God; see Scholarius, *Commentary on De ente et essentia* 94 (OGCS, 6:179–80, 284–85).

¹³⁶ Eugenicus, Scholarius, and Emperor John VIII had already studied Scotus together before the Council in 1437; see John Monfasani, “The Pro-Latin Apologetics of the Greek Émigrés to Quattrocento Italy,” in *Byzantine Theology and its Philosophical Background*, ed. A. Rigo (Turnhout: Brepols, 2011), 165–68. As per Monfasani’s investigation, Scotus likely allowed Mark and Scholarius to see that Latin alternatives comparable to Orthodoxy existed *contra* Aquinas. In Palamas, Mark had theological conclusions and patristic prooftexts, but at Florence, he argued with the Dominican Montenero by surprising recourse to arguments paralleling Scotism; see *Acta*, Session 2.18, Ins 20–28:

On the subject of divine items, essence and hypostasis differ from one another. However it is not the appropriate moment to speak [on this matter]; for it is probable that we [Greeks and Latins] also do not differ surrounding this argument. For, on another score, essence and hypostasis differ *simpliciter* (ἀπλῶς); namely, according to the manner through which property (τὸ ἴδιον) differs from universal (τοῦ κοινοῦ), just as [Ps.-]Basil the Great writes to his brother Gregory: “And by the mode that one predicates an essence of a man to differ from the universal concept, thus a person (πρόσωπον) and hypostasis (ὑπόστασις) differ” [from the divine essence]. (Xanthopoulos, *Quae supersunt Actorum Graecorum* 2:267)

Basil’s *Epistle* 38 to his brother Gregory, as referred to by Mark, may be a work of Gregory Nyssa. Wherefore, a study on Nyssa’s Trinitarian predication (in relation to Scotus) is quite relevant to the discussion; see Richard Cross, “Gregory Nyssa on Universals,” *Vigiliae Christianae* 56 (2002): 372.

yet felt comfortable adopting this confession of faith as the standard for post-Florentine Orthodoxy. Because the *Synaxis* conscientiously used calques from Latin in its profession, the hierarchs were undoubtedly aware of the Latin terminology, but they appear unconcerned that these differences threatened their liturgical traditions or age-old dogmatic tenets. Lombard's *taxis* (*partim*) and Scotus's sacramental theology (*speciatim*) were grafted onto Orthodox theology insofar as they contributed to Orthodox mission.

Conclusions

In this study, the standard narrative of Orthodoxy's reception of the seven sacraments has been shown to be simplistic and ultimately invalid. First, Orthodox do not appear beholden to Latino-papal professions of faith post-1260 (especially Lyons II). Secondly, although Alexander IV's Latin list was reorganized and utilized in the 1260 Cypriot synod, the Greek bishops equivocated on the nature and definition of the sacraments vis-à-vis Alexander IV's *Instruens graecos*. Thereafter, Alexander IV's and the 1260 Cypriot synod's influence culminated in Cyprus among the anti-Palamite Orthodox (e.g., George Lapithes) in the 1340s. The Cypriot-originated genus-species method of sacramental division was modestly attractive to Job and more robustly exploited in the fifteenth-century Symeon of Thessalonica, if only to be placed in dialogue with Peter Lombard's *Sentences*. Given the fact that Barlaam, Blastares, Cabasilas, and Symeon were all living and teaching in Thessalonica, and given the common library or sources shared between Cabasilas and Symeon, it is no surprise that all the aforementioned manifest an unusually detailed and accurate estimation of Latin opinions on select theological matters. Lombard was influential among Thessalonican Orthodox theologians for theological reflection and polemics (e.g., *filioque* arguments), as evidenced in the citations from Augustine in Barlaam, Blastares, and Lombard. Furthermore, Blastares's appeals to Ps.-Jerome, paralleling Lombard's *Sentences*, further solidify this line of argumentation. When we couple all this with the facts that Cabasilas cites the exact and unique excerpt from the Roman Canon as available in Lombard and that Cabasilas frames his arguments in perfect terminological and scriptural harmony with relevant sections of book IV of Lombard's *Sentences*, then the case appears closed. Nonetheless, evidence continues to multiply as we look at Symeon of Thessalonica having detailed knowledge of Latin sacramentology that was unavailable in anti-Latin polemical literature but easily accounted for by recourse to Lombard's *Sentences*.

Throughout my presentation of this new narrative for the adoption of the seven sacraments into Byzantium, we see all these celebrated theologians of the Orthodox Church manifesting peculiarly personal motives for their own approaches to and arrangements of the seven sacraments. Nevertheless, as each Orthodox author's sanctity or fame became celebrated, we infer that positive estimation and conclusions about the seven sacraments resulted in their benign adoption by pious Orthodox readers. Simultaneously, in no case studied have I found the profession of faith of Lyons II (or even that of Aquinas) to explain the arrangement, content, or speciation of the mysteries among approved Orthodox writers.

As a point of precision, although the *Sentences* were a universal source for Latin argumentation, as well as resource for lifting extracts and for writing dissertations, Eastern Orthodox should hardly be called "Scholastic" for utilizing this *proto*-Scholastic text for a variety of purposes. Orthodox interest in the *Sentences* does not *ipso facto* render such authors "Scholastic" in the standard sense of the term.

Concerning my last section of study, even though Symeon of Thessalonica's writings were influential upon Mark of Ephesus and George-Gennadius Scholarius, Mark never showed *ex professo* interest in the number or content of the sacraments, while both Scholarius and the *Synaxis* failed even to reference Symeon's sacramentology. Instead, the *Synaxis* approved of Scholarius' more sophisticated arguments, some of which drew upon the most powerful critic of Aquinas's theology in the Middle Ages, Duns Scotus. In the circumstances of post-Florence Byzantium, the *Holy Synaxis* and Scholarius shared the same motives for their adoption of seven sacraments: to profess their belief in the mysteries' content and effects to the Hussites in contradistinction to Rome. All the same, their sacramental faith was stated in manner that set the *Holy Synaxis* apart from only a few Latin practices and Thomistic *opinioniones theologicae*, which had proved controversial at the Council of Florence.

In light of the commitments of the *Holy Synaxis*, one might wonder in what way subsequent Orthodoxy positively employed its pre-Reformation reflections on seven sacraments to confront post-Reformation challenges. I speak now of the anti-Protestantism that supposedly acted as the sufficient cause for the definitive adoption, enumeration, and theology of seven sacraments as adopted by Orthodox synods in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. Narratives that essentially reduce the adoption of septimal lists of

sacraments and their relative order to an imitation of Tridentine Catholicism are likely incomplete. For instance, I note that Dositheus of Jerusalem (*floruit* 1672) was explicitly aware of documents and happenings surrounding the *Synaxis* in 1452.¹³⁷ This fact suggests that popular narratives of post-Reformation Orthodoxy merely mimicking “papal” or “Tridentine” sacramental enumeration and content *contra* Protestantism may also be of questionable worth. Whether before or after the fall of the *Polis* in 1453, the history of Orthodox reception of the sacraments needs to be revised in light of a more positive, creative, and tangible influence of irenic Latin sources, not to mention the significance of the holy *Synaxis*’s profession of faith, especially considering the fact that it was the sole body to resist the Council of Florence within the confines of Byzantium.¹³⁸ N&V

¹³⁷ CP, 25–27.

¹³⁸ I would like to thank Marie-Hélène Congourdeau (CNRS, Paris) and John Monfasani (Albany-SUNY) for their willingness to read and offer critiques on this paper.