

The Presence of Christ in the Eucharist *κατ' οὐσίαν*. On the interpretation and the source of a fragment from the Homily of George Scholarios and its impact on the Eucharistic doctrine of the Greek Orthodox Church¹

Mikhail Bernatsky 

St Tikhon Orthodox Humanitarian University, Moscow
mbernatski@me.com

The Homily On the mystical body of our Lord Jesus Christ by George Gennadios II — Scholarios (ca. 1400 — paulo post 1472) was the first original Orthodox theological text to use the word μετασώωσις (transubstantiatio) as an ex professo Eucharistic term and to adopt the doctrine associated with it. In this paper I propose a new reading of the fragment, in which Scholarios writes that God communicates with the faithful in the Eucharist by substance (κατ' οὐσίαν). I argue that this fragment was a paraphrase of the third paragraph of chapter 61, book four of Thomas Aquinas' Summa contra gentiles and should not be interpreted in the context of Palamite theology as has been proposed hitherto. I find support for my case in the manuscript Taurinensis XXIII (C-II-16), a compilation encouraged by Scholarios in 1432 and which contained the translation of the Summa contra gentiles by Demetrios Kydones. In addition, I outline the post Scholarium history of the expression κατ' οὐσίαν (secundum substantiam), which played a key role for the later development of the Eucharistic doctrine of the Orthodox Church in the post-Byzantine period.

Keywords: Eucharist; Byzantine theology; Thomas Aquinas; Gennadios Scholarios; Demetrios Kydones; Post-Byzantine Council; manuscripts; transubstantiation

1. A Fragment to be interpreted

The Homily *On the mystical body of our Lord Jesus Christ*² was the first original Orthodox theological text to use the word 'transubstantiation' (Greek μετασώωσις,

1 I would like to express my thanks to John A. Demetracopoulos, Fr Christiaan Kappes and Marie-Hélène Blanchet, who took the trouble to read this paper and offered a number of valuable comments.

2 Περὶ τοῦ μυστηριώδους σώματος τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, in Georges (Gennadios) Scholarios, *Œuvres complètes*, ed. M. Jugie, L. Petit and X. A. Siderides, 8 vols. (Paris 1928–36) I, 123–36.

Latin *transsubstantiatio*) as an *ex professo* Eucharistic term and to adopt the doctrine associated with it. Its author, Georgios Scholarios (ca. 1400 — *paulo post* 1472), the future Patriarch of Constantinople Gennadios, in chapter 4 compared the Eucharist with the other Sacraments and wrote:

Τὸ δὲ τοῦ Χριστοῦ σῶμα τῷ μὲν λόγῳ τοῦ σώματος τρέφον, τῷ δὲ τῆς καθαρότητος λόγῳ τῇ πρὸς τὴν θεϊαν φύσιν ἐνώσει καθαῖρον καὶ ἀγιάζον, ἀρκούντως ἡμῖν τὴν πνευματικὴν παρέχεται θρέμιν· τρεφόμενοι δὲ οὕτω καλῶς πρὸς τὴν πνευματικὴν καθαρότητα καὶ ὑγείαν ἐπαναγόμεθα... Ὡς μυστηρίου πάντων μυστηρίων ἱεροτάτου καὶ αὐτὸ τὸ τοῦ βαπτίσματος ὑπερβαίνοντος· δι' ἐκεῖνου μὲν γὰρ ἡμῖν ὁ δεσπότης **κατὰ δύναμιν μόνην**, διὰ δὲ τούτου **κατ' οὐσίαν ἡμῖν κοινωνεῖ**.³

The body of Christ, in relation to bodily nourishment and in relation to purity purifying and sanctifying by means of union [of the Body of the Lord] with the divine nature, provides us with sufficient spiritual nourishment; being nourished in such manner, we are perfectly returned to spiritual purity and health from which forbidden food had kept us. <...> O holiest of all Sacraments that surpasses even the sacrament of Baptism: for in the latter [Baptism] the Lord *communicates with us by power only*, and in the other [Eucharist] — *by substance*.⁴

2. Earlier interpretations

In 2008 Aleksey Dunaev in a paper on Eucharistic theology in the context of the Palamite controversies argued that this passage should be interpreted in the context of Palamite theology. According to this interpretation, Scholarios does not suggest, like Theophanes of Nicaea (d. 1381), that communion with God in the Eucharist is possible only through energy (operation) but, on the contrary, states that this sacrament enables one to communicate with God by substance indirectly — through the Body and Blood of Christ. Accordingly, the Eucharist surpasses all other sacraments.⁵ In Dunaev's opinion, Scholarios reverts to the doctrine of John Damascene⁶ on communicating with the divine nature in the Eucharist⁷ and does not share the energy-symbolic theology of the Eucharist which is the mark of such followers of Gregory Palamas as Theophanes of Nicaea and Philotheos Kokkinos.⁸ On this way of thinking, Gennadios' use of the verb *κοινωνεῖν*, the noun *δύναμις*, and the adverbial *κατ' οὐσίαν*, combined with the absence of traces of Palamism in his early works⁹ makes the interpretation of this passage in the

3 Georges, *Œuvres complètes*. I, 125. 32–36; 126. 21–24; PG, 160, 356d, 357b.

4 All translations are my own.

5 A. Dunaev, 'The Theology of the Eucharist in the context of the Palamite controversies', *Cristianesimo nella storia* 29(1) (2008) 33–52 (49, 51).

6 PG, 94, 1348.

7 This opinion has its followers among the Late Byzantine theologians (for example, Symeon the New Theologian and his disciple Niketas Stethatos).

8 This interpretation has been independently put forward by Archimandrite Ambrosius (Pogodin) (1925–2004) in his Russian translation of the Homily: Геннадий II (Георгий) Схολарий, патриарх Константинопольский, *Проповеди*, перевод с греческого архимандрита Амвросия (Погодина) (Санкт-Петербург 2007) 279–98. The date of the translation by Pogodin is unknown. (Probably the 1960s, but it was only published in 2007 after his death.)

9 For example, in the Homily on the Transfiguration (Georges, *Œuvres complètes*, I, 149–61) which was written at about the same time the homily on the Eucharist was composed, one may find a substantial number

context of partaking of divine essence attractive. However, I propose another reading of this passage.

3. A new source for the Homily

Martin Jugie, the editor of Scholarios' works, has established that one of the sources used in the Homily was the treatise *De sacramento Eucharistiae ad modum praedicamentorum*, attributed to Thomas Aquinas.¹⁰ The treatise expounds the Eucharistic theology of Aquinas in the light of the ten Aristotelian categories. Apparently, it was the form of exposition that determined its choice as a basis for the Homily by an Aristotelianizing Scholarios. The latter had first discovered Aquinas as a commentator on Aristotle. In the early 1430s he opened a school in which the philosophy of the Stagirite was taught, and he would later call Aquinas 'the best exegete and summarizer (συνόπτης) of Christian theology on those matters where his Church is in agreement with ours'.¹¹

The first part of the passage cited is to be found in chapter 4 of Scholarios' Homily. It reflects a traditional Patristic interpretation of the life-giving character of the Eucharist: this Sacrament is life-giving, because the Body of Christ being partaken of has already been joined in a hypostatic communion with the Divine nature. This interpretation goes as far back as Cyril of Alexandria. The opening part of the fragment follows closely the beginning of chapter 6 of the treatise of ps.-Thomas where the sacrament is approached in its relation to the category of 'action' (*actio* – making changes in another object).¹² In order to demonstrate how close the borrowed text is to the

of borrowings to the letter from Aquinas' *Summa contra gentiles* instead of the exposition of the doctrine of Gregory Palamas of the uncreated Divine Light; cf. the characteristic given by Jugie: 'l'orateur y exprime un palamisme discret' (Georges, *Œuvres complètes*, I, XLVI). Only some time after 1443–4 when Scholarios, a former advocate of Union, became the leader of the anti-Union party in Constantinople and dedicated himself to anti-Latin polemic did he come to write two Palamite works (Georges, *Œuvres complètes*, III, 204–28; 228–39) and a canon to St Gregory Palamas (Georges, *Œuvres complètes*, IV, 394–7).

10 Georges, *Œuvres complètes*, I, 129. Jugie referred to this work as a genuine work of Aquinas, which was conventional at that time. There is no extant Greek translation of the treatise. John A. Demetracopoulos suggests that Scholarios used some Latin manuscript: 'Scholarios' *On Almsgiving*, or how to convert a scholastic "quaestio" into a sermon', in D. Searby (ed.), *Never the Twain Shall Meet? Latins and Greeks learning from each other in Byzantium* (Berlin 2017) 129–78 (165).

11 Georges, *Œuvres complètes*, V, 2.10–12.

12 Editors have incorrectly argued that Scholarios used the treatise *De sacramento Eucharistiae* from chapter 7 onwards '<...> à partir d'ici [i. e. from line 11 of page 129. — M. B.], Scholarios s'est évidemment inspiré de S. Thomas, opusc. *De sacramento Eucharistiae ad modum praedicamentorum*, c. 2' (Georges, *Œuvres complètes*, I, 129). G. Podskalsky shares their opinion: '<...> aus den zehn aristotelischen Kategorien, unter denen das Sakrament gesichtet wird, greift Scholarios vor allem *substantia*, *quantum* und *ubi* heraus' ('Die Rezeption der thomistischen Theologie bei Gennadios II. Scholarios', *Theologie und Philosophie* 49 (1974) 305–23, here: S. 311, Anm. 38). All parallels are noted in my new edition of the Greek text of the Homily (forthcoming).

original version, and to give a reader an overview of the contents of chapter 4 of the Homily, I will compare the passages¹³ and provide a translation of the text by Scholarios:

Ps. -Thomas Aquinas	Scholarios
<p>Corpus autem Christi nutrit et reficit animam, quia ad hoc est istud sacramentum specialiter institutum. Deus autem instituit unum quod nos in esse gratiae generaret, ut Baptismus; et alii per quod nos in gratia regenerationis roboraret, ut sacramentum confirmationis; et tertium per quod roboratos nutriet in gratia et augmentaret, ut sacramentum Eucharistiae. <...> Corpus autem Christi propter excellentiam sanctitatis et puritatis, et propter unitatem divinitatis ita est spirituale, quod in ipso perfectissime concurrunt et conveniunt ratio cibi propter corporalitatem, et ratio spiritus propter sanctitatem et puritatem, et unitam divinitatem. Et ideo placuit Deo per talem cibum corporalem reducere hominem ad spirituale, pristinam et primariam puritatem, et finalem sanctitatem, ut morbo peccati tribueret medicinam congruentem. Homo enim cedit a vita beata per cibum corporalem a Deo vetitum et ab homine usurpatum Diabolo suggerente; et ideo conveniens existit, ut similia similibus, et contraria contrariis curarentur:¹⁴ quod scilicet homo reduceretur ad vitam a qua ceciderat per cibum similiter corporalem a Deo praestitum, et ab homine sumptum, ipso Dei filio ministrante et imperante.</p>	<p><...> τρέφει γὰρ καὶ ἀνακατᾶται τὴν ἡμετέραν ψυχὴν τὸ τοῦ Χριστοῦ σῶμα καθάπερ ὁ ἄρτος τῷ σώματι τοῦτο ἐργάζεται, καὶ καθάπερ ἀναγεννώμεθα βαπτιζόμενοι καὶ τὸ εἶναι τῆς χάριτος τοῦ εἶναι τῆς ἀμαρτίας ἀντιλαμβάνομεν, χριόμενοι δὲ τῷ μύρῳ ἐν τῷ τῆς ἀναγεννήσεως βεβαιούμεθα δώρῳ <...> οὕτω δεῖ καὶ τρέφεσθαι δυναμοθέντας καὶ τὴν ἐν τῇ χάριτι λαμβάνειν διαμονὴν καὶ ἐπίδοσιν τῷ μυστηρίῳ τῆς μεταλήψεως. <...> Τὸ δὲ τοῦ Χριστοῦ σῶμα τῷ μὲν λόγῳ τοῦ σώματος τρέφον, τῷ δὲ τῆς καθαρότητος λόγῳ τῇ πρὸς τὴν θείαν φύσιν ἐνώσει καθαῖρον καὶ ἀγιάζον, ἀρκοῦντως ἡμῖν τὴν πνευματικὴν παρέχεται θρέψιν· τρεφόμενοι δὲ οὕτω καλῶς πρὸς τὴν πνευματικὴν καθαρότητα καὶ ὑγίαν ἐπαναγόμεθα, ἥς ἡμᾶς ἢ τῶν κεκωλυμένων βρώσις ἐξέωσε τότε. Ἔδει γὰρ ἡμᾶς σωματικῇ τινὶ βρώσει τὴν ἀκεραιότητα καὶ τὴν ὑγίαν ἐκείνην ἀποβαλόντας σωματικῇ τινὶ πάλιν τροφῇ πρὸς ἐκείνην ἐπανελθεῖν καὶ τὰ μὲν ὅμοια τοῖς ὁμοίοις θεραπευθῆναι καλῶς, τοῖς δ' ἐναντίοις τὰ ἐναντία, οἷον βρώσεις μὲν ἄμφο σωματικαί, ἢ τε διαφθείρασα τὴν ἀρχὴν, ἢ τε σφύζουσα νῦν, καὶ ὑγία καὶ πνευματικὴ ζωὴ τὸ τε σφύζόμενον, τὸ τε φθειρόμενον· ἀλλ' ἐκείνη μὲν ἀπέτρεπεν ὁ Θεός, ταύτην δὲ νῦν ἐπιτρέπει καὶ χορηγεῖ· κάκεινη μὲν ὁ πονηρὸς εἰσηγεῖτο δαίμων, ταύτης δὲ ὁ τοῦ Θεοῦ υἱὸς οὐ σύμβουλος μόνον, ἀλλὰ καὶ διάκονος γίνετα.¹⁵</p>

Let us concentrate now on the second part of the passage under consideration. It tells us that in the Eucharist the Lord communicates with communicants by substance (κατ' οὐσίαν), and not by power (κατὰ δύναμιν), as in Baptism. The endings of the chapters

13 Georges, *Ceuvres complètes*, I, 125–26; Latin text of ps.-Thomas: *Tractatus Sancti Thome de Aquino ... de corpore Christi [=De Eucharista ad modum decem praedicamentorum]*, ed. Arnold Ther Hoernen, 30 fol. (Coloniae 1476); *Sancti Thomae Aquinatis opera omnia ut sunt in Indice Thomistico additis 61 scriptis ex aliis Medii Aevi auctoribus*, ed. R. Busa, VII (Stuttgart 1980) 684–7.

14 A reference to the Hippocratic principles of 'like cures like' (*similia similibus curantur*) and 'opposites are cured by opposites' (*contraria contrariis curantur*).

15 'For the Body of Christ nourishes and replenishes our soul just as bread does the body. And as we are regenerated in Baptism and acquire being in grace instead of sinful being, and in Anointing are confirmed in the gift of regeneration. <...> Thus the confirmed ought to be nourished and acquire strength and increase of [acquired] grace in the Sacrament of the Eucharist. <...> The body of Christ nourishes it in relation to the body and purifies and sanctifies it by union [of the Body of the Lord] with the Divine nature, and provides us with sufficient spiritual nourishment; being nourished in such manner, we are perfectly returned to spiritual purity and health that the forbidden food had kept us from. For it was necessary that we – who had lost wholeness and this health after having eaten certain corporal food – now be restored to it once again through some kind of corporal nourishment, so that like is cured by like and opposites by opposites. For both foods are corporal: that which had led us to perdition, and that which saves us, and the one leads to salvation, and the other to perdition. But that food had been prohibited by God and this food He encourages us to take and provides us with it. The other is provided by the arch demon, and as for this one, its counsellor and indeed minister is the Son of God.'

differ such that one can find no parallels to this passage in the treatise of pseudo-Thomas. However, I have managed to establish that this place is a paraphrase of the third paragraph of chapter 61, book 4 of Aquinas' *Summa contra gentiles*.¹⁶

Scholarios' use of this paraphrase at the end of chapter 4 of the Homily was quite justified both in the aspects of composition and theology. Just as chapter 6 of the treatise by ps.-Thomas and chapter 4 of the Homily by Scholarios (see the extracts tabulated), chapter 61 *On the Eucharist* of SG deals mostly with this Sacrament interpreted as necessary spiritual nourishment — as corporal food is needed for physical life — for spiritual life after Baptism (wherein we are regenerated spiritually). But the treatise by pseudo-Thomas, unlike SG, did not compare the sacraments of Baptism and the Eucharist and did not explain where the main difference between the two lay.

It is well known that in November 1432 Scholarios encouraged the compilation of the manuscript Taurinensis XXIII (C-II-16),¹⁷ which contains the SG's translation in Greek by Demetrios Kydones (1354), and that Gennadios was its first owner.¹⁸ The Homily on the Eucharist was written probably after 1432 and before he attended the Council of Florence in 1438. So we might seek support for our findings in the manuscript Taur. XXIII (C-II-16), and I shall argue that we should.¹⁹ Let us compare the passage of the Homily with the Latin text of SG. Lib. 4, cap. 61, n. 3 and the corresponding Greek text of SG's translation by Kydones. In addition, we have included in the table below the evidence from the epitome of SG's translation by Kydones, which Scholarios produced some time between 1454 and 1464,²⁰ several decades after the Homily on the Eucharist was written.²¹

16 Lib. 4, cap. 61, n. 3. *Summa contra gentiles* is referred to henceforth as SG.

17 P. Frassinetti, 'Il codice Torinese C-2-16 contenente la versione greca della Summa contra Gentes, ad opera di Demetrio Cidone', in *Atti dello VIII Congresso internazionale di studi bizantini (Palermo, 3-10 aprile 1951)*, I (Rome 1953) 78-85.

18 See the note in the manuscript made after the death of the Patriarch: Ἡ βίβλος αὐτῆ πρότερον μὲν ἦν τοῦ μακαρίτου κυρίου Γενναδίου πατριάρχου, ὕστερον δὲ γέγονε τοῦ πατριάρχου μακαρίτου κυρίου Μαξιμου. 'This book previously belonged to the Blessed Lord patriarch Gennadios, and later the Blessed Lord patriarch Maximos had it in his possession.'

19 My access to this manuscript was made possible only thanks to the invaluable help of John A. Demetracopoulos.

20 On the dating see M.-H. Blanchet, *Georges-Gennadios Scholarios (vers 1400 — vers 1472): Un intellectuel orthodoxe face à la disparition de l'empire byzantine* (Paris 2008) 217-18.

21 In the near future I shall present more developed arguments for the dating of some of Scholarios' homilies between 1432 and 1438. These arguments are based on the theological analysis of his other works. On the dating see also M. Jugie, 'La forme de l'Eucharistie d'après Georges Scholarios', *Échos d'Orient* 33 (1934) 289-97 (291). There is no evidence to support the date of the Homily proposed by F. Tinnefeld ('Georgios Gennadios Scholarios', in C. G. Conticello et V. Conticello (eds.), *La Théologie byzantine et sa tradition. II (XIII^e-XIX^e s.)* (Turnhout 2002) 509. He proposes 1464 as *terminus post quem* since the epitome of *Summa theologiae* (*sic!*) was made after 1464 ('Georgios Gennadios Scholarios', 506). But it is well known that 'there is, in any case, no current evidence that Scholarios ever worked on *Ilia Pars* or its *Supplementum*' of *Summa theologiae* (Demetracopoulos, *Scholarios' On Almsgiving*, 159-60), in which Eucharistic doctrine is presented. Also we can be sure that he did not use the *Summa theologiae* while writing his Homily for another reason. In chapter 9 (Georges, *Œuvres complètes*, I, 131) Scholarios follows chapter 7 of the treatise by ps.-Thomas, where the

The text of the Homily

Ἦ μυστηρίου πάντων μυστηρίων ἱερωτάτου καὶ αὐτὸ τὸ τοῦ βαπτίσματος ὑπερβαίνοντος· δι' ἐκείνου μὲν γὰρ ἡμῖν ὁ δεσπότης **κατὰ δύναμιν μόνην**, διὰ δὲ τούτου **κατ' οὐσίαν** ἡμῖν κοινωνεῖ.

SG. Lib. 4, cap. 61, n. 3 ²²	Kydones' translation of SG. Lib. 4, cap. 61, n. 3 (MS Taur. gr. XXIII, fol. 380rv)	Text of the epitome
Sed considerandum est quod aliter generans generato coniungitur et aliter nutrimentum nutrito in corporalibus rebus. Generans enim non oportet <i>secundum substantiam</i> generato <i>coniungi</i> , sed <i>solum secundum similitudinem et virtutem</i> : sed alimentum oportet nutrito <i>secundum substantiam coniungi</i> . Unde, ut corporalibus signis spirituales effectus respondeant, mysterium verbi incarnati aliter nobis coniungitur in Baptismo, qui est spiritualis regeneratio; atque aliter in hoc Eucharistiae sacramento, quod est spirituale alimentum. In Baptismo enim continetur verbum incarnatum <i>solum secundum virtutem</i> : sed in Eucharistiae sacramento confitemur ipsum <i>secundum substantiam</i> contineri. ²³	Θεωρεῖται δ' ἂν εἶη, ὅτι τῷ γεννωμένῳ ὁ γεννῶν, ἐτέρως συνάπτεται· καὶ ἄλλως ἢ τροφή τῷ τρεφομένῳ ἐν τοῖς σωματικοῖς· τὸν μὲν γὰρ γεννῶντα, οὐκ ἀνάγκη κατ' οὐσίαν τῷ γεννωμένῳ συνάπτεσθαι, ἀλλὰ μόνον καθ' ὁμοιότητα καὶ δύναμιν · τὴν δὲ τροφήν, ἀνάγκη τῷ τρεφομένῳ κατ' οὐσίαν ἐξομοιοῦσθαι· ὅθεν ἵνα τοῖς σωματικοῖς συμβόλοις τὰ πνευματικὰ ἀποτελέσματα οἰκείως ἔχη, τὸ τοῦ σαρκωθέντος λόγου μυστήριον, ἄλλως ἡμῖν ἐν τῇ πνευματικῇ γεννήσει ἐν τῷ βαπτίσματι ἡνοῦται· καὶ ἄλλως ἐν τῷ τῆς εὐχαριστίας μυστηρίῳ, ὅπερ ἐστὶ πνευματικὴ τροφή· Ἐν μὲν γὰρ τῷ βαπτίσματι, ὁ σαρκωθεὶς λόγος κατὰ μόνην δύναμιν περιέχεται· ἐν δὲ τῷ τῆς εὐχαριστίας μυστηρίῳ, ὁμολογοῦμεν αὐτὸν περιέχεσθαι κατ' οὐσίαν .	Σύμβολα δὲ τῆς πνευματικῆς ταύτης τροφῆς, ὡς καὶ περὶ τοῦ βαπτίσματος εἴρηται, οἷς κοινότερον οἱ ἄνθρωποι πρὸς τὴν σωματικὴν χροῦνται τροφήν· ἄρτος δὲ ἐστὶ ταῦτα καὶ οἶνος, ὅφ' οἷς τὸ μυστήριον παραδίδεται τοῦτο. Ἐπεὶ δὲ τῷ μὴν γεννωμένῳ ὁ γεννῶν συνάπτεται καθ' ὁμοιότητα καὶ δύναμιν ἐπὶ τῶν κτισμάτων, ἢ δὲ τροφή τῷ τρεφομένῳ κατ' οὐσίαν ἐξομοιοῦται, ἐν μὲν τῷ βαπτίσματι, ὅπερ ἐστὶ πνευματικὴ γέννησις, ὁ σαρκωθεὶς Λόγος κατὰ μόνην δύναμιν περιέχεται· ἐν δὲ τῷ τῆς εὐχαριστίας αὐτὸς περιέχεται κατ' οὐσίαν , ἦγουν ἐν μὲν τῷ εἶδει τοῦ ἄρτου τὸ σῶμα αὐτοῦ, καὶ τὸ αἷμα ἐν τῷ εἶδει τοῦ οἴνου... ²⁴

Sacrament is viewed in terms of 'suffering' (*passio*). The example of a mirror is used as an analogy for the Eucharist, in which consecrated bread is broken but the imperishable and resurrected Body of Christ remains complete and intact (*integrum et illaesum*) (since only the accidents of bread are broken but not the of the Body that is present in it by substance): if a mirror is broken, the image of a reflected thing is not broken but can be seen in every piece of the broken mirror. But Thomas Aquinas pointed out in the *Summa theologiae* that this analogy is incorrect (*ST. III q. 76, ar. 3, co*; see also *Super Sent. Lib. 4, d. 10, q. 1, a. 3, qc. 3 co.*). Taking the above-mentioned details into consideration, Tinnefeld's date cannot be accepted.

22 Translation of the Latin text of SG: 'But it should be considered that one who gives birth and the one born, and the nourishment and the one nourished are conjoined in different ways. In fact, the one that gives birth ought not to be conjoined with the one born *by substance* but only in similarity and *by power*; but nourishment ought to be conjoined with the one being nourished by it *by substance*. Since spiritual acts could correspond to corporal images, the mystery of the incarnate Word is conjoined with us in one way in Baptism, which is spiritual regeneration, and in another way — in the sacrament of the Eucharist, which is spiritual nourishment. For in baptism the incarnate Word is present only *by power*, and in the sacrament of the Eucharist, as we confess, he is present himself *by substance*.'

23 Thomas Aquinas, *Opera omnia*, V (Parmae 1855) 356. Cf. '<...> dicendum quod, simpliciter loquendo, sacramentum Eucharistiae est potissimum inter alia sacramenta. Quod quidem tripliciter apparet. Primo quidem, ex eo quod in eo continetur ipse Christus *substantialiter*, in aliis autem sacramentis continetur quaedam *virtus* instrumentalis participata a Christo...' (*ST. III q. 65, ar. 3, co*).

24 Georges, *Œuvres complètes*, V, 309. 2–10.

Now the idea formulated by Scholarios in a more condensed form in comparison to his Latin source becomes clear: in the Eucharist Jesus Christ communicates with the faithful *by substance of his body and by substance of blood* because of their respective presence in the holy sacrament *by substance* as it follows from the Thomist doctrine of *transubstantiation* adopted by Gennadios. It is no coincidence that the passage in which we are interested is followed by a rhetorical exclamation that expresses admiration for the miracle of *transubstantiatio*: 'O miracle that surpasses all miracles! O transubstantiation, miracle most wonderful and pleasing for those enlightened by faith!'²⁵

* * *

Here I would like to take our research out of the narrow philological field and point out that in the homily not only does Scholarios adopt in the Homily the formula κατ' οὐσίαν, he also relates in Greek the teaching which laid behind this formula in Thomism. What this teaching is we will briefly demonstrate in section 4 and examine certain synonyms of the formula, which are also used in the homily after SG and the treatise of ps.-Thomas. And in section 5 we will show that this reception did not remain exclusively in the manuscripts of Scholarios' works but influenced post-Byzantine Orthodox teaching on the Eucharist: the formula κατ' οὐσίαν and the associated doctrine were appealed to by the Orthodox Church from the fifteenth to seventeenth centuries and included in conciliar decrees.

4. The concept of the presence of Christ by substance (secundum substantiam) in Thomist Eucharistic doctrine

According to Thomistic doctrine,²⁶ in the Eucharist the substance of bread is transformed into the substance of the body of Christ, and the substance of wine into the substance of His blood. Simultaneously the accidents of bread and wine continue their individual being through divine power but without their subjects, i.e. the substances of bread and wine.²⁷ As a result of this transformation the body of Christ, His soul and divinity are present in the Eucharist in two ways.

First, *by virtue of the sacrament (ex vi sacramenti)* as it follows from its form — the words of the Saviour: 'This is My body' and 'This is My blood'. After the consecration *only the substances of the body and the blood* without their accidents²⁸ (and without soul and divinity) are present under the accidents of bread and wine.

25 Georges, *Œuvres complètes*, I, 126. 24–5.

26 See, above all, *ST*. III q. 75–6; *SG*. Lib. 4, cap. 61–7; *Super Sent.* Lib. 4, d. 8–10.

27 On the accidents of bread and wine being without their subjects after the transubstantiation see *ST*. III q. 77; *SG*. Lib. 4. Cap. 65.

28 Accidents should be distinguished from essential (absolute) qualities of the body, such as mortality, perishability, possibility etc. In his Commentaries on the 'Sentences' by Peter Lombard Aquinas argued that at the Last Supper the disciples were given the suffering, i.e. perishable, Body of Christ as it had been

Second, *by real concomitance (ex vi reali concomitantia)* the Sacrament also contains what is really conjoined (*illud quod realiter est coniunctum*) with the substances of the body and the blood, i.e., the soul of Christ, His Divinity²⁹ and the accidents of His body and blood including the primary accident of ‘measurable quantity’ (*quantitas dimensiva*) that is responsible for a body’s extension in space. Through this primary accident all other accidents have their individual being in a subject. Thus *totus Christus* is present in the Eucharist.

However, the body of Christ, according to Aquinas, is not present in the Sacrament as ‘in a place’ (*in loco, localiter*), with its own dimensions (*dimensiones*) and in the mode of its quantity (*non per modum quantitatis*), as in heaven; it is not present there physically, but rather mystically, namely — in the mode of its substance (*per modum substantiae*) or by substance (*secundum substantiam*).³⁰ In other words dimensions and accidents of the body of Christ are not present in the Sacrament in the mode of their own being, i.e., ‘as whole in whole and singular parts in singular parts’ (*totum in toto et singulae partes in singulis partibus*), but rather indirectly — in the mode of substance, by substance; its nature is to be whole in whole and whole in some of the parts (*cuius natura est tota in toto et tota in qualibet parte*).³¹

Thus the main conclusions of the doctrine of Thomas Aquinas are as follows: the body of Christ does not occupy more place in the Eucharist than the size of bread and wine under which it is present there in its substance; the breaking of the bread does not attain to the glorified and imperishable body of Christ³² but only applies to a measurable quantity of bread; *totus Christus* is present in every part of the Sacrament; the Eucharistic presence *by substance* makes it possible for the same true body of Christ which is in Heaven with its dimensions to be present in numerous churches at the same time.

It is noteworthy that the expression *secundum substantiam* — reflected in Scholarios’ *κατ’ οὐσίαν* — is used by Aquinas together with its synonym *substantialiter* only in the SG. Apart from the passage from chapter 61 cited above, it was also used in chapter 63 (n12) of book 4 of the SG. In the ST and Commentaries on the

before the Resurrection: ‘<...> sed comparatio ejus ad exteriora non est eadem; quia in specie propria comparatur ad exteriora secundum situm propriarum dimensionum; sed in sacramento secundum situm dimensionum panis; unde *illae proprietates quae insunt absolute corpori Christi, oportet quod eodem modo insint sibi secundum quod est in sacramento, et secundum quod est in specie propria*; sed illae quae conveniunt ei ex comparatione ad aliud corpus extra, non eodem modo, sicut patet de visione. Sed passibilitas est proprietas absolute ipsius corporis; unde cum in propria specie esset passibile, et in sacramento passibile erat...’ — *Super Sent.* Lib. 4, d. 11, q. 3, a. 3 co.

29 ST. III q. 76 a. 1 ad 1.

30 See also below.

31 ST. III q. 76 a. 4 ad 1.

32 As it also has not attained to the perishable Body given by the Saviour to His disciples at the Last Supper before the Resurrection, this Body ‘through mystic partaking of did not suffer and did not die’ (*per sacramentalem sumptionem non patiebatur neque moriebatur*) (*Super Sent.* Lib. 4, d. 11, q. 3, a. 3). See also above.

'Sentences' by Peter Lombard, Aquinas discusses the presence of the Body of Christ with its accidents in the Sacrament using the expressions: *per modum substantiae*,³³ *mediante substantia*,³⁴ *ratione substantiae*.³⁵ In the treatise by pseudo-Thomas the expressions '*ex substantia consequente et mediante*' (cap.8) and *mediante substantia* (cap.10) are used when its author deals with the presence of the quantity and the accidents of the body in the Sacrament. A parallel to this may be found in the Homily of Scholarios (ch.10):

Scholarios	Pseudo-Thomas (cap.8)
Ἐπὶ δὲ τοῦ σώματος τοῦ Χριστοῦ οὐχ οὕτως ἔχει· ἔστι γὰρ ἐν τόπῳ μεσιτευούσης τῆς ποσότητος τῆς καὶ πρότερον ἐνυπαρχούσης τῷ ἄρτῳ· εἰ δὲ καὶ ἡ ἰδίᾳ ποσότης τοῦ παναγίου σώματος ἀχωρίστως αὐτῷ σύνεστιν, ἀλλ' ἐπομένως καὶ τῆς οὐσίας μεσιτευούσης, ἥτις ἄνευ ἰδίας ποσότητος ὑφεστάναι οὐ δύναται. ³⁶	Sed in corpore Christi sub sacramento est e converso; quia ipsum est in loco mediante quantitate quae prius inerat pani. Et quamvis ibi sit vera et propria quantitas corporis Christi, tamen hoc est <i>ex substantia consequente et mediante</i> , quae sine propria quantitate subsistere non potest.

5. The adoption of the formula and the Thomistic concept of the Presence of Christ in the Eucharist κατ' οὐσίαν in the post-Byzantine theology (XVI–XVII c.)

The source analysis of the collection of Scholarios' homilies and the identification of all parallels with the Thomist corpus must be a task for the future. However, it may be proposed that the homilies were composed between 1432 and 1438 under the overwhelming influence of the Corpus Thomisticum. We may note borrowing from SG (Lib. 4, cap. 39) in the homily on the Annunciation.³⁷ Recently, the dependence on Aquinas' *Summa theologiae* has been convincingly demonstrated by Demetracopoulos in Scholarios' *Homily on Almsgiving*.³⁸

However, the case of borrowing from SG in the Homily on the Eucharist stands apart, because, as noted above, this borrowing came to be in great demand in post-Byzantine Orthodox theology. The Orthodox Church was drawn into the Catholic polemic with Protestantism, one of the main points of which was the doctrine of transubstantiation. As we will see below, the reception of Thomist doctrine took place in two stages:

33 See: *ST*. III q. 76, a. 1, ad 3; a. 3 co.; q. 76 a. 4 ad 1, 2; a. 5 co.; a. 7 co.

34 See: *ST*. III q. 76, a. 5 co.; q. 76 a. 7 co.

35 *Super Sent*. Lib. 4, d. 10, q. 1, a. 3, qc. 3 co.

36 Georges, *Ceuvres complètes*, I, 132. 13–18. 'In the case of the Body of Christ [in the Eucharist] the situation is not the same [as the case of other bodies existing in space — *M. B.*] since it is present in place by the quantity [of bread] that had had its being in bread before [i.e., before the transubstantiation — *M. B.*]. If the quantity of the holy Body is present with it inseparably [in the Sacrament], the quantity is there only *by concomitance and by substance* [of the Body] that could not exist without its quantity.'

37 Georges, *Ceuvres complètes*, I, 49. 1–16.

38 Demetracopoulos, *Scholarios' On Almsgiving*.

- 1) In the sixteenth century an abridged version of the Homily was composed;
- 2) In the seventeenth century that abridged version was published and used as a source for the decrees of the council of Jerusalem (1672) and the council of Constantinople (1691) along with the authorization of the word μετουσίωσις.

5.1. *An abridged and revised version of the Homily (XVI c.)*

This abridged and revised version was first published in 1690 under the name of Gennadios Scholarios, Patriarch of Constantinople.³⁹ It appeared in print by the efforts of Patriarch Dositheos II of Jerusalem within a volume which contains two separate works: *Refutation of Calvinist chapters and questions of Cyril Lucaris*, composed by a major post-Byzantine Greek theologian Meletios Syrigos (1585–1663), and *Enchiridion against Calvinist insanity* by Patriarch Dositheos II of Jerusalem.⁴⁰ The Meletios' treatise is the largest one in the volume. Therefore, Eusèbe Renaudot made the erroneous assumption that the abridged version of Scholarios' Homily was derived from Meletios Syrigos.⁴¹

In reality, this version was a part of Dositheos' *Enchiridion against Calvinist Insanity* and was included by him as evidence for the use of the word μετουσίωσις by Church Fathers and writers. In Syrigos' work there is no mention of Scholarios at all. Moreover, the earliest manuscript of this version of the Homily Vat. gr. 1724 dates to the sixteenth century. Another manuscript Jerusalem. Patriarchikê bibliothêkê. Panagiou Taphou. 111, can be dated according the colophons to 1588–1603, and the piece of the codex, which contains an abridged version, to 1603 specifically. The Vatican and Panagiou Taphou manuscripts are closely related: in both of them an abridged version of the Homily is accompanied by an excerpt from *De ecclesiastica hierarchia* of ps.-Dionysios the Areopagite. We must note here that this version of the Homily appears to be not just an abridgement of Scholarios' original work, but contains some new material specific to anti-Protestant polemic in the sixteenth century.

The abridged version sets out to retell 'briefly and clearly' (σύντομον καὶ σαφές) Scholarios' Homily on his behalf. Having said that the sacrament of the Eucharist surpasses all other God's miracles, including the Incarnation, the unknown author

39 Γενναδίου τοῦ Σχολαρίου Κωνσταντινουπόλεως γενομένου πατριάρχου ἐπὶ τῆς ἀλώσεως, ἀπόκρισις δογματικὴ πρὸς τινὰς ἐρωτήσαντας αὐτὸν περὶ τοῦ ἀγιωτάτου μυστηρίου τῆς ἱερᾶς εὐχαριστίας, ἐν ἣ ῥητῶς λέγει τὴν λέξιν τῆς μετουσίωσεως. The title belongs to Dositheos.

40 Τοῦ μακαρίτου Μελετίου Συρίγου διδασκάλου τε καὶ πρωτοσυγγέλου τῆς ἐν Κωνσταντίνου Πόλει Μεγάλῃς Ἐκκλησίας, κατὰ τῶν καλβινικῶν κεφαλαίων καὶ ἐρωτήσεων Κυρίλλου τοῦ Λουκάρεως, ἀντίρρησις. Καὶ Δοσιθέου πατριάρχου Ἱεροσολύμων ἐγχειρίδιον κατὰ τῆς καλβινικῆς φρενοβλαβείας (Bucharest 1690) 74–6 (the *Enchiridion* has got separate pagination from Syrigos' work).

41 Gennadius Patriarch Constantinopolitanus, *Homiliae de sacramento Eucharistiae: Meletii Alexandrini, Nectarii Hierosolymitani, Meletii Syrigi, et aliorum, de eodem argumento opuscula...* (Paris 1709) XIII, 29. E. Renaudot made the *editio princeps* of Scholarios' Homily on the Eucharist and reprinted the abridged version from the 1690 edition (these texts were reproduced in *PG*, 160, 351–80). The opinion of Renaudot was uncritically accepted by Tinnefeld, *Georgios Gennadios Scholarios*, 520. № 151.

then proceeds to the question that perplexes heretics and the ignorant, namely: how the instant transformation of the substance of bread and wine into the substance of the body of the Lord (εἰς τὴν οὐσίαν τοῦ σώματος) takes place; why after the transformation of the substance of bread into the substance of the Body the accidents of bread remain,⁴² so that the accidents of bread have their being without the substance of bread, while the true substance of the body is hidden behind accidents of another substance; how it is possible that whole Christ is present in a small amount of visible bread; how the mystical body of Christ remains undamaged although it is divided, and each of the parts [of the bread] is the whole and perfect body of Christ; and finally, the ultimate problem — how the same body of Christ can be in heaven and on numerous altars on earth at the same time.⁴³

Referring the readers to the full version of the Homily in order to learn about those questions in more detail, the unknown author then addresses them:

The abridged version ⁴⁴	Scholarios' original text ⁴⁵
<p>Ὑμεῖς δὲ ὀφείλετε πιστεῦειν ἀναμφιβόλως, καὶ πάντες Χριστιανοὶ οὕτω πιστεῦειν ὀφείλομεν, ὅτι ἐν μυστικῷ τούτῳ σώματι, αὐτὸς ἐστὶν ἄληθῶς ὁ Κύριος ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦς Χριστὸς, ὁ ἐκ τῆς Μαρίας Παρθένου γεννηθεὶς, ὁ ἐπὶ σταυροῦ, ὁ ἐν οὐρανῷ νῦν, αὐτὸς ἐκεῖνος ὀλόκληρος, ὑπὸ τοῖς συμβεβηκόσι τοῦ ἄρτου συγκαλυπτόμενος· καὶ κατ' οὐσίαν ἐστὶν ἐν τῷ μυστηρίῳ, οὐ κατὰ χάριν ἢ δύναμιν.⁴⁶</p>	<p><...> καὶ βεβαίως καὶ ἀναμφισβητήτως πιστεύωμεν ὅσα περὶ τούτου τοῦ μυστηρίου ἢ τοῦ Χριστοῦ ἐκκλησία διδάσκει ἢ μήτηρ ἡμῶν, τοῦτ' ἐστὶν ἐν τῷ μυστικῷ τούτῳ σώματι αὐτὸν ἄληθῶς εἶναι τὸν Χριστὸν ὑπὸ τοῖς συμβεβηκόσι τοῦ ἄρτου συγκαλυπτόμενον καὶ ὀλόκληρον εἶναι αὐτὸν ἐκεῖνον τὸν ἐκ τῆς μακαρίας παρθένου γεγεννημένον, τὸν ἐπὶ σταυροῦ τότε, τὸν ἐν οὐρανῷ νῦν...</p>

As we can see, the passage from Scholarios' Homily is interpreted as stating that Christ is present in the Eucharist *by substance* (κατ' οὐσίαν) of His body and blood and adds the rejection of Christ's presence in the Sacrament *by grace* or *by power* (κατὰ χάριν ἢ δύναμιν) in the context of anti-Calvinist polemic.

5.2. The formula κατ' οὐσίαν in the decrees of the Synod of Jerusalem (1672) and the Synod of Constantinople (1691)

In the seventeenth century the doctrine of the Eucharist stood at the centre of theological debate linked with polemics against Protestants and pro-Protestant Orthodox authors. The most famous of the latter was Cyril I Lucaris, Patriarch of Constantinople (1570/72–1638), the author of the *Eastern Confession of Christian Faith* published in 1629

42 An explanation is added: '<...> i.e., its [bread's] length, weight, width, colour, smell and quality of taste' (ἤγουν τὸ μήκος αὐτοῦ, τὸ βάρος, τὸ πλάτος, τὸ χρῶμα, τὴν ὄσμην, καὶ τὴν ἐν τῇ γεύσει ποιότητα).

43 Gennadius, *Homiliae de sacramento Eucharistiae*, 32–3 (=PG, 160, 377cb).

44 Gennadius, *Homiliae de sacramento Eucharistiae*, 33–4 (=PG, 160, 380a).

45 Georges, *Œuvres complètes*, I, 134. 20–5.

46 English translation: 'You should believe unambiguously (and all of us Christians should believe) that in this mystical Body our Lord Jesus Christ is truly present, He who was born of the Virgin Mary and was crucified, who now is in heaven, the same entire, hidden under the accidents of bread and wine, and [He] is present in the sacrament *by substance and not by grace or power*.'

in Latin and in 1633 in Greek. The ideas of Lucaris — who rejected the doctrine of transubstantiation and believed in the true presence of Christ in a ‘spiritual’ sense, ‘according to faith’⁴⁷ — were condemned by several Synods of Orthodox Churches in the seventeenth century, whose activity was not only determined by the struggle for dogmatic purity, but also had political reasons. Patriarch Dositheos II of Jerusalem, the editor of the abridged version of Scholarios’ Homily on the Eucharist, was an organizer of the Synod of Jerusalem (1672) and the Synod of Constantinople (1691).

The Synod of Jerusalem approved Dositheos’ *Confession of Orthodox Faith*.⁴⁸ The central chapter 17 of the Confession was dedicated to the Eucharist and the defence of the doctrine of transubstantiation. Here the Synod officially supported the Catholic Church and adopted the doctrine of transubstantiation. Scholarios’ Homily in its abridged version evidently was among this chapter’s sources: the statement of the real presence of the whole Christ *by substance* (κατ’ οὐσίαν) was included, a correct Thomistic interpretation of which is possible thanks to the material presented in this paper:

Also [we believe] that every part and particle of consecrated bread and wine contain not a part of the Body and Blood of the Lord but *by substance the entire whole Lord Christ, that is, with Soul and Divinity* (ἀλλ’ ὅλον ὀλικῶς τὸν δεσπότην Χριστὸν κατ’ οὐσίαν, μετὰ ψυχῆς δηλονότι καὶ θεότητος), or perfect God and perfect man.⁴⁹

47 Such a denial resulted from a misinterpretation of transubstantiation in terms of hyperrealism; this attitude was widespread at that time as a result of Protestant polemic. In his *Confession* Lucaris writes: ‘We confess and believe in the true and real presence of our Lord Jesus Christ but in such [presence] that faith informs us about and not a poorly invented transubstantiation. We truly believe that faithful communicants partake of the Body of our Lord Jesus Christ at the Supper, without tearing the sacrament apart by their teeth sensually but rather communicating through the feeling of the soul. For the body of Christ is not what is seen and perceived by eyes in the Sacrament but what is presented and offered to us by our faith through spiritual perception. Thus, it is true that if we believe than we eat, communicate and partake of [the sacrament] but if we do not, than we do not profit’ (I. N. Karmires, *Τὰ Δογματικά καὶ Συμβολικά Μνημεῖα τῆς Ὀρθοδόξου Καθολικῆς Ἐκκλησίας*, II (Athens 1968) 568 [647]).

48 In 1723 the Greek text of the *Confession* was delivered to Russia to be sent to Great Britain on behalf of the Holy Synod of the Russian Church as part of the ‘Epistle of the Patriarchs of the Eastern Church on the Orthodox Faith’. The Epistle was addressed to the Non-Jurors as an authoritative document containing a true statement of the Orthodox faith. The Eastern Patriarchs (Chrysanthos of Jerusalem, Jeremiah III of Constantinople and Athanasios III of Antioch) put forward agreement with this document as a necessary condition for achieving unity with the Anglican bishops (for details on the correspondence and the texts themselves, see: G. Williams, *The Orthodox Church of the East in the 18th century, which is the Correspondence between the Eastern Patriarchs and wicked bishops* (London 1868); J. D. Mansi, *Sacrorum conciliorum nova et amplissima collectio*, XXXVII (Paris 1905) 369–624; Karmires, *Τὰ Δογματικά*, II, 863–900).

49 Karmires, *Τὰ Δογματικά*, II, 762 [842]. There are two versions of the ‘Confession’. The first one, written in 1672, was published together with the acts of the Synod of Jerusalem in Paris in 1676 and 1678 with Latin translation; it was better-known and had been reprinted 11 times. The second version, corrected and enlarged, was published by Dositheos himself in Bucharest in 1690. As far as the cited fragment is concerned there is no differences between the two versions.

In due course the Synod of Constantinople was formally convoked in 1691 by Kallinikos II Akarnan, Patriarch of Constantinople (1630–1702), but in reality Dositheos was behind it. This Synod condemned the Great Logothete Ioannes Karyophilles (*ca.* 1600 — after 1693), who adhered to Calvinist views and rejected the word ‘transubstantiation’ (μετουσίωσις) in the Orthodox teaching on the Eucharist, as a Latin novelty alien to the Church Fathers. The dogmatic part of the decree was a verbatim quotation of the *Confession of Orthodox Faith* by Dositheos.

Moreover, in every part and particle of consecrated bread and wine is contained not a part of the Body and Blood of the Lord but *by substance the entire whole Lord Christ, that is, with Soul and Divinity* (ἀλλ' ὅλον ὀλικῶς τὸν δεσπότην Χριστὸν κατ' οὐσίαν, μετὰ ψυχῆς δηλονότι καὶ θεότητος), or perfect God and perfect man...

The Church has taken advantage of this [word μετουσίωσις], since it differs from ambiguous words and surpasses all the sophisms of heretics against the sacrament [Eucharist], having borrowed it not from the Latins, but many years before that (πρὸ χρόνων πολυαριθμῶν) from their own and true Orthodox teachers enriched by this word], as can be seen from the writings of the defender of piety, the Lord Gennadios, patriarch of Constantinople, who in the face of the Orthodox emperors, pious patriarchs, the holy Senate and the teachers of our Orthodoxy came out in defense of the sacred sacrament by means of the same word [μετουσίωσις], already known and recognized by the Church [by his time].⁵⁰

However, this time Dositheos, who was obviously the author of the decree, directly points to Scholarios as an Orthodox source for the dogmatic doctrine of transubstantiation and real concomitance. This was an anti-historical trick on the part of the Patriarch of Jerusalem, and he sought here to take advantage of Scholarios' fame as the leader of the anti-Uniate party after the death of Mark of Ephesus in 1444. In 1690 Dositheos published the abridged version of the Scholarios' Homily and in 1691 could refer to it in the decree.

In this way the result of Scholarios' fascination with Thomism in 1430s played a key role in the later development of the Eucharistic doctrine of the Orthodox Church in the post-Byzantine period and was acceptable to local Orthodox Councils in the seventeenth century.

* * *

Let me sum up. In this paper I have established Aquinas' *Summa contra gentiles* as a source for Scholarios' Homily on the Eucharist and outlined the history of the meaning of the term κατ' οὐσίαν, derived from the Latin *secundum substantiam* in Eastern Orthodox theology. The results of this study once again show the need for a

50 See Karmires, *Tὰ Δογματικά*, II, 779–80 [859–60].

new critical edition of Scholarios' works, accompanied by the parallels from Latin sources.⁵¹ The historical and theological analysis of his works in the context of events relating, in particular, to the Council of Florence will allow us in the future to clarify the dating of works and the evolution of George Gennadios II Scholarios as a theologian.

Mikhail Bernatsky studied ancient Greek and Latin at Yuriy Shichalin's Museum Graeco-Latinum and graduated from the State University of Management, Moscow, and later from the SS Cyril and Methodius Institute of Post-Graduate Studies. He has taught at the National Research University Higher School of Economics and currently works as a researcher in the Ecclesiastical Institutions Research Laboratory of the St Tikhon Orthodox Humanitarian University and as a scientific editor in the Publishing House of the Moscow Patriarchate. His research interests embrace Byzantine and post-Byzantine theology, Greek palaeography, the reception of Thomism in Byzantium, the Greek-Latin controversy, and the Metropolitanate of Kyiv in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries.

51 This research area is supported by the *Thomas de Aquino Byzantinus* project (2006-) supervised by John A. Demetracopoulos.