Theology for Rent: Nicholas Mesarites as a Compiler of Andronicus Camaterus

Dmitry I. Makarov

The Urals State M.P. Mussorgsky Conservatoire, Yekaterinburg, Russia
dimitri.makarov@mail.ru

Abstract

Nicholas Mesarites (*ca.* 1163/1164 – *post* 1214) was rather a “theologian of transition”, than an independent thinker. Yannis Spiteris discovered in 1977 that the entire chapter on the primacy of Rome in Mesarites’ treatise *The Account of the Political and Ecclesiastical Events of the Year 1214* turned out to be a large quote from the *Sacred Arsenal* (1173–1174) by Andronicus Camaterus. We have enlarged Spiteris’ observations by discovering that Chs. 35–50 of the treatise are a large quotation (with the elements of a paraphrase) of the triadological section of the *Arsenal*, which was centered on the *Filioque*. We can conclude that Mesarites’ piece might have served as a *florilegium* and a channel of transmission of Camaterus’ ideas concerning the interpenetration of the Persons within the Holy Trinity and the inadmissibility of confounding their hypostatic properties, like the Holy Spirit’s hypostatic projection by the Father, with the natural ones.

Keywords

Nicholas Mesarites – Andronicus Camaterus – *Sacred Arsenal* – *The Account of the Political and Ecclesiastical Events of the Year 1214* – *Filioque* – Holy Trinity – Byzantine anti-Latin polemics – Gregory of Cyprus – John Veccus – Gregory Palamas

* This research was conducted with the generous help of the Russian Foundation for Humanities, project no. 15-03-00665, “Varieties of Humanism and Its Ways: The Intellectual Legacy of Late Byzantium, Thirteenth to Fourteenth Centuries.”

Introduction. Why Nicholas Mesarites?

Five clear-cut positions of Byzantine ecclesiastical intellectuals in the *Filioque* debate evolved by the end of the thirteenth century, as far as we can see from the sources this crucial period immediately before and after the union of Lyons 11. The criterion which we applied for identifying the position of each author was his attitude toward the eternal shining of the Holy Spirit through God the Son as identical or non-identical with the hypostatic procession of the Holy Spirit from God the Father. For doing this one has to take into account the entire system of doctrinal coordinates of each author, that is, each author's understanding of the relationship between the *logoi* of nature, energy, and the hypostases of the Holy Trinity on the one hand, and the relationship between personal properties, τὰ ἴδια, τὰ προσωπικά or τὰ χαρακτηριστικά, and natural and common properties, on the other hand.¹ Let us briefly enumerate the attitudes before proceeding to the main argument which, as we will see, is closely related.

According to *Nicephorus Blemmydes* (ca. 1197–1269), the shining of the Holy Spirit was eternal and non-identical with His procession from the Father, whereas the Son and the Holy Spirit eternally came into being “one through the other” in a symmetrical fashion.² Blemmydes needed to make this

1 In the tradition of Patriarch Photius of Constantinople (858–867, 877–886), which was the doctrinal and theological core and basis for all the subsequent generations of Byzantine and Slavic theologians who elaborated the Trinitarian doctrine (not only for Gregory of Cyprus, Gregory Palamas and Nilus Cabasilas, as Theodoros Alexopoulos noted, but also for Andronicus Camaterus, Philotheus Coccinus, and Theophanes of Nicaea), the strict prohibition on commingling the personal properties of the Persons of the Trinity with the natural properties was in the center of any speculation on the Trinitarian matters. On this topic, see two important passages from Camateros which were omitted by Mesarites in his rewriting of the text of his predecessor: Andronici Camateri *Sacrum armamentum*. Pars prima, ed. A. Bucossi (CCSG, 75), Turnhout, 2014, p. 34.15.10–21, 49.37.18–21 (hereinafter Camaterus). From the secondary literature, see Th. Alexopoulos, *Der Ausgang des thearchischen Geistes. Eine Untersuchung der Filioque-Frage anhand Photios' Mystagogie, Konstantin Melitiniotes' Zwei Antirrhetici und Augustins De Trinitate*, Göttingen, 2009, pp. 3, 18, 21, 39. As far as Slavic theologians are concerned, in the Archbishop's “Promise” of Pavel, the Abbot of Pererva's St. Nicholas Monastery on the occasion of his being ordained the Bishop of Colomna and Kashira on April 30, 1676, we come across an almost literary quotation from the 1285 *Dogmatic Tome* by St. Gregory of Cyprus (cf. S. Greg. Cyp. *Expositio fidei contra Veccum*, in PG 142, col. 236A; В. М. Живов, *Из церковной истории времен Петра Великого: Исследования и материалы* [V. M. Zhivov, *From the Ecclesiastical History of the Time of Peter the Great: Studies and Texts*], Moscow, 2004, p. 290).

2 Nicéphore Blemmydès, “Lettre à Théodore II Laskaris,” 10, in: Nicéphore Blemmydès, *Œuvres théologiques*, vol. 1, ed. M. Stavrou (SC, 517), Paris, 2007, p. 346.4–5; p. 347 (the editor's French

statement to substantiate his doctrine on the interpenetration of the Persons (especially of the caused Persons, that is, the Son and the Holy Spirit), but in a small number of cases he seems not to draw a borderline between the *logoi* of hypostasis and the energy in God.

Gregory of Cyprus (ca. 1241–1290, Patriarch of Constantinople in 1283–1289) represents the most effective synthesis of the Orthodox pneumatology reached by the end of the thirteenth century. Its central point was the difference between the eternal shining of the Holy Spirit through the Son by grace, that is, the living energy of God, and the Holy Spirit's hypostatic coming into being from God the Father alone.³ The *Filioque* was inadmissible just because of the confusion of these two acts, which on a more profound level resulted from non-differentiating between the *logoi* of hypostasis, energy, and substance in God.

The *opponents of Gregory of Cyprus* (John XI Veccus, Constantine Meliteniotes, George Metochites, and John Cheilas, the Metropolitan of Ephesus) argued that the procession of the Holy Spirit *from* the Father *through* the Son (or, what was equal for them, *from* the Father *and* the Son as from a single cause) was identical with the shining of the Holy Spirit.⁴ From the viewpoint

translation). On this range of problems, see X. N. Σαββάτου, *Ἡ θεολογικὴ ὁρολογία καὶ προβληματικὴ τῆς πνευματολογίας Γρηγορίου τοῦ Κυπρίου*, Katerini, 1997, pp. 46–47, 51; D. Makarov, “The Holy Spirit as Life and Energy. The Treatment of *Ad Serapionem* 1.20–21 in the Late Thirteenth Century and Its Implications for the Hesychast Controversy,” *Byz*, 80 (2010), pp. 197–246; J.-C. Larchet, “Grégoire II de Chypre (1241–1290), patriarche de Constantinople (1283–1289). Vie – oeuvre – pensée théologique,” in: *La vie et l'oeuvre théologique de Georges/Grégoire II de Chypre (1241–1290), patriarche de Constantinople*, ed. J.-C. Larchet, Paris, 2012, pp. 95–113, esp. pp. 101–102; M. Stavrou, “Les comptes rendus des dialogues avec les Latins de 1234 et 1250. Introduction,” in: Nicéphore Blemmydès, *Œuvres théologiques*, vol. II, éd. M. Stavrou (SC, 558), Paris, 2013, p. 241; B. Lourié, “What Was The Question? The Inter-Byzantine Discussions about the Filioque, Nicephorus Blemmydes, and Gregory of Cyprus,” *Scr*, 10 (2014), pp. 499–506; Idem, “Nicephorus Blemmydes on the Holy Trinity and the Paraconsistent Notion of Numbers: A Logical Analysis of a Byzantine Approach to the *Filioque*,” *Studia Humana*, 5 (2016), pp. 40–54.

3 The Son, according to Gregory of Cyprus, was the One who manifested the Holy Spirit (and not projected Him, since procession of the Holy Spirit was the hypostatic property of the Father alone): Greg. Cyr., *Expositio fidei contra Veccum*, in PG 142, col. 239D–241B; Idem, *Contra Marcum*, Ibid., col. 250BC; Idem, *Apologia pro tomo suo*, Ibid., col. 263A; Idem, *De processione Spiritus Sancti*, Ibid., col. 285AB, etc. This fragment from the *De processione ...* is considered authentic (and not a part of Theodore Mouzalon's *Against the Blasphemies of Veccus*) by Jean-Claude Larchet (see J.-C. Larchet, “Grégoire II de Chypre” (see n. 3), pp. 59, 131–132, 145).

4 Cf. in Beccos: Joannis Vecci CP. Patr., *Refutatio libri Georgii Cyprii ...*, in PG, 141, col. 916A; in John Cheilas: PG, 142, col. 245C; the same criticism directed against Veccus and his entourage in

of Gregory of Cyprus and his adherents, for them there was no distinction between the *logoi* of energy and *logoi* of hypostasis; moreover, they did not even distinguish between the modes of the generation and procession in defining specific properties and hypostatic uniqueness of the Son and the Holy Spirit. Thus, according to Veccus, who strongly denied any possibility that the Holy Spirit proceeded immediately from the Father, if the Son and the Holy Spirit came into being *immediately from* the Father, they had to be treated as brothers!⁵ Thus, Constantine Meliteniotes proclaimed the Son to be the Intermediary (μέσον) between the Father and the Spirit.⁶ This was, strictly speaking, an essential shift from the system of coordinates of any “classical” Trinitarian doctrine, which went back to the Cappadocians and the Alexandrian period of the late fourth–first half of the fifth century, or even from its re-elaboration by Dionysius the Areopagite at the turn of the sixth century.⁷

The *moderately conservative Orthodox* (George Moskhambbar) believed that the word “shining forth” and its cognates (“illumination” etc.) would mean either the Son’s or the Holy Spirit’s coming into being (depending on the context of its use), turning out to be, therefore, a kind of a common designation for a number of nouns and verbs used to describe various actions both inside and outside the Holy Trinity, including the distribution of grace to the righteous people which has been taking place in time.⁸

George Moskhambbar (see Δ. Ι. Μονιού, *Γεώργιος Μοσχάμπαρ. Ένας ανθενωτικός θεολόγος της πρώιμης παλαιολόγιας περιόδου. Βίος και έργο*, Athens, 2011, pp. 306.4–15; 307.31–32).

- 5 Joannis Vecci CP. Patr., *Adversus Andronicum Camaterum*, in PG, 141, col. 589C; quoted in: Alexopoulos, *Der Ausgang* (see n. 2), p. 110. Meliteniotes’ theology has been most profoundly studied in the work by Alexopoulos, *ibid.*, pp. 105–127, esp. pp. 110–113, 123–126. As for George Metochites, it is clear that for him the Holy Spirit proceeds ἐξ ἑαυτοῦ (thus it does not matter whether it is to be taken as proceeding *from* the Son or *through* the Son); see George Metochites, *Fragmentum ex libris de processione Spiritus Sancti*, in: PG 141, col. 1412CD. See also: Greg. Cypr., *Expositio* (see n. 4). On some parallels (among many) from Veccus and Chilas see, e.g., Makarov, “The Holy Spirit” (see n. 3), esp. pp. 229–237.
- 6 Κωνσταντίνου Μελιτηνιώτου *Λόγος ἀντιρρητικός πρώτος κατὰ τοῦ τόμου τοῦ Κυρίου*, in: Κωνσταντίνου Μελιτηνιώτου *Λόγοι ἀντιρρητικοὶ δύο νῦν τὸ πρῶτον ἐκδιδόμενοι*, ed. M. A. Ορφανοῦ, Athens, 1986, pp. 141.14–142.1; cf. p. 140.1–2.
- 7 On this, cf. penetrating remarks in D. Biriukov, “Hierarchies of Beings in the Patristic Thought: Maximus the Confessor, John of Damascus, and the Palamites,” *Scr*, 10 (2014), pp. 281–304, esp. 284–286; Idem, “The neoplatonic tetrad in the context of the topic of the hierarchy of beings in the patristic thought: Maximus the Confessor and John of Damascus,” *Религия, Церковь в России и за рубежом*, 33:2 (2015), pp. 287–299, esp. 288–290; Idem, “Hierarchies of Beings in the Patristic Thought: Gregory of Nyssa and Dionysius the Areopagite,” in: *The Ways of Byzantine Philosophy*, ed. M. Knežević, Alhambra, CA, 2015, pp. 71–88, esp. 77 ff.
- 8 See Μονιού, *Γεώργιος Μοσχάμπαρ* (see n. 4), p. 314.43–53. But the procession of the Holy Spirit is not identical with His shining; the former is His hypostatic idiom, i.e., His τὸ πῶς ἔχει (German “So-Sein”) from the Father (*Ibid.*, p. 313.13–17).

The *radical “left” opposition* (the neo-pagans, primarily George Acropolites) claimed that the shining of the Holy Spirit was the essential act of His manifestation through the Son (οὐσιωδῶς ἐμφαινόμενον), which was treated by Acropolites as a necessary consequence of the Holy Spirit’s previous procession from the Father and as a prerequisite of His return to the Father in accordance with the Neoplatonic ontological model for the movement of created beings (μονή – πρόοδος – ἐπιστροφή).⁹ The fact that George Acropolites called God the Father “the originating substance” and not “hypostasis,” makes us suspect that his Trinitarian doctrine was in fact Tritheist, in full compliance with Moskhambar’s critique of Veccus for similar reasons.¹⁰

Therefore, a quite natural question is how all these varieties emerged? Who were the earliest Greek theologians of the century from the list and what was their role in preparing the flourishing ideas which would become so noticeable several decades later?

In our attempt to answer these questions, the somewhat enigmatic figure of Nicholas Mesarites (*ca.* 1163/1164 – *post* 1214),¹¹ the Metropolitan of Ephesus and the Exarch of all Asia, comes to mind. Despite the fact that his works were published by A. Heisenberg very long ago, until 1977 we knew almost nothing about any specific aspects of his Trinitarian views. The situation began to slightly improve after the publication of an article by Fr. (now Archbishop) Yannis Spiteris, OFM. He was the first scholar to discover that the entire chapter on the primacy of Rome in Mesarites’ extensive treatise *The Account of the Political and Ecclesiastical Events of the Year 1214* (the title was given by A. Heisenberg) turned out to be a large quote from another source, the well-

9 *In Gregorii Nazianzeni sententias*, in: Georgii Acropolitae *Opera*, Vol. II, ed. A. Heisenberg and P. Wirth (Bibliotheca Scriptorum Graecorum et Romanorum Teubneriana), Stuttgart, 1978, p. 78.15–19. For a more detailed analysis of Acropolites’ philosophy and theology, see Д. И. Макаров, “От меда поэзии – к Первоистоку. Взаимодействие античных и христианских элементов в риторических и философских произведениях Георгия Акрополита” [D. I. Makarov, From the Nectar of Poetry to the First Origin. The Interaction between the Ancient and Christian Elements in the Rhetorical and Philosophical Writings by George Acropolites], *Crkvene studije / Church Studies*, 12 (2015), pp. 489–512 (with English summary at p. 513).

10 Μονιού, Γεώργιος Μοσχάμπαρ (see n. 4), pp. 288.26–31; 289.62–65; 290.81–88. 95–102; etc. Cf. a statement by Bessarion of Nicaea (the 15th century): “Nothing whatsoever prevents that which exists from the essence of the Father and the Son to exist from their Hypostases (sic! – D. M.) as well” (Bessarion, *Contra Palamam Apologia inscriptionum Vecci*, in PG, 161, col. 284C). The obvious and glaring parallel in Veccus is found in his Dogmatic epistle to the Pope John XXI: *Johannis Vecci Epistola ad Joannem papam*, in PG, 141, col. 947AB.

11 A. Kazhdan, “Mesarites Nicholas,” in: *Oxford Dictionary of Byzantium*, ed. A. P. Kazhdan, Vol. 2, Oxford – New York, 1991, p. 1346.

known *Sacred Arsenal* by Andronicus Camaterus, a layman and a court theologian of the Emperor Manuel I Comnenus (1143–1180).¹² Y. Spiteris might have not even been aware of the extent of Mesarites' borrowings from Camaterus in this text. In our time we can fully recognize the nature and limits of Mesarites' dependence on Camaterus. The comparison of both texts allows us not only to form an idea concerning the methods of work followed by a high-rank Byzantine theologian, but also – and this seems to be a crucial issue – to appreciate the novelty and depth of Camaterus' ideas, their importance and their role in paving the way to the flourishing of theological thinking associated with the anti-Latin polemics, which would become the hallmark of the Photian tradition in the Byzantine theology and philosophy by the end of the thirteenth century. The warning against any commingling of personal properties of the Divine Persons re-appeared in Camaterus' doctrine along with some fresh ideas concerning the deepest inner interpenetration of the Persons, and in this sense his teaching may be regarded as a prefiguration of elaborate and dynamic doctrines of interpenetration which we may see in the writings of Blemmydes, Gregory of Cyprus, Gregory Moskhambur, and later in Gregory Palamas and the subsequent Palamites. In this sense Camaterus (followed by Mesarites) was really the person who inaugurated the new century.

1 The Compiler at Work: Camaterus' Text in the *Account* of Mesarites

Mesarites' *Account* (as we will call the text for the sake of brevity) is a composition of a mixed dogmatic, polemical, and historical genre with a complex inner structure. The *Sacred Arsenal* of Camaterus, which was composed ca. 1173–1174,¹³ is a gem of theological polemics with both Latins and Armenians (such a combination was typical for the middle and late Byzantine theologians, for example, for Nicetas Stethatus and Alexius I Comnenus). Quite naturally, historical parts of the Mesarites' *Account* were not borrowed from Camaterus.

12 G. Spiteris, "I dialogi di Nicolas Mesarites coi latini: opera storica o finzione letteraria?," in: *Collectanea Byzantina* (OCA, 204), Roma, 1977, pp. 181–186, esp. pp. 183–186.

13 The full title of the work is: *The Conversation of the Divinely Wise Great Emperor with the Most Wise Cardinals of the Elder Rome about the Procession of the All-Holy Spirit from the Father Alone* (Bucossi, p. 22). Its old dating was ca. 1170–1175 (see M. Jugie, *Theologia dogmatica Christianorum orientalium ab Ecclesia Catholica dissidentium*, Vol. I, *Origo, historia, fontes*, Paris, 1926, pp. 410–411; Spiteris, "I dialogi," (see n. 11), p. 183), but Alessandra Bucossi determined the time of the composition more precisely, placing it between 1173 and 1174: A. Bucossi, "Introduction. Dating of the *Sacred Arsenal*," in: Camaterus, pp. xxiv–xxvi.

Moreover, in the passages which we will discuss in more detail below, Mesarites described his personal experience of the time when the treatise was composed without turning to the historical past. Similarities and parallels with Andronicus Camaterus begin when we reach the Trinitarian polemics around the *Filioque* problem. In his note, Yannis Spiteris mentioned one example when Mesarites borrowed a passage from Camaterus, which was dedicated to the accusation of the Greek “apostasy” from their “mother,” that is, the Roman Church.¹⁴

Before presenting a complete Table of Mesarites’ borrowings from Camaterus, it seems useful to briefly list the content of the *Account*, following the division proposed by Heisenberg,¹⁵ so we may better see the inner structure of the treatise. The cohesive text begins with Chapter 4; thus we have the following structure:

- Ch. 4–10. Christological debate with Patriarch Michael IV Autoreanus;
- Ch. 11–22. Historical narrative on Mesarites’ visit to Nicaea and his negotiations with Cardinal Pelagius from Albana, which took place there;
- Ch. 23–31. Description of the disputation with Cardinal Pelagius on November 22, 1214¹⁶ concerning the azymes, and the comparison between the Law and the Gospel. The name of “the perfect monad” given to the number ten by our author reveals his interest in numerology and brings him close to George Acropolites;¹⁷
- Ch. 32–33. Transition to the main part of the work – the account of the ecclesiological and Trinitarian controversy;
- Ch. 34. Debate on the primacy of the Pope over the Orthodox Church;
- Ch. 35–50. Polemics with *Filioque*, which will exclusively interest us here;

14 Spiteris, “I dialogi,” (see n. 12), p. 184, n. 15. See Camaterus, p. 29.8.1–10; [Nicholas Mesarites,] “Der Bericht des Nikolaos Mesarites über die politischen und kirchlichen Ereignisse des Jahres 1214,” in: A. Heisenberg, *Quellen und Studien zur spätbyzantinischen Geschichte*, Gesammelte Arbeiten ausgewählt von H.-G. Beck (Variorum Reprints, CS 22), London, 1973 (hereinafter: Mesarites), II. 3, p. 36.35.1–7 (not verbal coincidence between the two texts).

15 A. Heisenberg, “Die Bedeutung der Schrift als Geschichtsquelle,” in: Mesarites, p. 55.

16 On the date, see *Ibid.*, p. 57.

17 Cf. Mesarites, p. 29.27.22–26 and the Acropolites’ teaching on the monad and the dodecade in Georgii Acropolitae *Opera*, Vol. II (no. 9), p. 107.13–15. Cf. Procli *Theol. Plat.*, VI, 18: Vol. 6, p. 85.12–18, Saffrey – Westerink.

- Ch. 51–52. Historical narration about the author’s meeting with the Patriarch, Mesarites’ diplomatic maneuvers and his return to Ephesus (in January or February, 1215¹⁸);
- Ch. 53–60. “The original fasting sermon,” as Heisenberg called it;¹⁹
- Ch. 61, the last one. The wish to the Emperor Theodore I Lascaris to have military victories.

Mesarites’ borrowings from Camaterus occur in Chapters 35–50. Having carefully examined their nature and scope, we can conclude with confidence that Camaterus’ Trinitarian doctrine, which was polemically aimed at *Filioque*, was not only the basis for the polemics by Mesarites, but also that it was the exactly same Orthodox Trinitarian doctrine which was borrowed by Mesarites in its integrity from the *Sacred Arsenal* and used in the *Account* under his own name.

Let us have a closer look at the original context of the borrowings (Table 1). We supplement the findings of Y. Spiteris with sixteen new parallels.

TABLE 1 *Borrowings from the Sacred Arsenal of Andronicus Camaterus (ca. 1174–1175) in the Account of Nicholas Mesarites (1214 or slightly later)*

No.	Original text by Camaterus	Its appropriation (or a shortened borrowing; see the notes) by Mesarites
1.	Ch. 7 (pp. 26.7.1–29.7.59)	Ch. 34 (pp. 34.34.22–35.34.35) ^a
2.	Ch. 8 (pp. 29.8.1–10)	Ch. 35 (pp. 36.35.1–7) (cf. no. 14 above)
3.	Ch. 9 (pp. 30.9.10–12)	Ch. 35 (pp. 36.35.8–10)
4.	Ch. 15 (pp. 33.15.1–34.15.6 [<i>a</i>]; 35.15.22–36.15.40 [<i>b</i>]; 36.15.44–37.15.66 [<i>c</i>])	Ch. 36 (pp. 36.36.22–26 [= <i>a</i>]; 36.36.26–37.36.6 [= <i>b</i>]; ^b 37.36.6–20 [= <i>c</i>])
5.	Ch. 27 (pp. 41.27.1–42.27.19)	Ch. 37 (pp. 37.37.27–38.37.8)
6.	Ch. 29 (pp. 43.29.1–18)	Ch. 38 (pp. 38.38.14–24) (with slight differences)
7.	Ch. 31 (pp. 44.31.10–45.31.27)	Ch. 39 (pp. 38.39.28–39.39.7) ^c
8.	Ch. 43 (pp. 52.43.1–53.43.16)	Ch. 40 (pp. 39.40.11–24) ^d
9.	Ch. 45 (pp. 54.45.6–11)	Ch. 41 (pp. 39.41.33–40.41.3) ^e

18 Heisenberg, “Die Bedeutung” (see n. 15), p. 58.

19 Ibid.

No.	Original text by Camaterus	Its appropriation (or a shortened borrowing; see the notes) by Mesarites
10.	Ch. 47 (pp. 55.47.1–56.47.28)	Ch. 42 (pp. 40.42.18–41.42.4) ^f
11.	Ch. 49 (pp. 57.49.3–12)	Ch. 43 (pp. 41.43.10–18)
12.	Ch. 51 (pp. 58.51.1–6 [a]; 59.51.10–13 [b])	Ch. 44 (pp. 41.44.27–31 [= a]; 41.44.34–42.44.3 [= b])
13.	Ch. 53 (pp. 59.53.1–60.1.23)	Ch. 45 (pp. 42.45.10–27) ^g

- a There are two slight *variae lectiones* in Mesarites as compared to the original text of Camaterus: *post κορυφαϊότατον om. Mesarites Πέτρον* (Mesarites, p. 35.34.5; cf. Camaterus, p. 27.7.20–21); *ἀν εἴη* (Ibid., p. 28.7.51); *ἀν ἦν* (Mesarites, p. 35.34.28). Here, as in other cases, Mesarites' text is slightly less exact than its source.
- b Slight modifications occur in Mesarites' text. See our remarks below.
- c The only important *varia lectio* here is: *ἐξ ἐνός ... αἰτίου ἐκατέρῳ ἢ πρόδοος* (Camaterus, p. 45.31.24–25; cf. in app. crit.: *ἐκατέροις* [the manuscript S reading]); *ἐξ ἐνός ... αἰτίου ἐκατέρα ἢ πρόδοος* (Mesarites, p. 39.39.4–5). The latter wording – “both processions” – is less reliable and is to be treated, in all probability, as a scribal error. It is extremely unlikely that Mesarites would equate the Son's and the Holy Spirit's modes of coming into being by calling both of them “procession.” It may be the case that the text here is a certain correction of Nicholas' text by Constantine Meliteniotes or some other opponent of Gregory of Cyprus.
- d There is an important *varia lectio* here. Referring to *Is. 11, 2*, Camaterus says: *οὐκ ἐξ ἐκάστης τούτων ἔχειν τὸ Πνεῦμα ... τὴν ἐκπόρευσιν* (Camaterus, p. 53.43.12–13) (“the Holy Spirit possesses His procession ... not from each one of [these energies]”; or “... not from each one of [the designations] of these [things]”); whereas the text by Mesarites reads: *οὐκ ἐξ ἐκάστου τούτων ἔχειν τὸ Πνεῦμα ... τὴν ἐκπόρευσιν* (Mesarites, p. 39.40.20–21), that is, “not from each one of [these things].” In addition, in this passage we find the phrase *ὑπαρξιν ἔχειν* which would be important for Gregory of Cyprus and George Moskhambars (cf., e.g., Μονιού, Γεώργιος Μοσχάμπαρ (see n. 4), p. 313.13–22, esp. p. 313.16–17; Greg. Cypri., *Expositio fidei*, in PG, 142, col. 237D; Idem, *Contra Marcum*, Ibid., col. 249A, 250A, 250C–251B), and a well-known argument about the lack of identity between the relations of belonging to somebody and originating from somebody, which we find, for example, in George Pachymeres' small treatise *Adversus eos qui dicunt ideo dici Spiritum Filii, quod habeat eandem atque ille naturam vel quod dignis ab eo suppediatur* (PG 144, col. 924B–928D; see also D. I. Makarov, “The Target of George Pachymeres' Polemics in his Treatise on the Holy Spirit,” *Scr*, 4 (2008), pp. 235–248).
- e Thus, only a part of Camaterus' Ch. 45 is reproduced by Mesarites in his Ch. 41, since Mesarites chose the most crucial fragments of his source, which he needed for his own argument.
- f There is a *varia lectio* here: *post ὁ μὲν add. Mesarites ἦτοι ὁ υἱός* (Mesarites, p. 40.42.36; cf.: Camaterus, p. 56.47.23).
- g The abridgment of the first sentence in Mesarites shows us that either Mesarites himself or the scribe cut out the quotation from *Is. 29:13*, probably, without recognizing the Scriptural allusion. Cf.: Camaterus, p. 59.53.1–3; Mesarites, p. 42.45.10–11. In all probability, the person responsible for this omission must have been a scribe, because it is unlikely that a Byzantine Metropolitan was unaware of the Scriptural citation.

TABLE 1 *Borrowings from the Sacred Arsenal of Andronicus Camaterus (ca. 1174–1175) (cont.)*

No.	Original text by Camaterus	Its appropriation (or a shortened borrowing; see the notes) by Mesarites
14.	Ch. 55 (pp. 61.55.1–62.55.33)	Ch. 46 (pp. 42.46.34–43.46.23)
15.	Ch. 57 (pp. 63.57.1–64.57.19)	Ch. 47 (pp. 43.47.29–44.47.6)
16.	Ch. 61 (pp. 65.61.2–25)	Ch. 48 (pp. 44.48.15–32) ^h
17.	Ch. 63 (pp. 66.63.1–68.63.48)	Ch. 49 (pp. 45.49.6–46.49.8) ⁱ

- h The *variae lectiones* are not significant here. For example, we can find two cases of γούν being used in Camaterus (pp. 65.5, 65.11), while in Mesarites we see οὖν in the first case and γούν in the second (Mesarites, pp. 44.16, 44.21). This alteration does not affect the meaning of the sentence.
- i It is characteristic that in the first phrase of the fragment Mesarites modified Camaterus' first person ἐπεχειρήσαμεν ("we have tried") and put ἐπεχειρήσατε ("you have tried") instead of it (cf.: Camaterus, p. 66.63.1–2; Mesarites, p. 45.49.6). This may serve as an illustration of the slightly unfriendly attitude of the Metropolitan of Ephesus towards his Latin interlocutors.

First, we should evaluate the weight of the borrowings in the general scope of the text. Since the cohesive text of the *Account* begins with Chapter 4, the size of Chapters 4–61 is about 1437 lines, while the borrowings from Camaterus is about 285 lines. This means that about 19.8 % (or about one fifth) of Mesarites' text does not belong to him, but was taken in almost intact form from the *Sacred Arsenal*. Thus, we may consider the *Account* a complex narration incorporating Camaterus' Trinitarian doctrine in its integrity, and it would be probably better to describe the *Account* as a work of two authors. However, we should not give too much weight to the question of authorship. Even if Nicholas Mesarites' text was the only channel of transmission for Andronicus Camaterus' ideas, the same position concerning unchangeability of properties and the interpenetration of the Persons of the Holy Trinity was sufficiently strong for making a pronounced influence on the Orthodox theologians of the second half of the thirteenth century; most likely, it might have been known to such erudites as Nicephorus Blemmydes, Theodore Hexapterygus, George Acropolites and probably George Moschambar, who also was a Professor of the Gospels in the Patriarchal Academy in Constantinople in the 1270s–1280s.²⁰

20 This was the office he held in 1281, to judge from the subscription of his *Antirrhetici against Veccus*. See V. Laurent, "Un polémiste grec de la fin du XIII^e siècle. La vie et les oeuvres de Georges Moschabar," *Echos d'Orient*, 28 (1929), pp. 129–158, p. 133.

However, in our case, Nicholas Mesarites' idea of the interpenetration of the Persons in the Holy Trinity was definitely borrowed from Andronicus Camaterus.²¹ As an example, one could point at a similarity between Camaterus' notion of τὴν ἐν ἀλλήλοις ἀδιάρρηκτον ἀλληλουχίαν (lit. "mutual holding together, not torn in pieces" [of the Persons])²² and George Moskhambars phrase τὸ φεραλλήλως ἔχεσθαι ("to cling closely to [or "toward," "in the direction of." – D. M.] each other"),²³ which was also applied to the hypostases of the Holy Trinity.

There are some more instances of Andronicus Camaterus' affinity to George Moskhambars. According to Camaterus, the natural properties of the Hypostases had "equal honor in all the three Persons."²⁴ In turn, Moskhambars thus wrote in 1281, "...the natural properties are common for the nature [in general]."²⁵ This idea would become a stumbling block in the Hesychast controversy of the mid fourteenth century because it could be interpreted in two opposite ways – one followed by Nicephorus Gregoras in his dispute with Palamas in 1355, and another by Gregory Palamas²⁶ and his followers, including, for example, the next Archbishop of Thessalonica, Nilus Cabasilas, immediately after 1351. Thus, for Gregoras, natural properties of the Trinity were inextricably commingled with the divine nature, which implied the lack of any differentiation between the *logoi* of substance and the *logoi* of energy in God.²⁷ Conversely, Nilus Cabasilas emphasized that divine properties were neither dissolved in

21 Camaterus, p. 67.63.17–19; Mesarites, p. 45.49.19–21.

22 Camaterus, p. 67.63.18–19.

23 Μονιού, *Γεώργιος Μοσχάμπαρ* (see n. 4), p. 294.87–92; cf. also τῇ φεραλλήλῳ (Ibid., p. 298.207); τῷ λόγῳ τῆς φεραλλήλῳ (Ibid., p. 408.140; 416.73; 426.88–89).

24 Camaterus, p. 42.27.5–6; cf.: Mesarites, p. 37.30–31.

25 Μονιού, *Γεώργιος Μοσχάμπαρ* (see n. 4), p. 302.31–32. See above note 20 on the dating.

26 We may recall, for example, his *Third Letter to Akindynos* where we find the essential principle of the Palamites, according to which the divine energy was not equal to the divine supra-substance (in the language of Areopagite), being its living manifestation in the world and its gift (δῶρον), or, to put it another way, a kind of θεότης ὑφειμένη (see J. S. Nadal Cañellas, S.J., "La redaction première de la *Troisième lettre de Palamas à Akindynos*," *OCF*, 40/1 (1974), pp. 233–285, here p. 252.5.10–12). Here we will not go into detail on the polemics around the latter definition, but this by no means implies any kind of subordination in God, since it describes the act of the living revelation in time of His eternal energy and glory, addressed to the righteous and holy.

27 M. Candal, "Fuentes Palamíticas. Diálogo de Jorge Facrás sobre el contradictorio de Pálamas con Nicéforo Grégoras," *OCF*, 16 (1950), p. 330.4.27–28). On the philosophical background of Gregoras see D. S. Biriukov, Commentary 17, in: *Георгий Факрасис, Диспут св. Григория Паламы с Григорой философом. Философские и богословские аспекты паламитских споров* [Georgius Fakrasis, *The Disputation of St. Gregory Palamas with Gregoras, the Philosopher. The Philosophical and Theological Aspects of the Palamite Con-*

the substance of God nor were commingled with it.²⁸ Cabasilas' position was close to that of Georges Moskhambor who had affirmed some seventy years before that the divine energy had to be considered "the natural product (παρακοιούθημα) of the divine nature,"²⁹ which could not dissolve in the substance of God. Moreover, it was that same energy which ensured the mutual interpenetration of the Persons in the Holy Trinity.

If we try to build a typology of Mesarites' techniques of quotation, two main approaches can be identified. The first approach is direct quoting of Camaterus with only minor changes in phrasing and syntax (Tables 2 and 3), while the second approach is somewhat radical altering or abbreviating the source (Table 4).

2.1 First Type of Borrowing

Our first example will be No. 4 of Table 1. The texts from Table 2 discuss unchangeability of personal properties.

TABLE 2 Borrowing from Camaterus' text on unchangeable personal properties in Mesarites

Camaterus, p. 35.15.35–36	Mesarites, p. 36.36.28–30
ὧν ἕκαστος τῶν προσωπικῶν τουτωνὶ χαρακτῆρων ἀμετάπτωτος μένει ὡπερ ἐμπέπηγεν·	ὧν ἕκαστον τῶν προσωπικῶν τουτωνὶ χαρακτῆρων ἀμετάπτωτον μένει ὡ παρεμπέ- πηγεν ^a ἰδιώματι·

- a On the meaning of παρεμπήγνυμι, see *Lexikon zur byzantinischen Gräzität*, Vol. VI, ed. E. Trapp (Wien, 2007), p. 1233: "hineinstoßen."

The translation of Camaterus' original text is, "Each of the personal [characteristics] remains immutable (or "unmoved." – *D. M.*) in the property in which it has been anchored."

trovery], ed. D. S. Biriukov (Σμάραγδος Φιλοκαλίας), The Holy Mount Athos – Moscow, 2009, pp. 92–99.

- 28 He stated this in his so-called *Rule of Faith* (shortly after 1351, according to Fr. Theophilos Kislas). See the edition and our commentaries to the Russian translation of the text (together with D. Biriukov): M. Candal, "La Regla teológica de Nilo Cabásilas," *OCP*, 23 (1957), pp. 237–266; *EINAI. Προβλήματα φιλοσοφίας u θεολογίας* [*Problems of Philosophy and Theology*], 2 (2) (2012), pp. 390–394 (an introductory note by D. Makarov), pp. 395–405 (Russian translation and commentary). On the dating of the *Rule* see Th. Kislas, "Introduction," in: Nil Cabasilas, *Sur le Saint-Esprit*, ed. Th. Kislas (Paris, 2001), pp. 66, 75.
- 29 Μονιοῦ, Γεώργιος *Μοσχάμπαρ* (see n. 4), p. 419.142–143.

From the analysis of Table 2, it becomes clear that Mesarites' intricate phrasing with a rare verb ὦ παρεμπέπηγεν occurred due to the splitting of the original pronoun ὦπερ, which was in Camaterus in the form ὦπερ ἐμπέπηγεν. The sentence in its present form must have appeared in the *Account* by a scribal error. The erroneous pronoun ἕκαστον as applied to the noun χαρακτήρ in Mesarites (instead of the required form ἕκαστος) is a further confirmation of our suggestion.

Had not the Persons preserved their individual properties, their interpenetration, which was the main subject of Blemmydes' or Moskhambars' thought, would not have been possible. Despite the ostensibly simple character of the argument in Table 2, it turns out to be one of the most important building blocks of the Orthodox Trinitarian doctrine since the Cappadocians until the present day. For proving his point, Mesarites copied the entire page and a half from the *Sacred Arsenal* with only five minor changes (Table 3).

TABLE 3 *The rest of the quotation from Chapter 15 of the Sacred Arsenal in Mesarites*

Camaterus, p. 35.15.34–37.15.66	Mesarites, p. 37.36.1–20
<p>Πῶς δ' αὖ ἐνὸς ἐσεῖται γνωριστικὸν τὸ νῦν μὲν ἐπὶ τοῦτο τῶν προσώπων, ἄλλοτε δ' ἐπ' ἄλλο μεταβαῖνόν τε καὶ μεταχωροῦν; Μένει γοῦν ἕκαστον τῶν προσωπικῶν χαρακτηρισμάτων ἀκίνητόν τε καὶ ἀμετάπτωτον· ἥνωνται γοῦν ἀσυγχύτως τοῖς φυσικοῖς, καὶ ἀδιαιρέτως τοῖς ὑποστατικοῖς διήρηνται ἰδιώμασι τὰ τρία τῆς μιᾶς θεότητος πρόσωπα, ἢ οικειοτέρως εἰπεῖν, τὰ ἐν οἷς ἡ θεότης ἢ ἅπερ ἡ θεότης ἐστίν.</p> <p>Οὐ μοναρχίᾳ γὰρ ἡμεῖς καταστενοῦμεν θεότητα, οὐδ' ἀφθονίᾳ προσώπων πολυαρχίαν εἰσάγομεν. Μηδεὶς γὰρ οἰέσθω τρεῖς εἶναι ἀρχικὰς ὑποστάσεις· ἀρχὴ γὰρ τῶν ὄντων μία, διὰ τοῦ Υἱοῦ ἐνεργοῦσα καὶ τελειοῦσα διὰ τοῦ Πνεύματος· καὶ οὔτε ὁ Πατήρ, ὁ τὰ πάντα ἐν ἅπασιν ἐνεργῶν [1 Cor. 12:6], ἀτελὴ τινα ἔχει τὴν οἰκείαν ἐνέργειαν, οὔτε ὁ Υἱὸς ἐλλιπὴ, τελειομένην διὰ τοῦ</p>	<p>πῶς δ' αὖ ἐνὸς ἐσεῖται γνωριστικὸν τὸ νῦν μὲν ἐπὶ τοῦτο τῶν προσώπων, ἄλλοτε δ' ἐπ' ἄλλο μεταβαῖνόν τε καὶ μεταχωροῦν; μένει γοῦν ἕκαστον τῶν προσωπικῶν χαρακτηρισμάτων ἀκίνητόν τε καὶ ἀμετάπτωτον· ἥνωνται γοῦν ἀσυγχύτως τοῖς φυσικοῖς <u>ἀυχήμασι</u> [1] καὶ ἀδιαιρέτως τοῖς ὑποστατικοῖς διήρηνται ἰδιώμασι τὰ τρία τῆς μιᾶς θεότητος πρόσωπα. [No break in the text.]</p> <p>ἀρχὴ γὰρ τῶν ὄντων μία, διὰ τοῦ υἱοῦ ἐνεργοῦσα καὶ τελειοῦσα διὰ τοῦ πνεύματος,</p>

TABLE 3 *The rest of the quotation from Chapter 15 of the Sacred Arsenal in Mesarites (cont.)*

Camaterus, p. 35.15.34–37.15.66	Mesarites, p. 37.36.1–20
<p>Πνεύματος, ἀλλὰ μία καὶ ἡ αὐτὴ ἐνέργεια τῆς θεότητος ἐν ἐκάστῃ θεωρεῖται τῶν ὑποστάσεων, ἡ αὐτὴ κατ' ἀριθμὸν καὶ οὐκ ἄλλη τυγχάνουσα. Τρία γοῦν νοητέον τὸν εὐδοκοῦντα Πατέρα, τὸν δημιουργοῦντα Υἱόν, καὶ τὸ Πνεῦμα τὸ στερεοῦν. Κατὰ τὴν ἀρίστην οὖν ταύτην τάξιν τε καὶ κατὰστασιν παιδαγωγικῶς καὶ εἰσαγωγικῶς ἐξ ἀρχῆς τὸ τῆς θεογνωσίας [2] τριπλῶς προελήλυθε κήρυγμα καὶ τὸ προκαταρκτικὸν τῶν ὅλων αἴτιον καὶ αὐτῆς τῆς θεότητος ρίζα τε καὶ πηγὴ ὁ Πατὴρ προκηρύττεται, τὸ δὲ δημιουργικὸν αἴτιον ὁ Υἱὸς ἐμφανίζεται, τὸ δὲ τελειωτικὸν καὶ ἀγιαστικὸν τὸ Πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον δημοσιεύεται.</p> <p>Τούτων οὕτως πρὸς τὴν παρούσαν χρεῖαν διευκρινηθέντων καλῶς, καὶ ὡς κοινῶν λημμάτων ὑποτεθέντων ἡμῖν καὶ παρ' ἀμφοῖν ὁμολογουμένων, πῶς οὐ συγγένων ἔσται τις καὶ μεταλλάττων κακῶς [4] τὸ τοῦ Πατρὸς γνωριστικὸν χαρακτήρισμα, τὸ τοῦ Πνεύματος δηλονότι προβλητικόν, εἴπερ καὶ τῷ Υἱῷ αὐτῷ [5] δὴ τοῦτο προσμαρτυρεῖ;</p>	<p>ἀλλὰ μία καὶ ἡ αὐτὴ ἐνέργεια τῆς θεότητος ἐν ἐκάστῃ θεωρεῖται τῶν ὑποστάσεων, ἡ αὐτὴ κατ' ἀριθμὸν καὶ οὐκ ἄλλη τυγχάνουσα. τρία γοῦν νοητέον, τὸν εὐδοκοῦντα πατέρα, τὸν δημιουργοῦντα υἱὸν καὶ τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ στερεοῦν. κατὰ τὴν ἀρίστην οὖν ταύτην τάξιν τε καὶ κατὰστασιν παιδαγωγικῶς καὶ εἰσαγωγικῶς ἐξ ἀρχῆς τὸ τῆς θεότητος [2] τριπλῶς προελήλυθε κήρυγμα, καὶ τὸ προκαταρκτικὸν τῶν ὅλων αἴτιον καὶ αὐτῆς τῆς θεότητος ρίζα τε καὶ πηγὴ ὁ πατὴρ προκηρύττεται, τὸ δὲ δημιουργικὸν αἴτιον ὁ υἱὸς ἐμφανίζεται, τὸ δὲ τελειωτικὸν καὶ ἀγιαστικὸν χαρακτήρισμα [3] τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον δημοσιεύεται.</p> <p>τούτων οὕτως πρὸς τὴν παρούσαν χρεῖαν διευκρινηθέντων</p> <p>πῶς οὐ συγγένων ἔσται τις καὶ μεταλλάττων τὸ τοῦ Πατρὸς γνωριστικὸν χαρακτήρισμα, τὸ τοῦ Πνεύματος δηλονότι προβλητικόν, εἴπερ καὶ τῷ Υἱῷ αὐτῷ [5] δὴ τοῦτο προσμαρτυρεῖ;</p>

The translation of the Camaterus' text is as follows,

"Furthermore, could it be the distinguishing characteristic of one Person such [a characteristic] which sometimes belongs to one Person and sometimes passes over and is transferred to the other [Person]?³⁰ Each of the personal characteristics remains unmoved and immutable. For the three Persons of the one divinity, or better to say Those, in Whom divinity abides and those Who

30 Here an obvious allusion to the *Filioque* can be seen.

are divinity Themselves, are united without confusion due to their natural [characteristics *add. Mesarites* {1}], and at the same time are indivisibly divided due to the hypostatic characteristics.

Thus, we neither confine the divinity to the monarchy, nor do we introduce the polyarchy due to the multiplicity of Persons. And let no one think that there are three initial hypostases, for the Principle of beings is one, He, Who operates through the Son and perfects [everything] through the Holy Spirit. And, indeed, neither the energy of the Father, Who *worketh all in all* (1 Cor. 12:6), possesses any imperfection, nor the own energy of Son has any deficiency, being perfected by the Holy Spirit, but one and the same energy of the divinity is contemplated in each hypostasis, identical to itself in number, and not some other [energy]. Thus, we should think about the Three – the benevolent Father, the creating Son, and the strengthening Spirit. It is, then, in accordance with this best order and state, pedagogically and in an introductory way, the knowledge of God [of the Divinity: *Mesarites* {2}] proceeded thrice from the beginning. The Father as the initial cause of everything and the root and source of the very divinity was proclaimed first; [then] the Son revealed Himself as the creative cause, and then the perfecting and sanctifying Holy Spirit was manifested.

Now, when we have examined perfectly and thoroughly these [things] which are needed for the present treatise, when we have posed them as general premises and have interrogated them on both sides, would not the person who all of a sudden would ascribe it to the Son (*Mesarites*: to the Son Himself {5}) appear distorting and *in a bad fashion*³¹ {4} altering the distinguishing characteristic of the Father, that is, the procession of the Holy Spirit?"

Five differences which we marked in brackets are the proof that *Mesarites'* text is a cleverly compiled summary of the *Sacred Arsenal*. We would focus on the third difference in more detail, because in describing the Holy Spirit as "character" *Mesarites* turns out to be less exact than *Camaterus*, tending to commingle the *logoi* (principles) of hypostasis and the hypostatic properties in God.

2.2 Second Type of Borrowings

In a sentence from the parallel No. 12 (see Table 1), *Mesarites* or the scribe (and this latter assumption seems to be less problematic) reworked *Camaterus'* text in such a way that the hypostatic property of the Father became altered. The original term γεννητικῶς ("in a generating manner") which was a classical definition of the Father as the eternal Begetter of the Only-begotten Son, was

³¹ This expression was omitted by *Mesarites*.

transformed into γεννητῶς (being begotten),³² which is far from being a correct definition of the Father. The Byzantine scribes of Mesarites' text in the thirteenth–fourteenth centuries must have been not very diligent in accurately copying his text. We would not dwell here on similar occurrences, the number of which can easily be multiplied,³³ but would rather point to a more important topic, especially in the light of the Palamite theology, that is, the energies and graces of God. The parallel No. 17 (see Table 1) is a Camaterus' sentence, which was abbreviated by Mesarites in a rather "risky" way (Table 4).

TABLE 4 A "risky" abbreviation in Camaterus' text by Mesarites

Camaterus, p. 67.63.31–33	Mesarites, p. 45.49.30–32
... διὰ τὸ μέρος τῶν τοῦ Πνεύματος ποικίλων χαρισμάτων καὶ δωρεῶν εἶναι τὴν τῶν ἀκαθάρτων πνευμάτων ἐξέλασιν.	... διὰ μέρος τῶν ποικίλων χαρισμάτων καὶ δωρεῶν εἶναι τὴν τῶν ἀκαθάρτων πνευμάτων ἐξέλασιν.

The text of Mesarites does not specify whose gifts and energies are described, and one might assign the operations of the Holy Spirit to any other actor (such as an angel) thus distorting the Trinitarian doctrine of the text. Such language was typical in describing the operations of angels since the times of Dionysius the Areopagite. Thus, for example, in the *Invocation of the Holy Archangels Michael and Gabriel* by Metrophanes, the Metropolitan of Smyrna (the late ninth century) (*BHG* 1292) we can read about the Archangels as being "the intellectual, lofty and luminous clouds of spiritual storms and gifts (τῶν νοητῶν ὀμβρῶν καὶ δωρεῶν) of the divine."³⁴ The ὀμβρῶν here was used to convey the idea of some powerful force which distributed the divine gifts first to the members of the Church, and then to other created beings. The parallel is even more justifiable since the topic of hunting wild beasts by the Archangels is the immediate continuation of Metrophanes' *Invocation* as well. Yet, in Mesarites' treatise which is centered on the Trinitarian theology, such a confusing omission of τοῦ

32 Cf. Camaterus, p. 58.51.3–6; Mesarites, p. 41.44.29–31.

33 Cf., for example, Camaterus, p. 58.51.1–3; Mesarites, p. 41.44.27–28; and: Camaterus, p. 61.55.1–4 (ἀλλεπάλληλον, lit. "one following another," "one after another"); Mesarites, pp. 42.46.34–43.46.1 (ἀκατάλληλον, "irrelevant," "improper").

34 E. Gielen and P. Van Deun, "The Invocation of the Archangels Michael and Gabriel Attributed to Metrophanes, Metropolitan of Smyrna (*BHG* 1292)," *BZ*, 108/2 (2015), pp. 653–671, see pp. 660.100–101, 660.104–105 (the Greek text), p. 667 (English translation by the editors).

Πνεύματος could be misleading. Nevertheless, Nicholas Mesarites, the Metropolitan of Ephesus seems to have reached his goal of presenting a coherent system of arguments against the *Filioque* to the Latins, since he was a faithful compiler of the *Sacred Arsenal*. It did not matter for Mesarites that it was only a borrowing from the earlier source. Thus, he can be called a “theologian of transition.”

Nicholas Mesarites, the Metropolitan of Ephesus was only a forerunner of the awakening of the Photian tradition of Trinitarian theology which we see emerging in the writings of Nicephorus Blemmydes, Gregory of Cyprus, and Georges Moskhambard. The *Antirrhethics against Veccus* by Moskhambard provides us with such formulations of the concept of interpenetration of the Persons in the Holy Trinity, which are traceable to some doctrines of Camaterus. Since John Veccus and Constantine Meliteniotes composed special treatises against Andronicus Camaterus, we can think that it was quite natural for Gregory of Cyprus and George Moskhambard to turn to Andronicus' ideas. Even though Mesarites' role in the transition process might have been only that of a *florilegium* for the later theologians, his efforts provided his successors with a set of arguments against the *Filioque* and other deviations from the classical Eastern Christian Trinitarian theology.