The Jansenist Controversy and the *Panoplia*

The latest period of the Jansenist controversy coincided with the initial phases of the preparation of the Tîrgoviște edition. The chapter on the Eucharist was discussed by Western theologians when Patriarch Dositheos was preparing the edition of his polemic collection. During the Jansenist Controversy, which marked theological debates in Western Europe in the second half the seventeenth century to a great extent, the Jansenists and their Calvinist opponents turned to the legacy of the Orthodox Church in search of arguments to support their views. The first contact on behalf of the Jansenists was made through the French ambassador in Sweden who requested information on the Orthodox view on *transubstantiation* from Nicolae Milescu Spatharios (1636–1708), a Moldavian nobleman and diplomat. Milesu’s reply encouraged Jansenist theologians to enhance their contacts with the Greek Church. For this reason they approached Patriarch Dositheos II, the Patriarch of Constantinople Dionysios IV, and Panagiotis Nikousios, who initially took a favorable position. As a result of this short cooperation some Orthodox authors were quoted in the main work of the Jansenists, *La perpétuité de la foi de l’Église Catholique, touchant l’Eucharistie, défendue contre le livre du Sieur Claude, ministre de Char- enton*. Moreover, the acts of the Synod of Jerusalem, organized by Dositheos were published in Paris in two editions—1676, 1678. The cooperation between the patriarch of Jerusalem and the French Catholics quickly ended with the disputes over the protection of the Holy Places, which began in 1674. But still, the Jansenists used the provided material and in 1709 published the works of more recent theologians, who have written on the Eucharist—Patriarch Gennadius, Meletios Pigas, Nektarios of Jerusalem and Meletios Syrigos (*De sacramento eucharistiae*, Paris, 1709).

---


Among the Greek fragments the Jansenists employed were some taken from the *Panoplia* of Emperor Alexios I Komnenos. Two of the prominent authors of *La perpétuité de la foi*, Antoine Arnauld and Eusèbe Renaudot were interested in the Eucharistic chapter of the anthology. Their references coincided with the moves by the Orthodox to publish the book.

Antoine Arnauld made the lengthiest reference to the *Panoplia*. It contains a summary of everything which was said by earlier authors in connection with Christ’s Real Presence in the Eucharist. Arnauld’s reference can be found in the second appendix of the present study since this is the most authoritative work of the Jansenist movement.

The fourth volume of *La perpétuité de la foi* contains one more reference to the *Panoplia*, this time by Eusèbe Renaudot. Renaudot discusses the volume of Patriarch Dositheos, published in 1672 in Paris, and the differences introduced by the patriarch in the second edition of the same book published in Bucharest (1690). Renaudot emphasizes that this is an edition sponsored by an Orthodox ruler, carried out by Greeks, and accepted without reservation in its natural milieu. Renaudot retells the account of Patriarch Dositheos in the *Panoplia* in connection with Berengar, quoted in an earlier section of this study. His full account is provided in the third appendix.

With this the story of the usage of the *Panoplia* in the seventeenth century should be over, had there been one more theological detail. It can be observed that the earlier authors preferred to refer to the texts of Gregory of Nyssa concerning the Eucharistic questions in chapter 25. But Arnauld himself did not hesitate to employ the fragment by John Damascene. The question was that the lines of Damascene’s text were problematic and referred to a view in which Orthodox and Catholics differed. This difference concerns the moment of the consecration of the Holy Gifts. For the Catholics the mystery happens with the Words of Institution “This is My Body ... This is My Blood”. According to Orthodox tradition the consecration consists of three elements: Thanksgiving, Anamnesis and Epiclesis. The mystery is completed at the Epiclesis, the invocation of the Holy Spirit to descend upon Holy Gifts and to sanctify them. The liturgy of St. Basil the Great contained a word describing the Eucharistic gifts which had a certain ambiguity—the word ἀντίτυπα, which can mean figure, symbol, image or sign, and is used for the offering before the moment of Epiclesis. While in part of the Orthodox tradition it did not raise problems, it was still felt that the word needs some clarification in the sense that it does not deny that Christ was fully and not figuratively present

---
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