



**Second Annual Academic Symposium**  
at  
**St Vladimir's Orthodox Theological Seminary**

Co-organized by  
**Ionuț-Alexandru Tudorie &  
Marie-Hélène Blanchet**

**November 2–4, 2023**

## Entangled Christian Polemics in the Late Byzantine Empire (13<sup>th</sup>–15<sup>th</sup> c.)

An impressive number of recent studies were devoted to religious polemics between Christians of the Byzantine commonwealth, but many were rather focused on the conflicts connected to the first ecumenical councils, the iconoclastic controversy or to the major anti-heretical writings from the Middle Byzantine period like the one by Euthymios Zigabenos.

However, a new *heresy* was added around the mid-14th century, the one having Barlaam and Akindynos as perpetrators, which divided the Palamites and anti-Palamites, while other controversies were connected with it, sometimes acknowledged as heresies and sometimes as schisms. These controversies targeted the Latins and their supporters, the Byzantine Unionists, but also the Arsenites, without forgetting the Bogomils. These different discourses often intertwined or overlapped up to the point that one accusation would, in fact, disguise another.

Therefore, the Late Byzantine period (13th–15th century) could be easily characterized by a multiplicity of assumed Christian religious deviances, to which we have to add those of the Jews and Muslims, and also by a growing religious literature heavily imbued with the idea of open conflict. The censures of the various dissenting groups are pronounced in the name of a needed uniformity to the religious *dogma* and *praxis*, which were defined in relation to ancient heresies, and uniformity to a *corpus* of texts that formed the theological and canonical tradition. However, the religious *dogma* and *praxis* is partly challenged by new theological interpretations, and the authority that claims to keep and protect the true religious *dogma* and *praxis* is now claimed by different actors. The Church itself becomes a major player charged with authority of investing power since it constitutes the institutional body responsible for establishing and disseminating the Orthodox faith.

These controversies which overlap and are entangled between the 13th and 15th centuries can therefore be approached from at least three viewpoints:

1) the contribution to the definition or redefinition of what constitutes the truthful Orthodox tradition and what is *novelty* and should be rejected and excluded, therefore of Orthodoxy and deviance (schism and / or heresy);

2) the different literary genres and various discursive strategies used by both the “heretics” and the “orthodox” to articulate and disseminate these *new ideas* that come to subvert, threaten or transform the Orthodox tradition;

3) the protagonists (individuals, groups, and institutions) who were in a position to determine this limit and define the *true* faith.

Using a similar methodological approach successfully implemented so far in the field of heresiology by Averil Cameron and Tia Kolbaba, our aim is to explore this major topic via a crossed and comparative approach, avoiding thus a mere analysis of a single controversy disconnected from the larger context. The invited speakers are, therefore, asked to contemplate, as much as possible, different intersecting polemical discourses, either in open conflict with each other (Palamite controversy and the discussion regarding the influence of Thomism), contaminated by one another (Palamite controversy and accusations of Bogomilism), subverted one by the other (Arsenite schism and the discussion of the Union between the Latin and the Byzantine Churches), echoes of previous discourses (continuous reference to ancient heresies in order to connect with these new ideas and realities; relations between the unionist discussion and the challenges connected with Thomism), or any other potential relationship that express this entangled polemical context.

**THURSDAY, NOVEMBER 2, 2023**

**7:00pm: Welcome** (Rangos Building / Metrop. Philip Auditorium)

**7:10–8:30pm:** Tia KOLBABA (Rutgers University, New Brunswick NJ), *Old Threats and New: Heresiology in the Final Centuries of the East Roman Empire* (followed by Q&A session)

**8:30pm: Reception** (Rangos Building)

**FRIDAY, NOVEMBER 3, 2023**

**10:00am: Introduction** (Ionuț-Alexandru TUDORIE and Marie-Hélène BLANCHET)

***Definition or Redefinition of Orthodoxy and heterodoxy I***  
(moderator: Tia KOLBABA)

**10:30–11:15am:** Alessandra BUCOSSÌ (University Ca' Foscari, Venice), *“I did not come to bring peace, but a sword” (Mt 10:34). Old and New Heresies and Weapons to Fight them*

**11:15am–12:00pm:** Tikhon Alexander PINO (Holy Cross Greek Orthodox School of Theology, Brookline MA), *Hypostasis or Energies? The Person and Descent of the Holy Spirit in Late Byzantine Polemics*

**12:00–2:00pm: Lunch**

***Definition or Redefinition of Orthodoxy and heterodoxy II***  
(moderator: Tia KOLBABA)

**2:00–2:45pm:** John DEMETRACOPOULOS (University of Patras), *Between Oriental Spirituality and the Western ‘Other’, or Why Thomistic Palamism and Thomistic anti-Palamism Emerged*

**2:45–3:30pm:** Norman RUSSELL (University of Oxford), *“Honored above the Hellenes:” the philosophical stand against the hesychasts of Nikephoros Gregoras*

**3:30–3:45pm: Coffee Break**

***Literary Genres and Discursive Strategies***  
(moderator Raúl ESTANGÜI GÓMEZ)

**3:45–4:30pm:** Cristian Ioan DUMITRU (University of Bucharest / Universität zu Köln), *Between Beliar, Aristotle, and the Church of Christ: Syllogisms, Dialectics, and Theology in Joseph Bryennios’ Twenty-One Homilies on the Trinity*

**4:30–5:15pm:** Francesca SAMORÌ (University of Padova / EPHE, Paris), *Historicizing Christian Polemics. Historiography as a (New) Mean of Dealing with Contemporary Controversies (13th–14th c.)*

**5:15–6:00pm:** Mihai-D. GRIGORE (Leibniz-Institut für Europäische Geschichte, Mainz), *A Synodikon for All? Considerations on the Palaiologan Synodikon of Orthodoxy and its Polemic Valences*

**6:00–6:15pm: Coffee Break**

**6:15–6:45pm: Presentation of Repertorium Auctorum Polemicorum (RAP) database** (Marie-Hélène BLANCHET and Alessandra BUCOSSÌ)

**SATURDAY, NOVEMBER 4, 2023**

***Defining the true faith: the protagonists***  
(moderator: Alessandra BUCOSSÌ)

**9:30–10:15am:** Ionuț-Alexandru TUDORIE (St Vladimir’s Orthodox Theological Seminary, Yonkers NY), *One Church, Two Ecclesiologies: the Arsenite case*

**10:15–11:00am:** Marie-Hélène BLANCHET (CNRS, UMR 8167 Orient et Méditerranée, Paris), *How to Stop an Internal Religious Controversy? The Authority of the Byzantine Emperor*

**11:00–11:45am:** Raúl ESTANGÜI GÓMEZ (CSIC, Madrid), *The Condemnation of Heresy by the Patriarchal Court of Constantinople in the second half of the 14th century*

**11:45am–12:00pm: Coffee Break**

**12:00–1:00pm: Conclusions** (moderator: Fr Christiaan KAPPES, Ss. Cyril and Methodius Byzantine Catholic Seminary, Pittsburgh PA)

**1:00pm: Lunch**

## Bios & Abstracts

**Tia Kolbaba** is an Associate Professor of Religion at Rutgers University, where she teaches courses on Christian history (from the New Testament to the present), religion and right-wing movements, and religious issues and current events. Her publications and research interests focus on relations between eastern and western Christians in the Middle Ages, especially on East Roman perceptions of and responses to western Christian doctrine and practice. Recently she has focused more broadly on East Roman heresiology related to Armenians, Paulicians, and Bogomils as she seeks to understand eastern Christian constructions of identity vis-à-vis different “others.” More specifically, her historian’s obsession is with the chronology of changes in those constructions from the middle Byzantine period to the end of the empire.

### ***Old Threats and New: Heresiology in the Final Centuries of the East Roman Empire***

Eastern Christian responses to the Latin West in the Palaiologan period changed dramatically as East Roman intellectuals became aware of western theological developments and were, in many cases, impressed by the sophistication of western thought and method. While Middle Byzantine heresiology had been as concerned with Armenians, Paulicians, and Bogomils as with Latins, the last now became virtually an obsession. The long-held East Roman condescension toward western theology wavered and then shattered as some eastern scholars read and translated western theological texts and became enamored by what they found there. Others, of course, were more appalled than admiring. The threats to orthodoxy and church unity were both old and new, and the responses to those threats looked both backward to older heresiological traditions and forward to modern Orthodox anti-Catholic polemics. This paper will provide a diachronic and comparative perspective on Palaiologan theological controversies, with specific emphasis on identifying the unique features of heresiology in the last centuries of the East Roman Empire.

**Alessandra Bucossi** is an Associate Professor of Byzantine Studies at Università Ca’ Foscari (Venice). Her main research interests are the relationship between East and West in the medieval world and, particularly, the division between the Greek and the Latin Churches between the 9th and the 13th centuries. Her major publications are the critical editions of *Andronici Camateri Sacrum Armamentarium – Pars Prima*, CCSG 75 (Turnhout, 2014) and of *Nicetae Thessalonicensis Dialogi sex de*

*processione Spiritus Sancti*, CCSG 92 (Turnhout, 2021; in collaboration with Luigi D’Amelia). In 2020 she co-edited with Anna Calia a volume titled *Contra Latinos et Adversus Graecos: The Separation between Rome and Constantinople from the Ninth to the Fifteenth Century* (Leuven, 2020) in the series *Bibliothèque de Byzantion 22*. She is in charge (with Marie-Hélène Blanchet) of the RAP research project – *Repertorium Auctorum Polemicorum de pace et discordia inter Ecclesiam Graecam et Latinam* (<https://pric.unive.it/projects/rap/home>).

### ***“I did not come to bring peace, but a sword” (Mt 10:34). Old and New Heresies and Weapons to Fight them***

The prodromes, in English medical terminology, are the symptoms that signal the impending onset of a disease. Starting from the metaphor of the disease, well attested in religious literature to define heresies, this paper will introduce to the prodromic developments of the relationship between the Latin and the Greek churches and the attempts at defining and redefining orthodoxy and heterodoxy on the eve of the 13th century. It will present some innovative features of the theological discussions of the period between the 11th and the 12th century and how these are both rooted in the past and forerunners of the discussions that will tear apart the church of the Late Byzantine Empire.

**Tikhon Alexander Pino** (PhD, Marquette University) is Assistant Director of the Pappas Patristic Institute at Holy Cross Greek Orthodox School of Theology in Boston, MA. He is the author of *Essence and Energies: Being and Naming God in St Gregory Palamas* (Routledge, 2022) and has published widely on the Greek theological tradition, from Aristotle and Plotinus to Maximus the Confessor and Mark of Ephesus. His research interests include the relationship between Byzantine and Scholastic theology and the intersection of metaphysics and spirituality/mysticism in the Orthodox tradition.

### ***Hypostasis or Energies? The Person and Descent of the Holy Spirit in Late Byzantine Polemics***

The doctrine of the Filioque and the problem of the procession of the Holy Spirit dominated theological polemics between East and West from the ninth through the fifteenth centuries. The latter part of the Palaiologan period and the final century of the Byzantine empire was no exception, despite the attention diverted in the Orthodox world towards the Barlaamite controversy and its aftermath. Indeed, with the growth of Palamite and pro-Palamite theological discourse, the problem of the Filioque would take on new dimensions, mingling with the foci and em-

phases of the essence-energies distinction to create a new phase in Byzantine anti-Latin polemics. This paper explores these new dimensions and the transformation of anti-Latin discourse in writers like St Gregory Palamas, Neilos Kavasilas, Symeon of Thessalonica, and Mark Eugenikos. It highlights the unique emphasis in Palamite theology on the distinction between the hypostasis and the operations of the Holy Spirit, used not only to distinguish the eternal procession of the Spirit from its economic mission but also to elaborate a doctrine of the gifts and reception of the Holy Spirit in the context of hesychast anthropology, Christology, and spirituality. In addition to exploring the contributions of Palamite theology to the question of the Filioque, this paper also draws attention to the implications of late Byzantine Trinitarian theology for modern patristic studies and systematic and ecumenical theology.

**John A. Demetracopoulos** is an Associate Professor of Philosophy and Theology, Centre for Greek and Latin Philosophical Literature “Linus Benakis”, Department of Philosophy, University of Patras. He directs the *Thomas de Aquino Byzantinus* research project (<https://thab.upatras.gr/>), co-hosted by the Hellenic Institute, Royal Holloway, University of London. He is the coordinator of the “Byzantine Philosophy” Commission of the *Société Internationale pour l’Étude de la Philosophie Médiévale* (S.I.E.P.M.), a member of the editorial board of the ‘Corpus Christianorum – Series Graeca’ (Brepols) and a member of the editorial board of the ‘Byzantinisches Archiv – Series Philosophica’ (De Gruyter).

***Between Oriental Spirituality and the Western ‘Other’, or Why Thomistic Palamism and Thomistic anti-Palamism Emerged***

Palamite hesychasm is a particular type of hesychasm; it consists of elements from Evagrian spirituality and 13th c. Sufi practices and it is theoretically justified by means of elements from the Neoplatonic doctrine of ‘ecstasy’ and the *corpus hermeticum*. Its salient points are the psycho-physical technique of moving the soul from brain to its natural place, i.e. the heart, the doctrine that light is inextricably related to God and the nature of the human soul, the idea that man can participate in God’s light, the idea that this participation, which is an ecstasy, is feasible and even desirable for one to attain in this life, and the theological doctrine of the real distinction between God’s substance and ‘energies’, which, for all its theoretical shortcomings, secures that participation on God does not impair God’s transcendence. Palamite hesychasm emerged as an alternative to the 13th- and 14th c. back-to-ancient-Greece movement, which provided the Byzantine intellectuals with a new identity and a feeling of superiority to the politically, militarily, economically

and culturally flourishing ‘others’, particularly the Europeans, combined with a feeling of ‘Orthodox’ superiority to the ‘heretic’ Latins. Byzantine Thomism emerged thanks to Demetrios Cydones, who by coincidence fell upon Aquinas’ *Summa contra Gentiles* and translated it into Greek. Most of the Byzantine readers of the sixteen Thomistic and Ps.- Thomistic writings fully or partially translated into Greek in the second half of the 14th and first half of the 15th c. underwent the same cultural shock with him, even if some of them reacted to them in a xenophobic way. Palamas’ determined efforts to theoretically – both theologically and philosophically – justify his spirituality paved the way for his sympathizers and opponents to use Aquinas’ philosophical theology in order to re-elaborate, in a more consistent and acceptable form, or refute Palamism. This partially shifted the philosophical terrain of the quarrel from Greek Neoplatonism to Thomism. The core of the disagreement was the issue whether it is possible for humans to reach happiness in *statu viae* by means of participating in God. Aquinas’ Aristotle-based critique of Averroes’ doctrine that the intellect can achieve unity with the intelligible substances in this life was put by certain anti-Palamites in the service of their critique of Palamas’ doctrine of ecstasy and its implication that man can receive full knowledge in this life. The encounter of Palamite hesychasm and Byzantine Thomism was coincidental. Each trend had its own roots. It fortuitously turned out that they crossed each other from the mid-14th to the mid-15th century. This resulted in a number of systematic or occasional efforts to theoretically justify or refute a number of fundamental, pre-philosophical and pre-theological, human stances towards, or feelings of, the world.

**Norman Russell** is Honorary Research Fellow at St Stephen’s House, University of Oxford, and Professor of Patristics and Byzantine Theology at the *Istituto Teologico di Santa Eufemia di Calcedonia* of the Orthodox Exarchate of Italy. He is the author of *The Doctrine of Deification in the Greek Patristic Tradition* (2004), and *Gregory Palamas: The Hesychast Controversy and the Debate with Islam* (2020). Of partly Greek descent, he lives in Burgundy, France.

***“Honored above the Hellenes:” the philosophical stand against the hesychasts of Nikephoros Gregoras***

Nikephoros Gregoras, a student of Theodore Metochites and the inheritor of his magnificent library, was the leading Greek philosopher of the later fourteenth century. His quixotic stand against the Palamites after the synod of 1351 and the insertion of the anathemas of Barlaam and Akindynos into the Synodikon of Orthodoxy was certainly not based on

any calculation of personal advantage. For him the “winged” people, the intellectually superior, had an absolute duty to take a stand against the less talented for the sake of truth. Like Palamas, he recognized that truth was superior to whatever could be arrived at by mere logic. But unlike Palamas, he could not accept the Church Fathers as authorities capable of supporting philosophical argument. The cognitive process for Gregoras is one whereby the intellect ascends from the particular to the intelligible, but also (in the case of the more advanced thinker) whereby the fundamental principles of the intelligible order are the starting-point and serve as a ladder by which the intellect ascends to true wisdom. The study of the celestial bodies is thus a more reliable guide to truth than any authorities rooted in this mutable world. As a Neoplatonist, Gregoras’ greatest bugbear was the compromising of the simplicity of the One (which he did not regard as beyond Being). He accuses Palamas of reifying Proclus’ emanations as divine “energies.” An examination of how each of the two uses the concept of participation, however, reveals problems in Gregoras’ use of the concept as a consequence of his uncompromising monism, which, in my view, are solved by Palamas.

**Cristian Ioan Dumitru** was trained in Orthodox Theology (BA 2019), Classical Philology (BA 2020), and Church History (MA 2021) at the University of Bucharest and is currently pursuing a Ph.D. in Byzantine Studies at the University of Bucharest (Romania) / University of Cologne (Germany). His doctoral project entails the first comprehensive analysis from a dogmatic, rhetorical, and literary perspective of the seminal *Twenty-One Homilies on the Trinity* authored by the Byzantine polemist Joseph Bryennios (c. 1350–c. 1431). His research interests focus on the dogmatic and philosophical polemics in Late Byzantium, the Filioque controversy, the evolution of Medieval Greek, levels of style in Byzantine literature, and textual criticism.

***Between Beliar, Aristotle, and the Church of Christ: Syllogisms, Dialectics, and Theology in Joseph Bryennios’ Twenty-One Homilies on the Trinity***

*The Twenty-One Homilies on the Trinity* are unquestionably Bryennios’ *magnum opus* and his theological testament for Byzantium. They represent a comprehensive articulation of the Orthodox position on the Filioque controversy. The present paper aims to investigate the methodological and apologetical function that the use of syllogisms carried out in the corpus. To this end, Bryennios expresses at length his uncompromising

stance on the subject in the *Fifth Homily* by tacitly reproducing the positions on the matter previously articulated by Barlaam of Calabria and Neilos Kabasilas. Bryennios’ reflex of silently relying on various sources is by no means confined to these two authors, but his writing technique based on unattributed incorporations encompasses a wide range of works and voices (most notably St Gregory Palamas). Although a vehement opponent of the employment of dialectics in theology, Bryennios resorts oftentimes to syllogisms, logic, and even quotations from Thomas Aquinas in order to underpin his theses. In this paper, I argue that this apparent methodological contradiction should be understood, on the one hand, in the broader context of Bryennios’ oeuvre and theological orientation and, on the other hand, by considering the deeply performative and diplomatic nature of the *Trinitarian Homilies*.

**Francesca Samorì** defended her dissertation in Byzantine Studies at the University of Padua (Italy) and the *École Pratique des Hautes Études* (Paris) in June 2023. The dissertation consisted in the first critical edition of the first book of the *Dogmatic History* by George Metochites, with an Italian translation and a commentary. She currently holds a post-doctoral position in Padua conducting a research project for a first survey on the works by John Bekkos and their manuscript tradition, and collaborates with the RAP project within the framework of an Italy-France mobility funding (UFI/UIF).

***Historicizing Christian Polemics. Historiography as a (New) Mean of Dealing with Contemporary Controversies (13th–14th c.)***

My presentation aims at studying the topic of late Byzantine controversies from the point of view of the discursive strategies adopted to convey polemical content. More precisely, the focus will be on the historiographical genre, for I will try to demonstrate how and why historicization of the polemical discourse widely spread in the last decades of the 13th century, and how the polemicists of the Union of Lyons (1274) played a key role in this process. I will argue that the content was significantly modified by this new historical interpretation, especially since history was more and more exploited to justify or condemn the schism between the Byzantine and the Roman Church. Therefore, historical arguments – supported by documentary evidence – became an essential element of the polemic, along with the theological ones. Moreover, I will argue that historicization of the schism for propaganda reasons concerned not only the Latins, but also the dissident groups within the Byzantine Church, as it is the case for the Arsenites.

**Mihai-D. Grigore** is currently an Associate Fellow at the Leibniz Institute of European History (Mainz), with a scholarship of the Gerda Henkel Foundation, conducting research on the mobility of monks and articulation of polycentric orders in the Orthodox World. His research interests include historical and political anthropology (rituals, symbolic communication, semantics) in the Middle Ages and early modern Europe, interconfessional dynamics between Orthodox, Catholics, and Protestants, Byzantine and south-eastern European intellectual history, and political philosophy before the Enlightenment. His major publications include: *Neagoe Basarab – Princeps Christianus. The Semantics of Christianitas in Comparison with Erasmus, Luther, and Machiavelli (1513–1523)* (Peter Lang 2021); Editor of *Orthodoxy on the Move. Mobility, Networks, Belonging between the 16th and 20th centuries* (Special Issue of *Studia Universitatis Babeş-Bolyai Theologia Orthodoxa*, vol. 68/1, 2023); “Eastern Orthodoxy as Confession: An Essay on Principles or Bringing the Synodikon of Orthodoxy into Discussion of Paradigms,” *Travaux et Mémoires* 25.1 (2021) [= *Le monde byzantin du XIII<sup>e</sup> au XV<sup>e</sup> siècle. Anciennes ou nouvelles formes d’impérialité*, ed. Marie-Hélène Blanchet, Raúl Estangüi Gómez], pp. 827–868.

#### **A Synodikon for All? Considerations on the Palaiologan Synodikon of Orthodoxy and its Polemic Valences**

In my paper, I trace the development of the *Synodikon of Orthodoxy* through tides. I aim to trace its change from a basically universal *formula fidei* for all Christianity of the Late Antique Oikumene into a confessional writing of the Orthodox alone. I attempt to underline this by showing how the *Synodikon’s* anathemas turn more and more against the Latins, even when they are not explicitly named, being *de facto* implicitly targeted. The focus falls on the so-called Palaiologan *Synodikon P* in the context of the hesychastic debates of the 14th century. My aim is to analyse the extent to which the Palaiologan version of the *Synodikon* unfolds its polemical potential in the dogmatic, political, and liturgical spheres, not only in the late Byzantine but also in the post-Byzantine period.

**Ionuț-Alexandru Tudorie** (dr. habil.) is Professor of Church History at St Vladimir’s Orthodox Theological Seminary. His research interests focus on Late Byzantine period, especially on Byzantine imperial ideology, Rome–Constantinople theological controversies, and State–Church relationship. More recently he explored the rich topic of the *Orthodoxa Confessio fidei* (15th through 18th centuries) and post-Reformation

theological dialogues between Christian confessions. He is a member of a research project titled *Saints-Making and Institutional Consolidation: the Veneration of Metropolitans in 14th–16th Century Muscovy* (PI: Dr. Iulia Nițescu / University of Bucharest) and senior researcher of ERC project *Orthodoxies and Politics. The Religious Reforms of Mid-17th Century in Eastern and South-Eastern Europe – ORTHPOL* (PI: Dr. Ovidiu-Victor Olar / Austrian Academy of Sciences, Vienna).

#### **One Church, Two Ecclesiologies: the Arsenite case**

Perceived through an ecclesiological framework, the main reason set out by the Arsenites for severing ties with the official Church in the second half of the 13th century revolved around the alleged inefficacy of the divine grace and, implicitly, of the Holy Sacraments if administered by a clergy whose conduct was not irreproachable. They would contrast the visible Church (institutionalized, hence willing to adopt perverted interpretations of the Holy Canons) with an invisible Church (charismatic, an ideal community abounding in divine grace and consisting solely of saints, its hierarchy being known by God alone, resorting exclusively to canonical strictness to preserve its purity). In this paper I intend to connect and compare this theological stance with the fifth century controversy between the Donatists and St Augustine, on the one hand, and with the thirteenth century famous expressions of Thomas Aquinas: *ex opere operato* (from the work performed; i.e., the Sacrament is efficient by itself) and *ex opere operantis* (from the agent’s activity; i.e., the Sacrament is efficient dependently on the merits of the clergy or faithful), on the other hand.

**Marie-Hélène Blanchet** received her PhD in history in 2005 and her Habilitation in 2020. She is a Senior Researcher at the Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique (CNRS, Paris, UMR 8167 Orient et Méditerranée). She specializes in late Byzantine history, especially in intellectual and religious history during the Palaiologan period (13th–15th centuries), including the question of the Union of the Churches. Among other publications, she is the author of *Georges Gennadios Scholarios (vers 1400-vers 1472). Un intellectuel orthodoxe face à la disparition de l’Empire byzantin* (Paris 2008); Théodore Agallianos, *Dialogue avec un moine contre les Latins* (1442) (Paris 2013); and she co-edited with Raúl Estangüi Gómez *Travaux et Mémoires* 25.1 (*Le Monde byzantin du XIII<sup>e</sup> au XV<sup>e</sup> siècle. Anciennes ou nouvelles formes d’impérialité*, Paris 2021). Currently, she is preparing critical editions of two Greek translations of Thomas Aquinas’ *De rationibus fidei* (within *Thomas de Aquino Byzan-*

tinus research project <https://thab.upatras.gr/>) and is in charge (together with Alessandra Bucossi) of the RAP project – *Repertorium Auctorum Polemicorum de pace et discordia inter Ecclesiam Graecam et Latinam* (<https://pric.unive.it/projects/rap/home>).

### ***How to Stop an Internal Religious Controversy? The Authority of the Byzantine Emperor***

In the Byzantine context, any religious controversy could lead to a schism within the Church. The chronicles of the 13th–15th centuries are presenting numerous episodes that pointed to ecclesiastical division. These crises involved a greater or lesser number of people for varying lengths of time, the most notable being the Arsenite controversy, the Palamite quarrel and the opposition to the various attempts to unite the Churches. The Byzantine emperor was always concerned about such events: they fell not only within the ecclesiastical competence, but also within his own authority, and he was sometimes in a position to prevent or resolve a schism. In this paper, I would like to examine the discursive arguments and the concrete power strategies employed by various emperors during the Palaeologan period when confronted with the dynamics of religious polemics leading to an internal split within the Byzantine Church.

**Raúl Estangüi Gómez** is a Scientific Researcher at the CCHS-CSIC (Madrid). His field of research is the political and institutional history of the Byzantine Empire during the Palaiologan period. He is currently working on the functioning of the patriarchal chancellery and on the role of writing and the written document in the practice of authority. He is also a member of the research team editing the Byzantine documents preserved in the monasteries of Mount Athos. He has published a monograph titled *Byzance face aux Ottomans: exercice du pouvoir et contrôle du territoire sous les derniers Paléologues (milieu XIV<sup>e</sup> – milieu XV<sup>e</sup> siècle)* (Paris 2014) and co-edited the *Travaux et Mémoires* volume dedicated to the history of the Palaiologan period (*Le Monde byzantin du XIII<sup>e</sup> au XV<sup>e</sup> siècle. Anciennes ou nouvelles formes d'impérialité*, Paris 2021).

### ***The Condemnation of Heresy by the Patriarchal Court of Constantinople in the second half of the 14th century***

The goal of this paper is to study the competences of the patriarchal court of Constantinople to condemn and punish heresy. An important change took place from the end of the 1360s, during the second patriarchate of Philotheos Kokkinos (1364–1376), concerning the prerogatives of the patriarchal court, amplifying its capacity to prosecute any deviation from the established doctrine (latinophrones and antipalamites).

This doctrine was the hesychastic theology defended by Gregory Palamas and approved in a series of councils in 1341, 1347 and 1351. Thanks to the preservation of part of the synodal register, we are able to analyse in detail some of these trials and observe the different acts involved in these judicial proceedings, in particular the case of the patriarchal officials. This augmented role of the patriarchal court in the condemnation and punishment of heresy is unprecedented in Byzantine history, and demonstrates the role of the patriarchate in the second half of the 14th century as an instrument of social control and even repression.



