

Causality and the Procession of the Holy Spirit in Manuel Kalekas's *De fide deque principiis catholicae fidei**

Reginald M. Lynch

Dominican House of Studies, Washington DC; rlynch@dhs.edu

■ Abstract

This article examines the way in which Manuel Kalekas describes the procession of the trinitarian persons in one of his earliest systematic treatises. As a member of so-called “Kydones circle,” Kalekas was part of a fourteenth-century group of Latinophrone Byzantine theologians who were interested in ecclesial union with the Latin West and in Latin theological sources. In addition to certain texts from Augustine, during the fourteenth century several works by Thomas Aquinas became available in Greek translation. Kalekas's *De fide* is of interest because it integrates conceptual and structural insights from Aquinas even as it draws on Greek traditions from Cappadocia and Byzantium. Although the importance of Aquinas's *Summa contra gentiles* for the work of the Kydones circle is often cited, this article argues that Aquinas's *Summa theologiae* was also a significant influence for Kalekas.

■ Keywords

Kalekas, Aquinas, causality, procession, Trinity, Byzantium

* This article would not have been possible without the encouragement of many friends, colleagues, and mentors. In particular, I am grateful to Yury Avvakumov, who inspired my initial interest in Kalekas and encouraged me to pursue this avenue of research. I am also indebted to the organizers of Thomas Aquinas and the Greek Fathers (Naples, FL, 2018), and the Symposium Thomisticum (Athens, 2018), where aspects of my research for this article were presented. Grants from the Nanovic Institute for European Studies and the Theology Department at the University of Notre Dame facilitated my participation in each of these events. I am grateful for the feedback that I received from participants at these conferences, and for the insights of two anonymous reviewers.

HTR 116:2 (2023) 254–275

■ Introduction

During the fourteenth century, the works of Thomas Aquinas and other Latin theologians became increasingly available in the Byzantine east. Manuel Kalekas (d. 1410), a pro-unionist Byzantine intellectual, belonged to a group of Byzantine Thomists who benefited from existing Greek translations of important Thomistic texts and who found mentors among Byzantine intellectuals like Demetrios Kydones who were already working extensively with the thought of Aquinas. Recent scholarship has called attention to the important role that Thomistic ideas played in Byzantine theology during this period.¹ Despite his historical importance, however, modern secondary scholarship on Kalekas is relatively limited.²

This present study will focus on the procession of the trinitarian persons in Manuel Kalekas's *De fide deque principiis catholicae fidei*. As one of Kalekas's early texts, *De fide* was completed in Constantinople during the last decade of the fourteenth century. During this time, Kalekas was an active member of the influential "Kydones circle"—a group of Byzantine theologians who were interested in the thought of Thomas Aquinas. After leaving Constantinople, Kalekas entered into full communion with the Western Church, eventually becoming a professed religious in the Dominican order. During this later, postconversion period, Kalekas would author a number of texts that deal with the procession of the Holy Spirit, such as his *Contra Graecorum errores* and his *De processione Spiritus Sancti*.³ While both

¹ In this regard, Marcus Plested's *Orthodox Readings of Aquinas* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2015) is certainly of note. See also idem, "'Light from the West': Byzantine Readings of Aquinas," in *Orthodox Constructions of the West* (ed. George E. Demacopoulos and Aristotle Papanikolaou; New York: Fordham University Press, 2013) 58–70; idem, "Aquinas in Byzantium," in *The Cambridge Intellectual History of Byzantium* (ed. Anthony Kaldellis and Niketas Siniosoglou; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2017) 542–56; John Demetracopoulos, "The Influence of Thomas Aquinas on Late Byzantine Philosophical and Theological Thought: À propos of the 'Thomas de Aquino Byzantinus' Project," *Bulletin de philosophie médiévale* 54 (2012) 101–24. There are also a number of other articles in *The Cambridge Intellectual History of Byzantium* (ed. Kaldellis and Siniosoglou) that highlight the importance of Western sources in Byzantium and other aspects of Byzantine history and thought relevant to this present study.

² Some treatments of Kalekas's work are available, however: see Plested, *Orthodox Readings of Aquinas*, 114–19. See also idem, "Aquinas in Byzantium," 549–50. In addition, the work of Claudine Delacroix-Besnier is also noteworthy, providing important insight into Kalekas's relationship with other Byzantine unionists (Claudine Delacroix-Besnier, "Manuel Calécas et les Frères Chrysobergès, grecs et prêcheurs," *Actes des congrès de la Société des historiens médiévistes de l'enseignement supérieur public* 32.1 [2001] 151–64). Concerning Kalekas's biography, the work of Raymond Loenertz is still the most extensive. In particular, Loenertz's critical edition of Kalekas's letters (1950) includes an introduction to his life and works, incorporating material from Loenertz's work on the letters and other research (Raymond Loenertz, *Correspondance de Manuel Calecas* [StT 152; Vatican City: Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, 1950]). See also Raymond Loenertz, "Manuel Calécas, sa vie et ses oeuvres d'après ses lettres et ses apologies inédites," *Archivum Fratrum Praedicatorum* 17 (1947) 195–207. Some other sources from early 20th cent. scholarship also deal with Kalekas's theology and its relationship to Western sources. See, for example, Jean Gouillard, "Les influences latines dans l'oeuvre théologique de Manuel Calécas," *Échos d'orient* 37 (1938) 36–52. Other relevant sources are cited in the following pages.

³ In addition to *De fide*, Kalekas authored a number of other systematic works, liturgical tracts,

of these texts have been cited in previous scholarship on Kalekas's approach to trinitarian procession, his earlier *De fide* remains understudied on this point.⁴ As a text, *De fide* is of interest not only because it is one of Kalekas's earliest works, but also because it is a preconversion text, authored prior to his entrance into full communion with the Western Church and completed before his departure from Constantinople in 1396. While many of Kalekas's postconversion texts adopt an overtly unionist (and arguably Western) apologetic, by comparison, *De fide* is a thoroughly Byzantine text, written for a Byzantine theological audience.⁵ Further, because *De fide* was completed while working under the direct influence of the important Byzantine Thomist Demetrios Kydones, studying *De fide* can also provide some insight into the way in which individual Thomistic texts were being utilized by the Kydones circle before its diaspora in 1396.

This article will examine Kalekas's approach to trinitarian procession in *De fide* in relation to his Byzantine and Latin theological sources. Because of the importance of Aquinas as a source for Kalekas and the other members of the

and polemical works. Aside from Loenertz's edition of his letters, almost none of Kalekas's works are available in a critical edition. The exception to this is *Adversus Iosephum Bryennium*, which Giovanni Mercati edited in 1931: *Notizie di Procoro e Demetrio Cidone, Manuele Caleca e Teodoro Metileniota. Ed altri appunti per la storia della teologia e della letteratura bizantina del secolo XIV* (StT 56; Vatican City: Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, 1931) 454–73. The textual editions of Kalekas's other works are as follows: *Contra errores Graecorum* (Version latine d'Ambroise Traversari; ed. P. Stevartius; Ingolstadt 1608; PG 152:13–258); *De essentia et operatione* (ed. F. Combefis; Bibliothecae Graecorum Patrum Auctarium novissimum; Paris, 1672; PG 152:283–428); *De processione Spiritus Sancti* (PG 154:864–958); *Expositio missae in Nativitate Domini iuxta ritum Ambrosianum*, in *Sposizione della Messa che si canta nella festa della Natività di Cristo secondo la tradizione di Santo Ambrogio. Dal Latino tradotta in Greco da Demetrio Cidonio* (ed. A. Fumagalli; Milan, 1757). See Loenertz, *Correspondance de Manuel Calecas*, v.

⁴ In his seminal work on this subject, Martin Jugie mentions Kalekas's *Contra Graecorum* numerous times, basing his assessment of Kalekas's teaching largely on this text; see Martin Jugie, *De Processione Spiritus Sancti ex fontibus Revelationis et secundum Orientales dissidentes* (Rome: Istituto Grafico Tiberino, 1936) 332–34; see also 171, 234, 240, 252. Jugie also mentions Kalekas's *De processione* in Jugie, *De Processione Spiritus Sancti*, 334 n. 1. Concerning modern secondary scholarship on *De fide* itself, few modern studies engage the content of this text directly. Plested does offer a summary of *De fide* as part of a wider treatment of the influence of Aquinas on Kalekas. On the subject of the Trinity, Plested emphasizes parallels between the text of *De fide* and Aquinas's *Summa contra gentiles* (Plested, *Orthodox Readings of Aquinas*, 115–17). In this he follows Gouillard, whose work on Kalekas's Latin sources is notable ("Les influences latines," 36–52). See also Plested, "Aquinas in Byzantium," 549–50. The text of *De fide deque principii catholicae fide* employed here, which appears in Migne's *Patrologia Graeca* (1863), originally appeared in 1698 as part of *The Book of Charity Against the Latins*. See Τόμος ἀγάπης κατὰ Λατίνων (Jassy, 1698) 413–90. This text was reprinted in PG 152:429–662. See John Meyendorff, "Eglises-soeurs. Implications ecclésiologiques du Tomos Agapis," *Istina* 20 (1975) 35–46. Textually, however, *De fide* stands in need of a modern critical edition. Migne's reprinting does not engage with the manuscript tradition before 1698.

⁵ For example, Kalekas's *De processione* is not only a postconversion text but is explicitly organized as a defense of Western trinitarian theology (Gouillard, "Les influences latines," 38). For similar reasons, Plested notes the theological importance of Kalekas's *De fide* as an authentically Byzantine text (Plested, *Orthodox Readings of Aquinas*, 117).

Kydones circle, particular attention will be paid to the relationship between *De fide* and those Thomistic texts that were available in Byzantium during the late fourteenth century. Because Kalekas's work is not well known, I will begin with a short biography of Kalekas that places his work in historical context. Following this, I will examine the relationship between *De fide* and Aquinas on the subject of trinitarian procession. On this question, previous scholarship by Jean Gouillard has identified parallels between *De fide* and Aquinas's *Contra gentiles*.⁶ Building on these findings, I will argue that parallels also exist between *De fide* and Aquinas's *Summa theologiae*. Although I argue that the *Summa theologiae* influenced *De fide*, an initial comparison of these texts also exposes a seeming disagreement between Aquinas and Kalekas on the role of causality in trinitarian theology. However, I will argue that when Aquinas's concerns are understood in their proper context, it becomes clear that they do not in fact apply to Kalekas; further, I will argue that, because of Aquinas's deepened familiarity with Greek patristic sources during his later period, in his treatment of the Trinity in the *Summa theologiae*, resources can be found that give some credence to Kalekas's approach, even on Thomistic grounds.

■ Kalekas in Historical Context

Manuel Kalekas, known for his expertise in rhetoric and theology, played an important role in the development of Byzantine theology during the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries. Although Kalekas would consistently identify himself as a son of Constantinople, the name Kalekas itself is originally of Slavic origin. Although sometimes he is identified as a nephew of Patriarch John XIV Kalekas, there is no historical evidence to establish a firm family connection between these two men. Nonetheless, the fate of Patriarch John XIV would impact Manuel greatly.⁷ In 1347, a council assembled by Empress Anna released Gregory Palamas from prison and deposed Patriarch John XIV. John XIV Kalekas died in prison, and Manuel Kalekas would spend his formative years in fear of persecution as a result of these events.⁸ When John VI Kantakuzenos entered Constantinople, he quickly called a synod to confirm his actions, and by 1351 a council was held that not only vindicated Palamas but declared his teaching on divine energies to be normative for the Byzantine Church. This development prompted a variety of different reactions from those unsympathetic to this doctrine. Nicephoros Gregoras opposed the teaching vigorously, which eventually ended in his imprisonment. A

⁶ Gouillard, "Les influences latines," 36–52. See also Plested, *Orthodox Readings of Aquinas*, 116. See n. 31 below.

⁷ Loenertz, *Correspondance de Manuel Calecas*, 17–18. For an overview of Byzantine theology during this period, see Gerhard Podskalsky, *Theologie und Philosophie in Byzanz. Der Streit um die theologische Methodik in der spätbyzantinischen Geistesgeschichte (14./15. Jh.), seine systematischen Grundlagen und seine historische Entwicklung* (Byzantinisches Archiv 15; Munich: Beck, 1977) 173–230.

⁸ Claudine Delacroix-Besnier, "Conversions constantinopolitaines au XIV^e siècle," *Mélanges de l'École française de Rome–Moyen-Age* 105 (1993) 747.

young Byzantine diplomat named Demetrios Kydones (d. 1397/8), who would later come to play a significant role in Kalekas's life, began a thorough study of theological sources, including Latin authors like Aquinas.⁹ We know from his later correspondence that Manuel Kalekas retreated to a monastery during much of the period following 1351 and that he did not return to Constantinople for many years. Although not a monk, he seems to have had an arrangement that allowed him to live as an associate of the monastery.¹⁰

During the 1350s, Aquinas's works became increasingly available in Constantinople and wider Byzantium. Although some extracts from the *Summa theologiae* were available in Greek translation as early as 1305, more complete translations of this work and the *Summa contra gentiles* were available by the end of the 1350s. Demetrios Kydones's translation of the *Summa contra gentiles*—which was completed in 1354—was particularly influential for Byzantine receptions of Aquinas during the second half of the fourteenth century.¹¹ Kydones would also translate portions of the *Summa theologiae* as well, completing the *Prima pars*, the *Prima secundae*, and the *Secunda secundae*.¹² Some elements of the *Tertia pars* would become available in Greek as well.¹³ Although perhaps not as ubiquitous as his translation of the *Contra gentiles*, the manuscript tradition of Kydones's translation of the *Prima pars* of the *Summa theologiae* suggests that this text was also widely circulated.¹⁴

In 1390, Manuel Kalekas returned to Constantinople on the advice of a friend in order to found a school of rhetoric, structured around the classical works of Greek antiquity.¹⁵ Although his school was not a success, during this time Kalekas came into contact with other like-minded Byzantine intellectuals, such as Demetrios Kydones, to whom he wrote in 1391. It is difficult to overstate the

⁹ Norman Russell, "Palamism and the Circle of Demetrius Cydones," *Porphyrogenita: Festschrift für Julian Chrysostomides* (ed. E. Harvarlia-Crook and J. Herrin; Aldershot: Ashgate, 2003) 154.

¹⁰ Loenertz, *Correspondance de Manuel Calecas*, 18.

¹¹ See Plested, *Orthodox Readings of Aquinas*, 1, 115; Loenertz, "Manuel Calécas, sa vie et ses oeuvres," 200. In 1305, some extracts from the *Summa theologiae* were made available in Greek translation by Bernard de Gaillac. Antoine Dondaine, "Contra Graecos. Premiers écrits polémiques des Dominicains d'Orient," *Archivum Fratrum Praedicatorum* 21 (1951) 320–446, at 325–27; Giovanni Mercati, *Notizie di Procoro e Demetrio Cidone, Manuele Caleca e Teodoro Metilentiota ecc.*, 11; Plested, *Orthodox Readings of Aquinas*, 66.

¹² Judith R. Ryder, *The Career and Writings of Demetrius Kydones: A Study of Fourteenth-Century Byzantine Politics, Religion and Society* (Leiden: Brill, 2010) 17.

¹³ Concerning the *Tertia pars*, only questions 1, 45, 54, and 55 are known to have appeared in Greek translation. John A. Demetracopoulos, "The *Sitz im Leben* of Demetrius Cydones' Translation of Pseudo-Augustine's *Soliloquia*," *Quaestio* 6 (2006) 191–258, at 226–27.

¹⁴ Ryder, *Career and Writings of Demetrius Kydones*, 17 n. 82. In this, Ryder relies on the research of S. G. Papadopoulos, *Ἑλληνικαὶ μεταφράσεις Θεωμιστικῶν ἔργων* (Athens: Φιλεχπαίδευτηρή Ἐταιρεία, 1967) 43, and elsewhere. Demetrios's brother, Prochoros Kydones, aided in this translation of the *Summa theologiae*, including articles from the *Tertia pars* and *supplement*. Ryder, *Career and Writings of Demetrius Kydones*, 17 n. 83.

¹⁵ Delacroix-Besnier, "Conversion constantinopolitaines au XIVe siècle," 747. Loenertz, *Correspondance de Manuel Calecas*, 18.

import of Kalekas's acquaintance with Kydones and his circle in Constantinople. His contact with this group brought him into conversation with a group of Byzantine intellectuals who shared his interests and sympathies. However, Kalekas's familiarity with Thomism probably began before his return to Constantinople. His *De fide deque principiis fidei catholicae* (the subject of this study) was the first of his theological writings and was probably begun prior to 1391. This text reflects a deep awareness of the works of Aquinas that had been available in Greek translation since the 1350s, thanks in large part to Kydones.¹⁶ From 1391 to 1396, Manuel studied under Kydones, benefiting greatly from his expertise; his study of Aquinas under Kydones clearly influenced the final version of *De fide*, which was completed before the end of 1396.¹⁷ While studying under Kydones, Kalekas would also become acquainted with a number of other students who shared his interests. Among these new associates were the brothers Maximos, Theodore, and Andrew Chrysoberges, all three of whom studied Aquinas under Kydones during this time.¹⁸ In particular, Kalekas's friendship with Maximos Chrysoberges was an important influence for Kalekas between 1391 and 1396, and their friendship would continue for many years even after both had left Constantinople.¹⁹

In 1396, the declarations of 1351 that had enforced conformity to Palamite doctrine were renewed. By the end of this year, Kalekas and many other members of the Kydones circle would seek refuge with the Genoese at Pera, in order to escape the persecution of the Palamites.²⁰ Judging from his letters, the events seem to have been an important moment in Kalekas's life, sparking a formal rupture with the Byzantine Church.²¹ From Pera, in the fall of 1396, Kalekas wrote to Emperor Manuel II Palaeologus, lamenting the fact that his opposition to Palamism had ostracized him from the church in Byzantium and effectively barred his entrance into religious life.²² It is not clear if the publication of *De fide*, which does not affirm the Palamite teaching on the Trinity, was the immediate cause of any unwanted personal attention.²³ Kalekas remained at Pera, staying with the Dominican community there

¹⁶ Loenertz, *Correspondance de Manuel Calecas*, 22.

¹⁷ Plested, *Orthodox Readings of Aquinas*, 115. See Loenertz, "Manuel Calécas, sa vie et ses oeuvres," 200. See also Loenertz, *Correspondance de Manuel Calecas*, 20–22. Gouillard, "Les influences latines," 43–46.

¹⁸ Plested, *Orthodox Readings of Aquinas*, 118–19. Raymond Loenertz, "Les dominicains byzantins Théodore et André Chrysobergès et les négociations pour l'union des Églises grecque et latine de 1415 à 1430," *Archivum Fratrum Praedicatorum* 9 (1939) 5–61, at 8.

¹⁹ Kalekas and Maximos were in contact in 1403 and for some time after that. Loenertz, *Correspondance de Manuel Calecas*, 32; see also 38, 40.

²⁰ Loenertz, "Manuel Calécas, sa vie et ses oeuvres," 201–2; idem, *Correspondance de Manuel Calecas*, 24.

²¹ Loenertz, *Correspondance de Manuel Calecas*, 25.

²² Ibid., 18; for the text of this apology, see appendix 1, 308–18. At the same time (Autumn, 1396) Kalekas wrote a second apology addressed to those ecclesiastics who had made themselves his adversaries (ibid., appendix 2, 318–21). There are also fragments of a third apology from the same period (ibid., appendix 3, 321–23).

²³ Around 1398, Kalekas wrote another text, *De essentia et operatione Dei*, which was specifically

from 1396 to 1399, and likely entered into full communion with the Roman Church in 1398.²⁴ Kalekas subsequently moved to Crete in 1400, where he continued to work with Maximus Chrysoberges and his brothers, Theodore and Andrew. From 1401 to 1403 Kalekas lived at the Benedictine monastery in Milan, where he completed *De processione Spiritus Sancti* and began *Adversus Graecos*. During this time, he also completed translations of Boethius's *De Trinitate* and Anselm's *Cur Deus homo*.²⁵ From here he moved to Lesbos, where he took the habit of the Dominican order and died in 1410.²⁶

■ Aquinas as a Source for *De fide*

Manuel Kalekas's *De fide* (1396) is intended to be a comprehensive presentation of Christian doctrine, covering theological topics from the doctrine of God to the seven sacraments. Although Kalekas quotes liberally from Byzantine and Greek patristic sources, the structure of the text itself reflects the influence of Latin scholasticism. The first chapter of *De fide* takes the form of a short methodological introduction to the work.²⁷ Following this, Kalekas deals with "the one God" (Περὶ τοῦ ἑνὸς Θεοῦ) in chapter 2, and "the one God as Trinity" (Περὶ αὐτοῦ τοῦ ἑνὸς Θεοῦ, ὃς ἐστὶ Τριῶς) in chapter 3.²⁸ Subsequent chapters discuss the image of the Trinity in creation (ch. 4), the incarnation of the Word according to Scripture (ch. 5), the seven sacraments (ch. 6), the fittingness of the incarnation according to reason (ch. 7), the future resurrection of the dead (ch. 8), and the future restoration of all things (ch. 9).

In addition to the general influence of Latin scholasticism, more specific parallels with individual Thomistic texts can also be discerned. At the outset, we notice that the methodological introduction found in the first chapter of *De fide* stresses Christ as a wisdom figure in a way that is similar to the first question of the *Contra gentiles*.²⁹ Further, the treatment of christology according to scriptural proof in chapter 5 and subsequently according to rational fittingness in chapter 7 echoes Aquinas's division of this subject in the *Contra gentiles*.³⁰ Gouillard has

opposed to the theology of Gregory Palamas. Claudine Delacroix-Besnier, *Les Dominicains et la chrétienté grecque aux XIV^e et XV^e siècles* (Rome: École Française de Rome, 1997) 267.

²⁴ Loenertz, *Correspondance de Manuel Calecas*, 30. Delacroix-Besnier, *Les dominicains et la chrétienté grecque*, 267.

²⁵ Loenertz, *Correspondance de Manuel Calecas*, 42.

²⁶ Nickiphoros I. Tsougarakis, *The Latin Religious Orders in Medieval Greece, 1204–1500* (Medieval Church Studies 18; Turnhout: Brepols, 2012) 205. See also Loenertz, "Manuel Calécas, sa vie et ses oeuvres," 195–207. Kalekas also translated many Latin works into Greek, a list of which can be found here: John Demetracopoulos, "Manuel Kalekas' Translation of Boethius' *De Trinitate*: Introduction, New Critical Edition, Index Latinograecitatis," *Synthesis Philosophica* 20 (2005) 85–118, at 86.

²⁷ PG 152:430a–31b.

²⁸ For the purposes of this study, we will focus our analysis on the doctrine of trinitarian procession found in the third chapter of *De fide* (PG 152:473d–529a).

²⁹ See Aquinas, *SCG* 1.1.

³⁰ See *ibid.*, 4.1–14, 53–55, et al. Compare this structure with that of his treatment of the same

argued that chapter 3 of *De fide* (which concerns us here) is dependent on Aquinas's *Contra gentiles*, noting a number of parallels between the fourth book of the *Contra gentiles* and this chapter of *De fide*.³¹ Without disputing these similarities, there are also reasons to suspect that Aquinas's *Summa theologiae*—a text also available to Kalekas in Greek translation—influenced the structure and content of *De fide*, and Kalekas's account of trinitarian procession specifically. The structure of the first four chapters of *De fide*—including Kalekas's treatment of the Trinity—bears a strong resemblance to the structure of the corresponding sections of the *Prima pars* of the *Summa theologiae*. Like *De fide*, the first part of the *Summa theologiae* begins with a methodological introduction (q. 1), followed by a treatment of God according to the transcendental qualities of oneness, truth, and goodness (qq. 2–26); Aquinas begins his tract on the Trinity against this backdrop (qq. 27–43). By contrast, although the *Contra gentiles* does deal with methodology and the one God in book 1, it does not take up the subject of trinitarian procession until its fourth and final book.

The internal structure of the third chapter of *De fide* further reinforces the impression that a certain parity exists between *De fide* and the *Summa theologiae*; Kalekas begins this chapter by invoking the examples of the Arian and Sabellian heresies to frame his treatment of the Trinity.³² Likewise, at the beginning of his own treatment of the Trinity in question 27 of the first part of the *Summa theologiae*, Aquinas uses the same examples to illustrate the dangers of describing the procession and distinction of the trinitarian persons in a way that results in either a difference of substance between the persons (Arianism) or a modalistic account that effaces the distinction between them (Sabellianism).³³ In *De fide*, Kalekas introduces orthodox trinitarian theology by framing his argument in a way that resembles the structure of Aquinas's approach in question 27. Like Aquinas, Kalekas argues that trinitarian orthodoxy is found somewhere between the extremes of Arianism, which leads to a triad of essences (τρεῖς οὐσίας), and Sabellianism, which denies the trinity of persons (τρία πρόσωπα).³⁴ For Kalekas, Sabellianism offers a purely modal distinction (ποτέ μὲν ὡς Πατέρα φαίνεσθαι, ποτέ δὲ ὡς Υἱόν, ποτέ δὲ ὡς Πνεῦμα ἅγιον) between the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit. In contrast to this error, Kalekas affirms the unity of essence that unites the three distinct persons. In this understanding, God is indeed one essence and three persons (μία οὐσία, πρόσωπα δὲ τρία).³⁵ While the doctrinal content of this teaching may be unsurprising, the

material in *ST III*^a q. 1–26.

³¹ Gouillard, "Les influences latines," 44. Plested, *Orthodox Readings of Aquinas*, 116.

³² PG 152:476d.

³³ Aquinas, *ST I*^a q. 27, a. 1, co.

³⁴ PG 152:476d–77a. The language of πρόσωπα (rather than ὑπόστασις) may indicate another point of Latin influence. There is some precedent for juxtaposing Arius and Sabellius in this way in the Cappadocians as well. For example, see Gregory of Nyssa, Κατὰ Ἀρείου καὶ Σαβέλλιου, *Gregorii Nysseni Opera (GNO)* (ed. Fredrick Mueller; 3 vols.; Leiden: Brill, 1958) 3.1:71–85.

³⁵ PG 152:477a.

structural apposition of Arianism and Sabellianism in Kalekas's argument mirrors the way in which Aquinas introduces these same doctrinal issues in question 27 of the first part of the *Summa theologiae*.³⁶ Conversely, no single text in the *Contra gentiles* provides a similar structural parallel.³⁷ Further, in addition to this structural similarity, Kalekas's emphasis on the unity of the divine essence in the context of trinitarian procession is also aligned with the way in which Aquinas situates the question of trinitarian procession in the larger context of the first part of the *Summa theologiae*, where the beginning of Aquinas's treatment of the Trinity in question 27 is framed against the backdrop of the unity of the divine essence that Aquinas works to establish in questions 3 through 26 of the *Prima pars*. At the beginning of his treatment of the Trinity in question 27, Aquinas continues to underscore the importance of this issue, emphasizing the risk of disrupting the unity of the divine essence through deficient conceptual accounts of the Trinity.³⁸ As we have seen, Kalekas's teaching on trinitarian procession in chapter 3 of *De fide* is also preceded by his treatment of the unity of the divine essence in chapter 2. Like Aquinas, Kalekas continues to reference the unity of the divine essence in chapter 3 as he moves to give an account of trinitarian theology itself.³⁹

The presence of structural parity, however, does not exclude the possibility of conceptual tension. Even within the context of these textual parallels, Aquinas and Kalekas propose different conceptual accounts of the *way in which* the distinction and procession of the trinitarian persons should be described. What is at issue here is the utility of the language of causality. While both Kalekas and Aquinas identify the importance of causality in this context, Aquinas is critical of its use, while Kalekas advocates for it. In question 27, Aquinas rules out two forms of causality, associating them directly with the errors of Arius and Sabellius. For Aquinas, the concept of procession should be said of the divine persons only after the forms of causality that he has associated with Arianism and Sabellianism are rejected. Kalekas takes the opposite approach, however, explicitly using $\alpha\tau\tau\iota\upsilon\upsilon$ to describe the relationship of the Father to both the Son and the Spirit in a way that he claims avoids the same errors of Arius and Sabellius.⁴⁰ Beginning with a warning against

³⁶ Aquinas, *ST I*^a q. 27–43 deals with the Trinity in itself. While the same doctrine is effectively taught in the *Contra gentiles*, Aquinas structures his argument differently there; see *SCG* 4.2–49.

³⁷ Aquinas, *SCG* 4.10.7 could be a partial exception to this—this text lists objections to the doctrine of divine procession and generation and gives Arianism and Sabellianism as examples of opposing errors that concern the unity of the divine essence. However, the broader structural context still seems to point toward the *Summa theologiae* as an important influence in this regard. For example, although Aquinas opposes Arianism and Sabellianism here, he does use causality to illustrate their errors. Likewise, although Aquinas treats the errors of Photius, Sabellius, and Arius as trinitarian heresies in the *Contra gentiles*, he does not use the concept of causality to characterize these positions as false approaches to the concept of trinitarian procession; see *SCG* 4.4–7.

³⁸ See Aquinas, *ST I*^a q. 27, a. 4, ad 1; see also Aquinas's arguments against Arianism in *ST I*^a q. 27, a. 1, co.

³⁹ PG 152:476d–77a.

⁴⁰ “God is therefore one substance, three persons: Father, Son, Holy Spirit. And we confess the

these two trinitarian errors, Kalekas describes the Father as the “cause” of the Son and the Spirit, who are referred to the Father by begetting (γεννητός) and procession (ἐκπορευτός), respectively.⁴¹ Kalekas’s account of trinitarian procession culminates in his description of the Spirit’s procession *through* the Son. In defense of this formulation, Kalekas cites the authority of the Seventh Ecumenical Council, held at Nicaea in 787.⁴² Despite Kalekas’s interest in Latin sources, the absence of the *filioque* should not surprise us here. Although dialogue between the Byzantine East and Latin West continued during this period over the *filioque* and church union, this aspect of Latin theology was not generally incorporated by the Byzantines during Kalekas’s time.⁴³ Although Kalekas will defend this position in his later

Father to be the cause of the Son and the Holy Spirit, and the Son and the Holy Spirit to be caused. For from him [the Father], the Son is by begetting, and the Holy Spirit by proceeding. Thence, with the Son and the Spirit referring back to the Father as to one cause, we think the one God is three when considered among themselves, but each is God when contemplated according to himself” (PG 152:477a; translation mine). Ἡ αἰτία and its grammatical variants have a broad semantic field in classical Greek, and differences between the scholastic use of “causa” and use of αἴτιον in 14th-cent. Byzantium cannot detain us here. However, both Aristotle and Plato specifically use the term in a causal sense. See Plato, *Tim.* 68e, *Phaed.* 97a, *Resp.* 464b; see Aristotle, *Phys.* 194b16, *Metaph.* 983a26. See LSJ, s.v. αἴτιον, τό, αἰτία, ἡ; αἴτιος, α, ov; et al. Αἴτιον also appears as “cause” or “source” in the New Testament and in the Septuagint; for example, see Heb 5:9; Macc 4:47, 13:4. *A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature: A Translation and Adaptation of Walter Bauer’s Griechisch-Deutsches Wörterbuch zu den Schriften des Neuen Testaments und der übrigen urchristlichen Literatur* (4th ed.; Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1957), s.v. αἴτιος, α, ov. See also *A Patristic Greek Lexicon* (ed. G. W. H. Lampe; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1961), s.v. αἰτία, ἡ and αἴτιος. Kalekas will continue to apply the language of causality to the internal relations of the trinitarian persons in the fourth book of *De fide*, which articulates a version of the psychological analogy (PG 152:541a).

⁴¹ See text in n. 40 above. The Greek text of the creed that appears in the first Council of Constantinople uses ἐκπορευόμενον to describe what in the Latin text appears as the “processio” of the Holy Spirit. *Decrees of the Ecumenical Councils* (ed. Norman Tanner; 2 vols.; Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press, 1990) 1:24 ln. 26–28. See also *A Patristic Greek Lexicon* (ed. Lampe), s.v. ἐκπορευτός, ἐκπορευτός, ἐκπορεύω.

⁴² “That the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Father through the Son is taught from the first to the seventh synod . . . Tarasios, most holy patriarch of Constantinople, convened the seventh synod, with a letter containing a profession of the right faith from the bishops of the East: ‘we believe also, in the Holy Spirit, who proceeds (ἐκπορευόμενον) from the Father through the Son, and is himself revealed to be God’” (PG 152:508b). Kalekas is referring to the acts of the council, which records a profession of faith sent by clergy from Antioch, Alexandria, and elsewhere to Patriarch Tarasios of Constantinople that describes the procession (ἐκπορευόμενον) of the Spirit from the Father through the Son. “Concilium Nicaenum II: Actio Tertia,” in *Sacrorum Conciliorum Nova et Amplissima Collectio* (ed. Joannes Mansi; 53 vols.; Florence: 1766) 12:1122d. (Tanner’s *Decrees of the Ecumenical Councils* does not reproduce this version of the Creed, instead referring the reader to the Nicene-Constantinopolitan creed; see *Decrees of the Ecumenical Councils* [ed. Tanner], 1:134.) The council documents, prefaced by a historical introduction, can be found in *Sacrorum Conciliorum Nova* (ed. Mansi), 12:951–1154.

⁴³ See A. Edward Sicienski, *The Filioque: History of a Doctrinal Controversy* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2010) 147–48. Nilus Kabasilas (d. 1363), who taught Demetrios Kydones, had argued strongly against the *filioque*, despite his student’s strong sympathy for Aquinas. Plested, *Orthodox Readings of Aquinas*, 96–100. See Nilus Cabasilas, *Sur le Saint-Esprit* (ed. Théophile

writings,⁴⁴ in *De fide* he argues that the procession of the Spirit *through* the Son follows from the causal model he first adopted to describe the distinction-in-unity of the divine persons.

Although a degree of conceptual tension seems to exist between Aquinas and Kalekas on the subject of causality, not all tensions necessarily reduce to contradictions. In this case, reading *De fide* and the *Summa* in their proper historical contexts can mitigate this tension significantly. To understand the divergence between Aquinas and Kalekas on this point, it is helpful to distinguish between theological doctrine itself and the theological and philosophical traditions that are used to explain and defend this doctrine. Considered doctrinally, in the context of post-Nicene orthodoxy, the simple rejection of Arianism and Sabellianism is unremarkable—what shows the influence of Aquinas in this case is not so much that Kalekas rejects Arianism and Sabellianism in a generic sense, but the fact that the methodology and structure of Kalekas’s approach to trinitarian procession in *De fide* mirrors Aquinas’s approach to the same subject in the *Summa*. As has been shown, both Kalekas and Aquinas begin with the unity and simplicity of the divine essence and introduce the notion of personal distinction and procession in the Trinity against this backdrop, portraying Arianism and Sabellianism as doctrinal errors that describe the Trinity in a way that compromises the unity of the divine essence. This structural similarity suggests that the convergence between Kalekas and Aquinas is not *merely* doctrinal in the abstract: in this case, Kalekas has also absorbed something of the theological methodology of Aquinas’s *Summa* as well, and of the theological tradition that it represents.

While it is clear that Aquinas has influenced Kalekas in important ways, neither the *Summa* nor *De fide* can be properly understood without reference to the historical context in which each was written. Acknowledging a difference of historical context between the *Summa* and *De fide* does not undermine the claim that the former text has exerted a real influence on the latter—rather, an awareness of contextual difference enables a more accurate understanding of the true nature and extent of this same influence. All subsequent receptions of texts take place in historical contexts that differ from the one in which the text received was originally authored. Even in the later reception history of Aquinas in the Latin West, an awareness of historical context is important when approaching subsequent engagements with Aquinas. In a similar way, the Byzantine context of Kalekas and the Kydones circle necessarily affects the way in which Aquinas is received. Therefore, the following section will study the relationship between Kalekas’s teaching in *De fide* and existing theological paradigms in Byzantium.

Kislas; Paris: Cerf, 2001). For a study of Nilus’s engagement with Aquinas’s pneumatology, see *Nilus Cabasilas et theologia S. Thomae de processione Spiritus Sancti* (ed. Emmanuel Candal; ST 116; Città del Vaticano: Biblioteca apostolica vaticana, 1945).

⁴⁴ Kalekas, *Contra errores Graecorum*, I, IV (PG 152:187–212). Jugie, *De Processione*, 234. Gouillard, “Les influences latines,” 38. See n. 5 above.

■ Kalekas and Existing Byzantine Traditions

Kalekas was not the first Byzantine theologian to use the language of causality to describe the procession and distinction of the trinitarian persons. In the 1270s, the unionist Patriarch John Bekkos promoted a causal approach to trinitarian procession. Explicitly acknowledging the substantial unity of the three trinitarian persons, in his *De unione* Bekkos used causality to explain the procession of the Spirit from both the Father and the Son, in a manner that he argues is consistent with the doctrine of the Roman Church.⁴⁵ In many ways, Bekkos's approach builds on Cappadocian sources that were in circulation in Byzantium at this time. Gregory of Nazianzus and Gregory of Nyssa both used causal language explicitly to distinguish the procession of persons in the Trinity and both were influential sources for thirteenth-century Byzantine theology.⁴⁶ Among the Cappadocians, however, it seems that Basil of Caesarea was particularly influential for Bekkos.⁴⁷ Basil distinguishes between

⁴⁵ "The Holy Spirit exists from the substance of the Father and the Son, which the Church of the Romans asserts, saying that he proceeds (ἐκπορεύεσθαι) from both" (*De unione* 2 [PG 141:17c]). Concerning the nature of this procession, in *De unione* 9 Bekkos argues that causality (αἰτίας) can be used to describe the procession of the Son from the Father, and the Spirit from both the Father and the Son. However, because all that belongs to the Son originates from the Father as first cause, it is not necessary, absolutely speaking, to ascribe two independent processional causes to the Spirit (both the Father and the Son). *De unione* 9 (PG 141:25c).

⁴⁶ See Christopher Beeley, "Divine Causality and the Monarchy of God the Father in Gregory of Nazianzus," *HTR* 100 (2007) 199–214. Joseph Lienhard, "Ousia and Hypostasis: The Cappadocian Settlement and the Theology of 'One Hypostasis,'" in *Trinity: An Interdisciplinary Symposium on the Trinity* (ed. Stephen Davis, Daniel Kendall, and Gerald O'Collins; New York: Oxford University Press, 2002) 99–121. For a recent study of Gregory of Nazianzus, see Andrew Hofer, *Christ in the Life and Teaching of Gregory of Nazianzus* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013). For a discussion of the connection between causality and divine paternity in Aquinas and Gregory Nazianzus, see John Baptist Ku, "Divine Paternity in the Theology of Ss. Gregory Nazianzen and Thomas Aquinas," in *Thomas Aquinas and the Greek Fathers* (ed. Michael Dauphinais, Andrew Hofer, and Roger Nutt; Ave Maria, FL: Sapientia Press of Ave Maria University, 2019) 110–29. See also idem, "Divine Spiritation in the Theology of Ss. Gregory Nazianzen and Thomas Aquinas," *The Thomist* 86.3 (2022): 373–415. Gregory of Nyssa's *That There Are Not Three Gods* appeared around the year 390, and develops the distinction between ousia and hypostasis using the language of causality (*GNO* 3.1:55–57). Gregory states explicitly that he does not intend the use of causality in this context to diminish the immutability of the divine nature in any way. Gregory argues that only the difference between the cause itself and the one that is from the cause can provide the necessary distinction between persons in the Trinity (*GNO* 3.1:56–57. For a discussion of this text and its implications, see Lewis Ayres, "On Not Three Gods: Gregory of Nyssa's Trinitarian Theology," in *Nicaea and Its Legacy: An Approach to Fourth-Century Trinitarian Theology* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004) 344–63.

⁴⁷ See *De unione* 9 (PG 141: 25c). Peter Gilbert shows the degree to which Bekkos is reliant on Basil of Caesarea in this text (Peter Gilbert, "Not an Anthologist: John Bekkos as a Reader of the Fathers," *Communio* 36 [2009] 259–304, at 285–87). After the Council of Lyon concluded in 1274, Bekkos worked for the acceptance of the council in Byzantine circles (Donald M. Nicol, *The Last Centuries of Byzantium, 1261–1453* [New York: Cambridge University Press, 1993] 61–65). Bekkos's *De Unione* attempts to argue for the legitimacy of the union achieved at Lyon to a Byzantine audience. Although the exact date of this text is not known, it was likely authored between 1275 and 1280. See Alexandra Riebe, *Rom in Gemeinschaft mit Konstantinopel. Patriarch*

principal and instrumental causality, naming the Son as an instrument or tool (such as a hammer) in relation to the Father as craftsman.⁴⁸ For Basil, the Father creates *through* the Son operating as a preceding cause.⁴⁹

Although not unknown in the East, relational accounts of trinitarian procession were dominant in the Latin West, largely due to the influence of Augustine. In his *De Trinitate*, Augustine used the category of relation to distinguish the persons of the Trinity without introducing a distinction of essence or substance.⁵⁰ Since the late thirteenth century, a Greek translation of Augustine's *De Trinitate* had been available in Byzantium, and Kalekas would have had access to this through Demetrios Kydones, who owned a copy of this translation.⁵¹ As a received text in the Byzantine East, therefore, *De Trinitate* was already being incorporated into the Byzantine theological tradition and the work of the Kydones circle during Kalekas's time in Constantinople. For his part, Kalekas is not only aware of Augustine's arguments but actively references them in *De fide*. In a demonstration of intellectual creativity, Kalekas argues that causal and relational accounts of the Trinity can be understood as compatible, finding texts from both Basil of Caesarea and Gregory of Nazianzus that could indicate that the causal relationship between the divine persons is fundamentally relational.⁵² Without citing Augustine explicitly, Kalekas discusses the possibility of opposing relations distinguishing the divine persons, even as he situates this conceptually against the larger backdrop of causality.⁵³ Nevertheless, Kalekas's account of trinitarian procession and personal distinction

Johannes XI. Bekkos als Verteidiger der Kirchenunion von Lyon (1274) (Mainzer Veröffentlichungen zur Byzantinistik 8; Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 2005) 123. For other uses of αἴτιος in the context of trinitarian procession by the Cappadocians and other patristic authors, see *A Patristic Greek Lexicon* (ed. Lampe), s.v. αἴτια, ἡ and αἴτιος.

⁴⁸ See Basil of Caesarea, *On the Holy Spirit* 4.6; as in Basile de Césarée, *Sur le Saint-Esprit. Introduction, texte, traduction et notes* (ed. Benoît Pruche; 2nd ed.; SC 17; Paris: Cerf, 1968) 268. In *On the Holy Spirit*, Basil defends the legitimacy of those doxologies that describe the Spirit proceeding "through" the Son. See esp. *Spir.* 1.3 (SC 17:256–58); 4.6 (SC 17:268–70); 8.18–19, 21 (SC 17:306–16, 318–20); 16.38 (SC 17:376–84). Concerning the relationship between causality and trinitarian procession, Basil distinguishes between principal, cooperative, and sine qua non causes; *Spir.* 3.5 (SC 17:264–68).

⁴⁹ Basil, *Spir.* 8.21 (SC 17:318–20). Concerning the three persons of the Trinity, Basil names the Father as the principal cause, the Son as the creative (or demiurgic) cause, and the Spirit as the performing cause; *Spir.* 16.38 (SC 17:376–78).

⁵⁰ Augustine, *Trin.* 5.5, 6.1–7. See Lewis Ayres, *Nicaea and Its Legacy: An Approach to Fourth-Century Trinitarian Theology* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004) 376. More broadly, see idem, "The Grammar of Augustine's Trinitarian Theology," in *Nicaea and Its Legacy*, 364–83.

⁵¹ Ryder, *Career and Writings of Demetrius Kydones*, 20. Gregory Palamas was also influenced by *De Trinitate*: Josef Lössl, "Augustine's *On the Trinity* in Gregory Palamas's *One Hundred and Fifty Chapters*," *Augustinian Studies* 30 (1999) 61–82.

⁵² PG 152:484a–b. See also PG 152:485ab. Migne provides the following citations for Gregory and Basil: Gregory of Nazianzus, *Or. Bas.* 33, 36; Basil, *Contra Eunom.* lib. 1.

⁵³ PG 152:484c–85d.

remains strongly indebted to the concept of causality: in the end, Kalekas will insist that *only* causality can adequately distinguish the divine persons.⁵⁴

Concerning the influence of Latin sources like *De Trinitate* on *De fide*, Kalekas's intentions in this regard are perhaps best understood in the context of the existing Byzantine unionist tradition. Like Bekkos before him Kalekas attempts to show that the Augustinian relational approach can be understood within the categories of Byzantine theology, thus providing a means of understanding Augustinian trinitarian theology in the language of the Byzantine East. Because *De fide* is a text written for a Byzantine audience, something of this same methodology is discernable in Kalekas's approach to Aquinas as well. Instead of addressing himself to Parisian scholastics, Kalekas offers an account of trinitarian procession from within the Byzantine tradition, even as he allows himself to be influenced by some elements of Aquinas's thought. Understood in this way, Kalekas's appeal to causality in this context seems not to be a rejection of Aquinas so much as an appeal to the conventions of existing Byzantine theology.

■ Aquinas on Causality and Creation

In order to better understand the relationship between Aquinas and Kalekas on the question of causal procession, it is important that Aquinas's account of trinitarian procession be understood on its own terms and within the context of existing Latin theological traditions. Like many thirteenth-century Latin scholastics, the influence of Augustine is clearly discernable in Aquinas's trinitarian theology. Although Aquinas will engage some ideas from the Greek fathers later in his treatise on the Trinity, the conceptual elements that actually structure Aquinas's account of procession at the outset of this treatise in question 27 appeal primarily to authorities and to philosophical concerns internal to the Latin tradition. Understood in this context, Aquinas's rejection of certain causal accounts of procession in question 27 should not be misconstrued as a reference to the Cappadocians but seen rather as a means of jettisoning certain philosophical assumptions about the concept of procession that would make it impossible to understand a relational account of trinitarian procession in an orthodox way. Although Aquinas associates certain forms of causal procession with Arianism and Sabellianism in question 27, in contrast to these errors Aquinas also begins to deploy an understanding of trinitarian emanation that is not only doctrinally orthodox but implicitly Augustinian. To describe the doctrine of trinitarian procession accurately, Aquinas invokes the Augustinian concept of the word of the heart: although it proceeds from the person in understanding, it remains within him.⁵⁵ Building on this, in question 28 Aquinas explicitly introduces an account of trinitarian relationality that is indebted to Augustine's, arguing that the real distinction between the divine persons results

⁵⁴ PG 152:481c.

⁵⁵ Aquinas, *ST* I^a q. 27, a. 1, co. This is echoed in idem, *SCG* 4.11.

from the oppositional qualities of their relations.⁵⁶ Here, Aquinas describes four real relations resulting from the internal processions of intellect and will, from each of which two opposite relations arise.⁵⁷

Although Aquinas draws on the resources of the Latin-Augustinian tradition to give an orthodox account of the doctrine of trinitarian procession, his rejection of Arianism and Sabellianism in question 27 enables his description of the relational distinction of the divine persons in question 28 by eliminating a certain kind of conceptual error that would associate the concept of procession with the limitations and finitude of creation. Because the divine persons are eternal and unchanging, the internal processions that provide the basis for their real distinction must also be eternal and not subject to change of any kind. With this in mind, any account of procession that might imply a sense of contingency or limitation must be eliminated. In question 27, Aquinas uses causality to identify certain specific forms of causal procession that imply these limitations. In the case of Arianism, Aquinas argues that, when the relation between the Son and the Father is described causally, the Son is implicitly described as *a creature*. Likewise, Sabellian modalism represents a different attribution of created limitation to divinity, in which the change and historicism that is characteristic of creation is attributed to the divine person who proceeds.⁵⁸ In the context of question 27, Aquinas's response to the first objection makes it clear that in this particular context, Aquinas intentionally uses the notion of causal procession to identify certain ways of thinking about procession in general that must be actively eliminated if we are to discuss the specific reality of divine procession. Although the objector asserts that no form of procession can be attributed to God because the concept of procession itself necessarily implies exterior motion to another, Aquinas argues that the objector's account of procession in general actually applies only to causal accounts of motion in space.⁵⁹ By rejecting those "causal" forms of procession that imply the limitations of created being in question 27, Aquinas is able to develop the remaining notion of uncreated procession using the Augustinian doctrine of relation in question 28.

For Aquinas, the connection between causal procession and the concept of creation that appears in question 27 is echoed in his treatment of creation later in the first part of the *Summa* (qq. 44–49). In question 44, Aquinas uses the language

⁵⁶ Aquinas, *ST I*^a q. 28 aa. 1–3.

⁵⁷ The resulting relations are paternity, filiation, spiration, and procession. For Aquinas, in order for the persons to be really distinct, a real relation must be established. As in the case of causal language, the difference between the inner life of the Godhead and the relationship between God and the world becomes significant. Because God has a logical relationship with creation, this procession *ad extra* cannot provide the analogical foundation for the distinction of persons. Because the inner processions of knowing and loving are real relations, however, they can provide a basis for the necessary distinctions. Aquinas, *ST I*^a q. 28 a. 4.

⁵⁸ Aquinas, *ST I*^a q. 27, a. 1, co. As in *S. Thomae de Aquino Ordinis Praedicatorum Summa Theologiae cura et studio Instituti Studiorum Medievalium Ottaviensis ad textum S. Pii Pp. V iussu confectum recognita* (5 vols.; Ottawa: Commissio Piana, 1941) 1:182a.

⁵⁹ Aquinas, *ST I*^a q. 27, a. 1, arg. 1, ad 1.

of causality to describe the emanation of creatures from God as a *form of procession* that differs from the procession that takes place in the emanation of the trinitarian persons.⁶⁰ Both are called procession or emanation, but in this case the term cause is applied to the procession of created things from the divine essence in the act of creation.⁶¹ In question 44, Aquinas describes God's act of creation *ex nihilo* using the language of causality: for Aquinas, God is not only the first efficient cause of creation but the cause of prime matter and the exemplar and final cause of all that has being.⁶² In this regard, Aquinas is consciously proposing his own interpretation of Aristotelian causality, which supports the Christian doctrine of creation *ex nihilo* and directly contradicts the Averroist interpretations of Aristotle's natural philosophy that were being advanced by some members of the arts faculty at the University of Paris.⁶³ It is likely that the concerns generated by the Averroist crisis explain in part the caution Aquinas exhibits when discussing the divine processions in question 27. Although Aquinas does not always associate causality with the limitations of creation, in the context of question 44 the concept of "causal procession" is associated with the form of procession that describes the divine creation of material things. In this form of causal procession, although the causal origin may be divine, the causal effect exists within the temporality and contingency of creation. Because the term of this form of procession or emanation is conditioned by temporality, the procession taken as a whole with both of its terms cannot be said to exist simply or eternally.

To a certain extent, Kalekas and Aquinas are simply approaching the questions of causality and procession from the perspectives of different theological and philosophical traditions. Although it seems that Kalekas has been influenced by some of the structural and methodological aspects of question 27, he does not engage the philosophical distinction between divine and created being that Aquinas makes in this context or associate causality with the concept of creation. When understood in its proper context, it is likely that Aquinas's cautions against causality in question 27 are primarily intended to warn against the use of certain models of causal procession in trinitarian theology that were current in Latin Aristotelianism, rather than those found in the earlier Greek patristic tradition. As will be shown, further evidence to support this supposition can be found in the wider context of Aquinas's treatment of the Trinity in the *Summa*, where he goes so far as to

⁶⁰ Aquinas indicates this transition in the first line of the prologue of question 44: "After considering the divine Persons, it remains to consider the procession of creatures from God"; *ST I*^a q. 44, *prooem* (Ottawa ed., 1:279a). See also *ST I*^a q. 45.

⁶¹ In question 44, Aquinas considers creation in relation to God as the cause of being and the mode by which creatures proceed from God as first cause; *ST I*^a q. 44, *prooem.*; q. 44, aa. 1–4.

⁶² Aquinas, q. 44, aa. 1–4.

⁶³ By 1277, these interpretations were condemned, and in the eyes of many Aristotle himself was under general suspicion. See Fernand Van Steenberghen, *Thomas Aquinas and Radical Aristotelianism* (Washington, DC: Catholic University of America Press, 1980), and idem, *Aristotle in the West: The Origins of Latin Aristotelianism* (Louvain: Nauwelaerts, 1970).

describe a particular causal understanding of trinitarian procession that differs from those that result in Arianism and Sabellianism and that could be employed in a doctrinally orthodox way.

■ The *Summa* and the Greek Fathers: Procession as Instrumental Causality

Unlike many of his Latin contemporaries at this time, Aquinas had a strong interest in the Greek fathers, and because of the presence of Dominican missionaries in Byzantium, he also had an unprecedented degree of access to Latin translations of Greek texts and Greek-speaking Dominicans familiar with the Byzantine theological tradition.⁶⁴ The influence of these sources would directly impact Aquinas's thinking on a number of subjects, including trinitarian procession. Despite his strong warning about the use of causal language in question 27, when discussing the individual trinitarian persons in the later questions of his treatise on the Trinity Aquinas shows a great deal of sensitivity toward the Greek patristic tradition. When discussing God the Father in question 33, Aquinas acknowledges that the language of causality is used among "the Greeks," arguing that in this usage "cause" is equivalent to the Latin concept of *principium*.⁶⁵ Gilles Emery shows that this position represents a development within the thought of Aquinas from his earlier position in the *Sentences*, where Aquinas ruled out any use of causality in this context.⁶⁶ The *Contra gentiles*, which was completed in 1265, before Aquinas departed from Orvieto for Rome, does not engage this issue directly.⁶⁷ Even in later works like *De potentia dei*, Aquinas still expresses concern that the language of causality may say more than is appropriate about the Trinity.⁶⁸ We have seen Aquinas express these sentiments in question 27 of the *Summa* as well. However, although Aquinas still

⁶⁴ Gilles Emery, *Trinity, Church, and the Human Person: Thomistic Essays* (trans. Jennifer Harms and John Baptist Ku; Naples, FL: Sapientia Press of Ave Maria University, 2007) 193–96. Dominicans working in Constantinople assisted Aquinas while he was composing his *Contra errores Graecorum* between 1263 and 1264. Subsequently, when composing his *Catena aurea*, Aquinas would continue to expand his knowledge of Greek patristic texts. After 1267, Aquinas's subsequent work would be influenced by Latin translations of Greek works made by William of Moerbeke, a Dominican from the Byzantine missions. Jean-Pierre Torrell, *The Person and His Work* (trans. Robert Royal; vol. 1 of *Saint Thomas Aquinas*; Washington, DC: Catholic University of America Press, 1996) 174–76. Pasquale Porro, *Thomas Aquinas: A Historical and Philosophical Profile* (trans. Joseph G. Trabbic and Roger W. Nutt; Washington, D.C.: Catholic University of America Press, 2016) 176–82.

⁶⁵ Aquinas, *ST I*^a q. 33 a. 1 ad 1 (Ottawa ed., 1:214b).

⁶⁶ Aquinas, *Super Sent.* I, d. 29, q. 1, a. 1. Gilles Emery, *The Trinitarian Theology of Saint Thomas Aquinas* (trans. Francesca Aran Murphy; Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007) 157–58. See also John Baptist Ku, *God the Father in the Theology of St. Thomas Aquinas* (New York: Lang, 2013) 143–44.

⁶⁷ For the composition history of the *Contra gentiles*, see Torrell, *The Person and His Work*, 332; Porro, *Thomas Aquinas*, 116–84.

⁶⁸ Emery, *The Trinitarian Theology of Saint Thomas Aquinas*, 158. See Aquinas, *De pot.* q. 10, a. 1, ad 9. *De potentia* was completed during Aquinas's Roman period, probably during 1265–1266, the first year of his stay there. Torrell, *The Person and His Work*, 335.

warns against an incautious use of causality in question 33, in this text he is also careful to assert that the Greeks do not mean to imply such things when they use the word “cause.”⁶⁹ Emery attributes this approach to Aquinas’s increasing familiarity with Latin translations of the works of Athanasius, Basil, and Gregory of Nyssa, among others.⁷⁰ In question 36, the influence of these Greek sources would directly affect Aquinas’s approach to trinitarian procession as well. In his discussion of the procession of the Holy Spirit in question 36, Aquinas actually provides a conceptual model for understanding causal accounts of trinitarian procession that avoids the pitfalls that are described in question 27. In this text, Aquinas argues that causality can be used to describe the procession of the Spirit *through the Son*. In support of this, he cites Hillary of Poitiers, who describes the Holy Spirit as being *through (per)* the only-begotten of the Father.⁷¹ Aquinas develops this in the body of the article by using an adapted form of causal language that differs from the forms of causality that he associated with Arius and Sabellius in question 27. In question 36, Aquinas argues that it is possible to speak of the procession of the Spirit as *through* the Son, inasmuch as the Son has received from the Father that the Holy Spirit proceeds from Him (the Son). As in his discussion of the Father in question 33, Aquinas again equates the concept of causality in this context with the Latin language of *principium*. Concerning procession itself, Aquinas argues that when “cause” is understood as *action through*, it is not construed as a median between the acting agent and the thing done. Instead, the term *through* is predicated of the *cause itself* of the thing done, such as an artist acting through a hammer, or a king acting through a bailiff. Additionally, this sense of *action through* can also be predicated indirectly, as in the case of the bailiff who works *through* his king.⁷² Like a hammer in relation to an artisan, the example of the bailiff and the king describes a relationship between a principal and an instrumental cause. When the causal action that proceeds from this relationship is examined, it can be understood from the perspective of either the principal or the instrumental agent. In many ways, these arguments reflect the influence of the same Cappadocian authors who influenced John Bekkos and other Byzantine unionists. For Aquinas, when causal *action through* is predicated both principally and instrumentally, it becomes possible to understand divine procession in the language used by both the Latin and the Greek Churches. When the language of causality is used to describe the Father and the Son, Aquinas argues that it is possible to claim with the Latin Church that the Spirit proceeds from the Father *and* the Son, because both are causal principles of the

⁶⁹ Aquinas, *ST I*^a q. 33 a. 1 ad 1 (Ottawa ed., 1:214b).

⁷⁰ Emery, *The Trinitarian Theology of Saint Thomas Aquinas*, 158.

⁷¹ Aquinas, *ST I*^a q. 36 a. 3 s.c. (Ottawa ed., 1:230a). See Hillary, *De Trin.* c. 12 (PL 10:471). For a study of the patristic sources for Aquinas, *ST I*^a q. 36, see Jaroslav Pelikan, “The Doctrine of the Filioque in Thomas Aquinas and Its Patristic Antecedents: An Analysis of *Summa Theologiae*, Part I, Question 36,” in *St. Thomas Aquinas 1274–1974: Commemorative Studies* (ed. Étienne Gilson and Armand A. Maurer; Toronto: Pontifical Institute of Mediaeval Studies, 1974) 315–36.

⁷² Aquinas, *ST I*^a q. 36 a. 3 co. (Ottawa ed., 1:230a–b). See also *ST I*^a q. 36 a. 3 ad 4.

Spirit's procession. Relying on the distinction between principle and instrumental causes, Aquinas argues that one may claim with the Greek Church that the Spirit's procession is from the Father *immediately*, and the Son *mediately*, not unlike the case of the king and his bailiff. In this understanding, the Spirit's procession can be said to be *from* the Father *through* the Son.⁷³

The significance of this should not be underestimated. Because of this careful, twofold predication of *through* as a causal term, Aquinas is able to use the language of Latin theology to establish the legitimacy of a causal understanding of procession in which the Spirit proceeds from the Father *through* the Son as an effect from a cause: "Therefore, because the Son has from the Father that the Holy Spirit proceeds from him, it is possible to say that the Father spirates the Holy Spirit through the Son, or that the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Father through the Son, which is the same in meaning."⁷⁴

Despite his strong warnings against causality in question 27, therefore, in question 36 Aquinas clarifies this teaching, specifying *which versions* of causality might be used to describe the procession of the Spirit *from* the Father and *through* the Son. Although causality initially seemed to be a point of conceptual divergence between Aquinas and Kalekas, it is clear that in the *Summa*, Aquinas's opposition to causality in the context of trinitarian procession is in fact restricted to certain noninstrumental forms of causality that imply created limitation. Given the prevalence of causal accounts of trinitarian procession in Byzantine theology, Kalekas would have had many reasons, independent of his interest in Aquinas, to adopt a causal account of trinitarian procession in *De fide*. However, a close reading of questions 33 and 36 in Aquinas's *Summa* would have certainly made it clear to Kalekas that Aquinas's warnings about causality in question 27 should not be adopted without qualification, and that Aquinas himself believed that Cappadocian accounts of trinitarian procession could be articulated in ways that were compatible with Latin theology.

■ After Kalekas: Subsequent Reception

In the years after Kalekas's death in 1410 the work Kalekas and others within the Kydones circle had done to place the theological traditions of the Greek East and the Latin West in dialogue would prove important. In 1431, the Council of Basel would begin to address formally some of the points of tension between Byzantine and Latin theology, and this work would be continued by the Council of Florence (1438–1445). With both Latins and Greeks in attendance, in 1439 the Council fathers agreed that, concerning the role of the Son in the procession of the Spirit, precedent existed within the church's tradition that justified the formulation of this procession of the Spirit as either *from* (ἐκ, *ex*) or *through* (διὰ, *per*) the Son, and

⁷³ Aquinas, *ST I*^a q. 36 a. 3 ad 1 (Ottawa ed., 1:230b).

⁷⁴ Aquinas, *ST I*^a q. 36 a. 3 co. Translation mine.

that these different formulations asserted the same truth.⁷⁵ Further, the Council interpreted the Greek formulation $\delta\iota' \upsilon\iota\omicron\upsilon$ using the language of causality ($\alpha\iota\tau\acute{\alpha}$), arguing that the formulation of the Spirit's procession through the Son found in the Greek fathers should be interpreted within the language of causality that is used by the Greek tradition to describe the procession of the Spirit from the Father, in such a way, of course, as not to create two principles.⁷⁶ In this regard, the council effectively acknowledged a doctrinal equivalence between the Greek language of cause ($\alpha\iota\tau\acute{\alpha}$) and the Latin language of principle (*principium*), when speaking of the trinitarian processions.⁷⁷ We may surmise that those texts from Aquinas's *Summa theologiae* that have been examined here likely provided an important resource within Latin theology for these conclusions. From the perspective of Byzantine theology, the continued influence of the Kydones circle played an important role in reaching this doctrinal agreement. Both Theodore and Andrew Chrysoberges—members of the Kydones circle in Constantinople in the 1390s and associates of Kalekas—were part of formal conversations between the Byzantine and Latin Churches in 1415 and 1430 that served as a foundation for the union established at the council of Florence.⁷⁸ As an early product of the Kydones circle, *De fide* shows that a speculative synthesis inspired by Aquinas between Byzantine and Latin approaches to trinitarian procession was actively discussed in the Kydones circle while still in Constantinople during the 1390s—at a minimum, we may conclude that the Chrysoberges brothers were aware of *De fide* and other similar projects and participated in the conversations within the Kydones circle that gave rise to them.

Although the departure of Kalekas and his confreres from Constantinople and the continued pressures of the Palamite controversy may have initially prevented *De fide* from being read widely in the East, in later centuries this text would be well received in Orthodox Christian circles. As late as the seventeenth century, *De fide* was included as part of a larger collection of Byzantine works compiled in

⁷⁵ Florence, sess. 6. *Decrees of the Ecumenical Councils* (ed. Tanner), 1:525 ln. 36–42.

⁷⁶ *Ibid.*, 1:526 ln. 43–527 ln. 10.

⁷⁷ *Ibid.*, 1:527 ln. 3–10.

⁷⁸ During these important years leading up to the Council of Florence, both Theodore and Andrew were very active in diplomatic circles. Tsougarakis, *The Latin Religious Orders*, 205. Loenertz, “Les dominicains byzantins,” 5–61. Even while still in studies, Andrew was called upon to preach twice at the Council of Constance between 1414 and 1417. He was later made archbishop of Rhodes in 1432 and archbishop of Nicosia in 1447. At the Council of Florence, Andrew would be present as an official representative of the Latin Church, where his knowledge of the Greek language and Byzantine theology was highly valued. Tsougarakis, *The Latin Religious Orders*, 210; Delacroix-Besnier, *Les Dominicains*, 355–57. Both Chrysoberges would play important roles in the negotiations for union between the Byzantines and Latins in 1415 and 1430, which formed an important precedent for the Council of Florence in 1438–39. See Loenertz, “Les dominicains byzantins,” 5–61. Plested argues that Andrew Chrysoberges, writing on the eve of the Council of Florence, may have been the first to comment explicitly on the incompatibility of Palamite and Thomist doctrines on the essence-energies distinction. Although earlier writers, such as Kydones and Kalekas, would argue against the Palamite doctrine, their reliance on Aquinas in this regard remained unstated. Plested, *Orthodox Readings of Aquinas*, 119 n. 48.

1698 by Patriarch Dositheos of Jerusalem, titled *The Book of Charity Against the Latins*.⁷⁹ Although the inclusion of a text like *De fide* in an anti-Latin tract may seem somewhat ironic, by selecting *De fide*, Dositheos also acknowledged the status of Kalekas's text as an authentic expression of the Byzantine theological tradition.

■ Conclusion

In the preceding pages, I have argued that in his treatment of trinitarian procession in *De fide*, Manuel Kalekas is in dialogue with a range of Byzantine and Latin sources, including Thomas Aquinas. Building on previous scholarship that has shown the influence of Aquinas's *Contra gentiles* on Kalekas's *De fide*, I have argued here that there are reasons to consider Aquinas's *Summa theologiae* as an influential source as well. Although Kalekas and Aquinas may seem to disagree about the usefulness of causal accounts of trinitarian procession, it is clear that Aquinas's cautions in question 27 are directed only at certain forms of causality that Kalekas does not employ, and that Aquinas actively believes that instrumental understandings of causality can be licitly used to describe the procession of the Holy Spirit *from* the Father and *through* the Son. Building on the same Greek patristic traditions that influenced Aquinas during his later period, in *De fide* Kalekas uses causality to describe the way in which this procession occurs, mirroring the structure of question 27 of the *Prima pars* even as he employs conceptual resources that can be found in questions 33 and 36.

In many ways, *De fide* is an example of the unique genre of Thomism that emerged within the Latinophrone community in Byzantium during the late fourteenth century. Like all receptions of Aquinas, the Thomism of Kalekas and the Kydones circle was not only conditioned by external cultural factors and the interests of its adherents but by the particular Thomistic texts that were received as well. In this regard, the influence of the *Summa* on *De fide* calls attention to the importance of the *Summa theologiae* for the work of the Kydones circle during the

⁷⁹ Τόμος ἀγάπης κατὰ Λατίνων (Jassy, 1698), 413–90. See ODCC, s.v. “Dositheus.” See also Meyendorff, “Eglises-soeurs,” 35–46. The version of Kalekas's *De fide* that appears in Migne's *Patrologia Graeca*—which is cited here—is taken from PG 152:429–662. See n. 4 above. Plested argues that the inclusion of *De fide* in this volume represents a kind of eventual confirmation of Kalekas's own intention to compose a Byzantine text aimed at a Byzantine audience: “Kalekas writes as an Orthodox for the Orthodox, but one who recognizes Thomas as an exceptionally useful guide and teacher in the study and exposition of Scripture and the Fathers. Kalekas' treatise (*De fide*) is designed to incorporate Aquinas's wisdom and rigour within a presentation of the teachings of the universal Church. And to a great extent it succeeded: this decidedly Thomist work earned the express approbation of the zealously anti-Latin patriarch of Jerusalem, Dositheos, who published it without attribution in his *The Book of Charity Against the Latins*. Dositheos commends the work in his introduction as ‘highly theological, highly edificatory, highly clear, and highly Orthodox.’ Rarely has a Byzantine Thomist found such explicit recognition as a standard-bearer for Orthodoxy” (Plested, *Orthodox Readings of Aquinas*, 117). Plested attributes this quote from Dositheos to the 5th page of the unpaginated preface to the Τόμος Ἀγάπης κατὰ Λατίνων. Loenertz, *Correspondance*, 22, 200. See also Plested, *Orthodox Readings of Aquinas*, 117 n. 40.

1390s. By contrast, it would not be until the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries that the *Summa theologiae* would become the subject of commentaries and classroom instruction in the Latin West.⁸⁰ As early as the fourteenth century, however, it seems clear that a greater significance was attached to both the *Summa contra gentiles* and the *Summa theologiae* by some Byzantine Latinophrones and the Dominican missionaries who influenced them. For Kalekas, I have argued that his access to the text of the *Summa theologiae* shaped his account of trinitarian procession in important ways. Although clearly rooted in the Byzantine tradition, *De fide* also represents a unique reception of Aquinas that calls attention to aspects of Aquinas's teaching that have not always been emphasized in his Western reception.

⁸⁰ See Martin Grabmann, *Mittelalterliches Geistesleben: Abhandlungen zur Geschichte der Scholastik und Mystik* (3 vols.; Munich: Huber, 1926–1956) 3:370–410. Jean-Pierre Torrell, *Aquinas's Summa: Background, Structure, and Reception* (trans. Benedict M. Guevin; Washington, DC: Catholic University of America Press, 2005) 95–96.