

Eustratius of Nicaea, a Theologian: Toward the recent publications by Alexei Barmin¹

Ευστράτιος Νικαίας. Οπровержительные слова. Издание подготовил А. В. Бармин. *Библиотека сборника «Богословские труды»*. Moscow: The Editorial House of the Patriarchate of Moscow, 2016. LXIV + 243 pages.

Eustratius of Nicaea. Λόγοι ἀντιρρήτικοί. Edition [with a Russian translation] by A. V. Barmin. *The Library of the Collection "Theological Studies."*

Eustratius, metropolitan of Nicaea (the middle of the eleventh century – shortly after 1117) is and always was one of the most known Byzantine philosophers, especially due to his commentaries to Aristotle. He is no less known as a theologian, and a very controversial one, but the contents of his works remain understudied, and an important part of them was unpublished until recently. Alexei Barmin in 2016 finished his two-decades-long research resulting into the *editio princeps* of the four Eustratius's theological treatises thus exhausting the list of the *inedita* by Eustratius. All these works are in some relation to the first, after 1054, major meeting between the Greek and Latin theologians in 1112 in Constantinople.

The self-standing Eustratius's treatise *Sermon on the Holy Spirit* (Λόγος περὶ τοῦ παναγίου πνεύματος) has been published by Barmin within his 2006 monograph.² The subject of Barmin's 2016 book is a series of three discourses on the procession of the Holy Spirit written by Eustratius against the 1112 tractate by Pietro Grossolano. The critical edition is based on five manuscripts (including two of the thirteenth century) and provided with a Russian translation (rather good but not to be discussed here) and the relevant fragments of the Grossolano's tractate where available (in Russian translation only). A detailed historical commentary to the presently published works was already given in the 2006 monograph³ and is therefore only briefly summarised now. Barmin is commenting, however, on Eustratius's doctrinal views, as they were expressed in the works under publication and elsewhere.

The whole corpus of Eustratius's works—as Barmin shows—is to be taken into account in an analysis of Eustratius's understanding of the procession of the Holy Spirit. The most theologically important Eustratius's works are the following. Beside those published by Barmin himself, there are two other pieces of Eustratius's polemics against the *Filioque* published by archimandrite Andronicus Demetracopoulos in 1866, who included in his first (and the only published) volume of the *Ἐκκλησιαστικὴ βιβλιοθήκη* the most comprehensive collection of Eustratius's theological legacy.⁴ There exist, moreover, Eustratius's theological treatises dedicated to his polemics against Leo, metropolitan

¹ The present study is a part of a larger project Nr 16-18-10202, *History of the Logical and Philosophical Ideas in Byzantine Philosophy and Theology*, implemented with a financial support of the *Russian Science Foundation*.

² А. В. БАРМИН, Полемика и схизма. История греко-латинских споров IX–XII веков [A. V. BARMIN, *Polemics and the Schism: The History of the Greek-Latin Quarrels from the Ninth to the Twelfth Century*]. *Bibliotheca Ignatiana*. Moscow 2006, 518 – 565. My review: В. М. ЛУРЬЕ, На греко-латинском фронте. Размышления по поводу книги: Бармин А.В. Полемика и схизма... [B. LOURIE, On the Greek-Latin Front: Thoughts about the book: Barmin A. V. *Polemics and the Schism...*]. *Византийский временник* 69 (2010) 349 – 361. Then, I avoided any discussion of theological topics in Eustratius, knowing that the publication of the remaining Eustratius's works by Barmin was pending. Therefore, my present review article is covering this part of the Barmin's 2006 monograph as well.

³ Within the long ch. 9 "The Constantinople Discussions of 1112–1113" [БАРМИН, Полемика и схизма (as footnote 2 above), pp. 309 – 358].

⁴ А. К. ДΗΜΗΤΡΑΚΟΠΟΥΛΟΣ, *Ἐκκλησιαστικὴ βιβλιοθήκη*, Leipzig 1866. The bibliographical description by Barmin (p. 228) contains a typo or mistake in the year of publication: 1886 instead of 1866. Barmin provides a review of all literary works by Eustratius. This list includes the anti-Latin treatise *On the Azymes* that was published by the Jerusalem Patriarch Dositheos in his 1698 volume *Τόμος ἀγάπης κατὰ Λατίνων* under the name of John of Jerusalem. It was restored to Eustratius by Barmin according to the manuscript tradition and some peculiarity in contents [БАРМИН, Полемика и схизма (as footnote 2 above), 322 – 323].

of Chalcedon, on the veneration of the holy icons (the subject of this polemics was mostly Christological) and against the Armenians (Christological as well) — all of them published by Demetracopoulos. Later pieces of Eustratius's anti-Armenian polemics were condemned and burned in 1117, and therefore are known to us exclusively in quotations and summaries made by the Byzantine opponents of Eustratius.

The publication of the Eustratius's theological works, now completed, sheds light on the principal lines of theological thought in Byzantium throughout the period between the schism of 1054 and the Union of Lyon (1274-1283). *A priori* this was not self-evident. Such a feeling about the importance of Eustratius arose after the first Barmin's publication on the topic in 2000, when he demonstrated that the dogmatic core of the pro-*Filioque* argumentation of the Greek metropolitan of Thessalonica (sometime around 1233) Niketas "of Maroneia" goes to Eustratius (and not to Latin sources, as it was previously supposed), and in such an extent that Niketas has repeated him sometimes verbatim.⁵

Niketas became a key figure in the theological preparation of the future Union of Lyon and, then, one of the main sources of John Bekkos's theology. Indeed, Niketas turned Eustratius's arguments against the *Filioque* in the opposite sense, thus obtaining from them arguments *for* the *Filioque*, but he did so *mutatis mutandis*, without touching the core of Eustratius's understanding of what kind of unity and what kind of difference are present in the Holy Trinity. Both Eustratius and Niketas were convinced that the Holy Spirit proceeds from the nature of the Father through the Father's hypostatic idiom; they disagreed only in defining this idiom (for Eustratius, it does not imply an involvement of the Son in procession of the Spirit, whereas, for Niketas, it does). These theories have in common that, in triadological reasoning, the notion of hypostasis could be substituted with its conceptual constituents, "nature" and "hypostatic idiom." In both theories, the hypostasis is not a kind of whole that is "greater," in some way, than its parts and, therefore, not reducible to the elements whose conjunction it seems to be—at least, *in divinis*, where there is no complexity and no parts at all. We will return to Eustratius's role in these discussions later.

Niketas "of Maroneia" is present in Barmin's 2016 book as well. As an addition to Eustratius's treatises, he published for the first time the ending of the first Niketas's treatise on the *Filioque* (pp. 211 – 225), whose only edition by Joseph Hengenröther in *PG* 139 (1865) (cols. 169 – 201) is incomplete in this part.⁶

Barmin's real commentary has little shortcomings⁷ but, normally, is precise and sufficiently detailed. Eustratius's background in non-polemical theological literature is grasped in a lesser extent,⁸

⁵ A. BARMINE, Une source méconnue des *Dialogues* de Nicéas de Maronée. *RÉB* 58 (2000) 231 – 243.

⁶ Let us notice that Barmin systematically attributes the publication of Niketas's *Dialogues* II, III, and IV to Aurelio Palmieri instead of Nicola Festa; p. LXII; cf. earlier BARMINE, Une source méconnue, 231 (Palmieri as the editor); БАРИН, Полемика и схизма (as footnote 2 above), 424 – 426 (no mention of the editor at all). The exact reference to this publication should be N. FESTA, Niceta di Maronea e i suoi dialoghi sulla processione dello Spirito Santo. *Bessarione* 16 (1912) 80 – 107, 126 – 132, 266 – 286; 17 (1913) 104 – 113, 295 – 315; 18 (1914) 55 – 75, 243 – 259; 19 (1915) 239 – 246. Aurelio Palmieri published an introductory paper on Niketas in the same journal in 1912, referred to by Barmin, which seems to have provoked this mistake.

⁷ E.g., commenting on the term βῆμα applied to the emperor's throne as the place from where the emperor has to declare his judgment, Barmin refers to the *bema* of Syrian and Byzantine churches (p. 47, fn. 19), whereas the actual meaning is non-liturgical and very common, already in the Septuagint: "judgment seat." The mention of the πύργος Χαλάνης "tower of Chalanes" (p. 72.13) should be commented not with the reference to Is 10:9 alone (in fact, only in the Septuagint version) but, first of all, with an explication that this is another—and quite popular in Byzantium—name of the Tower of Babel; Barmin's explanation of this place (p. 73, fn. 33) misses the point.

⁸ For instance, in the paragraph of the *First Antirrhetics* where Barmin proposes remote parallels from Eustratius's commentaries in Aristotle and a vague reference to his "Platonism" (p. 22.201-208), there was a need to recognise a paraphrase of Dionysius the Areopagite, *De eccl. hier.*, V, 7 (*PG* 3, 508 D – 509 A = ed. Suchla, pp. 109.1 – 110.5: ἡ θεαρχία τοῦς

but this is a consequence of Barmin's general approach—that is rather philological and historical than theological.

In the historical part of his Introduction (which contains an original historical study of the Eustratius affair of 1117) I find problematic only a bit confused picture of what happened to Eustratius after the condemnation of his teaching and his act of penitence in 1117: Barmin put under suspicion the later Niketas Choniates's (1155/1157–1217) witness⁹ that Eustratius was defrocked (p. XXII). Nevertheless, his own analysis proves the same, despite his attempts of softening the meaning of contemporary sources. Niketas of Serra's formula εἰς τὸν θρόνον αὐτοῦ μὴ παραδέχεσθαι “not to accept on his [sc., Eustratius's] see” (p. XIX) could not be interpreted as “to be banned from the liturgical service” (*pace* Barmin, p. XXI¹⁰). It means exactly “to be defrocked,” that is, to be put outside any hierarchical orders and become a layman or a monk. However, Barmin's conclusion (against previous scholars, especially Périclès-Pierre Joannou) that the condemnation of Eustratius was caused by purely theological rather than political reasons (pp. XXIII – XXV) seems to me well founded. It is therefore even stranger that Barmin does not realise enough the gap between Eustratius's theology and the Byzantine Orthodoxy.¹¹ Especially in Christology Barmin's understanding of Eustratius leaves

... νοὰς ἀποκαθαίρει πρῶτον, εἴτα φωτίζει καὶ φωτισθέντας ἀποτελεῖοι πρὸς θεοειδῆ τελειουργίαν ... Cf. in Eustratius: “Ὅσον γὰρ καθαίρονται, τοσοῦτον μιμοῦνται [one of the key notions in the Areopagite doctrine of hierarchies: cf. paragraph “Θεομίμησις” in A. GOLITZIN, *Et introibo ad altare Dei: The Mystagogy of Dionysius Areopagita, with Special Reference to Its Predecessors* in the Eastern Christian Tradition. *Ἀνάλεκτα Βλατάδων*, 59. Thessalonica 1994, 137 – 139]· καὶ ὅσον μιμοῦνται, τοσοῦτον εἰσέρχονται [sc., to the Father]· καὶ τοσοῦτον γινώσκουσιν, ὅσον γινώσκονται [cf. 1 Cor 13:13: τότε δὲ ἐπιγνώσομαι καθὼς καὶ ἐπεγνώσθη; not recognised by Barmin]. Τοὔτέστιν ἐφ’ ὅσον τὸ ἀλλότριον ἀποβάλλονται, καὶ οἰκείως τῇ ἐαυτῶν φύσει διὰ τῆς καθάρσεως τὸ οἰκεῖον εὔ [cf. Areopagite's distinction between εἶναι and εὔ εἶναι as introduced in *De coel. hier.*, XIII, 4; 304 CD = Suchla p. 47, esp. line 9] ἐν ἐαυταῖς διαμορφούμενον περιφέρουσι, τοσοῦτον ὡς οἰκεῖαι τῷ ποιητῇ καὶ πλάστῃ γνωρίζονται, καὶ ἀναλόγως [another one of the key notions in the Areopagite; cf. V. LOSSKY, *La notion des ‘analogies’ chez Denys le pseudo-Aréopagite. Archives d'histoire doctrinale et littéraire du Moyen-Âge* 5 (1931) 279 – 301] τῇ γνωρίσει ταύτῃ τὴν ἑλλαμψιν καὶ τὴν γνώσιν κομίζονται [for this transmission of, first, ἑλλαμψις and, then, γνώσις within the hierarchies, see, in the Areopagite, *De coel. hier.*, VII, 3; 209 C = ed. Suchla, p. 30.15–17; *ibid.*, XIII, 3; 304 A = ed. Suchla, p. 46.14–16; *De eccl. hier.*, VI, 6; 537 B = ed. Suchla, p. 119.23–26]. In this part of his first *Antirrhetics* Eustratius elaborates on the Areopagite and not on anyone else. Cf. below on John Italos's influence on Eustratius's Triadology.

⁹ PG 140, 137 A; the only published fragment from book XXIII of Choniates's *Thesaurus Orthodoxae Fidei* is dedicated to Eustratius (PG 140, 136 D – 137 A).

¹⁰ To 1117, Byzantine views on the status of bishops removed from their sees for whatever reasons were not established—as will show in 1151 the discussion on the patriarchate of Nicholas Mouzalon. It resulted into the first apology of possibility to preserve the bishop rank without the bishop see written by Nicholas of Methone (against Theodore Balsamon who insisted that the bishop resigned from his see is no longer a bishop at all): ed. by ΔΗΜΗΤΡΑΚΟΠΟΥΛΟΣ, *Ἐκκλησιαστικὴ βιβλιοθήκη* [as footnote 4 above], 266 – 292; cf. J. DARROUZÈS, *Documents inédits d'ecclésiologie byzantine. Archives de l'Orient chrétien*, 10. Paris 1966, 66 – 74, 310 – 331. Nevertheless, even Nicholas of Methone did not allow preserving the administrative bishop functions without the liturgical ones, as it is hypothesised by Barmin. According to the latter, a possible meaning of the quoted formula by Niketas of Serra and a possible outcome of the Eustratius's affair was the life-long ban from the liturgical service whereas preserving administration of the diocese; the word θρόνος in Niketas's phrase was allegedly used in the sense of liturgical presiding only—“bishop seat” in the literal sense and not “bishop see” (p. XXI).

¹¹ Even the most evidently “Nestorian” Eustratius's phrases can be interpreted by Barmin as not so openly “unorthodox.” Cf. his commentary to Eustratius's claim that the Father is to be confessed ...ὡς εἶναι τὸν πατέρα, πατέρα μὲν αὐτοῦ, ὡς υἱοῦ καὶ θεοῦ· θεὸν δέ, ὡς ἀνθρώπου (*First Antirrhetics*, p. 16.123–125), that is, “...the Father of him [sc., the Son] as of the Son and God, but God as of the human.” Barmin comments that “[i]n underlying the difference between the two natures in Christ, Eustratius eventually was confronted with the rejection of his views in the Byzantine Church...,” thus referring to the future 1117 condemnation (pp. 16 – 17, fn. 5). However, in this phrase, there is not a mere “underlying” of the difference between the two natures but ruining of the Byzantine understanding of hypostatic unity: the humanity of Christ is no longer sharing the relation to the Father proper to the hypostasis of the Logos. No wonder that Barmin is sceptical toward Niketas Choniates's evaluation of Eustratius's anti-Latin polemics as having performed οὐκ ἀσφαλῶς, οὐδὲ ἐπαινετῶς “not without errors, nor praiseworthy” (PG 140, 136 D). Barmin (p. XXX) supposes that these words were provoked by the peculiar arguments preserved in Eustratius's treatise *Sermon on the Holy Spirit* and not repeated in the present

much to be desired,¹² but, fortunately, this does not affect his edition of Eustratius's triadological treatises.

All this said Barmin's theological commentaries contain a very pertinent observation. In paragraph 8 of the *First Antirrhetics*, Eustratius continues his interpretation of the gospel saying *Pater meus maior me est* (Jn 14:28) (pp. 14/15 – 16/17 txt/Russ. tr.). Shortly before, he interpreted it traditionally—in the sense of μοναρχία of the Father (the Father is the unique “cause” of the three hypostases). Now, he refutes those who understand these words as said by Jesus according to the humanity in respect to the divinity. Barmin justly notes that here Eustratius goes against the future councils of 1166 and 1170, which proclaimed both interpretations orthodox (p. 15, fn. 4). Indeed, let us add to Barmin's commentary, Eustratius did so out of his “Nestorian” conviction that “...if the Saviour calls the Father his father as that of a human, he says that is what is not and pronounces words that do not correspond to the reality” (...εἰ ὡς ἀνθρώπου λέγει ἑαυτοῦ ὁ σωτὴρ πατέρα τὸν πατέρα, οὐ τὸ ὄν φησιν, οὐδὲ τοὺς λόγους ἐκφέρει καταλλήλους τοῖς πράγμασι) (p. 16.126-128).

The theological problems that such professional logicians as Eustratius and already John Philoponos were attempting to resolve did not allow logically consistent—that is, free of contradictions—decisions. Some Byzantine authors have spent buckets of ink to explain the need of logical inconsistencies for modifying the ancient Greek logic in conformity with Christian truths but some others, Eustratius including, were following Philoponos's program of contradiction-free Christian theology. The discussion on the *Filioque*, at least, since 1112 on, has been marked with this opposition of logical “programs” used in theology. As Barmin showed, Eustratius “program” has been

Antirrhetics. In fact, as Barmin notices himself in his footnotes to the text, these “peculiar” (that is, “mathematical”; see below) arguments were nevertheless repeated in the present *Antirrhetics*, although in a very brief summary (p. 115, fn. 64; cf. p. XLIII, fn. 117). These arguments did certainly contribute to shaping the Choniates's opinion, but the “Nestorianism” (in the Byzantine sense of word) of Eustratius's argumentation against the *Filioque* was even more striking.

¹² Barmin summarises Eustratius's polemics against Leo of Chalcedon (in 1086), which was focused on the veneration of the holy icons but is crucial for understanding of Eustratius's Christology in this early period. He refers (p. XIII, fn. 14) to my two studies on this subject [B. LOURIÉ, Une dispute sans justes: Léon de Chalcédoine, Eustrate de Nicée et la troisième querelle sur les images sacrées. *Studia Patristica* 42 (2006) 321 – 339 (a detailed account of the theological discussion); В. М. ЛУРЬЕ, История византийской философии. Формативный период <B. Lourié, The History of Byzantine Philosophy: The Formative Period>, St. Petersburg 2006, 497 – 514 (a summarised account put into a broader historical content)] and points out what seems to him to be a self-contradiction: I interpret Eustratius's notion of κυριακὸς ἄνθρωπος (“lordly human”) as an attempt to rethink the common human nature assumed by the Logos in the Philoponian sense (ЛУРЬЕ, История, 511 – 512), whereas earlier (*ibid.*, p. 218) I have stated that Philoponos denied the real existence of the common natures. In fact, I have meant that Eustratius called “common” the nature that Philoponos called “particular”, whereas, together with Philoponos, Eustratius did not allow the real existence of the common natures in the ordinary = Philoponian sense of word (and this became one of the points of charges against him, when Niketas of Serra accused him of denying the unity of the humanity in Christ and in us). Eustratius returned to Philoponos's mode of thinking (perfectly known to him as the Philoponos's most illustrious colleague in commenting Aristotle), already rejected by the Fathers of Byzantine Orthodoxy in the sixth and seventh centuries (especially Maximus the Confessor). Namely, these Fathers rejected the Philoponian concept of “particular nature” in the sense of a real particular existence without its particularising features (hypostatic idioms); according to them, “particular natures” in any real sense must be the same as the hypostases. Eustratius does not accept this decision because, otherwise, his Christology would become openly Nestorian (the humanity of Christ—which Eustratius separated from the hypostasis of the Logos—would become a separate human hypostasis). Therefore, Eustratius continued to call his *de facto* Philoponian particular nature of the “lordly human” the common one. Then, he ascribed to this “lordly human” everything applicable to the hypostasis—and all this quite expectably led him to the condemnation as a crypto-Nestorian. For the philosophical and logical context, see now Dirk KRAUSMÜLLER, *Enhypostaton*: Being “in Another” or Being “with Another”?—How Chalcedonian Theologians of the Sixth Century Defined the Ontological Status of Christ's Human Nature. *Vigiliae Christianae* 71 (2017) 433 – 448; *idem*, Under the Spell of John Philoponus: How Chalcedonian Theologians of the Late Patristic Period Attempted to Safeguard the Oneness of God. *The Journal of Theological Studies* 68 (2017) 625 – 649.

accepted and developed by the *latinophrones* theologians starting from the very first among them, Niketas “of Maroneia.”

The logical nature of Eustratius’s triadological argumentation is the most explicit in the “mathematical” part of the *Sermon on the Holy Spirit* (still understudied, having been first published by Barmin in 2006). Here, Eustratius opposed to the Latin teaching schematised by him as linear (Father—Son—Spirit) his own scheme of an isosceles triangle (κατὰ σχῆμα τριγωνικόν¹³; let us translate “according to the triangle scheme”; see below on the meaning of the word “scheme” in my translation) with the Father at the top vertex and the Son and the Spirit at the two bottom vertices. The Trinity is, according to Eustratius, consisting of the Monad (Father)—that have the priority of being the cause of the Dyad (Son and Spirit)—and of the Dyad itself. He elaborated on the Neoplatonic, especially pseudo-Iamblichus’s teaching on the numbers, where both Monad and Dyad were considered as exempted from the further numeral row.¹⁴ Eustratius’s own teacher John Italos left a short triadological treatise in the same vein (although not polemical).¹⁵ The basic numerological statement of Eustratius is the following:

Φύσει δὲ καὶ ἡ μονὰς προϊοῦσα καθ’ ἑαυτήν, εἰς δυάδα πρώτην ποιεῖσθαι τὴν πρόοδον πέφυκεν· οὐκ ἂν προβησομένη εἰς ἀριθμῶν γένεσιν, εἰ μὴ πρώτην σχήσει δυάδα ἐξ αὐτῆς ἀναφαινομένην.¹⁶

According to the nature, when the Monad is going forth by itself, it normally makes its proceeding to the first Dyad, because it would not step forward into generation of the numbers without previously having the Dyad appeared from it.

Thus, in the Eustratius’s scheme, any breaking of symmetry between the Son and the Spirit (such as the *Filioque*) would destroy the whole Trinity, because the Son and the Spirit would cease to form a dyad not overlapping with Father’s monad. This scheme is clearly anti-Latin and consistent in the sense of containing no contradiction.

Let us make a remark on the importance of this place for the history of logic. Eustratius insists that the Monad and the Dyad, which together generate the numbers, form an adequate model of the Christian Trinity—in such an extent that this model has been used by him for argumentation: some triadological ideas are, according to Eustratius, to be rejected simply because of not fitting with his model. Eustratius’s triangle¹⁷ is a graphical representation of propositions (not only of terms, as it was usual since antiquity in graphical charts illustrating logical and philosophical treatises) and is therefore appropriate for logical “calculations.” Such schemes are now called “logical schemes” and are considered by the modern historians of logics as first proposed by Leonard Euler in 1763 (who, in turn, was elaborating on Leibniz’s ideas); however, they became widespread in Byzantine theology in

¹³ БАРМИН, Полемика и схизма (as footnote 2 above), 556, line 559.

¹⁴ Cf. especially the commented translation: The Theology of Arithmetic. On the Mystical, Mathematical and Cosmological Symbolism of the First Ten Numbers Attributed to Iamblichus. Translated from the Greek by R. WATERFIELD. *A Kairos Book*. Grand Rapids, MI, 1988 (see here also on the Pythagorean background of this doctrine); A. WOSZCZYK, Własności monady i diady w “Theologumena arithmeticae” przypisywanej Jamblichowi z Chalkis [Characteristics of the Monad and the Dyad in *Theologumena arithmeticae* Attributed to Iamblichus Chalcidensis (in Polish)]. *Folia Philosophica* 30 (2012) 37 – 47; for a more remote Neoplatonic background of the numerological doctrine used by Eustratius, see S. SLAVEVA-GRIFFIN, Plotinus on Number. Oxford 2009.

¹⁵ Ioannes Italos, Quaestiones quodlibetales (Ἀπορίαι καὶ λύσεις), ed. P. JOANNOU. *Studia patristica et byzantina*, 4. Ettal 1956, 114 – 117 (Nr 69).

¹⁶ БАРМИН, Полемика и схизма (as footnote 2 above), 546.15-18.

¹⁷ Probably Eustratius has never added a graphical scheme of this triangle to his manuscripts, but, anyway, he described in words both this scheme and the linear scheme ascribed by him to the Latins.

the twelfth century.¹⁸ Now we have to add that it was the case not without an important contribution of Eustratius.

The Eustratius's scheme, of course, did not convince everybody. The Latins would have objected—and already Niketas “of Maroneia” implicitly objected—that insisting on the perfect symmetry between the Son and the Spirit is somewhat inconsistent with the obvious asymmetry between the Father and the two other hypostases: if an asymmetry is allowed in this case, why it cannot be allowed in another case? Eustratius's answer was clear but hardly convincing for either Latins or Greeks: this would contradict to the (pseudo-Iamblichian) teaching on generation of the numbers, where the Monad must state the first and alone and the Dyad must follow it as the next unity.

For the Greeks, Eustratius's Triadology was not appealing not only because of its implied crypto-Nestorianism. His idea to preserve “natural” (φύσει, see the quote above) order of one, two, and three in the Holy Trinity was unacceptable either. In Byzantine patristics, starting from the Cappadocian Fathers in the fourth century, the number three applied to the three hypostases of God was never considered as identical to the number three known from arithmetic. In particular, in the “three” applied to the Holy Trinity has never been implied “two”: no pair is allowed in the Trinity. Gregory of Nazianzus commented on this “skipping,” or “overstepping” of “two” between “one” and “three” with the reference to the material world where “two” is inevitable due to the dualism between the form and the matter (*Sermon XXIII*, 8). His direct disciple Evagrius Ponticus wrote (*Gnostic Chapters VI*, 10–13) that the Holy Trinity is different from the numerical triad in the fact that, in God, “three” is not preceded by “two” and not followed by “four.”¹⁹ In the late Byzantine anti-Filioque polemics, the defenders of Byzantine Orthodoxy were also insisting on necessity to exclude any kind of pairing within the Trinity.²⁰ Indeed, these patristic triadological concepts were blatantly inconsistent, but they were inconsistent in their own logical way that is now called paraconsistent logic (the logic allowing subcontrary contradictions).

The problem of pairing within the Trinity has been discussed from a traditional Byzantine viewpoint in one of the Byzantine treatises on the Holy Spirit presented to Emperor Alexios Komnenos in 1112, together with Eustratius's *Sermon on the Holy Spirit*. This is the *On the Proceeding of the Holy Spirit* (ch. 47) by Nicholas Mouzalon,²¹ then the recently (ca 1110) abdicated archbishop of Cyprus and, in a remoted future (1147), patriarch of Constantinople. Nicholas explicitly rejected any idea of pairing within the Trinity and was not afraid to declare such an order of things “supernatural”—ὑπερφυές in contract to Eustratius's φύσει:

Οὐδαμοῦ δυάς τῇ μιᾷ θεότητι παραζεύγνυται· οὐδεὶς ἐν τῇ Τριάδι συνδυασμός· οὐ μετὰ τὴν μονάδα δυάς, εἴτα τριάς, ἵνα καὶ δυάδα πρὸ τῆς μονάδος νοῆς· ἀλλὰ μονάς μὲν ἡ πηγαία τῶν ἐξ αὐτῆς δύο μονάδων, φθάνει δὲ ταύτας ἑαυτὴν νοοῦσα καὶ πρὸ δυάδος νοουμένη τριάς, καὶ ἅμα ἐνί με φωτὶ περιστράπτουσα καὶ τρισίν.

¹⁸ As a test pit in this unexplored field, see B. LOURIÉ, A Logical Scheme and Paraconsistent Topological Separation in Byzantium: Inter-Trinitarian Relations according to Hieromonk Hierotheos and Joseph Bryennios, in D. Bertini / D. Migliorini (eds.), *Relations: Ontology and Philosophy of Religion*, Milan 2018 (forthcoming). Further studies are needed, especially in theological works of Niketas “of Maroneia” and logical works of Nicephorus Blemmydes and his disciple Theodore Doukas Laskaris.

¹⁹ B. LOURIÉ, What Means “Tri-” in “Trinity”? An Eastern Patristic Approach to the “Quasi-Ordinals”, *Journal of Applied Logic* (forthcoming).

²⁰ B. LOURIÉ, Nicephorus Blemmydes on the Holy Trinity and the Paraconsistent Notion of Numbers: A Logical Analysis of a Byzantine Approach to the *Filioque*, *Studia Humana* 5 (2016) 40 – 54.

²¹ The critical edition as the Παράρτημα in: Θ. Ν. ΖΗΣΗΣ, Ὁ πατριάρχης Νικόλαος Δ΄ Μουζάλων, *Επιστημονική Επετηρίδα Θεολογικῆς Σχολῆς Θεσσαλονίκης* 23 (1978) 233 – 330, here 325, 6-10 and 22-24.

<...> μονάς μονάδων αἰτία πρὶν διαθῆναι τρισσοῦμενον, καὶ τριάς τὴν δυάδα προφθάνουσα, ἵνα κὰν τούτῳ ὑπερφυῖς αὐτῆς παραδείξῃ.²²

Nowhere to the unique divinity is applicable a dyad. There is no pairing in the Trinity. The monad is not followed by a dyad and then by a triad, so that you would think a dyad before the monad,²³ but the monad is the fountain [the term of the Areopagite, *De div. nom.* II, 7; PG 3, 645 B = ed. Suchla, p. 132.1] of the two monads which are from it, but it is preceding them thinking itself and being thought as the triad that is before the dyad and flashing around simultaneously as single and triple.

<...> the monad is the cause of the monads, which is becoming triple before being disposed (in order), and the triad is preceding the dyad, so that, in this way, it will show forth its supernaturality.

Nicholas Mouzalon's future defender (at his trial in 1151) and the leading theologian of the twelfth century, Nicholas of Methone (ca 1100s–1160/1166) in his refutation of Proclus (1150s) made explicit that, in this “arithmetic,” “one” is equal to “three,” even though “one” and “three” remain clearly distinct²⁴:

οὐκ οὐδ' ἡ παρ' ἡμῶν σεβομένη τριάς πληθός· ἦν γὰρ ἂν μόνον τριάς, ἡ δὲ ἐστὶ ἡ αὐτὴ καὶ μονάς· διὸ οὐδὲ δυάς πρὸ ταύτης, οὔτε μὴν ἡ μονάς πρὸ τῆς ἐν αὐτῇ δυάδος ἀλλ' ἅμα τῇ πατρικῇ μονάδι καὶ ἡ ἐξ αὐτῆς δυάς συνεκφαίνεται, καὶ ἅμα τὸ ὅλον μονάς ἐστὶ καὶ τριάς καὶ οὔτε μονάς μόνον, ὅτι καὶ τριάς, οὔτε τριάς, ὅτι καὶ μονάς· ἀλλ' οὐδὲ δυάς τὰ ἐκ τῆς μονάδος, ὅτι μὴ κατὰ τὸν αὐτὸν τρόπον ἄμφω ἐκείθεν ἀλλ' ἰδίως ἐκάτερον, τὸ μὲν γεννητῶς, τὸ δὲ ἐκπορευτῶς. οὕτω δὲ καὶ ἕκαστον τῶν τριῶν καὶ τὰ τρία ἅμα τὸ ἐν.²⁵

...Therefore the Trinity/triad we are worshipping is not a multiplicity either, as it would be in the case if it is only a triad, but this triad is both triad and monad. Thus, neither the dyad is before it, nor the monad is before the dyad that is within it, but the paternal monad and the dyad that is from it are showing themselves simultaneously, and the whole is simultaneously monad and triad and not only monad but also triad, and not (only) triad but also monad. However, what is from the monad is not a dyad, because the two are from it not in the same way, but each of the two in a specific way—one being born and another one being proceeded. Thus, also each of the three is simultaneously three and one.

These quotations are sufficient to demonstrate that Eustratius's numerical rationalism was going against the mainstream Byzantine theological teaching of his epoch. No wonder that his Triadology was later called for by the *latinophrones* such as Niketas “of Maroneia.” No wonder either that Eustratius's Triadology was enrooted in Neoplatonic theological numerologies known to him both directly and *via* his teacher John Italos.

The above observations of Eustratius's texts first published by Barmin could serve to give, at least, a general idea of what mine of theological, philosophical, and logical thought Barmin opened to the scholarly community. We need to reward him, above all, with deeper studies of Eustratius and other understudied Byzantine authors of the twelfth and thirteenth centuries.²⁶

²² The second passage is taken from the list of true statements that would become false if the *Filioque* is true.

²³ In this chapter, Nicholas argued that, in the case of the *Filioque*, the Trinity would be decomposed into a monad causing a dyad, which, in turn, causes another monad; such a sequence where the monad is the cause of the dyad, and the dyad is the cause of the monad, would, in turn, generate other numbers beyond three, thus leading into a bad infinity.

²⁴ For other instances of this equating “1 = 3,” see LOURIE, What Means “Tri-” in “Trinity”? (as footnote 19 above) and *idem* = Василий ЛУРЬЕ, Понятие числа в триадологии восточной патристики [The Notion of Number in the Triadology of Eastern Patristics], *Esse* 1.1 (2016) <http://esse-journal.ru/?p=1713>.

²⁵ Nicholas of Methone, Refutation of Proclus' Elements of Theology. A critical edition with an introduction on Nicholas' Life and Works by Athanasios D. ANGELOU. *Corpus philosophorum Medii Aevi. Philosophi byzantini*, 1. Athens—Leiden 1984, 135.24–31.

²⁶ An importance of then unpublished Eustratius's works as sources of Niketas “of Maroneia” was noticed, with a reference to Barmin's 2000 paper, by Alessandra BUCOSSI, Seeking a way out of the impasse: the *Filioque* controversy during John's reign, in A. Bucossi / A. R. Suarez (eds.), John II Komnenos, emperor of Byzantium: in the shadow of father and son. *Publications of the Centre for Hellenic Studies, King's College London*. Farnham 2016, 121 – 134, here 129.

