HUMANISM AND THE COUNCIL OF FLORENCE, 1438-1439

DISSERTATION

Presented to the Graduate Council of the
University of North Texas in Partial
Fulfillment of the Requirements

For the Degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

By

Samuel J. Swisher, Jr., B.A., M.Div.
Denton, Texas
December, 1991

HUMANISM AND THE COUNCIL OF FLORENCE, 1438-1439

DISSERTATION

Presented to the Graduate Council of the
University of North Texas in Partial
Fulfillment of the Requirements

For the Degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

By

Samuel J. Swisher, Jr., B.A., M.Div.
Denton, Texas
December, 1991

Swisher, Samuel J. Jr., Humanism and the Council of Florence, 1438-1439. Doctor of Philosophy (History), December, 1991, 256 pp., bibliography, 108 titles.

The Council of Ferrara-Florence was important to the church because it was an attempt to reunite the Latin and Greek obediences which had been separated since 1054. A notable aspect of the council was the fact that it brought together some of the greatest scholars of the era to participate in the debates.

Humanism was an attempt among intellectuals committed to the study of the humanities to rediscover and imitate the literary and oratorical style associated with the classical past of ancient Greece and republican Rome. The humanist methodological approach to the arts of rhetoric, grammar and textual criticism can be said to have gained widespread acceptance among intellectuals in fifteenth century Italy. Curiously, however, little has been written regarding the influence of humanism on the church during that same period, particularly in the early fifteenth century. This work was written to address this issue, at least in part, by exploring the relationship between humanism and the proceedings of the important Council of Florence. The examination focuses solely on the Latin delegation, since the humanist movement was primarily a western phenomenon.

The study begins with the development of the nature and character of fifteenth century Italian humanism. It then proceeds to delineate the humanist methodological approach to three key areas; rhetoric, grammar, and historical criticism. Having thus laid this necessary foundation, the work examines selected portions of the debates of the council with regard to each of the three key areas, in order to ascertain whether or not a humanistic approach was utilized by the Latin participants in their argumentations.

This investigation concludes that the Latin advocates of the council did indeed employ humanist methodology in both the preparation and presentation of their arguments in the debates. Therefore, such evidence strongly suggests that an appreciation and acceptance of the humanist approach to rhetoric, grammar, and textual criticism existed in the church in the early decades of the fifteenth century.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER 1

EARLY FIFTEENTH CENTURY ITALIAN HUMANISM

While the Burckhardtian thesis[1] concerning the nature of the period we know as the Renaissance may now be considered inadequate after more than a century of additional research, Burckhardt nevertheless accurately identified the unique blend of cultural milieu and men of intellect which existed in Italy during the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries. This period, as Kristeller notes, witnessed a rebirth of Italian arts and letters which provided her a certain independence from the other western European countries, especially France, which had culturally dominated the continent since the early middle ages.[2] Italy during this era also produced the great literary genius Dante, the talented Bocaccio, and the pious poet and philosopher, Francesco Petrarcha.

Within the context of the Renaissance, an intellectual movement emerged which had as one of its primary objectives a return to the classical past, the humanist movement. There is, of course, a great debate as to the definition of the term "humanist", but Kristeller argues convincingly that in Renaissance Italy it was strictly applied to a teacher of the humanities, a prescribed discipline of academic subjects

known as the studia humanitatis, consisting of; grammar, rhetoric, poetry, history and moral philosophy.[3] A humanist, therefore, was primarily a scholar-educator, who because of the nature of his craft, was interested in the writings of ancient authors, both Roman and Greek. This interest was engendered by a love of the wisdom and eloquence which characterized the writings of the ancients and which came to be prized virtues among the humanists themselves. Burckhardt viewed the humanists as mediators "between their own age and a venerated antiquity," who by virtue of their understanding and imitation of the ancients overthrew a Church-based medieval culture.[4]

Although Francesco Petrarca, or Petrarch (1304-1374), has been generally acknowledged as the progenitor of Renaissance humanists, some have resisted the tendency to exaggerate his importance to the Renaissance and the humanist movement. Burckhardt, for example, credited Dante with being the first "mediator" between antiquity and Renaissance culture in Italy, not Petrarch.[5] In a similar fashion, Kristeller prefers to speak of Petrarch as humanism's "first great representative" rather than its initiator.[6] Nevertheless, no one denies the important role which Petrarch played in directly contributing to the humanist movement with his own literary efforts, and the influence which he had upon many disciples who actively promoted its ideas.

Eighteen years after the death of Petrarch, in 1392, one such disciple, Giovanni Conversini (1347-1406), was appointed to the Chair of Rhetoric at the University of Padua. Conversini was an admirer of Petrarch and Cicero and promoted humanistic interests at the university when other academic institutions were shunning the ideas of the new movement.[7] Several of Conversini's pupils such as Poggio Bracciolini (1380-1459), Vittorino da Feltre (1378-1446), and Guarino da Verona (1374-1460), became great humanists and made significant contributions to the movement.[8]

Milanese humanism also stemmed from Petrarchan influence as well as from close ties to Florentine humanism in general.[9] A number of important humanists resided in Milan or in its subject-city Pavia, the ancient Lombard capital, during the late fourteenth and early fifteenth centuries, including Lorenzo Valla (1407-1457) and Francesco Filelfo. In 1421, after a successful teaching carreer, the well known humanist-educator Gasparino Barzizza (1360-1430) was recalled to Milan from Padua by Filippo Maria Visconti because of an important discovery of Ciceronian manuscripts by the bishop of Lodi, Gerardo Landriani.[10] This discovery alone would have assured Milan a significant place in the tradition of Italian humanism, but there was to be more. Barzizza, for example, was established after his return in an important chair of rhetoric at Pavia, and many humanists, including Leon Battista Alberti (1404-1472) and Francesco

Filelfo (1398-1481), were educated under his tutelage. Barzizza was succeeded by Valla in 1431.[11] While at Pavia, Valla wrote his first important work, De Voluptate (1431), as well as the early notes regarding his De Elegantiis Linguae Latinae (1442).[12] However, fifteenth century Milan achieved its most lasting contribution to Renaissance humanism as a center for the discovery, editing and publication of classical texts, such as the Lodi manuscripts, for which it later became renowned.[13]

The existence of a large papal bureaucracy at Rome provided a great opportunity for humanist employment and service in the early Quattrocento.[14] The voluminous paperwork requirements of the curia ensured an ongoing need for men of letters such as the humanists. One of the most important curial posts was that of apostolic secretary. This office was originated to assist the pope with his heavy workload.[15] Certainly one of the most famous of these secretaries was Poggio Bracciolini, who held his appointment for a half century (1403-1453), and during his tenure, accompanied Eugenius IV to the Council of Florence.[16] Lorenzo Valla, like Bracciolini, also served as secretary in a papal administration, having been appointed to this office by Pope Nicholas V in 1448.

Yet another opportunity for service for humanists in Rome in the early Quattrocento was provided by the existence of "familias," or groups of individuals who

assisted popes, cardinals or secular lords in the performance of their work.[17] Humanists made up a large part of the members of these "familias", with two of the best known of these groups being those of Cardinal Bessarion and Cardinal Todeschini-Piccolomini.[18] These benefactors sponsored gatherings of the members of the "familias" for the purpose of dialogue and philosophical discussion which eventually led to the creation of the Roman academies, which served the same purpose but were under the control of the humanists themselves instead of a curial representative.[19]

When Petrarch moved to Venice in 1361 he brought with him his treasured library of Latin classics.[20] He was warmly received by the Venetian government who went to great lengths to provide him with a comfortable setting in which to live and work. It was during the seven years he spent in Venice that Petrarch wrote on his most famous works, De Viris Illustribus, which contained thirty-one biographies of famous Romans.[21]

Humanistic elements in Venice were derived from many different sources apart from the direct contributions of Petrarch during his brief stay there. One of these sources was the nearby university at Padua, where Conversini taught and many young Venetians were educated. Another was the process of cultural exchange which developed between Venice and the Greek East as a result of her position as a dominant maritime economic power, by which many classical

and Patristic manuscripts made their way into the city.[22] Despite many direct and important contributions, humanism as a philosophical outlook or worldview never dominated the intellectual or cultural environment in Venice nor was it even generally appreciated there until the late Quattrocento. The same can also be said of Naples, where little interest in the new movement existed in the early fifteenth century, apart from the patronage of Alfonso V, king of Aragon and Sicily (1396-1458), which provided Valla the opportunity to write his extremely important work, The Falsely Believed and Forged Donation of Constantine (1440).[23]

The focal point of the humanist movement, despite what was going on in other parts of Italy as the result of the influence of Petrarch and his disciples, had always been and still was, Florence. Charles Stinger attributes Florence's receptivity to the new movement to three basic factors.[24] First, Florentine commercial activity was cosmopolitan and broad-based, giving the city a worldly outlook, opening it to new ideas, and providing for a less rigid social structure than that of some of the other states. Second, the people of Florence were eager for self-understanding and a sense of purpose. The humanists provided an opportunity for both in their zeal to recover and apply the wisdom of the ancients to practical life issues. Finally, the absence of a major university in Florence provided humanism with a clear

path to intellectual acceptance, since it did not have to compete directly with Aristotelianism which predominated in them.

Giovanni Boccaccio, (1313-1375) Petrarch's noted disciple, was responsible for introducing humanistic ideas to Florence in the late Trecento where they were eagerly accepted by the Florentine chancellor Coluccio Salutati (1331-1406) and his intellectual circle.[25] Salutati had proven himself to be a strong civic leader during both the Ciompi revolt of 1378 and the war between Milan and Florence in the last decade of the century. Therefore many scholars are puzzled concerning his endorsement of the "vita studiosa," the quiet life of study and contemplation of the monk, as set forth in his De Seculo et Religione (1381) over the "vita activa," the life of active participation in state affairs so promoted by the humanists.[26] Though Salutati may never have resolved this inner conflict, he undoubtedly championed the tenets of humanism, and was a pivotal figure in its development in Florence. He assembled an excellent library of ancient texts and was responsible for inviting the Greek scholar Manuel Chrysoloras to Florence in 1397 as the chair of Greek studies at the Florentine Studium.[27]

If Salutati had difficulty in choosing between the active and contemplative lives, his disciple and successor Leonardo Bruni (1369-1444) did not. His energetic career alternated between service to Florence and to the papal

chancery for nearly four decades. Bruni studied Greek under Chrysoloras[28] and was part of a group of humanists who met regularly for discussion which included Niccolo de Niccoli (1364-1437), Carlo Marsuppini (1399-1453), and Ambrogio Traversari (1386-1438).[29] Bruni translated the works of many ancient authors including Plato and Aristotle, and he also wrote an important history of Florence, History of the Florentine People. In his History, Bruni utilized humanistic methodology, carefully verifying his sources, and applied it to a classical model, specifically Livy's History of Rome.[30] He had as an objective the praise of the republican virtue found in ancient Rome and revived in contemporary Florence. Indeed, Baron considered Bruni to have been the originator of a new form of humanism, "civic humanism", which glorified active participation in public life, praising the virtue of the old Roman Republic while vilifying the tyranny of the Roman Empire.[31]

Niccolo Niccoli espoused a variant of humanism which prized classics for classic's sake. An important humanist of the early fifteenth century in Florence, he built up a library of ancient texts without equal in the city.[32] Niccoli, along with Ambrogio Traversari, also began to explore the rich depths of Patristic literature and valued the stylistic achievements of the early Church fathers such as Jerome and Augustine. Both were also interested in the original languages of the texts, and

Traversari, who became an accomplished Greek scholar, later served as the primary translator between Greeks and Latins at the Council of Florence. Interest in Greek studies prior to the Council of Florence was heightened by scholars such as Giovanni Aurispa (1369-1459), and Francesco Filelfo, who brought back hundreds of manuscripts from Constantinople during the decade of the 1420s.[33] Along with Niccoli, many Florentine patricians such as Antonio Corbinelli, Palla Strozzi, and Cosimo D'Medici established libraries containing Greek classical works within this same decade.[34] Florence in the early Quattrocento therefore, appears to have been uniquely provided with the necessary means to achieve and develop an understanding of the ancients whether in philosophy, rhetoric or even history, because of the vast holdings and quality of its libraries.

Hans Baron's thesis that Florentine "civic humanism" was the essence of Italian humanism during the Quattrocento[35] has been effectively challenged by many Renaissance historians. Yet the fact that Florentine humanism was indeed the essence of Italian humanism in this period has not been called into question. There were several reasons for this. The republican government of Florence, at least until 1434, did foster civic involvement, and humanistic ideas were allowed to take root under the sponsorship and advocacy of its humanist chancellors, Salutati and Bruni. Furthermore, Florence was the home of

many of the greatest members of the new movement, and certainly those who had been in the forefront of its development. Burckhardt described these Florentines as "distinguished scholars, or else distinguished dilettanti who maintained the scholars." They also were "of peculiar significance during the period of transition at the beginning of the fifteenth century, since it was in them that humanism first showed itself practically as an indispensable element in daily life."[36] Finally, the building of quality libraries, growing interest in Greek studies, and the influx of important Greek manuscripts placed Florence in the very forefront of activity with regard to the recovery of literary antiquity.

While Renaissance humanism was certainly not a Christian movement, it would be equally wrong to say that it was an anti-Christian one or that it was totally secular in nature. There is absolutely no question after all, that Petrarch was a devoutly religious man,[37] and that he always subordinated the elements of the new movement to religion. Certainly many of the adherents of the new movement were also pious men of the Church. This can be said of Salutati and his successor, Bruni, and most assuredly of the Camaldulensian general, Ambrogio Traversari. Even such a harsh critic of Church abuses as Lorenzo Valla clearly demonstrated his faith in his De Libero Arbitrio, where he sought to reconcile God's foreknowledge and the freedom of

the human will.[38] This should not be surprising, since the humanists were a product of their culture, which was still predominantly a Christian culture. Indeed, Trinkaus remarks concerning the humanists that:"Their concern with God and religion was inseparable from their concern with man in his otherworldly destiny and his thisworldly condition."[39]

For the Christian humanists, the return to the classical past, in addition to reclaiming the works of ancient authors, also involved rediscovering the works of the early Church fathers. These Church fathers included both Greeks--such as Origen (ca. 185-254), Basil the Great (ca. 330-379), and Gregory of Nyssa (ca. 330-395)-- as well as Latins: Ambrose (ca.339-397), Jerome (ca. 345-420), Gregory the Great (ca. 540-604) and Augustine (354-430).

Although the Latin Fathers had been well known throughout the middle ages, their Eastern counterparts had not been. Eugene Rice underscores the important role which the humanists played in the "renaissance" of this segment of Christian antiquity: "the bulk of Greek patristic literature was first made readily available to European intellectuals during the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries, principally in Italy, by western humanist scholars and emigres."[40] Traversari was responsible for the Medici sponsorship of Aurispa's efforts from 1421 to 1423 to recover some 238 ancient Byzantine manuscripts, including those of the Greek Fathers.[41] The crucial role which

Traversari played in this renaissance of patristic scholarship in the early Quattrocento is, of course, the subject of Stinger's Humanism and the Church Fathers: Ambrogio Traversari (1386-1439). Stinger maintains that Traversari's "principal purpose was to begin to recover for the Latin West the patrimony of ancient Greek Christian literature, just as his humanist contemporaries were revealing the long-lost wisdom of the Greek philosophers".[42] In support of this thesis, Stinger ably demonstrates the fact that Traversari applied humanist methodology to the study of Patristic texts, such as philological, textual and rhetorical analysis, as particularly evidenced by his translation work in support of the Latin scholars who participated at the Council of Florence. Rice further identified three main areas in which the Renaissance humanists improved contemporary patristic scholarship. First, they made an important contribution by evaluating texts and by eliminating those spurious documents not actually written by the Fathers. Next, they eradicated numerous myths and legends which had attached themselves to genuine works over many centuries. Finally, they produced improved editions of the authentic writings using the new philological methods of the movement.[43]

Humanists also benefited in other ways from their study of Christian antiquity. They were able to justify their interest in Greek classical authors, for example,

because the Fathers had also been interested in them. Rabil has demonstrated the fact that Petrarch was strongly influenced by Augustine, and that the Bishop of Hippo unashamedly drew inspiration from his pagan literary background as well as from the Bible.[44] Like Augustine, Petrarch subordinated all truth to Biblical truth, but like his theological predecessor, he was inclined to think that pagan philosophy had also discovered that same truth, albeit by a different path. This theme was further developed by the early fifteenth century humanists, notably Salutati, who in defense of the propriety of studying both the studia humanitatis and the studia divinitatis cited the Greek Father St. Basil, who argued in his Homilia ad Iuvenes de Legendis Libris Gentilium that an understanding of ancient classical literature better prepared a person to understand the Bible.[45] St. Basil, who had one of the best classical educations of his day, was a figure upon whom the Christian humanists of this period often relied in presenting a justification for their study of secular as well as religious classical literature.

The general antagonism of the humanists toward Scholasticism was also greatly aided by the revival of interest in the writings of the early Church Fathers, because these represented a simpler, more genuine Christian faith as opposed to the complex, doctrinally-oriented belief system created by the schoolmen.[46] It was therefore easier

for the humanists to bolster their arguments against the schoolmen, by portraying such arguments as the means for reviving the simplicity of belief characteristic of the early church.

Interestingly, the Latins at the Council of Florence later took advantage of many of the Greek patristic documents brought back to Italy by such notable humanists as Bracciolini and Nicholas Cusanus to undermine thoroughly the position of the eastern church on the procession of the Holy Spirit and other doctrinal issues. Ambrogio Traversari, as noted previously, was chief among the Latin humanists in the translation of these texts, and he made an invaluable contribution both to patristic scholarship and to the success of the western doctrinal position at the council. He translated, for example, Basil's Adversus Eunomium,[47] in which Basil refuted the Arian view of Eunomius (d. 394) regarding the Divine nature of Christ. This document was referred to repeatedly in the debates by Cardinal Cesarini and others, such as John of Montenegro, as a witness in favor of the Latin position.

Humanist regard for the Sacred Scriptures differed little from that of their medieval predecessors, in that both held them in high esteem. Petrarch, although not impressed with the Bible as a literary achievement, nonetheless understood its importance to his faith. He expressed this clearly in a letter to Francesco Nelli in

which he distinguished between his love for classical literature and for the Bible; "...the concern for salvation is greater than that for eloquence. I have read what delighted, I read what profits."[48] Biblical authority was still sought in the affirmation or rejection of any doctrinal position. The allegorical approach to biblical exegesis so characteristic of the medieval period certainly continued into the Renaissance. However, the great contribution of Renaissance humanism to biblical scholarship was that the Bible came to be treated critically by many fifteenth century humanists, that is, it was subjected to the same methodological analysis as pagan literature. This approach utilized various techniques such as the comparison of manuscripts, textual criticism and philological analysis in the hope of obtaining documents faithful to the originals.

Salutati, while affirming the allegorical approach to biblical interpretation, chose to look at the Bible literarily as a poetic work, which concealed a deeper meaning within its metaphors and figures of speech extending beyond both the literal and allegorical interpretations.[49] This plainly humanistic understanding allowed for a more free translation or paraphrase of Scripture into verse for which Salutati had ample historical precedent in many Christian poets, including Juvencus (4th century) and Sedulius (9th century). Traversari, on the other hand, had

grown to appreciate the exegetical approach and works of the church fathers, as he began to study them in the decade of the 1420s. He was particularly impressed with the exegetical writings of Origen and Gregory of Nyssa, although he tended to favor the literal approach to exegesis of the Antiochene school most represented by the efforts of St. John Chrysostom (c.347-407).[50] Chrysostom's homilies demonstrated a practical concern for biblical exegesis, namely, as providing a foundation for rhetorical sermons, and this emphasis particularly suited the humanists. Traversari was particularly excited by Chrysostom's use of the biblical text as a means of exhortation to piety and a life of faith, what Stinger calls the "ethico-spiritual concern" Traversari exhibited in his religious life, and which dominated his Scriptural study.[51] He was involved in the translation of Chrysostom's Homilies on Matthew as well as those on the pastoral epistles, Titus and 1 and 2 Timothy, and these greatly contributed to a renewed appreciation of patristic scholarship on the part of the humanists.[52] Thus Traversari's interest in the exegetical study of the Scriptures was practical, not simply philological.

Any attempt at the critical study of the New Testament presupposed a knowledge of Greek, a revival of interest in which occurred in the late fourteenth and fifteenth centuries in the west. There had certainly

been a widespread acquaintance with the original languages of the Bible among the early church fathers. A precipitous decline in the number of those scholars capable of working with them occurred, however, from the death of Bede (c.735) until the end of the fourteenth century.[53] During the medieval period there were significant individual scholars who advocated the knowledge of Greek and Hebrew as the basis for sound biblical exegesis. Among these were, Roger Bacon (1220-1292), Ramon Lull (1235-1315), and Pierre d'Ailly (1350-1421).[54] It was not until the arrival of Manuel Chrysoloras in Florence in 1397 however, that renewed interest in the original language of the New Testament truly began in the west. It is interesting to note that this famous Greek educator was concerned with theology as well as classical scholarship. This truth is evidenced by the fact that he participated in the theological debates at the Council of Constance as well as in translating various Latin documents into Greek, including the Collects of the Roman Missal and the Mass of Gregory the Great.55 Bruni was Chrysoloras' most famous pupil, and his mastery of Greek enabled him to translate works of Plato, Aristotle, Plutarch and St. Basil, as well as to become a tutor in the Medici household.[56] Guarino da Verona was another of Chrysoloras' disciples whose skills were utilized not only in translating sacred and secular texts but also in that most characteristic of humanistic enterprises, the collection of

manuscripts. Valla was in turn the noteworthy student of Bruni and carried on the legacy of Chrysoloras' Greek scholarship into the middle of the fifteenth century and beyond. It seems that Traversari was self-taught in Greek,[57] but this did not diminish his great facility in the language nor his ability to impart his learning to others, chief among whom was Gianozzo Manetti (1396-1459), arguably one of the most able original language scholars of the early fifteenth century.

Manetti, not unlike his mentor Traversari, followed the developing humanist tendency toward the textual-critical, and philological analysis of the biblical text. Accordingly, he made a translation of the New Testament from a Greek text sometime between the years 1453-1458.[58] However, his greatest legacy to biblical scholarship was his interest in the area of Hebrew and Old Testament studies.[59] He learned Hebrew possibly at the instigation of his teacher Traversari, and later attempted a translation of the Old Testament only managing to complete the Psalter, which he dedicated together with an Apology to king Alfonso of Naples c. 1458.[60] Manetti's Apology essentially defended the work of Jerome who had been accused by some Jewish scholars as having mistranslated the Hebrew Old Testament into Latin, thus causing Christian theological misunderstanding of that portion of the Scriptures. Although he never directly indicated it, Manetti seemed to feel that

his work was a necessary improvement, or update, of the pioneering effort of that great patriarch of the church.[61]

It was Lorenzo Valla who first fully utilized the literary-critical methods of the new movement in his study of the New Testament, differing markedly from his predecessors. Valla's Annotations on the New Testament (1442-43) in which he attempted to correct the Latin Vulgate of Jerome, clearly demonstrated this new approach. Valla methodically analyzed the text in order to compare it with the early Greek manuscripts, exposing and correcting deviations.[62] The New Testament, in this way, was handled like the humanists handled the pagan classics, thus the Bible was treated as an historical document, as a literary work. Trinkaus offers another way in which Valla's approach was novel and perhaps extreme, namely, in the effect of his research upon then prevailing theological views. "But what was essentially radical in Valla's textual criticism was his grasp of theological implications, or of the support that could be offered or removed from particular doctrines by 'correct' or 'incorrect' philology."[63] There is absolutely no question that Valla laid the foundation for such biblical scholarship not only for a generation of later humanist biblical scholars, including Erasmus and Melanchthon, but also for the Protestant reformers as well.

Byzantine scholarship played a significant role in the development of early fifteenth century humanism in

Italy. Kristeller[64] and Geanakoplos[65] have both shown that the Italian Renaissance benefited greatly from the Byzantine "Palaeologian Renaissance" which occurred during the last two centuries of the empire's existence. This era, which saw a renewed emphasis in the study of literature, rhetoric, philology, philosophy, mathematics, and science in Byzantium, is thought to have been triggered by the reestablishment of Greek control over Constantinople by Emperor Michael Palaeologus in 1261.[66] Chrysoloras' importance to the humanist movement has been well documented, and it was largely his efforts that fomented the great renewal of interest in classical literature in early quattrocento Italy. However, other Greek scholars were important contributors to the humanist movement. One such man was John Aryropoulos (1416-1486), who according to Geanakoplos was primarily responsible for the mid-century shift in the movement from rhetoric to metaphysics.[67] Agyropoulos, a "true representative of the Palaeologan Renaissance"[68], held the chair of rhetoric at the Florentine Studium from 1456-1471, and he managed to revive the debate among humanists as to the relative merits of Platonism and Aristotelianism, which had never caused problems among the Byzantines, but had been a source of great controversy in the west. Indeed, this controversy had been heightened earlier by another Greek scholar, Gemistos Pletho, who lectured on Plato in conjunction with his arrival in

Florence as part of the Greek delegation to the Council of Florence in 1438. Later contributions to the development of the humanist movement were made by George of Trebizond, who by translating a number of works of church fathers such as Gregory of Nazianzus, Basil and Gregory of Nyssa which were widely disseminated in Italy, aided in the rediscovery of Christian antiquity characteristic of the efforts of the Christian humanists.[69] Bessarion of Nicea played a key role in the Greek acceptance of the Latin-originated decree of union at Florence. He also provided manuscripts from his library which were used by many scholars including George of Trebizond, Thomas of Gaza, and perhaps even Lorenzo Valla in developing translations from Greek secular and patristic texts, including mathematical texts which promoted an expansion of interest in this field among the humanists.[70]

Byzantine translations were marked by a certain license ad sententiam transferre (according to sense) which provided for a less rigid adherence to the text than the medieval western scholastic ad verbum (word for word) tradition. Bruni was one of the first western humanists to utilize this method of translation in his version of Aristotle's Politics.[71] Geanakoplos argues that this legacy of free translation according to the spirit of the text was the greatest gift of Byzantine scholarship to the humanist movement.[72] He further states that this attitude, away from a rigid literalism, was absolutely essential in the ability

of western scholars to understand the wealth of Greek classical works which found their way to Italy in the early years of the fifteenth century.[73] As Kristeller also notes, humanist attitudes toward the texts they dealt with were much more greatly influenced by the Byzantine tradition in this regard than that of the scholastics.[74] Thus the Greek scholars and educators who emigrated to the west before and up to the fall of Constantinople were not simply the bearers of Greek culture as some historians have maintained, they were its interpreters. They provided the necessary catalyst in Italy for the development of humanism.

Perhaps it would be presumptuous to attempt any definition of humanism, yet for the purpose of this discussion such a definition must be achieved. A particular definition may be judged inadequate because it fails to account for the diversity of the movement, or because it oversimplifies its complexity. However, as with most classifications, a certain amount of generalization can be accomplished without distorting the true nature of this remarkable intellectual movement. Kristeller accurately states that Italian humanism was "a broad and pervasive cultural movement that affected at the same time the literature and philosophy, the historiography and philological scholarship of the period and that also had wide repercussions in theology, in the sciences, and in the arts."[75] Humanists were definitely intellectuals: scholars,

theologians, artists, educators, philosophers, civic leaders, rhetoricians, grammarians and poets. They commonly held a view that by recovering the ancient literature, a revival of the nobility and virtue of antiquity could be achieved and transmitted to their contemporary culture. They were impressed with the eloquence and literary style of the ancients and sought to emulate that style in their own writings. They were concerned about content, but more concerned with eloquence, style and rhetoric. Their objective in public speaking was always to move their audience to thought or action, not simply to inform. Civic involvement was a characteristic of Florentine humanism, but not necessarily all humanism. The intellectual concerns of the humanists, after all, were shaped by many external factors, including political restrictions.

Humanists and humanism were not simply concerned with the recovery of ancient texts, but also with understanding them in their original languages. These objectives were satisfied not only by the extensive searches for manuscripts undertaken by the humanists, but also by their renewed study of the ancient languages, principally Greek. Efforts in these areas coupled with the philological emphasis of Italian humanism in the early quattrocento led to the pioneering work of Lorenzo Valla and Giannozzo Manetti in the field of biblical textual criticism.

The dignity of man was a common theme of humanist

writings, yet because of the influence of religion upon their cultural framework, they recognized that man was indeed a creature whose appetites necessitated some form of external control.

Christian humanists, in their search for the revival of antiquity, rediscovered the wealth of writings of the church fathers, primarily the Greek fathers, who had been generally neglected in the west during the middle ages. An important corollary to this was a justification among Christians for the study of pagan classical authors, because the early church fathers themselves had had such a background. Humanism, when coupled with a deep piety, produced a revival of interest in the Bible as a literary document without any dilution of its authority. Humanist philological methodology, combined with a desire to educate morally led to venacular translations of biblical commentaries and other religious literature.

Humanism, therefore, can be viewed as an intellectual movement concerned with the recovery of ancient classical literature and culture with a view toward the moral improvement of contemporary culture. The recovery of classical literature involved the gathering of manuscripts, the use of new interpretive methods such as textual critical analysis, and the learning of the languages in which the original manuscripts were written. The participants of the movement as previously noted, were

scholars, who pursued various aspects of the movement which derived from the whole, as represented by Valla in the area of philology, Traversari in the area of rhetoric, and Ficino in philosophy. Humanism was not a completely new phenomenon; it had its roots in the medieval period. However it did promote a modified worldview which recognized the ability of man to achieve, whether in speaking, writing or the arts, while acknowledging his idebtedness to God in the context of what was still an essentially Christian culture.

ENDNOTES

[1]Jacob Burckhardt, The Civilization of the Renaissance in Italy Vol. 1 trans. by S.G.C. Middlemore. (New York: Harper & Row Pub., 1958), 175.

[2]Paul Oskar Kristeller, Renaissance Thought: the Classic, Scholastic, and Humanist Strains (New York: Harper & Row Pub., 1955), 93-95.

[3]Paul Oskar Kristeller, Eight Philosophers of the Italian Renaissance (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1964), 3.

[4]Burckhardt, 211.

[5]Ibid., 212.

[6]Kristeller, Eight Philosophers , 5.

[7]Henry S. Lucas, The Renaissance and the Reformation (New York: Harper & Brothers Publishers, 1934), 211.

[8]Ibid.

[9]Albert Rabil, Jr. "Humanism in Milan." In Renaissance Humanism: Foundations Forms, and Legacy Vol. 1: Humanism in Italy. ed. Albert Rabil, Jr. (Philadelphia: University of Philadelphia Press, 1988), 236.

[10]Ibid., 243.

[11]Ibid., 247.

[12]Ibid., 248.

[13]Ibid., 257.

[14]John F. D'Amico, Theory and Practice in Renaissance Textual Criticism (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1988), 270.

[15]Ibid., 271.

[16]Will Durant, The Story of Civilization: Part V The Renaissance (New York: Simon and Schuster, 1953), 82-83.

[17]D'Amico, 273.

[18]Ibid.

[19]Ibid., 275.

[20]Durant, 41.

[21]Ibid., 42.

[22]Lucas, 263.

[23]Ibid., 278.

[24]Charles L. Stinger, "Humanism in Florence." In Renaissance Humanism: Foundations, Forms, and Legacy. Vol. 1 Humanism in Italy ed. Albert Rabil Jr. (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1988), 176-177.

[25]Donald J. Wilcox, In Search of God and Self: Renaissance and Reformation Thought. (Boston: Houghton-Mifflin, 1975), 74.

[26]Ibid., 82.

[27]Ibid., 182-183.

[28]Lewis Spitz, The Renaissance and Reformation Movements Vol. 1 The Renaissance. (St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1971), 162.

[29]Durant, 82.

[30]Stinger, 189.

[31]Wilcox, 84-85.

[32]Stinger, 186-187.

[33]Ibid.

[34]Ibid.

[35]Albert Rabil, Jr. "The Significance of 'Civic Humanism' in the Interpretation of the Italian Renaissance." In Renaissance Humanism: Foundations, Forms, and Legacy Vol. 1 Humanism in Italy. ed. Albert Rabil, Jr. (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1988), 148.

[36]Burckhardt, 224.

[37]Charles Trinkaus, In Our Image and Likeness Vol. 1 (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1970), 3.

[38]Kristeller, Eight Philosophers., 25.

[39]Trinkaus, 4.

[40]Eugene F. Rice, Jr. "The Renaissance Idea of Christian Antiquity: Humanist Patristic Scholarship." In Renaissance Humanism: Foundations, Forms, and Legacy ed. Albert Rabil, Jr. (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1988), 18.

[41]Stinger, 36.

[42]Ibid., 14-15.

[43]Rice, 18.

[44]Albert Rabil, Jr., "Petrarch, Augustine, and the Classical Christian Tradition." In Renaissance Humanism: Foundations, Forms, and Legacy ed. Albert Rabil, Jr. (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1988), 96-97.

[45]Stinger, 11.

[46]Rice, 26.

[47]Ibid., 25.

[48]Trinkaus, 567.

[49]Ibid., 568.

[50]Stinger, 152.

[51]Ibid., 157.

[52]Ibid.

[53]Jerry H. Bentley, Humanists and Holy Writ (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1983), 15.

[54]Ibid.

[55]Charles L. Stinger, Humanism and the Church Fathers: Ambrogio Traversari (1386-1439) (Albany: State University of New York Press, 1977), 18.

[56]Spitz, 19.

[57]Stinger, Traversari, 19.

[58]Trinkaus, 573.

[59]Ibid., 578.

[60]Ibid., 582.

[61]Ibid., 584.

[62]D'Amico, 16.

[63]Charles Trinkaus, In Our Image and Likeness Vol. 2 (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1970), 574-575.

[64]Paul Oskar Kristeller, Renaissance Concepts of Man, and Other Essays (New York: Harper and Row Pub., 1972), 72.

[65]Deno John Geanakoplos, Constantinople and the West (Madison: The University of Wisconsin Press, 1989), 4.

[66]Ibid., 3.

[67]Ibid., 15.

[68]Ibid., 32.

[69]Ibid., 20.

[70]Ibid., 22.

[71]Ibid., 10.

[72]Ibid., 32.

[73]Ibid.

[74]Kristeller, Renaissance Concepts, 75.

[75]Ibid., 64.

CHAPTER 2

HUMANISTIC CONCERNS: RHETORIC

In order to ascertain the influence of humanism as a framework for intellectual thought and argumentation upon the Council of Florence, it will be necessary to identify, define, and describe the methods which the humanists utilized in their quest to recover and interpret ancient texts, and in their forensic skills of public discussion and debate. The emphasis of this and the following chapter is not to compile a laundry list of issues which were of importance to humanists, but rather to focus upon those areas which embodied the major thrusts of the movement, namely, the grammatical-philological, rhetorical, and textual critical concerns, areas which related to the proceedings at Florence. Once these areas of humanist interest are defined and described, it will then be possible to evaluate the proceedings of the council, in order to determine whether or not these issues influenced the thought and method of the participants.

Rhetoric

If there was one fundamental characteristic of Renaissance humanism, it was that it was a rhetorical

movement.[1] Rhetoric was one of the disciplines of the studia humanitatis studied and taught by the humanists, and was derived from both Greek and Roman models. Simply put, rhetoric was the art of persuasion whether literarily or orally, the objective of which was to move an audience to adopt some particular viewpoint. As a skill, it embodied certain techniques which required both instruction and practice in order to be retained and perfected. Clark suggests that the art of rhetoric as a formally studied discipline actually began in Sicily "about one hundred and fifty years before Aristotle as an instrument for training speakers to carry on litigation in the law courts." [2] Perhaps the earliest implementation of rhetorical instruction in ancient Greece was as a part of the activity of the sophists, who were known to be practicing their art from the fifth century B.C.. These were itinerant professors who taught several practical disciplines for a fee, chief among which was rhetoric. Their aim was practical, not philosophical nor ideological, and they taught rhetoric as a necessary tool for those who would be successful in Greek political life. Their legacy is part of the tradition from which the humanists drew in their pursuit of eloquence. The more well known Athenian philosophers from Isocrates to Aristotle, all made valuable contributions to the field of rhetoric. Isocrates' (436-338 B.C.) addition was, in contrast to the sophists, to moralize the content of

rhetoric, and he attempted to inculcate proper moral and political attitudes in his pupils.[3] Aristotle (384-322 B.C) taught that the orator should also be aware of the psychological factors present among his listeners, thus he should seek to appeal to both their emotions and prejudices.

Plato (c.427-347 B.C.) distinguished between what he considered noble rhetoric and that which was false. Plato considered the rhetoric of the sophists to be false for several reasons: it lacked morality and did not seek virtue or righteousness as its end; it was based upon opinion instead of philosophical truth; it utilized emotional appeals to the ignorant instead of dialectical demonstrations to the intellectual; and it was ignorant of the nature of the soul.[4] Noble rhetoric, on the other hand, was that which was practiced by the philosopher, who both knew truth and understood the soul, since these were his areas of expertise; further he was a practitioner of the method of dialectic which was the only proper means of ascertaining truth. Finally, the philosopher's ultimate goal in the use of rhetoric was to project morality, the knowledge of virtue and justice.[5]

Aristotle, unlike his mentor, understood rhetoric to be complimentary to logic.[6] This he believed to be true because rhetoric dealt with the concrete, practical issues germane to the needs of the audience, while the concerns of logic were the abstract, speculative, and by

implication, less practical issues of life. His views regarding the discipline were explained in his well known Rhetoric. Aristotle postulated a fourfold function for rhetoric: first, "to make truth prevail by presenting it effectively," second, "to advance inquiry by such methods as are open to men generally," (by this he probably meant dialectic utilizing the "enthymeme", his term for a logical device leading to a concrete conclusion, as opposed to the syllogism, which led to abstract deductions), third, "to cultivate the habit of seeing both sides and of analyzing sophistries and fallacies," finally, "to defend oneself and one's cause."[7] He further identified three fields within the craft, namely, deliberative address; by which he meant persuasive speeches in public assemblies which solicited action; second, the forensic accusation and defense oratory of the courts; and third, the occasional or panegyric speech; which employed the vehicles of praise or blame in the commemoration of an occasion such as a funeral or award ceremony.[8]

Kristeller suggests that, in addition to their imitation of the ancients, the humanists were the "heirs and successors" of the medieval "dictatores", men who were rhetoricians and teachers of the discipline during that period.[9] This skill had developed primarily as an adjunct to the two famous medieval movements which emphasized literary eloquence and the revival of antiquity,

the Carolingian and twelfth-century renaissances. Kristeller further notes that the humanists were involved in precisely the same professions as their medieval predecessors: service to the state as city secretaries, or princes of cities; or as teachers of grammar and rhetoric at universities or secondary schools.[10] The humanists, Kristeller emphasizes, indeed carried on the medieval traditions of the ars dictaminis (the art of writing letters, as well as other documents) and the art of rhetoric, but they enlarged and gave them new direction by placing a strong emphasis on the imitation of classical models.[11]

One way that the imitation of the ancients manifested itself was in the humanist's efforts to recapture classical eloquence.[12] According to their understanding, true eloquence "could only arise out of a harmonious union between wisdom and style; its aim was to guide men toward virtue and worthwhile goals, not to mislead them for vicious or trivial purposes."[13] Eloquence, or the style with which the orator spoke and delivered his words, was the means by which the audience was persuaded. Eloquence was that aspect of rhetoric "which endowed the precept with life, immediacy, persuasive effect, and which stimulated a man's will as well as informing his reason."[14] Content was only secondary to eloquence in classical thought, and although the humanists desired to evoke a particular moral response from their hearers, the sophist tradition from which humanist rhetoric

descended in part, "taught 'rhetoric', the art of arguing convincingly, irrespective of subject-matter."[15]

One of the chief pursuits of Renaissance humanists was that of the unification of eloquence and wisdom.[16] For the humanists, wisdom encompassed "the knowledge of human and divine things, knowledge of first causes and principles, or knowledge of the highest things."[17] These, of course, are the primary elements of moral philosophy. Thus to combine eloquence and wisdom meant to harmonize rhetoric and philosophy. In their attempts to follow the ancients in this regard, clearly the humanists favored Marcus Tullius Cicero (c.106-43 B.C.), the eminent Roman orator, author, and political figure.[18] Cicero was a prolific author, but in the field of rhetoric his most famous and influential work was De Oratore (c. 55 B.C.). Written in dialogue form and in three books, Cicero's objective in De Oratore was to elucidate the nature of oratory, and to describe the necessary training for and goals of the orator in the conduct of his craft.[19] The essential duty of the orator was threefold, according to Cicero; "flectere, probare, delectare.", that is, to shape, to prove, and to delight.[20] Cicero maintained the usual classical arrangement of the field of rhetoric, dividing it into three categories: 1.) vis oratoris, or the resources of the speaker. 2.) oratio, the speech itself and 3.) quaestio, the occasion or circumstances of the speech. He likewise kept to the

traditional subcategories within these larger areas such that a more or less complete taxonomy can be set forth:[21]

Cicero's Categories of Rhetoric

A. Vis Oratoris:

1. Inventio: gathering of material.
2. Dispositio: arrangement of the material.
3. Elocutio: the embellishment and adorning of the material.
4. Memoria: memorization of information for delivery.
5. Pronuntatio or actio: the actual delivery of the material.

B. Oratio:

1. Exordium: opening remarks intended to render the audience receptive to the speaker.
2. Narratio: a statement of facts colored in favor of the speaker.
   Partitio: a forecast of the speaker's main points.
3. Confirmatio: affirmative proof for the argument.
   Confutatio: Refutation or rebuttal.
4. Conclusio or Peroratio: Conclusion.

C. Quaestio:

1. Quaestio Infinita: A general discussion, also called a "thesis" by Cicero.
2. Quaestio Finita: A discussion which dealt with particular persons or occasions.

Such a chart as this is helpful, not only because it details the various parts and divisions of classical rhetoric known to all who studied the art, but also because it may later aid in the identification of formal elements of the classical model which would be expected to be found in the debates at Florence if indeed they were modeled after the ancients, according to the practice of the humanists. It is also important to note, however, that as significant as the rules and categories were to the teaching of rhetoric, Cicero always maintained that merely following them was not the substance of the art of rhetoric. It was rather, the imitation of those eloquent men of the past in combination with frequent practice which truly made one a rhetorician, a concept which was widely accepted and emphasized in the Renaissance.[22]

According to Siegel, the humanists of the quattrocento did indeed follow the "Ciceronian model" in their synthesis rhetoric and philosophy.[23] Cicero was impressed by the lofty intellectual aims of philosophy, yet more concerned about the practical, common, everyday human issues which were addressed by rhetoric. Cicero valued the stoic philosophic tradition which exalted the sapiens, or wise man, who placed the highest worth on virtue, honesty, and sacrifice, while disdaining earthly wealth.[24] However, it was the "peripatetic" school of philosophy which was more suitable to the orator, he believed, since it recognized

that humanity could not completely divorce itself from worldly concerns, and was less rigid in its teaching in this regard than the stoics.[25] The peripatetics had in fact made Cicero's point that philosophy without rhetoric would never have any practical effect on human affairs. Therefore, the humanists drew from this Ciceronian attitude a respect for philosophy; while understanding that they should not be caught up in unfruitful intellectual debate, but rather that philosophic concerns should be made practical and suitable to human needs. Siegel notes that the reason behind this adherence to Cicero was the fact that the humanists of this period shared Cicero's commitment to rhetoric, and his desire to recognize philosophy's role as the foundation of rhetoric.[26]

What the humanists, beginning with Petrarch, had admired about Cicero was his advocacy of man's need for virtue and honor, true wisdom, which he maintained as the aim of philosophy, and his stress on eloquence, or persuasive power, in bringing that message home to his audience.[27] Stinger accurately points out the fact that the discovery of the Lodi manuscripts of Cicero's rhetorical works in 1421 further stimulated the humanists' emulation of the ancient author's concepts and methodology concerning the discipline of rhetoric in the early quattrocento.[28] For Petrarch, however, the sought-after element of wisdom was piety, not simply

philosophy made practical and driven home by determined eloquence. Thus a shift occurred in the transfer of the Ciceronian model, since it had emerged from the pagan culture of Rome, and reemerged in the Christian context of Renaissance Italy. At least for the humanists who were Christians, that shift saw a fundamental change in the definition of wisdom from the classical ideal of virtue and honor to include also the Christian emphasis on piety, faith, and eternal salvation. For these humanists, the sources of truth were divine revelation and the testimony of Christian antiquity, namely, the writings of the fathers of the church. Rhetoric itself was more or less unaffected by the shift, since it was the means to deliver the message by which human hearts would be moved to change.[29] Stinger demonstrates the survival and elevation of rhetoric by relating an incident in the life of the famous preacher St. Bernardino of Siena. It seems that St. Bernardino was accused of attempting to form a new cult based on the name of Christ and brought before Pope Martin V to face a charge of heresy in 1426.[30] Bernadino was able to defend himself by appealing to applicable passages of the Scriptures before the curia and was exonerated of all charges.[31] Ambrogio Traversari saw these proceedings as a remarkable victory for eloquence, and he along with others urged Bernardino not to accept successive bishoprics which were later offered him by the pope in order that he might continue his most effective

preaching activities.[32]

Italian humanism benefited from a longstanding rhetorical tradition of secular oratory in the cities dating back to the eleventh century.[33] Therefore, favorable conditions for the acceptance of rhetoric as a discipline and its application as part of the citizen's responsibility in society existed in Italy long before the incipient stages of the revival of antiquity associated with Petrarch's discovery of Cicero's oration Pro Archia, in 1333.[34]

One of the first tasks which faced the humanists in their attempt to revive the ancient art was the recovery of texts dealing with classical rhetoric, an objective which was largely completed by 1430.[35] In this process, some important discoveries were made, among them were Bracciolini's find at the monastery at St. Gall in Switzerland in 1416 which included Asconius Pedianus' commentary on five Ciceronian orations, and Quintilian's Institutiones Oratoriae ; as well as the previously mentioned Lodi manuscript discovery of 1421, which contained a complete text of Cicero's De Oratore and other important rhetorical works.[36]

One of the most influential figures of the early quattrocento in the teaching of rhetoric was Gasparino da Barzziza (1359-1431). Barzziza was an educator who had begun a humanist school in Padua in 1408.[37] In addition to writing several important rhetorical works of his own, Barzziza was

asked to come to Milan by Filippo Maria Visconti in 1421 to help identify and translate the newly discovered Ciceronian manuscripts on rhetoric found at Lodi.[38] His most significant work on rhetoric was De Compositione, (1420) written for his son Guiniforte, which illustrated principles of rhetoric from the writings of Cicero and Quintilian.[39] Monfasani writes that Barzziza's humanist contemporaries "attributed to him the first effective teaching of Ciceronian style in the Renaissance."[40]

Another humanist who made important contributions to the field of rhetoric was Antonio Loschi, (1368-1441). Although from Milan, Loschi and other Milanese humanists maintained a close association with the Florentine humanists, Loschi having worked with and studied under Salutati in the Florentine chancery during the 1380's. Loschi was instrumental in introducing the elements of Florentine humanism in Milan.[41] The eminent Milanese humanist also wrote a very influential commentary on eleven Ciceronian orations entitled Inquisitio Artis in Orationibus Ciceronis (1392-1396),and developed a six-fold scheme of rhetorical analysis later used by others including Barzziza in their commentaries on Ciceronian speeches.[41]

Because of the powerful impulse to imitate the ancients, there were no significant rhetorical manuals of style produced by early quattrocento humanists. The one great exception to this, however, was the effort produced by

the Greek emigre, George of Trebizond, (1396-1486) who wrote a highly acclaimed manual of rhetoric, Rhetoricorum libri V, published at Venice in 1433-1434.[42] George defended the discipline of rhetoric by demonstrating the fact that Aristotle, and other great philosophers had been men of eloquence.[43] The most important achievement of his treatise was, however, his successful combination of Latin rhetorical tradition represented by such men as Fortunatianus, and Martianus Capella, and that of the Greeks, embodied in the works of such men as Dionysius of Halicarnassus and Hermogenes of Tarsus.[44] George effectively combined the principles taught by Cicero, pseudo Cicero, Quintilian, and Fortunatianus with the "seven forms" of stylistic categories found in Hermogenes' writings, which competed well with the manuals of the logicians in teaching argumentation. [45]

In concluding this section on rhetoric, four prominent fifteenth century humanists who are representative of the movement will be briefly discussed in order to place the early quattrocento use of the art in context. These four are Coluccio Salutati, Leonardo Bruni, Ambrogio Traversari, and Lorenzo Valla.

The importance of Salutati as a humanist has been underestimated according to Berthold Ullman who argues that the Florentine chancellor was the one "who was the undisputed leader of the humanist movement for over thirty-two years, from the death of Petrarch in 1374 to

his own demise in 1406".[46] Like his mentor Petrarch, Salutati adored Cicero, whom he called fons eloquentiae, the font of eloquence.[47] From the age of fourteen, Coluccio had studied rhetoric as part of his preparation for a career as a notary. He studied with Pietro da Moglio, a well respected teacher of the art at Bologna, which had an established reputation for rhetorical studies by the thirteenth century.[48] As a function of his role as chancellor, Salutati became well known as an effective writer of official letters among his contemporaries.[49] To further demonstrate the high regard Salutati's peers had for his literary rhetorical ability, Ullman cites the minutes of the meeting in Florence in 1388, in which he was reelected chancellor, where he was called "eloquentie fontis et splendissimi oratorum Ciceronis alumni...".[50] As yet another verification of contemporary acknowledgement of Salutati's acumen in the ancient discipline, Ullman notes that when Salutati and his family were honored with Florentine citizenship in 1400, "the citation mentioned particularly his eminence in rhetoric and the ars dictaminis."[51] Like most humanists, Salutati felt that quality speech and writing required stylistic embellishment, but unlike some of his contemporaries, he disdained the venacular and viewed Latin as the only language suitable to proper eloquence.[52] Concerning his own particular style, Ullman states that "One of the chief features of Coluccio's style consisted of the numerous apt

exempla and illustrations taken from ancient literature."[53]

Salutati's greatest rhetorical legacy appears to have been his letters, both public and private.[54] His use of rhetoric in his letter-essay works is quite evident. In one of his most famous early works, De Seculo et Religione (1381), he wrote with great eloquence in defense of the monastic life to a Camaldolese monk who requested encouragement in persevering in his vows.[55] Another example of Salutati's rhetoric is seen in a letter written to a friend named Antonio Barrufaldi, a physician who desired to know whether eloquence was necessary in the practice of medicine.[56] Salutati's letter entitled "Quod medici eloquentie studeant et de verecundia an sit virtus aut vicium," argued in favor of the physician's need to study eloquence, and explained that shyness was a virtue, appealing to ancient Roman authors, including Cicero and Seneca.[57] In another letter, De Tyranno, written in 1400 at the request of a law student, Salutati provided a definition of a tyrant as one who usurps authority and rules unjustly.[58] He justified the overthrow of an unlawful ruler by the citizenry, but criticized those who murdered Julius Caesar because although a usurper, he ruled lawfully.[59] In his Invectia in Antonium Luscum, Salutati directed a vicious, point by point rebuttal against the arguments of his former pupil, Antonio Loschi, who had written an attack against Florence during its war with Milan.[60]

Indeed, Salutati's efforts in that same conflict prompted the famous remark by Gian Galeazzo Visconti of Milan that "a thousand Florentine horsemen did less damage to him than the letters of Coluccio."[61] Finally, examples of Coluccio's rhetorical skill have been found among his many orations which have been discovered and preserved, including examples of deliberative rhetoric such as an exhortation to defend Bologna against the Milanese; as well as epideictic rhetoric, as demonstrated by a letter to the Anconians in celebration of their military victory.[62]

Leonardo Bruni was born in Arezzo in 1369, and came to live in Florence where he became associated with Salutati and his humanist circle during the last decade of the century. In 1405, he left the city in the employment of the papal curia, serving both the pope and Florence for brief periods until he secured his permanent post as chancellor there in 1427.[63] Bruni had learned Greek from Chrysoloras, a skill which he later put to use in translating the works of the ancients, which provided the humanists with an understanding of their use of rhetoric. Leonardo was a professional rhetorician, who like his peers among the humanists, recommended the imitation of ancient orators; in his work, On Studies and Letters (1423-26), he wrote concerning the ancients:"Ab his et laudare bene facta et detestari facinora addiscemus; ab his consolari,

cohortari, impellere, absterrere."[64] Leonardo so elevated rhetoric as a discipline, that in an attempt to unify wisdom and eloquence, he made it appear to have been the chief concern of Aristotle, followed by the fields of civic and moral philosophy and logic.[65] Illustrative of Leonardo's efforts to arrive at a synthesis of rhetoric and the other fields of philosophy was a dispute which occurred between Bruni and the bishop of Burgos, Alonzo of Cartagena. Alonzo had read Bruni's translation of Aristotle's Nichomachean Ethics around 1430. He was concerned with Bruni's sarcasm regarding its previous translator, and sought to defend him.[66] In his subsequent debate with Alonzo, who argued that orators should not involve themselves in philosophy, Bruni countered that wisdom, or philosophy, should be "clothed in the language of rhetoric" in imitation of Aristotle and Cicero.[67] Bruni further impugned the ability of a man like Alonzo to criticize his writings, since Alonzo knew no Greek. However, Alonzo appears to have understood Aristotle better than Bruni, since the Greek sage had argued for a separation between oratory and philosophy in his Rhetoric. This episode serves to underscore Bruni's commitment to the art of rhetoric as well as his passion for the discipline. In fact, Siegel identifies Bruni as the first among several well known humanists to arrive at a "new image of Aristotle", which emphasized the fact that the ancient

philosophers were also men of eloquence, a shift from the schoolmen who had generally downplayed the discipline of rhetoric.[68] Among those who followed Bruni's lead in this regard were Francesco Filelfo and George of Trebizond.[69]

Ambrogio Traversari was born in the village of Portico di Romagna in 1386. At the age of fourteen, he left his village and entered the cloister of the Camaldulensian monastery of San Maria degli Angeli in Florence.[70] Traversari remained cloistered until his election as General of the Camaldulensian order in 1431.[71] Traversari did not have the benefit of a university education.[72] He gained immensely, however, from his association with disciples of Chysoloras, like Niccolo Niccoli, and Demetrio Scarano, a Greek monk from Constantinople who joined the monastery at San Maria degli Angeli in 1406, who had a significant influence on Traversari's Greek scholarship.[73] Stinger also credits the intellectual climate fostered by the leadership of San Maria's abbot, Matteo, for lending itself favorably to Traversari's humanistic studies.[74]

Traversari was well disposed toward the art of rhetoric regarding it "as the central discipline of human discourse."[75] Traversari was familiar with the Ciceronian rhetorical texts discovered at Lodi in 1421, and translated Niccoli's copy of Quintilian's De Oratoria Institutione, one of the most influential texts on classical rhetoric of the Renaissance.[76] One of the most important sources of

rhetorical inspiration for Traversari however, was his study of Christian antiquity, the church fathers. Evidence of this is clearly found in a letter to Niccoli written in 1424, after Traversari had read several works of Athanasius; "What is striking is a certain incomparable beauty in this man's writing, both in thought and words, which deserves everyone's imagination, veneration, and love."[77] His admiration of rhetoric of the ancients led Traversari to admire the similar eloquence he discovered in the writings of the fathers. He was impressed by the combination of stylistic elegance and pristine piety he found in their writings which was also borne out in their lives. Stinger concludes that Traversari's interest and scholarly focus thus became the recovery of the writings of these men because of their spiritual and homiletical values.[78]

Lorenzo Valla (1406-1457) is probably best known as a philologist because of his Elegantiae Linguae Latinae (1444), but the discipline of rhetoric played a significant role in his scholarship. His involvement with the art of rhetoric came early in his career, as he taught the subject at the University of Padua from 1429-1433.[79] Siegel illustrates Valla's enthusiasm for rhetoric by quoting from a letter written by Valla to Pope Eugenius IV in 1434 in which he wrote: "My resolve has always been to please God and help men through the study of oratory."[80]

Valla believed rhetoric to be superior to philosophy

and gave an analogy which demonstrated his point: "Philosophy is like a soldier or a tribune under the command of oratory, the queen, as a great tragedian calls it."[81] Siegel suggests that the reason Valla preferred Quintilian to Cicero was precisely because of this issue, as Quintilian steadfastly maintained the subordination of philosophy to rhetoric, while Cicero was ambivalent on the question.[82] Confirmation of this fact may be seen in a lesser known work, Disputations on Dialectics (1439), in which Valla articulated the view that rhetoric was more practical than the dialectic and metaphysics of medieval scholastic philosophy, and thus philosophy was to be subordinated to rhetoric.[83]

Finally, no better understanding of Valla's use of rhetoric can be seen than in two of his great polemical works, The Profession of the Religious (1439-1442), and the more famous, The Falsely Believed and Forged Donation of Constantine, (1440). In the former work, Valla challenged the claims made by some members of religious orders that their acts and lives somehow carried more spiritual significance than those of laymen. Skillfully utilizing his knowledge of Greek, as well as Latin grammar, Valla showed that the term "religious", which had come to signify those devoted to a religious community during the medieval period, had in classical usage simply denoted piety.[84] He further demonstrated the fact that, contrary to popular

understanding among the religious community, so-called sacred vows were not only unnecessary to achieve favor with God, they were also unbiblical.[85] The Profession was, however, an impassioned plea for reform of the attitudes concerning the religious life of Valla's day. As would be expected, the organization and presentation of his exhortation was that of classical rhetoric, in the form of a dialogue between two disputants, Laurentius, who is Valla's spokesman, and the Friar, who obviously represented those of the religious orders whose pretensions were being attacked by Valla.[86] In the course of the dialogue, Valla contrasted the lives of the so-called religious who were constrained externally to act in a proper manner, with the superior acts of pious laymen, who, having no such external restraints, had to rely on self-discipline.

Valla's The Falsely Believed and Forged Donation of Constantine, devastated papal claims to secular power. Although doubted by earlier critics of papal authority, Valla was the first to substantially prove its lack of authenticity. Besides arguing from textual and philological standpoints which are well known, Valla reasoned with a technique common to rhetorical argument, that it would have been against natural common sense and experience to believe that a ruler would voluntarily give up sovereignty, when normally he would stop at nothing to acquire it.[87] Despite his commitment to eloquence, Valla did not view rhetoric as

simply a means for winning an argument, rather, it was to be employed as a means for ascertaining the truth, and that was his aim in the Donation. In both this work and in The Profession, Valla's great rhetorical skill is evident. Not only did he seek to emulate the ancients in the style of his argument, but in each case, the persuasive power of eloquence and logic were used in order to drive home his point. His success in the application of classical rhetoric to his own writings is signified by the great value placed on these writings by later scholars, not only because of their pioneering efforts in the area of philology, but also in the discipline of rhetoric as well.[88] It is fitting that this great scholar ended his life and career as a teacher of rhetoric, this time at the University of Rome, from 1450-1457.[89]

Thus the humanists in their persuasive orations and writings closely imitated the ancient authors, following primarily the stylistic methodology of Cicero. They were concerned with eloquence and its relationship to wisdom, or philosophy, most giving preeminence to style, while maintaining a respect for knowledge. Rhetoric for the humanists was intensely practical; it served them as a tool in the legal, civil, religious and educational realms in which they were occupied. Finally, rhetoric served as unifying force among the humanists, who were able to agree or disagree with each other within a common intellectual

framework. If by the early fifteenth century humanism had become an important influence on the intellectual thought of the participants of the Council of Florence, these same rhetorical emphases and techniques would have been expected to manifest themselves in their orations and writings as they took part in the disputations themselves.

ENDNOTES

[1]Jerrold E. Siegel, Rhetoric and Philosophy in Renaissance Humanism (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1968), 173.

[2]Donald Lemen Clark, Rhetoric in Greco-Roman Education (Morningside Heights: Columbia University Press, 1957), 25.

[3]N.G.L. Hammond and H.H. Scullard, The Oxford Classical Dictionary (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1970), 20.

[4]Clark, 40.

[5]Ibid.

[6]Charles Sears Baldwin, Ancient Rhetoric and Poetic (New York: The Macmillan Co., 1924), 23.

[7]Ibid., 9.

[8]Ibid., 15.

[9]Paul Oskar Kristeller, Renaissance Thought: The Classic, Scholastic, and Humanist Strains (New York: Harper & Row Pub., 1955), 102.

[10]Ibid.

[11]Ibid., 100.

[12]John Monfasani, "Humanism and Rhetoric," in Renaissance Humanism: Foundations, Forms, and Legacy vol. 3, Humanism and the Disciplines ed. Albert Rabil, Jr. (Philadelphia: University of Philadelphia Press, 1988), 171.

[13]Hanna H. Gray, "Renaissance Humanism: the Pursuit of Eloquence," Journal of the History of Ideas 24 no. 4 (1963): 498.

[14]Ibid., 500-501.

[15]Julia Annas, "Classical Greek Philosophy," in The Oxford History of the Classical World eds. John Boardman, Jasper Griffin and Oswyn Murray (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1986), 236.

[16]Siegel, xiii.

[17]Ibid.

[18]Kristeller, Renaissance Thought, 18-19.

[19]Hammond and Scullard, 236.

[20]Ibid.

[21]Clark, 69-71.

[22]Ibid., 149.

[23]Siegel, 29.

[24]Ibid., 19.

[25]Ibid., 22.

[26]Ibid., 30.

[27]Charles L. Stinger, Humanism and the Church Fathers: Ambrogio Traversari (1386-1439) (Albany: State University of New York Press, 1977), 57.

[28]Ibid., 58.

[29]Ibid.

[30]Ibid., 62-63.

[31]Ibid.

[32]Ibid., 64-65.

[33]Monfasani, 176.

[34]Ibid., 177.

[35]Ibid.

[36]Ibid., 178.

[37]Henry S. Lucas, The Renaissance and Reformation (New York: Harper & Brothers Pub., 1934), 255.

[38]Albert Rabil, Jr. "Humanism in Milan." In Renaissance Humanism: Foundations, Forms, and Legacy 3 vols, vol. 1 Humanism in Italy. ed. Albert Rabil, Jr. (Philadelphia: University of Philadelphia Press, 1988), 243.

[39]Ibid., 244.

[40]Ibid., 236.

[41]Ibid., 237.

[42]Monfasani, 189.

[43]Siegel, 135.

[44]Monfasani, 189-190.

[45]Ibid.

[46]Berthold Ullman, The Humanism of Coluccio Salutati (Padua: Editrice Antenore, 1963), 39.

[47]Giuseppe Toffanin, History of Humanism (New York: Las Americas Publishing Co., 1954), 141.

[48]Ullman, 5.

[49]Ibid., 112.

[50]Ibid.

[51]Ibid.

[52]Ibid., 113.

[53]Ibid.

[54]Ibid., 19-20.

[55]Ibid., 26-28.

[56]Ibid., 31.

[57]Ibid.

[58]Ibid., 58.

[59]Ibid., 33.

[60]Ibid., 33-34.

[61]Ibid., 14.

[62]Ibid., 35.

[63]Siegel, 100.

[64]Ibid., 108, note.

[65]Ibid., 112.

[66]Ibid., 124.

[67]Ibid., 131.

[68]Ibid., 135.

[69]Ibid., 133-134.

[70]Stinger, 1.

[71]Ibid., 2.

[72]Ibid., 25.

[73]Ibid., 18-20.

[74]Ibid., 20-23.

[75]Ibid., 27.

[76]Ibid., 56.

[77]Ibid., 60.

[78]Ibid., 82.

[79]Paul Oskar Kristeller, Eight Philosophers of the Italian Renaissance (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1964), 24.

[80]Siegel, 139.

[81]Ibid., 142.

[82]Ibid., 143.

[83]Lorenzo Valla, The Profession of the Religious and the principal arguments from The Falsely-Believed and Forged Donation of Constantine trans. and ed. by Olga Zorzi Pugliese (Toronto: Center for Reformation and Renaissance Studies, 1985), 2.

[84]Ibid., 5.

[85]Ibid.

[86]Ibid., 7.

[87]Ibid., 9.

[88]Ibid., 10.

[89]Ibid., 3.

CHAPTER 3

HUMANISTIC CONCERNS: GRAMMAR, TEXTUAL CRITICISM

Grammar

Renaissance humanism cherished the literature of antiquity, and that necessarily entailed a knowledge of the languages of the ancients, Latin and Greek. Almost without exception, the humanists knew Latin, but only a few knew Greek, the original tongue of Plato and Aristotle. Fundamental to the use of either language, however, was a good understanding of its grammar.

A modern definition of grammar is that it is "That department of the study of a language which deals with its inflexional forms or other means of indicating the relations of words in the sentence, and with the rules for employing these in accordance with established usage;..."[1] In the ancient world, however, this term encompassed the entire study of literature, including textual criticism, philology, and literary history, as well as the actual study of the language itself.[2]

Linguistic analysis and classification is thought to have begun during the time of the Greek sophists, roughly the fifth century B.C.[3] It was the well known sophist, Protagoras, (c. 481), who wrote the first grammatical

treatise entitled Peri Orthotetos Onomaton, or On the Correctness of Names.[4] Little is known about the actual contents of this pioneering effort, but it may have contained a classification of the language into parts of speech.[5] Murray suggests that our understanding of the mature Hellenistic system of grammar derives from two main sources, the Techne Grammatike of Dionysius Thrax (c.170-90 B.C.), and the Peri Suntaxeos of Apollonius Dyscolus(2nd c. A.D.).[6] Dionysius' work was very influential, being utilized up to the Renaissance, and Apollonius' stature as a grammarian is best understood by relating the title later given him by Priscian of "grammaticorum princeps".[7]

In the Greek educational system, formal education of children began at age seven, the primary level, chiefly concerning itself with the teaching of reading.[8] Reading included elements of grammar such as the alphabet, syllables, and syntax, although the formal study of grammar was reserved for the secondary school.[9] Marrou points out that it is difficult to determine at what age the secondary level was achieved, because it depended so much on the individual student; "Roughly, then, it may be said that any child who wanted to go on beyond the primary-school stage went to the secondary school as soon as he could read and write fluently".[10] In secondary school, the student was instructed by a "grammatikos", a grammarian, and the area of investigation was "an elaborate study of the classical poets

and classical writers generally: this was his (grammatikos) proper sphere, distinguishing his kind of 'grammar' from that of the primary school grammatist."[11] The third and final phase of Greek education occurred after the student reached the age of eighteen.[12] This phase was concerned with military instruction by the state, primarily, although it later came to include the disciplines of philosophy and rhetoric. This final segment of Greek education called "ephebeia" dates from the 4th century B.C. and was the nearest classical equivalent to a modern university education.[13]

Because of the curricular emphasis on literature in the secondary school, a more or less standard reading list was developed. Chief among the works studied were Homer's Iliad and Odyssey, along with those of Hesiod, and the lyric poets Alcman, Alcaeus, Sappho, and Pindar. The plays of Euripedes, Aeschylus and Sophocles were also included in the lists as was the comic poetry of Aristophenes and Menander, and the prose contributions of historians such as Herodotus, Xenophon, Hellanicus, and Thucydides were examined as well.[14] Marrou relates the Dionysian approach to the grammatical analysis of an author as comprising four stages: diorthosis or criticism of the text, anagnosis, reading of the work, exegesis, the exposition of the material, and krisis, judgment.[15] The most important of these appears to have been exegesis,

which included the building of vocabulary lists, etymology, and the understanding of the content of the document itself, the "historikon", information which was later utilized in testing the student.[16]

Roman education was solidly based on the Greek model, in fact, Marrou notes that, "it was on the whole a pure and simple transfer."[17] It was also, from the standpoint of the study of grammar, centered upon the reading and analysis of works of various authors. In contrast to their Greek predecessors, Roman schools initially read and studied contemporary authors, as demonstrated by Q. Caecilius Epirota, who introduced " 'Virgil and the other modern poets'" into his school in 26 B.C. while the author was still alive.[18] By the end of the first century A.D. however, a return to the "classical" authors was initiated, marked by a renewed interest in the study of the works of the "old poets", such as Virgil, Terrence, Sallust, the well regarded historian, and of course Cicero.[19]

The examination of the texts themselves, as would be expected, also followed the Greek example. Prior to reading a given text, a great deal of preparation took place. The lesson would begin with an explanatory reading of the passage by the master, called a praelectio, which took into account variant readings and orthography.[20] Following the explanatory reading, most important aspect of the lesson, the enarratio, or exposition of the text was undertaken.[21]

The exposition had two components: the verborum interpretatio, the interpretation of the words of the passage which also included the criticism of style, and the historiarum cognitio, or the understanding of the content of the work.[22] The term historiarum had little to do with the modern "history", it was rather a detailed analysis of the entire content of a document. The process was obviously thorough, and such an examination of a given piece of literature, gave the students a good grasp of every aspect of it. Thus in both the Greek and Roman systems, the study of grammar was a necessary prerequisite to the study of literature which was their central focus.

The palace school which originated during the reign of Charlemagne, and later the cathedral schools which grew up all over Europe, firmly established the "seven liberal arts" in the tradition of medieval education. These were first introduced in the fifth century by the North African, Martianus Capella, in a work entitled The Marriage of Philology and Mercury. The arts had been divided by Martianus into two categories, the trivium; consisting of grammar, dialectic and rhetoric, and quadrivium; which included geometry, arithmetic, astronomy and music. Cassiodorus, the Italian monastic scholar who exerted great influence on the curricula of medieval cathedral schools had also endorsed Martianus' categories, even going so far as to say that an understanding of the liberal arts was necessary

for a proper monastic education.[23] While under the direction of Bishop Fulbert between 1006 and 1028, the study of grammar in the cathedral school at Chartes "included the writing of compositions in prose and verse, according to rule, and the reading of classical authors".[24] One of the works studied at Chartes was Bede's De Arte Metrica, as well as the works of pagan authors such as Livy, Valerius Maximus, Virgil, Ovid, Horace, Statius, and of course Boethius.[25] The beginning grammar text used in medieval schools was Donatus' Ars Minor (c. 350), while the more advanced students worked with Priscian's Institutio De Arte Grammatica, (c. A.D. 500).[26] These texts were used up to and during the Renaissance, with only a few new grammatical works being written in the intervening period, the most significant of which were late fifteenth century efforts. The normal pattern of medieval grammatical studies with regard to literature appears to have been first, an examination of the Bible, beginning usually the Psalms, then the Latin fathers, and finally the ancient classical authors.[27]

The curricula of the medieval universities gradually became standardized such that during the thirteenth century a prescribed course of study had been arranged either by papal decree or university legislation.[28] Grammar studies within this normative curriculum included the traditional works of Donatus and Priscian but spent little time on

classical Roman literary efforts.[29] The two ancient instructional methods of praelectio, the explanatory reading of the text, and enarratio, the exposition of the text, appear to have been used in medieval universities as well. The master would begin a lesson with a reading of the text with its glosses, or explanatory notations within the page margins, then he would explain the content of the passage, making appropriate comments and clarifications.[30] Thus, at least as far as methodology is concerned, there seems to have been little development or change in grammar studies from ancient times to the medieval period.

As a final note to this brief survey of the study of grammar in the middle ages, it is interesting to note that grammatical studies were of such importance to the church that the fourth Lateran Council (1215), "required the establishment of a chair of grammar in every cathedral of the Christian world,".[31]

The one aspect of literary studies which seems to have been least subjected to humanistic renovation was that of grammar. This is not because the humanists devalued its significant role in the arts, but rather, because, as W. Keith Percival states; "the study of grammar had been in a perfectly healthy state in the middle ages and hence was in no need of revival."[32] Percival proceeds to give a good definition of how grammar as a discipline was understood in the Renaissance. He explains that grammar was part of the

normal school curriculum, and that it was "devoted to the inculcation of the skills of speaking and writing a specific language--Latin--and by a natural semantic extension, it also applied to the knowledge students gained in that process."[33]

As in previous epochs, grammar was perceived in the Renaissance as foundational to the study of literature, and was almost always studied in conjunction with literary works. That is not to say that grammar texts were not utilized, and both the Ars Minor of Donatus and Institutio De Arte Grammatica of Priscian were standard authorities in the Renaissance study of the discipline.[34] The knowledge of grammar was important to the humanists because it was the basis of an understanding of rhetoric and logic, and because it provided the skills necessary to investigate other disciplines, such as moral philosophy.[35]

Interest in the study of grammar, already kindled among Italian intellectuals by the efforts of men like Petrarch who sought to recover and understand the works of the ancients, was further excited by the arrival of Manuel Chrysoloras in Florence in 1397. Chrysoloras stirred up a great enthusiasm for the study of the Greek language and literature, started schools, and wrote a grammatical textbook, the Erotemata, or "Questions".[36] This text served as the basic authority for the study of Greek in Italy for an extended period.[37]

One of Chysoloras' well known pupils was Guarino da Verona (1374-1460), who had lived with Chrysoloras at his home in Constantinople for five years. Guarino succeeded his mentor as professor of Greek at the university of Florence in 1412.[38] He wrote a a grammar text entitled Regulae Grammaticales, which was based on the traditionally accepted works of Donatus and Priscian and did not attempt to be comprehensive.[39]

One of Guarino's pupils, Vittorino da Feltre (1378-1446), was responsible for organizing a school at Mantua which was later to become famous. This school was a part of a network of court schools which sprang up in early quattrocento Italy in such cities as Florence, Venice, Padua, Pavia, and Verona. These court schools were initiated by princes and other aristocrats as a means for educating their children, and involved the hiring of a scholar as a private tutor.[40] Vittorino was a highly educated man and was a scholar both of Latin and Greek, having studied the former under Barzizza, and the latter under Guarino.[41] Vittorino's intention for his school was to educate his pupils in the style of the ancients, in both mind and body, and to prepare them for a life of active service to God and State.[42] His method centered upon the study of grammar; "To accomplish this, Vittorino felt that the best subjects were those connected with the grammatical and literary study of the Greek and Roman writers."[43] The students of Vittorino's

school studied the literature of Greek and Roman authors as well as that of the church fathers, both Latin and Greek.[44] As far as instructional method was concerned, Vittorino's school modeled the ancient and medieval pattern. "The master usually dictated the vocabulary and inflections of the passage, then translated and explained it, commented on the style, and drew moral lessons from the subject matter.[45] Da Feltre initiated a new approach to education in that he attempted to tailor the curriculum to the needs of the individual student. Vittorino left a tremendous educational legacy in the form not only of methodology, but in the lives of his students, many of whom were to become great leaders both in the church and in the government.[46]

Renaissance educators such as Guarino and Vittorino sought to return to the ancient ideal of educating both mind and body, in contrast to the medieval emphasis on theology and otherworldly concerns.[47] The strong emphasis of Renaissance education on grammar stemmed in large part from the necessity of learning the Greek and Latin languages in order to study the writings of the ancients. This is not to say piety and religious training were not important in the Renaissance, but only that they were incorporated into the total education of the individual, they were no longer the sole focus of that education. The most important innovation of the Renaissance, however, in the field of the study of grammar was the addition of Greek language studies to the

school curriculum.[48] This phenomenon ultimately led to the great recovery and revival of ancient Greek literature in the west, particularly that of Plato, Homer, and Sophocles, and also the Greek fathers.[49]

Percival concludes that the Renaissance treatment of grammar can be distinguished from that of the medieval period by the fact that it was studied not simply to provide a means for entering into a profession such as law or medicine, but in order to provide for individual enjoyment of literature and culture.[50] The Renaissance revived the classical appreciation of literature for its own sake, and validated the propriety of allowing both sacred and profane bodies of learning to coexist. Nevertheless, despite its broader scope and significant additions to the medieval art of grammar, the basis of the Renaissance science was formed in large part by the tradition of the Carolingian and French cathedral schools, as well as the continuous classical Greek scholarship of the Byzantine Empire.[51]

It will of course be necessary to end this section on grammar by discussing the relation of the discipline to the humanists. As in the previous chapter, four representatives of the movement will be briefly considered with regard to their understanding and use of the art, in order that some general conclusions may be drawn.

Coluccio Salutati had a high regard for the ancient writers, as well as the church fathers, whom he classified

among the ancients.[52] Salutati did not know Greek, so his understanding of the Greek authors was based on Latin translations.[53] He was aware of the importance of knowing Greek, which is evident by the fact that he was instrumental in bringing Chrysoloras to Florence. Coluccio was, however, a superb Latinist, and his concern for stylistic detail in his use of the language was typical of the humanists. Ullman describes Salutati's Latin as containing many "medievalisms", such as the use of quod for ut in result clauses, suus for eius and sibi for ei.[54] However, in one important respect, Salutati followed Petrarch in initiating a practice which diverged from medieval usage and marked a writer as a humanist, that is, in using the singular familiar form of address for an individual, tu, instead of the more formal plural form, vos.[55]

The field of orthography, which was a significant facet of both the ancient and Renaissance study of grammar, was one which fascinated Salutati. His enthusiasm for the correct spelling of words appears to have been fostered by his reading of Priscian's Institutio De Arte Grammatica.[56] Coluccio, in fact,is thought to be the first humanist to devote a significant amount of attention to this aspect of grammar. The absolute seriousness with which Salutati approached the study and application of orthography is evidenced by two separate incidents. The first involves a letter which Salutati is said to have written to Chrysoloras

wanting to know the rules for the use of rough and smooth breathings in the Greek language.[57] As he relates the event, Ullman comments on Chrysoloras' reply; "In his reply Chrysoloras compliments his correspondent on his desire for accuracy in even small matters, and with his letter he encloses a little treatise on Greek breathings."[58] The second incident regards Coluccio's tendency to favor medieval Latin forms, which resulted in a dispute with his disciple Poggio Bracciolini over the spelling of the reflexive pronoun mihi and the noun nihil. Poggio favored these spellings while his mentor argued for the medieval michi and nichil.[59] These incidents reveal the depth of Coluccio's commitment to detail in the area of orthography, and they further demonstrate his humanistic tendency to obtain absolute accuracy in the translation of a text. This passion for grammatical accuracy was common among the humanists, and it was an issue of extreme importance to the participants at the Council of Florence, who labored to translate correctly texts in support of their doctrinal positions.

Leonardo Bruni, one of Salutati's greatest disciples, studied Greek under Chysoloras and thus surpassed his master Coluccio in this regard. However, Bruni credited Coluccio with motivating him both to study Greek and to pursue other areas of his scholarly interest.[60] Bruni made translations of many classical works, including such well known efforts

as Plato's Apology, Crito, and Gorgias.[61] His production of Aristotelean translations was equally significant, and included the Nichomachaen Ethics as well as the Politics.[62] Indeed, Bruni was one of the most outstanding translators of Greek classics in the early quattrocento. One of the primary concerns of any translator is of course to produce an accurate translation. Bruni was aware of the need to provide texts which accurately portrayed the original intent of the ancient authors. In his work On Correct Translation (1424-26), Bruni set forth his understanding of this crucial issue.[63] The translator not only had to be a skilled linguist, he must also be thoroughly familiar with idioms, figurative phrases, and literary genres which might be encountered.[64] Furthermore, the translator's role required him to adapt himself to the style and characteristics of individual authors such that their purpose and intentions would be fully manifested to their audiences.[65] Bruni's work contributed to the growth and development of what was to distinguish Renaissance translations from their medieval predecessors; he advocated the free or Ad Sententiam method of the humanists while rejecting the more rigid Ad Verbum approach of medieval scholars. The humanists rejected the more literal approach because it allowed less room for eloquence, and because it often obscured rather than clarified the intentions of the author.

Ambrogio Traversari, like Bruni, knew both Latin and

Greek. Although self taught in Greek, Traversari nonetheless gained a reputation for great skill in the language among his peers.[66] Traversari's enthusiasm for the study of grammar was no doubt imparted to him by his friend and benefactor, Niccolo Niccoli (1364-1437). Niccolo had an intense concern for the proper use of grammar, and he was constantly asked by other humanists to review their work with regard to style. "Niccoli wrote little, but his fastidious concern for the seeming minutiae of classical scholarship-for orthography, especially the correct use of dipthongs, and the use of ancient script-made him an arbiter of taste."[67] It was Niccoli who provided manuscripts for Traversari's emendation and who gave Ambrogio full use of his remarkable library.[68] During the 1430's, Traversari met and became friends with Vittorino Da Feltre, the humanist educator and grammarian. Traversari was impressed with Vittorino's teaching methodology in the field of Greek studies, and the translation work of his students, which included a noteworthy translation of a work of Chrysostom.[69]

Traversari shared in the humanistic desire not only to learn the original languages of the classics, but also to purify the current Latin "from the accretions of the 'Dark Ages' of ignorance."[70] Unlike most of his contemporaries, Traversari attempted late in his life to learn Hebrew, and probably influenced his student Giannozzo Manetti to learn the language.[71]

Traversari used his knowledge of the ancient languages to produce many emendations of classical and patristic texts, including those of Quintilian, Aulus Gellius, and the Greek of Francesco Barbaro's manuscript of Lactantius.[72] Thus Traversari, in keeping with humanist practice, used his scholarship for a practical purpose."Traversari held that the study of languages and the new critical scholarship were not ends in themselves but simply the means to acquire the wisdom of the long buried Greek and Latin classics, which through the efforts of the humanists were coming to light again."[73]

Lorenzo Valla is best known for his work in the field of grammatical studies. He wrote his famous grammatical work Elegantiae Lingua Latinae (1444) in order to restore proper Latin usage in accordance with the ancient practice.[74] "His aim, as he proudly announces in the Preface, was to restore the Latin language to the glory and purity that marked it before its corruption by the barbarians."[75] Although written after the Council of Florence, and therefore without any ability to have influenced the action of the council's participants, this and other of Valla's works undoubtedly reflected the humanistic tenor of early quattrocento Italy in its renewed focus on the study of grammar. Another of Valla's writings which greatly contributed to the Renaissance understanding of grammar was his Collatio Novi Testamenti (1443). In this effort, Valla undertook the task

of evaluating Jerome's Vulgate translation of the New Testament by comparing it with the Greek text.[76] Bentley notes that Valla's evaluation uncovered three main problems with the Vulgate as a translation: "it presented scripture in an inferior or inappropriate style; it inaccurately translated many passages of the Greek text; and it in general obscured the meaning of the original Greek New Testament."[77] Valla did not mean by his criticism to impugn the work of the great Father Jerome, for he proposed the then novel view that Jerome either had not translated the Vulgate, or scribes had completely subverted his efforts.[78]

Valla was highly critical of medieval exegesis, especially that which was attempted by persons unacquainted with the Greek language. He was extremely unkind to the ninth century teacher Haimo of Auxerre and St. Thomas Aquinas whom he described in the Collatio; "as men not truly refined nor well versed in good letters."[79] Valla continued his criticism; "But since they were utterly ignorant of the Greek language, I am amazed that they dared to comment on Paul, who spoke Greek, especially in the wake of so many Greek and Latin expositors who were experts in that language."[80] The underlying principle Valla sought to establish was that an ignorance of Greek would lead first to a mistranslation of the Scriptures and ultimately, to an incorrect and inappropriate application of the text. He also seems to have denied the allegorical interpretation of

medieval exegesis, favoring a more literal approach. Yet he spoke of an interior sensus in the Collatio, which although never explained entirely in that text, could possibly have had some relation to medieval allegorization.[81]

In the process of producing a better translation of the original Greek text, Valla's Adnotations uncovered some discrepancies in translation which had implications in the realm of doctrine. An important example of this phenomenon involved the Vulgate's translation of 2 Cor. 7:10.[82] For the Greek metanoia, "change of mind with a view toward reformation," the Vulgate had the Latin poenitentia, "penance". Valla was outraged at this mistranslation because the Latin word used had none of the positive connotation of the Greek original.[83] The Catholic interpretation of the passage stated that it supported the sacrament of penance, but Valla argued against that view saying that "this opinion (in support of the sacrament) contributes nothing to the elucidation of Paul's teaching."[84] Valla clearly laid the foundation for subsequent New Testament scholarship with his Adnotations and furthered the humanist concern for grammatical accuracy in the process. There is no doubt that because of Valla, later humanists and other scholars were better equipped to investigate the texts of antiquity, armed with the philological tools he provided. It is certainly true, for example, that Erasmus was greatly influenced by Valla in the compilation of his edition of the New Testament

which appeared in 1516.

The Renaissance concern for grammar was therefore a concern for both the language and literature of the classical past. The humanists were interested in language because it was the necessary key to unlocking the minds of the ancient writers. They learned about the nuances and subtleties of language as they studied the literature of antiquity. The humanists were concerned about accuracy in translation, because they wanted to know as exactly as possible what the ancients had said. The humanists revived the study of Greek, adding it to their educational curricula, because it was important to understanding the ancient Greek civilization. Thus they pursued the study of philology, orthography, and exegesis for practical purposes, not simply as an academic exercise, and they used the discipline as a beginning point for understanding and applying the other subjects of the trivium.

Textual Criticism

In the words of one author, "Textual criticism has for its sole object to determine as nearly as possible the words written by the author of the original text, wherever the reading has become corrupt or doubtful."[85] This concise definition is a good starting point for the discussion of Renaissance textual criticism. Textual-critical analysis was

a necessary part of the Renaissance study of ancient literature because originals of these works no longer existed. This is an important point, because the humanists were generally quite insistent upon accurate translations, which in turn required manuscripts as close to the original documents as possible. In the middle ages, textual criticism was subsumed under the broad field of grammar in the trivium. But the humanists were so dedicated to the gathering and emending of manuscripts during the Renaissance that textual criticism can be said to have become an entirely separate field during that time.

The tradition of Greek artistic expression was primarily oral until the arrival of the Attic Tragedy in the fifth century B.C., when it rapidly became a literary one.[86] There was no systematic production of literature during this period, and those works which existed were privately sponsored copies. Many textual corruptions occurred in the process of making these individual copies, whether or not they were accomplished by educated copyists.[87] Therefore, often corrupt copies existed almost immediately, and sometimes circulated within an author's lifetime.

The science of textual criticism is thought to have originated among scholars gathered in Alexandria sometime after the death of Alexander the Great in 323 B.C..[88] Hall notes that the first task of these scholars was to catalogue the many Greek manuscripts which had been gathered at the

libraries in Alexandria, the Brucheum and the Serapeum.[89] Once this had been accomplished, these scholars set to work analyzing the texts in order to remove interpolations from them.[90] They utilized two standard criteria in this process which later became accepted methodology in the field of textual criticism. First, they relied upon "the external authority of the manuscripts," and second, "the internal evidence afforded by the text before them or by other parts of the author's work."[91]

The Paleologian Renaissance (1261-1453) inspired great scholars such as Manuel Moschopulus, Thomas Magister, Theodorus Metochites and Demetrius Triclinus to undertake the textual-critical analysis of ancient Greek literature.[92] These and others made an invaluable contribution to later scholarship by working to preserve the ancient documents, but as Hall notes, they were not always fair with the texts they emended. "Occassionally they were right, as were the Italian scholars, but for the most part they defaced the text with trivial emendations based upon their own inadequate theories of metere and language."[93]

The transmission of ancient Latin literature followed basically the same pattern as had been established earlier by the Greek form. That is, there was no organized effort to preserve them, and they existed primarily because of privately made copies. This changed however, through the influence of Crates Mallotes, a grammarian from Pergamum,

who visited Rome in 169 B.C. and fomented an interest among the Italians in the textual-critical tradition of the Alexandrine school. The Romans were led to appreciate that texts could be authenticated and preserved based on an appeal to the best sources available.[94]

The Roman Empire's acceptance of Christianity in the fourth century did not undermine the preservation of classical literature as might have been expected. One reason for this may be that despite a mistrust in the works of pagan authors, many of the great minds of early Christianity had been classically trained and therefore recognized their stylistic and even moral value. Cassiodorus, the Roman Senator and Christian educator, played an important role in the survival of literary antiquity. His instructions to the monks at the monastery of Vivarium regarding the copying of ecclesiastical documents were also applied to the translation and preservation of pagan literature used "for the purposes of education and for the defence of the faith."[95] These instructions included refraining from modifying biblical texts in order to improve their style, carefully observing punctuation, following the ancient authorities in orthography, and treating the Biblical text according to the rules of secular grammar.[96]

The Carolingian revival of the late eighth and early ninth centuries was an extremely important era in the transmission of ancient texts. In the process of educating a

class of administrators and clergymen, Charlemagne created an intellectual atmosphere supportive and appreciative of classical scholarship. Through the efforts of a circle of scholars led by Alcuin of York, books were produced on a large scale in order to meet the needs of the palace and cathedral schools. These works were copied into what became known as Carolingian miniscule, an uncial script actually developed in Ireland and later transported to the continent. Many classical works were translated as a result of the efforts of the Carolingian scholars. Among those found to have been in existence in Charlemagne's court library in 790 include: Statius' Thebaid, Horace's Ars Poetica, some of Cicero's speeches, the Verrines, Catilinarians, Pro Rege Deiotaro, and a collection of orations excerpted from Sallust's Bella and Historiae.[97]

The most important of the Carolingian textual-critical scholars was Lupus de Ferrieres (c.805-862). Lupus was educated at Fulda under the great scholar Rabanus Maurus (780-856), and he later returned to Ferrieres as abbot from 842 until his death.[98] He actively emended classical texts, one of the more important of these being Cicero's De Oratore, which manuscript is now in the British Museum (Harley 2736).[99] Lupus was a careful scholar and his textual-critical method revealed that fact. "His practice of leaving spaces where lacunae are established or expected, marking corruptions, and recording variants, reveals a sound

approach to classical texts which outweighs the modest quality of his own critical contribution."[100]

By the eleventh and twelfth centuries, educational activity had begun a shift from a monastic base to the cathedral and urban schools.[101] William of Malmesbury (d.1143), was an avid researcher and collector of the classics, which well suited his job as librarian of Malmesbury.[102] He is most well known for his collections of related classical works, of which one containing a number of Ciceronian efforts still exists in a later copy at Cambridge.[103] John of Salisbury (c1110-1180) was a strong defender of classicism, and often referred to the ancients in his writings. He is most noted as an outstanding stylist and his work, the Metalogicon was primarily a defense of the study of grammar, rhetoric, and logic.[104] Although these great representatives of the twelfth century revival did not necessarily introduce any original contributions to the field of textual criticism, they can be said to have built upon the foundation already laid during the Carolingian Renaissance, thus aiding in the perpetuation of the art.

The close association between humanism and the study of grammar, as well as the propensity among humanists to collect ancient manuscripts, led inevitably to a heightened interest in textual criticism in the Renaissance. As an art, textual criticism was aided by the resurgence in Greek studies in Italy during the later trecento and early

quattrocento. It was a skill made necessary by the need to recover the writings of ancient authors whose original works no longer existed. The humanistic concern for absolute textual accuracy, the desire for correct translation and spelling of words and thus the discovery of the precise intent of the author, further underscored the importance of textual criticism as it was practiced in the Renaissance.

John F. D'amico, in his study Theory and Practice in Renaissance Textual Criticism, identified two basic textual-critical methods used in the Renaissance. The first, emendatio ope codicium, involved the selective comparison of sections of the manuscripts or printed versions of a given text.[105] The second, emendatio ope ingenii or emendatio ope coniecturae, utilized the inventiveness of the author through his knowledge and talents in supplying correct readings independent of manuscript authority.[106] D'amico states that of the two methods, the latter predominated during the Renaissance, although it was generally agreed that manuscript evidence should form the basis of all corrections.[107] Therefore he concludes that the most accurate description of Renaissance textual-critical theory would be that it included both the use of manuscript evidence as well as editorial coniectura or ingenium.[108]

Petrarch, the noted progenitor of humanism, was involved with textual-critical investigation early in his life. He began a compilation of Livy's History

of Rome while still in his early twenties which contained books 1-10 and 21-40, later he added the third and fourth decades, completing his effort by 1329.[109] Petrarch made an important contribution to the field of textual criticism by his solitary effort; "The whole text was supplemented, corrected, annotated--and so in a sense edited--by Petrarch himself;"[110] A significant aspect of Petrarch's Livy is that his emendations in books 26-30 came from a manuscript not associated with the Puteanus manuscript from which all other extant copies of Livy had been derived.[111] This source document was later used by Beatus Rhenanus and Gelenius for their Froben edition of 1535.[112] Of course Petrarch was also an avid collector of manuscripts, chief among which were Ciceronian texts including the Letters to Atticus and Quintus, the Rhetorica and speeches such as the Pro Archia and Pro Cluentio.[113]

Petrarch's disciple, Boccaccio (1313-1375) became involved in the collection of facts about ancient life and literature which subsequently led to the study and translation of manuscripts.[114] His work in the preservation of antiquity did much to promote the understanding of classical literature and his emendation of Ovid's Priapea is the oldest copy in existence today.[115] There is yet another way in which Boccaccio contributed to the transmission of antiquity to Renaissance humanism, however. The library at Monte Cassino was known to be rich in its holdings of

classical literature. Boccaccio was apparently acquainted with some of its holdings such as the Annals and Histories of Tacitus, Apuleius' Golden Ass, and Varro's De Lingua Latina.[116] These works had been preserved through the middle ages only at Monte Cassino, and Boccaccio, with the aid of the humanist secretary of the monastery Zanobi Da Strada, was instrumental in their eventual removal to Florence.[117]

Ullman believes Coluccio Salutati's contribution to the field of textual criticism to have been the most significant, yet least known, of his scholarly accomplishments.[118] This contribution was in his own emendations as well as in his transmission of textual-critical methodology to his disciples, such as Bracciolini, Bruni, and Niccoli.[119] Coluccio knew that textual errors often resulted from the ignorance of scribes who unintentionally corrupted them by omitting portions and changing words they did not understand. He recognized also the fact that some textual corruptions were done intentionally in the interest of promoting a particular viewpoint. As a protection against such malpractice, Coluccio advocated the founding of public libraries, in which texts would be stored and emended by careful scholars, according to ancient practice.[120] In his own work, Salutati preferred to examine many manuscripts, favoring the older codices.[121] Ullman gives an example of Salutati's remarkable dedication to the textual-critical art by relating an

anecdote regarding a textual difficulty in Gregory the Great's Dialogues.[122] It seems that there was a question as to the ancient name of the Citta di Castello mentioned in the Dialogues. Coluccio searched through twenty separate manuscripts in order to find an answer, comparing the textual variations, of which he found thirteen.[123] "Coluccio concluded that Tyberine or Tyferne, or both together, was the name of the town, finding partial corroboration in Pliny, Mela, the Geographas Ravennas, and Ptolemy.[124] It was a truly amazing feat of textual-critical scholarship especially with regard to its thoroughness, for Ullman suggests that there are probably no more than twenty manuscripts of the Dialogues available today, and they are more accessible now than they were then.[125] Salutati espoused the principle, which later was generally adopted by textual critics, that those variants which promoted order in the text were to be preferred over those which disturbed or distorted it, "Rationabilius tamen est, si varios invenerimus esse textus, illum qui sequitur ordinem eligere quam disturbam atque distortum anteferre,..."[126] Salutati clearly enhanced the tradition of textual-critical scholarship begun by his humanist predecessors. Ullman goes further in declaring him to have been "the first really serious textual critic of the humanistic period."[127]

One of the more important aspects of Renaissance textual criticism which occupied the efforts of the

humanists was the process of gathering manuscripts. The humanist most associated with this activity was Poggio Bracciolini (1380-1459). A disciple of Salutati, he may have derived some of his enthusiasm for the art of textual criticism from his mentor. Poggio is most known for the discoveries he made while participating at the Council of Constance (1414-1417) as a papal secretary.[128] While at Constance, Poggio visited the monastery at Cluny, Burgundy, there discovering an important eighth century Ciceronian manuscript, now known as the vetus Cluniacensis.[129] This manuscript contained several of Cicero's speeches, including two, Pro Roscio and Pro Murena, which had been previously unknown.[130] Poggio also found other manuscripts at St. Gall in 1416 and 1417, among which were Asconius' Commentary of Ciceronian speeches, a source still used today.[131] In 1417 he made two significant discoveries in France and Germany; first, eight formerly unknown speeches of Cicero including Pro Caecina, Pro Roscio, Comoedo, and Pro Rabirio Postumo, and second, a rare text of Statius' Silvae.[132] Poggio is also credited with the development of the humanists script, an attempt to return to the Carolingian miniscule, which had strayed from its original form, becoming "more angular and thick, and considerably less attractive".[133]

Ambrogio Traversari shared the humanist desire to return to the littera antiqua, feeling as did his contemporaries, that the Gothic script had corrupted Latin

texts, and his translations were accomplished in the new style developed by Bracciolini.[134] Because Traversari was a linguist, he was able to make textual emendations on the basis of the emendatio ope ingenii method, which "made possible the restoration of Greek words and passages in Latin manuscripts where medieval scribes, ignorant of the language, had either misrepresented the words or left them out entirely."[135] Traversari practically applied his knowledge by collaborating with Niccoli in restoring the Greek to works of Quintilian and Aulus Gellius.[136] He made it a practice as well to gather and utilize the oldest and best preserved manuscripts in the process of making his translations.[137] An example of Traversari's thoroughness in this regard is seen in an event related by Stinger in conjunction with an emendation of a text by Diogenes Laertius. Traversari had two manuscripts of the text in his own possession, yet he requested a third from a humanist friend in order to complete his work: "The comparison of three sources should be greatly conducive to emending and polishing the work."[138] Finally, Traversari demonstrated the crucial importance of textual analysis in determining authorship, when in 1432 he identified an ancient manuscript on Isaiah as a work of Origen, and when he showed two works formerly attributed to Cicero, the Synonyma and Differentiae as forgeries, both on the basis of style.[139]

The work of previous textual critics was greatly

advanced by that of Lorenzo Valla (1407-1457). Valla developed what D'Amico called "a sophisticated historical attitude toward the fluctuations in the Latin language that would allow a reader to determine the idiom appropriate to the text."[139] This attitude recognized stylistic changes which had occurred in the language over time and gave the textual critic the means to determine what the intention of the original author might have been. A good example of Valla's practical utilization of this awareness is found in his famous work, The Principal Arguments From the Falsely Believed and Forged Donation of Constantine (1440). One of Valla's arguments against the validity of the Donation was its crude style. "...Is the barbarousness of his (the author's) style not sufficient proof that such a piece of nonsense was forged not in Constantine's day but much later?..."[140] Valla wrote two very important textual critical works in the Emendationes (1444) to Livy and his Adnotationes to the New Testament (1442-1457). In the Emendationes, Valla sarcastically criticized the textual-critical scholarship of Bartolomeo Facio and Antonio Panormita, while demonstrating his superiority in the field.[141] In the process of revealing the faults of his contemporaries and earlier textual scholars, Valla showed that they had erred by relying on their grasp of rhetoric instead of a careful analysis of the manuscripts.[142] "He emphasized the paleological origins of error; he noted how

corruptions resulted from unfamiliar handwritings and maintained that an analysis of these errors could correct readings."[143] In his Adnotationes, Valla compared Greek and Latin manuscripts of the New Testament in order to validate the Vulgate translation. Valla subjected the Vulgate to the same type of analysis that he applied to the works of classical authors.[144] Bentley argues that Valla's greatest contribution with regard to the textual emendation of the New Testament was his clarification of Jerome's Latin translation, since the underlying Greek text itself provided no difficulty.[145] There is no doubt that Valla was the most skilled humanist textual critic, and that his work, as in the area of grammar studies, provided the foundation upon which later scholars such as Erasmus would build.

Humanist concern for textual criticism was a recognition of the need to recover the original works of ancient authors, through the emendation of manuscript copies. These manuscripts were important because the author's original works no longer existed. Thus the humanists sought to arrive at the content of the original works through the emendation of texts which they were able to procure. This process was accomplished by a combination of careful textual analysis, and coniectura, conjecture, or educated guesswork, based on a familiarity with ancient style and grammar. Authorship was also capable of being determined, primarily by stylistic means, and this

methodology was also employed by the humanists in determining the validity of the documents they found. Textual criticism was an important tool of the humanists. It was employed by both sides in the discussions at Florence, especially with regard to manuscript sources related to the primary doctrinal dispute, the procession of the Holy Spirit.

ENDNOTES

[1]The Compact Edition of the Oxford English Dictionary, rev. ed. (1979), s.v. "grammar."

[2]Ibid.

[3]N.G.L. Hammond and H.H. Scullard, The Oxford Classical Dictionary (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1970), 474.

[4]Gilbert Murray, Greek Studies (Oxford: Oxford at the Clarendon Press, 1946), 177.

[5]Ibid.

[6]Ibid., 181.

[7]Leonard Whibley, A Companion to Greek Studies (Cambridge: Cambridge at the University Press, 1906), 148.

[8]H.I. Marrou, A History of Education in Antiquity trans. by George Lamb (New York: Sheed and Ward, 1956), 150.

[9]Ibid., 151-152.

[10]Ibid., 161.

[11]Ibid.

[12]Whibley, 511.

[13]Ibid.

[14]Marrou, 162-164.

[15]Ibid., 165.

[16]Ibid., 167-168.

[17]Ibid., 265.

[18]Ibid., 277.

[19]Ibid., 278.

[20]Ibid., 279.

[21]Ibid.

[22]Ibid.

[23]Norman F.Cantor, Medieval History (New York: the MacMillan Company, 1963), 77.

[24]Henry Osborn Taylor, The Medieval Mind Vol. 1 (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1951), 300.

[25]Ibid.

[26]Ibid.

[27]Will Durant, The Story of Civilization: Part V The Renaissance (New York: Simon and Schuster, 1953), 915.

[28]Frank Pierrepont Graves, A History of Education During the Middle Ages and the Transition to Modern Times (Westport: Greenwood Press Publishers, 1970), 88.

[29]Ibid., 89.

[30]Ibid., 91.

[31]Durant, 914.

[32]W. Keith Percival, "Renaissance Grammar." In Renaissance Humanism: Foundations Forms, and Legacy Vol. 3 Humanism and the Disciplines ed. Albert Rabil, Jr. (Philadelphia: University of Philadelphia Press, 1988), 67.

[33]Ibid.

[34]Ibid., 68

[35]Ibid.

[36]Graves, 119.

[37]Ibid.

[38]Ibid., 120.

[39]Percival, 74.

[40]Graves, 123.

[41]Ibid.

[42]Ibid., 125.

[43]Ibid.

[44]Ibid.

[45]Ibid., 126.

[46]Ibid., 127.

[47]Ibid., 131.

[48]Percival, 76.

[49]Paul Oskar Kristeller, Eight Philosophers of the Italian Renaissance (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1964), 158.

[50]Percival, 78.

[51]Kristeller, Eight Philosophers, 163.

[52]Berthold Ullman, The Humanism of Coluccio Salutati (Padua: Editrice Atenore, 1963), 95.

[53]Ibid.

[54]Ibid., 106.

[55]Ibid.

[56]Ibid., 109.

[57]Ibid.

[58]Ibid., 110.

[59]Ibid.

[60]Ibid., 123.

[61]Paul Oskar Kristeller, Renaissance Concepts of Man, and Other Essays (New York: Harper & Row, 1972), 92.

[62]Jerrold E. Siegel, Rhetoric and Philosophy in Renaissance Humanism (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1968), 100.

[63]Ibid., 114.

[64]Ibid.

[65]Ibid.

[66]Charles L. Stinger, Humanism and the Church Fathers: Ambrogio Traversari (1386-1439) (Albany: State University of New York Press, 1977), 30.

[67]Ibid., 21.

[68]Ibid., 23.

[69]Ibid., 42.

[70]Ibid., 51.

[71]Ibid., 54.

[72]Ibid.

[73]Ibid., 55.

[74]Kristeller, Eight Philosophers, 125.

[75]Ibid.

[76]Jerry H. Bentley Humanists and Holy Writ (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1983), 36.

[77]Ibid., 50.

[78]Ibid.

[79]Ibid., 61.

[80]Ibid.

[81]Ibid., 62.

[82]Ibid., 64.

[83]Ibid.

[84]Ibid.

[85]Whibley, 610.

[86]F.W. Hall, A Companion to Classical Texts (Chicago: Argonaut Inc., 1970), 27.

[87]Ibid., 28.

[88]Ibid., 32.

[89]Ibid.

[90]Ibid., 33.

[91]Ibid., 33-34.

[92]Ibid., 43-44.

[93]Ibid., 44.

[94]Ibid., 54.

[95]Ibid., 68.

[96]Ibid., 66.

[97]L.D. Reynolds and N.G. Wilson, Scribes and Scholars (Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1974), 86.

[98]Ibid., 92.

[99]Ibid.

[100]Ibid., 93.

[101]Ibid., 97.

[102]Ibid., 99.

[103]Ibid.

[104]F.L. Cross and E.A. Livingstone, The Oxford Dictionary of the Christian Church (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1974), 754.

[105]John F. D'Amico, Theory and Practice in Renaissance Textual Criticism (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1988), 10.

[106]Ibid.

[107]Ibid., 11.

[108]Ibid.

[109]Reynolds and Wilson, 114.

[110]Ibid., 115.

[111]Ibid.

[112]Ibid.

[113]Ibid., 116.

[114]Ibid., 118.

[115]Ibid.

[116]Ibid.

[117]Ibid.

[118]Ullman, 99.

[119]Ibid., 100.

[120]Ibid., 102.

[121]Ibid., 101.

[122]Ibid., 102.

[123]Ibid., 103.

[124]Ibid.

[125]Ibid.

[126]Ibid., 105.

[127]Ibid., 105-106.

[128]Reynolds and Wilson, 121.

[129]Ibid.

[130]Ibid.

[131]Ibid.

[132]Ibid., 122.

[133]Ibid., 123.

[134]Stinger, 53.

[135]Ibid., 54.

[136]Ibid.

[137]Ibid.

[138]Ibid., 55.

[139]D'Amico, 14.

[140]Lorenzo Valla, The Profession of the Religious and the Principal Arguments from the Falsely-Believed and Forged Donation of Constantine translated and edited by Olga Zorzi Pugliese (Toronto: Center for Reformation and Renaissance Studies, 1985), XVIII, 58, 70.

[141]D'Amico, 15.

[142]Ibid.

[143]Ibid.

[144]Ibid., 16.

[145]Ibid., Bentley, 41.

CHAPTER 4

THE COUNCIL OF FLORENCE:BACKGROUND

There have certainly been many periods during which both the unity and authority of the church have been challenged. One of the more important of these eras, however, was that of the fourteenth and early fifteenth centuries, during which the church faced several crises which threatened both its organic unity and authoritative hierarchy.

Authority within the church had long been associated with and embodied in its hierarchy, the chief representative of which was the pope. From its inception, the church had struggled with an organizational structure, gradually developing a system in which an episkopos, the Greek term best translated "overseer", exercised territorial jurisdiction and control. In the early church, five episkopoi, or bishops as they later became known, had preeminent authority; the bishops of Rome, Constantinople, Antioch, Alexandria, and Jerusalem.

Pope Leo I (440-461) was the first pope to argue for a Roman supremacy in jursidiction and authority. He based his claims to supremacy on Matthew 16: 15-19, where Christ had transferred His authority to Peter, as chief among the

apostles.[1] As a result, Leo argued for a hierarchy based on the principatus, or primacy of Peter, thereby subordinating the ruling power of the other four bishops to his own. Evidence for a Roman primacy was also based on the established tradition that Peter had been the first Roman bishop and had been martyred there.[2] Therefore, Peter's authority was passed on to his successors, the bishops of Rome, on the basis of the biblical record as well as the tradition of the church. Leo is credited with having first formulated this so-called "Petrine Doctrine" of papal primacy, which had its definitive pronouncement in the decrees of the First Vatican Council of 1870.[3]

Although implied early in the development of the doctrine, the principle regarding the ultimate sovereignty of the pope over the secular ruler was later specifically claimed in the Dictatus Papae (1073) of Gregory VII. The basis of the extension of this authority to the secular realm was the concept of the church as the "societas fidelium", first developed by Nicholas I (858-867). This "society of the faithful", which was subject to papal authority, naturally included the Christian king. Gregory, (c1020-1085), known as one of the most forceful advocates of papal authority, set forth his program of reform in this famous document which "asserted the supremacy of the papal authority over the church, reserved the power of deposing, transferring, and reinstating bishops to the pope alone, and

placed the papacy above all institutions of human legal jurisdiction."[4] Gregory subsequently attempted to utilize this power in his dispute with Henry IV over the practice of lay-investiture in Germany, an attempt which ultimately failed.

A similar confrontation took place in the early fourteenth century between the king of France, Philip IV, called "the Fair" (1285-1314) and Pope Boniface VIII (1294-1303). This conflict actually began in a dispute over French taxation of the clergy in 1296, which tax was designed to provide funds for a war with England. The churchmen's protest to the pope resulted in the bull Clericis Laicos, which denied the right of the king to tax the clergy or confiscate church property.[5] Philip's refusal to yield to papal authority in the matter prompted Boniface to issue the famous bull Unam Sanctam, 1302, which boldly asserted what other popes had already claimed, namely, preeminent authority over the secular ruler with regard to the affairs of the church. Boniface was later humiliated by being arrested at Anagni in September, 1303, in a mercenary action led by William of Nogaret, who supported the French government's struggle with the papacy.[6] Boniface VIII died one month later in Rome, having been rescued by the Anagnese and others loyal to the papacy, but broken in spirit by his failure to meet the French challenge to his authority.[7]

An awareness of the limitations of papal hegemony was

evidenced by the conciliatory actions of Boniface's successor, Benedict XI, (1303-1304), who repealed the sanctions placed upon Philip by Boniface and achieved a reconciliation with the French sovereign. The success of French political power over that of the church led to a more important event however, the transfer of the papacy from Rome to Avignon from 1309 to 1378; a period known as the "Babylonian Captivity" of the church. This period was initiated during the papacy of Clement V (1305-1314), a Frenchman who followed Benedict XI, and who was said to have been Philip's choice for the papal office.[8] Clement's choice of Avignon as his residence was not without precedent; popes had sought refuge in France in the past, as Innocent IV had done in 1245, for example, to avoid the ire of the Hohenstaufen Frederich II. Philip utilized Clement to destroy the order of the Knights of the Temple, as well as to justify his harsh actions toward Boniface VIII.[9] During Clement's reign as pope, French control over the affairs of the church was strengthened by the appointment of numerous French cardinals and the removal of the papal treasure from Perugia to France.[10] Although an assertion that the Avignonese popes were merely puppets of the French sovereign is an exaggeration of the truth, it is certainly true that papal power and prestige during the captivity were diminished by the challenge of strong secular leadership.

The return of the papacy to Rome was effected by

Pope Gregory XI in 1377. From his ascension to the highest office in the church in 1370, Gregory had desired to move the papacy back to Rome, but this desire was impeded by a lack of funds and by the state of war between France and England.[11] Gregory's death in 1378 triggered yet another controversy which resulted in what has come to be known as the "Great Schism" of the church. This period, from 1378 until 1415, saw the church divided into two, and later three obediences to as many different popes, all reigning concurrently.

The responsibility for electing a new pope after Gregory's death fell to the college of cardinals, the majority of whom were non-Italians. Of the sixteen cardinals present in Rome to complete this task, eleven were French, four Italian and one was a Spaniard.[12] The city of Rome itself was a hotbed of discontent regarding the affairs of the conclave, and there was anger and anxiety among the residents of the city at the prospect of the election of a non-Italian pontiff. Whether or not the body of cardinals were intimidated by the potentially hostile crowds gathered outside their chambers has not been clearly established; they nevertheless hastily elected an Italian, Bartolomeo Prignano as pope.[13] Prignano, who chose the name Urban VI upon his election, immediately antagonized his electors by condemning their unethical practices, and announcing his intention to reform the church beginning at the top.[14] In

addition, he proposed to elect new cardinals to their body so as to achieve an Italian majority.[15] These actions precipitated a revolt among the French cardinals, who met in August of 1378 and declared the election of Urban invalid because they had chosen him under duress. In September of that year, the French cardinals elected Robert of Geneva as pope, and Robert assumed his office under the title of Clement VII.[16] The election of Clement VII as anti-pope initiated the Great Schism and polarized the obedience of the faithful along national lines. France of course sided with Clement, as did Spain, Scotland, and the kingdom of Naples, while England, Germany, Flanders, Poland, Bohemia, Hungary, and Portugal remained faithful to Urban.[17]

The establishment of two rival popes was certainly not beneficial to the church. The existence of these obediences not only divided the Body of Christ; the need for funds to support both curias led to increased taxation which threatened to foment rebellion among its members as well.[18] As a result, many nefarious practices were utilized in order to raise funds for the papal treasuries.[19] Denys Hay writes that "The 'Roman' popes (of the Schism) were insignificant as men and leaders."[20] Perhaps this was the result of their preoccupation with acts necessary to compete with their adversaries, the Avignonese papacy. Strangely enough, it was France which took the first step toward ending the Schism in the church by first participating in a conciliatory mission

to both curias in 1397, and by withdrawing obedience from the Avignonese pope, Benedict XIII, who had succeeded Clement VII in 1394.[21] Neither effort met with success. While the last Roman pope of the Schism, Gregory XII (1406-1415), and Benedict XIII jockeyed for leverage over each other, their cardinals, tired of the bitter struggle which seemed interminable, met to negotiate at Livorno.[22] They agreed to summon a council in order to bring the matter to a solution, and they decided on Pisa as its location. At the Council of Pisa (1409), these cardinals settled the question of two obediences by deposing both Gregory and Benedict and choosing a third pope, the Franciscan Peter Philargi, who took the name Alexander V.[23] The cardinals proved unwilling, however, to face questions regarding church reform, which some of the participants desired to address.[24] The effectiveness of this sparsely attended though accepted Council was moot, for both existing popes rejected their depositions, and excommunicated its members.[25] Therefore the church now had three different popes, although the majority of nations within Christendom, including France, Germany, England, and most of Italy regarded Alexander V as the legitimate pope.[26] As a result of these two major crises, the removal of the papacy to Avignon and the Great Schism, the church entered the fifteenth century with a diluted papal authority and lacking the organic unity so necessary for its well being.

Conciliarism

The experiences of the crises of the fourteenth century led to the development of a new theory of ecclesiastical authority known as the Conciliar Theory. The proponents of this theory argued that the authority of the general council was superior to that of the pope in the affairs of the church. The underlying foundation of this assertion was the Conciliarists' view of the nature of the church. The conciliar position regarding the church was clearly expressed in the Epistola Concordiae (1380), written by Conrad of Gelnhausen, one of the movements' most well known advocates (1320-1390). Written soon after the outbreak of the Schism, Tierney notes that; "Its (Epistola) central feature was a sharp distinction between the Universal church (the whole congregatio fidelium) and the Roman church (understood as the Pope and cardinals), together with an uncompromising assertion that the former was superior to the latter."[27]

Tierney, in his work Foundations of the Conciliar Theory, demonstrates that the concepts espoused by the Conciliarists were not new, but had been developed from the body of canon law which had long existed within the church.[28] The Concilarists drew their ideas from the body of canon law contained primarily in the compilation of the Camaldolesian monk Gratian (d. 1159), known as the Decretum Gratiani, or Gratian's Decretum, (c.1140). This body of

documents contained nearly 4,000 patristic texts, conciliar decrees and papal pronouncements, arranged by Gratian in order to facilitate their use as references.[29]

The development of the Conciliar theory itself has been traced back to twelfth century Decretists, or scholars of the Decretum, one of the most important of whom was Huguccio, Bishop of Pisa. It was Huguccio's great summary of Decretist scholarship, Summa Super Decreta (1190), that first enunciated the conciliar principle that the pope could err, and that infallibility was possible only in the judgments of the universal church.[30] This position was based on Huguccio's exegesis of the two famous passages: Matthew 16:18-19, "Tu es Petrus," which had been used by popes for centuries as the foundation of their primacy and plenary authority, and Luke 22:32, which had long supported papal claims to indefectability, or the impossibility of committing heresy and falling away from the faith. Huguccio, in an interpretation also favored by other Decretists, viewed the "rock" referred to in Matthew 16:18, upon which the church was to be built, either as Christ, or Peter's faith, but not Peter himself.[31] From this interpretation the Conciliarists formed their doctrine that the pope represented the church and derived his power and authority from the universal Body of Christ. Thus when they exegeted the latter passage of Scripture, Luke 22:32, in which Christ said to Peter, "but I (Christ) have prayed for you that your

faith may not fail...", Huguccio and the other Decretists argued that Christ's prayer applied to Peter only as a representative of the church as a whole, and that the promised indefectability was therefore characteristic only of the universal church.[32] An important corollary to the interpretations of the twelfth century Decretists was that prolonged schism was bound to produce heresy, and such heresy would make it necessary to depose the pope.[33] This development would later prove significant in the struggle between conciliar and papal authority which characterized the early decades of the fifteenth century.

In the Decretum, the Conciliarists found support for the essential principles of their movement which were: first; the universal church consists of the congregatio fidelium, or the congregation of the faithful; second, all authority in the church is vested in the congregatio fidelium, therefore, the greatest expression of that authority is in the decrees of the general council, which represents that body; third, that the pope was to be seen as the head of the corporate church, thus while having full authority, ruled only by the consent of those whom he represented, and could be deposed for heresy or improper conduct; and finally, a zealous concern for unity within the church, based on the "corporation concept" which was developed by medieval decretists. Tierney writes concerning this last point; "...the conviction that this corporate

unity of the faithful was also an integral part of 'the whole Christ', that, in a sense, the body of Christ was lacerated by the continuing Schism in his church, also inspired in the foremost Conciliarists that passionate will to unity which characterized all their works and without which the tortuous problems raised by the Schism could never have been resolved".[34]

Indeed, this emphasis on unity was the major thrust of the well known Concilarist, Jean Gerson (1363-1429), who wrote two tracts concerning the issue; The Union of the Church (1391), and The Unity of the Church, 1409.[35] While supporting the superiority of the general council to the pope, Gerson nonetheless advocated a unified church under "one undoubted vicar of Christ,"[36] thus exhibiting what Tierney calls "the central problem of conciliar thought".[33] That is, in order to achieve the desired unity, the Concilarists necessarily supported the singular headship of the pope, whose ultimate authority they denied. "It seemed Christendom could only be given a single pope by a procedure which implicitly denied the unique competence of the papacy; the steps necessary to end the Schism involved an attack on the very institution that had always been regarded as the indispensable keystone of ecclesiastical unity".[37]

Conciliarism, while challenging the unbridled excercise of papal sovereignty, nonetheless provided a measure of stability and unity to the church when the power of the

papacy was unable to do so. The movement was not schismatic and desired to work within the existing framework of canon law and organizational structure of the church in order to effect change. There is some question as to how the Schism would have been ended if it had not been for the infusion of conciliar ideas among the leadership of the church. Indeed, conciliar theory ultimately returned the church to a single obedience, actually restoring and strengthening the papacy. Among moderate churchmen, the Conciliar theory offered a solution both to the abuse of papal authority and the encroachment of secular power into the affairs of the church. It was in fact only after the movement saw its most extreme expression at the Council of Basle (1431-1449) that it failed, largely because it attempted to completely disempower the papacy, not simply hold it accountable.

The Council of Constance (1414-1418)

The Council of Constance was convoked by Pope John XXIII, who had succeeded Alexander V upon his death in May, 1410. John, however, did not summon the council of his own accord, but rather at the insistence of the Roman Emperor, Sigismund, whose support John sought because of the political problems he faced in Italy.[38] Sigismund, as the real power behind the conclave, uniquely organized the voting procedure such that nations voted individually in order to balance the disparate sizes of their contingents.[39]

One of the chief purposes of this ecclesiastical convocation was to end the Schism which had divided the church since 1378. This task was effectively accomplished with the election of Martin V as pope on November 11, 1417, and the depositions of John XXIII and Benedict XIII. The council exercised authority in the conciliar fashion, deposing Benedict XIII for supporting the Schism and thus acting as a heretic.[40]The fundamental concepts of the Conciliar movement were also embodied in the major pronouncement of the council, known as the Haec Sancta (1415). In this decree, the council stated that its power was derived directly from Christ, and that "everyone, of whatever status and rank he may be, and even the pope, is bound to obey it in matters pertaining to the faith, and to the abolition of the said schism,".[41] The validity of the decree has been debated by historians, but there is no question that it was accepted at the time by church and pope alike.[42] Thus Martin was elected as true head of the church, but he exercised authority only as it was given him by the council. To ensure continued conciliar control and to maintain a check upon abuses of papal authority, the council also issued the decree Frequens in October, 1417, which mandated the convocation of a further council five years after its own dissolution, another to meet seven years later, and the gathering of future general councils at ten year intervals.[43]

The Council of Constance failed to produce any major reforms largely due to national differences and the fear of cardinals and other leaders that their powers and privileges might be curtailed.[44] Its effect upon the unity of the church was beneficial, as the Body of Christ was once more united under a single obedience. The limitations, however, it placed upon papal power ultimately led to the resurgence of that power which was later manifested at the Council of Florence.

The Council of Pavia-Siena (1423)

In obedience to the decree Frequens, Martin V convened a general council at Pavia in 1423. The council was subsequently transferred to Siena due to an outbreak of the plague.[45] Pavia-Siena failed to yield substantial results in the way of reform, due to Martin's unwillingness to enhance the power of the council against his own, as well as its lack of support by any great secular leader.[46] What was accomplished, however, was further condemnation of Wycliff and Huss, who had been declared heretics at Constance, and the choice of the city of Basel as the site for the next general council.[47]

The Council of Basel (1431-1449)

Although the Council of Basel met over an eighteen year period, the importance of the convocation as background

for the Council of Florence lay in the events of its early stages, from 1431 to September 1437. It is this period which will be briefly discussed here.

Basel had been determined as the site of the next general council at the Council of Pavia-Siena. On February 20, 1431, Martin V died, having laid the necessary groundwork for the convening of the new council, to include the choice of its president, Cardinal Giuliano Cesarini of St. Angelo.[48] Martin was succeeded as pope by Gabriele Condulmaro, a Venetian from an affluent merchant family.[49] One of the first acts of Condulmaro, who took the name Eugenius IV upon his election to the pontificate on March 3, 1431, was to confirm Cesarini's appointment to Basel as papal Legate.[50] The council opened on July 25, 1431, although Cesarini himself did not actually arrive at Basel until September 9, 1431, due to his participation in a crusade against the Hussites.[51] The primary objectives of the council were church reform and the settlement of the Hussite controversy.[52] Instead of the national divisions of Constance, Basel was divided into four "deputations", comprised of delegates from each of the participating nations.[53] "Measures were first discussed in the deputations and then, if accepted, confirmed in a general session. The agreement of three Deputations was sufficient for a measure to be considered approved by the Council."[54] This arrangement had the effect of lessening the voting power of

individual nations, which was exactly opposite of the situation at Constance thirteen years earlier.

At an early stage of the development of the council, Eugenius realized the threat it presented to his power and authority. Therefore, on December 18, 1431, being enticed by reports of difficulties facing the synod, he attempted to dissolve it with the bull Quoniam Alto.[55] This pronouncement was predictably received by the delegates at Basel, who defied its authority; even Cesarini wrote the pope, asking that he might allow the assembly to continue.[56] Because of the political situation which he faced; civil war in Italy, the struggle between the Orsini and Colonnas, and widespread support of Basel by secular rulers such as Emperor Sigismund, Charles of France, Philip of Burgundy, and his arch enemy, the Duke of Milan, Eugenius backed down from his order.[57] After failing to gain an advantage against Basel after a prolonged struggle, Eugenius issued the bull Dudum Sacrum (December 18, 1433), in which he declared the council valid and annulled all previous decrees against it.

During the following years, the council became increasingly disdainful of the papacy, often brashly asserting its supremacy to papal authority. This attitude on the part of the council was clearly evidenced in its dealings with matters pertaining to papal income. "On June 9, (1435), a decree was passed abolishing annates, and all dues on presentations, on receiving the pallium, and on all

such occasions."[57] This was seen by the moderates at Basel as a direct assault on the papacy, not simply an act of reform. Creighton writes concerning this event: "It marked the rise into power of the extreme party in the Council--the party whose object was the entire reduction of the Papacy under a conciliar oligarchy."[58] This attitude among the leadership of the council, gradually began to foment support for Eugenius among its participants, including the humanist Ambrogio Traversari. Traversari and other Italian churchmen felt compelled to defend Eugenius and the office of the papacy against these encroachments. Indeed, Traversari as Creighton observes, "now placed himself on the Pope's side, and went to Basel to defeat the machinations of what he considered a lawless mob."[59]

Over the course of the next two years, circumstances changed dramatically in favor of Eugenius. By the end of 1435, Eugenius' political situation had improved; peace was obtained between Venice, Florence, the pope, and their common adversary, the Visconti of Milan.[60] The truculence of the fathers of Basel had also tempered the support of the secular princes who did not desire to promote schism within the church. In addition, the Compacts of Prague (July 1436) were signed; thus reconciling the Hussites and the church, and thereby depriving Basel of another reason for its continuation.[61] By the fall of 1437, Eugenius was once again in position to assail Basel and its usurpation of papal

prerogatives. This he accomplished in his bull Doctoris Gentium (September 18, 1437), in which he condemned its intransigence and failure to negotiate successfully with the Greeks concerning reunification; these circumstances therefore made it necessary for him to transfer the council to Ferrara.[62] In December 1437, Cessarini left Basel for Ferrara, indicating the shift in support among its more moderate delegates to papal obedience. Further support for Eugenius came in the form of the Greek church leaders, who accepted his offer to attend a council whose main purpose was the reunification of Eastern and Western Churches. That the Greeks chose Eugenius over Basel was indeed a tremendous boost to papal prestige, though hardly surprising: "In spite of Latin conciliar theory, they (Greeks) had no doubt that the only head of the Latin church was the pope;"[63]

The struggle between Basel and Eugenius did much to strengthen the papacy, largely because of the extreme efforts of the Conciliarists to abase it. There were many necessary reforms enacted by the council, but they are unfortunately overshadowed by its intense conflict with Eugenius. As pope, Eugenius was careful to appeal to one fundamental issue in his condemnation of the council, that of unity. The preservation of unity was of primary importance to the western church, having just emerged from a period of painful separation. Unity was certainly a major concern of the moderates at Basel, who deplored the divisive

efforts of extremists. But unity between east and west, which had not existed since 1054, was a most cherished hope of all Christians. It was this latter issue which was to become the focal point of Eugenius' papacy, and he deftly utilized it to bring both Latin and Greek churches under his sovereignty.

Schism Between East and West

The primary objective of the Council of Florence was the reconciliation of the eastern and western branches of Christendom. In order to understand the significance of the council in this respect, it will be necessary first to review the history of previous efforts to reconcile the eastern and western churches.

The Schism of 1054

The beginning of the Schism between East and West can actually be traced to the mid-ninth century conflict between Pope Nicholas I (858-867) and Photius, the eastern patriarch (858-867, 877-886). Nicholas had been appealed to as mediator in a dispute over the emperor's appointment of Photius, a laymen, to replace the deposed Patriarch Ignatius.[64] Ignatius had criticized the immorality of the Emperor Bardas, thus incurring his wrath and deposition. Nicholas sided with the legally elected bishop, Ignatius and against Photius, threatening the latter's own deposition and

excommunication if he did not step down.[65] Photius defiantly delivered a counter encyclical of excommunication against Nicholas, based on a number of doctrinal differences between East and West, one of which was the west's corruption of the Nicene Creed (325) by the addition of the Filioque clause.[66] This clause, translated from the Latin "and the Son," spoke to the issue of the procession of the Holy Spirit. The Greeks argued that the Holy Spirit proceeded only from the Father as written in the Nicene Creed, while the Latins viewed the procession as from the Father "and the Son," which they claimed was implied in the Creed. Photius thus became the first Greek to raise the issue of the Filioque, which was to become the primary area of disagreement between east and west.[67] The breach between the two main branches of Christendom was thereby opened, though not yet fixed, by the so-called "Photian Schism".

By the mid-eleventh century, the eastern empire had achieved a measure of power and prestige it had not seen since the days of Justinian (527-565).[68] The eastern church had long regarded itself as equal in authority to the Latin, and it was this feeling which apparently emboldened the patriarch Cerularius (1043-1058) to close the Latin churches in Constantinople and condemn their practices in four areas, among which were the use of unleavened bread in the liturgy, and of course, the addition of the Filioque.[69] Pope Leo IX (1049-1054) in turn condemned

the actions of the patriarch, demanding recognition of Roman supremacy by the Greeks.[70] Leo sent a delegation to Constantinople in order to effect a reconciliation led by Cardinal Humbert.[71] The mission, however, ended in failure and with the questionable excommunication of Cerularius by the western legates (1054). These men claimed to have acted in behalf of Pope Leo, who had already died.[72] Cerularius, as would have been expected, wrote a similar bull of excommunication against the Roman legates and pope. This document contained an enumeration of the supposed doctrinal errors of the Latins, which Gill terms "an interminable list of ecclesiastical trifles."[73] With this mutual excommunication, the eastern and western churches entered into the period of division which existed until their reunification at Florence three hundred and eighty-five years later.

The Fourth Crusade (1204)

There were two occasions prior to the Council of Florence when union between Greek and Latin churches had been declared; the first occurred at the conclusion of the Fourth Crusade of 1204.[74]

This crusade was initiated by an appeal from Pope Innocent III, one of the strongest, and ablest of all those who have occupied the papal office. The pope's urgent appeal for a crusade was enthusiastically affirmed by the lower

nobility and bishops, especially in France.[75] The Crusade began inauspiciously in Venice in the summer of 1202, with the crusaders lacking the requisite funds to pay the Venetians for transportation by sea to Outremer.[76] In order to satisfy this debt, the mission was diverted to an attack on Zara in Dalmatia, which although held by the Christian King of Hungary, was claimed by the Venetians as their own. This adventure caused great conflict among the crusaders, who balked at the prospect of fighting against other christians, and also brought the leadership of the crusade into conflict with the pope.[77] After the fall of Zara, for which the participants were excommunicated by Innocent, the crusaders yet again defied his wishes for the crusade by marching on Constantinople to restore the Byzantine throne to Prince Alexius.[78] Prince Alexius was the son of the Emperor Isaac II (1203-1204), who had been deposed by the present Emperor Alexius III. The prince, as an incentive, had offered material support for the crusade in return for military aid against those who had usurped his throne.[79] Contrary to the express will of the pope, the crusaders restored the prince and his father to the Byzantine throne in the summer of 1203.[80] Shortly after this, Isaac died and his son Alexius was killed, negating the efforts of the crusaders to restore the rightful rulership to the empire. The latter event prompted the crusaders to retake the city by force, which they accomplished on May 13, 1204. What

followed can only be described as horrible and unfortunate, as the Europeans sacked and plundered the ancient capital.

Pope Innocent, although unaware of the barbarity with which the crusaders had occupied Constantinople, nevertheless viewed the military action as sanctioned by God for the reunification of the church.[81] Concerning this event he wrote, "Truly we proclaim them (Greeks) brethren, partners, friends, because, though We have the office of government over them, it is a government that leads not to domination but to service."[82] In the same discourse, Innocent spoke regarding the restoration of the eastern church to Roman obedience:

> But by God's grace they came because after the Empire of Constantinople was in these days transferred to the Latins, the Church also of Constantinople came back to obedience to the Apostolic See like a daughter to a mother and a member to the head, so that for the future there might reign between us an undivided partnership.[83]

Innocent, therefore, seized the opportunity presented by this aspect of the crusade to further the concept of Roman primacy by proclaiming a unified obedience of eastern and western churches under his rule. This submission, which was never agreed to by the Greeks themselves, only lasted as long as it was enforced by Latin might.

Council of Lyons (1274)

Yet another attempt at reunification of the Latin and Greek churches was made by the Second General Council of

Lyons in 1274.

Constantinople was retaken from the Latins in July of 1261. The new emperor, Michael VIII Palaeologus (1259-1282), immediately began negotiations with Pope Alexander IV regarding reunion.[84] The efforts of the Greek emperor were based primarily on political concerns, for there was great sentiment in the west to attempt to recapture Constantinople, and Michael realized that he could not withstand a combined military thrust from the European powers.[85] Therefore Michael was willing to do anything which might discourage western aggression and allow him to carry out his own program of expansion in Greece, even to lead his church into reunification with the west.

On March 31, 1271, shortly after his election to office, Pope Gregory X announced the convocation of a general council to meet on May 1, 1274.[86] This council was to be concerned with three main issues: ' "to deal with the withdrawal of the people of the Greeks which has withdrawn itself from devotion and obedience to the Holy See, with the complete overwhelming and fearsome destruction of the Holy Land, and with the decadence of morals." '[87] In a letter informing the emperor of the upcoming council, Gregory demanded from the Greeks complete submission to his authority, as his predecessors had also done. "The Emperor was asked to make the profession of faith in their (Latin representatives) presence and to sincerely accept the

primacy of Rome, and finally to have his clergy and people do the same."[88] Before the council even began, therefore, acceptance of conditions previously unfavorable to the Greeks had been made a prerequisite for negotiations. Gregory did later make concessions regarding the language which would be required of the Greeks in their oath of submission, but these changes hardly affected the reality of their subordination.

Michael had a difficult task at hand in any attempt at reunion with the west: that of gaining its acceptance by the Greek clergy. The emperor utilized various methods to accomplish this ranging from persuasion to physical abuse.[89] In the end, Michael was able to convince his bishops that the council would only require them to submit in three areas; "the primacy of the Holy See, the right of appeal for everyone who felt himself unjustly treated in a local ecclesiastical tribunal, and commemoration of the pope in the diptychs."[90] With the approval of his church, the emperor thus prepared the way for the council, which he hoped would end western attempts to reclaim the Byzantine capital.

The Council of Lyons was convened on May 7, 1274. The Greek delegation arrived on June 25, 1274, and delivered a letter from the emperor stating that "they were coming to offer complete obedience to the holy Roman Church, acknowledgement of the faith that the Church holds and of

the primacy itself."[91] The delegates were treated with honor and respect by the Latins, and without humiliation in their initial meeting with Pope Gregory.[92]

During the fourth session of the council on July 6, 1274, the emperor's profession of faith was read. This document affirmed Michael's obedience to the Latin views regarding the Filioque, purgatory, and papal primacy.[93] It further requested that the pope allow the Greeks to continue their traditional rite in worship and to recite the creed as they had done from the Schism to the present day.[94] The Latins demanded "some written guarantee" of the validity of the fact that the legates were in agreement with the Emperor, so the Greek representatives, Germanus, Acropolites, and Theophanes signed such a document, pledging their allegiance directly to the pope.[95] On July 17, 1274, the sixth session of the council, the pope read the only dogmatic decree of the council, which declared the procession of the Holy Spirit as being both from the Father and the Son, and the council was ended.[96] This final session served to cement the union between Greek and Latin churches, which in reality, had already been accomplished by the reading of the emperor's profession of faith during the fourth meeting.

On January 16, 1275, the union was proclaimed by the Byzantines in the church of the Blachernae which was located in the Imperial Palace.[97] The proclamation was marked by the

reading of the epistle and gospel in both Latin and Greek and the commemoration of Pope Gregory at the appropriate place in the mass.[98] Anti-union sentiment, however, was already apparent within the empire. Patriarch Joseph, who had opposed the union from the beginning, abdicated only after being forced to do so by a synod of the church. He became the center of anti-unionist resistance at his place of exile, the monastery of St. Michael at Anaplous.[99]

The Emperor and John Beccus, the new Patriarch, countered the anti-unionists by requiring the leaders of the church to sign a tomographia, a statement of their commitment to union.[100] At least forty-one of the officials of St. Sophia did sign such a document.[101] Additionally, the penalty of excommunication was to be imposed on any who refused to endorse the reunion.

Despite these measures, opposition to the union increased. This resistance was strengthened in part by the stringent requirements imposed on the Greeks to demonstrate their compliance by successive popes.[102] It was further enhanced by the natural distrust which the Greeks had for the West, especially with regard to Latin attempts to dominate them. Finally, the inclusion of a requirement for the Greeks to accept the Filioque presented yet another strong reason for opposition to the union.

Martin IV, the newly elected pope (February 22, 1281) accelerated papal policy toward Byzantium with regard to the

union. Emperor Michael's envoys were given a cold reception by the pope, who, it seems had become aware of the fact that the union was superficial at best in the east and Michael had been simply playing for time.[103] Martin acted to end what had become a farce by excommunicating the Greek emperor on November 18, 1281.

> With the advice of Our brethren We, in the presence of a great concourse of the faithful, formally declare that Michael Palaelogus, who is called Emperor of the Greeks, as patron of the Greeks who are inveterate schismatics and fixed in the ancient schism, has incurred a sentence of excommunication and will be held bound by that sentence.[104]

This action formally ended the short-lived union of east and west. Emperor Michael, who had worked hard to effect and maintain the reunification of the two branches of Christendom, ultimately was rejected by both. At his death he was hastily interred by his son Andronicus, having been excommunicated by the west, and refused the right of christian burial by his own church.[105]

Michael was certainly motivated by political aims in his advocacy of the union. The threat of an expedition to the east by Charles of Anjou was constant throughout this period, and it was stayed only because of the importance of the union. Yet Michael seems also to have become personally convinced of the theological basis for such a union, for he worked diligently to maintain it in spite of tremendous opposition. Even if the pope had not excommunicated him, the union would not have survived beyond

Michael's lifetime. The widespread opposition to reunion with the west was held in place only by the emperor's power; "The combination of bishops, monks, and laity was a formidable opposition that Michael held in check by fear. His death removed the restraint."[106]

ENDNOTES

[1]Norman F. Cantor, Medieval History (New York: The MacMillan Company, 1963), 65.

[2]Philip Schaff, The Creeds of Christendom, vol. 2, The Greek and Latin Creeds (Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1985), 262.

[3]Cantor, 66.

[4]Ibid., 315.

[5]Philip Schaff, The History of the Christian Church, vol. 6, The Middle Ages (Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans Pub. Co., 1910), 17.

[6]Ibid., 22.

[7]Ibid., 23.

[8]Ibid., 49.

[9]Ibid., 50-53.

[10]Ibid., 58-59.

[11]Denys Hay, Europe in the Fourteenth and Fifteenth Centuries (London: Longman Group Ltd., 1966), 279.

[12]Ibid., 280.

[13]Ibid.

[14]Will Durant, The Story of Civilization Part V: The Renaissance (New York: Simon & Schuster, 1953), 361.

[15]Ibid.

[16]Hay, 280.

[17]Durant, 362.

[18]Henry S. Lucas, The Renaissance and Reformation (New York: Harper & Brothers Pub., 1934), 87.

[19]Ibid., 86.

[20]Hay, 281.

[21]Ibid., 283.

[22]Lucas, 95.

[23]Ibid.

[24]Ibid., 96.

[25]Ibid.

[26]Hay, 283.

[27]Brian Tierney, Foundations of the Conciliar Theory (Cambridge: Cambridge university Press, 1955), 3-4.

[28]Ibid., 18-19.

[29]F.L. Cross and E.A. Livingstone, eds. The Oxford Dictionary of the Christian Church (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1974), 589.

[30]Ibid., 326.

[31]Tierney, 26-27.

[32]Ibid., 35.

[33]Ibid., 57.

[34]Ibid., 246.

[35]Jaroslav Pelikan, The Christian Tradition, vol. 4, Reformation of Church and Dogma (1300-1700) (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1984), 73.

[36]Ibid.

[37]Tierney, 240.

[38]Geoffrey Barraclough, The Medieval Papacy (New York: W.W. Norton and Co., Inc., 1968), 178.

[39]Ibid.

[40]Lucas, 99.

[41]Lucas, 98.

[42]Brian Tierney, "Hermeneutics and History: The Problem of Haec Sancta," chap. in Church Law and Constitutional Thought in the Middle Ages (London: Variorum Reprints, 1977), 369.

[43]C.M.D. Crowder, Unity, Heresy and Reform, 1378-1460 (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1987), 146.

[44]Lucas, 99.

[45]Schaff, History, vol. VI, 168.

[46]Hay, 288.

[47]Schaff, History, vol. VI, 168-169.

[48]Joseph Gill, S.J., The Council of Florence (Cambridge: The Cambridge University Press, 1961.), 45-46.

[49]Joseph Gill, S.J., Eugenius IV: Pope of Christian Union (Westminster: The Newman Press, 1961), 15.

[50]Gill, Council, 46.

[51]Ibid.

[52]Schaff, History, vol. VI, 170.

[53]Gill, Council, 50.

[54]Ibid, Footnote #4.

[55]Ibid., 47.

[56]Ibid., 48.

[57]M. Creighton, A History of the Papacy, vol. 2, From the Great Schism to the Sack of Rome (New York: Longmans, Green, and Co., 1897), 270.

[58]Ibid.

[59]Ibid., 271.

[60]Gill, Eugenius, 82.

[61]Aeneas Sylvius Piccolomini, De Gestis Concilii Basilensis Commentariorum Libri II, ed. Denys Hay and W.K. Smith (Oxford: Oxford at the Clarendon Press, 1967), xviii.

[62]Ibid., xix.

[63]Gill, Council, 84.

[64]Schaff, Creeds, 313.

[65]Ibid.

[66]Ibid., 314.

[67]Cross & Livingstone, 1088.

[68]Gill, Council, 4.

[69]Durant, 544.

[70]Ibid.

[71]Ibid., 545.

[72]Ibid.

[73]Gill, Council, 6.

[74]Deno John Geanakoplos, "The Council of Florence and the Problem of Union Between the Byzantine and Latin Churches." In Byzantine East and Latin West (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1966), 85.

[75]Joseph Gill, S.J., Byzantium and the Papacy 1198-1400 (New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press, 1979), 14.

[76]Ibid.

[77]Ibid., 15.

[78]Ibid.

[79]Ibid., 18.

[80]Ibid., 19.

[81]Ibid., 28.

[82]Ibid.

[83]Ibid.

[84]Ibid., 106.

[85]Ibid.

[86]Ibid., 123.

[87]Ibid.

[88]Ibid., 125.

[89]Ibid., 131-32.

[90]Ibid., 132.

[91]Ibid., 134.

[92]Ibid.

[93]Ibid., 136.

[94]Ibid.

[95]Ibid., 138.

[96]Ibid., 139.

[97]Ibid., 163.

[98]Ibid.

[99]Ibid.

[100]Ibid., 164.

[101]Ibid.

[102]Ibid., 173.

[103]Ibid., 178.

[104]Ibid.

[105]Ibid., 180.

[106]Ibid., 181.

CHAPTER 5

THE COUNCIL OF FLORENCE: OVERVIEW

The Greeks Come To Ferrara

When Emperor John VIII Palaelogus (1425-1448) sailed with his delegation to Italy on November 27, 1437, in ships supplied by the pope, he did so primarily to gain political and military support against the ever encroaching Turks.[1] But, much like his predecessor Michael, he was also personally impressed by a need to reunite with the Latins: "John, like all other Christians of the time, sincerely believed that the schism dividing east and west was a tragedy and that to try to heal that breach was worthy of a man's best endeavors."[2] It would seem that the Greeks should have preferred to attend the synod at Basel rather than that which was convoked by Eugenius IV at Ferarra. After all, neither the Greeks nor the Conciliarists wanted to be in subjection to the pope. Furthermore, the gathering at Basel had the support of the secular princes, including Emperor Sigismund, whose aid John VIII was soliciting in his conflict with the Turks. There are indications, however, that even the princes began to grow weary of the extremist's attempts to efface completely all papal authority. If this growing disatisfaction on the part of the secular rulers was known to the Greeks, it may have played some role in their

decision. However, it was precisely because of the significance of the office of the papacy, with its recognized authority, that the Greeks decided to accept Eugenius' invitation. As Gill writes:

> His (John VIII) only hope of saving his capital from the fate that had befallen most of the rest of his empire lay in the West, to persuade the Christian princes that immediate action was needed if there was to be preserved that last bulwark of Christianity in the east, which was at the same time the first line of defence of the Western kingdoms. There was no one in the West whose influence could compare with that of the pope.[3]

The relationship between Eugenius and the fathers at Basel deteriorated to the point that the pope was charged by the council on July 31, 1437, to present himself in order to answer certain grievances against him.[4] Eugenius having become more confident in his standing with regard to the Council of Basel, replied with the bull Doctoris Gentium (September 18, 1437) in which he translated, by his authority as pope, the council to Ferrara.[5] It seems that Florence had been the pope's original choice for the site of the council, but this was later changed because of the threats made by the Duke of Milan to bar access to the city if it was used as the meeting place of the synod.[6]

Ferrara was a congenial site for such a gathering, not only for its beautiful fruit gardens and countryside, but also because of its intellectual background. It was the home of a studio, whose degree granting charter had been established by Pope Boniface IX in 1391, and also of two

great scholars, Guarino da Verona and Ugo Benzi.[7] Ferrara also provided the council a certain measure of security from enemies, such as the Duke of Milan, due to its large standing mercenary army.[8]

At Basel meanwhile, Eugenius, who had not presented himself to the council to answer the charges against him, was declared contumacious on October 1, 1437.[9] But at the insistence of Sigismund and the German Electors, Eugenius was given further time to appear before the synod.[10] Despite such efforts at conciliation, however, the fathers became increasingly unyielding in their attitude toward Eugenius. It was this intransigence which prompted Cardinal Cesarini, who presided over the council as papal representative, to depart Basel on January 9, 1438 for Ferrara.[11]

On December 30, 1347, Pope Eugenius had declared the council fully transferred to Ferrara in his Bull, Pridem ex Justis.[12] The first session was to be convened on January 8, 1438.[13] The initial session of the newly transferred synod indeed took place at the cathedral church of St. George on January 8th, under the leadership of Cardinal Nicolo Albergati who declared the assembly convened to work " 'for all those objects for which the synod of Basel had been convened, also as the Oecumenical council in which union of the western and eastern churches should be treated of and, with the Lord's help, brought to a conclusion.' "[14] During a second session on January 9, the pronouncements of Basel

were declared void and sanctions invoked against any who would interfere with the members or proceedings at Ferrara; on January 10th, all the newly proclaimed decrees were read and approved in a plenary session.[15] As Gill remarks; "By these three sessions the Council of Ferrara was firmly established canonically and its members protected."[16] Pope Eugenius arrived at Ferrara on January 24, 1438. On the same day the Council of Basel announced further sanctions against him. "It (January 24th) was the day when the remnant at Basel held their thirty-first session, in which, along with two decrees concerning reform, they declared the pope suspended and deprived of all power both spiritual and temporal, which the fathers arrogated to themselves as long as the suspension should last."[17] These sanctions were applied as well to any who would be inclined to support Eugenius: "At the same time all princes, cardinals and bishops were forbidden to obey him: instead, those who had the right and duty of participating in a council should proceed forthwith to Basel."[18]

On February 8th, the pope addressed the assembly to offer both an explanation for his transfer of the council to Ferrara, and to solicit the advice of its members in dealing with the extremists at Basel.[19] With the uniform support of the church leadership gathered at Ferrara, the pope issued the Bull Exposcit Debitum on February 15th. This Bull summarized the reasons for which the council had been

transferred to Ferrara by the pope, and warned those who remained at Basel once again to leave that city or suffer the pain of excommunication.[20]

The Greek delegation, including the emperor and Patriarch Joseph II, arrived at Venice on the morning of February 8, 1438.[21] On the next day, they were welcomed to the city by the Doge, Francesco Foscari, with a spectacular parade.[22] Eugenius, upon being informed of the arrival of the Greeks, immediately dispatched a welcoming delegation to Venice,led by Cardinal Albergati.[23] The papal envoys reached Venice on February 13th, and made an official visit to the emperor and patriarch the following day. The represenatives of the pope entreated the emperor to continue on to Ferrara without delay. The emperor, however, did not comply with the request, citing weariness from the journey as an excuse.[24] At this point, there seems to have been some wavering among the Greek delegation as to whether they should continue to Ferrara, or divert to Basel.

> The Patriarch, so Dandolo (Venetian representative to the Holy See) was told with instructions to pass on the information confidentially to the pope, disturbed by the continued division between the pope and Basel and the pope and the princes, had secretly asked the Doge's counsel what he and the emperor should do. The Doge had strongly advised him to choose the pope, since the more important and worthy prelates had abandoned Basel, and the princes, with the exception of the King of Aragon and the Duke of Milan, now favoured the Sovereign Pontiff.[25]

By February 18th, the Greeks had reaffirmed their decision to meet with the pope at Ferrara.[26] Confirmation of the fact

that the Greeks had experienced only a momentary lapse of resolve regarding their decision to attend Ferrara comes in a letter which was written by the emperor to the fathers at Basel on February 25th: "He had always, he said, refused to agree to Basel as the scene of the council and now, even had he wished to go there, he could not, for his physical condition after the rigours of the voyage was such that he could not mount a horse."[27]

The emperor arrived at Ferrara on March 4, 1438, but due to a lack of suitable ships, the Patriarch was unable to travel with his sovereign, and reached the city three days later, on March 7th.[28] Upon being informed that the pope expected the Greek clerics to comply with the tradition of kissing the papal foot at their introduction, the Patriarch refused to leave his ship and threatened to return to Venice.[29] Eugenius made a concession by not insisting upon adherence to this custom on the part of the Greeks: "Late that evening (March 7) Eugenius yielded so as not to ruin the whole project of union at the outset on a point of etiquette. But he would not receive the Greek ecclesiastics solemnly and publicly. They should salute him in groups of six in a private room."[30]

Efforts to get the council underway immediately were not successful, because of Greek hesitancy to begin the deliberations. "The Patriarch pleaded his fatigue after the journey, and the emperor, one of whose chief objects in

coming to Italy at all was to contact the western princes, demanded that time be given for their representatives to reach Ferrara and that meantime the discussions on the principal subjects of difference between the churches be left in abeyance."[31] Both sides agreed to a four month delay in the actual discussions toward union; however, the council was to be formally convened in the interim, and envoys from the various nations were to be invited to attend the proceedings.[32] This delay was particularly burdensome for the pope, who had agreed to pay the Greeks' expenses as part of the condition of their coming to Ferrara. "In the three months, February to April 1438, he (the pope) disbursed more than 46,733 florins for the Greeks alone."[33] The Latin commitment to support the Greek delegates forced Eugenius to borrow money from the Medicis of Florence and greatly strained the papal budget.[34] Disbursement of these funds to the Greek delegates was often untimely, leading to recurrent complaints from the Byzantines concerning their treatment by the pope.

The formal opening of the council took place on April 9, 1438, in the cathedral of St. George, with the Latin celebration of the High Mass of the Holy Spirit.[35] The Greeks did not enter the cathedral until after the solemn mass was concluded. By previous arrangement, the Latins occupied the north side of the church, the Greeks the south side. In attendance among the Latins were some 160

patriarchs, bishops and abbots.[36] Present with the Greek delegation, in addition to the Emperor John VIII Paleologus, and his brother Demetrius, were some 31 bishops, abbots, and cardinals of the eastern church; Patriarch Joseph II was unable to attend this initial session due to illness.[37] The papal Bull Magnas Omnipotenti Deo was read to the entire assembly which reaffirmed the ecumenicity of the council and expressed the intention that "with peace and charity the holy project of union should be treated of and with God's help brought to a happy conclusion."[38] With agreement on both sides regarding the purpose and legitimacy of the synod, the opening session was concluded.

Preliminary Discussions: (May-September, 1438)

The Latins were unable to draw their conterparts into any kind of debate until May, when the Greeks agreed to form committes of ten which were to begin informal discussions.[39] The Greek representatives included Mark of Ephesus, Dositheus of Monembasia, Bessarion of Nicea, Sophronius of Anchialus, Michael Balsamon the Chartophylax, and Syropoulus the Ecclesiarches. Among the Latins were the Cardinals Cesarini and Capranica, Andrew, archbishop of Rhodes, John of Torquemada, and Ambrogio Traversari, General of the Camadulensian order.[40] The emperor appointed Mark of Ephesus and Bessarion as his only speakers while for the Latins, Cardinal Cesarini was the spokesman throughout.[41] Repeated

attempts to turn these discussions into doctrinal debates failed, so Cesarini was forced simply to ennumerate the differences between the two parties which included; "the Procession of the Holy Spirit, the sacrifice in leavened or unleavened bread, Purgatory, and the position of the pope in the church--and left it to Greeks to decide which of these should be the subject of debate."[42] After some consulation with the emperor, the eastern representatives chose the subject of Purgatory as the initial topic of debate.[43]

On June 4, 1438, the discussions concerning Purgatory began, with Mark of Ephesus and Bessarion arguing the Greek position, and Cardinal Cesarini and John of Torquemada the Latin viewpoint. The Latin position, as enunciated by Cesarini, was essentially that there was an intermediate state to which the truly repentant depart after death in order to be purified, even by fire, for sins for which they did not actually do penance during their lifetimes. This position was supported "with arguments from Scripture and the fathers, both Latin and Greek."[44] The Greeks delayed answering the Latin proposal until June 14, when Bessarion rebutted their argument chiefly on the aspect of the existence of fire in Purgatory, which the Greeks denied.[45] John of Torquemada then entered the controversy with a stirring defense of the Latin view, in which he defended the exegesis of Augustine and Gregory Dialogus concerning the text of I Corinthians 3:13-15. Utilizing contextual,

literary, and philological analysis to support his position, Torquemada argued that St. Paul, by his use of the verb sothesetai, "he will be saved" in this passage, was speaking of eternal salvation through the Purgatorial fire (puros), rather than the fires of Hell, as Chrysostom had suggested.[46] Although discussions continued until July 17, 1438, no agreement on the doctrine of Purgatory was reached by the two sides.[47]

Outbreaks of the plague were common in Italy during this era, and one such outbreak occurred in the cities of Ferrara, Florence, and Bologna in the summer of 1438.[48] Plans to move the council to a different location were discussed, but none proved suitable. Homesickness, fear of treachery, and boredom weighed heavily on the Greek delegation as the hot summer wore on. They began to press the emperor to accelerate the the activities of the council, to begin discussions on the substantive issues for which the synod had been convened.[49] The emperor maintained his position that no deliberations should begin before the arrival of the representatives of the secular princes. The pope, however, was not in the mood to continue making concessions to the Greeks, and he pressed them to begin the work for which they had come to Italy. After some further reasoning the Greeks proposed that the doctrine of the Procession of the Holy Spirit be the first subject of debate. Deliberations among the Greeks themselves led to

refinement of the topic: the debate should begin on the issue of the legitimacy of any addition to the Creed of Nicea (325 A.D.). This latter topic was favored by Mark of Ephesus, and Gemistus Pleithon.[50] The Latins agreed to this proposal, but insisted that three council sessions should be held per week, regardless of whether or not the emperor and patriarch were present.[51] Both parties assented to this arrangement in writing on or about September 14, 1438.[52] The two delegations chose six orators each to conduct the debates. The Greeks chose Mark of Ephesus, Isidore of Kiev, Bessarion of Nicea, Gemistus, Michael Basalmon, and Theodore Xanthopoulos. The Latins elected Cardinal Cesarini, Andrew Chrysoberges (archbishop of Rhodes), Aloysius of Pirano (bishop of Forli), John of Montenegro (provincial of Lombardy), Petrus Perquerii, and Giovanni di S. Toma.[53] The Greeks were to open the debate in each meeting. Thus all preparations were completed for the initial dogmatic session of the council.

The Addition to the Creed

The opening session of the dogmatic discussions took place on October 8, 1438.[54] Pope Eugenius, Emperor John VIII, and Patriarch Joseph were all in attendance at the session which was convened at the chapel of the ducal palace. The six representatives of each side sat at long tables oposite one another, with the interpreter Nicholas

Sagundino, along with three notaries from each party in front of them.[55] The task of the notaries was to record accurately the proceedings of the meeting in Latin and Greek.[56]

The Greek orator, Bessarion of Nicea, began with a conciliatory speech in which he praised the efforts of Eugenius and John VIII in seeking unity and expressed the hope that the result of the council's efforts would indeed be a reunited catholic church.[57] Andrew of Rhodes rose after Bessarion to make known Latin agreement with the Metropolitan's remarks. With the conclusion of the opening statements, attention turned to the first item of discussion, the legitimacy of an addition to the Creed of Nicea. This, of course, referred to the Creed of the Council of Nicea (325 A.D.) from which the famous statement of faith derived.

The question, which the Greeks had previously raised in 1054, concerned the addition of the phrase "and the Son" to that part of the Creed which related to the procession of the Holy Spirit. According to the Creed, the Holy Spirit "proceeds from the Father" ex Patre procedentem.[58] The Latins proposed to add the words, "and the Son," the Filioque, to this statement concerning the procession, for they felt it to be in the spirit of the Creed, and a logical corollary to it. Canon VII of the decrees of the third ecumenical Council of Ephesus (431 A.D.), however, forbade

any addition to the Creed of Nicea regarding a "different faith," pistin heteran.[59] The Council of Ephesus had prohibited additions to the Nicene Creed because it feared the proliferation of local creeds, such as that of Nestorius, which it had condemned.[60] The Greeks therefore, argued that any addition to the creed was illegitimate based on this particular canon. It seems evident, however, that in its use of the Greek heteran, "another", the council meant "contradictory", not simply "another" in the sense of an amplification of meaning, which is what the Latins proposed.[61]

In this initial meeting, the chief Greek spokesman Mark of Ephesus, made it clear that the position of the eastern church was indeed that the addition of the Filioque was illegitimate, and that any attempt at union must first deal with this root cause of the Schism.[62] The meeting ended with a short exchange between Mark and Andrew; "If the Latin Church, asked Andrew, has erred in the faith, why have the orientals never proved it? And if the addition is true, why not add it? Because it is forbidden, rejoined Mark."[63] With this issue unresolved, the first session ended.

The next meeting, which occurred on October 13, did no more than to arrange a closed session between the six elected representatives of each obedience.[64] In this conclave, the Latins acquiesced to the reading of conciliar decrees from the seven ecumenical councils.

On October 16, Mark of Ephesus read excerpts from the pronouncements of these councils which appeared to support his position, "all extolling the inviolability of the faith handed down and imposing its strict observance."[65] At this point, Cesarini displayed an ancient Latin codex of the Seventh Council (II Nicea 787 A.D.) in which the words et ex Filio, "and from the Son," appeared after a statement regarding the procession of the Holy Spirit.[66] The Greeks disdained such evidence, however, prompting Cesarini to recall that Nicholas of Cusa had spoken to him earlier regarding a Greek manuscript of the same council which he had found in Constantinople. In this particular codex, the words et ex Filio, having once been written, showed clear evidence of having been erased.[67] How Cesarini now wished he had that document to show the disbelieving Greeks.

Between the public sessions, it was customary for the leading participants of each side to meet in closed colloquy. Such gatherings served to allow those involved in the discussions to verify sources, and gain clarification on points made in the previous session.

> There a speaker who had quoted from Councils or Fathers had to produce the codices he had used for the inspection of the other side, and the two sets of notaries had to compare their versions of the speeches they had taken down, so that each side should have an accurate and mutually-agreed record of what had been publicly said. It was on the basis of these records that subsequent speakers met the arguments of their adversaries.[68]

Andrew of Rhodes answered Mark of Ephesus' arguments in

the next public session of October 20, 1438. Utilizing a syllogism, Andrew stated that "An exposition or development is not an addition; but the Filioque is a development being contained in ex Patre therefore it is not an addition."[69] The archbishop denied that a development of doctrine was forbidden by the council, since such elaboration was not prohibited by the New Testament, fathers, or councils.[70] Andrew further argued that in its prohibition, the council of Ephesus was referring to the formulation of a different faith, not simply a development of existing doctrine. In the following session of October 25, Andrew continued his line of argument, claiming that the Latins had done no more to the Creed than what was done by the Council of Constantinople in its clarification of it.[71] The Greeks had ample time to refute the Latins on this point Andrew asserted, but had not done so. Even Photius had neglected to assail the pope with this particular accusation, and his failure to do so, according to Andrew, made it clear that the issue did not cause the Schism.[72]

In the following two meetings, on November 1st and 4th, Bessarion of Nicea replied to the Latin argument. Bessarion stated that development was not forbidden, but that any addition to the Creed was. He suggested that Ephesus obeyed its own injunction against adding to the Creed by refraining to add the term theotokos, "God bearer" to it, a concept which was implied by Nicea, and which would have aided the

church in her struggle against the Nestorian heresy.[73] This clearly proved that the council forbade any addition, correct or not.

Aloysius, bishop of Forli, and Cesarini led the discussion for the Latins in the subsequent sessions of November 8th, and 11th. In these two sessions, Aloysius once again asserted that the prohibition of Ephesus referred to contradictory statements to the faith, not the development of doctrine.[74] If the doctrine of the Procession from both Father and Son can be proven from Scripture, and he believed it could, then the concept should be judged a development, and not an addition.[75]

Cardinal Cesarini's line of argument in the November 11th meeting had been essentially that the Latin position had historical precedents in both individual and conciliar actions. He deftly showed that the prohibition of Ephesus should apply only to changes of meaning regarding the Creed, not to form, which the Greeks had argued. Cesarini showed that a man named Charisius had composed a creed identical in substance to the Creed of Nicea, yet he utilized different words. He read this statement before the council in order to demonstrate his orthodoxy. He was not condemned by the Fathers, yet Nestorius, whose expression of faith differed materially from the Creed, was condemned.[76] Cesarini also pointed out the fact that the Council of Chalcedon (451 A.D.) had refined the Creed of Nicea, a process which

included development of doctrine without changing the meaning of the earlier Creed.[77] He gave yet another example; "Similarly the seventh Council (II Nicea, 787 A.D.) claimed to add nothing to and to take nothing away from Nicea, yet formulated a definition about images."[78] In summation he argued that if the Filioque is true, it should therefore be added to the Creed, for there is no prohibition against such an addition. Mark of Ephesus, unmoved by the arguments of his Latin colleague, explained that the prohibition applied only to the Creed of the church as it was used in the Liturgy, not to private professions.[79] Mark reasoned that what Cesarini had called "development" or "refinement" was simply the addition of definitions, which had not been proscribed by the Fathers of Ephesus.[80] The issue of the legitimacy of an addition to the Creed of Nicea was yet unresolved by the time of the concluding session at Ferrara, which met on December 13, 1438.

The session of November 27 was interrupted by the arrival of envoys from the Duke of Burgundy, who in their haste to pay their respects and obeisance to the pope, completely neglected the emperor, an act which infuriated the sovereign.[81] The affront was so great as to threaten the continuation of the meetings, so fictitious letters from the Duke were prepared and delivered to the emperor in order to assuage his feelings.[82] The Greek regent accepted the letters and the discussions were allowed to continue.

As Gill accurately assesses, one of the greatest difficulties facing both Latins and Greeks in the debates was a lack of reliable manuscripts.[83] He relates the fact that several Latins had attempted to obtain accurate codices in Constantinople such as John of Ragusa, who had great difficulty in doing so, and Nicholas of Cusa, who had moderate success in locating some.[84] The Greeks, however, had brought some copies of the more important documents with them, including the crucial Adversus Eunomium of St. Basil.[85] As a result, a policy was devised which provided for the sharing of manuscripts between the participants, while the Latins continued to search for any copies of documents they deemed important to their cause.[86] The Greek manuscripts were of little use to the Latins until they could be translated, therefore that task was assigned to the scholar Ambrogio Traversari, who had a reputation for being a skilled linguist. "Traversari was told by Cesarini that if he lived to the age of Methuselah he could do nothing so useful as spend night and day now translating the entire volume of Basil's Adversus Eunomium."[87] Traversari's translating abilities were indeed crucial to the preparation of the Latin position; John of Montenegro's patristic argumentation at Florence, for example, certainly was indebted to Traversari's efforts.[88]

The fourteen public sessions which met at Ferrara from October 9, 1438 until December 13, 1438, produced little in

the way of agreement between the Greeks and Latins. Yet, the arguments of the Latins had engendered some doubt among the Greek theologians as to the inviolability of their position.[89] One notable example of this came from the Greek George Scholarius, who said while at Florence: "Either then it must be shown that the doctrine of the Latins is far removed from the truth or, if we cannot do that, we should respect it and entertain it in our minds and then manifest the faith also by the Creed."[90] Bessarion of Nicea was also apparently taken by the persuasiveness of the Latin argument, particularly that articulated by Cesarini.[92] "Bessarion says that he was not the only one of the Greeks who was confounded by Cesarini's proofs. The whole body of them was..."[93] According to Gill, the Greeks feared a discussion of the truth of the addition to the Creed, the next step once it was decided that such an addition was legitimate, because their defense of the first issue proved so inadequate.[94] For this reason, and the fact that they were tired, homesick, and lacking in the promised financial support of the pope, the attitude of the entire Greek delegation became downhearted as Christmas approached.[95] Indeed, the Greeks were ready to end the debates and go home, especially upon hearing rumors that the pope planned to transfer the council once again, this time to Florence. It was only after the exercise of great persuasive effort by the Emperor that they were induced to stay and comply with

the pope's plan to shift the convocation to Florence. On January 2, 1439, the Greek delegates agreed to continue on in Italy, but only under certain conditions, which mainly concerned the receipt of the promised papal support and the payment of the expenses of the move to Florence.[96]

There were several good reasons for Eugenius' choice of Florence as the site for the continuation of the synod. First, the Duke of Milan's condotierre, Niccolo Piccinino, had come near to Ferrara, and there was no guarantee that he would not attack the city and attempt to take the pope prisoner.[97] Second, the city offered financial incentives to the pope, who was himself near bankruptcy, offering to support the Greeks with a monthly stipend of either 1500 or 1700 ducats per month for eight months.[98] Finally, the city agreed to "provisions about rents, prices, taxes and the good order of both citizens and visitors for the duration of the council."[99] Yet on January 6, 1439 the pope informed the Latin delegation of his desire to transfer the council due to a possible resurgence of the plague which had occurred in the summer of 1438. The Bull of translation, Decet oecumenici concilii, was read to the plenary session of January 10, 1439 in the cathedral of St. George. The use of the plague as a pretext for the transfer of the council is, as Gill points out, not altogether surprising. "In any case the pope could hardly have said in a Bull to be promulgated throughout the Christian world that he was bankrupt and

afraid of attacks from his enemies."[100]

The Council Resumes at Florence

"Florence welcomed the Council for two reasons, because the city was very alive to commercial openings and because, more than any other, it was the home of so many humanists who drew their inspiration from the Greek language and culture."[101] Florence was indeed an appropriate site for the resumption of the council. The city was well known as the center of Italian humanism, which sought to accomplish in the philosophical and cultural realm what the Latin and Greek theologians were attempting to effect in the spiritual sphere. The humanists would certainly have been expected to have welcomed the Greeks to Florence with great enthusiasm; therefore Gill reasonably questions the lack of information regarding any interaction among them:

> Yet, curiously, there is little record of the relations that the Florentine humanists must have had, during the months that the Council sat in Florence, with their Greek counterparts (for there had been also in Constantinople a florescence of classical culture centring on Plato and Platonism).[102]

The pope arrived at Florence on January 27, 1439, after taking a circuitous route from Ferrara in order to guard against possible attacks from his enemies. The first of the Greeks entered Florence on February 4, led by Isidore of Kiev. The patriarch arrived on February 7th, and was

followed by the emperor, who reached the city on February 15th. On February 18, 1439, the Greeks met in private to discuss strategy regarding the resumption of the debates.[103] They expressed to the Latins their desire to continue the discussions in private, rather than public meetings.[104]

A preliminary meeting took place on February 26, 1439, in a great hall of the monastery of Santa Maria Novella, and in deference to the wishes of the Greek delegation, was a private session.[105] In this colloquy, procedures for the debates which had been agreed upon in Ferrara were recalled, and the Greeks consented to move on from the issue of the legitimacy of an addition to the creed. They did so, however, without in any way yielding to the Latin position.

The initial plenary session in Florence took place on March 2, 1439.[106] This meeting was a public one, despite the wishes of the Greeks to the contrary, largely because the pope felt that no benefit would accrue from such closed sessions.[107] The debate now turned to the one point of doctrine crucial to the reconciliation of the Greek and Latin churches; the Procession of the Holy Spirit. Did the Holy Spirit proceed from the both Father and Son as the Latins argued, or from the Father alone, as the Greeks claimed? The terms which both sides utilized in the discussion concerning this doctrine came not only from the Scriptures, fathers and councils, but also from pagan

philosophy. This was true because the debate centered on the Trinity, the definition of which required an understanding of certain metaphysical concepts, such as the nature of being and existence, and first causes.[108] Both the Greek and Latin churches had come to grips with the terminology which best explained their doctrinal point of view. One of the problems facing the council at this juncture, however, was to agree on such terminology for the purposes of debate, a process complicated by the fact that in the history of the doctrinal development of the church, the terms were not always used with the same meaning.[109] Eventually such agreement was achieved. As Gill notes, the theologians of both sides were in agreement on the nature of the Trinity, the only sticking point was the issue of the Procession.[110] The following explanation of the terms involved and their equivalents may be beneficial in order to better understand this main issue of discussion, as it is briefly recounted here.

The Procession of the Holy Spirit

Concerning the Trinity:

Latin Term:		Greek Term:
Substantia	"essence"	Ousia
Persona	"person"	Hypostasis (Later "Prosopon" accepted as equal)

Formulation for Discussion:

"God is One Essence in Three Persons"

Latin: One Substantia, three Persona

Greek: One Ousia and three Hypostases

Concerning the Procession of the Holy Spirit:
(John 15:26)

Latin Term:		Greek Term:
Procedere	"Proceed"	Ekporeuomai
Causa	"Cause"	Aitia
Principium	"Beginning	Arche

The primary advocate for the Latins in this first dogmatic session was John of Montenegro, provincial of Lombardy, and for the Greeks, Mark of Ephesus. John began the debate by referring to a text of Epiphanius (315-403), bishop of Salamis, which indicated that the Holy Spirit proceeded from both Father and Son.[214] Mark refuted this text, by claiming that it was a corrupt version of the original.[112] In return Mark referred to a passage in St. Basil's Adversus Eunomium, which indicated that the Holy Spirit proceeded solely from the Father.[113] John replied by arguing that Basil was simply refuting the belief of Eunomius that the Holy Spirit was a created being in his remarks.[114] The session concluded with Mark's denial of the Latin assertion concerning this particular text, stating emphatically that both Basil and Epiphanius sought only to prove that the Holy Spirit came from no other source but the Father alone.[115]

Argumentation concerning this issue was resumed in the next gathering held on March 5, 1439, with the same

respondents from each side. The investigation returned once again to the passage from St. Basil's Adversus Eunomium, which had been discussed in the previous session. In this meeting, John of Montenegro set forth the important principle that within the Trinity, procession may involve the communication of essence, substantia, without the transference of personhood, or persona. "Therefore the Father generates the Son, communicating everything of Himself except the property of Fatherhood, and also that the Son should be the principle of the Holy Spirit, which in no way militates against the property of sonship."[116] It is noteworthy that John developed his arguments primarily from the writings of Greek and Latin Fathers, depending on the translation work of the humanist-scholar, Ambrogio Traversari.

In the next session, convened on March 7, 1439, Mark of Ephesus initiated the proceedings, once again basing his remarks on the passage of St. Basil. Mark again questioned the veracity of the codex from which the Latins argued, saying that in Constantinople there were several thousand copies of the same document which agreed with the Greek version, and only a handful which supported that of the Latins.[117] John responded by saying that the manuscript which the Latins were using was brought from Constantinople by Nicholas of Cusa, and besides being obviously ancient, had not been in the west long enough to have been

altered.[118] John further suggested that it was more likely that the majority of texts were changed to support the Greek position during the Schism, and that the few which were not altered escaped by virtue of the protection of the Holy Spirit.[119] Mark next addressed the issue of order within the Trinity. He claimed that Basil denied that the Holy Spirit was third in order and dignity, and that the relationship between Son and Holy Spirit did not concern order but enumeration. That is to say, when Basil said concerning the Holy Spirit that he "depends on the Son" he meant only that He (Holy Spirit) was enumerated or listed along with the Son.[120] At this point, John skillfully demonstrated that such an interpretation implied that there was no order in the Trinity whatsoever, which contradicted Basil's view. Such order did not imply, however, an order of nature, for the godhead in this regard was completely equal. Therefore, John argued, St. Basil understood that within the Trinity there was an order of person and dignity, but not an order of nature. The conclusion to be drawn from this was that as the Son is second in order and dignity to the Father, the Holy Spirit is after Him (Son) in order and dignity, therefore it is logical to presume that the Holy Spirit proceeds not only from the Father, but from the Son as well.

On March 10, 1439, the Latins introduced another text of St. Basil which supported their position. This text belonged to the Greek metropolitan of Mitylene,

Doretheus.[121] Furthermore, John produced a letter of the Saint which he suggested was representative of the great Father's mature thought on the subject. This letter had been found in a codex belonging to Leonardo Bruni, the noted humanist Chancellor of Florence.[122] Basil's letter supported John's contention that the Saint indeed viewed the relationship between the Trinity as one of order, in opposition to what Mark had said in the previous session. In addition, John compared the Greek text of Doretheus which he had just introduced with that which Mark had used, showing line by line that Basil's intention was to refute Eunomius' conclusion that if the Holy Spirit was third in order and dignity, he was third as well in nature.[123] Because of the length of John's argument, the Greeks deferred their reply until the following session.

The fifth round of discussion was convened on March 17, 1439, in which Mark initiated debate with reference to John 15:26; "When the Helper comes, whom I will send to you from the Father, the Spirit of truth, who proceeds (ekporeuomai) from the Father, He will bear witness of Me,"[124] In his approach, Mark abandoned the previously agreed to format of question and answer in favor of a full exposition of the Greek argument.[125] Mark went on to reiterate the Greek position, that based on the Scriptures, the Fathers and the councils, the Holy Spirit proceeded from the Father alone, and to add anything to the Creed regarding this doctrine was

forbidden. On the question of the authenticity of the St. Basil codices, Mark stood by his original contention that the majority of extant manuscripts favored the Greek position, while John argued that numbers were immaterial since those which favored the Latin view were more ancient. Both stances were in keeping with sound textual-critical principles. John ended the episode by making an important point concerning causes. The Greeks were able to gain ground by accusing the Latins of postulating two causes (Greek aitia; Latin causa) for the Holy Spirit, namely that of the Father, which the Scriptures plainly assert, and the Son,(the Latin position). To suggest that there were two causes for the Holy Spirit would be heresy. Therefore John declared that the Roman church did not err in this matter, and that there was but one cause of the Holy Spirit, that is, the Father.[126] The Son in this statement, was seen as the principium, "source" or "beginning" (corresponding to the Greek arche), of the Holy Spirit, not its cause. The meeting ended with this helpful clarification.

An important event occurred thereafter in a private meeting among the Greeks on March 18, 1439. A letter from St. Maximus at Constantinople to one of the Greek participants at Florence, a certain Marinus, indicated that synodical letters from the pope had been received which stated the Latin position concerning the Procession.[127] In this communication, the pope made it clear to those

remaining in the Byzantine capital that the Latins did not assert that there were two causes of the Holy Spirit, but one cause, that being the Father. Furthermore, the letter continued, the Latins only sought to show that the Holy Spirit "comes forth through him (Jesus)."[128] This development was so well received by the Greek delegation that they decided that if this were truly the Latin position, they would agree to unite with them without further discussion.[129]

Although union was within sight, the Latins still seemed fixed on debate at this juncture, so on the 21st of March, another public session was convened. The Greeks came without Mark of Ephesus, because they did not intend to speak.[130] The Latins wanted to take advantage of the opportunity to refute the Greek position as it had been outlined by Ephesus in previous meetings. John of Montenegro was again the chief Latin spokesman, and he proceeded to outline his defense under four headings; "the Scriptures, Latin doctors held in respect by the early councils, Greek doctors of the greatest repute, reply to the Greek objections."[131] John drew upon Scriptural passages, quotations from the Latin fathers and ecumencial councils to make his point, all supporting the Latin view that the Holy Spirit proceeded from both Father and Son. He was about to cite the writings of the Greek fathers which upheld his argument when time was at an end for the session.[132]

On March 24, 1439, John of Montenegro resumed his refutation of the Greek viewpoint, basing his remarks on the writings of the eastern fathers. John quoted from a long list of works, including those of St. Basil, Epiphanius, Athanasius, and Cyril of Alexandria, with Traversari reading the Greek texts and translating their explanation to the Byzantine delegation.[133] In summation, John refuted Mark's arguments drawn from the works of several respected fathers, denying the Greek's interpretations, and offering his own explanations. When John had finished, the Greeks led by Isidore of Kiev, asked for an opportunity to examine the manuscripts used by their opponents in the current session.[134] Cardinal Cesarini agreed to "exhibit the Latin codices (of which he would have copies made at least of the relevant parts) in the sacristy of St. Francis's on the following Thursday, where the notaries of both sides could compare the transcripts of the speeches."[135] This meeting concluded the public debates on the Procession of the Holy Spirit at the Council of Florence.

During the roughly three month period between the end of the debates concerning the Procession and the actual decree of union on July 6, 1439, two factions developed among the Greeks: the unionists and the anti-unionists. The unionists, led by Bessarion of Nicea, Isidore of Kiev, and George Scholarius, had been genuinely convinced of the validity of the Latin argument regarding the Procession,

largely because of its support among the writings of the fathers.[136] These leaders were therefore advocates of union with the Roman church, because the main theological stumbling block to reunification had been removed. The anti-unionists, whose chief spokesmen were Mark of Ephesus and Anthony of Heraclea, remained steadfast in their opposition to the Latin doctrine of the Procession, thus opposing any union as well. During this time as well public discussion gave way, with the exception of some unfruitful conferences in April, to the exchange of proposals concerning union between the two sides. These cedulae were proposed utilizing language which was intended to be acceptable to the other delegation, and dealt with the theology of the Procession as the basis of an endorsement of union. The problem with this approach, however, was that no such statement was acceptable to the Greek anti-unionist faction. In addition, the Latins were suspicious of Greek terminology concerning the Holy Spirit which could be ambiguously understood, thus "in no way clarifying the eternal relationship of the Spirit to the Son."[137] The failure to arrive at an acceptable formula frustrated both Latins and Greeks, but caused the latter group to become so demoralized as to question the worth of their sojourn to Italy.

A pivotal event in the ultimate union of east and west was the speech delivered to the Greeks by Eugenius on May

27, 1439. In this address, Eugenius cleverly played upon the fears of the Greeks concerning Constantinople, from which disturbing news regarding the advance of the Turks was arriving at Florence on a daily basis. Eugenius argued that an unwillingness to reunite with the Roman church on their part would be ill received by the western princes. "Union however once achieved, both the western princes and all of us will be greatly rejoiced and will provide generous help for you."[138] This speech galvanized support even among the anti-unionist party which then pressed the emperor, who favored union himself, to take measures among his delegation to ensure its ultimate achievement.[139]

On the very next day, the Greeks assembled at the direction of the emperor, to determine whether union could be attained with the west. One issue which became the subject of sharp debate in the ensuing discussion was that of the authenticity of the quotations used by the Latins in their argumentation.[140] The validity of such passages had been denied by the anti-unionists. After much wrangling and debate, and after a great deal of personal lobbying on behalf of union by the Emperor, the majority of the participants accepted the disputed writings as authentic.[141] By June 3, 1439, the Greeks had agreed among themselves to accept reunification with the Latins, having satisfied themselves with the orthodoxy of the Roman position, providing that they were not forced to add the Filioque to

their Creed or change their worship practices.[142]

Yet another obstacle to union was erected, however, when the emperor brought the Greek statement concerning the union to the pope for his approval on June 5, 1439. Much to the surprise of the emperor the pope declared that union could not be achieved without agreement on the other disputed doctrines; papal primacy, the Eucharist and Purgatory.[143] Furthermore, the emperor was told, the Greek statement regarding union must be examined for approval before any additional progress could be made. The Latins did in fact make changes to the Greek statement, eliminating the word "through" in the phrase "that he (Holy Spirit) proceeds eternally and essentially from the Father through the Son," as being ambiguous and "open to a false interpretation."[144] After additional internal debate, the Greek delegation at length agreed to the revisions, and the approved statement was read in a joint session on June 8th, in the presence of the pope.[145]

With the death of the Patriarch Joseph II on June 10, 1439, the Greek delegation was deprived of its chief conciliator. The patriarch had acted as a buffer between the unionist and ant-unionist factions among the Greeks, and with his death, the role of completing the task of reunification with the west fell solely upon the emperor. Eugenius, sensing the fatigue of the Byzantines, now began to press the emperor to come to grips with the three

remaining issues which separated the two groups. Work began immediately thereafter to arrive at acceptable definitions regarding the Eucharist, Purgatory, and papal primacy, which could then be included in the ultimate decree of union.

On June 27, 1439, after much debate, proposal and counter-proposal, the two sides came to an agreement regarding these final matters.[146] The Greeks had expressed the desire to announce the decree of union on the feast day of the Apostles Peter and Paul, June 29, if possible.[147] Therefore, Eugenius had the decree written the next day, June 28, 1439, in order to submit it to the emperor.[148] This objective was not met, however, because the emperor objected to some of the language of the decree, in particular the opening words which made no mention of him as the one who had convoked the council.[149] The Greeks also objected to the wording of the decree concerning the primacy of the pope, but by July 4, all difficulties had been ironed out such that six representatives from each obedience were designated to draft the final document.[150]

The Greeks, meeting in the imperial palace, signed the official decree of union on July 5, 1439.[151] Later that same day, a small party from the Greek delegation led by Bessarion went to witness the Latin signing of the decree.[152] Bessarion read aloud a statement concerning the Greek acceptance of the Latin view of the Eucharist; "When Bessarion had finished all rose and went into a neighbouring

hall where the pope, standing, signed the decree: Ego Eugenius catholice ecclesie episcopus ita diffiniens subscripsi, and then the rest of the Latins added their signatures."[153] The entire city of Florence celebrated this event on the following day, July, 6th, and both Greek and Latin delegations participated in a celebratory mass in which the Decree of Union, Laetentur Caeli (Let the Heavens rejoice), was read in both languages.[154] Thus the primary goal of the council was now achieved, and the two Churches which had been separated for almost four centuries, were united once again.

For all practical purposes, the Council of Florence ended with the solemn promulgation of the Decree of Union on July 6th. The union of Greeks and Latins however, prompted other groups in the east to seek reunification as well. Such unions were in fact subsequently achieved under the provisions of the council with the Armenians (1439), Copts of Egypt (1442), Syrians (1444), and Church of Cyprus (1444).In February of 1443, Eugenius, with the Bull Miserator et Misericors Dominus, transferred the council from Florence to the Lateran basilica in Rome.[155] Rome was after all, the seat of the papacy, the center of the ecclesiastical authority of the church. In Rome, the council "would continue the work for the eradication of heresy, for reform and for peace and union, for which it had been originally convened."[156] The council subsequently ended in

Rome, without fanfare. There was no official conclusion to the council, no bull of dissolution exists; even Gill's thorough account leaves us only with this vague statement: "At some date after 7 August, 1445, when the union of the Cypriots was celebrated, and before Eugenius' death on 23 February 1447, the Council of Ferrara/Florence/Lateran came to an end."[157]

The significance of the Council of Florence lies in the fact that union was indeed achieved between the two main branches of Christendom, ending nearly four centuries of schism. However nominal acceptance of the union may have been in the east, the fact remains that the Emperor, John VIII, worked hard to obtain it, even though he may not have done as much as he could have to ensure its approval once he returned to Constantinople. Nevertheless, after a great deal of internal struggle between the pro and anti-unionist factions, the union was officially proclaimed in the Church of St. Sophia on December 12, 1452.[158] The depth of commitment to the union among the Greeks to this day remains a subject of debate. With the Turkish conquest of Constantinople six months later, however, the union, however superficial, was ended. The council is also important, because it achieved unity of doctrine without excluding diversityof practice. Thus the Greeks were allowed to continue to recite the Creed without the addition of the Filioque and to continue in their use of leavened bread in

the Eucharist. Finally, the Council of Florence was noteworthy as a victory for the papacy in its battle with the Conciliar movement: "The great achievement of the Council for the West was that it secured the victory for the popes in the struggle of papacy versus council, and the survival of the traditional order of the Church."[159] Eugenius did not live to see the conclusion of this struggle, but it was largely because of his determination and efforts at Florence, that the ultimate triumph of papal over conciliar authority was won.

ENDNOTES

[1]Joseph Gill, S.J., The Council of Florence (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1961), 88.

[2]Ibid., Footnote #2.

[3]Ibid., 88.

[4]Ibid., 91.

[5]Ibid.

[6]Ibid., 92.

[7]Ibid., 92-93.

[8]Ibid., 93.

[9]Ibid., 94.

[10]Ibid.

[11]Ibid.

[12]Ibid.

[13]Ibid., 95.

[14]Ibid.

[15]Ibid.

[16]Ibid.

[17]Ibid., 96.

[18]Ibid.

[19]Ibid.

[20]Ibid., 98.

[21]Ibid.

[22]Ibid., 99.

[23]Ibid., 101.

[24]Ibid., 102.

[25]Ibid.

[26]Ibid.

[27]Ibid., 104.

[28]Ibid., 105.

[29]Ibid.

[30]Ibid.

[31]Ibid., 106.

[32]Ibid.

[33]Ibid., 108.

[34]Ibid., 109.

[35]Ibid.

[36]Ibid.

[37]Ibid.

[38]Ibid., 110.

[39]Ibid., 114.

[40]Ibid., 115.

[41]Ibid.

[42]Ibid., 116.

[43]Ibid.

[44]Ibid., 118.

[45]Ibid., 121.

[46]Ibid., 123.

[47]Ibid., 125.

[48]Ibid., 126.

[49]Ibid., 128.

[50]Ibid., 129.

[51]Ibid.

[52]Ibid.

[53]Ibid., 130.

[54]Ibid., 143.

[55]Ibid.

[56]Ibid.

[57]Ibid., 144.

[58]Philip Schaff, The Creeds of Christendom, vol. 2, The Greek and Latin Creeds (Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1985), 57.

[59]Philip Schaff and Henry Wace, eds. Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers of the Christian Church, vol. XIV, The Seven Ecumenical Councils (Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1988), 231.

[60]Ibid.

[61]Ibid.

[62]Gill, 146.

[63]Ibid.

[64]Ibid., 147.

[65]Ibid., 148.

[66]Ibid.

[67]Ibid.

[68]Ibid., 150.

[69]Ibid., 151.

[70]Ibid., 152.

[71]Ibid.

[72]Ibid., 153.

[73]Ibid., 154.

[74]Ibid., 156.

[75]Ibid.

[76]Ibid., 159.

[77]Ibid., 160.

[78]Ibid.

[79]Ibid.

[80]Ibid., 162.

[81]Ibid., 157.

[82]Ibid., 158.

[83]Ibid., 163.

[84]Ibid.

[85]Ibid., 164.

[86]Ibid.

[87]Ibid., 165.

[88]Ibid.

[89]Ibid., 166.

[90]Ibid., 167.

[91]Ibid., 168.

[92]Ibid., 169.

[93]Ibid.

[94]Ibid.

[95]Ibid., 170.

[96]Ibid., 174.

[97]Ibid., 176.

[98]Ibid., 177.

[99]Ibid.

[100]Ibid., 178.

[101]Ibid., 184.

[102]Ibid., 188.

[103]Ibid., 189.

[104]Ibid.

[105]Ibid., 190.

[106]Ibid., 191.

[107]Ibid.

[108]Ibid.

[109]Ibid.

[110]Ibid., 194.

[111]Ibid., 195.

[112]Ibid.

[113]Ibid., 196.

[114]Ibid.

[115]Ibid.

[116]Ibid., 198.

[117]Ibid., 199.

[118]Ibid., 200.

[119]Ibid.

[120]Ibid., 201.

[121]Ibid., 203.

[122]Ibid., 204.

[123]Ibid.

[124]Jn. 15:26 NASB (New American Standard Bible).

[125]Gill, 207.

[126]Ibid., 212.

[127]Ibid.

[128]Ibid.

[129]Ibid., 213.

[130]Ibid.

[131]Ibid.

[132]Ibid., 217.

[133]Ibid., 218.

[134]Ibid., 222.

[135]Ibid., 223.

[136]Ibid., 224-225.

[137]Ibid., 251.

[138]Ibid., 254.

[139]Ibid., 255.

[140]Ibid.

[141]Ibid., 256.

[142]Ibid., 260.

[143]Ibid., 264.

[144]Ibid., 265.

[145]Ibid.

[146]Ibid., 285-286.

[147]Ibid., 284.

[148]Ibid., 287.

[149]Ibid., 288.

[150]Ibid., 290.

[151]Ibid., 291.

[152]Ibid., 292.

[153]Ibid.

[154]Ibid., 294.

[155]Ibid., 334.

[156]Ibid.

[157]Ibid., 337-338.

[158]Ibid., 387.

[159]Ibid., 411.

CHAPTER 6

THE COUNCIL OF FLORENCE AND RHETORIC

In this chapter, the relationship between the council and the art of rhetoric as it was expressed in the humanist movement, will be demonstrated. In a previous chapter, it was noted that the humanists were concerned with the imitation of classical rhetoric, the wedding of eloquence and wisdom. The humanists patterned themselves stylistically after the ancients, but were particularly fond of the works of Cicero. Indeed, they largely used Ciceronian stylistic methodology in their compositions. The humanists were, however, also practical in their aims, thus in their orations and written documents they often sought to persuade their audiences to take some form of action. Therefore it can be said that humanist rhetoric had two major concerns; first proper classical style, and second, persuasive power. Five orations will be examined in order to ascertain whether or not humanist rhetoric played a role in the debates at Florence. These speeches were chosen because of their relative importance to the council itself; all were delivered at important junctures during the deliberations. It is hoped that while not exhaustive, this investigation might allow the formation of some legitimate conclusions

regarding the relationship of humanist rhetoric and thus humanism itself, and the council.

The Council of Florence-Sources

Before beginning the actual analysis of the oratory of the council, a few words concerning the sources from which this material has been drawn are necessary. For the council itself there are three main sources: the Greek Acts, (also known as the Practica), the Latin Acts, and the Memoirs of Sylvester Syropoulos, a Greek participant at the council.[1] The Greek Acts, as demonstrated by Gill, are actually comprised of three documents, all interwoven into one composition.[2] The first and largest of these three documents gives the actual texts of the speeches delivered at Ferrara and Florence, and is part of the authentic protocol of the sessions.[3] According to Gill, this segment of the Practica alone merits the title of "Greek Acts", and is the most authoritative document of the discourses made at the public meetings.[4] This document of the protocol, however, gave little beyond the texts of the speeches, therefore a second element was added which "filled in" the account, describing the events of the council in more detail. This addition, taken from a work written by yet another Greek participant at the council, perhaps Dorotheus of Mitylene, Gill calls the Description.[5] The final portion of the Practica consists

of a short introduction and a few genuine documents added to the protocol.[6] The Latin Acts are an account written by Andrea da Santa Croce, a consistorial advocate present with the Latin delegation at the council.[7] Gill is uncertain as to whether Santa Croce was one of the three Latins appointed to compile a protocol which was to correspond to that of the Greeks; he appears to have written his own account.[8] Gill suggests that the accuracy of the account of Santa Croce is guaranteed by its close agreement with the Practica.[9] The Memoirs of Sylvester Syropoulos were written sometime after the conclusion of the council, and did not claim to be a full account of the proceedings.[10] The chief value of the Memoirs lies in its account of the activities that went on behind the scene of the council among the Greek delegation.[11] Its value as a history of the council is diminished by its marked antagonism to the union of Greeks and Latins. In fact, Gill describes the Memoirs as "an apologia for those Greeks who signed the Florentine decree in Italy and repudiated their signatures in Constantinople."[12] Gill suggests that a comparison of the Greek Acts with the Latin Acts would "furnish safe material for the record of the public sessions."[13] Therefore, I have chosen to follow professor Gill's suggestion by using these two documents as primary sources for the discussions in this and the subsequent chapter. All translations are my own, and are derived from the original texts.

The first oration which will be examined is the Papal Bull Magnae omnipotenti Deo. This Bull of Pope Eugenius was delivered at the opening session of the Council at Ferrara, on April 9, 1438.[14] This initial ceremony took place in the cathedral church of St. George, and the Bull was not read by Eugenius himself, but by Antonius Martins, bishop of Oporto in Portugal.[15] This speech was important to the council because it set the tone for the entire proceeding, noting the centrality of union with the Greeks. The Bull asserted Eugenius' authority with regard to the transfer of the council to Ferrara, yet spoke of the union as the mutual goal of both Basel and the pope. The Bull called for an unequivocal acceptance of the legitimacy of the newly convened council and was sanguine in its outlook regarding the prospect of reunification with the east.

Before looking at the text of Magnae omnipotenti Deo it will be necessary to determine what if any relationship Eugenius had with the Humanist movement. Gill, writing concerning this relationship, remarks; "Eugenius was not a humanist, though not insensible to the new spirit of the age. He had humanists in his service, including the unworthy Poggio. His own library contained the, for those days, considerable number of 350 volumes, mostly theological."[16] Thus Gill did not believe that Eugenius was a humanist. Yet the same author notes that when Eugenius was the governor of the March of Ancona (1420-1423) he began to learn Greek.[17]

This undertaking, while not necessarily making Eugenius a humanist, at least implies a certain affinity with the inclinations of the movement; possibly more than simply a lack of insensibility toward it.

When Eugenius fled in exile to Florence in 1434, he came to the very center of humanism. Florence was a well known cultural center, home to such great artists as Donatello, Lorenzo Ghiberti, Massaccio, and Fra Angelico.[18] Eugenius promoted the arts, consecrating the finished work of Brunelleschi, the cupola of the cathedral of Santa Maria del Fiore in 1436.[19] Florence was as well a focal point for literary activity, and as such, attracted the humanists. The first modern public library was begun in Florence with the donation of manuscripts to the city by the humanist Niccolo Nicoli.[20] The chancellor of the city at this time was also a noted humanist, Leonardo Bruni, who upon the arrival of the Greeks in 1437 greeted them with welcoming orations in their own tongue.[21] Another prominent Florentine humanist, Ambrogio Traversari, faithfully served Eugenius by lobbying in his behalf among the delegates at Basel, and later at the court of the Holy Roman Emperor Sigismund.[22] Traversari subsequently provided the Latins with the indispensable service of Greek translation during the debates themselves. What influence humanism had upon Eugenius as he sojourned in Florence is not fully clear. Yet it seems unlikely that such a pervasive intellectual movement would not have had some

impact upon the thought of the exiled pope. When Eugenius returned to Rome in 1443, he maintained his patronage of the arts, commissioning artists to fashion new doors for St. Peter's.[23] One such set of bronze doors, crafted by the Florentine artist, Antony Averulano, represented for Gill, one aspect of humanistic influence on Eugenius; "these doors of bronze typify in a certain way the spirit of the early fifteenth century and reflect the attitudes of the humanists, for they combine the traditional religious with the mythological pagan."[24] Another avenue of contact between Eugenius and the humanist movement was through his employment of various papal secretaries who were humanists. Gill suggests that the popes tolerated such unsavory humanists as Poggio Bracciolini as a necessary evil; they were important to the efficient operation of the curia, yet he criticizes Eugenius and Martin V for doing so.[25] Gill does observe, however, the positive contribution of Christian humanists like Flavio Biondo, who not only served Eugenius as a good stylist, but was also true to his faith.[26]

It seems evident that Eugenius was in many ways sympathetic to the interests of humanism. He attempted to learn Greek and he owned a large library of books which he diligently read.[27] He was associated with prominent humanists within the Curia, and promoted humanism in the arts. The question that remains to be answered however, is

whether Eugenius adopted humanist rhetorical methods and aims in his own oratory. It is precisely that issue which will be addressed in the following discussion, with regard not only to Eugenius, but to each subsequent orator.

Each of the following speeches has been analyzed with regard to Cicero's categories of rhetoric, specifically the organizational category Oratio, which is shown below.

Oratio:

1. Exordium: Opening remarks intended to render the audience receptive to the speaker.
2. Narratio: A statement of facts colored in favor of the speaker.
   Partitio: A forecast of the speaker's main points.
3. Confirmatio: Affirmative proof for the argument.
   Confutatio: Refutation or rebuttal.
4. Conclusio or Peroratio: Conclusion.

Papal Bull
Magnae Omnipotenti Deo
(Delivered to the council April 9, 1438)

(Exordium):

Eugenius, bishop, servant of the servants of God to perpetual memory. Great things are gained by us by giving thanks to Almighty God, who, not unmindful of His compassion of old, always restores His glorious church with fruitful progress. Yet notwithstanding the fury and driving storm of temptations and tribulations whenever he allows them, he never permits her to submerge: but saves her uninjured from

the swelling waves and demonstrates his ineffable benevolence toward the human race that in the course of many and various misfortunes and afflictions she might stand more vigorous and strong. See how the eastern and western people, having been separated from one another for some time, hasten to come together in one esteem of unity and peace. For being vexed, as an equal is, by a long period of sacred discord, after many generations, it is clear that the desire of the holy association itself to meet together in this place is from the One who gives all good things abundantly.

(Narratio/Confirmatio):

Therefore we understand our service, and that of the entire church, to be to strive with all men that these favorable beginnings might advance to their happy end with continuous and uninterrupted zeal; that we might deserve to be co-laborers in the grace and authority of God. Certainly our most beloved son John Palaeologus, Emperor of the Romans, together with our most pious brother Joseph, Patriarch of Constantinople and the remainder of the vicars of the Patriarchal Sees, of great archbishops, bishops, men of the church and others of the noble retinue came to Venice on about the 8th day of February, the port itself is most beautiful; where the emperor himself, as he had often done previously, openly declared the reasons he was not able to attend the celebrated ecumenical synod of Basel; which reasons he indicated through letters to the assembly of Basel, exhorting all and demanding from all that they come to Ferrara, which according to the pronouncement of such a council was transferred, that the pius work which they themselves conferred might indeed be accomplished. We therefore, to whom this most sacred union is always chiefly dear, desiring that most important goal be accomplished with zeal, in accordance with the decree of the general council of Basel and with the consent of the Greeks, and with the place having been chosen in which the ecumenical synod might be convened, in the same way those who were of the council of Basel were themselves compelled to confirm along with us the site of Bologna, even in the presence of the legates themselves first of the emperor, then of the patriarch; and whatever other things besides they consider with regard to this holy work of uniting, according as our obligation of service demands, we firmly strive to advance and bring it to a conclusion.

(Conclusio):

We therefore decree and declare to all by a better manner and form, with the verbal consent of the emperor and Patriarch who perceived this matter beforehand, and to all

those presently assembled at this synod, that the holy and ecumenical synod must be celebrated in this city of Ferrara, a free and safe place, moreover it ought to be considered and spoken of as a consecrated synod by all men. Whereby without any quarrelsome contest or turbulence of soul itself and yet with a great deal of eagerness and persistence, indeed, rather with all affection this holy business of union will have been negotiated, which we anticipate will be directed to succeed by a gracious God along with the remainder of the negotiations, for which this synod has been convened. Given in Ferrara, the ninth day of April, in the year of our Lord fourteen hundred and thirty eight.[28]

The next speech was delivered by Cardinal Giuliano Cesarini (1398-1444) on November 11, 1438, the ninth public session at Ferrara.[29] Cesarini, a Roman, studied law in Rome, Bologna and Padua, ultimately receiving the Doctor in both Laws (in utroque jure) degree.[30] He subsequently taught law in Bologna, having among his students Domenico Capranica and Nicholas of Cusa, both future cardinals.[31] Cesarini became involved in church matters as a vicar in the family of Cardinal Adimari, accompanying the cardinal on various missions to Germany (1419-1422) in the pursuit of disciplinary reform within the German church.[32] Cesarini established a reputation for integrity and demonstrated his considerable leadership abilities in various positions which he held in the curia during the years that followed.[33] He was made a cardinal in 1426, and became a trusted subordinate of Pope Martin V, working with the pope with regard to curial reform.[34] Cesarini was appointed by Martin V as president of the newly convoked Council of Basel in 1431.[35] He was confirmed in this appointment by Martin's

successor, Pope Eugenius IV.[36] Although appointed as papal representative at Basel, Cesarini had been in full agreement with the council's subordination of papal authority to its own.[37] He later began to have reservations about the aim of the council, however, when it became clear that the total abasement of the papacy had become its goal. This uncertainty was solidified by the attempt of the majority of the council to negotiate directly with the Greeks regarding reunification, which attempt Cesarini opposed.[38] Seeing that the majority at Basel was more concerned about preserving and asserting its own authority than achieving union with the eastern church, Cesarini abandoned the council for Ferrara.[39] He was gratefully received by Eugenius, and played an important role in the course of the debates. Cesarini's link with humanism is by no means concrete, yet as a jurist, he was part of a tradition which was significant to the its development. Indeed, as Walter Ullmann suggests in his work, Medieval Foundations of Renaissance Humanism, the study of law contributed to the "secularization of government" which actually allowed humanism to develop in Italy.[40] Roman Law, as it was studied in the Renaissance, he further suggests, was to the jurist what Roman classical literature was to the humanist, in that it was the exemplary model.[41] The University of Bologna, where Cesarini both studied and taught, was well known as early as the twelfth century as the

leading European institution with regard to the study of jurisprudence.[42] The study of law, to be sure, was intimately connected with the intellectual milieu of northern Italy in the early fifteenth century. In addition, it is quite possible that Cesarini himself was trained in the disciplines of humanism during his university education. Thus, although Cesarini may not be said to have been a humanist, having been both an educator and jurist in Italy he almost certainly was acquainted with the disciplines of humanism, including the Ciceronian rhetorical method.

This particular oration of Cesarini was in relation to the issue of whether or not any addition to the Nicene Creed, in this case, the phrase Filioque, was legitimate. The Greeks of course, denied any addition whatsoever to the Creed as being legitimate, based on the prohibition of the Council of Ephesus.[43] The persuasive power of this particular oration cannot be overstated. It was probably the most important of all discourses delivered by a Latin disputant at the council. This is because it was the one which first caused the Greeks to have doubts about their position. Gill attests to this fact: "Bessarion later declared that at that stage of the discussions (before Cesarini's discourse) the Greeks were in the ascendant, but that when Cesarini took the floor their case subsided; to his arguments they could only reply: 'It is forbidden. It is forbidden.' It was Cesarini that convinced Bessarion of the

of the worthlessness of the Greek case over the addition, and with Bessarion, many more."[44] This speech was therefore critical to the Latin case and proved absolutely crucial to the eventual capitulation of the Greek majority to the Latin position. This oration was so powerful that George Scholarius, a Greek participant acknowledged; "Either then it must be shown that the doctrine of the Latins is far removed from the truth or, if we cannot do that, we should respect it and entertain it in our minds and then manifest the faith also by the Creed."[45] Cesarini successfully demonstrated that the prohibition of Ephesus applied to assertions contrary to the faith of Nicea, not its grammatical composition. He gave concrete examples from conciliar history to underscore his point. Charisius, for example, was allowed to recite his own belief statement at Ephesus which differed verbally but not substantively from the Nicene document, yet he was not condemned as was Nestorius, whose creed went contrary to the Nicene faith. Cesarini's oration easily admits to Ciceronian organization:

Session IX November 11, 1438

Cardinal Giuliano Cesarini

Cesarini:

(Exordium):

Seeing that many things have been said by both parties quite shrewdly and accurately, which are perhaps better

understood by theologians skilled in the Scripture than by laymen and others not so learned, I myself will speak regarding a certain confusion concerning this issue, in the hope that it might be understood not only by those with knowledge of these things, but also by the untaught, in order that uncertainty concerning this investigation, unless concealed, might be easily removed. Because it is certainly proper that by means of complete discourses we may come to a concise reasoning, if it please you to hear our speech, I will continue; but if not, it is up to you.

Emperor John VIII:
Go on, let the Cardinal speak, let him speak.

Cesarini:

(Narratio/Partitio):

And so I will come to the root of the uncertainty. The subject of debate is the prohibition put in place by the Council of Ephesus, namely these words: "No one may be allowed to add to, to rewrite, or compose" and the rest. Which words we maintain should be thus understood, that no one may be allowed to speak contrary to the faith of Nicea. You yourselves wish to understand it to apply not only with regard to another and contrary faith, but also to any explanation or exposition or addition whatever, moreover that any addition however appropriate either of exposition or interpretation of the creed is forbidden by that prohibition. However, those skilled in legal matters maintain that a statute cannot be understood unless it is thoroughly examined. Wherefore in order to come to an understanding of this matter it is necessary that we know those things which preceded the statute.

(Confirmatio) Proof #1:

It is read in the acts of the Council, before the fathers wrote that prohibition, that a certain exposition was read aloud by Charisius concerning the faith of Anastasius and Photius, who were disciples of Nestorius, by whom a certain Jacob was sent to publicly declare the Nestorian heresy, who likewise led many astray with regard to a different faith, moreover he asserted that Charisius was treacherous not of the faith, that he had betrayed the Creed. Indeed the same man among others is said to have been accused by Jacob and his followers, that they themselves did not receive the faith. Therefore Charisius also, that he might demonstrate his orthodoxy, first gave an exposition of his faith; thereafter he related the creed of Nestorius and his followers in order that he might describe it and bring

it to light. Thus he first recited his pius creed, which was however, found neither at Nicea nor Constantinople. I will speak first concerning the exposition having been read by Charisius regarding his faith, afterwards that which was itself produced by Nestorius. Afterwards Charisius said this: "It is reasonable to me" he says "that heretics are deprived of fellowship; but I believe in one God," etc. Nor is it in this creed: "Moreover those who claim it to have been at some time when it was not," In fact he took this from the Creed of Nicea and inserted that phrase: "And in the Holy Spirit one substance with the Father and the Son," which is neither in the Nicene Creed nor in that of Constantinople. Likewise he afterwards recited the Nestorian creed, which he called a faithless creed. To those for whom it had been read aloud the Holy Synod said: "No one may be allowed to add to or to teach another faith." Later it condemned those who might hold to the creed fashioned and set forth by Nestorius, yet it did not condemn any word of the confession and faith of Charisius. Whereas if it had been its intention to forbid anyone's confession, moreover if it would not allow another creed to be recited except that of Nicea, preserving the words of its set form, without doubt the confession of Charisius would have been rejected; but because the confession of Charisius was true the Council did not reject the creed set forth by him, but by its confirmation condemned the belief of the Nestorians. Whereby it follows that opposition to the faith of Nicea was indicated by those words, and for me this seems to be adequate to show what that prohibition meant.

(Confirmatio) Proof #2:

Second, the Council not only ordered that no one may be allowed to add to, to compose and the rest, but indeed that no one may be allowed to consider another faith besides that set forth by Nicea. If I will have asked you whether you believe God to be eternal with your heart, you will indeed affirm it. But if anyone said to you that you were subject to an anathema on account of this because it is not contained in the creed, yet you may otherwise perceive it to be in the creed and are able to support your position by means of several truths. Indeed whereas you claim it is lawful for private persons in accordance with their own authority both to explain and declare their views as it pleases them, certainly the same privilege is not allowed the catholic church, and I say this is contrary to the words of the Decree. For it says there in the beginning: "No one may be allowed to add to" etc. and indeed in the end: "Whether he may be a bishop, deposed bishop", etc. From which it is clear that the decree applies both to individuals and to all, whether they may be bishops or

clerics; who along with laymen may commemorate it, it is evident that discourse spoke with reference to every laymen. The laity are not accustomed to sing the Creed in church, but clerics are; therefore it has been proposed that it may be forbidden to all both laymen and clerics both inside and outside of the church. From this it is certainly clear that private persons are forbidden to produce a writing with regard to a different faith. But if you wish to understand a different faith generally, there are many and all are thus far under anathema. Beyond this we will speak to the issue more fully by explaining the statement which Pope Agatho wrote and sent to the Council, not on his own behalf, but on behalf of many, for it concerned the entire Eastern Church. Now in it Pope Agatho spoke on behalf of all who were subject to himself in the Eastern Church, indeed one hundred and twenty-five bishops signed that letter. With regard to this letter the ruler of Nicea, speaking concerning it by means of a superior discourse which Colossensis delivered with immediate and urgent necessity, refused to place it in the decree: Even if there is a necessity, it is not to be received. I say therefore by the plain words in the decree that a thing is not to be determined by private persons whether singly or universally; therefore such a prohibition is understood to apply equally to all men.

(Confirmatio) Proof #3:

I say in addition at the Council of Ephesus no one was to publicly say the Creed of Constantinople. Well these fathers forgot this fact and thus desired to sing the creed in church; now that we ought to sing for all posterity nothing other than the Nicene creed, and indeed that we might do badly by singing the Constantinopolitan Creed, since it ought not be sung; either they neglected to remember it as contrary and unworthy to be sung; or they surely regarded it to be the same, yet while the Nicean Creed was considered to differ in many ways from the Constantinopolitan, because they contain the same sense and faith, I understand them to be one and the same and not contrary. And you have said that the Creed of Constantinople is maintained by Nicene virtue, by having read one I understand the other. Therefore where a matter is in agreement with the sense of a creed, it ought to be considered one with it, not opposed to it: this is not prohibited by the decree, but only a different faith. Wherefore a contrary faith ought to be understood as that which differs from the truth.

(Confirmatio) Proof #4:

I will speak another way to the greater declaration of

truth. That which was defined by the Council, clearly it was defined through the Holy Spirit and the same Holy Spirit is in everyone. But moreover in the sixth Council, when the decree was recited, the fathers said: "No one may be allowed," etc. or to think another way or to overthrow what they had defined. Thus the sixth council, or the Holy Spirit who openly declared through it, explains, "No one may be allowed to advance a different faith," this is a contrary faith, being lifted up against the true faith; nevertheless they did not prohibit that which was done in accordance with the true declaration. Moreover, since there is uncertainty concerning certain words of the law it is necessary to come back to the intention of the legislators. Certainly that intention is to be discovered either in the introduction or in the words of the law itself, or from that which follows as a consequence of it. Therefore it was intended by the fathers when they convened initially, to have the Creed of the Nicean fathers recited and also that discourses might be examined with regard to the Creed, in order that those in agreement with it might be approved, those otherwise, rejected. Whereby the legislators had proposed nothing other than to prohibit a different faith, or another explanation which might tend toward the destruction of the true faith; moreover the judgment of those men was to examine not the words but the sense of sacred Scripture. This is evident from a letter of Saint Cyril who, as soon as he recited the Nicene Creed, said firmly: "Not conforming to the confession of the fathers, we strive after the intention of their resolve and we clearly set out what is the correct faith." This same conclusion was established by the seventh synod, where it says: "Both examining and pursuing the true faith with all diligence:" and later by these same fathers: "Following the correct faith without wavering, we take away nothing, in addition we add nothing to the faith of the Nicene fathers." Yet these men themselves produced other definitions according to their own conceptions. From this it is understood that the legislators proposed that truth in all things be proclaimed, taught, spoken, not concealed.

(Confirmatio) Proof #5:

I have reserved for last a certain matter, which appears to me to be an issue which itself is never considered: I will speak first concerning another example which makes the affair plain. The synod of Chalcedon says that there were some, who Pope Leo spoke against, calling them strangers to the statement of faith, interpreting the faith in a way other than that authorized by the Nicene fathers. These are the words of the Council: "And no one may accuse Pope Leo, of constructing a new statement of faith, for no one may be allowed to produce another statement

besides that which was made by the Nicene fathers." The Council decided against those who rose up against the truth and defended Leo, moreover it denied anyone who acted against the prohibition, while it explained and interpreted the statement of faith. "Indeed, because errors have arisen, different remedies from the holy fathers ought to be employed against them. And the faith allowed by the fathers is sufficiently set forth, although there are many who wish to distort their true intention, for that reason the Council assembled to better interpret and declare this same statement of faith. For if all definitions are compared with the faith, a work ought not be carefully examined except by the Nicene statement; and because many are led away from the correct path by a circuitous way, namely through the way of deceit and error, it is necessary for us to point out the true way and to make clear," etc. It asserted many other things also, which related to this issue.

Now I come to that which I desire finally to say. You are not unaware that Eutychus was condemned by Flavianus at the Council of Constantinople; later the issue was taken up by the Robber Council of Ephesus, which was condemned, over which Dioscorus tyrannically presided; and Eutychus, who was present, since he desired to plead his cause and to show himself not to be in error, recited his statement of faith, that it was in accordance with the words of the Nicene Creed: afterwards, "This is" he says " the faith of the fathers in which I wish to live and die." But because the Nicene faith had been confirmed by the Council of Ephesus, it was forbidden to add another faith statement to that first document and it was decreed that no one may add to, or take away from it: wherefore he said this: I hold to the true faith, but Flavianus does not hold to the true faith, since he declares Christ to be from two natures and in Him there are two natures, moreover in the Nicene Creed it is not stated that Christ has two natures or that he is from two natures. Eutychus took up this pius opinion, that not even accents were permitted to be added to the Creed. Now upon hearing this a certain Eusebius bishop of Dorulaious cried aloud: "He has lied: there is no rule which prescribes this". Dioscorus responded: "How do you say there is no rule? There are five books among us and it is written in each that it is unlawful to add anything to the Nicene Creed." These matters were taken up at the Council of Chalcedon, which said nothing against Eusebius of Dorulaious, but approved that which he embraced. Yet under Dioscorus a judgment was passed against Flavianus, which it announced saying: "For that reason he is to be deprived of his episcopate, who may transgress the decree of the council of Ephesus, by which it is established, that whether bishop or cleric he who advances a different faith or adds to or detracts from it is to be deposed from his episcopate,

since," etc. for this reason Eusebius and Flavianus, being transgressors of this law, were expelled from their episcopates. But all those bishops, though they had embraced the opinion of Dioscorus, were later condemned; along with all who had flourished because of that prohibition produced by the council. Whereby they said accordingly: "Flavianus and Eusebius are themselves declared by all esteemed priests to be strangers, who dared to add to and take away from that concerning the Holy Faith set forth by the Council of Nicea and approved by Ephesus. Therefore it is just that those who add to or take away from the faith be removed, bishops from their episcopate, and clerics from their office." when they read this at the Council of Chalcedon, they all said: "Dioscorus is anathematized, because he judged badly, this hour Dioscorus is condemned." Thus the Council repealed everything which was established against Flavianus, and it resolved that Flavianus did nothing contrary to the Council of Nicea or Ephesus, and those words in which Christ is said to have two natures or to be from two natures, it allowed to be expressed although they are not read in the Nicene Creed, nevertheless they are not contrary to the truth, and may be deduced from the excellent Nicene Creed. Whereby it is necessary neither to censure nor rebuke those who add or interpret, provided that what they produce is consistent with the truth and the catholic faith. And it appears to me that no one may be able to find an example more appropriate to the issue than this itself which has been revealed concerning Flavianus.

(Conclusio):

Therefore I conclude that these words of the prohibition: "No one may be allowed to add to, or to think" and the rest are to be understood to apply to those who either hold to a contrary faith or who alter Sacred Scripture or the Nicene Creed. For myself, unskilled in the law, these things are able to remove all uncertainty. But if is not thus so, I may wish to be taught by you. Whereby since the Latin Church says nothing contrary to the truth or to Sacred Scripture or the Nicene Creed, nor has it added to the definitions of other councils, it is worthwhile, having passed over this question whether it may be allowed or not, to approach another, namely, whether or not it is true that the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Son. But if you are able to show that He does not proceed from the Son, I will openly declare it to be an addition unlawful to be added by the Holy Roman Church, since it is contrary to the true faith; but if you are not able to prove it false, it will have indeed been shown to be beneficial and true, it must be conceded that it is permitted in order to interpret the Creed, and there will be peace for both parties. These things I have been able to

say with amendments themselves being subject to the most blessed Father and our Lord even the most serene Emperor and the other fathers.[44]

Two very important orations were later delivered at Florence by John of Montenegro, Provincial of Lombardy, a Dominican theologian. These speeches, delivered on March 21, and March 24, 1439, spoke to the accuracy of the Latin doctrinal position regarding the Filioque. Montenegro utilized the Scriptures, and the writings of the Greek and Latin fathers in his argumentation.[45] Montenegro was able to show that the writings of the Greek fathers supported the doctrinal position of the Latins regarding the Filioque. This fact greatly undermined the Greek position against the addition and eventually led to a compromise between the two parties on the issue. In these discourses, as had Cesarini in his earlier speech regarding the legitimacy of the addition, Montenegro relied upon the translation work of the humanist scholar, Ambrogio Traversari.[46] Virtually nothing is known concerning Montenegro other than his office and the fact that he was a Dominican theologian of some reputation.[47] Yet it was Montenegro who was the principal Latin disputant during the dogmatic discussions of March, 1439 regarding the doctrinal truth of the Filioque.[49] These two orations were the last public debates concerning this issue. Montenegro was an intellectual of the first rank, and his metaphysical explanations were not always fully grasped by the Greeks.[50] Yet his speeches greatly influenced the

Greek audience as Gill states: "But the Lombard Provincial had done two things that had impressed them. He roundly affirmed western belief in there being but one cause of the Holy Spirit and, particularly in the last two sessions, he had produced an array of Fathers both Latin and Greek to support his assertions."[51] The two discourses are provided one after another in chronological order, and are arranged according to the Ciceronian category of Oratio.

Session VIII (Florence) March 21, 1439

John of Montenegro

John:

(Exordium):

I might desire Ephesus (Mark) to be present with us in this session, that he might hear the refutations of his words; but that appears to be hopeless, because he has not dared to come to the gathering. Therefore I will speak to you and this general assembly.

The emperor responds.

Emperor:

We desire to say nothing in the present session; therefore neither has Ephesus come here with us nor do we come to dispute, but that we might comply with your desire and in order that there be peace between us, and that these sessions might not be disregarded. We have come then; if anyone of you desires, speak; we will give you no response.

(And so John (of Montenegro), a Latin priest, spoke.)

John:

(Narratio/Partitio):

We have disposed of neither of the two questions set before us. For the statement, or rather statements, of Basil

the Great most clearly show the Holy Spirit to have been from the Son as well as from the Father: we confess the Father as the one cause of the Son and the Holy Spirit, and that the Son produced the Holy Spirit chiefly by the Father, yet we have not been able to bring this question to an end. Therefore, having abandoned this, I will speak concerning that which Ephesus himself advanced. Accordingly, I will now respond, moreover I will cite the beginning of a speech made by our Lord Jesus Christ Himself.

(Confirmatio):

Indeed he says in the Gospel: "But when the Comforter shall come, whom I will send to you from the Father, the Spirit of Truth, who proceeds from the Father," etc. Now that word: "Mittam (I will send)", what does it signify other than that he is sent by someone? Accordingly he who sends, sends someone peculiar to himself, and from himself is that one sent. For instance, when the Prefect executes the law of the Emperor, he does not execute it by his own authority, but by Imperial mandate; surely the Son does not produce the Holy Spirit by himself, but by consubstantiality with the Father, receiving in his generation that paternal virtue and having naturally produced in Himself the Holy Spirit Itself also, though not chiefly, since the Father is indeed the root and source of divinity. For truly the Father is inseparable in essence, indeed since He Himself may, with respect to essence itself, not be understood to have essence distinct from objective reality; for it is not by nature, but by reason alone, that the objective reality of the Father is separated from His essence.

Therefore the Father exists as a substantial reality and He essentially generates the Son; and the Son is generated, He Himself also as a substantial reality; and there are certainly two persons, but one God and one nature of both, together with whom the Holy Spirit is inseparably understood, who is neither Father nor Son nor anyone besides. Now it is proper to refer to the Spirit as Spirit with regard to inspiration. But because the Spirit is the Spirit of the Father, and that Spirit is declared by Scripture to also be the Sons', therefore the Father and Son are those inspiring Him. The Son also with regard to the Father according to divinity says: "I and the Father are one", and: I am in the Father and the Father is in Me", and:" Whoever sees me also sees the Father" Therefore according to one virtuous spiration of two persons and one producing strength there are not two inspirators but, one and the same in number, indeed the Father is to be understood as the one by whom the Son Himself exists; and by virtue of this the Father and Son are said to be one element, without confusion of persons. Now the Father

exists, and the Father exists naturally; and the Son, the Son is begotten, according to cause and effect; likewise we ought to assign some order to the Holy Spirit with respect to the Father and the Son, lest unavoidable confusion be established in the Divine.

(Conclusio):

But since the Father imparts this essence to the Son having begotten Him, inasmuch as there is mutual participation with the Son, truly the Son Himself receives that imputation from Him, and imparts the same to the Holy Spirit, such that that imputation is from the Son Himself, because there is one essence according to which this one is generated and that one proceeds, therefore the one beginning and cause of the Holy Spirit is the Father and the Son, and He (The Holy Spirit) proceeds from both. Moreover because the Holy Spirit is said to naturally proceed from the Father through the Son, therefore the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Father and the Son; for in this passage per "through" means the same thing as ex "from".[52]

Session IX (Florence) March 24, 1439

John of Montenegro

John:

(Exordium):

I would wish that Ephesus (Mark) might also be present and that he might hear the responses to that which he himself said, but, because I know he will not come, we will undertake to deliver the discourse to you and publicly reveal the words of the holy eastern fathers.

(Confirmatio/Conclusio):

Indeed the great Basil says: "For as the Son is second in order after the Father," indeed previously He was placed in enumeration with the Father, by the Lord saying: Namely, "Baptizing them," he says, "in the name of the Father and Son and Holy Spirit;" and moreover in dignity of position, certainly the Son is from the Father, the Father is not from the Son, but in fact they have equal natures: "I and the Father are one;" thus although the Holy Spirit is second in order even after the Son, yet He is declared in enumeration with Him; likewise in dignity of position, the Spirit is said to be from the Son, since He is brought about through

the Son: "He has sent," he says, "God the Spirit of His Son in our hearts;" the Spirit is indeed not the Son, but in fact has a nature equal to the Father and Son; for those engaged in the same labor also have the same nature. Moreover the great Epiphanius: "If Christ is believed to be from God, as God is from God, certainly the Holy Spirit is from both. In whatever way no one knows the Father except the Son, thus I dare say, nor the Son except the Holy Spirit, who proceeds from both." Also the great Cyril: "Thus the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Son, even as clearly as he does from the Father." Furthermore the most learned Didymus and great Athanasius: "That He (Holy Spirit) proceeds from the Father," he says, "will both be accepted by me and announced to you; therefore the Holy Spirit (proceeds) from the Father and the Son."[53]

Although many of the Greeks had been persuaded of the truth of the Latin arguments by the end of March 1439, many still were unwilling to concede to the Latin viewpoint, and thus abandon their tradition.[54] In fact the period between April, and July 1439, when union was actually achieved, may best be described as one of behind the scene persuasion. Bessarion, for example, worked diligently to show his colleagues that by acquiescing to the Latin position, they were not actually giving up anything, since the Latins had shown the Filioque to be supported by their own tradition.[55] The extent of his effort in this regard is shown by his important Oratio Dogmata delivered to his fellow Greeks on April 12, 1439.[56] This speech was an eloquent and powerful exhortation to union with the Latins, and it left no doubt as to the fact that, at least for Bessarion, the Latins had removed all uncertainty regarding the doctrinal truth of their assertions.[57] Having secured at least a tentative agreement from the Greeks regarding the Latin position, the

majority of the remainder of this period was spent trying to arrive at language acceptable to the Greeks concerning the decree of union. Yet even this process seemed interminable. Finally Eugenius, frustrated by the lack of progress being made toward union, and what he considered to be Greek unreasonableness, asked to address the Greek delegation.[58] Eugenius' speech, delivered to the entire Greek congregation on May 27, 1439, was the ultimate catalyst in Greek acceptance of union with the west. In this significant speech, Eugenius expressed amazement at the fact that the Greeks, having come so far and having endured so many hardships in order to achieve union with the west, were now delaying the successful conclusion of their mutual goal by their indecision. He played heavily on the events taking place in Constantinople, the favor of the western princes, and the importance of union with regard to facing the Turkish threat in the east. Gill notes: "The Pope's words moved his hearers deeply."[59] Indeed several influential Greeks, including Bessarion, Isidore of Kiev, and Dorotheus of Mitylene, entreated the emperor to act to bring about the desired union. "John was rather overawed by their firm stand (which was the real beginning of the movement that ended in union) and as a result summoned a meeting of the Greek synod."[60] Eugenius was unsparing in his criticism of the Greeks, but his directness appears to have been precisely what was necessary to move them to action. This important

oration follows, organized, of course, according to the Ciceronian model:

Oration of Pope Eugenius IV to the Greek Delegation

May 27, 1439

Pope Eugenius:

(Exordium):

I, aristocratic brothers of the eastern church, began this divine work of union of the church, not because of some corporeal reason nor for any advantage of this life, but having been aroused with great enthusiasm by the Holy Spirit I undertook this labor. For you know best how greatly I have contended on behalf of this goal from beginning to end. Now I hoped it would happen that you might also strongly apply yourselves to this task, and since I had seen you actively and resolutely encounter the dangers and labors of land and sea to welcome with zeal the union of the church of God, I nourished great hope.

(Narratio/Confirmatio):

But now I have viewed your inactivity, and I wonder what excuse might be made for it. Indeed I am pained that when recalling your homeland you refrain from seeing the inevitable difficulties which are presented to the church by these misfortunes. Now what good is accomplished by your idle discussions? Or what benefit will we receive by not uniting the church of God? For since your arrival at this place I invested a great deal of enthusiasm in order that the discussions might begin and, after it was proclaimed an ecumenical council, I did not cease to urge you toward the dogmatic investigation. Yet I don't know why you always hesitated. We spent nearly a year at Ferrara; twenty-five discussions were completed with difficulty. Truly I patiently tolerated everything, contemplating the holy goal of union. Moreover whatever you asked of me, I liberally fulfilled, having been influenced by the hope of union. Thereafter, with a common purpose we came to Florence. I never ceased to stir you to discussion, partly by rebuking you, partly by recalling to memory our agreements which we

made at Ferrara also specifying that we assemble among ourselves so that, having disregarded every excuse, a discussion might be held three times a week. But if it may happen that either emperor or pope or patriarch or someone from the disputants becomes ill, the discussion is nevertheless not to be interrupted; and moreover if an accident may occur, or with regard to feast days, that on the next day the assembly may be convened and discussion begun; and for no reason are we to be in repose, lest we spend our time in vain. Now I know that you assembled for five or six sessions at Florence, and were unwilling to attend further, but you asked to retire in order to assemble and find a means of union; truly we agreed to this: but in truth time was also wasted by it. You requested that we deliver to you a written copy of our faith statement, because the east had indeed always been estranged from the esteem of the Roman church; yet you know best with what honor the easterners have always been received by the Roman church, as many as will display obedience. And again we accommodated our plan to this; moreover we wrote and sent the statement: but even in this time was spent in vain. You sent us unclear Scriptures regarding the faith; we ask that you might explain them and you do not wish to; and what am I to say? I see plainly before my eyes division all around, and I wonder what such division may profit you. But if it be so, how will it be received by the western princes? With how much sadness will we ourselves receive it? Indeed how will you be returned to your homeland? But if union be achieved, both western rulers and all of us will take great pleasure in it and we will be of great help to you, and our aid will greatly encourage Christians dwelling in the east and those burdened by servitude to Godless men.

(Conclusio):

Therefore I beseech you, brothers, by the precept of our Lord Jesus Christ, let no division be made in the church of God: but with concentrated zeal, arouse yourselves, let us give glory to God together. Our union will bring much profit to the soul; our union will furnish the body with great honor; enemies both corporeal and incorporeal will fear our union; both saints and angels will rejoice at our alliance, and there will be great joy in heaven and earth.[61]

The Humanist concern for rhetoric indeed emphasized both style and persuasive power. These five orations can be seen to meet these criteria. This conclusion does not

necessarily mean that Pope Eugenius, Cardinal Cesarini, and John of Montenegro were humanists. Yet it seems that it would have been impossible for these men not to have at least some acquaintance with the outlook and methods of humanism. The location of the Council at Florence, the educational backgrounds of these men, indeed their association with noted humanists both within the curia and in the Florentine community all suggest this fact. It is, after all, not the intention of this work to declare the Latin participants at the council to have been humanists. But, based on the five orations in this chapter, it can indeed be suggested that these disputants at Florence were acquainted with, and utilized humanist rhetorical methodology in the course of their argumentation at the council.

ENDNOTES

[1]Joseph Gill, The Council of Florence (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1961), viii.

[2]Ibid., ix.

[3]Ibid.

[4]Ibid.

[5]Ibid., x.

[6]Ibid.

[7]Ibid.

[8]Ibid.

[9]Ibid.

[10]Ibid., xi.

[11]Ibid.

[12]Ibid., xii.

[13]Ibid., xiv.

[14]Ibid., 109-111.

[15]Ibid., 111.

[16]Ibid., 347.

[17]Joseph Gill, Eugenius IV, Pope of Christian Union (Westminster: The Newman Press, 1961), 182.

[18]Ibid., 70.

[19]Ibid.

[20]Ibid., 72.

[21]Ibid.

[22]Ibid., 79.

[23]Ibid., 194.

[24]Ibid., 195.

[25]Ibid., 196.

[26]Ibid.

[27]Ibid., 196-97.

[28]Joseph Gill, ed. Quae Supersunt Actorum Graecorum Concilii Florentini Vol 5. of Concilium Florentinum: Documenta et Scriptores (Rome: Pontificium Institutum Orientalium Studiorum, 1953), 16-18.

[29]Gill, Council, 158.

[30]Joseph Gill, Personalities of the Council of Florence (New York: Barnes and Noble, Inc., 1964), 95.

[31]Ibid.

[32]Ibid.

[33]Ibid., 96.

[34]Ibid.

[35]Ibid.

[36]Ibid., 97.

[37]Ibid., 98.

[38]Ibid., 99.

[39]Ibid.

[40]Walter Ullmann, Medieval Foundations of Renaissance Humanism (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1977), 11.

[41]Ibid., 40.

[42]Ibid., 12.

[43]Gill, Council, 147.

[44]Gill, Actorum Graecorum, 176-183.

[45]Gill, Council, 167.

[46]Ibid., 213.

[47]Ibid., 165.

[48]Ibid., 140.

[49]Ibid., 194.

[50]Ibid., 229.

[51]Ibid., 230.

[52]Gill, Actorum Graecorum, 393-96.

[53]Ibid., 397-98.

[54]Gill, Council, 230-31.

[55]Ibid., 232.

[56]Ibid., 240.

[57]Ibid., 241.

[58]Ibid., 253.

[59]Ibid., 254.

[60]Ibid., 255.

[61]Gill, Actorum Graecorum, 422-24.

CHAPTER 7

THE COUNCIL OF FLORENCE AND GRAMMAR, TEXTUAL CRITICISM

If indeed the humanists sought the rediscovery of Christian antiquity, that is, the writings of the Latin and Greek fathers, as well as that of the pagan classics, then the Council of Florence provides us with a striking example.[1] For nothing was more important to the proceedings of the debates, especially those in Florence with regard to the Procession of the Holy Spirit, than the writings of the Greek and Latin fathers. In their employment of textual criticism, it has already been stated that the humanists were concerned with the procurement and emendation of ancient manuscripts. Furthermore, that this interest was heightened by the resurgence of Greek studies in Florence after the arrival of the Greek scholar Chrysoloras in that city in 1397. Once obtained, these manuscripts were subjected to rigorous analysis with regard to variant readings and accuracy of translation. Humanists emphasized orthography, morphology and and the proper application of the rules of grammar in their interpretations. The practical nature of the application of these disciplines has also been emphasized; the humanists always desired to apply their knowledge to the world in which they lived. The Council of

Florence demonstrated this bent of the humanists as well, for clearly the manuscript evidence and exegetical methods employed by the participants were utilized in order to achieve that cherished goal; the unification of the Holy Catholic Church.

In this final chapter, the relationship between the disciplines of grammar and textual criticism and the proceedings of Florence will be set forth. Issues will be discussed with reference to events which occurred at various points during the assembly, but with particular emphasis on the dogmatic discussions which occurred during the month of March, 1439 at Florence. This particular period was the one in which the debate centered on the addition of the Filioque to the Creed, and it provides us with the most important examples of the utilization of humanist disciplines with which this chapter is concerned. Once again, the contributions of the Latin participants will be of primary consideration in this discussion.

Because of the fact that the issues with which the council was concerned involved the interpretation of previously written documents, grammar and textual critical matters assumed importance from the outset. An early example of the utilization of the disciplines by the Latins occurred in June of 1438, during the preliminary meetings at Ferrara. In these initial exchanges, dealing with the subject of Purgatory, the crucial role of the humanist Ambrogio

Traversari in the translation of documents critical to the Latin position is clearly shown. "Here Traversari's knowledge of Greek proved itself, for he complains in a letter to one of his monks: 'It is I who do all this business of the Greeks, translating from Greek into Latin or from Latin into Greek all that is said or written.'"[2]

On June 27, 1438, the Dominican theologian John of Torquemada delivered an important discourse on I Corinthians 3:15, based on Chrysostom's Homilies on I Corinthians.[3] This work had not been previously translated into Latin, again demonstrating the significance of Traversari's contribution.[4] The Latins of course, argued that literal fire was the means of purification in Purgatory, while the Greeks denied that assertion.[5] The text of I Corinthians 3:15, which refers to the appearance of the righteous man before the judgment seat of Christ after his death, states: "If any man's work is burned up, he shall suffer loss; but he himself will be saved, yet so as through fire."[6]

The Greeks argued that the Chrysostom was speaking with regard to eternal fire in this passage, that is the fires of Hell.[7] The Greeks appear to have interpreted the word, "he shall be saved" (salvabitur), in this particular passage to mean only that the individual would continue in his existence.[8] Thus the Greeks took Chrysostom's comments to refer to an unbeliever facing the Last Judgment, who having had his evil works burned up, would have a continued

existence under the punishment of eternal fire.[9] They further claimed that to speak of temporal fire such as might exist in the state of Purgatory, would be reminiscent of the Origenist heresy which denied the eternality of the fires of Hell.[10] Torquemada deftly showed by recourse to Scriptural exegesis that the "salvation" spoken of in I Cor. 3:15 concerned eternal life, not just continued existence:[11]

> And the word 'he shall be saved' (salvabitur) is to signify salvation, help, freedom from punishment, a refreshment, and likewise is to be received and accepted in a good not evil sense, according to the prophetic saying: 'Help (or Save) me Lord, seeing that the godly man fails,'(Psalm 12:1) and: 'My Lord, save your servant who trusts in you,'(Psalm 86:2), and: 'O excellent Lord, direct us, show us your face and we shall be saved.'(Psalm 80:19)[12]

No agreement was of course reached on the doctrine of Purgatory; a factor which contributed to this failure, at least according to Ostroumoff, was the Greek rejection of Latin grammatical exegesis such as had been done Torquemada:

> 'It is very right to suppose,' wrote the Orthodox teachers, 'that the Greeks should understand Greek words better than foreigners. Consequently, if we cannot prove that any one of those saints, who spoke the Greek language, explains the Apostle's words, written in Greek, in a sense different to that given by the blessed John (Chrysostom), then surely we must agree with the majority of these Church celebrities.' The expressions sothenai (to save), sozesthai (to be saved), and soteria (salvation), used by the heathen writers, mean in our language continuance, existence (diameno "to remain", einai "to be, exist")[14]

Therefore it can be seen that grammar was an important issue early on in the debates, and that the proper use of grammar was important to both Latins and Greeks. Yet,

contrary to what the Greeks considered to be an inability on the part of the Latins to handle the exegesis of documents in their mother tongue, the Humanist revival of Greek studies had actually enabled the Latins to successfully face this challenge. As will be seen, Traversari's abilities in the area of Greek grammar and translation, although often challenged by the Greeks themselves, would ultimately form the basis for Latin success.

One of the chief concerns of the Latins involved in the debates of the council had been the appropriation of reliable manuscripts. This textual critical problem was spoken of by Gill: "One of the difficulties that beset the contestants was the paucity of trustworthy codices."[15] An attempt was made to allow important manuscripts to be shared in order to verify their use in the support of positions in the debates:

> Of the Adversus Eunomium of St. Basil, which would figure so largely in the discussions at Florence, Dorotheus of Mitylene had three copies, the Emperor had one and the Patriarch another which he procured from the monastery of Xanthopouloi, while the Latins possessed still another. To ease the difficulty, therefore, it was agreed that each side should on request lend its books to the other, and there were occasional complaints that codices were being held back.[16]

The importance of this particular textual critical issue was also demonstrated at an early point in the debates, during the initial sessions at Ferrara concerning the issue of the legitimacy of an addition to the Creed. The

Greeks, desirous of proving that any addition whatsoever to the Creed was prohibited, read excerpts from the decrees of numerous councils, all supporting their position.[17] Gill relates what happened next:

> When the Greeks had read the decree of the seventh council Cardinal Cesarini exhibited a Latin codex which he claimed, written as it was on parchment, was very ancient and, though it agreed with the Greek codex in all else, yet contained in the profession of faith of the Patriarch Tarasius the words et ex Filio ("and from the Son"). Tarasius of course, was noted for having used the phrase "through the Son", so the Greeks were not impressed, even though the Cardinal had his version read officially at the end of the session.[18]

Cesarini was understandably upset by the Greek denial of his evidence, especially because he had remembered seeing a particular codex of the same council which had been brought back to Italy from Constantinople by Nicholas of Cusa.[19] This document showed clear evidence of having been altered, "the words et ex Filio ("and from the Son") had been erased, but so badly that they could still be read."[20] Astonishingly, the Latins failed to press the Greeks regarding this issue in any of the subsequent sessions.[21]

The use of manuscripts was an essential part of the debates of the Council of Florence. In the private meetings between the orators of both sides, these documents were utilized by each orator to clarify and understand the position of his opponent. Gill writes concerning the importance of this practical application of the textual-critical art to the council:

> Each public session was followed by a private session of this kind. There a speaker who had quoted from Councils or Fathers had to produce the codices he had used for the inspection of the other side, and the two sets of notaries had to compare their versions of the speeches they had taken down, so that each side should have an accurate and mutually agreed record of what had been publicly said. It was on the basis of these records that subsequent speakers met the arguments of their adversaries.[22]

The importance of the eight dogmatic sessions which occurred at Florence during the month of March, 1439, has already been amply stressed. One of the most significant aspects of these discussions was the employment by both sides of the two disciplines; grammar and textual criticism. These meetings, of course, dealt strictly with the issue of whether or not the Holy Spirit could be said to proceed from the Father only, as the Greeks suggested, or from both Father and Son, as the Latins argued.

In the initial debate occurred on March 2, 1439, the two speakers were Mark of Ephesus for the Greeks, and John of Montenegro for the Latins. These men continued to be the chief spokesmen for their respective groups throughout the dogmatic sessions at Florence. John began his discourse by developing an argument which asserted that if a member of the Godhead was said to receive His existence from another member, he could also be said "to proceed" from that member. Mark assented to this, but wanted evidence: "For now we will allow it, but we deny the conclusion, and we therefore ask that you demonstrate that the Holy Spirit receives His

existence from the Son."[23] John responded; "What you say is agreeable, because we thus conclude that the Holy Spirit receives His existence from the Son."[24] Having laid this foundation, John was now ready to appeal to his first major source, St. Epiphanius, 315-403, Bishop of Salamis, and a noted apologist and defender of orthodoxy. "It will first be shown by the authority of St. Epiphanius, who in a certain work called Ancoratus, and that authority transcribed by the Camaldulensian General (Traversari) from a Greek book; first says this: 'The Father calls Him Son, who is from Himself; but (He calls) the Holy Spirit, who alone is from both.'"[25] From this statement, John drew the desired conclusion; "Now from this, if the Spirit is from both, therefore He receives His essence (from both)."[26] John continued his argument by quoting again from Epiphanius: "Just as no one knows the Father except the Son nor the Son except the Father, I dare to say this: no one knows the Holy Spirit except the Father and Son, from whom He receives and from whom He proceeds; nor the Son and Father except the Holy Spirit, who truly glorifies, who teaches all, who is from the Father and the Son."[27] Having thus supported his position by this quotation from the well known eastern father, Montenegro challenged Mark to respond; "Therefore by this authority I hold that the Spirit receives existence from the Son. Speak to this authority."[28] Mark rejected Montenegro's conclusion; "For holy Epiphanius did not say the Spirit received existence

from the Son, but he received from the Son." Indeed Mark continued, this is what the Lord Himself meant in John 16:14, when He said concerning the Holy Spirit, "He receives from Me and discloses to you."[29]

A controversy then arose concerning the verb "is" in the text of Epiphanius' work; "The Father calls Him Son who is from Himself, but the Holy Spirit who alone is from both."[30] Evidently the verb was interpolated by Traversari as he translated the document from Greek into Latin.[31] While such interpolation is often required in order to achieve an accurate translation, and may well have been implied in the original text of Epiphanius, it was vigorously denied by Mark of Ephesus. "He (Epiphanius) says this, that the Spirit proceeds from the Father and receives from the Son, accordingly in that discourse, when he says from the Father and the Son, it ought to be understood according to the expositions of his faith, that He (Holy Spirit) is from the Father and receives from the Son."[32] Mark continued by explaining his objection to Montenegro's assertion concerning the testimony of Epiphanius; "You see fathers, that word "is" does not lie (in the text), which that father (Montenegro) accepted, and through which he also desired to argue existence, arguing on the basis of that word. That word "is" is not joined to this (text) but when he (Epiphanius) says 'from the Father and the Son', we are able to understand according to theology and teachers, the Spirit

as such may be from the Father and the Son in that He has subsistence from the Father and the Son, and He receives from them, those who believe in Him, and while this authority does not hinder us, neither does it infer, what you have proposed."[33] Montenegro accordingly defended his translation as both proper and necessary; "As to whether this word "is" may not exist when 'from the Father and from the Son' is referred to, the word is necessarily understood from the original, and the teachers made this (translation) in relation to the original (text), since when it is said, 'another from whom' and 'who from another', later in that same Ancoratus the word 'is' is there. We say: 'who from Himself, the Spirit, who from both.' In line 2[a] the authority (Epiphanius) says 'the Spirit, who from the Father and the Son'. Accordingly I judge that by necessity it ("is") is understood, because by that interpolation the intention of the discourse's theme is conveyed;...[34] This first session ended without concession or agreement, but with the positions of both sides outlined to some extent. Already the impact of the humanist concern for grammar and textual analysis can be seen in the debates concerning the Procession, and these issues continued to occupy a central position throughout the remainder of the dogmatic discussions.

The next session, convened on March 5, 1439, continued the debate concerning the Procession of the Holy Spirit. The

focal point of this meeting was the text of another outstanding Greek Father, Basil the Great's Adversus Eunomium. In the first session, Mark had referred to this text in affirmation of his assertion that the Holy Spirit is from God and not another source; "St. Basil says: [God] 'sends forth the Spirit through His mouth...for the Spirit is from Him and not from elsewhere'."[35] Mark's point, of course, was that the Holy Spirit could not be said to be from the Father and Son, because the Son could therefore be construed as another source.

Montenegro initiated the debate in this second session by challenging Mark's allegation; "With your holy benediction we had been dismissed in the preceding meeting, the authority of the blessed Basil having been introduced by you, reverend father, in which authority you said the Spirit to be, according to Basil's intention, from the mouth of the Father Himself and not elsewhere, that He (Spirit) is from no other person, just as you had explained."[36] Montenegro turned the issue back to that which the Latins strongly maintained, namely, that to proceed from both Father and Son was to proceed from one source, their mutual essence or substance (substantia). "I have responded, that by 'elsewhere it was understood that He is from no other essence (substantia) than God. The reason; because Basil maintained (it) in his book against Eunomius saying, that the Holy Spirit has His existence from the Son, therefore he

was not able to say, that he may have it from no other person, without contradiction, and beyond this I have sought, as it may be seen from the original (work) of Basil himself, that the truth may become known to all concerning Basil's intention, because such teachers are the foundation of our faith."[37] This concern for developing the author's intention as a bridge to understanding is certainly characteristic of the humanist approach in the area of literary interpretation. It seems reasonable to assume that Montenegro was made aware of this fact in his collaboration with Traversari, upon whose translation skills he depended. Montenegro concluded his remarks by saying; "Now we see the chief point of Basil, and along with two interpreters we have striven, that without any addition or diminution of these words, they have been faithfully translated."[38] Once again, the concern for translation accuracy is enunciated by Montenegro, a concern equally shared by the humanists.

Mark of Ephesus initiated the debate in the next session on March 7, 1349. Mark challenged the authenticity of the manuscript of St. Basil's Adversus Eunomium which the Latins were using; "That book is thus found by us to be corrupt, being falsified with respect to that authority, as it is expressed by you; for in Constantinople there are four or five books, which even maintain it thus; moreover there are properly a thousand or more books, which maintain the correct and incorrupt opinion, which are of a certain worth

both because of their number and antiquity, and which also preserve the natural sequence (of the text) according to the intention of the teacher."[39] Montenegro quickly defended the Latin text; "Concerning the issue of the book we say thus, that this book was taken from Constantinople last year and brought here by lord Nicholas of Cusa, and the book was on vellum, not papyrus, and most ancient, and thus according to the judgment of many who saw it, the script having been seen, appeared by its antiquity to beyond six hundred years old and thus before this separation, and it was thus taken up and ordered in short sections, so that it may in no way be diminished."[40] Both Mark and John supported their assertions with sound textual-critical reasoning. Mark argued that there was a majority of ancient manuscripts which held to the Greek interpretation, and John utilized a similar argument, emphasizing the obvious age of his text. Yet John offered another reason for his position; perhaps the Greeks had altered the texts themselves. Gill writes concerning Montenegro's supposition; "It was much more likely that the change was made (to the large number of extant texts possessed by the Greeks) in the early days of the schism to remove from St. Basil what favoured the traditional doctrine of the Procession of the Holy Spirit, who we may think, preserved this book from corruption to witness to the truth."[41]

Subsequent to this debate concerning the authenticity

of the Latin codex of St. Basil, the remainder of the March 7 session concerned whether or not the great father saw an order within the Godhead. As he would throughout the disputation, Montenegro returned to the testimony of the Fathers. John argued that Athanasius held the same view which Basil espoused concerning order in the Trinity. "That most blessed Athanasius, arguing against Arius in that dialogue also spoke these words. This is the letter. 'Therefore the Spirit is from the essence (substantia) of the Father and the Son, of course by His grace, the Son of God names Him third in the holy formula, in the formula where it says: 'As you go baptize them in the name of the Father and the Son and the Holy Spirit.' From this Athanasius, since it placed three persons in the holy formula, concluded that it may concern the essence of the Father and the Son and thus, that He (Holy Spirit) necessarily possessed his essence from the Father and the Son."[42] Montenegro ended his discourse by once again affirming his belief that the two great Greek fathers did not contradict one another; "It is not to be believed that Basil contradicts Athanasius, and in the following meeting, if God wills, it will be shown from Basil himself, that he says the same thing as blessed Athanasius."[43]

Mark of Ephesus opened the following session on March 10, 1439, by denying that either St. Basil or Athanasius believed there to be a subordination of dignity within the

Trinity.[43] "But that the great father Athanasius did not hold the same opinion as you concerning the procession of the Spirit, nor did he perceive the Son to be the cause of the Spirit, nor on account of this did he say there was an order (in the Trinity), is clearly shown from this, as he says in another (work), relating a separation among the Divine Persons, 'The only source of deity is the Father as the only not begotten one'; now this same member is as he had said the only genitor and spirator, moreover therefore, He did not perceive the Son to be the cause of the Spirit, since he said that the Father was the only source of deity."[44] Furthermore St. Basil, he argued, spoke against such a concept of order within the Trinity, since just such an order was postulated by the heretic Eunomius.[45]

In his rebuttal, Montenegro reaffirmed the Latin position regarding St. Basil's view of the Trinity. The following excerpt from this particular discussion evidences something of the nature of the entire discourse. "First you have said, what (you had) in the previous assembly, when you asked whether it had been the opinion of St. Basil, that the Spirit was third in order and dignity, to which I responded that this was the opinion of Basil, and again I say that this was the true opinion of Basil, that the Spirit was third in dignity and order, because our book distinctly and clearly says this."[45] To underscore the Latin argument, further manuscript evidence was produced, a corroborating

copy of Basil's Adversus Eunomium belonging to a member of the Greek delegation, Dorotheus of Mitylene. Andreas De Santa Croce comments regarding this event: " This book was brought in the midst (of the assembly), which belonged to the archbishop of Mitylene, which was found to conform to our document, and was a most ancient book..."[46] Montenegro thereafter began a discourse in which he made comparisons between the manuscript from which the Greeks argued and that to which the Latins subscribed: "Our text thus says: 'Why is it necessary, if the Spirit is third in order and dignity, that He also be third in nature?' Accordingly your text thus says: 'Why is it necessary, if the Spirit is second in order and dignity, that He also be second in nature?' It says, as it were: it is by no means a necessity. Accordingly you may see the difference, because our text says: the Spirit is third and yours says: the Spirit is second."[47] To this Mark of Ephesus replied: "It does not say thus, but: 'Why is it necessary, if the Spirit is third, that He be third in nature?'"[48] Montenegro subsequently continued his comparison: "In our text it follows: 'Second in dignity to the Son, having existence from Him and by Him both receiving and declaring (it) to us and based entirely on that reason itself, He delivered a pious discourse. Neither from the teachings of Holy Scripture, nor from the discourses (of the saints) are we able to conclude (the Spirit to be) third in nature.' Yours says thus: 'Neither from the teachings of

sacred doctrine, nor from the discourses (of the saints) are we able to conclude (Him to be) third in nature.' Now we see that he steadfastly subjects this to examination saying: 'since the son is second to the Father, since He has His dignity from Him, since His beginning and cause is the Father Himself, and through Him He approaches and brings to the Father that which is according to God, according to true nature since there is one deity in both' and by this we are conformed, and by this the issue of cause is reintroduced, since Basil thus desired to indicate; thus it is apparent, also that 'the Spirit, although He follows the son in order and dignity, it does not rightly follow that He exists from another nature.' Your text say thus: 'to the words which they spoke regarding the Son, we are conformed.' But by this it is thus apparent: that we differ (at this point) because yours says: thus it is apparent, that 'although He (Spirit) is subordinate to the Son, and that we now we thus concede, nevertheless it does not follow, that He exists from another nature.' Thus when our text says that He is subordinate it also removes the difficulty, since ours says: 'although He follows the Son in order and dignity'. Yours says; although He is subordinate to the Son.'"[49] Montenegro demonstrated by these comparisons that the Latin text showed Basil to affirm an order of dignity within the Trinity, but not an order of nature. In addition, this display of great textual-critical skill was in keeping with the humanist desire to accurately

arrive at the authorial intent, and thus the true meaning of the text. The assembly concluded after the long explanation by Montenegro, there not being enough time for the Greeks to make a response.[51]

The fifth meeting, on March 14, 1439, once again revolved around the disputed text of St. Basil. But one passage in particular became the focal point of debate in this session. The Latins had briefly referred to a homily of St. Basil in the previous meeting in which Basil said "For we do not receive anything from the Spirit in the same way as the Spirit from the Son; but we receive Him [i.e. the Spirit] coming to us and sanctifying us, the communication of divinity, the pledge of eternal inheritance, and the first fruits of the eternal good."[52] Mark argued that in this passage that, "the quotation does not assert that the Spirit receives being from the Son. St. Basil wished to prove that the Spirit is different from the Son..."[53] Mark translated the passage this way: "for indeed, we do not receive anything from the Spirit as (we receive) the Spirit from the Son."[54] In the latter portion of this passage, "as (we receive) the Spirit from the Son," Mark took the position that "Spirit" was in the accusative case: We say "Spirit" (accusative case), because "spirit" in Greek is of neuter gender and as such pneuma (Greek word for spirit) may be either accusative or nominative."[55] Mark's translation made the believer the subject of the action in the phrase

"as (we receive) the Spirit from the Son." This appalled the Latins because it implied that there was a distinction between that which occurred when the believer received the Holy Spirit at salvation (Romans 5:6), and when he or she received spiritual gifts from the Spirit (I Cor. 12). Montenegro expressed his amazement at the translation of the Greeks: When he (Basil) says "just as," the word pneuma (spirit) may not be in the accusative case, because he (Basil) compares our reception with the reception the Spirit has from the Son, as we may say: for indeed, I do not receive anything from the Emperor, as an inferior prelate receives from the Supreme Pontiff; it is impossible for 'the inferior prelate' to be in the accusative case, therefore it necessarily follows, that 'Spirit' is in the nominative case."[56] Montenegro further argued that the context of the passage also supported the Latin view; "But St. Basil says that we do not receive as the Spirit receives, so he was contrasting the uncreated divine essence that the Spirit receives from the Son with the created gifts which we receive from the Spirit, which gifts St. Basil goes on immediately to enumerate in the same passage, and so 'Spirit' must be the subject of the verb, not the object."[57] Mark's translation had introduced a foreign subject into the passage "just as the Spirit from the Son," by taking the "Spirit" as the direct object of the phrase. The Latin translation which regarded the "Spirit" to be the subject of

the phrase, was more natural and better complied with the principles of grammar for the reasons given by Montenegro himself. The Latin objection to Mark's translation created some confusion among the Greek delegation, causing the discussion to be discontinued for a time.[58] The assembly concluded with Montenegro recapitulating the Latin position that St. Basil did indeed understand there to be an order of dignity within the Trinity, but in contrast to the heretic Eunomius, he did not conclude that the Holy Spirit was third in nature.[59] The attention to such matters of detail regarding the disputed text of St. Basil clearly shows the importance of grammar to the debates. The necessity for accuracy in translation and grammatical detail also highlights once again the crucial nature of the work of the humanist Traversari in support of the Latin participants at the council.

The Greeks inaugurated the debate in the next session of March 17, 1439, with Mark attempting to change the format of the previous sessions by making a complete explanation of the Greek position.[60] Mark's intention in this particular meeting was to demonstrate that both the fathers and the Scriptures as well as the councils of the church supported the Greek contention that the Holy Spirit proceeded from the Father alone.[61] Mark began with a familiar quotation from the Scriptures, John 15:26; "'When the Helper shall come, whom I will send from the Father, the Spirit of truth, who

proceeds from the Father, that one (Spirit) will bear witness concerning Me.' In this (statement) since three divine persons are in view, the Lord Himself by these words attributed to whomever He ascribed them his own (nature), but concerning the Spirit alone He says: 'when He shall come', concerning Himself along with the Father He says, 'whom I will send to you from the Father', again concerning the Father alone, 'who proceeds from the Father.' From this you may now see accurate theology."[62] Mark invoked passages from notable Fathers such as Gregory of Nazianzus, and Cyril of Alexandria as well in support of the Greek viewpoint. In addition, he presented excerpts from the proceedings from the councils, for example: "Leontius of Caesarea at the Council of Nicea declared: 'and of the Holy Spirit proceeding from Him, the Father,' adding the word 'Father' lest his hearers should think that he referred to the Son, whom he had mentioned immediately previously."[63]

The Latin delegation was frustrated by the fact that Mark had diverted from the agreed upon format. They were also unhappy because Mark had chosen not to respond to the arguments already set forth by them concerning the disputed passage of St. Basil's Adversus Eunomium.[64] Montenegro showed his frustration with the opposition: "Since therefore the authority of the divine Scripture of Jesus Christ (as quoted by St. Basil, for example) was first placed among (us) by the holy teachers and introduced by strength of

argument, it is wholly absurd and unbecoming of such an audience, to have dismissed this great authority without discussion, without making a reasonable response, to that which they clearly prove, (and now) we must move on to another issue."[65] The Latin orator thereafter challenged Mark to rebut that which has already been set forth by him: "I demand that he (Mark), by an honest pledge and reasoning, might respond to my assertions, because from these we have the clear intention of St. Basil, unless our most holy Lord commands another to me. I have said elsewhere and I say now, that in the third Council (Ephesus, 431 A.D.) this was maintained, as Cyril said, and this ought to be a model to you and to me, as he says: 'following the confessions of the holy fathers, which they made, the Holy Spirit speaking in them, and investigating their understandings we say'; in this way evidences ought to be derived, as we investigate the intentions of the holy (authors)."[66]

Mark, it seems, was still unwilling to return to the text in question, yet when he finally did so later in the session, he once again maintained that the Latin manuscript of St. Basil's Adversus Eunomium was defective. "In that book produced by you there are ambiguities and variations, unlike that text which was established by me, nor in my opinion is it of such a kind, but by a concession (we will discuss it), because we desire to move on to another issue and not to stand on this one, for I have a most accurate

assurance."[67] Montenegro immediately retorted: "You may respond to the argument."[68] Mark replied: "I have chiefly established this, since I know that in the city of Constantinople there are more than a thousand (codices) which conform to ours."[69] Once again Montenegro refused to accept this argument of the Greeks: "One (codex) is false, and a hundred thousand are false."[70] Mark then appealed to Conciliar authority: "Because of their age and number, they (the Greek codices) were approved in the Councils."[71] Montenegro reminded Mark that the Latins had two manuscripts at Florence which supported their interpretation, the Greeks only one: "There are two of ours and one of yours. Speak to the argument, therein is truth."[72]

At this point in the debate, Mark, realizing that the Latins simply would not give up on this issue, took the position the St. Basil was simply conceding a point for the sake of argument, namely, that the Spirit is third in order and dignity, but he did not believe it to be so.[73] Montenegro, of course, vehemently argued against this position, saying that St. Basil, "desiring to prove that the Spirit was second in order and dignity to the Son, and that similarly, the Son (was second) to the Father, began: 'In whatever way', saying, 'as the Son is with respect to the Father, thus is the Spirit in respect to the Son', and he set forth reasons of such kind, that were certainly noted and manifested by him in two preceding books, in which he

demonstrated against Eunomius, that even if the Son is second in order and dignity to the Father, He is nevertheless not second in nature, as Eunomius said, also Arius."[74] But the most important development of this fifth dogmatic session was the announcement by Montenegro that the Latins did not believe, because of their view of the Procession, that there were two causes of the Holy Spirit.[75] He announced "that the Spirit eternally proceeded from the Father and the Son, yet not from two origins, but from one, not from two causes, but from one,"[76] This declaration by Montenegro greatly relieved the Greek delegation, since it coincided with their belief as well. With this statement it appeared among them that there might be enough common ground to build the union after all. Thus this fifth colloquy was brought to an end, having once more provided a clear picture of how greatly the two parties depended upon textual criticism in the promotion of their particular viewpoints. Montenegro also continued to manifest a desire to ascertain the intent of the authors of the texts which were utilized in the debate. This attitude certainly reflects the concern which the humanists had for careful application of a text based on authorial intent. It is noteworthy that the Greeks, despite their refusal to acknowledge the validity of the Latin codex of Basil's Adversus Eunomium, nevertheless did not attempt to refute the Latin assertions regarding the possible falsification of their own documents. In the end

this proved both to strengthen the Latin position and to cause uncertainty among their own delegation.

Immediately prior to the last two meetings on March 21, and 24th, 1439, the Greeks assembled at the request of the Emperor. John VIII made it clear to his congregation that in his pursuit of union with the west he was carrying on the work of his father (Michael VIII Palaeologus).[77] He further implored his countrymen to be receptive to union with the Latins, especially since Montenegro had made it clear that the Latins were not postulating two causes for the Holy Spirit: "Time is going by and we have achieved nothing worth while, and if that goes on what will be the fate of our race? a persecution worse than that of Diocletian and Maximian. So we must give up discussions and find some other means towards union."[78] The Greeks at this point were favorably disposed to union, but the Latins insisted on replying to the arguments set forth by Mark of Ephesus in the previous session.[79]

In the final two sessions of March 21, and 24, 1439, John of Montenegro responded to the full exposition of the Greek position which had been given by Mark. Montenegro drew upon the Scriptures as well as both Latin and Greek fathers in his argumentation. Key points were made during these sessions which were based on grammar, as the following brief examples demonstrate.

Montenegro began by quoting from the Scriptures; "Now

we find in Sacred Scripture, that the Spirit is called 'the Spirit of the Son' according to that 'God sent the Spirit of His Son (to be) in your hearts' (Gal.4:6) and elsewhere, 'whoever does not have the Spirit of Christ, this one is not of Him' (Rom.8:9) and in the Acts of the Apostles 'they tried to enter into Bythinia, and the Spirit of Jesus did not permit (them)(Acts 16:7) and many other similar (passages) in the Scriptures."[80] The construction "Spirit of the Son" indicated that the Spirit "belonged to the Son" a grammatical relationship which, for Montenegro and the Latins, supported an order of dignity within the Trinity. "therefore this has to do with origins, thus it says 'Spirit of the Son', because He is second to the Son in dignity and order and the Son is the beginning of the Spirit."[81] A second Scriptural support for the Latin doctrine of the Procession came from the Gospel of John: "We find in Sacred Scripture chiefly in the Gospel of John, that the Spirit is sent from the Father according to that text 'the Comforter whom the Father sends in My name'. Then it is discovered that He is sent from the Son, when He comes 'Comforter, which I will send to you'.(John 15:26) The Latins made the obvious inference from this statement that since the Holy Spirit is sent from both, that "according to necessity that it presupposes origin from those persons, from whom He is sent."[82] On the basis of this concept of the unified origin of the Spirit, and the normal usage of the word "mittam" (I

shall send), the Latins could adduce a procession of the Holy Spirit from both Father and Son.

The final conclusion which Montenegro drew from the Scriptures related to the phraseology concerning the Procession which was found to be acceptable to the Greeks, namely, that "the Spirit proceeded from the Father through the Son."[83] This formulation had been recently stated in a letter of St. Maximus of Constantinople to a member of the Greek delegation at Florence in which he shared his relief that the Latin position did not promote two causes of the Holy Spirit. On the contrary, he understood that its purpose was "to show the he (Spirit) comes forth through him (Son) and in that way to establish the conjunction and the immutability of substance."[84] The Latins did not object to this formulation, but argued further that there was no difference in accepting the fact that the Holy Spirit proceeded "from", (Greek 'ek') the Father "through" (Greek 'dia', Latin 'per') the Son, and their position that He proceeded from both.[85] The preposition "through" ('dia' or 'per'), commonly signified agency, but the Latins believed there to be no ultimate difference in effect between "through", and "from", which usually denoted source. Montenegro referred to Hebrews 9:14 regarding this issue, quoting from the Scripture which says; "He offered Himself through the Holy Spirit", and the Provincial added; "and thus you may find adduced by this testimony, that the Son

works through the Spirit."[86] Montenegro then brought his argument to a conclusion; "None of the teachers says, that the Son receives essence from the Spirit, but the contrary; so therefore for this reason, just as Christ is a divine person, it is necessary to say, that if He works through the Spirit, then He gives virtuous labor and divine essence to the Spirit, and to receive essence and virtue is itself, what (it means) to proceed."[87]

Montenegro thereafter turned to the fathers of the church, both Latin and Greek in order to demonstrate their support of the Latin position. The opinions of the Greek Fathers were especially important since they were more well known to the eastern church, and commanded a greater respect among the Greek delegation at the council. Accordingly, the Latins attempted to refute the Greek assertions regarding the Procession by recourse to their own fathers, as the following examples show. These excerpts from the final two sessions will suffice to make clear the importance of the humanistic discipline of grammar to the closing arguments of the dogmatic debates.

Athanasius had been quoted many times by Mark of Ephesus, Montenegro therefore drew upon the writings of that revered eastern father in rebuttal; "Thus he says in a dialogue given at Nicea against Arius: 'If the Spirit is not <u>from</u> the substance of the Father and Son, by whose grace did God name Him in the symbol of sanctification saying: 'As you

go, baptize in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit?' Therefore by this authority it is made clear; and from this, what follows, that the Spirit is from the substance of the Father and the Son."[88] And later in the same document Athanasius wrote concerning the importance of a part of speech within the text, the preposition "from" (Latin 'de'); "This preposition 'from' (Latin 'de') conveys beginning and consubstantiality, and to say He is from the substance of the Son, is to say He is substantially from the Son, or that the Son substantially produces Him."[89]

Cyril of Alexandria had been referred to extensively by Mark, Montenegro, in his rebuttal, utilized the work of this same author. Cyril had written a piece against the Nestorian heresy entitled Salvatore Nostro, "Our Savior."[90] In this document, Cyril addressed two primary issues, attacking the Nestorian position which held that Jesus was not "one divine person with two natures," and that "the Spirit was not from the Son nor did He receive His essence from the Son."[91] Cyril declared against the Nestorians, that the Spirit indeed was from the Son, basing his opinion on a grammatical point; " He is called 'Spirit of Truth' and (since) Christ is truth, therefore from this it is not unsuitably said, that He is called Spirit of Truth, and this condition (that He is) by natural origin from the Father is understood from the genitive case, just as the Latin teachers applied: 'and He flows forth from Him (Christ), just as He does from God

the Father'."[92] Lest the Greeks challenge the Latin view at this point regarding whether "to flow forth" from the Son was the same as "to proceed" from Him, Montenegro resumed his quotation from Cyril: " 'By having gone through Christ's discourse, the blessed fathers said they were reminded concerning the Spirit, to believe in Him, as (they had) in the Father and in the Son, (since) He (Spirit) is consubstantial with and surely flows forth (from them), even as it is evident that He proceeds from the source of God and Father'; therefore he (Cyril) declares that "to proceed" and "to flow forth" are the same and since he says "to flow forth" from the Son, it is necessarily appropriate to say according to this opinion from the Savior, which was received by the third synod (Ephesus) and by Chalcedon, that the Spirit thus proceeds from the Son even as (He does) from the Father."[93]

Montenegro dealt once more with the grammatical issue regarding the difference between the phrase "to proceed through the Son" (Greek preposition 'dia') and "to proceed from the Son" (Greek preposition 'ek'), by referring to yet another work of Cyril of Alexandria. The Latin Provincial was able to highlight Cyril's position by examining his work Ad Hermias, a document written as an apologetic against the Arian heresy. Montenegro thus set forth this additional support for the Latin view; "Likewise he (Cyril) says, that this Holy Spirit naturally flows forth from the Father

through the Son, and since formerly he had shown, that it may be impossible (for the Spirit) to proceed through the Son, since He indeed proceeds from the Son, therefore all our teachers and yours (also) rarely or never say 'through the Son', but always 'from the Son', and this is the reason, because although it may be the same in meaning, it is signified in a different way, and no one should believe from this, that the Son may be the instrument, though which the Father produces the Spirit, as Arius has said;"[94] With this line of evidence, Montenegro conclude his arguments from the Fathers, having shown that they clearly supported the Latin understanding of the Procession of the Holy Spirit.

In his final remarks to the Greek delegation, Montenegro summarized his program of debate, clearly implying that to hold a position contrary to that of the Latins was to adhere to heretical doctrine. "From this it is sufficiently evident and clear first from the testimony of Scripture, from the testimonies of so many Fathers Latin and Greek, which were made at the same time and by the illumination of one and the same Spirit, and yet it is marvelled at in this negotiation, that the same fundamental (positions) which the Latin teachers maintained, these same Greek Fathers accepted according to proof, namely that the Spirit is from the Son as from the Father and that they are one beginning, and accordingly, no one may say to the contrary, since they are in fact one beginning, lest he

place a distinction in nature between the Father and Son, as Arius has said."[95] There is no doubt that Montenegro felt that he had successfully declared and defended the Latin doctrine of the Procession of the Holy Spirit, "to my satisfaction I have fulfilled my office in this response."[96]

These last two sessions having been concluded, the Greeks took time to calculate what their response would be. Many of the leading members of the Greek delegation were swayed by the persuasive style of both Cesarini and Montenegro, among them Bessarion and George Scholarius.[97] More than anything, they were overwhelmed by the sheer enormity of evidence brought forth by the Latins. There is no doubt that the grammatical and textual-critical evidence adduced by the westerners also played an important role in convincing some of them to abandon their former views.[98]

Both disciplines of grammar and textual-criticism were employed extensively in the argumentation of the Latins at Florence. These disciplines were absolutely essential to the Latins in proving their assertions concerning the doctrine of the Procession of the Holy Spirit. The fact that such emphasis was placed on grammar and textual criticism in the debates, along with the fact that the entire translation work of the Latins depended completely on the skills of the noted humanist Ambrogio Traversari, strongly suggests that a humanistic approach guided the development, structure and presentation of the Latin argumentations at the council.

ENDNOTES

[1]Eugene F. Rice, Jr. "The Renaissance Idea of Christian Antiquity: Humanist Patristic Scholarship." In Renaissance Humanism: Foundations, Forms, and Legacy ed. Albert Rabil, Jr. (Philadelphia: University of Philadelphia Press, 1988), 17.

[2]Joseph Gill, The Council of Florence (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1961), 118.

[3]Charles L. Stinger, Humanism and the Church Fathers Ambrogio Traversari (1386-1439) (Albany: State University of New York Press, 1977), 211.

[4]Ibid.

[5]Gill, Council, 120-121.

[6]I Corinthians 3:15 NASB (New American Standard Bible).

[7]Gill, Council, 121.

[8]Ibid., 123.

[9]Ivan N. Ostroumoff, The History of the Council of Florence (Boston: Holy Transfiguration Monastery, 1971), 53.

[10]Gill, Council, 123.

[11]Ibid.

[12]Joseph Gill, ed. Concilium Florentinum: Documenta et Scriptores , vol 5. (Rome: Pontificium Institutum Orientalium Studiorum, 1953) Quae Supersunt Actorum Graecorum Concilii Florentini , 23-24.

[13]Ostroumoff, 50.

[14]Ibid., 52.

[15]Gill, Council, 163.

[16]Ibid., 164.

[17]Ibid., 148.

[18]Ibid.

[19]Ibid.

[20]Ibid.

[21]Ibid., 149.

[22]Ibid., 150.

[23]George Hofmann, ed., Concilium Florentinum: Documenta et Scriptores (Rome: Pontificium Institutum Orientalium Studiorum, 1955), vol. 6, Acta Latina Concilii Florentini, by Andreas de Santa Croce, 137.

[24]Ibid.

[25]Ibid.

[26]Ibid.

[27]Ibid., 138.

[28]Ibid.

[29]Ibid.

[30]Ibid., 137.

[31]Gill, Council, 195.

[32]Hofmann, Acta Latina, 143.

[33]Ibid.

[34]Ibid.

[35]Gill, Council, 195.

[36]Hofmann, Acta Latina, 144.

[37]Ibid.

[38]Ibid.

[39]Ibid., 155.

[40]Ibid.

[41]Gill, Council, 200.

[42]Hofmann, Acta Latina, 164.

[43]Gill, Council, 203.

[44]Hofmann, Acta Latina, 167.

[45]Gill, Council, 203-4.

[46]Hofmann, Acta Latina, 168.

[47]Ibid.

[48]Ibid., 170.

[49]Ibid.

[50]Ibid.

[51]Ibid., 173.

[52]Gill, Council, 204.

[53]Ibid., 205.

[54]Hofmann, Acta Latina, 176.

[55]Ibid.

[56]Ibid.

[57]Gill, Council, 206.

[58]Ibid.

[59]Ibid., 207.

[60]Ibid.

[61]Ibid.

[62]Hofmann, Acta Latina, 184.

[63]Gill, Council, 208.

[64]Ibid.

[65]Hofmann, Acta Latina, 187.

[66]Ibid., 188.

[67]Ibid., 193.

[68]Ibid.

[69]Ibid.

[70]Ibid.

[71]Ibid.

[72]Ibid.

[73]Gill, Council, 211.

[74]Hofmann, Acta Latina, 195.

[75]Gill, Council, 212.

[76]Hofmann, Acta Latina, 195.

[77]Gill, Council, 212.

[78]Ibid.

[79]Ibid., 213.

[80]Hofmann, Acta Latina, 197.

[81]Ibid.

[82]Ibid., 198.

[83]Gill, Council, 213.

[84]Ibid.

[85]Ibid., 215.

[86]Hofmann, Acta Latina, 199.

[87]Ibid.

[88]Ibid., 213.

[89]Ibid.

[90]Ibid.

[91]Ibid., 214.

[92]Ibid.

[93]Ibid.

[94]Ibid., 215.

[95]Ibid., 221.

[96]Ibid.

[97]Gill, Council, 224-5.

[98]Ibid., 224.

CONCLUSIONS

It would be impossible to conclusively prove that the Latin participants at the Council of Florence approached their task in the debates through a humanist understanding of the classical disciplines without express statements from them to that effect. Such statements are not available, nor could anyone expect them to be, since even the humanists themselves would not have made them. What is strongly suggested by this analysis, however, is that a humanist methodological approach, as it concerned itself with the art of rhetoric, as well as the literary arts of grammar and textual-criticism, was indeed utilized by the Latin disputants at the council in the preparation and delivery of their arguments.

A definition acceptable to all who have studied humanism in the Renaissance is an elusive goal. Nevertheless it can be stated, as it has been in this work, that the humanists were men who desired to achieve in their own efforts the literary style and virtuous wisdom which they associated with the classical past, both in ancient Greece and republican Rome. For the humanists who were christians, the desire to recover the classical past also included the rediscovery of the writings of the church fathers.

In the early fifteenth century, a number of factors

made the intellectual climate of Florence favorable to the new movement, not the least of which was the renewed interest in Greek studies which was occasioned by the arrival of Manual Chrysoloras in Florence in 1397. This interest in Greek studies prepared the way for a man like Traversari to be able to make his contribution to the council, and fostered an appreciation among the humanist community in Florence for the arrival of the Greeks to that city in 1439.

There is no doubt that for the humanists, the art of rhetoric consisted in the skillful employment of literary style in the construction of an oration, and its persuasive delivery. The speeches delivered at the synod suggest just such a combination. The discourses outlined in chapter 6 of this work all admit to organization according to Ciceronian stylistic methodology, which the humanists were fond of imitating. These orations also were delivered in order to persuade; their intent in this regard is completely obvious, and can be ascertained simply by reading them. Moreover, there are direct statements from Greek delegates, attesting to the persuasiveness of the Latin speeches, which are well documented in the proceedings of the council. Therefore it is quite evident from the examples given in the sixth chapter that the humanist concept of rhetoric, both in its desire to imitate classical style and to persuade, was employed by the Latin orators in the public discourses at

Florence.

Grammar and textual criticism were disciplines necessarily utilized by the humanists in the recovery and translation of the documents of antiquity. These skills proved absolutely essential to the Latin arguments made at the council. Questions regarding the authenticity of the manuscripts involved in the debate, especially St. Basil's Adversus Eunomium, led to the initial success of the Latins in their dispute with their eastern brethren. It was, after all, the fact that the Latins were able to demonstrate the antiquity and correctness of their documents which first caused such able opponents among the Greeks as Bessarion and George Scholarius to doubt the position of their own church regarding the Procession of the Holy Spirit. Montenegro's forceful presentation of grammatical arguments in favor of the Latin position also greatly influenced many of the Byzantine delegates such that substantive obstacles to reunification were removed. The manifestly inaccurate interpretations set forth against them by Mark of Ephesus, on the other hand, undermined the Greek position and provided a great measure of credibility to the Latin view. From the evidence provided in chapter seven concerning the employment of grammar and textual-critical principles in the debates, it seems quite apparent that the the Latins were again guided by the humanist understanding of these skills as they prepared and delivered their appeals.

The adoption of a humanistic methodological approach in the disputations of Florence can certainly be seen as a positive aspect of the council. If the need for unity was the most important issue facing the church prior to Florence, as indeed both Pope Eugenius and Emperor John VIII believed that it was, then the means for achieving that union must be viewed as beneficial. The achievements of the council itself, apart from reunification with the east were many, including the restoration of papal power and prestige; these accomplishments however, could not have occurred apart from the Latin "victory" at the synod.

Ultimately, it was political expediency, and not superior argumentation, which brought about the final acquiescence of the Greeks. Emperor John VIII had been the primary advocate for reunion throughout the deliberations of the council, and his chief concern was to secure western aid in the empire's struggle aginst the Turks. There is no doubt that the Greeks delegates were under tremendous pressure to bring matters to a conclusion in order to provide the means for achieving this goal. The easterners were able to save face doctrinally by accepting the fact that their spiritual ancestors, the Greek fathers, really had said the same thing as the Latins regarding the Procession. This acceptance allowed the Greeks to justify their indorsement of the decrees of the council and subsequent reunion with the west. For the Greeks to have reached such a position would simply

not have been possible without the tremendous skill and effort of the humanist Traversari, whose translation work made the Greek fathers accessible to his countrymen, and whose grammatical expertise provided convincing power to the Latin presentation.

SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

Aston, Margaret. The Fifteenth Century: The Prospect of Europe. New York: W.W. Norton & Co. Inc., 1968.

Augustine, St. City of God. ed. Vernon J. Bourke, trans. by Gerald G. Walsh, S.J., Demetrius B. Zema, S.J., Grace Monahan, O.S.U. and Daniel J. Honan. Garden City: Image Books, 1958.

Baldwin, Charles S. Ancient Rhetoric and Poetic. New York: The MacMillan Co., 1924.

Baron, Hans. "Leonardo Bruni: 'Professional Rhetorician' or 'Civic Humanist'?" Past & Present no. 36, April 1967.

_____. "Toward a More Positive Evaluation of the Fifteenth Century Renaissance." Journal of the History of Ideas vol. IV. January-October, 1943.

Barraclough, Geoffrey. The Medieval Papacy. New York: W.W. Norton and Co. Inc., 1968.

Benson, Thomas W. and Prosser, Michael H. eds. Readings in Classical Rhetoric. Davis: Hermagoras Press, 1988.

Bentley, Jerry H. Humanists and Holy Writ. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1983.

Berkhof, Louis. Principles of Bibilical Interpretation. Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1950.

_____. The History of Christian Doctrines. London: The Banner of Truth Trust, 1969.

Bilderback, Loy. "Eugene IV and the First Dissolution of the Council of Basle". Church History vol. xxxvi September 1967 no. 3.

Boardman, John, Griffin, Jasper, and Murray, Oswin, eds. The Oxford History of the Classical World. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1986.

Breen, Quirinius. Christianity and Humanism. Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans Pub. Co., 1968.

Burkhardt, Jacob. The Civilization of the Renaissance in Italy. vol. I & II., Trans. by S.G.C. Middlemore. New York: Harper & Row Publishers, 1958.

Candal, E. ed. Concilium Florentinum: Documenta et Scriptores. vol. II., Apparatus Super Decretum Florentinum Unionis Graecorum. by Ioannes De Torquemada, O.P. Romae: Pontificium Institutum Orientalium Studiorum, 1942.

_____. ed. Concilium Florentinum: Documenta et Scriptores. vol. VII Fasc. II., De Spiritus Sancti Processione. by Bessarion of Nicea, Romae: Pontificium Institutum Orientalium Studiorum, 1961.

_____. ed. Concilium Florentinum: Documenta et Scriptores. vol. VII Fasc. I., Oratio Dogmatica De Union. Romae: Pontificium Institutum Orientalium Studiorum, 1958.

Cantor, Norman F. Medieval History. New York: The MacMillan Co., 1963.

Cassirer, Ernst. "Some Remarks on the Question of the Originality of the Renaissance". Journal of the History of Ideas vol. IV. January-October, 1943.

_____, Kristeller, P.O. and Randall, J.H. Jr., The Renaissance Philosophy of Man. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1948.

Chastel, Andre. Art of the Italian Renaissance. trans. by Linda and Peter Murray. New York: Arch Cape Press, 1983.

Clark, Donald Lemen. Rhetoric in Greco-Roman Education. Morningside Heights: Columbia University Press, 1957.

Copleston, Frederick, S.J. A History of Philosophy: Greece and Rome Part 1. vol. 1., Garden City: Image Books, 1962.

Creighton, M. A History of the Papacy: From the Great Schism to the Sack of Rome. vol. II., New York: Longmans, Green, and Co., 1897.

Cross, F.L. and Livingston, E.A. The Oxford Dictionary of the Christian Church. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1974.

Crowder, C.M.D. Unity, Heresy, and Reform 1378-1460. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1987.

Cummings, G.J. and Baker, D. eds. Studies in Church History vol. 7, Councils and Assemblies. Cambridge: The Cambridge University Press, 1971.

Cusanus, Nicholas. Of Learned Ignorance. trans. by Fr. Germain Heron, London: Routledge and Kegan Paul Ltd., 1954.

D'Amico, John F. Theory and Practice in Renaissance Textual Criticism. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1988.

Dolan, John P. ed. Unity and Reform. Notre Dame: The University of Notre Dame Press, 1962.

Durant, Will. The Story of Civilization Part IV: The Age of Faith. New York: Simon and Schuster, 1950.

_____. The Story of Civilization Part V: The Renaissance. New York: Simon and Schuster, 1953.

Ferguson, Wallace K. "The Interpretation of the Renaissance: Suggestions for a Synthesis". Journal of the History of Ideas vol. XII., October, 1951.

_____. The Renaissance in Historical Thought. Cambridge: The Riverside Press, 1948.

Geanakoplos, D.J. "Byzantine Empire and & Caesaropapism" Church History vol. 34, 1965.

_____. Byzantium. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1984.

_____. Constantinople and the West. Madison: The University of Wisconsin Press, 1989.

_____. Interaction of the 'Sibling' Byzantine and Western Cultures in the Middle Ages and the Italian Renaissance. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1976.

Gill, Joseph, S.J. Byzantium and the Papacy 1198-1400. New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press, 1979.

_____. ed. Concilium Florentinum: Documenta et Scriptores. vol. V fasc. 1., Quae Supersunt Actorum Graecorum Concilii Florentini, Romae: Pontificium Institutum Orientalium Studiorum, 1953.

_____. Eugenius IV Pope of Christian Union. Westminster: The Newman Press, 1961.

_____. Personalities of the Council of Florence. New York: Barnes & Noble, 1964.

_____. The Council of Florence. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1961.

Gilmore, Myron P. Humanists and Jurists Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1963.

_____. The World of Humanism, 1453-1517. New York: Harper Publishers, 1952.

Graves, Frank P. A History of Education During the Middle Ages and the Transition to Modern Times. Westport: Greenwood Press Publishers, 1970.

Gray, Hanna H. "Renaissance Humanism: The Pursuit of Eloquence", Journal of the History of Ideas vol. 24 no.4, 1963.

Griffiths, Gordon. "Leonardo Bruni and the Restoration of the University of Rome (1406)". Renaissance Quarterly vol. XXVI no.1, Spring 1973.

Hall, F.W. A Companion to Classsical Texts. Chicago: Argonaut Inc., 1970.

Hammond, N.G.L. and Scullard, H.H. The Oxford Classical Dictionary. Oxford: The Oxford University Press, 1970.

Hay, Denis. Europe in the Fourteenth and Fifteenth Centuries. London: Longman Group Ltd., 1966.

_____. The Church in Italy in the Fifteenth Century. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1977.

Hofman, G. ed. Concilium Florentinum: Documenta et Scriptores. vol. VI, Acta Latina Concilii Florentini. by Andreas de Santa Croce, Romae: Pontificium Institutum Orientalium Studiorum, 1955.

_____. ed. Concilium Florentinum: Documenta et Scriptores. vol. III, Fragmenta Protocolli Diaria Privata, Sermones. Romae: Pontificium Institutum Orientalium Studiorum, 1951.

Jacobsen, Eric. Translation, A Traditional Craft Copenhagen: Gyldendalske Boghandel-Nordisk Forlag, 1958.

Kahn, Victoria. "The Rhetoric of Faith and the Use of Usage in Lorenzo Valla's De Libero Arbitrio". The Journal of Medieval and Renaissance Studies vol. 13 no. 1, Spring 1983.

Kennedy, George A. A History of Rhetoric vol. III: Greek Rhetoric Under Christian Emperors. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1983.

Kristeller, Paul Oskar. Eight Philosophers of the Italian Renaissance. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1964.

_____. Medieval Aspects of Renaissance Learning. ed. and trans. by Edward P. Mahoney. Durham: Duke University Press, 1974.

_____. Renaissance Concepts of Man, and Other Essays. New York: Harper & Row, 1972.

_____. Renaissance Thought and the Arts. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1965.

_____. Renaissance Thought and the Classic, Scholastic and Humanist Strains. New York: Harper & Row Publishers, 1955.

_____. The Classics and Renaissance Thought. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1955.

_____. "The Place of Classical Humanism in Renaissance Thought". Journal of the History of Ideas. vol. IV, January-October 1943.

Kustas, George, L. "The Function and Evolution of Byzantine Rhetoric". Viator vol. I, 1970.

Lampe G.W.H. ed. The Cambridge History of the Bible vol. 2: The West From the Fathers to the Reformation. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1969.

Laurent, V. ed. Concilium Florentinum: Documenta et Scriptores. vol. IX, Le Memoirs Du Grand Ecclesiarque De L'Eglise De Constantinople. by Sylvester Syropoulos. Romae: Pontificium Institutum Orientalium Studiorum, 1971.

Leith, John H. ed. Creeds of the Churches. Atlanta: John Knox Press, 1982.

Lucas, Henry S. The Renaissance and Reformation. New York: Harper & Brothers Publishers, 1934.

Marrou, H.I. A History of Education in Antiquity. trans. by George Lamb. New York: Sheed and Ward, 1956.

Murray, Gilbert. Greek Studies. Oxford: Oxford at the Clarendon Press, 1946.

McKeon, Richard ed. Introduction to Aristotle. New York: The Modern Library, 1947.

_____. "Rhetoric in the Middle Ages". Speculum vol. XVII, January, no. I, 1942.

Ostroumoff, Ivan N. The History of the Council of Florence. Boston: Holy Transfiguation Monastery, 1971.

Pelikan, Jaroslav. The Christian Tradition vol. 3: The Growth of Medieval Theology (600-1300). Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1978.

_____. The Christian Tradition vol. 4: Reformation of Church and Dogma (1300-1700). Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1984.

Perreiah, Alan. "Humanistic Critiques of Scholastic Dialectic". The Sixteenth Century Journal vol, XIII, no. 3, Fall 1982.

Piccolomini, Aeneas Sylvius. De Gestis Concilii Basilensis Commentariorum Libri II. eds. Denys Hay and W.K. Smith, Oxford: Oxford at the Clarendon Press, 1967.

_____. Memoirs of a Renaissance Pope: the Commentaries of Pius II. ed. Leona C. Gabel Trans. by Florence A. Gragg, New York: Capricorn Books, 1959.

Rabil, Albert. ed. Renaissance Humanism: Foundations, Forms and Legacy. Vol. I: Humanism in Italy. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1988.

_____. Renaissance Humanism: Foundations, Forms and Legacy. Vol. II: Humanism Beyond Italy. Philadelphia: University of Philadelphia Press, 1988.

_____. Renaissance Humanism: Foundations, Forms and Legacy. Vol. III: Humanism and the Disciplines. Philadelphia: University of Philadelphia Press, 1988.

Reynolds, L.D. and Wilson, N.G. Scribes and Scholars. Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1974.

Runciman, Steven. The Great Church in Captivity. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1968.

Schaff, Philip. History of the Christian Church. Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdman's Publishing Co., 1910.

_____. and Wace, Henry, eds. Nicene and Post Nicene Fathers of the Christian Church vol. XIV, The Seven Ecumenical Councils. Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1988.

_____. The Creeds of Christendom. Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1985.

Seigel, Jerrold E. Rhetoric and Philosophy in Renaissance Humanism. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1968.

Spitz, Lewis W. The Religious Renaissance of the German Humanists. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1963.

_____. The Renaissance and Reformation Movements vol. 1 The Renaissance. St. Louis: Concordia Pub. House, 1971.

Stevens, H.J. "Lorenzo Valla and Isidore of Seville". Traditio vol. XXXI, 1975.

Stinger, Charles L. Humanism and the Church Fathers: Ambrogio Traversari (1386-1439). Albany: State University of New York Press, 1977.

Stuhlmacher, Peter. Historical Criticism and Theological Interpretation of Scripture. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1977.

Taylor, Henry O. The Medieval Mind. vol. 1, Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1951.

Tierney, Brian. Foundations of the Conciliar Theory. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1955.

_____. "Ockham, the Conciliar Theory and the Canonists". Journal of the History of Ideas 15, 1954.

_____. "Hermeneutics and History: The Problem of Haec Sancta," chap. in Church Law and Constitutional Thought in the Middle Ages. London: Variorum Reprints, 1977.

Toffanin, Giuseppe. History of Humanism. New York: Las Americas Pub. Co., 1954.

Trinkaus, Charles. "Humanism, Religion and Society: Concepts and Motivations of Som Recent Studies". Renaissance Quarterly vol. XXIX no. 4, Winter, 1976.

_____. In Our Image and Likeness. vols. 1 & 2, Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1970.

_____. The Scope of Renaissance Humanism. Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan Press, 1983.

Tsirpanlis, Constantine N. Mark Eugenicus and the Council of Florence, A Historical Re-Evaluation of His Personality. New York: Center for Byzantine Studies, University of Thessaloniki, 1979.

Ullman, Berthold. The Humanism of Coluccio Salutati. Padua: Editrice Antenore, 1963.

Ullmann, Walter. Medieval Foundations of Renaissance Humanism. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1977.

_____. The Growth of Papal Government in the Middle Ages. London: Methuen & Co. Ltd., 1955.

Whibley, Leonard. A Companion to Greek Studies. Cambridge: Cambridge at the University Press, 1906.

Wilcox, Donald. In Search of God and Self: Renaissance and Reforamtion Thought. Boston: Houghton-Mifflin 1975.

Witt, Ronald. "Medieval 'Ars Dictaminis' and the Beginnings of Humanism: A New Construction of the Problem". Renaissance Quarterly vol. XXXV no. 1, Spring, 1982.