

PONTIFICIO CONSIGLIO PER I TESTI LEGISLATIVI
XX ANNIVERSARIO
DELLA PROMULGAZIONE DEL CODICE DEI CANONI DELLE CHIESE ORIENTALI
18.10.1990 - 18.10.2010

CONVEGNO DI STUDIO

*Il Codice delle Chiese Orientali:
la storia, le legislazioni particolari, le prospettive ecumeniche,
Roma, 8-9 ottobre 2010*

The Council in Trullo in the Eastern Code and its Incidence on Ecumenism

Rev. Prof. GEORGE NEDUNGATT, S.J.

Pontificio Istituto Orientale

COMUNICAZIONE

Summary: 1. A Divisive Ecumenical Council?; 2. Overcoming the division; 3. The Name; 4. Historical Context and Date; 5. The Canons; 6. The Council in Trullo an Ecumenical Council; 7. The Two Name; Conclusion.

The 1995 edition of the *Codex Canonum Ecclesiarum Orientalium fontium annotatione auctus* cites the Quinisext Council as a source, placing this council among the ecumenical councils of the first millennium when the East and the West were united as one Church. However, this council, which is called also the Council in Trullo and is dated 692, is not generally recognized as an ecumenical council in modern Latin canonistics. This constitutes an important difference between the two common codes of the Catholic Church, the CIC and the CCEO, a difference which can have some incidence on the East West ecumenical relations.

1. A Divisive Ecumenical Council?

In the comparative study of the two codes of the Catholic Church, the Eastern Code and the Western Code, which has been increasingly adopted as the proper methodology of the study of canon law in the two decades following the promulgation of the *Codex Canonum Ecclesiarum Orientalium*, students of Latin canon law may be surprised or puzzled to see references to a council called Quinisext or the Council in Trullo in the Eastern Code. The 1995 edition of the CCEO *fontium annotatione auctus* contains a reference to this council already in the footnote to canon 2, which reads: «*Canones Codicis, in quibus plerumque ius antiquum Ecclesiarum orientalium recipitur vel accommodatur, praecipue ex illo iure*

aestimandi sunt» («The canons of the Code, in which the ancient law of the Eastern Churches has been mostly received or adapted, are to be assessed chiefly by that law»). By *ius antiquum* (ancient law) is meant the sacred canons. The sources of canon 2 mentioned in the footnote are: "Chalc. can. 1; Quinisext can. 2; Nic. II, can 1; Constantinop. IV, can. 1. Placed between the two ecumenical councils of Chalcedon and of Nicea n, the Quinisext council is presented here obviously as an ecumenical council. It is explicitly stated in the «De accessu ad fontes», which figures as a kind of appendix to the 1995 edition of the CCEO, that the order of citing the sacred canons is the one adopted by the Quinisext Council in its second canon: «ponuntur fontes ex profunditate historiae Ecclesiae hausti, inter quos primum locum tenent "Sacri Canones", dispositi iuxta ordinem in secunda Quinisexti Concilii regula statutum». ¹ It is thus made quite clear that this council is treated in the CCEO as one of the ecumenical councils of the first millennium. This fact can be perplexing to many students of the Latin code, which does not mention the Quinisext/Trullan Council anywhere, not even in the 1989 edition with the sources. ² This absence may cause concern to ecumenists. For Church unity is not only a matter of faith but also of discipline. This was stated recently in quite explicit terms by the Joint International Commission for the Catholic-Orthodox ecumenical dialogue, which met at Ravenna on 8-15 October 2007. ³ Regarding the relevance of canon law to ecumenism, the Ravenna Agreed Statement affirms: «In order for there to be full ecclesial communion, there must be between our Churches reciprocal recognition of canonical legislations in their legitimate diversities» (16). For «the decisions of the Ecumenical Councils remain normative ... their solemn doctrinal decisions and their common faith formulations, especially on crucial points are binding for all the Churches and all the faithful, for all times and all places» (no. 35).

It is often stated that on the basis of the dogmatic definitions and canonical legislation of the seven ecumenical councils of the first millennium the East and the West are already united. But the canonical legislation of the Quinisext/Trullan Council with its 102 canons is the most voluminous disciplinary corpus of the first millennium; and if precisely on this council the East and the West are divided, – the East recognizing it while the West repudiates it – it would seem to be paradoxical, or even contradictory, to speak of unity. Rather it would seem that logically we should say that the East and the West are divided on the Quinisext/Trullan Council, turning the oft-mentioned first millennium unity into a

¹ PONTIFICIUM CONSILIUM DE LEGUM TEXTIBUS INTERPRETANDIS, *Codex Canonum Ecclesiarum Orientalium auctoritate Ioannis Pauli PP. promulgatus, fontium annotatione auctus*, Libreria Editrice Vaticana, 1995, p. 565.

² *Codex Iuris Canonici fontium annotatione et indice analitico-alphabetico auctus*, Libreria Editrice Vaticana, 1989.

³ JOINT INTERNATIONAL COMMISSION FOR THE THEOLOGICAL DIALOGUE BETWEEN THE ROMAN CATHOLIC CHURCH AND THE ORTHODOX CHURCH, *Ecclesiology and Canonical Consequences of the Sacramental Nature of the Church: Ecclesial Communion, Conciliarity, and Authority in the Church* (the «Ravenna Document») October 13, 2007. http://www.Vatican.va/roman_curia/pontifical_councils/chrstuni/ch_orthodox_docs/rcjpc_chrstuni_doc_2W_1013_documento-ravenna_en.html (accessed January 31, 2010). Hereafter this document will be referred to by paragraph number.

mirage. Such then is our statement of the problem. And it may be added that, although the Quinisext/Trullan Council deals exclusively with discipline or Church order and not with issues of faith, it is significant not only for canon law but also for dogmatic theology, Church history, liturgy, moral theology, art, etc.

The Quinisext/Trullan Council will strike as divisive if we take a look at the most widely used edition of the decrees of ecumenical councils in the Catholic Church today. This is, as is well-known, *Conciliorum oecumenicorum decreta*, the first edition of which appeared in 1962 edited by a five-member team headed by Giuseppe Alberigo of the Istituto di scienze religiose of Bologna. Abbreviated COD, it included twenty councils from Nicea I to Vatican I, but it did not include the Quinisext/Council in Trullo. This publication was a runaway success. Appearing on the eve of Vatican II in an attractive edition, it was soon in great demand and rushed into a second edition in the same year 1962. The third edition appeared in 1973 and included the documents of Vatican II. It was translated into several languages (Italian, English, German, French, and Korean) and has remained a standard reference work ever since.⁴ Adhering to the lead of Cesare Baronio, it omitted the Quinisext/ Trullan Council along with Toledo XI, while recognizing that they were «in themselves of great importance historically».⁵ However, since fourteen canons of the Quinisext/Trullan Council had been cited by the Second Council of Nicea (787), and these canons were duly mentioned by COD in the footnotes to the Nicene decrees and properly indexed under «Particular Councils».⁶

2. *Overcoming the Division*

There was some debate among the five member editorial committee of COD (G. Alberigo, J. A. Dossetti, P.-P. Joannou, C. Leonardi and P. Prodi) about the question of including or excluding certain councils as ecumenical. About this debate and diversity of opinion there is a veiled reference in the statement of Hubert Jedin, the consultant editor, who wrote in the preface:

It is ... as accurate a text as is presently possible of the canons and decrees of the twenty councils which are recognized by the Roman Catholic Church [as ecumenical]. Some explanation is needed here. For although only the twenty councils which are regarded as «ecumenical» are included, the editors are aware that this numbering is due more to custom than to any declaration of ecclesiastical authority.⁷

⁴ For the English edition, see NORMAN P. TANNER, ed., *Decrees of the Ecumenical Councils*, 2 vols. (Washington: Georgetown University, 1990).

⁵ GIUSEPPE ALBERIGO ET AL., eds., with HUBERT JEDIN, *Conciliorum oecumenicorum decreta* (Bologna: Istituto di scienze religiose, 1962), p. xvii; TANNER, I, p. xiii.

⁶ For the index see ALBERIGO, *Loci conciliorum*, p. 21*; TANNER, II, *Index of Councils*, pp. 1193-1194.

⁷ ALBERIGO, COD, vii-ix, at vii.

In fact, as I shall mention shortly, one of the five co-editors, Pericles-Pierre Joannou, published in the same year 1962 a collection of the canons and decrees of the ecumenical councils of the first millennium including the Quinisext/Trullan Council. But let us first follow the success story of COD, which as we said ran into a second edition in same year 1962 and came out with a third edition in 1973. In 2006 a fourth edition (although not so qualified explicitly) of COD was announced and its first volume appeared, again under the general editorship of Giuseppe Alberigo, although not published by the Istituto di scienze religiose of Bologna, but by Brepols of Turnhout.⁸ The new edition has a revised title: *Conciliorum oecumenicorum generaliumque decreta: Editio critica* (hereafter COGD). Volume 1 of COGD (hereafter COGD-I) is entitled in English (no more in Latin), *The Oecumenical Councils from Nicaea I to Nicea II (325-787)*.⁹ The most notable novelty of COGD-I is the inclusion of the Council in Trullo among the ecumenical councils.¹⁰ This has been a matter of surprise or perplexity for many Western readers. Surely this publication of COGD-I in 2006, with the Council in Trullo included, marks a significant change or a new development. It indicates progress of scholarship in the study of the ecumenical councils.

A few landmarks of this change and progress may be indicated. As mentioned earlier, already in 1962, the same year as the publication of the first edition of COD, Périclès-Pierre Joannou, one of its five co-editors of COD, brought out another edition of the texts of the ecumenical councils. It included the Council in Trullo called also the Quinisext Council. It was entitled in French *Les Canons des conciles œcuméniques* and belonged among the *Fonti*, the sources of the Eastern canon law published by the Pontifical Commission for the Redaction of the Eastern Code of Canon Law.¹¹ Its Greek text marked an improvement on the standard Greek Orthodox edition of Rhalles-Potles.¹² The most competent reviewers of this work expressed satisfaction at the inclusion of the Council in Trullo as constituting the

⁸ GIUSEPPE ALBERIGO ET ALII (nine others), ed., *Conciliorum oecumenicorum generaliumque decreta*, vol. 1 (Turnhout: Brepols, 2006).

⁹ Volume 2 has not yet appeared but is scheduled to deal with the medieval Councils (869-1517). Volume 3 was published recently by Brepols and carries the title *The Oecumenical Councils of the Roman Catholic Church, From Trent to Vatican II 1545 – 1965* with a change in the title as announced in 2006, which was *The General Councils of the Roman Catholic Church, 1545-1965*. Volume 4 was scheduled to contain a «History of the Councils», a «Bibliography of the Councils», and several indexes. This project is said to have been expanded to include a volume on the general councils of Orthodoxy and another volume on those of Protestantism.

¹⁰ Its novelty is highly appreciated by UGO ZANETTI, who observes: «An important addition, that of the Quinisext council or “in Trullo” of 692 (by G. NEDUNGATT AND S. AGRESTINI) ... was lacking in the previous editions of 1962 and 1973. Its decrees are indeed a fundamental source of canon law and liturgy of the Churches of the Byzantine tradition, and it has always been regarded by them as “ecumenical” ... a happy innovation» (review of COGD-I, *Irenikon* 80 [2007] 711-12, at 712).

¹¹ PERICLES-PIERRE JOANNOU, *Discipline générale antique*, vol. 1, *Les canons des conciles œcuméniques*, *Fonti*, fasc. 9, Pontificia commissione per la redazione del codice di diritto canonico orientale (Rome: Tipografia Italo-Orientale «S. Nilo», 1962).

¹² GEORGIOS A. RHALLES and MICHAEL POTLES, eds., *Syntagma tōn Theōn kai hierōn Kanonōn tōn te hagiōn kai paneuphēmōn Apostolōn...*, 6 vols. (Athens: Chartofylax, 1852-1859; Athens: Kassandra M. Girgori, 1966) (see 2:295-554 for the Council in Trullo with the commentaries of Zonaras, Balsamon, and Aristenus).

principal source of the common discipline of the Eastern Churches.¹³ Indeed, one may say that this edition had a sort of semiofficial character inasmuch as it carried a preface by Cardinal Peter-Gregory Agagianian, secretary (today equivalently prefect) of the Congregation for the Eastern Churches, who was also president of the aforesaid Pontifical Commission. Joannou's work was published as the work of this commission. However, this work went almost unnoticed by the wider reading public in the West, being eclipsed by its bestselling rival COD, which, as we said, after some debate in the editorial group, had been published without including the Council in Trullo. However, it is remarkable that two Catholic editions of the ecumenical councils appeared in the same year 1962, of which one featured 20 councils (up to 1870, including Vatican Council I), while the other contained seven ecumenical councils (up to 787, including Nicea II). The former excluded the Council in Trullo/Quinisext Council; the latter included it.

The year 1991-1992 marked a turning point with the thirteenth centenary of the Council in Trullo/Quinisext Council. It was celebrated in several places including Istanbul,¹⁴ Rome,¹⁵ and Brookline (Massachusetts).¹⁶ A number of studies were published on this occasion and a scholarly consensus emerged about the status of this council as being ecumenical. In the following decade this consensus gained momentum among scholars in the West.¹⁷ The time was mature for the appearance in 2006 of COGD-I with a more international participation of scholars. It was published, as stated earlier, not by Istituto di scienze religiose of Bologna, but by Brepols of Turnhout.

At the invitation of Giuseppe Alberigo, the general editor, I wrote the introduction to the Council in Trullo in COGD-I. Earlier, in 1995, I had coedited a collective work on the Council in Trullo containing the papers of the Roman centenary symposium and had written its introduction and collaborated with Michael Featherstone, who translated into English the canons of this council.¹⁸ In what follows I will briefly present this council, stressing its credentials for inclusion among the ecumenical councils. It should be noted at

¹³ Such as VITALIEN LAURENT, «L'Oeuvre canonique du concile in Trullo (691-692): Source primaire du droit de l'Église orientale», *Revue des études byzantines* 13(1965) 7-41.

¹⁴ See seven articles in *Annuario historiae conciliorum* 24 (1992) 78-185, 273-285; see esp. HEINZ OHME, «Zum Konzilsbegriff des Concilium Quinisextum» 112-126.

¹⁵ GEORGE NEDUNGATT and MICHAEL FEATHERSTONE, eds., *The Council in Trullo Revisited*, *Kanonika* 6 (Rome: Pontificio Istituto Orientale, 1995). Among the seven articles included in this volume (189-451) see esp.: VITTORIO PERI, «Introduzione» 15-36; PETER LANDAU, «Überlieferung und Bedeutung der Kanones des Trullanischen Konzils im westlichen kanonischen Recht» 215-28; and HEINZ OHME, «Die sogenannten „antirömischen“ Kanones des Concilium Quinisextum» 307-22 (summaries in English, 455-62).

¹⁶ *Greek Orthodox Theological Review* 37 (1992) 1-246.

¹⁷ Among the recent publications that recognize the ecumenical standing of the Quinisext/Trullan Council may be mentioned *The Cambridge History of the Byzantine Empire c. 500-1492*, ed. JONATHAN SHEPARD (New York: Cambridge University, 2008); see esp. ANDREW LOUTH, «Byzantium transforming (600-700)» 244-48.

¹⁸ GEORGE NEDUNGATT and MICHAEL FEATHERSTONE, eds., *The Council in Trullo Revisited*, *Kanonika* 6 (Rome: Pontificio Istituto Orientale, 1995).

the outset, in order to avoid any misunderstanding, that it is a council *sui generis* and does not raise the number of the ecumenical councils of the first millennium from seven to eight – the traditional number seven remains unchanged. This is but one of several peculiarities of the Council in Trullo.

The COGD-I now presents the decrees or canons of this council in the original Greek and a Latin version in the best currently available critical texts, but there is no accompanying translation into a modern language like English, although the subtitle is «The Oecumenical Councils From Nicaea I to Nicaea II (325-787)». The absence of a translation into a modern language will be a difficulty for many readers, especially students.¹⁹ Moreover, its outstanding novelty, namely, its inclusion of the Trullan Council, has already been misunderstood as the addition of an eighth ecumenical council to the traditional seven of the first millennium.²⁰ The layout of the table of contents of COGD-I is perhaps partly to blame for creating this erroneous impression. However, a careful reading of the introduction to the Council in Trullo could prevent or dissipate any such misconception.

For the success of the ongoing Catholic-Orthodox ecumenical dialogue it is important to have and promote a proper understanding and appreciation of the Trullan Council. Whereas in the East the status of the Council in Trullo as an ecumenical council was never in doubt, in the West it has had a mixed reception. After an initially negative response, it was received and was for long on the canon of the councils till the late Middle Ages when its ecumenicity was denied. And then finally it was let slip into limbo. Although recent scholarship, has rescued it and placed it back in the canon of the ecumenical councils, most of those in the West who use COD as the standard reference work on ecumenical councils are not likely even to have heard of the Trullan Council. Even its name may need explanation.

¹⁹ For an English translation, see *Council in Trullo Revisited* 55-185 (together with the original Greek text and an ancient Latin version). For an earlier English version, see HENRY R. PERCIVAL, *The Seven Ecumenical Councils*, vol. 14 of *A Select Library of Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers of the Christian Church*, ser. 2 (1899; Grand Rapids, Mich: Eerdmans, 1979) 359-408. For a German translation see HEINZ OHME, *Concilium Qumisextum: Das Konzil Quinisextum*, *Fontes Christiani* 82 (Tumhout: Brepols, 2006) 160-293; see also the bibliography, 294-334. For an Italian translation of the canons of the Council in Trullo from the Greek text of Joannou by CARLA NOCE, see ANGELO DI BERARDINO, ed., *I canoni dei concili della chiesa antica*, *Studia Ephemeridis Augustinianum* 95 (Rome: Augustinianum, 2006) 91-182.

²⁰ HERMANN-JOSEF SIEBEN, for example, writes: «The first volume contains eight councils, that is, besides the seven ancient ecumenical synods from Nicea I to Nicea II of the undivided Christendom, the Council in Trullo, which did not figure in the earlier editions. It is now joined no longer to the earlier Council of Constantinople (680- 681) but is introduced as a council by itself, the Council in Trullo» (review of COGD-I, *Theologie und Philosophie* 82 [2007] 284-87, at 284, my translation). Sieben adds that COGD-I contains «together with the Synod in Trullo a total of eight synods of the ancient Church». But this is a misunderstanding, as the contrary is stated clearly in the introduction to the Trullan Council in COGD-I, 205-15.

3. The Name

The Council in Trullo is so called after the Domed Hall (Greek, *ho troûllos*, from late Latin *trullus*, «dome») of the imperial palace of Constantinople, where the Council Fathers assembled. Emperor Justinian II convoked the council ten years after the sixth ecumenical council (Constantinople II, 680-681), which had been wholly occupied with Monothelitism just as the fifth ecumenical council (Constantinople I, 553) was concerned entirely with questions of faith raised by the «Three Chapters». Neither of these two councils had dealt with matters of discipline. Matters of faith already settled, the agenda of the present council focused on what was left over, namely, discipline. For this reason it was regarded as completing the sixth council of 680-681 in a sort of second session held in 692. In the twelfth century, however, the Byzantine canonist Balsamon (ca. 1135 - ca. 1195) attached it also to the fifth council and named it *Penthekte* (Latin, *Quinisextum*), literally, «fifth-sixth» council.²¹ This neologism was designed to draw attention to the fact that the Trullan Council was the canonical completion of *both* the Fifth and the Sixth Ecumenical Councils. In the Greek tradition ecumenical councils are regularly called the «First Council» (Nicaea I), the «Third Council» (Ephesus), etc., a tradition that was received also in the West and preserved by the classical canonists like Gratian. Local councils are not named thus with an ordinal number. Hence the designation «fifth-sixth» stamped the Trullan Council as ecumenical, but without the claim to be ecumenical on its own detached from the Sixth Council, Constantinople in (680-681). Since, however, numerical designation of councils is no more traditional in the West, and «Quinisext» might seem to prejudice dogmatically the question of ecumenicity from the start, it may be preferable to use the rather neutral title «in Trullo» as a purely historical designation. Indeed, the council of 680-681 was also held in the same Domed Hall and so one might call it «Trullanum I», as some indeed have done. However, this would be mere Latin logic, which could go on to require that the Quinisext council should be called «Trullanum II». Such specifications or distinctions are foreign to the Greek historical sources, in which the name «the Council in Trullo in Constantinople» or simply «the Council in Trullo» is well-established, so that the manuscript and historiographical tradition precludes any danger of confusion.

A further caution for Western students, who are used to expressions like «the Council of Nicaea», «the Council of Chalcedon» etc., with the genitive of place, is that the Greek uses the locative, as in «the Council *in* Nicaea», or «the Council *in* Chalcedon», etc. The present council follows this Greek usage in its being called «Council *in* Trullo» or the «Trullan Council» (*Concilium Trullanum*). But to call it «Council of Trullo» would betray ignorance of the long established terminology.

²¹ MIGNE, PG 137.508d; *Syntagma tōn Theōn kai hierōn Kanonōn* 2:300.

4. Historical Context and Date

For 240 years after the Council of Chalcedon (451) no ecumenical council had issued any norms of Church discipline. Meanwhile the Eastern Roman (or Byzantine) Empire had undergone profound social, demographic, and political changes, being especially convulsed with «the invasions of die barbarians» (the Slavs, the Persians, and the Arabs). The Empire had practically shrunk to Asia Minor in the East, and to Rome and Ravenna in the West. Ethnic minorities such as the Armenians were asserting themselves and following their different traditions in liturgy and discipline. The Christian Empire was in a crisis, and this was interpreted as divine punishment for moral failures. There was a general decadence of order and of morals, which affected even clerics and monks. Paganism, Judaism, and certain heresies had revived or made deep inroads. As the Church and the Empire constituted a single social unit, Emperor Justinian I (483-565) had enacted much legislation affecting the Church, but this legislation had not been conciliarly received. It was in this context that Emperor Justinian II (685-695, 705-711) as «the Guardian of the Orthodox Faith» and the holder of the highest sacral-political power convoked the Trullan Council. He was young, not yet twenty-five years old (born ca. 668), sanguine and ardently orthodox Church reform through disciplinary updating was the agenda he set for the new council.

The date of the Council in Trullo cannot be determined with precision from the available sources. Canon 3 places it in the year 6200 of the world, that is, between September 1, 691 and August 31, 692. Within this period, some scholars opt for autumn 691, and some even indicate more precisely October 691. But presuming that the ancient custom of synods assembling in the period following Easter was observed, many others think of the spring of 692 as more probable.

5. The Canons

The Fathers of the Council of Chalcedon had decreed in their first canon: «We decree that the canons established by the holy fathers in each and every council are to remain in force».²² But Chalcedon had not issued an official list of these councils; and so there was need for a council of equal authority to fill in that lacuna, which the Council in Trullo set out to do in its second canon. An earlier effort to dress up a canon of councils was the compilation known as the *Synagoga L Titulorum* by John Scholasticus, Patriarch of Constantinople (569-577), in which he assembled the canons of the councils to which the Fathers of Chalcedon had referred. To these he added 68 canons of Basil of Caesarea, justifying the addition by the authority of this great Cappadocian Father.²³ Following the

²² My translation.

²³ VLADIMIR N. BENEŠEVIČ, *Sinagoga v 50 titulov I drugie juridiceskie sborniki Ioanna Scholastika: k drevnejšej istorii istocnikov prava greko-vostocnoj cerkvi* (St. Petersburg, 1914) 217-19; for the text, see BENEŠEVIČ, ed., *Ioannis Scholastici Synagoga L Titulorum ceteraque eiusdem opera iuridica* (Munich: Bayerischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, 1937).

lead of John Scholasticus, a more complete manual known as the *Syntagma of XIV Titles* was compiled at Constantinople, «most probably in 629», by an expert with the approval of the patriarch, who added the canons of the other Fathers not mentioned in the *Synagoga*.²⁴ For at least six decades this *Syntagma of XIV Titles* had been practically the manual of canon law in use at the see of Constantinople. In his admirable edition and study of this work, Vladimir Benešević writes: «The Council in Trullo in 692 made use of the *Syntagma* to compose its list of canons» and enumerated in its second canon «the very same authors and in exactly the same order».²⁵ When these facts are considered, what struck the Western polemicists as lack of discussion and haste in the conduct of the Council in Trullo can be seen in a different light. The agenda of the council was mostly well-trodden ground for the Eastern participants, whereas the Western delegates might have felt disoriented.

Following conciliar practice, the Trullan Council with its first canon received and confirmed the *faith* of the Church defined by the preceding six ecumenical councils. Its second canon received and confirmed the ecclesiastical *canons*, the canons of all the four preceding ecumenical councils; the canons of all the local councils of the East and of two local councils of the West (Serdica and Carthage); and the canons of the Fathers and of those of the Apostles as received by the Fathers. Thus the Trullan Council sanctioned a corpus of 643 canons of varying origin and authority, thereby investing them with its own authority. It then added 100 canons of its own, divided into three sections corresponding to the threefold division of persons in the Church, which is traditional in the East: «priests and clerics» (cc. 3-39), «monks and nuns» (cc. 40-49), and «laypeople» (cc. 50-102). Except for the canons of the second group, which is homogeneous, the other two are in fact a medley of canons put together under two convenient heads: *klerikoi* and *laikoi*. Taken together, it can be said that the 102 Trullan canons leave hardly any aspect of ecclesial and social life untouched. A few examples will show this.

In section 1, some canons concern matters that would be regarded today as belonging to the Church's constitutional structure rather than to clerics as such; thus they are of interest to theology. An example is the canon determining the precedence of the patriarchal sees. To the see of Constantinople is assigned an authority based on seniority (*presbeia*) equal to that of the senior Rome (36). Another canon confirms the policy that the civil rank of cities must be respected in establishing ecclesiastical structures (c. 37). A third canon decrees that country and village parishes are to remain under the authority of the local bishop (c. 25). Other canons reinforce an existing norm: the metropolitan is to convoke a provincial synod each year (c. 8); the respective age for the ordination of presbyters, deacons and deaconesses is fixed (c. 14); simony is forbidden (cc. 22, 23).

²⁴ VLADIMIR N. BENEŠEVIČ, *Kanoničeskij sbornik XIV titulov so vtoroj četverti VII veka do 883 g.* (St Petersburg, 1905) 227-29; for the date see 229-30, § 8.

²⁵ *Ibid.* 241-42, § 5.

As regards clerical celibacy, the Council in Trullo canonized the civil law forbidding bishops to cohabit with their wives (c. 12) but did not impose any such restriction on presbyters and deacons. In this it claimed to «adhere strictly to the Apostolic norm and discipline», whereas the Roman Church was blamed for innovating by forbidding the marital cohabitation of presbyters and deacons (c. 13). This Roman practice was not expressly condemned, but even such blame was not acceptable to Rome not only on account of theory (celibacy being regarded as superior to marriage and highly suitable, indeed even necessary, for NT ministers) but also in practice in places like Illiricum, a see contested by Rome and Constantinople as their own canonical territory, where the coexistence of the two systems created friction.

Canon 3, the lengthiest in section 1, claims to combine Roman severity and Constantinopolitan clemency in the matter of the reform of clerical sexual morals and practice. The canon censures the uncanonical situation of presbyters who have married twice, or have married after ordination, and of clerics who have married a widow or divorcee. Sexual offences of clerics are threatened with punishment (cc. 4, 5). Priests who have vowed to live in total abstinence with their spouses should no longer cohabit (c. 30).

Section 3, entitled «On the Laity», is a sort of miscellany containing several canons on marriage, prohibition to play dice (c. 50) or to fast on Sundays and Saturdays except Holy Saturday (cc. 55, 89), or to genuflect on Sunday (c. 90) – matters obviously not specific to laypeople! Missing mass for more than three consecutive Sundays is punishable with deposition for clerics and with excommunication for laypeople (c. 80); the same punishment is prescribed also for procuring harlots (c. 86). Jesus Christ is not to be depicted as the lamb of God indicated by John the Baptist, which was regarded as an undue concession to the Jews (c. 82). Canon 95 gives norms for the reception of heretics. There are penalties for abortion (c. 91), for reviving paganism with oaths (c. 94) or with peculiar plaits of hair (c. 96) or with the practice of clerics and monks bathing together with women in public baths (c. 77). Also condemned are other similar pagan practices (cc. 65, 71), including mimes (c. 51), theatrical dancing (cc. 51, 62) and sorcery (c. 61). The penalties, however, are to be medicinal, aimed at the healing of the soul (c. 102) in keeping with the prevailing theory of punishment in the Christian East.

Not all these canons will be felt to be relevant today like those about peculiar plaits of hair or theatrical dancing. According to Orthodox theology and canonistics, however, a contrary custom cannot abolish a canon of an ecumenical council, which needs another ecumenical council to abolish it. A practical interim solution may be had by applying the principle of *oikonomia*. However, Orthodox theologians are not in agreement about this principle. There is surely room for Catholic-Orthodox dialogue on *oikonomia* as well as on the Catholic theory and practice that a canon of an ecumenical council can be abolished by contrary custom or by the Roman Pontiff.

6, *The Council in Trullo an Ecumenical Council*

The Trullan Council designated itself as a «holy and ecumenical synod» twice in its introductory address to the Emperor Justinian and twice in two of its canons (cc. 3, 51). Of course such self-declaration by itself does not make a council ecumenical. But the Trullan Council was subsequently recognized as ecumenical by the Seventh Council, Nicea II. However, the necessary recognition by the first see of Rome came only gradually, after initial refusals. Despite the emperor's threat to arrest him, Pope Sergius I (687-701) resolutely refused to subscribe to its acts «because it contained some uncanonical provisions».²⁶ Pope John VII (705-707) also declined to countersign the Trullan canons, which had been salt to him. Later, however, three popes approved this council, although with some reserve: Constantine I (708-715), Hadrian I (772-795), and John VIII (872-882).

The reservation of these popes concerned the so-called «anti-Roman» canons (especially cc. 2, 13, 36, 55). The primary purpose of these canons, however, was not to take an *anti-Roman* stand but to impose uniformity of discipline according to the Byzantine pattern in order to consolidate the threatened unity of the empire.²⁷ This same policy can be seen also in the council's «anti-Armenian» stance: for example, contrary to Armenian usage, some water is to be added to the wine in Holy Eucharist (c. 32); priestly ordination is not to be a matter of family succession (c. 33); norms about fasting and abstinence are to be stricter (c. 56); meat offerings are forbidden (c. 99). As regards the Roman see, canon 36 reaffirmed the respective ranks of the five patriarchal sees as already determined by the Councils of Constantinople I (c. 3) and Chalcedon (c. 28). Perhaps this was unnecessary, given c. 2. But the prolonged Roman opposition to conferring equal dignity (*presbeia*) on Constantinople as «New Rome» was probably the reason for Trullo's harping on the patriarchal hierarchy, which indirectly casts light on the difference between Rome's idea of the Roman primacy and that held then by the rest of the Church. Seen as a persistent threat to its primatial position and privileges, the so-called anti-Roman canons of the Trullan Council were rejected by the «First See».

It is this rejection and the presence of the «anti-Roman» canons that led to the Trullan Council being regarded as not ecumenical from the late Middle Ages till recently. Thus, for example, the seventeenth century Roman edition of the ecumenical councils²⁸ included the Trullan canons as those of «the so-called sixth council» (vol 3, pp. 302-334) with a «warning to the reader» that it was not an ecumenical council (pp. 295-299). This example was followed by most of the later Western editions like those of Philip Labbe and Gabriel

²⁶ LOUIS DUCHESNE, ed., *Liber Pontificalis* (Paris: E. Thorin, 1886), I, 373: «quaedam capitula extra ritum ecclesiasticum fuerant in eis adnexa».

²⁷ OHME, «Die sogenannten „antirömischen“ Kanones», 307-22.

²⁸ *Tōn hagiōn oikoumenikōn synodōōn tēs katholikēs ekklēsiās hapanta: Concilia generalia ecclesiae catholicae Pauli V pont. max. auctoritate edita*, 4 vols. (Rome: Typographia Vaticana, 1608-1612). Note that the Latin «concilia generalia» in the title renders the Greek «ecumenical synods».

Cossart, of Joseph Catalan, and Mansi,²⁹ each containing a «monitum» to the reader that the Trullan Council, whose canons were being published, was not ecumenical. Mansi called this council «pseudo-sixth», a «conciliabulum reprobatum».³⁰ Hefele-Leclercq saw it as an anti-Roman council never really approved by any pope; the approval by Pope Hadrian I was rated as imprudent and that by Nicea II was attributed to the fact that the participants were almost wholly Greek.³¹ In the same way the volume entitled *The Seven Ecumenical Councils of the Undivided Church* in the series *Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers*, warned that the Quinisext Council should not be mistaken for an ecumenical council.³² The *Dictionnaire de théologie catholique* did not rate it as an ecumenical council, but devoted an article to the «Quinisexte (concile)», and a short notice to the «Concile in Trullo», disposed of it as an «oriental council».³³ In the twelve-volume history of the ecumenical councils from Nicea I to Vatican I, published under the general editorship of Gervais Dumeige, the Council in Trullo was given short shrift³⁴ with no mention of Joannou's work, in which the argument for the ecumenicity of the Trullan Council was admittedly jejune within the limits of an introduction. Thus the Western devaluation of this council continues to show itself occasionally up to the present.³⁵

In an ecumenical age it is possible to appreciate more positively the following historical facts. First of all, through dialogue between Emperor Justinian II and Pope Constantine I, an oral compromise was reached at Nicomedia in 711, which led to the papal approval of the Trullan Council, albeit with a proviso concerning «the privileges of the [Roman] Church».³⁶ Pope Constantine refused to put his signature on the list of participants in the *second* place *after* the emperor, which he saw as smacking of undue imperialist ideology. The attribution of eastern Illyricum to the jurisdiction of Constantinople was

²⁹ See «Council in Trullo» in *Conciliorum collectio regia maxima*, 11 vols. in 12, ed. PHILIP LABBE and GABRIEL COSSART (Paris: Regia, 1714-1715), vol. 3, cols. 1645-1749. JOSEPHUS CATALANUS, *Sacrosancta concilia oecumenica commentariis illustrate*, 4 vols. (Rome: Antonius de Rubeis, 1736-1749); see 2: 40-232; and s.v. «historia» 40-42, concluding that the Trullan Council is not ecumenical. GIOVAN DOMENICO MANSI ET AL., *Sacrorum conciliorum nova et amplissima collectio...*, 53 vols. (Florence, 1759-1927), vol. 11, cols. 621-1006: «Concilium in Trullo»; vol. 12, cols. 47-56: «Conciliabulum Constantinopolitanum pseudosextum universale et reprobatum».

³⁰ MANSI, *Sacrorum conciliorum nova et amplissima collectio*, vol. 12, col. 47.

³¹ KARL JOSEPH VON HEFELE and HENRI LECLERCQ, *Histoire des conciles d'après les documents originaux*, 8 vols, in 15 (Paris: Letouzy, 1907-1952)3: 560-81.

³² See HENRY R. PERCIVAL, «The Canons of the Councils in Trullo», in *Seven Ecumenical Councils* 356 and 359-408 (with commentary).

³³ *Dictionnaire de théologie catholique*, s.v. «conciles», vol. 3, pt. 1, cols. 636-76; s.v. «Quinisexte», vol. 13, pt. 2, cols. 1587-97; s.v. «Trullo», vol. 15, pt. 2, col. 1925.

³⁴ See F. X. MUIPHY and P. SHERWOOD, *Constantinople II et III* (Paris: Orante, 1974) 244-47; vol. 3 of *Histoire des conciles œcuméniques*, 12 vols., ed. Gervais Dumeige (Paris: Orante, 1963-1981).

³⁵ In a review of COGD-I, e.g., JOSEPH CAROLA says of the Council in Trullo: «The Catholic Church does not rank it among the ecumenical councils... Its inclusion in this present collection is not without controversy» (*Gregorianum* 89 [2008] 202-3).

³⁶ *Liber Pontificalis* I, 391.

another sticking point. However, later Pope Hadrian I, in a 787 letter to Patriarch Tarasios of Constantinople read out at the Council of Nicea II, declared: «I receive the sixth sacred council with all its canons which have been promulgated according to divine law (*jure ac divinitus*)». ³⁷ Since the sixth council or Constantinople III (680- 681) had not issued any canons, the expression «the sixth council with all its canons» can only refer to the Trullan Council understood as the second session of the sixth council. Although the phrase *jure ac divinitus* could be interpreted either as qualificative or restrictive, the latter sense is more likely: Hadrian received only those canons that were not contrary to divine law. However, no such restriction was expressed by the Council of Nicea II (787) itself which in its first canon received and confirmed «the canons of the six holy and ecumenical councils». Thus the seventh ecumenical council ascribed the Trullan canons without reserve to the sixth council, thereby recognizing the Trullan Council itself as ecumenical. In other words, with its reception by Nicea II the Trullan Council stood confirmed as ecumenical.

It is to be noted that Nicea II went further and cited the authority of the Trullan Council in determining the periodicity of provincial councils. The norm of their biannual convocation had been established by Nicea I (c. 5) and confirmed by Chalcedon (c. 19), but this norm was seldom observed in practice. The Trullan Council reduced the frequency of provincial councils to an annual celebration (c. 8), a modification pointing to the consciousness and claim of the Trullan Council itself to be an ecumenical council. And Nicea II recognized this claim by stating: «The holy fathers of the sixth synod decreed “they should be held in any case and despite all excuses, once a year, and all that is incorrect should be put right” » (c. 6). ³⁸ Here again «the sixth synod» refers clearly to the Trullan Council, whose authority is invoked. Further, the Trullan canon 82 was cited and put to good use by the Council of Nicea II in its defence of the veneration of images. ³⁹ It is thus established beyond doubt that Nicea II regarded the Trullan Council as the second session of Constantinople III («the sixth synod») and thereby recognized it as an ecumenical council. And this gave rise to the canonical tradition that attaches an ordinal number to this council («the sixth council»), which is done only for ecumenical councils, not for local councils. In fine, if it were merely a local council, the emperor would not have taken so much trouble to have it approved by the pope of Rome, nor would the popes of Rome have regarded the question of the approbation of Trullo worth much consideration. The very resistance of some popes to the Trullan Council is the reflection of their conviction that their signature would seal it as ecumenical.

³⁷ GRATIAN, *Decretum*, Dist. XVI, c. 5; MANSI, *Sacrorum conciliorum nova et amplissima collectio*, vol. 12, col. 1080A. The double adverb «*iure ac divinitus*» has the force of a hendiadys, *ius divinum*: Hadrian accepts whatever is decreed by the sixth council as of divine law.

³⁸ TANNER, *Decrees* 1:144 n. 2, «Conc. Quinisext, (692), c. 8».

³⁹ See HEINZ OHME, «Das Quinisextum auf dem VII. ökumenischen Konzil», *Annuario historiae conciliorum* 20 (1988) 325-44; OHME, «Die Beziehungen zwischen Rom und Konstantinopel» 70.

The reception of the Council in Trullo by the Roman See was indeed deferred and gradual. In this it is comparable to the Council of Constantinople I (381), which was convoked as an Eastern council and was conducted without any Western participation at all. And it was not received by the Roman See at first. But in the sixth century its dogmatic definitions were approved, but there was still some lingering reserve as regards its third canon about the «New Rome». Nevertheless, this council came to be recognized universally by degrees as an ecumenical council.

Another example is the Council of Nicea II (787) itself.⁴⁰ Although it was presided over by papal delegates and received or confirmed by Pope Hadrian I, it was ratified formally only after a lapse of 93 years. The case of the Trullan Council is analogous. Ecumenical reception is a historical process in act, as Vittorio Peri puts it.⁴¹ In this process it has been suggested that what is ultimately decisive is «connumeration», that is, being numbered along with the series starting with Nicea I.⁴² The Trullan Council was numbered «the sixth» along with Constantinople III by the seventh ecumenical council. And this conciliar lead was followed later by the canonical tradition.

The ecumenical status of the Trullan Council was commonly recognized by the classical Western canonists of the second millennium such as Ivo of Chartres, Pope Innocent III, and Gratian.⁴³ For example, Gratian, following Ivo's lead, included 16 canons of the Council in Trullo in his *Decretum*. He regarded this council as the second session of the Sixth Ecumenical Council: «the first was held under Emperor Constantine IV, but it issued no canons; and the second, held under his son Emperor Justinian II, issued the above-mentioned canons».⁴⁴ Referring to Pope Hadrian's letter to Patriarch Taiasios cited above, Gratian wrote: «*sexta synodus auctoritate Adriani corroboratur*» (the sixth synod is confirmed by the authority of Pope Hadrian) through reception.⁴⁵ Thus it is clear that Gratian saw the Trullan Council as belonging with «the sixth synod» as its second session and therefore as ecumenical. Hence Gratian stated that its canons were formulated by

⁴⁰ See ERICH LAMBERZ, ed., *Concilium universale Nicaenum secundum*, Acta conciliorum oecumenicorum, ser. 2, vol. 3, pt. 1 (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2008).

⁴¹ VITTORIO PERI, «L'ecumenicità di un concilio come processo storico nella vita della Chiesa», *Annuario historiae conciliorum* 20 (1988) 216-44.

⁴² Discussing the criteria of the ecumenicity of councils, Sieben («Die Liste ökumenischer Konzilien» 535) states that the decisive criterion is a council's being counted and listed along with the First Council (Nicea I): it is «Konnumerierung» that makes a council ecumenical. However, in his examination of the «lists» of the ecumenical councils of the first millennium Sieben considers only the councils from Nicea I to Constantinople III, thus overlooking the Council in Trullo (pp. 537-540), although this council was counted along with Nicea I and listed together with it by Nicea II in its canon 2.

⁴³ GRATIAN, *Decretum*, Dist. IV, c. 122; LANDAU, «Oberlieferung...» (see n. 24).

⁴⁴ «*Sexta synodus bis congregata est: primo, sub Constantino, et nullos canones constituit; secundo, sub Justiniano filio eius, et praefatos canones promulgavit*» (GRATIAN, *Decretum*, Dist. XVI, c. 6).

⁴⁵ GRATIAN, *Decretum*, Dist. XVI, c. 5.

«divine inspiration».⁴⁶ In fact the ecumenicity of the Council in Trullo was once standard doctrine in the West as in the East, but in the subsequent East-West polemics, the West rejected this council and denigrated it in proportion to its determined defence and exaltation in the East.

While the Orthodox Churches stand by the tradition or the canon of the seven ecumenical councils fixed by Nicea II, Catholics generally exhibit a longer list of 21 ecumenical councils including the two Vatican Councils. But this is not an official list or canon fixed by any ecumenical council or papal definition or decree, as we stated earlier by citing Hubert Jedin. During the Counter Reformation Catholics drew up several lists of ecumenical councils. One such, by Robert Bellarmine, listed 18 of them (omitting Constance but including Trent).⁴⁷ A group of Roman scholars working under the patronage of Pope Paul V assumed Bellarmine's list but added to it the Council of Constance and published a complete collection of the decrees of the ecumenical councils. This so-called «Roman edition»⁴⁸ did not, however, contain any papal decree and, therefore, was not an *official* Catholic collection. Nevertheless, with it a list of 19 ecumenical councils began to circulate in the West. And with the addition of the two Vatican Councils the number grew to 21, although, as I said, no authoritative Church magisterium established this canon.⁴⁹ Indeed, even in this list the ecumenical status of certain second millennium councils like Pisa (1409) is disputed, and the addition of some general councils has been suggested. With these reservations, the proposed canon of councils in COGD includes a total of 23 «ecumenical and general councils». Although the term «general» has often been used in the past as synonymous with «ecumenical», here it is obviously not.

Historically, the second millennium councils belong to the divided and separate traditions of the East and the West – the Council of Florence (1439-1445), as a union council, will need special consideration. According to Vittorio Peri, the Council of Trent was a wholly Western council.⁵⁰ The Ravenna document says that in the second millennium, «both sides of Christendom convoked councils proper to each of them... In the Roman Catholic Church, some of these councils held in the West were regarded as ecumenical» (39).

It is a matter of canonical doctrine and practice that a council can be celebrated in two or more sessions separated by some years. For example, in the East, the two councils of

⁴⁶ «Eadem sancta synodus, divinitus inspirata, iterum ... congregata est et canones numero cii ad correctionem Ecclesiae promulgavit» (GRATIAN, *Decretum*, Dist. XVI, c. 6).

⁴⁷ ROBERT BELLARMINE, «IV Controversia generalis, De Conciliis», *Opera omnia* 12 vols. (Paris: Ludovicum Vivès, 1870) 2:199-204.

⁴⁸ See note 28 above.

⁴⁹ See VITTORIO PERI, «Il numero dei concili ecumenici nella tradizione cattolica moderna», *Aevum* 37 (1963) 433-501; PERI, *I concili e le chiese* (Rome: Studium, 1965); and PERI, *Da oriente e da occidente: Le Chiese cristiane dall'Impero romano all'Europa moderna*, 2 vols. (Rome: Antenore, 2002) 1:460-96.

⁵⁰ VITTORIO PERI, «Trento: un concilio tutto occidentale», in *Cristianesimo nella storia: Saggi in onore di Giuseppe Alberigo*, ed. Giuseppe Alberigo and Albert Melloni (Bologna: Il Mulino, 1996) 213-77.

Constantinople of 869-870 and of 879-880, formerly seen as opposed to each other in the matter of the Photian controversy or schism, have come to be regarded by scholars today as two sessions of one and the same council, albeit not ecumenical. In the West, what is commonly called the Council of Florence was celebrated in four different places in four different periods: Basel (1431-1437), Ferrara (1438-1439), Florence (1439-1443), Rome (1444-1445). The Council of Trent (1545-1563) was held in three periods: 1545-1548, 1551-1552, and 1560-1563. In the East, the sixth ecumenical council was held in two sessions: the first in 680-681 and the second in 692. The ecumenicity of the second session called Council in Trullo was never in doubt, a point I will not belabour here.⁵¹

7. *The Two Names*

Neither of the two names now in use – the Quinisext Council, the Council in Trullo – is fully satisfactory. Wishing to stress that this council made up for the vacuum left in canonical legislation by the sixth and the fifth council, as already noted, Theodore Balsamon called it *Penthekte* (Quinisext in Latin). But Nicea II had counted it with the sixth council only, and the classical canonists followed this conciliar lead in both East and West.

«Quinisext» attaches this council equally to the *fifth* and the *sixth* councils, which is to deviate both from history and from Nicea II, which regarded it as attached to the sixth council as its second session. The fact that the Trullan Council completes *in contents* also the fifth council does not make it the second session of this council to warrant the name «Quinisext», which thus turns out to be a misnomer. Perhaps this insight underlies the preference for the designation «Trullanum» by Rhalles-Potles. In the East-West dialogue today, moreover, the name «Quinisext» may seem to prejudge the ecumenicity of this council from the start, whereas the designation «Council in Trullo» would appear to be neutral. However, this latter is not a fully satisfactory name either: it fits awkwardly in the list of the ecumenical councils. This very awkwardness can, however, serve to underscore the fact that it is an ecumenical council *sui generis*. Giatian regularly called this council the sixth council as had done Nicea II.

The Council in Trullo truly occupies a unique place in the canon of the ecumenical councils of the first millennium. Patriarch Photius underscored its singularity by qualifying it in relation to the ecumenical councils as a «sister council»,⁵² an expression that has its modern parallel in the «sister Churches». It is to be emphasized, the inclusion of the Council in Trullo in the canon of the ecumenical councils of the first millennium does not raise their

⁵¹ See *Basilika* 5.3.2 (*Basilika* is the code issued by Leo VI the Wise); Novels 5,6,76,79,123,133,137, etc. (the Novels or «Novellae Constitutiones» are a fourth unit of the Roman law issued by Justinian I). References to more Eastern sources can be found in NICOLAE DURÀ, «The Ecumenicity of the Council in Trullo: Witnesses of the Canonical Tradition in East and West», in *Council in Trullo Revisited* 229-62. (Durà's assessment of the Western evidence is insufficiently critical).

⁵² JEAN-BAPTISTE PITRA, *Juris ecclesiastici graecorum historia et monumenta* (Rome: Collegio Urbano, 1864- 1868) 2:449.

number from seven to eight. The table of contents of a volume that includes the ecumenical councils of the first millennium needs to be prepared with care so as not to mislead readers. Until the Council in Trullo is fully lifted out of limbo, the Table of Contents will do well to indicate the two sessions of the Sixth Council (Constantinople III) and place the Trullan Council in the second. Once this rescue has been fully achieved, the Table of Contents may only need to mention the two sessions but can omit explicit mention of Trullo. In this regard the «conspectus materiae» in COGD-I is not a model to follow; it has apparently already misled some into thinking that this volume presents eight ecumenical councils from Nicea I to Nicea II, contrary to the clear warning in the introduction to the «Concilium Trullanum».⁵³

The ecumenical councils do differ among themselves so much that it has been suggested that «ecumenical» as a conciliar category needs to be understood analogously.⁵⁴ Perhaps the teaching of the Second Vatican Council about «the hierarchy of truths» may be applied to the ecumenical councils as well, so that the Trullan Council can be set on a scale of ecumenical councils. This would be in keeping with the tradition according to which Pope Gregory the Great saw the first four ecumenical councils on a level apart and analogously to the four canonical Gospels.

In the Ravenna dialogue in 2007 some progress was achieved when the term «universal Church» was received into the Orthodox theological vocabulary. The Orthodox theologians used to conceive the Church as a communion of local Churches without calling it universal Church, as Catholics theologians are wont to do. And the term «universal council» has been used occasionally in the past as a synonym for «ecumenical council» and it is being used in the titles of the volumes in the series *Acta conciliorum oecumenicorum* (the latest to appear, *Concilium universale Nicaenum secundum*). It would seem that the most suitable term to express conciliarity at its widest extension and highest level is «universal council».

Conclusion

Pope John Paul II, in his apostolic constitution *Sacri canones*, with which he promulgated the *Code of Canons of the Eastern Churches*, referred implicitly to the Trullan Council while citing the first canon of Nicea II, which confirmed the canons of «the six holy and universal synods». Thus one may say that while promulgating the Eastern code Pope John Paul II implicitly rated the Trullan Council ecumenical, although very few might have recognized this because of the tortuous phrasing of the sentence with which this was done,⁵⁵ probably to avoid causing too many eyebrows to rise.

⁵³ COGD-I, p. 212

⁵⁴ BERTRAND DE MARGERIE, «L'Analogie dans l'oecuménicité des conciles: Notion clef pour l'avenir de l'oecuménisme», *Revue Thomiste* 84 (1984) 425-45.

⁵⁵ JOHN PAUL II, apostolic constitution *Sacri cconones*, October 18, 1990, *Acta Apostolicae Sedis* 82 (1990)

After the Catholic-Orthodox dialogue at Ravenna in 2007 Cardinal Kasper, the President of the Pontifical Council for Promoting Christian Unity and co-chair of the dialogue, stated in an interview: "We Catholics have to reflect more clearly on the problem of synodality or conciliarity, especially at the universal level."⁵⁶ In this reflection the Council in Trullo is likely to have no negligible part. The recently published COGD-I, by placing the Council in Trullo among the seven ecumenical councils of the united Church of the first millennium, already marks a forward step in this reflection with a positive potential for the progress of ecumenism.⁵⁷

⁵⁶ Quoted in GERARD O'CONNELL, «Vatican Top Ecumenist Hails Orthodox "Breakthrough"», *Our Sunday Visitor*, February 3, 2008.

⁵⁷ The present study offers a slightly revised and adapted text of a recent article of mine, GEORGE NEDUNGATT, «The Council in Trullo Revisited: Ecumenism and the Canon of the Councils», *Theological Studies* 71 (2010) September 651 -676.