

## *Augustine in Byzantium*

by JOSEF LÖSSL

As Cornelius Mayer wrote recently, the massive output of literature on Augustine (*c.* 50,000 extant titles) cannot hide the fact that ‘much scholarly work remains to be done on the enormous variety and scope of Augustine’s *influence*’.<sup>1</sup> One area of which this is particularly true is Augustine’s impact on Byzantine theology.

While Augustine’s own use of Greek patristic literature and contacts with the Greek patristic world have been investigated for some time and in some detail, his influence on Greek authors – especially during the later Byzantine era – has been sadly neglected. However, recent research on such authors as Maximos Planudes (*c.* 1255–1305), Gregory Palamas (1296–1359) and Prochoros Kydones (*c.* 1333–*c.* 1370) has done something to remedy that situation. This paper seeks to present a summary of that development and provide a context for further study.

### *Augustine’s interest and impact in the east during his lifetime*

Augustine’s relationship to Greek may seem somewhat ambiguous. Partly, the ambiguity is of his own making. While he did little to hide the fact that he had never set foot in a Greek-speaking country and, as a boy, attended without much benefit the lessons of his Greek ‘grammaticus’<sup>2</sup> he

*ACO* = *Acta conciliorum oecumenicorum*; *AL* = C. Mayer, *Augustinus-Lexikon*, i, Basle 1994; *BZ* = *Byzantinische Zeitschrift*; *JOB* = *Jahrbuch der österreichischen Byzantinistik*; *Plan.*, *Aug. Triad.* = Αὐγουστίνου Περὶ Τριάδος Βιβλία Πεντεκαίδεκα, ἅπερ ἐκ τῆς Λατίνου διαλέκτου εἰς τὴν Ἑλλάδα μετένεγκε Μάξιμος ὁ Πλανούδης. Εἰσαγωγή, ἑλληνικὸ καὶ λατινικὸ κείμενο, γλωσσάριο, *editio princeps*, ed. Μανόλης Παπαθωμόπουλος, Ἴσαβέλλα Τσαβαρί, Gianpaolo Rigotti, Athens 1995; *REAug.* = *Revue des Études Augustiniennes*

<sup>1</sup> *AL* i, p. xiii.

<sup>2</sup> Augustinus, *Confessiones* i. 13. 20, CCL xxvii. 11, line 16; ep. cxx. 2. 10, CSEL xxxiv/ii. 712, lines 22–3; *De trinitate* ix. 6. 10, CCL 1. 302, lines 25–8. See also the survey in P. Courcelle, *Late Latin writers and their Greek sources*, Cambridge, Mass. 1969, 149–65 (on language), 165–208 (on the influence of pagan and patristic Greek literature).

displayed a keen interest in and a considerable knowledge of Greek during his later years.<sup>3</sup> In consequence scholars have taken different views on the matter. Some have tried to extrapolate from his theological genius and present him as an outstanding classicist and exegete as well. Others have questioned his competence in the latter two fields, especially as compared to Jerome. Against both tendencies Pierre Courcelle has stressed the importance of looking at the gradual growth and development of his interests in Greek during his later life and their connection with his theological concerns.

At the beginning of his career as a theologian Augustine was not acquainted with the groundbreaking theological developments in the east a generation before. His approach to Greek patristics was a peculiar one, especially compared to that of Fathers like Marius Victorinus, Hilary, Ambrose and Jerome. His ‘theological culture was... individual’ and ‘his belated reading of the Greek Fathers helped only to confirm and direct the orthodoxy of original views’.<sup>4</sup> Indeed we have to remember that well into his thirties he had not much interest in church theology at all. For his personal religion he adhered to Manicheism and his professional aim was to become an accomplished orator. In 386 it had been rather by accident – or, as he saw it, divine decree – that he had come across some neo-Platonic texts which, in conjunction with Ambrose’s teaching, made him accept the orthodox creed and baptism, and only after he had become a presbyter in Hippo in 390 or 391 did he realise the need to learn more about eastern theology. Courcelle stresses that even around 405 he was still largely ignorant of much of the latter, as he confirms in ep. lxxxii. 23 to Jerome. Yet ‘afterwards’ – and we have to consider that he had still twenty-five years to live – ‘he made a heroic effort to know the Fathers of the Eastern Church’.<sup>5</sup>

Augustine was keen to present his theology as in line with eastern orthodoxy. He saw that as his episcopal right and duty. Quite unlike Jerome, who for love of learning did not even exercise his presbyterial functions, Augustine did not study Greek texts for their own sake. He only referred to them when compelled to, especially in controversies, when they were quoted by his opponents in order to show that his teaching was not in line with (Greek) orthodoxy. In such cases, especially during the Pelagian crisis, Augustine tried to retaliate by proving that the Greek theologians cited by his enemies held no other faith than he, and that his

<sup>3</sup> Ibid; G. J. M. Bartelink, ‘Die Beeinflussung Augustins durch die griechischen Patres’, *Augustiniana Traiectina*, Paris 1987, 9–24; B. Altaner, ‘Augustinus und die griechische Sprache’, in his *Kleine patristische Schriften*, ed. G. Glockmann, Berlin 1967, 129–53; O. Rottmanner, ‘Zur Sprachenkenntnis des hl. Augustinus’, *Theologische Quartalschrift* (1895), 268–76.

<sup>4</sup> Courcelle, *Late Latin writers*, 149–54, 208.

<sup>5</sup> Ibid. 207–8; Bartelink, ‘Beeinflussung’.

theology, although, as some of his opponents, especially Julian of Eclanum, would have it, discredited by its Latin and African background, nevertheless represented genuine orthodoxy.<sup>6</sup> His method was two-fold. He either discussed the source in question on the basis of the (Latin) quotation in his opponent's text (without checking its authenticity) or, if one was in his reach, he used a translation of the work from which his opponent had taken his text. Only rarely did he discuss Greek patristic texts in the original language. Some examples may illustrate each of these points.

Apart from a saying on incarnation and salvation in various sermons Augustine quotes only two passages from Irenaeus' *Adversus haereses* in his entire work, although he uses them repeatedly and thus creates the impression that he is rather familiar with the work of Irenaeus.<sup>7</sup> The way, however, in which he interprets these passages suggests that he lacked an overall understanding of Irenaeus' theology.<sup>8</sup> Against Pelagius and Julian he made a great deal of his knowledge of John Chrysostom.<sup>9</sup> Courcelle attributes this to his obsession with accumulating proof texts,

<sup>6</sup> Cf. Aug., *Contra Iulianum* i. 4. 13–14, PL xlv. 648; Courcelle, *Latin Latin writers*, 196. On Julian challenging Augustine for being 'Punic' see J. Lössl, "'Te Apulia genuit'" (Aug. *Contra Iulianum opus imperfectum* vi. 18) – some remarks on the birthplace of Julian of Eclanum', *REAug* xlv (1998), 223–39 at pp. 228–34. That Julian may have had a point is shown by the history of Pelagianism in the east up to its condemnation at the Council of Ephesus in 431: L. Wickham, 'Pelagianism in the east', in R. Williams (ed.), *The making of orthodoxy: essays in honour of Henry Chadwick*, Cambridge 1989, 200–13 at pp. 206–9.

<sup>7</sup> On the saying see Aug., *Sermones* clxvi. 4; cxcii. 1; cxciv. 2, PL xxviii. 909. 1011f., 1016; the other passages are cited in *C. Iul.* i. 5, 32; ii. 33, 37; iii. 32, PL xlv. 664. 662. 697. 700f. 719; *C. Iul. imp.* iv. 72f., PL xlv. 1380. See also N. Brox, 'Irenaeus von Lyon', *Reallexikon für Antike und Christentum* xviii (1998), 820–54 at pp. 849f.

<sup>8</sup> The passages are taken from Irenaeus, *Adversus haereses* iv. 2. 7; v. 19. 1, SC c. 410–12; cliii. 248–50. In one it is said that only faith in Christ can heal the wound inflicted by the bite of the old serpent ('non aliter saluari homines ab antiqua serpentis plaga, nisi credant in eum, qui secundum similitudinem carnis peccati in ligno martyrii exaltatus a terra'), in the other that the wisdom of the serpent is overwhelmed by the simplicity of the dove ('serpentis prudentia deuicta per simplicitatem columbae'). Augustine uses both passages to prove that Irenaeus taught a doctrine of original sin similar to his, a view fiercely contested by Julian and not endorsed by modern studies: A. Orbe, *Antropología de San Ireneo*, Madrid 1969; P. Lassiat, 'L'Anthropologie d'Irénée', *Nouvelle Revue Théologique* c (1978), 399–417; Y. de Andia, *Homo vivens: incorruptibilité et divinisation de l'homme selon Irénée de Lyon*, Paris 1986; J. Lössl, *Intellectus gratiae: die erkenntnistheoretische und hermeneutische Dimension der Gnadenlehre Augustins von Hippo*, Leiden 1997, 334 n. 115. On that basis I cannot agree with Altaner and Courcelle who suggest that Augustine might have had a comprehensive knowledge of Irenaeus' *Adversus haereses*. He may have repeatedly quoted from it, but it was always these two passages, and always for the same narrow purpose: B. Altaner, 'Augustinus und Irenaeus', in his *Kleine patristische Schriften*, 194–203; Courcelle, *Late Latin writers*, 198.

<sup>9</sup> See Aug., *C. Iul.* i. 26, PL xlv. 658, where Augustine quotes a long passage from John Chrysostom, *Homilia xxi ad neophytos*, SC 1. 178, in Greek and translates it. See

characteristic for his later years.<sup>10</sup> But how did he gain access to such texts? There is no indication that he knew any of Chrysostom's works before 414, when he first quoted a passage which he had found in Pelagius' *De natura*.<sup>11</sup> He seems to have had no direct access to texts or translations of Chrysostom's works but relied on material in the works of Pelagius and Julian of Eclanum, and when for once he referred to a text he had looked up for himself in a translation of sermons of Chrysostom, he picked one whose real author was the Arian Bishop Potamius of Lisbon.<sup>12</sup> Similarly he ascribed a text entitled *Adversus Manichaeos*, which was recently, however doubtfully, attributed to Serapion of Thmuis, to Basil of Caesarea.<sup>13</sup> Thus, despite his eagerness to demonstrate his interest in Greek patristics he must have failed to impress as a connoisseur. Once he even confused Gregory Nazianzen with Gregory of Nyssa, calling the former Basil's brother.<sup>14</sup> His only source of texts of Gregory Nazianzen may have been Rufinus' translation of nine of his theological orations.<sup>15</sup>

Despite their scarcity then,<sup>16</sup> it may have been these few texts which inspired him when writing *De trinitate*, though it has proved difficult in this case to trace the sources exactly. Except in his polemical writings Augustine was not forced to account in detail for his references.<sup>17</sup> It can

also F.-J. Thonnard, 'Saint Jean Chrysostome et saint Augustin dans la controverse pélagienne', *Revue des Études Byzantines* xxv (1967), 189–218; J.-P. Bouhot, 'Version inédite du sermon "Ad Neophytos" de s. Jean Chrysostome utilisée par s. Augustin', *REAug* xvii (1971), 27–41; Lössl, *Intellectus gratiae*, 339.

<sup>10</sup> Courcelle, *Late Latin writers*, 208.

<sup>11</sup> See Aug., *De natura et gratia* 76, CSEL lx. 291; *C. Iul.* i. 18–27, PL xlv. 651–60; Lössl, *Intellectus gratiae*, 337–40.

<sup>12</sup> See A. Wilmart, 'Le "De Lazaro" de Potamius', *JTS* xix (1918), 289–304, and 'La Collection des 38 homélies latines de saint Jean Chrysostome', *ibid.* 305–27; B. Altaner, 'Augustinus und Johannes Chrysostomus', in his *Kleine patristische Schriften*, 302–11 at p. 308; Lössl, *Intellectus gratiae*, 338.

<sup>13</sup> Though in this case he was supported by tradition. Julian of Eclanum, too, thought the work was by Basil. See G. J. M. Bartelink, 'Basilus', *AL* i (1994), 614–17 at pp. 615f., and Lössl, *Intellectus gratiae*, 336 n. 134. On the possibilities of identifying pseudo-Basilus, *Adversus Manichaeos*, with Serapion of Thmuis, *Adversus Manichaeos* see N. Cipriani, 'L'autore dei testi pseudobasileiani riportati nel "Contra Iulianum" i. 5. 16–7 e la polemica anti-agostiniana di Giuliano d'Eclano', *Atti del congresso internazionale su S. Agostino nel XVI centenario della conversione*, i, Rome 1987, 439–49. On more examples of confusion over authorship in Augustine see Courcelle, *Late Latin writers*, 204–8.

<sup>14</sup> See Aug., *C. Iul.* i. 19, PL xlv. 653; Courcelle, *Late Latin writers*, 203 n. 39, 202–3.

<sup>15</sup> See CSEL xlvi; B. Altaner, 'Augustinus und Gregor von Nazianz, Gregor von Nyssa', in his *Kleine patristische Schriften*, 277–85.

<sup>16</sup> Like the Platonic books triggering his conversion in 386, they were 'paucissimi libri': Aug., *De beata uita* 4, CCL xxix. 67. Like them they might have had a momentous impact.

<sup>17</sup> Chevalier's attempt to demonstrate comprehensively that Augustine depends on Basil was soon dismissed by Altaner: I. Chevalier, *S. Augustin et la pensée grecque: les relations trinitaires*, Fribourg 1940, esp. pp. 127–40; B. Altaner, 'Augustinus und Basilus der Grosse', in his *Kleine patristische Schriften*, 269–76 at p. 276. Altaner himself, however,

at least be said, however, that prior to any influence of *De trinitate* on Byzantine theology it was itself influenced by Greek orthodox theology, although some of Augustine's more daring original conclusions, especially in the field of the psychological Trinity, were later rejected in the east. Interestingly, the deeper reasons for that and the lack of enthusiasm in the east for Augustine's theology of grace as opposed to Pelagianism may be closely related. Both the psychological Trinitarian analogies as developed in the speculative parts in the second half of *De trinitate* and the doctrine of grace as held against the Pelagians are based on a rather subtle concept of divine-human relationship, so subtle that the distinction between divine and human intellect and will might have been obscured altogether. Was the psychological teaching of the Trinity a preclusion from the human to the divine? Was the concept of individual predestination a preclusion from the concept of God to human salvation cutting out the theological virtues of faith and hope? Augustine's speculations in these matters transcended the traditional realm of theology. They sounded distinctly philosophical, if not Gnostic.<sup>18</sup> They were, as Henry Chadwick wrote recently, 'always open to the lethal charge of *curiositas*, claiming to know matters which God has not thought fit to reveal'.<sup>19</sup> In the west, where philosophical analysis was to become an essential part of theological study, this may have been acceptable, but in the east, where theologians increasingly prided themselves on not adding anything new to the sacred tradition such 'creativity' was greeted with suspicion, and later rejected altogether.

Thus the ambiguity remains. Augustine's efforts in Greek patristics in his later years are admirable and his achievements, especially compared to the level of his learning on the outset, must be acknowledged. However, it would be misleading to place Augustine on the same footing as Jerome, Ambrose, Hilary and Marius Victorinus, who promoted Greek theology in the west and were known for that in the east. That did not prevent him, of course, from becoming the single most important Father in the west. On the contrary, it actually supported the process which made him, after all, 'the father of the west' – as opposed to the east. Yet it may explain to some extent why his work and thought had such little subsequent impact

tracked down Eusthatius' translation of Basilus' *Homiliae in Hexaëmeron* in Aug., *De Genesi ad litteram* (Altaner, 'Augustinus und Basilus', 270f.), and J. F. Callahan identified an heresiological digest of Basilus' *Contra Eunomium* as the source of Aug., *Conf.* i. 21: J. F. Callahan, 'A new source of St Augustine's theory of time', *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology* lxxiii (1958), 437–54; cf. Courcelle, *Late Latin writers*, 203–4.

<sup>18</sup> Given Augustine's Manichean past that should not have come as too much of a surprise, a view strongly held by Julian of Eclanum.

<sup>19</sup> H. Chadwick, 'Orthodoxy and heresy from the death of Constantine to the eve of the First Council of Ephesus', in Averil Cameron and P. Garnsey (eds), *The Cambridge ancient history*, XIII: *The late empire, A.D. 337–425*, 561–600 at p. 593.

in the east.<sup>20</sup> Although it was never entirely unknown, ‘its originality and profundity were hardly ever recognized’.<sup>21</sup>

Augustine himself as well as his supporters in the west were for a long time unable to accept that. Augustine had ambitions in the east. With the exception of Jerome no other western Father was as keen as he to make an impact there, especially during the Pelagian controversy.<sup>22</sup> But unlike Jerome and in spite of his support he simply lacked the qualifications and the vocation for such a pursuit. Jerome, the ‘trilingual man’, actually lived in the east, where Latin was about to fall into utter oblivion. He had established contacts there and a reputation, if an ambiguous one. Augustine could only send his works, in Latin. In order to make an impact they had to be translated. As the Pelagian controversy went on, some translations were indeed made. But they were hasty, catering only for immediate needs and carrying the risk of creating further misunderstandings.<sup>23</sup> Whether some of these ‘working translations’ later developed so that in the end whole works of Augustine were translated into Greek, even perhaps during his lifetime, remains very much an open question.<sup>24</sup> Some attempts on Augustine’s side to establish personal contacts with eastern bishops, too, seem to have ended in failure.<sup>25</sup> At least

<sup>20</sup> On the traces see B. Altaner, ‘Augustinus in der griechischen Kirche bis auf Photius’, in his *Kleine patristische Schriften*, 75–98, and ‘Augustinus und die griechische Patristik’, *Revue Bénédictine* lxii (1952), 201–13; D. Z. Nikitas, ‘Η παρουσία τοῦ Ἀύγουστίνου στὴν Ἀνατολική Ἐκκλησία’, *Κληρονομία* xiv (1982), 18–19; A. Nichols, ‘The reception of St Augustine and his work in the Byzantine–Slav tradition’, *Angelicum* lxiv (1987), 437–52; H. M. Biedermann, ‘Augustinus in der neueren griechischen Theologie’, in *Signum pietatis: FS C. P. Mayer*, Würzburg 1989, 609–43. On the ecclesiastical dimension in general see A. Nichols, *Rome and the eastern Churches*, Edinburgh 1992, 188–229.

<sup>21</sup> See Plan., *Aug. Triad.*, xlvi–xlviiii.

<sup>22</sup> On Augustine’s interventions in the east (and complaints about lack of response) see O. Wermelinger, *Rom und Pelagius: die theologische Position der römischen Bischöfe im pelagianischen Streit in den Jahren 411–432*, Stuttgart 1975, 46–87, 91–3, 134–46, 163–5, 209–38; Wickham, ‘Pelagianism in the east’, 202f, 207f; O. Wermelinger, ‘Neuere Forschungskontroversen um Augustinus und Pelagius’, in C. Mayer and K. H. Chelius, *Internationales Symposium über den Stand der Augustinusforschung 1987*, Würzburg 1989, 189–217 at pp. 202–4.

<sup>23</sup> For example at the synods of Diospolis and Jerusalem. See Aug., *De gestis Pelagii* 2, 4, 39, CSEL xlii. 53, 56, 95; Orosius, *Apol.* vi. 1; vii. 4, CSEL v. 610, 612.

<sup>24</sup> Altaner, ‘Augustinus in der griechischen Kirche’, 73–6, 97, may be a bit too optimistic in that regard. See E. Dekkers, ‘Les Traductions grecques des écrits patristiques latins’, *Sacris Erudiri* v (1953), 193–233, 208–10; Wermelinger, *Rom und Pelagius*, 113 n. 160.

<sup>25</sup> See Aug., ep. clxxix to John of Jerusalem; ep. iv\* to Cyril of Alexandria; ep. vi\* to Atticus of Constantinople (CSEL xlv. 691; lxxxviii. 26, 32) from AD 416, 417, 420/1 respectively. In Aug., *C. Iul. imp.* iv. 88, PL xlv. 1389, Julian of Eclanum is quoted as referring to Aug. ep. iv\*. According to Aug. ep. xix\*. 4 to Jerome (CSEL lxxxviii. 93), Augustine tried to get in contact with other eastern dignitaries as well, for example Eulogius of Caesarea. On the dates and circumstances of the letters see M.-F. Berrouard,

no responses are extant. When at last Theodosius II invited him to the Council of Ephesus in 431, it was too late.<sup>26</sup> He had died in August 430.

In the following centuries at least his name seems to have been held in high regard.<sup>27</sup> Yet his work continued to be benignly ignored. Naturally one would not expect that situation to change as the relationship between east and west progressively deteriorated during and after the Photian Schism at the turn of the millennium. That split, which was to last for centuries, turned Augustine and his work into one of the major theological obstacles to reunification. Paradoxically, however, in the long run the schism also created a need for dialogue. Ironically, in the peculiar atmosphere of cultural encounter of the high Middle Ages and early Renaissance period a number of significant eastern theologians discovered Augustine the theologian and through the translation and adaptation of some of his works made the world of his thought part of the eastern tradition. In comparison to what had happened in that respect during Augustine's lifetime and in the 750 years after his death, this was something entirely new and groundbreaking.

*Maximos Planudes and his translation of Augustine's De trinitate*

The reconquest of Constantinople in 1261 under Michael VIII Palaiologos ended two centuries of bitter struggle between east and west.<sup>28</sup> In the wake of his victory Michael followed a course of reunion with the west culminating in the Union of Lyons in 1274.<sup>29</sup> Among the men at his court

'Les Lettres 6\* et 19\* de saint Augustin: leur date et les renseignements qu'elles apportent sur l'évolution de la crise "pélagienne"', *REAug* xxvii (1981), 264–77; J.-P. Bouhot, 'Une Lettre d'Augustin d'Hippone à Cyrille d'Alexandrie (Epist. 4\*)', in *Les Lettres de Saint Augustin découvertes par J. Divjak*, Paris 1983, 147–54; G. Bonner, 'Some remarks on letters 4\* and 6\*', *ibid.* 155–64, and *God's decree and man's destiny: studies on the thought of Augustine of Hippo*, London 1987, cl. xii. See also *Œuvres de Saint Augustin: lettres 1\*–29\*: nouvelle édition du texte critique et introduction par J. Divjak: traduction et commentaire par divers auteurs* (= *Bibliothèque Augustinienne 46B*), Paris 1987.

<sup>26</sup> The invitation reached Carthage at Easter 431: Capreolus, ep., PL liii. 845; Council of Ephesus, *Collectio Veronensis* xviii. 1, *ACO* I/ii. 64. On background and further references see now A. Fürst, *Augustins Briefwechsel mit Hieronymus* (= *Jahrbuch für Antike und Christentum: Ergänzungsband* 29), Münster 1999, 210–20, and 'Augustinus im Orient', forthcoming.

<sup>27</sup> He is mentioned, for instance, on a list extant from the Second Council of Constantinople, actio iii. 4. 3, *ACO* IV/1. 37. See Altaner, 'Augustinus in der griechischen Kirche bis auf Photius'. On another instance see S. Salaville, 'Une Mention de Saint Augustin dans les diptyques de la liturgie grecque de Saint Jacques', *Année Théologie* xi (1950), 52–6.

<sup>28</sup> Beginning with the schism in 1054 and culminating in the sack of Constantinople by the Fourth Crusade and the erection of a Latin empire in 1204. See D. M. Nicol, *The last centuries of Byzantium 1261–1453*, 2nd edn, London 1993, 1–37 (on the Latin prelude to Michael's reign), 39–89 (on Michael's reign).

<sup>29</sup> In 1274 Michael imposed the union on the city, dismissed the Patriarch Joseph and

was the father of a boy who had been born around 1255 in Nicomedia. The boy's name was Manuel Planudes.<sup>30</sup> Educated at court he developed a special interest in Latin and before long he was the most outstanding Latin scholar in the east. Michael probably intended to employ Manuel's skills for his policy of reunion. The translation of Augustine's *De trinitate*, completed c. 1280 and certainly before 1282, has to be seen in that context and also in the light of what happened shortly afterwards. For Michael's successor, Andronikos II Palaiologos, who came to power in 1282, reversed Michael's policy of reunion.<sup>31</sup> It might be significant that despite his apparent friendship with Andronikos, Manuel did not stay on at court.<sup>32</sup> Some time after 1280, probably even after 1283, he became a monk and changed his name to Maximos.<sup>33</sup>

His monastic life enabled him to concentrate on his intellectual pursuits. For most of the time during the following decade he seems to have been able to stay in the capital and teach and encourage research at the Καθολικὸν Μουσεῖον, the famous high school of the city attached to the imperial Chora monastery.<sup>34</sup> In 1296 he was asked by the emperor to join an embassy to Armenia to negotiate ecclesiastical union. It seems that he succeeded in rejecting this offer without further repercussions, but he ended up accepting another, more delicate, one. He was invited to go to Venice to mediate in a political crisis. The mission turned out to be ill-fated.<sup>35</sup> The ambassadors were imprisoned by the Venetians, nearly executed and thrown out of the country without having achieved any

replaced him with John XI Bekkos, who had written a work in favour of the union. See Plan., *Aug. Triad.* (introduction), pp. xvi–xvii; PG cxli; H. G. Beck, *Kirche und theologische Literatur im byzantinischen Reich*, 3rd edn, Munich 1977, 681–6.

<sup>30</sup> On the following see Plan., *Aug. Triad.* (introduction), pp. xv–clviii; on Planudes's biography see his letters (*Maximi monachi Planudis epistulae*, ed. P. L. M. Leone, Amsterdam 1991, ed. M. Treu, Breslau 1890); C. Wendel, 'Planudes, Maximos', *Paulys Realencyklopädie* xx/ii (1950), 2202–53; C. N. Constantinides, 'The scholars and their books in the late thirteenth century', *JOB* xxxii (1982), 13–21; N. G. Wilson, *Scholars of Byzantium*, London 1983, 230–41; A. P. Kazhdan and others, *The Oxford dictionary of Byzantium*, iii, Oxford 1991, 1681–2.

<sup>31</sup> The new emperor dismissed Bekkos and reinstated Joseph, who was succeeded in 1283 by Gregory II of Cyprus, author of a τόμος πίστεως against Bekkos. See PG cxlii. 233–46; Beck, *Kirche und theologische Literatur*, 685–6. In 1285 Gregory presided over the council in Constantinople which defined the inner-Trinitarian distinctions (ἐκπόρευσις of the Spirit from the Father, ἕκφανσις of the Spirit through the Son) introduced to avoid the 'filioque': A. Papadakis, *Crisis in Byzantium: the filioque controversy in the patriarchate of Gregory II of Cyprus (1283–1289)*, New York 1983; Nicol, *The last centuries*, 93–100.

<sup>32</sup> On Planudes's friendship with Andronikos see Plan. epp. iv, xi, xix (11–44 Leone edn); Plan., *Aug. Triad.* (introduction), p. xxii n. 29.

<sup>33</sup> On the discussion about when exactly Planudes took the habit see *ibid.* pp. xix–xx.

<sup>34</sup> *Ibid.* pp. xx–xxi, xxvi–xxxiii; C. N. Constantinides, *Higher education in Byzantium in the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries (1204–c. 1310)*, Nicosia 1982.

<sup>35</sup> Cf. Plan., *Aug. Triad.* (introduction), pp. xxii–xxiii; D. M. Nicol, *Byzantium and Venice: a study in diplomatic and cultural relations*, Cambridge 1988, 212–27.



results. Finally, on their way home they were shipwrecked off the Albanian coast. Planudes arrived at home at the end of 1297 after a dangerous and excruciating journey overland, ill and exhausted. Back to his scholarly routine he seems to have spent the remaining eight years of his life partly in his monastery near the modern-day Scutari and partly in the academy of the Καθολικὸν Μουσεῖον, especially in its library, at the decline of which he expresses concern in one of his letters.<sup>36</sup> He died in 1305.

Besides his political involvement Planudes was above all renowned as a master of the classical languages. As far as Latin is concerned he was unequalled in the east. However, flattering as that may sound, it also indicates that neither he nor anyone else in Byzantium taught Latin at a higher level, or in a systematic way, and nobody of similar calibre seems to have shared his interest in the language and its literature.<sup>37</sup> His effort and achievement in translating an impressive body of pagan as well as Christian Latin texts seems to have been widely appreciated and admired but it remained unique and does not seem to have resulted in a surge of Latin studies in the east.<sup>38</sup>

In terms of intellectual – and especially theological – impact his greatest achievement was undoubtedly his translation of Augustine's *De trinitate*. It was the pioneering effort towards bridging the huge gap between Augustine's paramount role in the west and near oblivion in the east, a gap that had since the mid seventh century acquired a polemical charge, as Augustine became known in the east as the father of the defamed 'filioque'.<sup>39</sup> By translating his *De trinitate* Planudes put Augustine on the map of Byzantine theology, no matter what exactly the purpose of

<sup>36</sup> Plan., ep. lxvii; *Aug. Triad.* (introduction) p. xxiv n. 36.

<sup>37</sup> Cf. W. O. Schmitt, 'Lateinische Literatur in Byzanz: die Übersetzungen des Maximus Planudes und die moderne Forschung', *JOB* xvii (1968), 145.

<sup>38</sup> On other translations besides Aug., *De trin.* see Plan., *Aug. Triad.* (introduction), pp. xxxiv–xlvi. They include works of Cicero, Macrobius, the *Rhetorica ad Herennium*, Boethius, Ps-Donatus, Cato, Ovid and ps-Cyprian, *De duodecim abusivis saeculi*, an Irish apocryphal writing from the seventh century, popular in medieval times as a spiritual guide: W. O. Schmitt, 'Pseudo-Cyprians "De duodecim abusivis saeculi" in der Übersetzung des Maximus Planudes', *Sitzungsberichte der Berliner Akademie der Wissenschaften. Philosophisch-historische Klasse*, Berlin 1973, 13–36.

<sup>39</sup> The formula can be found in Aug., *De trin.* v. 15, CCL 1. 223; cf. Plan., *Aug. Triad.* 377. Based on John xv. 26; xx. 22, Augustine held the divinity of the Spirit – against the 'Arians' of the day, who taught that the Spirit was the supreme creature – on the ground that the Spirit, as the third person of the Trinity, is sent forth by the Father and the Son, Father and Son being one principle and origin. In the west this was included in the Creed. In the east this was contested on the ground that the Father and only the Father may be considered origin and principle, of the Son by begetting, of the Spirit by sending forth. The relationship between the Son and the Spirit was expressed in the east by formulae other than 'sending forth': 'Double procession', and 'Filioque', in F. L. Cross and E. A. Livingstone (eds), *The Oxford dictionary of the Christian Church*, 3rd edn, Oxford 1997, 505, 611 (further literature). See also n. 31. above

the translation may have been in the wider context of Emperor Michael's efforts towards reunion. Planudes was obviously captivated by the unique literary and theological quality of the work and 'the fact that he dutifully rendered the Latin doctrine of the procession of the Spirit from the Father and the Son should bear witness not only to his intellectual propriety but also to his esteem for Latin learning and theology'.<sup>40</sup> But can it be said that he ever shared the Latin position? To be sure, within a few years of completing the translation he had written two polemic treatises against the 'filioque'.<sup>41</sup> This has puzzled scholars ever since.<sup>42</sup> Did he change his mind, 'convert', so to speak, from the western to the eastern position? Did he act opportunistically under the new regime? Was he coerced under Andronikos into writing those treatises, as was suggested by Demetrios Kydones (1324–97/8) and Cardinal Bessarion (1403–72)?<sup>43</sup> Did he consider the engagement in Trinitarian speculation as part of his spiritual formation, no matter what its doctrinal implications?<sup>44</sup> Had he been fired by a youthful enthusiasm for the Latin language and the prospect of union under Michael VIII Palaiologos,<sup>45</sup> only to wake up to the political and ecclesiastical realities when Andronikos reversed Michael's policies and reinstated John Bekkos as patriarch?

While there may be some truth in each of these suggestions, none of them reveals the whole picture. Planudes himself gives only a slight hint when he states in ep. cxiii that he was coerced into writing theology.<sup>46</sup> He saw himself primarily as a classical scholar and a monk, not as a theologian. Whatever personal or spiritual interests he may have had, the primary purpose of his translation was to provide others with a good text as a basis for further study. Considering the difficulties and confusions of Trinitarian terminology, that alone was an ambitious enough objective.<sup>47</sup> It also points to two aspects of Augustine's theological genius in which Planudes may have shared, his speculative powers and his reluctance to give assent to positions which he thought he had not fully understood.<sup>48</sup>

<sup>40</sup> Plan., *Aug. Triad.* (introduction), p. xlvii.

<sup>41</sup> Περὶ τῆς ἐκπορεύσεως τοῦ ἁγίου πνεύματος κε ἀλαία συλλογιστικά κατὰ τῶν Λατίνων and Λόγος περὶ πίστεως: *ibid.* p. xlvi.

<sup>42</sup> See the discussion *ibid.* pp. xlvi–xlix (literature).

<sup>43</sup> See L. Möhler, *Kardinal Bessarion als Theologe: Humanist und Staatsmann*, Paderborn 1923, 220–3, and M. H. Congourdeau, 'Planudes, Manuel', in *Catholicisme, hier, aujourd'hui, demain*, xi, Paris 1988, 488–90 at p. 489.

<sup>44</sup> Thus the explanation given in Plan., *Aug. Triad.* (introduction), pp. 1–li.

<sup>45</sup> Thus Congourdeau, 'Planudes'.

<sup>46</sup> Cf. Plan., *Aug. Triad.* (introduction), p. liv n. 170.

<sup>47</sup> Cf. Aug., ep. clxix, CSEL xlv. 612, where Augustine writes that many people use Trinitarian terminology but have little idea what they are talking about.

<sup>48</sup> In *Conf.* xiii. 11. 12, CCL xxvii. 247, and ep. ccxlii. 5, CSEL lvii, Augustine writes that those who claim to have a complete understanding of the Trinity prove by that very claim that they do not possess the light of truth. See also L. P. Schrenk, 'Augustine's *De trinitate* in Byzantine skepticism', *Greek, Roman and Byzantine Studies* xxx (1989), 451–6.

Such academic detachment made him a role model for later monastic humanists like Prochoros Kydones, who considered translating theological texts in itself a theological enterprise.<sup>49</sup> But it earned him little recognition in an era when such detachment was generally eyed with suspicion. If, for instance, Gregory Palamas little less than a century later had recourse to the text when writing his ‘150 Chapters’, he kept quiet about it. Yet as the number of thirty odd extant manuscripts suggests, Planudes’s translation was widespread, even in the west, where parts of it were printed in the seventeenth century, though a complete critical edition was published only in 1995.<sup>50</sup> With Planudes’s translation Augustine’s theology, welcome or not, had entered the eastern domain. The theological consequences now have to be considered.

*Gregory Palamas and his use of Planudes’s translation*

The reign of Andronikos II Palaiologos was followed by an era of civil wars, which ended only under John VI Cantacuzene (1347–54).<sup>51</sup> Parallel to the political conflicts a theological battle raged. It was finally settled at the Council of Constantinople of 1351, when Palamitic Hesychasm was declared orthodox.<sup>52</sup> Hesychasm was a certain type of mystical prayer aimed at union of heart and mind and popular among monks. Its major proponent was Gregory Palamas. Born in Constantinople in 1296<sup>53</sup> of noble Anatolian stock, he had become a monk on Mount Athos in 1318. In 1326 he was ordained priest of the diocese of Thessalonica. His teaching was focused on the idea that persons who are spiritually exceptionally gifted may through practising the Hesychast way of prayer reach a beatific vision of the divine light, or Thabor light, which resembles God’s uncreated energy, i.e. the Holy Spirit. In defence of that teaching Gregory maintained, especially from 1337 onwards, a heated debate with the Calabrian monk Barlaam (1290–1348).

Both Gregory and Barlaam were rooted in Byzantine tradition. Under the influence of the apophatic tradition of pseudo-Dionysian neo-Platonism Barlaam contested Gregory’s distinction between divine essence and energy and his claim that it was possible, by way of simple prayer, to

<sup>49</sup> See Plan., *Aug. Triad.* (introduction), pp. lv–lvi, esp. n. 176.

<sup>50</sup> Ibid. (introduction). In 1630 Pietro Arcudio in Rome published excerpts of bk 15: P. Arcudius, *Opuscula aurea theologica circa processionem Spiritus Sancti*, Rome 1630, 587–613. This edition is included in PG cxlvii. 1111–30. The oldest extant manuscript is Bodleian Library, Oxford, ms Laud. gr. 71, from 1342. <sup>51</sup> Nicol, *The last centuries*, 151–250.

<sup>52</sup> See J. Meyendorff, *Introduction à l’étude de Grégoire Palamas*, Paris 1959; Fairy von Lilienfeld, ‘Hesychasmus’, *Theologische Realenzyklopädie* xv (1986), 282–9.

<sup>53</sup> On the biographical data see Meyendorff, *Introduction*, 45–170.

attain a state in which one could perceive the uncreated divine light with one's bodily eyes.<sup>54</sup> In Barlaam's view Palamas was going too far in making such definitive statements on the nature of God in relation to his creation in general and to man in particular. Barlaam held that Palamas ignored the fundamental distinctions between creator and creation and between spirit and matter, which also had implications for Palamas's teaching on the Trinity. In return, Palamas and his supporters accused Barlaam of rationalism. In their view he reduced the working of God's spirit to the human intellect, which could only grasp what God was not.

While the Palamites saw Barlaam as an enemy of the faith, who sabotaged their efforts towards developing an orthodox doctrine, for Barlaam it was rather Gregory and his adherents who were throwing overboard such orthodox fundamentals as the principle of tradition founded on Scripture and the doctrine of the primitive Church. Barlaam was not the only one to criticise the new teaching on these grounds. His concerns were shared by figures like Gregory Akindynos (c. 1300–48) and Nicephoros Gregoras (1292–1361).<sup>55</sup> But Palamas would not recant. Supported by his fellow monks on Mount Athos and the patriarch he was appointed archbishop of Thessalonica in 1347. In 1351 his teachings were officially recognised as orthodox. He died in 1359.

The renewed interest which Palamas's teaching has attracted since the early days of the twentieth century has shed fresh light on the controversy, though some of its aspects may have also been obscured.<sup>56</sup> Thus the rejection of Palamas's concept of divine energy has been seen as leading to secularism, nihilism, irrationalism, materialism, atheism, the denial of the fundamental orthodox teaching of cosmic sacredness and of salvation as human and cosmic deification, a denial which has led in the west to a concept of creation as subject to human domination, exploitation and destruction. Such arguments, whether valid in themselves or not, are purely modern. They largely fail to recognise the concerns behind the debate in the fourteenth century, which were essentially theological. (For

<sup>54</sup> On the same grounds Barlaam also turned against western theology, for example against the epistemologically optimistic 'realist' scholasticism of St Thomas Aquinas: J. Meyendorff: 'Les Débuts de la controverse hésychaste', *Byzantion* xxiii (1953), 87–120 at pp. 92–103; *Introduction*, 340–3; and 'Un Mauvais Théologien de l'unité au xive siècle: Barlaam le Calabrais', in *1054–1954: l'église et les églises*, ii, Chevetogne 1957, 47–64.

<sup>55</sup> On Akindynos see *Gregorii Acindyni Refutationes duae operis Gregorii Palamae cui titulus dialogus inter orthodoxum et barlaamitam*, ed. J. N. Cañellas, Turnhout 1995 (= CCG xxxi), esp. pp. xiii–xxviii, 411–48. See also Nicol, *The last centuries*, 213–15. On Nicephoros Gregoras see Meyendorff, 'Les Débuts', 94–5; Nicol, *The last centuries*, 232–4.

<sup>56</sup> For a recent discussion see R. Flogaus, 'Der heimliche Blick nach Westen: zur Rezeption von Augustins *De trinitate* durch Gregorios Palamas', *JOB* xlvi (1996), 275–97, 276 (literature). On the following see now also his *Theosis bei Palamas und Luther: ein Beitrag zum ökumenischen Gespräch*, Göttingen 1997, esp. pp. 98–109, 143–58, and the review by G. Podskalsky, *BZ* xci (1998), 118–20 (with further literature).

instance, the discussion about the nature of the Palamite concept of divine energy is reminiscent of the discussion about the divinity of the Logos and the Spirit in the fourth century.) It would be misleading and anachronistic to present Palamas's opponents as westernised rationalists (or, for that matter, irrationalists, as has also been claimed), agnostics and materialists, influenced at the same time by Italian Renaissance humanism, late medieval nominalism, medieval and early modern Augustinianism and Thomism.<sup>57</sup> In reality the controversy between Palamas and his opponents emerged from the heart of Byzantine tradition. It was a home-made affair and the way in which Augustine, a representative less of western than of patristic thought, was drawn into it (alongside the likes of Basil of Caesarea and Gregory Nazianzen), firmly underlines that.

The view that Palamas may have used Planudes's translation, especially in his *Capita*,<sup>58</sup> was first advanced by Martin Jugie,<sup>59</sup> who argued that Palamas's reference to the Spirit as love (ἔρως) between the Father and the Son<sup>60</sup> could not have originated from any other source but Augustine's *De trinitate*, be it directly, or indirectly via Thomas Aquinas. The latter now seems less likely. Demetrios Kydones had not finished his translation of the *Summa contra gentiles* any earlier than Christmas 1354.<sup>61</sup> (His was the translation Palamas would have had to rely on.) Yet Palamas had finished his *Capita* by 1350 at the latest.<sup>62</sup> By that time he would already have known Planudes's translation of Augustine's *De trinitate* for not less than five years.<sup>63</sup>

But could Palamas not have drawn the concept from a Greek source? To be sure, attempts have been made at showing precisely that.<sup>64</sup> Yet according to Vladimir Lossky, a renowned expert in Palamite theology, the idea that the Spirit is the mutual love between Father and Son is alien to Greek tradition.<sup>65</sup> But how did it enter Palamas's work and, moreover,

<sup>57</sup> On some examples see Flogaus, 'Der heimliche Blick', 277 nn. 8, 9.

<sup>58</sup> Γρηγορίου τοῦ Παλαμᾶ Συγγράμματα V, ed. P. Chrestou and others, Thessalonica 1992; R. E. Sinkewicz, *Saint Gregory Palamas: the one hundred and fifty chapters: a critical edition, translation and study*, Toronto 1988.

<sup>59</sup> M. Jugie, 'Palamas', *Dictionnaire de théologie catholique* xi (1932), 1766.

<sup>60</sup> See Greg. Pal., *Cap.* 36 (54–5 Chrestou V edn; 121–3 Sinkewicz edn).

<sup>61</sup> On the circumstances see Nicol, *The last centuries*, 257 (literature).

<sup>62</sup> See Flogaus, 'Der heimliche Blick', 278 n. 12, 278–9.

<sup>63</sup> Flogaus (ibid. 282–3, 296) argues, in my view convincingly, that Palamas may have first encountered the work during his arrest at the imperial palace after his excommunication in 1344. Interestingly, not long afterwards his fate changed for the better.

<sup>64</sup> For example the Cappadocians, Didymus the Blind, Gregory of Sinai († 1346) and Theoleptos of Philadelphia († 1324/5), Palamas's spiritual father: Flogaus, 'Der heimliche Blick', 279–82; N. Cipriani, 'La retractatio Agostiniana sulla processione-generazione dello Spirito Sancto (*De trin.* v. 12. 13)', *Augustinianum* xxxvii (1997), 431–9 at pp. 434–5.

<sup>65</sup> V. Lossky, *The mystical theology of the eastern Church*, London 1957, 81, 213; cf. Flogaus, 'Der heimliche Blick', 278 n. 13.

what are the consequences? According to Sinkewicz ‘Palamas clarified the analogy of the Spirit as love. In man this has its foundation in the divine image and likeness to be found in the mind. The relation of the mind to its immanent knowledge is described as ἔρωσ or ἔ εσις.’<sup>66</sup> But Sinkewicz warns:

Because of the similarities with Augustine’s trinitarian analogies there is a great temptation to start reading Augustine’s ideas into the text of Palamas. The temptation should be avoided. Gregory spoke of the knowledge naturally inherent in the mind, but he did not equate this with the mind’s knowledge of itself (*notitia sui*). He spoke of the relation of the mind to the knowledge immanent in it as one of love, but he did not describe this as the mind’s intending its self-love (*amor sui* and *voluntas sui*). Above all, Palamas very clearly did not conclude that the Holy Spirit is the relation of love between the Father and the Son.<sup>67</sup>

Following Flogaus I have tried to show elsewhere that with this statement Sinkewicz fails to do justice to either Palamas or Augustine.<sup>68</sup> For in *Cap.* 36 Palamas did speak of the Spirit as love, while when Augustine did he always pointed out either that by doing so he was applying an analogy of the mind, or that what he referred to is ‘God’s will’, a concept that comes close to that of the Spirit as ἐνέργεια.<sup>69</sup> To be sure, there are differences between Palamas and Augustine (Planudes).<sup>70</sup> But these are found in

<sup>66</sup> *Saint Gregory Palamas: the one hundred and fifty chapters*, 18.

<sup>67</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>68</sup> See Flogaus, ‘Der heimliche Blick’; J. Lössl, ‘Augustine’s On the Trinity in Gregory Palamas’ One Hundred and Fifty Chapters’, *Augustinian Studies* xxx (1999), 61–82. A middle position is held by J. Lison, ‘L’Ésprit comme amour selon Grégoire Palamas: une influence augustinienne?’ *Studia Patristica* xxxii (1997), 325–32. Lison, too, argues for Palamas’s use of Planudes’s translation but doubts whether that means that Palamas was (heavily) influenced by Augustinian thought.

<sup>69</sup> Cf. Aug., *De trin.* xv. 5, CCL 1 A. 465: ‘amans et quod amatur et amor’ (Plan., *Aug. Triad.* 859: ὁ ἐρῶν καὶ τὸ ἐρώμενον καὶ ὁ ἔρωσ, sc. the self-reflecting mind as likeness of the Trinity). See also Flogaus, ‘Der heimliche Blick’, 292 n. 51; Greg. Pal., *Cap.* 36 (54–5 Chrestou V edn; 122 Sinkewicz edn): τὸ πνεῦμα... οἷόν τις ἔρωσ ἐστὶν ἀπόρρητος τοῦ γεννήτορος πρὸς αὐτὸν τὸν ἀπορρήτως γεννηθέντα λόγον. In *De trin.* xv. 27 (CCL 1 A. 501; Plan., *Aug. Triad.* 929) Augustine points out that according to 1 Jn iv. 8, 16, the Spirit cannot be identified with ἀγάπη because God is called so. In *De trin.* xv. 41, CCL 1 A. 515; Plan., *Aug. Triad.* 961, he maintains that what can be said about the Spirit in this whole puzzle (αἰνίγμα) (sc. of Trinitarian relationships) is that it (πνεῦμα) is ‘will at its most effective (ἐρρωμενεστέρα θέλησις), or better, ἔρωσ ἢ ἀγάπη, ‘amor seu dilectio’. On the importance of this passage in the history of the concept of the will see J. Lössl, ‘Augustine on the will’, in M. Stone, and T. Pink (eds), *The will and theories of human action: from the Stoics to the present day*, London 2000, forthcoming. On parallels between the Augustinian concepts of divine will (inner Trinitarian and in the economic context of the operations of grace) and the corresponding Greek concept of θέλησις in connection with the concept of the Spirit as ἐνέργεια, as in Maximus the Confessor and John the Damascene (cf., for example, idem, *Expositio fidei* 59), see below n. 81.

<sup>70</sup> In the case of the Augustinian concepts of ‘notitia sui’ and ‘amor sui’ Sinkewicz is largely right, although even here Augustine’s identification of ‘notitia’ and ‘amor’

theological concepts rather than philological evidence. For the latter is overwhelming, especially in *Cap.* 125–35.<sup>71</sup> The danger here is not to ‘read Augustine’s ideas into the text of Palamas’ but to fail to see Augustine’s text behind the ideas of Palamas.

*Cap.* 125 consists largely of a literal rendering of Augustine’s summary in *De trin.* xv. 5 of *De trin.* v, in which Augustine provides an (anti-Eunomian) analysis of expressions like Father, Son and creator,<sup>72</sup> which must not be conceived of as substances but as relations (relative, ἀναφορικῶς), as they relate to something (‘ad aliquid’, πρὸς τι) other than self. To make the point Palamas simply copies a long passage from Planudes’s translation. But at the end he changes a significant detail. Where Augustine states that divine relations to temporal conditions – like God’s lordship over creation – are to be understood strictly as temporal (ἐν χρόνῳ), i.e. not affecting God’s immutable state in eternity, he adds, partly in his own words, that this includes God’s lordship over all those who are ‘in eternity and over the Aeons themselves; for being Lord is an uncreated energy of God, distinct from the substance, as it is spoken of in relation to something else, which he is not’.<sup>73</sup>

What is here the decisive difference between Augustine and Palamas? Augustine had been careful not to give the impression that his teaching required the concept of an eternal cosmos. He insisted that God’s lordship could only be conceived of as occurring in time.<sup>74</sup> For him, time was

through the concept of ‘intellectus gratiae’ makes it possible to relate the concepts of God as the supreme intellect (Augustine) and the supreme goodness (Palamas) respectively and thus point out that there are indeed aspects in which the two theologies converge. In the case of *Cap.* 36 no literal parallels can be found. But see (in the light of nn 68–9 above) the following references with a variety of partly overlapping concepts of love. Planudes preferred ἀγάπη as reference to God’s love, or to God as love, which renders Augustine’s, ‘caritas’ as opposed to φιλία, which stands for Latin ‘amicitia’, the mutual love between friends: Aug., *De trin.* vi. 7, CCL 1. 235; Plan., *Aug. Triad.* 399–401; Aug., *De trin.* v. 12–3, CCL 1. 218–20; Plan., *Aug. Triad.* 367–71; Aug., *De trin.* vi. 11, CCL 1. 242; Plan., *Aug. Triad.* 413; cf. Flogaus, ‘Der heimliche Blick’, 291–2 n. 50; Aug., *De trin.* xv. 27, CCL 1 A. 501; Plan., *Aug. Triad.* 929; Aug., *De trin.* xv. 27–39, CCL 1 A. 501–15; Plan., *Aug. Triad.* 929–59; Aug., *De trin.* xv. 37, CCL 1 A. 513; Plan., *Aug. Triad.* 951; Aug., *De trin.* 41, CCL 1 A. 517–19; Plan., *Aug. Triad.* 961–3. Note also that in archaic Greek ἰλίᾱ denotes family relation, συγγένεια. On the Augustinian terminology see I. Hadot, ‘Amicitia’, *AL* i (1994), 287–93; D. Dideberg, ‘Amor’, *ibid.* 294–300, and ‘Caritas’, *ibid.* 730–43.

<sup>71</sup> See Flogaus, ‘Der heimliche Blick’, 280–93. *Capp.* 1–63 outlines Palamas’s teaching in general, *Capp.* 64–150 mainly refute specific points raised by Gregory Akindynos.

<sup>72</sup> Aug., *De trin.* xv. 5, CCL 1 A 463; Plan. *Aug. Triad.* 857; Flogaus, ‘Der heimliche Blick’, 281, esp. n. 21.

<sup>73</sup> Greg. Pal., *Cap.* 125 (106 Chrestou V edn; 229–30 Sinkewicz edn); Aug., *De trin.* xv. 5, CCL 1 A. 464; Plan., *Aug. Triad.* 857; cf. Flogaus, ‘Der heimliche Blick’, 281 n. 21. Only the italicised passages are literally taken from Augustine. On the rest of the passage see Lössl, ‘Augustine’s On the Trinity’ 72–4.

<sup>74</sup> For example in *De trin.* v. 17, CCL 1. 225; Plan., *Aug. Triad.* 379–83.

essentially creational. The distinction between the temporal and the eternal was equivalent to the distinction between God and creation. The limits of time were the limits of perception, even, and in particular, of the human perception of God.<sup>75</sup> From this point of view there were certain properties which could be applied to God in a proper sense on the basis of the biblical faith, because they referred to God's presence in time, for example that he is Lord. But there were also properties which could be applied to God only by way of analogy, since they were not accessible to the human mind by virtue of their very nature, such as the Trinitarian relations and the eternity of God's substance. With his concept of God's energy Palamas shifted the boundary between the concepts of the eternal and the temporal, God and creation. In his view it is possible for the human mind to perceive with certainty that God is Lord, not only 'over time', i.e. creation in history, but also 'in and over eternity'. Asked what that was supposed to mean, and whether it might not amount to dropping the distinction between God and creation, he declared that the concept of divine energy includes creation, insofar as it implies that creation is in the process of deification.<sup>76</sup> Thus one might concede that he upheld the distinction in some sense, namely as the distinction between God's essence and God's energy, although his opponents would have pressed further the question as to how it can be perceived that God, in himself, is Lord in and over an essentially other one, as if either the distinction were not real, or as if it constituted a division in God himself.

What his opponents actually asked was whether he understood his distinction between God's essence and God's energy as a substantial or an accidental one. He replied that in his view it was neither, but relational. The relevant passage in *Cap.* 127 draws literally on *De trin.* v. 5.<sup>77</sup> Pressed further as to whether he understood 'relational' as substantially or accidentally 'relational', he conceded that he understood 'relational' 'somehow' (πῶς) as accidental rather than substantial.<sup>78</sup> He obviously

<sup>75</sup> See in Gregory Nazianzen, *Oratio* xxix. 16, SC ccl. 210, the cautious remarks on the use of a term like σχέσις in reference to the οὐσία of the Father and xxx. 18, SC ccl. 262–4, the distinction between relative and absolute concepts of God. See Flogaus, 'Der heimliche Blick', 281–2 n. 22, against *Saint Gregory Palamas: the one hundred and fifty chapters*, 47–8.

<sup>76</sup> As a challenge to Palamas's concept see, for example, Gregory Akindynos, *Antirrheticos* ii. 3. 12. 43–104 (182–3 Cañellas edn). See also Flogaus, 'Der heimliche Blick', 282.

<sup>77</sup> Aug., *De trin.* v. 5, CCL 1. 209–10; Plan., *Aug. Triad.* 349–50; Greg. Pal., *Cap.* 127 (106–7 Chrestou V edn; 229–30 Sinkewicz edn); Flogaus, 'Der heimliche Blick', 282–3 n. 23.

<sup>78</sup> See Greg. Pal., *Cap.* 127 (107 Chrestou V edn; 230 Sinkewicz edn). Flogaus, 'Der heimliche Blick', 283 n. 27, suggests that this brings Palamas closer to Thomas Aquinas than to Augustine. He is right in that in *Summa theologiae* i. 3. 6 Aquinas counts relations among accidents. But then *ibid.* i. 29. 4 he also singles out the inner-Trinitarian relations as subsisting relations. Thus the impression is rather that Palamas stood mid-way between them.



wanted to rule out the assumption that he referred to a split in God's substance and tried to avoid speaking of God's energy as if it was a substance. After all the concept had been developed largely against a tendency towards substantialism in Trinitarian theology.<sup>79</sup>

He also tried to apply this strategy against an argument of Nicephoros Gregoras based on a quotation from Gregory Nazianzen, turning it into a counter-attack.<sup>80</sup> Nazianzen had argued that if the Spirit is not thought of as a subsisting being (ὑπόστασις) but only as an 'accidens', he must be thought of as God's energy. Everything else might imply that there are several substances in God. However, if the Spirit is conceived in that way, he cannot be thought of as an agent. For accidents cannot be causes. They are effects of substances. Only with certain precautions can some of them be called secondary agents. However, if the Holy Spirit were conceived in that way he would cease to exist as an agent at the very moment at which he begins to exist by being caused by the Father.

Nazianzen obviously intended the argument in this form as a 'reductio ad absurdum'. In Nicephoros Gregoras's view it raised a serious question concerning Palamas's concept of the Spirit as divine energy: If it was 'only' an 'accidens', how could it be a ὑπόστασις? The subsistence and divinity of the Spirit was in question. Palamas, however, understood the argument as supporting his view. The term ὑπόστασις had been introduced precisely in order to avoid substantialism in Trinitarian speculation. God was, and acted, not as three substances but as one substance. Yet he subsisted in three ὑποστάσεις. To speak of the Spirit as a 'divine accidens' meant to say this of the Spirit in respect to God's substance, not to God's ways of subsisting. In Palamas's view therefore, in contrast to Nazianzen's polemical conclusion, the Spirit *subsisted precisely as* God's energy proceeding from the Father through the Son.

Palamas found his conclusion supported by a passage from the *Expositio fidei* of John Damascene which contains the concept of 'uncreated energy' as a middle-term between 'divine ὑπόστασις' and 'created ἀποτέλεσμα' or 'ἐνέργημα'.<sup>81</sup> Repeatedly he insisted on the distinction between God's

<sup>79</sup> See Lossky, *Mystical theology of the eastern Church*, 213. Flogaus, 'Der heimliche Blick', 284 n. 30, relates this to the Augustinian idea, related to the one of God's lordship over time, that there is only one centre of action *ad extra* in God. Other (temporal, locational and habitual) categories may be applied to God metaphorically (translate, μεταορικῶς), the category of action may be applied properly ('verissime', ὀληθέστατα): Aug., *De trin.* v. 9, CCL 1. 215–16; Plan., *Aug. Triad.* 363; Greg. Pal., *Cap.* 133 (110 Chrestou V edn; 239 Sinkewicz edn).

<sup>80</sup> Cf. Nic. Greg., *Antirrheticos* i. 1. 8. 13 (189–91 Beyer edn); Flogaus, 'Der heimliche Blick', 283 n. 28.

<sup>81</sup> Io. Dam., *Exp. fid.* 59 (*Patristische Texte und Studien* xii. 144); Greg. Pal., *Cap.* 129, 131, 143 (108, 115, Chrestou V edn; 233, 235–6, 247 Sinkewicz edn); Flogaus, 'Der heimliche Blick', 284–5.

essence and God's will on the ground that it is a necessary precondition for the distinction between the begetting of the Son and the creation of the universe.<sup>82</sup>

Like Gregory Nazianzen, Augustine tells a slightly different story. In *De trin.* v. 14–15 he develops the notion that God can be thought of as origin and cause ('principium', ἀρχή) in two ways, inner-Trinitarian and economic. In the first way the Father is called the ἀρχή of the Son and the Spirit, in the second the Trinity is called the ἀρχή of creation.<sup>83</sup> Palamas quotes nearly the entire passage. Only where Augustine's argument comes to its obvious conclusion he suppresses the following passage:

If the one who is given is at the same time the one who gives (for he does not receive his proceeding from anyone else but from him), we must confess that the Father *and the Son* are the ἀρχή of the Holy Spirit, not two ἀρχαί but, as Father and Son, one God.<sup>84</sup>

Augustine makes this statement on the assumption that there is no distinction in God between essence and attributes.<sup>85</sup> In his view the Spirit proceeding from the Father and the Son proceeds from one source only. Palamas agrees that the Spirit proceeds from one source only, but he holds that this one source is the Father *and the Son*. On the basis of traditional teaching established over the centuries in the east he argues that there has to be a clear distinction between God's will, conceived as his primordial energy (besides other energetic properties) communicated *through* the Son, and God's essence, originating in, and proceeding *from*, the Father. A divine οὐσία supposedly prior to all the persons taken together was to be rejected in his view.<sup>86</sup>

However, in the chapters surrounding *Cap.* 36, where he puts forward his concept of the Spirit as ἔρωσ between Father and Son, he seems to make an exception to that rule. In *Cap.* 34 he states that God is the

<sup>82</sup> Cf. Greg. Pal., *Cap.* 135 (111–12 Chrestou V edn; 240–1 Sinkewicz edn); Flogaus, 'Der heimliche Blick', 287.

<sup>83</sup> According to Augustine the expression 'Father' can be used to refer properly to the relationship between God and creation as originating solely in God. In other words, the Father is the sole cause. This is thoroughly eastern doctrine. Flogaus, 'Der heimliche Blick', 286–7 n. 21, observes that in Greg. Pal., *Cap.* 132 (109–10 Chrestou V edn; 237 Sinkewicz edn) Palamas does not even use the term 'energy'. He relies exclusively on Augustine's text.

<sup>84</sup> Aug., *De trin.* v. 15, CCL 1. 223; Plan., *Aug. Triad.* 377; cf. Flogaus, 'Der heimliche Blick', 286.

<sup>85</sup> Cf. *De trin.* xv. 38, CCL 1 A. 515–16; Plan., *Aug. Triad.* 955–6. See also Greg. Naz. *Or.*, xxix. 7, SC ccl. 190; Flogaus, 'Der heimliche Blick', 287.

<sup>86</sup> To illustrate this point see *ibid.* n. 38, quoting from pseudo-Justin, *Quaestiones Christianae ad Graecos*, PG vi. 1433 B: 'τὸ βούλεσθαι ἢ οὐσία ἐστίν, ἢ πρόσεστι τῇ οὐσίᾳ... εἰ δὲ πρόσεστι τῇ οὐσίᾳ, ἐξ ἀνάγκης ἄλλο καὶ ἄλλο ἐστίν· οὐκ ἐστὶ γὰρ τὸ ὄν καὶ τὸ προσὸν ταύτόν.' As a possible response see Greg. Akind., ep. xlii. ad Lapithem (*Letters of Gregory Akindynos*, ed. A. C. Hero, Washington 1983, 178).

supreme good and possesses his goodness not as a mere quality (ποιότης) but as a substance (οὐσία); yet immediately he corrects himself saying that by this he does not mean to separate God and God's life, or wisdom, or eternity, or beatitude. Rather, all of these are one in God in the highest sense, i.e. in his goodness. In *De trin.* xv. 7–9 Augustine holds a similar view,<sup>87</sup> only he derives God's properties not from his goodness but from his wisdom, or intellect. This seems epistemologically sounder,<sup>88</sup> for it enabled Augustine at any moment in his inquiry to put on the brake and point out the limitations of Trinitarian speculation.<sup>89</sup> To him such speculation was more of a formal, philosophical, insight, less binding than what had to be accepted in faith from Scripture and tradition. Palamas did not make that distinction. His need to correct himself in his point on God as the supreme goodness shows that he tried – though in vain – to put forward a concept which would be as formally sound as filled with doctrinal content.<sup>90</sup> That he tried it, and the way in which he tried, however, is due to Augustine's influence.

In *Cap.* 35 Palamas distinguishes four meanings of λόγος in an attempt to clarify the concept of the Son as 'God's word from heaven' (ἀνωτάτω λόγος). He maintains that the latter, as far as its likeness to a dimension of being human is concerned, is neither like an uttered nor like an unuttered word, or thought, but like the ever present reality of the mind (νοῦς), which in a certain sense can be called eternal.<sup>91</sup> An obvious parallel to this can be found in *De trin.* xv. 17–25,<sup>92</sup> especially in Augustine's assumption that the ultimate level of likeness between God's word and the human mind lies in γνῶσις.<sup>93</sup>

<sup>87</sup> See Aug., *De trin.* xv. 7–9, CCL 1 A. 468–71; Plan., *Aug. Triad.* 865–71; Flogaus, 'Der heimliche Blick', 288 n. 40.

<sup>88</sup> Sinkewicz holds that against him (see n. 67). But already Barlaam the Calabrian had pointed out that Augustine's theology was consistent in that respect. In his view Palamas would run into difficulties trying to prove it wrong: Barlaam, ep. i to Palamas, in *Archivio storico per la Calabria a la Lucania*, ed. G. Schirò, i (1935), 66–70; iii (1936), 322, 324.

<sup>89</sup> See, for example, *De trin.* ix. 1. 1, CCL 1. 292–3.

<sup>90</sup> Sinkewicz (see above n. 67) is of course right in pointing out that by defining God as supreme goodness Palamas is true to church tradition. But that is not exactly the point here. The point is – and that is why, for example, Barlaam queried it (see above n. 88) – that Palamas claimed that his concept of God's goodness as his οὐσία is more than just church tradition, that it is a necessary truth, accessible through speculation, reason and mystical power, rather than a church doctrine to be accepted by faith.

<sup>91</sup> Greg. Pal., *Cap.* 35 (53–4 Chrestou V edn; 121 Sinkewicz edn); Flogaus, 'Der heimliche Blick', 289 n. 41. The inconsistency particularly between this concept and the one put forward in *Cap.* 36 is obvious. What kind of logic forces us to conclude from the likeness of God's word to the human mind that God's essence is supreme goodness?

<sup>92</sup> *De trin.* xv. 17–25, CCL 1 A. 486–99; Plan., *Aug. Triad.* 893–927; Flogaus, 'Der heimliche Blick', 289–90 nn. 43–4. Note the expressions προσοριστός λόγος (Palamas); λόγος προοριστός ἐν θόγγω (Planudes); 'verbatim prolativum in sono' (Augustine); λόγος ἐνδιάθετος ('verbum cogitatum'); ἐν τῇ διανοίᾳ λόγος ('in animo').

<sup>93</sup> See Flogaus, 'Der heimliche Blick', 290, esp. n. 45; Aug. *De trin.* xv. 25, CCL 1 A.

In *Cap.* 37 Palamas even goes as far as to combine this with the concept of ‘supreme ζῆρος’ signifying the likeness of the Spirit in humanity, as pointed out in *Cap.* 36. Human beings, he writes, have an insatiable thirst (ἔφεσις) for γνῶσις.<sup>94</sup> Augustine, *De trin.* ix. 18, speaks of an ‘appetitus’ (ὄρεξις) in human beings, which through the rebirth of human knowledge in the Spirit develops into a genuine divine love for what, or whom, is ultimately intended to be known, namely God himself. It can be called a likeness of the person of the Spirit in the human being.<sup>95</sup>

*Cap.* is not the only one of Palamas’s writings which may be influenced by *De trin.*, or Planudes, *Aug. Triad.* Flogaus mentions particularly *Homilia* 16 and *Ad Xenam* as candidates for rendering further evidence in that respect. He points out that there are works, especially from the time after 1344, which nobody has as yet looked into.<sup>96</sup> His studies so far have shown that it may well be worth doing so. While we may not be able to speak of a reception of Augustinian theology in Palamite thought,<sup>97</sup> the fact that the latter is influenced by the former seems now well established; and since we can well speak of a reception of Palamite thought in later Byzantine theology, we may look for further evidence of that influence. In works like that of Prochoros Kydones, discussed in the next section, it surfaces and is made more explicit. However, the teaching of the Palamite had emerged in a context of fierce struggle and controversy,<sup>98</sup> and to be sure, that particular aspect was now perpetuated as well, with disastrous consequences for some participants in the ongoing theological debate.

#### *Prochoros Kydones – an Augustinian Palamite?*

The case of Prochoros Kydones<sup>99</sup> is particularly telling in that respect. Having been one of Palamas’s most ardent followers during his lifetime he

498–500; Plan., *Aug. Triad.* 923–5. See also Palamas’s argument concerning the λόγος ἐν δianoίᾳ, which cannot be the image of God’s word, because its perfection needs time, in Aug., *De trin.* vii. 4, CCL 1. 251–2; Plan., *Aug. Triad.* 431–6.

<sup>94</sup> Greg. Pal., *Cap.* 37 (55 Chrestou V edn; 123 Sinkewicz edn); Flogaus, ‘Der heimliche Blick’, 292 n. 52.

<sup>95</sup> Aug., *De trin.* ix. 18, CCL 1. 310; Plan., *Aug. Triad.* 549; Flogaus, ‘Der heimliche Blick’, 293 n. 53.

<sup>96</sup> See Flogaus, ‘Der heimliche Blick’, 293–4.

<sup>97</sup> See the reflections on this by G. Podskalsky, *BZ* xci (1998), 118–20 at pp. 119, 120.

<sup>98</sup> On the political and ecclesiastical context see, brilliantly, Nicol, *The last centuries*, 210–50.

<sup>99</sup> Not to be mistaken for his brother Demetrios Kydones (1324–97/8) who is known for his translations of Aquinas, especially of the *Summa contra gentiles*, and a number of pseudo-Augustinian and Augustinian works, for example Prosper Tiro, *Liber sententiarum ex operibus Sancti Augustini* (autograph in Cod. Vat. gr. 1096, fos 171r–99r; CCL lxxviii A); Fulgentius of Ruspe, *De fide ad Petrum seu De regula fidei* (Cod. Vat. gr. 1096, fos 199v–221v; Vat. gr.

ended up being condemned a heretic, not in line with Palamas's teaching, and has ever since been known as an 'anti-Palamite'.<sup>100</sup>

Palamas was still struggling with his opponents when Prochoros joined the *μεγίστη λαύρα* on Mount Athos, still a boy. After some years as a lay monk he was ordained and became a *ἱερομόναχος*. He studied Latin and began to apply his knowledge to the works of Augustine and Thomas Aquinas. In contrast to Planudes, who in his youth translated what is probably Augustine's most sublime work, Prochoros began his Augustinian studies by translating some fairly basic passages from early works like the first fifteen paragraphs of *De uera religione*,<sup>101</sup> five paragraphs of *De beata uita*<sup>102</sup> and a large part of the first book of *De libero arbitrio*.<sup>103</sup> Only a collection of eight letters contains later material.<sup>104</sup>

In *De vera rel.* Augustine puts forward the principle of unity ('the one') as the guiding principle for religious worship<sup>105</sup> and as a characteristic of Christian teaching and worship as opposed to the plurality of pagan cults and Manichean dualism. The concept of 'the one', he recognises, is, of course, also central to Platonism. But Platonism, he insists, has failed,

606, fos 220r–38v; CCL xci A), a work depending on Augustine's *Enchiridion*; pseudo-Augustinus, *Soliloquia*, a work dating from the thirteenth century (Cod. Vat. gr. 607, fos 1r–56v; PL xl. 863–98), excerpts from Aug., *C. Iul.* (Cod. Vat. gr. 1096, fo. 222r–v) and *In Iohannis euangelium tractatus* (Cod. Vat. gr. 1115, fos 83v–90r; CCL xxxvi); on further details see M. Jugie, 'Démétrius Cydonès et la théologie latine à Byzance aux xive et xve siècles', *Échos d'Orient* xxvii (1928), 385–402 at p. 396; *Demetrios Kydones: Briefe*, I/i, ed. F. Tinnfeld, Stuttgart 1981, 68–9; Fürst, 'Augustinus im Orient'.

<sup>100</sup> See Flogaus, 'Der heimliche Blick', 277–8; *Prochoros Kydones: Übersetzung von acht Briefen des Hl. Augustinus*, ed. H. Hunger, Vienna 1984, 7–8.

<sup>101</sup> Περὶ τῆς ἀληθοῦς θρησκείας (Cod. Vat. gr. 1096, fos 149r–56r); Aug., *De vera rel.* 1–15, CCL xxxii. 187–97, line 25 'ut diem dei uideant'. It dates from c. 390.

<sup>102</sup> Cod. Vat. gr. 609, fo. 173r–v; Aug., *De beata uita* 4–8, CCL xxix. 66, lines 80–70 at line 61). The Greek title is not extant. The work dates from 386.

<sup>103</sup> Περὶ τῆς αὐτεξουσιότητος (Cod. Vat. gr. 609, fos 180r–4r); Aug., *De lib. arb.* i. 1–90, CCL xxix. 211–29, dating from 388. See *Prochoros Kydones: Übersetzungen von S. Augustinus, De libero arbitrio i. 1–90 und Ps.-Augustinus, De decem plagis Aegyptiorum*, ed. H. Hunger, Vienna 1990, 12–53. The second work in this edition is an anonymous compilation formerly ascribed to Augustine and now thought to be a work of Caesarius of Arles (CCL ciii. 407–13).

<sup>104</sup> The only surviving ms is Cod. Vat. gr. 609, fos 185r–91v, 202r–v, 209r–v. See R. Devreesse, in *Codices Vaticani Graeci*, iii, Vatican City 1950, 16–18; *Prochoros Kydones: Übersetzung von acht Briefen* (introduction), 9–11. The letters are ordered as follows: ep. cxxxii (fo. 185r; CSEL xlv. 79–80); ep. cxxxvii (fos 185r–8r; CSEL xlv. 96–125); ep. cxxxviii (fos 188r–90r; CSEL xlv. 126–48); ep. xcii. 1–6 (fo. 190r–v; CSEL xxxiv/ii. 436–43, line 18; i.e. the last two sentences are missing); ep. cxliii (fos 190v–1r; CSEL xlv. 250–62); ep. xxviii (fo. 191v; CSEL xxxiv/i. 103–13); ep. cxlvii. 46–53 (fo. 202r–v; CSEL xlv. 321, line 19 'et quod'–329, line 24 'sicut'); ep. lxxxii. 1–7 (fo. 209r–v; CSEL xxxiv/ii. 351–7, line 13 'posuisse'); cf. *Prochoros Kydones: Übersetzung von acht Briefen*. Most of the letters originate from the second decade of the fifth century.

<sup>105</sup> See J. Lössl, 'The One (unum): a guiding concept in *De vera religione*', *REAug* xl (1994), 79–103. On paragraphs 1–15 see *ibid.* 95–6. See also *Intellectus gratiae*, 42–9.

historically and, by implication, soteriologically as well. What he means is that Christianity has attracted and empowered more people in history than Platonism to do the good, find the truth and reach perfection in an intellectual beatific vision of God.<sup>106</sup> One paragraph earlier he had stressed the distinction between creation and the ‘creatrix trinitas’. The attractions as well as the problems of this model for Palamism are clear. The mystical aspect, salvation as a progress towards unity in the One, was acceptable. But the scholastic distinction between creator (‘creatrix’) and creation and physical and intellectual vision was a source of conflict. The possibility of perceiving the uncreated divine light with one’s bodily eyes was a crucial concept of Hesychasm and Prochoros was going to criticise it.

*De beata uita* 4–8 contains a similar account, only in autobiographical terms.<sup>107</sup> Augustine recalls his attraction to philosophy during his youth, triggered by his reading of Cicero’s *Hortensius*, his errant years as a Manichean and his conversion through books of Plotinus. Now he recognises Christianity as the ‘true philosophy’ and believes it will lead him to a beatific intellectual life. The ensuing dialogue underlines that. It refutes sceptic positions, states the existence of an individual mind soul as opposed to the body and dwells on the idea that the soul needs to be nourished with intellectual food as the body needs to be fed with material food. In order to feed the soul the intake of bodily food has to be lessened. This account, too, has traits that appealed to Palamism and others that did not. To focus on the latter: Augustine has no concept which would suggest an eventual integration of the mind soul into an ‘ultra-intellectual’ dimension in which the divine light is visible with bodily eyes and in which the beatific vision is ‘more’ than ‘just’ intellectual perfection.

*De lib. arb.* i. 1–90 deals with the phenomenon of the will. God creates everything good. Man chooses to reject God’s goodness. His will turns evil and loses its freedom. For by their very nature evil wills cannot ‘learn’ (‘improve’, become ‘better’) or do the good by choice and reach the intellectual beatific vision. Thus human beings need to have their good and free will reinstated by God.<sup>108</sup> Here divine grace and human freedom are for the first time opposed. One cannot be mistaken for the other. Conversion is the change, by the intervention of divine grace, of a person who wills evil into one whose free will for the good is sustained by divine grace. Thus, although there are again a number of affinities, the Augustinian model falls short of the Palamite concept of deification, no matter how intrinsically interwoven one imagines divine grace and

<sup>106</sup> See esp. *De vera rel.* 13–14. The stress in the latter part of the argument lies on ‘intellectual’ as opposed to ‘sensual’. The road to salvation is the way from the senses to the intellect.

<sup>107</sup> See Lössl, *Intellectus gratiae*, 9–22.

<sup>108</sup> Idem, ‘Wege der Argumentation in Augustinus’ *De libero arbitrio*, *Theologie und Philosophie* lxx (1995), 321–54 at pp. 333–9.

human free will to be in the process of conversion and in the state of beatific vision.

Finally, Prochoros's collection of eight letters of Augustine is ordered along the lines of one of the most widespread medieval collections,<sup>109</sup> with two exceptions. Epp. cxxxv and cxxxvi, second and third in the western collections, are omitted by Prochoros. Epp. cxlvii and lxxxii, found much later in the western collections, are added on as nos 7 and 8. These discrepancies may not be entirely accidental. Epp. cxxxv and cxxxvi may be omitted because they are addressed *to* Augustine and do not contain any material relevant for Augustinian thought which could not be better obtained from one of Augustine's own letters. Epp. lxxxii and cxlvii do contain such material. Moreover, they are closely related to epp. xxviii and xcii respectively and they have their own reception histories. Ep. cxlvii is also known as *Liber de uidendo deo*. It has been transmitted in separate manuscripts and often in a fragmentary state, as also in Prochoros's collection.<sup>110</sup> Epp. xcii to Italica and ep. cxlvii to Paulina are letters addressed to ascetic aristocratic women in Italy during the harrowing time of the Gothic invasions in the years shortly before the sack of Rome in 410. Like ep. xxviii, ep. lxxxii is addressed to Jerome. The correspondence between him and Augustine has a reception history of its own, too.<sup>111</sup> Obviously, there are a number of reasons why epp. lxxxii and cxlvii could have moved up from nineteenth or even fifty-seventh position in the medieval western collections to seventh and eighth in Prochoros's Kydones.

There is also some internal coherence in Prochoros's collection. Ep. cxxxii is addressed to Volusianus. Volusianus' response, ep. cxxxv, is one of the letters omitted by Prochoros. Epp. cxxxvii and cxxxviii are Augustine's responses to epp. cxxxv and cxxxvi, written by Marcellinus. Ep. cxliii is also addressed to Marcellinus. Augustine's correspondence with Marcellinus is of particular importance.<sup>112</sup> It marks the beginnings of the Pelagian controversy. Encouraged by Marcellinus and Volusianus, Augustine expounded his soteriological epistemology and hermeneutics, stressing the superseding role of grace under the condition of original sin and refuting what was later to become 'Pelagianism'. Prochoros, although not interested in the historical circumstances of the controversy, as the omission of epp. cxxxv and cxxxvi shows, is none the less fascinated by its theological implications, in particular the links Augustine draws between

<sup>109</sup> Epp. cxxxii, cxxxvii, cxxxviii, xcii, cxliii, xxviii, cxlvii, lxxxii. The oldest extant manuscript of that group is Munich, clm. 6266 (s. x); cf. CSEL xlv. xi (Goldbacher); on the reception of the text see also CSEL lxxxiii. xx-i (Divjak edn).

<sup>110</sup> See CSEL lviii. vii, xii, xxxix, xli-ii (Goldbacher edn).

<sup>111</sup> See A. Fürst, *Augustins Briefwechsel mit Hieronymus*, 240-7.

<sup>112</sup> See M. Moreau, 'Le Dossier Marcellinus dans la correspondance de saint Augustin', *Recherches Augustiniennes* ix (1973), 3-181; Lössl, *Intellectus gratiae*, 121-3.

epistemics and salvation, which is also a central concern of Palamite Hesychasm.

Ep. cxxxii contains instructions on a soteriologically relevant and intelligent reading of Scripture. Ep. cxxxvii reflects on the hermeneutical difficulties of speaking about the Incarnation against the background of the philosophical problem of speaking about God. Ep. cxxxviii discusses two questions: How can the God of the Old Testament reject the sacrifices of the Old Testament but accept new sacrifices? Does Christ's teaching contradict the ethical teaching of non-Christian human societies? Augustine always discussed such questions at a very fundamental level. In his view everything depended on how one defined the relationship between divine grace and human nature in the context of one's theological epistemology. Ep. xcii discusses scriptural passages on God's visibility. In 1 John i. 5 God is called 'light'. In Augustine's view this calls, once more, for the distinction between God and creation, spiritual and physical light and, correspondingly, spiritual and physical eyes. Prochoros would follow him in that – and run into trouble with his religious authorities. Ep. cxliii contains Augustine's famous saying that he would rather make mistakes than not improve in life. In the context of *De lib. arb.* this refers to the concept of free will. Pelagius had claimed that it endorsed his own. Augustine denied that but insisted that even if it were so it would still leave the possibility that his teaching had improved since writing *De lib. arb.* He then went on to discuss his doctrines of original sin and predestination in the light of the concepts of the immortality of the soul and freedom, stressing how all this is related to an epistemic notion of salvation. Ep. xxviii contains questions concerning the canon of the Old Testament. In addition ep. lxxxii also discusses Galatians ii. 14 about the quarrel between Peter and Paul in Antioch. Earlier Fathers had played it down and declared it a sham, as Jerome did. Augustine, however, insisted that it was a real conflict.<sup>113</sup> Again he treated it as a challenge to soteriological epistemology and hermeneutics as well as to Christian ethics and spirituality. Conflicts, he insisted, must not be overlooked, or hypocritically denied and suppressed but tackled in brotherly love and care. Ep. cxlvii, relating to ep. xcii, also addresses the question of how to so acquire knowledge and insight (with the help ultimately of God himself and his will) that it included the basic Christian attitudes, or virtues, of faith and striving towards moral perfection.

Prochoros's association with such ideas raised the suspicion of his fellow monks. In the meantime Palamism had been accepted as orthodox and Palamas himself had died. When Prochoros discussed some of the theological problems he had left behind he was accused of heresy. The

<sup>113</sup> See J. N. D. Kelly, *Jerome: his life, writings and controversies*, London 1975, 263–4; Fürst, *Augustins Briefwechsel mit Hieronymus*, 2–87.



patriarch, Philotheos Kokkinos, encouraged his fellow monks to put him on trial. The proceedings took place in 1368. Prochoros's teachings were anathematised, Prochoros himself was excommunicated. He died shortly after.

If Prochoros was allowed to speak at the trial at all, no records are extant. Therefore it is not possible to establish his position exactly. Unlike Palamas and his opponents a generation before, he never had the chance to trigger and sustain a controversy. But to judge from his extant writings it is unlikely that this would have been his intention. He did not refute Palamas's teaching as a whole, but rejected the notion that the physical Thabor light was uncreated. In his view it was created (κτιστόν) and he tried to prove his point by resorting to scholastic methods in logic and dialectic.<sup>114</sup> For his opponents that alone was sufficient to put him on trial. In an attempt to understand their reaction one might imagine that to them his position might have looked as Eunomius' position had seemed to Basil of Caesarea: an attempt to put divinity on a level with creation on purely logical and philosophical grounds. Roughly speaking Eunomius had argued from the meaning of the word 'father' that the Father alone is divine, while the Son and the Spirit are wholly unlike the Father in this respect. However, Prochoros's position, unlike that of Eunomius, was never thoroughly assessed. If he was wrong, no Basil stood up against him. It was rather the lesser spirits of his age that rose against 'his unerring assessment of opposing views and concepts', as one scholar put it, 'his ability to expose the untraditional centre-pieces behind the delusive accessories of ambitious but impossible expectations'.<sup>115</sup> However, doctrinal questions aside, to what extent, if at all, was Prochoros's position influenced by Augustine?

The patriarch's letter of condemnation concluding the trial confirms that Prochoros cited Augustine as a church Father, a guardian of orthodox tradition. Interestingly he does not dare to question Augustine's authority, but doubts instead Prochoros's justification in calling upon him as a witness for his own cause:

And ostensibly (δῆθεν) he introduces Augustine as a witness purporting to show that in one of his writings that church Father says that when the good as well as the evil will see (ὄψονται) the judge of the living and the dead, then undoubtedly the evil, too, will not be able to see him in any other way. They will not see him in the form according to which (κατὰ τὴν μορφήν) he is the Son of Man but in

<sup>114</sup> See M. Candal, 'El libro iv de Prócoro Cidonio', *Orientalia Christiana Periodica* xx (1954), 247–97; *Prochoros Kydones: Übersetzung von acht Briefen* (introduction), 9; G. Podskalsky, *Theologie und Philosophie in Byzanz: der Streit um die theologische Methodik in der spätbyzantinischen Geistesgeschichte (14/15. Jahrhundert), seine systematischen Grundlagen und seine historische Entwicklung*, Munich 1974, 124–73.

<sup>115</sup> Podskalsky, *Theologie und Philosophie in Byzanz*, 209. More recently see idem, *BZ* xc (1997), 114–15.

the glory (ἐν τῇ δόξῃ) which reveals him as judge, not in the humiliation (ἐν τῇ ταπεινώσει) of one who is judged.<sup>116</sup>

It is clear from this that Augustinian thought had entered the discussion – and led to confusion and tragic misunderstanding. What Prochoros must have pointed out is that the narrative of the Last Judgement makes sense only if we imagine all participants, not only the saved, as ‘seeing’ their judge. In that sense all will have a ‘vision’ of God, but of course, not all will have a ‘beatific vision’. Prochoros’s opponents would not accept that distinction. For them it was scandalous to speak of ‘vision’ in such an ambiguous way. The patriarch’s letter of condemnation even omits Prochoros’s clarifying distinction, as becomes clear from Prochoros’s own words extant in his autograph, which read, in addition to what the patriarch had paraphrased:

What has to be added, of course, is that, obviously, the wicked will not see the form (μορφή) of the Son according to which he is equal to the Father.<sup>117</sup>

Here Prochoros clearly distinguishes between the judgement in which Christ is seen in his glory by the wicked as well as by the blessed, and the beatific vision of the blessed in heaven. But implied in this statement is another important distinction. What Prochoros is saying here is that even the blessed in heaven will see God only in their capacity of being his creatures. They will not participate in his divine nature in the same way as Christ. The light in which they see God is created. In that respect they have more in common with the wicked in hell than with God. This is not just a very Augustinian but a generally orthodox notion, although Augustine has given the whole idea a new twist through his extended reflections on the fate of the damned, which is not present in the eastern tradition. It has to be seen in relation to his notion of divine grace and human freedom, or indeed God and Man as competing forces and entities. Not unlike Pelagianism, Augustinianism therefore stood for the development of ideas such as human emancipation, secularisation, the solidarity of the human race in the miseries of history and the eschaton, and the question whether God has not abandoned humanity, or humanity God. But these were tendencies which only in the later Middle Ages developed into full-blown concepts. Augustine himself, in spite of the differences between eastern and western theology already in his lifetime, stood for a worldview not unlike that of the Greek Fathers of his time; and generally the tendency to distinguish sharply between God and creation is also inherent in the eastern tradition. It was one of the driving forces behind the Nicene movement and again behind the movement that stood

<sup>116</sup> *Prochoros Kydones: Übersetzung von acht Briefen* (introduction), 14; cf. PG cl. 707A15–B8; Candal, ‘El libro iv de Prócoro Cydonio’, 264, lines 10–16.

<sup>117</sup> *Prochoros Kydones: Übersetzung von acht Briefen* (introduction), 14; cf. Cod. Vat. gr. 609, fo. 211r, lines 7–10.

by the formula of Chalcedon. It is this connection which Prochoros tries to use as a starting point.

Only God has the will and the power (the love) to save, while humanity is in need of salvation. To speak of a saviour who is not fully divine is a contradiction in terms. As a Palamite, however, Prochoros faced a dilemma. If he called the divine energy ‘created’, he would deny God his proper attribute. He would fall into a heresy similar to that of the so called Arians of the fourth century who denied the divinity of Christ. On the other hand, if he called created matter ‘uncreated’ and ‘divine’, he would commit idolatry, what Augustine, referring to his Manichean past, once called ‘superstition’. As a way out of this dilemma Prochoros in this short passage tried to break down the whole complex along Christological lines. He applied the concept of the ‘interchange of the properties’ (‘*communicatio idiomatum*’), according to which everything that can be predicated of the divine nature of Christ can equally be predicated of human nature, because of Christ’s unity as a person, in a soteriological context, i.e. as applying, in some respect, to all men. Combining the Augustinian concept of grace with Chalcedonian Christology he could relate the created and the uncreated – for example in the instance of judgement and salvation as illumination by grace, the latter being the beatific vision of the saved – as two aspects of one process, namely deification, *and* still uphold the necessary distinctions between God and creation, spirit and matter. Quoting from Augustine’s *De trinitate* i. 3. 30 he writes:

For the same reason [Augustine] teaches that ‘it is characteristic of the true believers (τῶν εὐσεβῶν ἰδίων) to hear the message of [Christ’s] incarnation in such a way that they believe in it on the ground that he is equal to the Father in the form of God (ἐν μορφῇ τοῦ Θεοῦ). Equally true is what follows from this, as the one who holds it firmly proclaims: As the Father has life in himself, he gives life to the Son to have it in himself. Then he continues to deal with the vision of his [Christ’s] glory in which he will come as judge, which will be common to the wicked as well as the just’.<sup>118</sup>

<sup>118</sup> *Prochoros Kydonos: Übersetzung von acht Briefen* (introduction), 14–15; Cod. Vat. gr. 609, fo. 211r, lines 11–15; Candal, ‘El libro iv de Prócoro Cydonio’, 264, lines 22–4. As Hunger shows from manuscript evidence, Prochoros cites here more or less exactly from Planudes’s translation of Aug., *De trin.* i. 3. 30, omitting only a few phrases. It is a commentary on Jn v. 24 (‘He who listens to my word and believes him who sent me, has eternal life’): ‘This eternal life is that sight which the bad have no part in... And this applies exclusively to loyal believers, who... believe him to be equal to the Father in the form of God... Then [following Jn v. 27: “And he also gave him authority to do judgment”] he comes to the sight of his splendour in which he will come to judgement, a sight that will be shared by wicked and just alike... Yes, even the bad will be given a sight of the Son of man: a sight of the form of God will be granted only to “the pure of heart, because they shall see God” (Matt. 8).’ See Plan., *Aug. Triad.* 107, lines 93–109, 101 = Aug., *De trin.* i. 3. 30. The modern translation is taken from *Augustine: the Trinity*, intro, trans. and notes E. Hill, New York 1990, 88.

Philotheos would have rejected this solution already on the grounds of his more pneumatological understanding of Palamas's teaching. But he also condemned Prochoros for his use of Augustine, although he had only used a text which had been around in the east for about half a century, Planudes's translation of *De trinitate*. But again, Philotheos did not attack Augustine directly. He only condemned Prochoros's 'heretical' use of him, when he justified his ruling:

Asked how he understands (νοεῖ) that [expression] 'the glory of his glory' (ἐν τῇ δόξῃ αὐτοῦ ἢ δόξῃ) Prochoros answered: 'As that of the only-begotten Son of the Father, which he has together with the Father and the Spirit in regard to creation, that which has become, and as that which also shows itself in the countenance (ἐν τῷ προσώπῳ) of Christ on the Holy Mountain, according to which the wicked, too, will see him.'<sup>119</sup>

For Philotheos 'seeing God' was equivalent to 'being saved'. He did not allow for Prochoros's distinctions between the divine and the created and among the latter between the saved and the damned. In his view Prochoros's teaching either implied that God was not quite God and the wicked were also in some respect saved, or salvation, understood as a vision of God, is not quite what it seems to be, if even the wicked will share in it.

### Conclusion

To what extent Prochoros's use of Augustine worked against him is difficult to establish. However, it is remarkable how far he did make use of him in his attempt to show that it was possible to uphold all the distinctions required by western doctrine and still remain within the confines of Palamite orthodoxy. Does this suggest that he felt encouraged by what he may have known of Palamas in this regard to make use of Augustine in order to inform his own teaching? We do not know. Palamas had not signalled his use of Augustine and Prochoros, who did, was condemned as a heretic. There were attempts after Prochoros to place Augustine in the Hesychast tradition.<sup>120</sup> But as a whole the short-lived 'reception process' of Augustinian thought in later Byzantine theology, if indeed it can be called that, was not what one would call a success, despite the stupendous achievement that Planudes's translation undoubtedly represents. The ambiguity of Augustine's own relationship to

<sup>119</sup> *Prochoros Kydones: Übersetzung von acht Briefen* (introduction) 15. See also PG xli. 707B8–13.

<sup>120</sup> On a hymn in that vein composed by Michael Kritoboulos from Imbros in the fifteenth century see M. Rackl, 'Die griechischen Augustinusübersetzungen', in *Scritti di storia e paleografia in onore di Francesco Ehrle*, i, Rome 1924, 1–38 at p. 38. Another witness in that regard is Demetrios Kydones: *ibid.* 20.

Greek language and culture, his attempts to establish contacts with eastern church leaders, the hesitation of the latter to respond to his calls, and the widespread ignorance and lack of interest in the east of the implications of his teaching are reflected in that process. Even though there has been a trickle of Augustinian studies in eastern theology up to the present day,<sup>121</sup> the impact of Augustinian thought as in the translations of Planudes and Prochoros Kydones was never reached again.

<sup>121</sup> See Biedermann, 'Augustinus in der neueren griechischen Theologie', and the more recent literature cited by Podskalsky, *BZ* xci (1998), 118–20.