

**Never the Twain Shall Meet?**

# **Byzantinisches Archiv – Series Philosophica**

---

Herausgegeben von  
Sergei Mariev

Wissenschaftlicher Beirat:  
John Demetracopoulos, Jozef Matula,  
John Monfasani, Inmaculada Pérez Martín,  
Brigitte Tambrun-Krasker

## **Band 2**

# Never the Twain Shall Meet?

---

Latins and Greeks learning from each other in Byzantium

Edited by  
Denis Searby

**DE GRUYTER**

ISBN 978-3-11-055958-3

e-ISBN (PDF) 978-3-11-056107-4

e-ISBN (EPUB) 978-3-11-055973-6

ISSN 1864-9785

**Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data**

A CIP catalog record for this book has been applied for at the Library of Congress.

**Bibliographic information published by the Deutsche Nationalbibliothek**

The Deutsche Nationalbibliothek lists this publication in the Deutsche Nationalbibliografie; detailed bibliographic data are available in the Internet at <http://dnb.dnb.de>.

© 2018 Walter de Gruyter, Berlin/Boston

Printing and binding: CPI books GmbH, Leck

♻️ Printed on acid-free paper

Printed in Germany

[www.degruyter.com](http://www.degruyter.com)

## Acknowledgements

This volume would not have been possible without the generous support of the Swedish Research Council (*Vetenskapsrådet*) that funded the Stockholm University conference “Never the Twain” (June 24–26, 2015) which was the basis for the papers collected here. Also to be thanked in this connection are the *Harald och Tonny Hagendahls minnesfond* which provided additional funding as well as the Department of Romance Studies and Classics at Stockholm University which hosted the conference, and Astrid Söderbergh Widding, the Vice Chancellor of the university, for her words of welcome inspiration that opened the conference. Naturally, the contributing authors as well as the anonymous reviewers are also to be thanked for all their hard work. A special note of gratitude is due to Professor Sergei Mariev, the editor of the *Byzantinisches Archiv – Series Philosophica*, and to his team of highly effective typesetters who worked with impressive celerity once they received the final versions of the papers.

Stockholm, May 2017

Denis Searby



# Contents

List of Contributors — IX

Denis M. Searby

Foreword — 1

Franz Tinnefeld

Translations from Latin to Greek — 9

Marcus Plested

Reconfiguring East and West in Byzantine and Modern Orthodox  
Theology — 21

John Monfasani

George of Trebizond, Thomas Aquinas, and Latin Scholasticism — 47

Antoine Levy

Translatable and Untranslatable Aquinas — 63

Panagiotis C. Athanasopoulos

Bessarion of Nicaea vs. Mark Eugenikos — 77

Irini Balcoyiannopoulou

New Evidence on the Manuscript Tradition and on the Latin and Greek Background  
to George Scholarius' In "*De Interpretatione*" — 93

Marie-Hélène Blanchet

The Two Byzantine Translations of Thomas Aquinas' *De Rationibus Fidei* — 115

John A. Demetracopoulos

Scholarios' *On Almsgiving*, or How to Convert a Scholastic "Quaestio" into a  
Sermon — 129

Pantelis Golitsis

ἑσέντζια, ὀντότης, οὐσία — 179

Brian M. Jensen

Hugo Eterianus and his Two Treatises in the Demetrius of Lampe Affair — 197

Christian W. Kappes

**Gregorios Palamas' Reception of Augustine's Doctrine of the Original Sin and  
Nicholas Kabasilas' Rejection of Aquinas' Maculism as the Background to  
Scholarios' Immaculism — 207**

Michail Konstantinou-Rizos

**Prochoros Cydones' Translation of Thomas Aquinas' *Quaestiones disputatae de  
potentia* and *Quaestio disputata de spiritualibus creaturis* — 259**

Sergei Mariev

**Nature as *instrumentum Dei* — 275**

Tikhon Alexander Pino

**Hylomorphism East and West — 291**

Georgios Steiris

**Pletho, Scholarios and Arabic philosophy — 309**

**Selected Bibliography — 335**

**Index — 355**



# List of Contributors

**Panagiotis C. Athanasopoulos**, PhD is a research assistant at the Department of Humanities, Ca'Foscari University of Venice, and a collaborator of the *Thomas de Aquino Byzantinus* research project (2007–). His interests include Christian Literature, and Greek and Latin Medieval Philosophy. Currently, he is working on the *Editio Princeps* of the Greek Translation of Thomas Aquinas' *Summa Theologiae* la IIae by Demetrius Cydones and its incomplete *Compendium* by Bessarion.

**Irini Balcoyiannopoulou** is a doctoral student at the Department of Education, University of Patras, Greece. The title of her ongoing dissertation is *The Logical Handbooks of George Scholarios-Gennadios II: Method, Sources and Innovations*. Her research interests focus on the reception of Latin philosophical thought in late Byzantium, mainly its philological and historical aspect. Since 2014, she is a member of the *Thomas de Aquino Byzantinus* research project.

**Marie-Hélène Blanchet**, PhD, is a research fellow at CNRS (UMR 8167 Orient et Méditerranée, Monde byzantin) in Paris. Her research focuses on the intellectual and religious history of the Byzantine Empire during the Palaiologan period (13th–15th centuries). Among other works, she is the author of *Georges Gennadios Scholarios (vers 1400–vers 1472): un intellectuel orthodoxe face à la disparition de l'Empire byzantin* (Paris 2008), and *Théodore Agallianos, Dialogue avec un moine contre les Latins (1442)* (Paris 2013). She is working on three critical editions within the *Thomas de Aquino Byzantinus* project, the two Greek translations of Aquinas' *De rationibus fidei*, and two works by Matthew Angelos Panaretos.

**John A. Demetracopoulos** is Assistant Professor of Philosophy and Theology at the Department of Education, University of Patras, Greece. His main scholarly interests are Greek and Latin Medieval philosophy and theology, with an emphasis on the philological evidence of the Greek-Latin philosophical and theological interaction in the Late Middle Ages and the post-Byzantine era. He is the director of the *Thomas de Aquino Byzantinus* international research project (2007–), currently sponsored by the Stavros Niarchos Foundation. He is the author of numerous scholarly publications, including the monograph *Ἀπὸ τὴν ἱστορία τοῦ βυζαντινοῦ θωμισμοῦ Πλήθων καὶ Θωμᾶς Ἀκινάτης* (Plethon and Thomas Aquinas, Athens 2004), and the forthcoming *The Christian Platonism of Barlaam the Calabrian: In Search of the Theological and Philosophical Sources of His Greek Epistles*.

**Pantelis Golitsis** is Assistant Professor of Ancient and Medieval Philosophy at the Aristotle University of Thessaloniki. He is the author of *Les Commentaires de Simplicius et de Jean Philopon à la Physique d'Aristote. Tradition et innovation* (Berlin & New York, 2008; Prix Zographos de l'Association pour l'encouragement des Études Grecques en France), of a Modern Greek translation and commentary of Aristotle's *Progression of Animals* and *Motion of Animals* (Athens, 2017), and of several articles on ancient and Byzantine philosophy. He currently works on a new critical edition of Alexander of Aphrodisias' commentary on Aristotle's *Metaphysics*.

**Brian M. Jensen** is Associate Professor of Latin and a member of the Ars edendi research programme at the Department of Romance Studies and Classics at Stockholm University. His main fields of research include medieval Latin liturgy and hagiography, the Rule of St Benedict, the speeches of Cicero, and the fable genre. He has published numerous works on tropes, sequences and hagiography. His latest

publications are *The Story of Justina and Cyprian of Antioch as told in a Medieval Lectionary from Piacenza* (Stockholm 2012) and the *editio princeps* of *Lectionarium Placentinum. Edition of a Twelfth Century Lectionary for the Divine Office I-IV* (Florence 2016–17).

**Rev. Dr. Christiaan Kappes** is the academic dean and professor of dogmatics of the Byzantine Catholic Seminary of Ss. Cyril and Methodius (Pittsburgh). His research is focused on the Greek reception of Scholasticism in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, especially Trinitarian theology, liturgiology and Mariology. He is working on *The Epiclesis Debate: Mark of Ephesus and John Torquemada, OP, at the Council of Florence 1439* for Notre Dame University Press, and on his doctoral thesis *The Theology of the Divine Essence and Energies in George-Gennadios Scholarios* (at Aristotle University in Thessaloniki).

**Michail Konstantinou-Rizos** studied at the National and Kapodistrian University of Athens and pursued his doctoral studies at the Royal Holloway, University of London, where he has recently defended his PhD thesis: *An edition of Prochoros Cydones' (ca. 1330–1369/71) unpublished Greek translation of Thomas Aquinas' Quaestiones disputatae de potentia and Quaestio disputata de spiritualibus creaturis*. He is a member of the *Thomas de Aquino Byzantinus* research project.

**Antoine Levy**, PhD is a Dominican priest and vice-director of Studium Catholicum in Helsinki, Finland where he moved after undergraduate studies at Sorbonne Paris-IV and ENS (St Cloud) as well as graduate studies at Sorbonne Paris-IV and in Italy (Pontificia Università San Tommaso d'Aquino) and doctoral studies at the University of Fribourg in Switzerland. He is an adjunct professor of theology at the University of Helsinki and a professor of Russian Ideas and Religions at the University of Eastern Finland. Among his publications is the monograph *Le créé et l'incréé: Maxime le Confesseur et Thomas d'Aquin: aux sources de la querelle palamienne* (Paris 2006).

**Sergei Mariev** is an Associate Professor at the Institut für Byzantinistik, Byzantinische Kunstgeschichte und Neogräzistik of the Ludwig-Maximilians-Universität München. He completed his BA in Classics and Classical Civilization at Brigham Young University, Utah, USA in 1996, and later received his Master (2002) and Ph.D. (2005) in Classics, Byzantine Studies and Latin Philology of the Middle Ages from LMU Munich. His *Habilitationsschrift* with the title *Ästhetische Theorien in Byzanz* (2013) explores the reception of the Neoplatonic theories of beauty and the development of image theory in Byzantium. Among his other recent works are *Bessarion: Über Natur und Kunst* (Hamburg 2015), and *Ioannis Antiocheni fragmenta quae supersunt omnia* (Berlin 2008). He is the founder and editor-in-chief of *Byzantisches Archiv – Series Philosophica*.

**John Monfasani** is a Distinguished Professor Emeritus of the University at Albany, State University of New York. He received his BA at Fordham University in 1965 and his doctorate in history under Eugene F. Rice, Jr., and Paul Oskar Kristeller at Columbia University in 1973. His special fields of interest have been Renaissance Humanism and Byzantine émigrés to Renaissance Italy. He has published almost a hundred articles to date and fourteen books, with critical editions of George of Trebizond's *Comparatio Philosophorum Platonis et Aristotelis* and *Protectio Problematum Aristotelis* forthcoming.

**Tikhon Pino** is a PhD Candidate at Marquette University in Milwaukee, Wisconsin, USA. He has published articles on hylomorphic theory in Aristotle and Plotinus, on the Trinitarian theology of Maximus the Confessor and Bonaventure, and on the metaphysics of Philo of Alexandria. He is currently

completing his dissertation: “The Palamite School: The Followers of St. Gregory Palamas and the Reception of the Essence-Energies Distinction.”

**Marcus Plested** (D.Phil., Oxford University, 1999) is Associate Professor of Greek Patristic and Byzantine Theology at Marquette University (Milwaukee, Wisconsin). Previously he was Vice-Principal and Academic Director of the Institute for Orthodox Christian Studies (Cambridge). He has been a member of the Center of Theological Inquiry and the Institute for Advanced Study (Princeton) and has taught, lectured, and published widely in patristic, Byzantine, and modern Orthodox theology. He is the author of two books: *The Macarian Legacy: The Place of Macarius-Symeon in the Eastern Christian Tradition* (Oxford: OUP 2004) and *Orthodox Readings of Aquinas* (Oxford: OUP 2012).

**Georgios Steiris** is currently Associate Professor of Medieval and Renaissance Philosophy at the National and Kapodistrian University of Athens. He has also taught at the University of Peloponnese, the Paideia Program at the University of Connecticut and the Hellenic Open University. His most recent publications include: *The Problem of Modern Greek Identity: from the Ecumene to the Nation-State*, eds. G. Steiris, S. Mitralaxis, G. Arabatzis (Newcastle 2016), and *Maximus the Confessor as a European Philosopher*, eds. S. Mitralaxis, G. Steiris, S. Lalla, M. Podbielski (Eugene OR 2017).

**Franz Tinnefeld** is retired Professor of Byzantine Studies (LMU Munich). He studied Catholic Theology, Classical and Slavic Philology and Byzantinology at the Universities of Bonn and Munich, was awarded his PhD in 1962 at the University of Bonn for a dissertation on the textual history of the New Testament and received his *Habilitation* in Byzantine Studies at LMU Munich in 1971. He has published important studies of the social structures of the early Byzantine Empire, social and political aspects of the later empire, and has translated Demetrios Kydones' correspondence. His most recent book is *Die Briefe des Demetrios Kydones. Themen und literarische Form* (Wiesbaden 2010).



Denis M. Searby  
**Foreword**

The poster of the conference on which this volume is based shows the Valens Aqueduct as it may have looked in thirteenth century Constantinople. This fourth century aqueduct, which is still standing in modern Istanbul, appears to divide the city in two, and thus is an apt symbol of division; yet it is symbolic in other ways as well. Its construction was ordered by a Latin-speaking emperor, reminding us, obviously, that the Byzantine East in its very foundations was conjoined with the Latin West. Moreover, though in one respect the aqueduct may be said to separate, in another it unites. It united, of course, the water of the hills with the reservoirs of the city, but, in so doing, it also united people; it was and is like a bridge. This serves as a reminder that at least some of the perceived divisions between East and West – even the tiresome Filioque controversy – may on closer examination reveal an underlying unity.

This volume of papers, like the conference, was conceived as a means of shedding light on the mutuality of theological and philosophical methods and interests in the two halves of the former Roman Empire in its final period, to emphasize the lively intellectual engagement between “Latins” and “Greeks” of the Palaeologan period as well as the long-lasting repercussions of the dialogue between them. Historically speaking, the volume concentrates primarily on the period from the reconquest of Constantinople in 1261 by Michael VIII Palaiologos up to the aftermath of the Fall of Constantinople to the Ottomans in 1453, a period covering cataclysmic political, philosophical and theological developments, including the ill-fated but tremendously important attempt at ecclesial union at the Council of Florence-Ferrara (1437–39) and the stream of Greek emigrés to the West once their capital city had fallen; it was a period that saw the end of the Middle Ages and a new world discovered in 1492, transforming all previous conceptions of East and West. A reader equipped only with general knowledge of the Fourth Crusade of 1204, which resulted in the subjugation of Constantinople under Frankish power for six decades, and formed by perceptions of some fundamental dichotomy between Roman Catholicism and Eastern Orthodoxy, cannot but be astonished to discover not only translations of Augustine and Thomas Aquinas into Greek at this time along with an appropriation of Western scholastic ideas and methods in Constantinople but also an impressive knowledge of Latin theology and philosophy among Byzantine intellectuals throughout the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries.

During the first half of the twentieth century, scholars, in particular Catholic scholars and especially Martin Jugie (1878–1954), published a number of studies and editions of these Thomistically-minded Byzantines, provoking responses from Orthodox theologians, such as John Meyendorff (1926–1992), among others. Though Jugie’s works were solid, even great, contributions to scholarship, they could be put to polemical use and, thus, bore the taint of controversialism. This volume is intended

to transcend the confines of confessional scholarship, to move beyond the stereotypes and point the way to a more nuanced understanding of the dialogue between Eastern and Western Europe during the late Middle Ages – for the papers collected here show that it was a dialogue, at least in its early stages, if not always friendly, and that, happily, it is once more becoming a dialogue, that is, a genuine exchange of ideas and scholarship.

Since several of these papers pursue their arguments in great philological detail, this foreword is an attempt to summarize certain essential points in order to aid the reader. The first paper itself provides a framework for the remainder of the volume. In it Franz Tinnefeld sets the stage for the ensuing discussion with a clear presentation of one of the most basic forms of intellectual exchange, namely, translation. In the past forty years, translation studies have burgeoned into a fertile field of research detailing the impact of translation on society throughout literate history, although the impact on Byzantine society and subsequently on Greek and Slavic Orthodoxy of the translations of Latin theological works into Greek remains relatively unknown to many scholars. Two pivotal figures dominate Tinnefeld's presentation, Maximos Planoudes, the learned monk of the late thirteenth century, and Demetrios Kydones, a leading statesman of the fourteenth. Likewise, two of their translation projects in particular had a philosophical and theological impact that will reverberate throughout the papers contained in this volume. Although Planoudes translated much besides, not least Ovid's *Metamorphoses*, his translation of Augustine's *De trinitate* will emerge as a source not only for the "latinophrones" but also for, more significantly, Gregory Palamas and his followers. Furthermore, Demetrios Kydones' enthusiasm for the thought of Thomas Aquinas, which resulted in translations of the *Summa contra gentiles* and the *Summa theologiae*, provides the framework for much of the intellectual exchange between the "Latin West" and the "Greek East" studied in the remainder of this volume. If one were not already cognizant of the fact but only informed by modern perceptions of the differences between Roman Catholicism and Greek Orthodoxy, who would expect to discover an enthusiastic reception of Aquinas as well as translations of his works from one moribund language to another in fourteenth century Byzantium?

It was the discrepancy between the Byzantine reception of Thomas Aquinas and our own expectations of "clearly delineated theological and ecclesial categories" of East and West that furnished a starting-point for Marcus Plested's exploration of the construction of these categorical concepts in his book *Orthodox Readings of Aquinas* (2012). In his contribution to the present volume, he revisits and develops this topic. Plested shows that assumptions of a fundamental doctrinal or methodological dichotomy between eastern and western theology are not an accurate reflection of the historical sources. Rather, there was a presupposition of harmony and compatibility on both sides in the late Middle Ages as well as in the early modern period. He traces the beginnings of a pervasive and "instinctive anti-Westernism within Orthodox theology" to the Russian Slavophile movement of the nineteenth century, in reaction to the "policy of Westernisation favoured by Peter the Great and his successors" as well as to

the thitherto dominant Thomistic and scholastic traditions in the theological schools of the Russian Empire. After pointing out the influence of German idealism on Slavic anti-Westernism, Plested goes on to discuss the construction of the identities of the cataphatic and rationalizing West (think Augustine and Aquinas) and the apophatic and mystical East (think pseudo-Dionysius and Palamas) in the leading Orthodox theologians of the twentieth century. Toward the end of his paper, “to explode the notion of an inherent East-West dichotomy”, Plested returns to the Middle Ages, pointing to Palamas’ serious engagement with Augustine, and to the fact that it was precisely Aquinas’ use of the Greek tradition that fired Kydones’ enthusiasm. He also discusses the scholasticism of the anti-unionist Mark Eugenikos and that fervent Thomist but committed Palamite, George Gennadios Scholarios, patriarch of Constantinople, who will figure amply in these pages. In his conclusions, Plested conjectures that the oppositional mode of Orthodox self-definition was more suited to the Cold War period of clearly defined blocks, whereas in our globalized era we are better positioned to “eschew simplistic dichotomies”.

Let us now consider another supposed dichotomy, that between scholasticism and humanism. The engagement of Byzantine intellectuals with Latin scholasticism took place primarily in the form of an encounter with Thomism during the late thirteenth century and onwards. This encounter lasted throughout the fourteenth and up to and beyond the fall of Constantinople, acting as an important stimulus to the final blossoming of Byzantine thought and Byzantine humanism, what we sometimes refer to as the Palaeologan Renaissance. Humanists like Demetrios Kydones, his friends and students Andreas and Theodore Chrysoberges, Manuel Chrysoloras, and others later on, such as the famous Cardinal Bessarion, as well as many other Greek humanists took a tremendous interest in and expressed admiration of Thomas Aquinas and his brand of scholastic Aristotelianism. There is a deep irony in this. At a time when Petrarch was lamenting the low level of learning in the West and was complaining about the “noisy, crazy crowd of scholastics” (*insanum et clamosum scolasticorum vulgus*), a number of Byzantine Greeks were studying Thomistic Aristotelianism. As John Monfasani makes abundantly clear in his paper, George of Trepizond (1395–1484) not only resists facile labelling as belonging to either East or West but also “fractures the supposed wall between humanism and Scholasticism”. As Monfasani notes, George, “despite being one of the leading humanists of the Quattrocento and one of the most important, if not the most important authority on rhetoric in the Renaissance up to the second half of the sixteenth century ... vigorously and vociferously defended Scholasticism against the attacks of its critics.” Neither, however, can George be classed among the Byzantine Thomists, at least not without a number of qualifications, the first of which is simply that he moved to Italy from his native Crete at too young an age to be counted among them. Examining George’s *Comparatio Philosophorum Platonis et Aristotelis* (1457), Monfasani finds that he took positions contrary to Aquinas on four out of five key philosophical issues. George was not a Byzantine Aristotelian nor a Byzantine Thomist but rather “a Greek émigré who enthusiastically em-

braced the philosophical and theological traditions of his new home” and “a Latin Aristotelian with a knowledge of Greek”. Who is Latin, who is Greek? What is East, what is West? In his very person George of Trepizond challenges us to rethink the way we use these labels.

Here I must pause to say a word about the internal arrangement of the papers in this volume. Tinnefeld, Plested and Monfasani were three of the four keynote speakers at the conference in Stockholm, and for this reason their papers are placed first. Because it raises broad issues relevant to the volume as a whole, Antoine Levy’s paper follows these three. After this the papers are arranged alphabetically by author’s surname. The fourth keynote speaker was John Demetracopoulos, whose lecture dealt with “The Essence of Speculative Thought in ‘East’ and ‘West’ in light of Latin into Greek Translations” and who offered participants a long and detailed list of translations in a handout. In the end, Demetracopoulos preferred not to publish his lecture at the conference, opting instead to submit a more specialized study, which explains why it is placed among the alphabetically arranged papers. As the driving force behind the project *Thomas de Aquino Byzantinus*, John Demetracopoulos was essential to the success of the conference and his research is mentioned in nearly every paper in this volume.

Now to resume my sketch of the contents of the papers, Antoine Levy questions the apparent incompatibility of Aquinas and Palamas, a tenet of the Orthodox identity discussed by Plested. The controversy regarding Palamism revolved at first around the doctrinal issue of the distinction between God’s essence and his operations or energies but subsequently expanded to become a discussion on the meaning of deification. Before entering the thick of the debate, however, Levy first ruminates on problems inherent in translations and on the concept of retroversion, i. e. the process of translating a translation back into its original language. Paradoxically, a “bad” translation is one that reveals more of the untranslatable genius of the original than the typically “good” translation that manages to build a semantic economy equivalent to that of the original, thus masking in its smoothness the untranslatable greatness of the original. Levy claims that Demetrios Kydones, deeply impressed with the “Greekness” of Aquinas, intended his translations of Thomas to be a means of giving back to Byzantine thinkers an awareness of their own tradition. However, this new reading of the Greek Fathers through Latin lenses so unsettled these Greek-speakers that the “retroversion” gave rise to impressions of dogmatic incompatibility between the two poles on the theological compass represented by Thomas Aquinas and Gregory Palamas. Feeding these impressions were Kydones’ own anti-Palamism and the use of Kydones’ translations by the anti-Palamite faction as well as the lingering effects of the condemnation of certain Greek theses by William of Auvergne, bishop of Paris, in 1241. At the heart of the whole controversy concerning the “divine energies” lies, according to Levy, a difference in cosmic perspective that is obscured in the process of translating. Palamas views the doctrine from the perspective of God’s perfections emanating to the realm of created things, God manifesting himself through a plurality of attributes, whereas



Aquinas views deification from the perspective of the multiple ways in which rational creation receives the divine outpourings or supernatural grace. Aquinas' emphasis on the creature's receptivity to God seemed to obscure his affirmation of God's essential incomprehensibility, while Palamas' emphasis on the eternal energies seemed to obscure God's essential simplicity as well as the inseparable character of divine essence and divine energies. Yet the two theologians are viewing the same phenomenon from two different angles, Levy claims, and their supposed incompatibility is a mirage: the anti-Palamite stance of Kydones and his colleagues was not that of Thomas Aquinas who, it turns out, understood the Greek tradition better than his Greek translator.

All the remaining papers but one document the Byzantines' thoroughgoing engagement with Latin scholasticism in the final centuries of the Empire. The one exception is Brian Jensen's paper dealing with Hugo Eterianus (1115–1185), an example, one might suppose, of Latins and Greeks not learning from each other. It is also the one paper specifically dealing with the Filioque controversy, that bugbear of ecumenists. However, Hugo as well as his brother Leo Tuscus did at least learn Greek from the Greek-speakers and both did in their different ways supply Greek-speakers with knowledge of both Latin theology and political affairs. Jensen thus highlights the role of bilingualism and translation that is the *sine qua non* of intellectual exchange between language communities and that forms the pre-text of this volume.

Also dealing specifically with translations are the papers by Marie-Hélène Blanchet and Michail Konstantinou-Rizos, both of whom are editing Byzantine translations of Latin works. Konstantinou-Rizos analyzes the translation style of the other Kydones, Prochoros the monk, who predeceased his older brother Demetrios by many years. He takes a look at Prochoros' translations of two treatises by Thomas Aquinas, *Quaestiones disputatae de potentia Dei* and *Quaestio disputata de spiritualibus creaturis*, both chosen for their relevance to Palamism. He confirms Prochoros' thorough grasp of Latin and capacity for rendering it into good Atticist Greek, underscoring the importance of stylistic considerations in Prochoros' style. Interestingly, Prochoros, like his brother Demetrios, gives priority to rendering the Latin as it stands even in those passages where Thomas quotes Greek sources accessible to the translator.

Marie-Hélène Blanchet, on the other hand, is able to contrast two different translations of the same Thomistic treatise, *De rationibus fidei*, the one by Demetrios Kydones, the other by an otherwise unknown translator named Atoumes, perhaps to be identified with Theodore Atouemes or Simon Atoumanos. Blanchet defends, moreover, the importance of editorial work on the Greek translations of Thomas Aquinas, a task which, it is safe to say, remains low on the list of priorities among most Byzantinists. However, as she points out, editorial work is the necessary preparation for an analysis of how Aquinas entered the Byzantine intellectual universe and for an appraisal of both the borrowing and the rejecting of key Thomistic ideas in this formative period of Orthodox identity. She calls for a different paradigm than that of estrangement and mutual hostility in order to analyze the relationship between the Byzantine-Slavic East and the Latin-dominated West.

John Demetracopoulos has provided us with an in-depth analysis of George Scholarios' homily on almsgiving as a case-study proving Scholarios' heavy dependence on Thomistic sources even when delivering a moralizing discourse; indeed the subtitle runs: "How to convert a scholastic *quaestio* into a sermon". It is a *tour-de-force* that will be indispensable for future research on Scholarios and the *corpus Thomisticum*. At the same time, given that Scholarios does not cite Thomas as a source, his paper provokes questions for a modern reader: Is this an act of plagiarism? Did fear lead Scholarios to conceal his sources?

Similar questions arise in Irini Balcoyiannopoulou's study of Scholarios' logical treatise entitled by Jugie the *Ars vetus*, which she is reediting based on new knowledge of the sources and manuscript tradition. The part Balcoyiannopoulou focuses on is the commentary on Aristotle's *De interpretatione*, but both this and all the other parts represent a patchwork of translations made from Latin sources – Thomas Aquinas, Radulphus Brito, and others. Although Scholarios acknowledges using Latin sources, he does not mention the specific sources by name, and he does claim his work as his own, making frequent use of the heading "Scholarios' *exegesis*". Is this plagiarism or is it a recycling of sources that pays homage to its origins by hinting at them? It is perhaps our own presuppositions that view Scholarios' methodology as mere plagiarism.

Pantelis Golitsis uses the question of plagiarism as a springboard to a discussion of Scholarios' understanding of Thomas Aquinas' short but seminal work *De ente et essentia*. In his book on the Thomism of Scholarios, Hugh Barbour expressed amazement at Scholarios' pawning off Armandus de Bellovisu's commentary on the *De ente et essentia* as his own. Yet Golitsis shows this to be a misunderstanding on Barbour's part, perhaps due to prejudices against Scholarios and, at any rate, a less than careful reading of the Greek. Linguistic misunderstandings, he argues, are one factor impeding the meeting of East and West. Golitsis proceeds to offer a nuanced case-study of the difficulties in translating the words for being and essence back and forth between Greek and Latin in order to point out deficiencies in our own traditional interpretative and historiographical categories – "Byzantine", "Palamite", "Thomist", etc.

Scholarios figures again in Georgios Steiris' paper on that more eastern East represented by Arabic philosophy. He contrasts the approaches to it in the rival philosophies of Pletho and Scholarios, the rivalry of these two reflecting the perceived rivalry between Platonism and Aristotelianism. Pletho was averse to Arabic philosophy while Scholarios at least appreciated its value. However, the salient point here is that, although the Byzantine world bordered on the Islamic world for centuries, knowledge of Arabic philosophy was primarily a result of Byzantine interaction with Western Scholasticism: the Byzantines of the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries were not familiar with Arabic philosophy in the original but only with its interpretation in Western Europe. Pletho's critical stance toward Arabic philosophy reflects his hostility to scholasticism; Scholarios' appreciation of it reflects his sympathy for Western scholasticism.

Chris Kappes traces an intricate interplay between Greek East and Latin West in his discussion of Scholarios' understanding of the immaculate conception of the Virgin Mary, an intricacy seen in the very title of his paper with its string of genitives positing relationships between various thinkers. He finds not only reactions to but also a surprising assimilation of the Augustinian conception of original sin already in Gregory Palamas. As he points out, Scholarios could be regarded simply as the culmination of a process of synthesizing Augustinism and Thomism with Orthodox theology; more than a synthesis it was a process of dialogue between Eastern and Western theologians. Despite his Thomistic proclivities, Scholarios shows a keen awareness of the position of Duns Scotus and his followers on the immaculate conception, which readily lent itself to being harmonized with eastern Mariology.

George Scholarios was only one of the prominent Greek delegates at the unionist Council of Florence-Ferrara who makes frequent appearances in these pages. Two others are Mark Eugenikos or Mark of Ephesus and Basilios Bessarion, the former refusing to sign the act of union, the latter going on to become a Roman cardinal. Panagiotis Athanasopoulos offers us a study of how these two clashed over the typically Thomistic "principle of individuation" regarding material substances in the preparation of the Council; this metaphysical issue had a bearing on the Filioque controversy central to the discussions at the Council. Mark addressed the issue in his *Capita syllogistica* and Bessarion replied in his *Refutatio Marci Ephesini*. It will not surprise the reader to find Bessarion drawing on a wide range of texts within the Aristotelian tradition. What is surprising is to see how thoroughly the anti-unionist Mark has absorbed the modes of discourse of western Scholasticism and, even more so, the coincidences of his argumentation with passages in Duns Scotus.

Another great personage at the Council of Florence was Georgios Gemistos Pletho who, one might say, brought the debate of "Plato versus Aristotle" to the West with the treatise he wrote during the Council, *Περὶ ὧν Ἀριστοτέλης πρὸς Πλάτωνα διαφέρειται*. Sergei Mariev explores Cardinal Bessarion's contribution to this debate by investigating how Bessarion made use of Aquinas' conception of nature as God's instrument in order to prove the basic accord between Platonism and Christianity. In the face of criticism from that eastern Westerner, George of Trepizond, Bessarion made the Greek East and Latin West converge in the service of Christian Platonism.

I close my survey of the contents of the papers with Tikhon Alexander Pino's study of the extent to which Mark Eugenikos' angelology is indebted to Thomas Aquinas. Pino uses his study of the specific, to modern minds, abstruse question of angelic matter to make important points relevant to the theme of this volume as a whole. For he finds a Byzantine theological milieu *in conversation with* the sources and problems of Latin Scholasticism. As he puts it: "Not only are Greeks and Latins learning *from each other* ... it is clear that they were also to a great extent learning, and philosophizing, together."

Up until now I have said nothing about the title of this book, but I will do so in conclusion. The first line of Kipling's *Ballad of East and West* has often been used to

supply catchy but unimaginative titles for books or conferences about real or supposed dichotomies, and the present volume is no exception. But the poem, though acknowledging a division between Eastern (i. e. Asian) and Western (i. e. European) culture, is really about mutual respect and friendship across cultural divides. Not many people who cite the line “Oh, East is East and West is West, and never the twain shall meet” know how the poem continues. In fact Kipling’s ballad, an adventure story set at the border between British India and Afghanistan, and rooted in the historical, intercultural context of Queen Victoria’s Own Corps of Guides, immediately proclaims borderless brotherhood within the same refrain:

But there is neither East nor West, Border, nor Breed, nor Birth  
When two strong men stand face to face, tho’ they come from the ends of the earth!

Yet those opening words have become so proverbial as to be used as a mere cliché, a conversation-stopper, a thought-stopper, much like that other phrase “to each his own” (*suum cuique*), which has become similarly detached from its original context. East and West are, of course, relative terms, entirely dependent, geographically speaking, on one’s position between the rising and the setting sun, but also relative when used metaphorically. The papers collected here underscore how the paradigmatic construct of a supposedly Greek East and a supposedly Latin West as well as that of an Eastern and a Western Church obscures the fact that we are dealing with twin phenomena, far more alike than unlike, comparable indeed to the twin lungs of a single organism, to borrow a favorite expression of Pope John Paul II. In a careful and scholarly way these papers prove that the twain has met and still meets.

Franz Tinnefeld

## Translations from Latin to Greek

A contribution to late Byzantine intellectual history

Diplomatic, cultural, religious, and economic contacts between Byzantium and the Latin West were never completely interrupted, although, of course, they varied in intensity over time and place. Whereas Western interest in Greek language and literature was constant over time in varying degrees,<sup>1</sup> Byzantines displayed but little interest in the Latin language and literature for several centuries after late antiquity, and their readiness to translate Latin literature into Greek was even less evident.<sup>2</sup> This situation did not change until the so-called Fourth Crusade (1202–04), when Western powers gained a foothold in Byzantine territory and founded the Latin Empire of Constantinople.<sup>3</sup> While this was naturally viewed as a disaster by most Byzantines, it did at any rate strengthen the mutual contacts between East and West.<sup>4</sup> Against this background, it does not seem so strange that Byzantine intellectuals began to develop an interest in Western culture as well as in outstanding works of Latin literature. The language barrier between East and West still hampered intellectual exchange, however, and created a demand for translations from Latin to Greek.

Fifty years ago, W. O. Schmitt published a study of Latin literature in Byzantium (Schmitt 1967b), and here I shall offer an updated overview of the Greek translations of Latin literature in late Byzantium. For a list of the relevant publications, see the attached bibliography. A glance at it will reveal how knowledge of the subject has expanded since Schmitt's survey, as has the number of available critical editions. All this will be familiar territory to many readers of this book, but this paper is intended as a useful framework for and an introduction to the more specialized discussions of the shared intellectual interests of East and West in the remainder of this volume.

Two phases of translating activity may easily be distinguished, the first being that of the late thirteenth century. In this period, although texts of a popular philosophical and moralizing tendency prevail, other genres were also translated; in the second period philosophical and theological texts of Western scholasticism predominate.

The history of late Byzantine Greek translations from Latin starts right off with a master, of course, the Byzantine intellectual Manuel and later monk Maximos Planudes (ca. 1255–ca. 1305).<sup>5</sup> Planudes translated classical and post-classical lit-

---

1 Berschin 1980; Rochette 1997.

2 Gigante 1981a, 65–101.

3 Schmitt 1967b, 127; Kazhdan 1991, vol. 2, 1183–1185.

4 Bydén 2004.

5 Schmitt 1967b; Fisher 1990.

erature as well as patristic texts. He revealed none of the distrust of his orthodox compatriots towards anything Latin, at least as long as Michael VIII (1259–82), the founder of the Palaiologan dynasty at the expense of the Lascarids, ruled Byzantium.<sup>6</sup> When his general, Alexios Strategopulos, had reconquered Constantinople from the Latins in 1261, Michael Palaiologos put an end to the Latin Empire of Constantinople but found himself by no means in an easy situation. He coped with the claims of Western rulers on Byzantine territories through clever diplomacy and also by backing papal efforts at ecclesiastical union between East and West. His policy was supported by Planudes whose interest in Latin shows unionist tendencies. At any rate, during the reign of Michael VIII, Planudes translated the *De Trinitate* of Saint Augustine into Greek, that is, the foundational work of Western theology written by the pre-eminent father of the Latin Church.<sup>7</sup> Of course, in contrast to orthodox theology, Augustine defends there the procession of the Holy Spirit not from God the Father alone but from the Father and the Son (Filioque),<sup>8</sup> which became the main point of controversy between Eastern and Western theology. The issue of the Filioque played an important role at the so-called union council of Lyon in 1274 and was more or less forced upon the Byzantine delegates, with some concessions to the orthodox point of view.<sup>9</sup> Planudes translated the *De Trinitate* very probably when the Filioque became an accepted position under the rule of Michael VIII. Later on, during the orthodox reaction under Andronikos II, son and successor of Michael VIII, Planudes wrote two critical treatises on the Filioque,<sup>10</sup> in obvious dependence on the ruling power.

As to the reasons for Planudes' other translations we cannot be certain and are left to speculation. There is, first, a group of philosophical or moralizing works that were held in much esteem throughout the Western world. To begin with, we find his translation of *De duodecim abusivis saeculi*, a treatise erroneously ascribed to Cyprian of Carthage (ca. 200–258) but most probably written in the seventh century in Ireland. It belongs among the more popular works of the Latin Middle Ages.<sup>11</sup> Basically it is an admonition to lead a Christian life, containing descriptions of morally conflicting character types, for instance, the old man without piety (*senex sine religione*) or the woman without shame (*femina sine pudicitia*). We may assume that in translating this popular work of morality, Planudes simply hoped to convey moral instruction to his own contemporary society.

---

<sup>6</sup> On Michael VIII see Geanakoplos 1959, which is still the most detailed work on the emperor and his political activities; see also Kazhdan 1991, vol. 2, 1991, 1367.

<sup>7</sup> Papatomopulos, Tsabare, and Rigotti 1995.

<sup>8</sup> Papatomopulos, Tsabare, and Rigotti 1995, vol. 2, 974 (Latin), 975 (Greek), with reference to the gospel of John 20:22, where Jesus says: “λάβετε πνεῦμα ἅγιον.” Augustine quotes this in proof of the procession of the Holy Spirit also from the Son.

<sup>9</sup> Roberg 1990, 263–267.

<sup>10</sup> Rigotti 1994, 187.

<sup>11</sup> Giannakes 1974.

Pseudo-Cyprian was not the only moralizing text translated by Planudes. There was also the so-called *Disticha Catonis*, a collection of short moralizing sentences that in part display a Christian tendency. Distichs (consisting of two hexameters) actually occur only in the second part of the collection. The original work was composed already before the late antique age and had been in general use as a school book since the fourth century. The large number of manuscript copies testifies to the popularity of the Greek translation.<sup>12</sup>

Planudes also translated a classical piece of prose that remained of central importance throughout the Western Middle Ages, the so-called *Somnium Scipionis*, part of the sixth and last book of Cicero's *De re publica* of which only fragments remain.<sup>13</sup> The dream of Publius Cornelius Scipio Africanus Minor (185/184–129 B.C.), as reported by Cicero, culminates in the idea that worthy statesmen will be rewarded after their death with eternal bliss in the afterlife. The belief in eternal life for good statesmen, deriving from the Platonic doctrine of the immortality of the soul (Plato, *Phaedrus*, 245c–246a), was doubtless very welcome in a Christian environment, Western as well as Eastern. Planudes' further Greek translation of Macrobius' commentary on the *Somnium* is now available in a critical edition by Megas.<sup>14</sup>

The last but not least of the philosophical or moralizing works translated by Planudes to be considered here is *De Consolatione Philosophiae*, the literary masterpiece of Anicius Manlius Severinus Boethius (ca. 480–ca. 524), a high official at the court of Theodoric the Great in Ravenna.<sup>15</sup> This is perhaps the best of Planudes' Greek translations and may almost be ranked at the same literary level as the Latin original. This is true not only for the prose passages but even more so for the poetic ones which Boethius interspersed throughout the *Consolatio*.<sup>16</sup> Planudes translates these in the same poetic metres as used in the Latin original.<sup>17</sup> Why did Planudes decide to translate this unique, Late Latin work? Most likely he wanted to make it known to his Greek compatriots, on the one hand, because its philosophical background depends on Aristotelian as well as on Christian philosophy, and, on the other hand, because of the dramatic circumstances of its composition. As is well known, Boethius was in prison when he wrote it, having been accused of high treason, awaiting his execution seeking consolation in philosophy. Jesus Christ is not expressly mentioned in the *Consolatio*, but there is no doubt about the author's Christian orientation in the theology and philosophy of Augustine.<sup>18</sup>

12 Schmitt 1967a; Ortoleva 1992; Papathomopoulos 2009.

13 The translation of the Latin text of the *Somnium* into Greek by Planudes is transmitted in numerous manuscripts. A critical edition of the *Somnium* is found in Pavano 1992.

14 Megas 1995. For the textual criticism of the Greek *Somnium* see Gigante 1981b, 105–130.

15 Critical edition of the Greek *Consolatio*: Papathomopoulos 1999.

16 Papathomopoulos 1999, XXXIII–XLII.

17 Papathomopoulos 1999, LIII.

18 Papathomopoulos 1999, XXVI–XXVII.

It is striking that Planudes translated not only moralistic and philosophical works from Latin but also classical poetry. Of course, these categories cannot always be clearly distinguished. Thus Ovid's *Metamorphoses*, the Roman poet's great hexameter work which Planudes translated into Greek prose,<sup>19</sup> while without doubt a masterpiece of narrative art, does engage in moralizing, for its characters are transformed into animals in punishment for immoral behaviour. Hence Ernst Robert Curtius called the *Metamorphoses* a "Schatzhaus der Moral".<sup>20</sup> At the same time, however, the entertainment value of Ovid's work, which, after all, was the main reason for its popularity throughout the ages, would have been motivation enough for Planudes' translation. Compared to contemporary Byzantine literary romances such as, for instance, the romance of Kallimachos and Chrysorrhoe, the *Metamorphoses* displays far more outstanding literary qualities and sheer inventiveness, while at the same time offering readers a number of erotic episodes.<sup>21</sup>

Who supplied Planudes with Latin manuscripts? We do not know, but we can assume that some of them were carried in the luggage of Westerners traveling to Byzantium. However, we also know that Planudes went to Venice in 1296 as an ambassador of Emperor Andronikos II. This was very likely an opportunity for him to bring Latin books back to Constantinople. Moreover, we also know that Dominican monasteries in the East sometimes transmitted knowledge of Western literature to Byzantium.<sup>22</sup>

Planudes was not the only Byzantine intellectual of his time to translate Latin literature. The philologist and poet Manuel Holobolos (born ca. 1240 and living at least until after 1284) was probably also a translator, since at least two translations of logical treatises of Boethius are ascribed to him: *De hypotheticis syllogismis* and *De topicis differentiis* (= *De dialectica*). The latter treatise is an excellent introduction to the Aristotelian topics, an indispensable element in Aristotelian logic.<sup>23</sup> It was in fact translated twice later on in the 14<sup>th</sup> century, first by Georgios Pachymeres (1242–ca. 1310) from a shorter Latin original, and, later again, by Prochoros Kydones (ca. 1335–ca. 1370).

An anonymous contemporary of Planudes translated sentences (ἐπιγραφαί) of mainly moral content from the fourth and fifth books of the *Speculum doctrinale*, one of the three parts of the *Opusculum maius*, an encyclopedia written by the Dominican Vincent of Beauvais (ca. 1184/94–ca. 1264). It was probably Guillaume Bernard de

<sup>19</sup> Edition: Papathomopoulos and Tsabare 2002. On Planudes' translation see Fisher 1990, 69–98.

<sup>20</sup> See Schmitt 1967b, 139.

<sup>21</sup> Other texts written by Ovid and translated into Greek that have mainly an erotic character are: the *Heroides* (love letters written by mythical women to mythical women), the *Ars amatoria*, the *Amores* and the *Remedia amoris*. With the exception of the *Heroides* these are only transmitted in fragments, and it is not certain that these were translated by Planudes.

<sup>22</sup> Cf. what is said below on Guillaume de Guillac and the anonymous teacher of Demetrios Kydones, both Dominicans; see also n. 24.

<sup>23</sup> Niketas 1984.



Guillac, the founder of a monastery of Dominicans near Constantinople in Pera who introduced the *Speculum* to Constantinople.<sup>24</sup> On ff. 225<sup>v</sup>–228<sup>r</sup> cod. Vaticanus gr. 1144 contains a collection of sentences under the title “Ἐκ τοῦ ἄκτορος<sup>25</sup> λατινικοῦ βιβλίου” which, according to Sternbach 1900/01, go back to books IV and V of the *Speculum*. This discovery remained unnoticed until in 1986 W. J. Aerts published a very careful edition of the text in that same manuscript. In 1997 Inmaculada Pérez Martín was able to supplement this with the edition of a similar text from cod. Vaticanus gr. 12, ff. 187<sup>r</sup>–193<sup>r</sup>.<sup>26</sup> According to Pérez Martín it is probable that the anonymous translator of the sentences in the book of the “actor” was the Byzantine monk Sophonias<sup>27</sup> who had a good command of Latin, especially after he had travelled as an envoy of Emperor Andronikos II to the court of Charles II of Anjou at Naples, where he stayed from 1294 to 1296, converting there to the Roman Church.

We come now to the second phase of Greek translations from Latin in the second half of the fourteenth century, which primarily concerns translations of works by Thomas Aquinas as well as other theological works emanating from the same milieu. The leading persons of this phase were two brothers from Thessalonike, the statesman and humanist Demetrios Kydones and the monk Prochoros Kydones.<sup>28</sup> Demetrios was born ca. 1324, almost twenty years after Planudes’ demise; Prochoros was about ten years younger. Demetrios entered civil service around 1347 under Emperor John VI Kantakuzenos; his brother became a monk in the monastery Megiste Laura on Mount Athos. In one of his autobiographical treatises, Demetrios tells us that he had from the start only practical intentions in learning Latin. Due to his ministerial post, he had to negotiate with Western ambassadors and merchants, and he desired personal contact with them without having to resort to the mediation of often unreliable interpreters. In search of a teacher of Latin he turned to the monastery of the Dominicans in Pera.<sup>29</sup> There he made friends with one of the monks who was also well versed in the writings of his fellow Dominican Thomas Aquinas (1224/5–1274). It was through the efforts of this monk that Demetrios was not only introduced to Latin but also to Thomas’ theology and philosophical methodology. After his initial progress in both the Latin language and Thomistic theology, Kydones received a very demanding exercise book from his teacher, namely, Aquinas’ *Summa contra Gentiles*, which, of course, is a philosophical and theological defense of Roman Catholic belief with respect not only to paganism but also to Islam (especially Averroism), Judaism and certain Christian heresies. The fourth and last book deals with the controversial doctrines of Byzan-

<sup>24</sup> Pérez Martín 1997a, 81–82.

<sup>25</sup> “Actor”, i. e. “auctor”, refers to the author of the collected sentences.

<sup>26</sup> Pérez Martín 1997a, 102–132.

<sup>27</sup> On Sophonias see Pérez Martín 1997a, 100–101; Failler 2002; Bydén 2004, 137–142; Searby 2016.

<sup>28</sup> For historical details of Demetrios Kydones’ life see Tinnefeld 1981, 4–52. For Prochoros see Tinnefeld 1981, 237–244. For their theological background: Plested 2012d, 63–84.

<sup>29</sup> Cf. n. 22 and 24 as well their corresponding texts.

tine Orthodoxy. As he studied the work, Demetrios became increasingly enthusiastic about the author's clear style and rigorous method as well as about his knowledge of Aristotelian philosophy. Eventually Demetrios continued not only to read but also began to translate the book. His efforts at translating, as Kydones tells his readers, attracted the favour of Emperor John VI.<sup>30</sup> In an autograph manuscript of the Greek translation of SG we find a note stating that Kydones completed his translation on 24 December 1354, shortly after the abdication of Emperor John VI.

Already in the following year, Kydones began to translate Aquinas' even more voluminous *Summa theologiae*, and gradually managed to complete Book One (*pars prima*) and Two (*pars prima secundae partis* and *pars secunda secundae partis*). Here he found material in order to defend his developing theological positions against accepted orthodox doctrine and in agreement with the Roman doctrine on the Holy Trinity and on the procession of the Holy Spirit from the Father and the Son, but also as regards the doctrine of the divine energies developed by Gregorios Palamas. The result was that Kydones approached ever closer the Roman Catholic position on these fundamental issues, until, probably in 1357, he joined the Roman Church.

Kydones also translated several other theological texts. In my own translation of Kydones' letters, I offer a list of all his translations including those not related to Aquinas; almost all his translations were of theological works.<sup>31</sup> In this paper I confine myself to a few of his more noteworthy translations, beginning with that of a mystical treatise erroneously ascribed to Augustine (354–430) but really written at some time after 1215, the so-called *Monologia* sive *Soliloquia* ("Soliloquiorum animae ad Deum" in *Patrologia Latina* 40, 863–898). Its Greek version has recently attracted scholarly attention thanks to the critical edition by Anna Koltsiou in 2005, over two hundred years after the (non-critical) editio princeps by Nikodemos Hagiorites in 1799.

John Demetracopoulos has published a lengthy study of Koltsiou's edition along with a detailed examination of the dating of the Greek translation of the *Soliloquia*.<sup>32</sup> Prior to Koltsiou, the common scholarly opinion on its dating was 1371/74, which was the date proposed by Loenertz for letter no. 25 in his edition of Kydones' correspondence.<sup>33</sup> In this letter, Kydones comments on the delivery of a copy of his *Soliloquia* translation to Empress Helena Palaiologina, wife of emperor John V Palaiologos and patroness of Kydones. I accepted this dating in my commentary to letter no. 25 (= no. 92 of my German translation),<sup>34</sup> but Koltsiou rejected it, being, to my knowledge, the first scholar to propose a much later date for the translation. In her opinion, Kydones translated this work because he was seeking consolation in expectation of his

<sup>30</sup> Plested 2012d, 84–89.

<sup>31</sup> Tinnefeld 1981, 68–72.

<sup>32</sup> J. A. Demetracopoulos 2006d, 191–258.

<sup>33</sup> Loenertz 1956–1960, 54–55.

<sup>34</sup> Tinnefeld 1982, 497–499.

approaching death.<sup>35</sup> Against this dating J. A. Demetracopoulos 2006d defended the traditional opinion, arguing that Kydones' decision to translate the *Soliloquia* can also be explained as seeking consolation for the far too early death of his brother Prochoros during Demetrios' stay in Italy 1370/71. Certainly, Demetracopoulos' "Sitz im Tode" argument, as he calls it, provides a cogent reason for the traditional dating of the translation.

Kydones' commitment to scholasticism is also evident from his translation of the anti-Islamic treatise *Contra legem Sarracenorum* by the Florentine Dominican and scholastic Riccoldo da Monte Croce (1243–1320).<sup>36</sup> This translation was the main source of the anti-Islamic treatise of Emperor John VI Kantakuzenos.<sup>37</sup> It is worth mentioning that Kydones clearly stated in some of his letters that he was a determined adversary of the Islamic Turks also for political reasons. I refer especially to his correspondence with his student and friend Rhadenos whom he implores in numerous letters to leave his place of residence in Thessalonike because it is in danger of being conquered by the Turks. He warns him not to surrender to the "ungodly" (ἄσεβεις) Muslims and thus lose his liberty and endanger his soul.<sup>38</sup>

Finally, also attributed to Kydones on hardly questionable grounds is the only complete Greek translation of the *Constitutum Constantini* or Donation of Constantine, the well-known forgery ceding the Western part of the Roman Empire to the papacy. With this translation Kydones was obviously trying to demonstrate to his Byzantine fellow citizens that the first "Byzantine" emperor, Constantine the Great, was a so-called λατινόφων, a friend of the Latin part of the Roman Empire.

Although Prochoros (ca. 1333/34–1369/70), the younger brother of Demetrios, was not as productive a translator, his work deserves acknowledgement. While still a young monk on Mount Athos, he acquired not only a splendid knowledge of Latin, but also, partly under the influence of his brother, a solid understanding of scholastic methodology. During his brief life he composed not only several translations of Latin writings but also some works of his own under scholastic influence. No less a scholar than Giovanni Mercati praised his "informazione, singolare per un bizantino, nella lingua Latina e nella teologia occidentale."<sup>39</sup> In the introduction to his edition of Prochoros' translation of eight letters of Augustine, Herbert Hunger considered the reasons for Prochoros' choice. For six of the eight letters the choice was probably determined by their placement at the head of a widespread medieval collection of Augustine's letters. The remaining two letters deal with the vision of God, a theme

<sup>35</sup> According to Ganchou 2002, 479, Demetrios Kydones died certainly in 1397, and not in 1398, a year long accepted as a possible alternative date of his death.

<sup>36</sup> For Riccoldo, his biography and work see Todt 1991, 231–282.

<sup>37</sup> For Kantakuzenos' use of Riccoldo's work for his *Ἀπολογία καὶ λόγοι κατὰ τοῦ Μωάμεθ*, see Todt 1991, 392–566, who only uses a German version of the title (*Apologien und Reden gegen Muhammad*).

<sup>38</sup> Tinnefeld 1985, 234–236.

<sup>39</sup> Mercati 1931e, 39.

relevant to the debate on Palamism,<sup>40</sup> which, of course, has to do with the beholding of God through the so-called energies, a doctrine rejected by its initial opponents as approaching polytheism.<sup>41</sup>

Both Prochoros' translation of these letters and his translation of Augustine's dialogue *De libero arbitrio* (Περὶ τῆς αὐτεξουσιότητος)<sup>42</sup> are transmitted in autograph manuscripts.<sup>43</sup> The text of the latter translation ends for no clear reason<sup>44</sup> in Book I, chapter 90. As already noted,<sup>45</sup> Prochoros also made a third Greek translation of Boethius' *De topicis differentiis*, no doubt because of his conviction that theological knowledge was not possible without logical thinking. Prochoros also continued the work of his brother Demetrios in translating a large part (at least 76 articles) of *ST IIIa* as well as six articles of the supplement and, in addition, the opusculum *De aeternitate mundi*.<sup>46</sup> Prochoros wrote his own chief work (edited only in part) Περὶ οὐσίας καὶ ἐνεργείας (= *De essentia et operatione*) surely with a view to Aquinas' *De ente et essentia*.

Manuel Kalekas, a disciple and friend of Demetrios Kydones, converted to Roman Catholicism in 1396, becoming a Dominican around 1404 in a Latin monastery on the island Lesbos, where he died in 1410. Under the influence of Kydones he studied Aquinas and translated works of Western theology into Greek, such as the *De Trinitate* of Boethius.<sup>47</sup> Ever since Mercati 1931e, 90, a Greek translation of the *Cur Deus homo* of Anselm of Canterbury (1033/34–1109) has been ascribed to Kalekas, although the main reason for this assumption was that the manuscript containing the translation (Vaticanus gr. 614, 84–109) was written in Kalekas' hand. Recently, however, Demetracopoulos<sup>48</sup> has rejected this attribution, arguing that Kydones, the translator of other works of Anselm, could very well have dictated the translation of this work to his disciple Kalekas.<sup>49</sup>

Last in this line of translators deserving mention is Georgios Gennadios Scholarios, the first orthodox patriarch of Constantinople after the city's conquest by the Turks in 1453. From his hand we have not only Greek translations, but also abridged versions (epitomai) of Latin works. Among the titles attributed to him<sup>50</sup> three Thomistic works may be mentioned here: 1) Περὶ διαφορᾶς οὐσίας καὶ τοῦ εἶναι, a translation

<sup>40</sup> Hunger 1984b, 13–14.

<sup>41</sup> See Tinnefeld 1982, 397, n. 11; Tinnefeld 2007, 12.

<sup>42</sup> Hunger 1990a, 12–53.

<sup>43</sup> Hunger 1984b, 10–11; Hunger 1990a, 7.

<sup>44</sup> On Prochoros' reasons for leaving the dialogue unfinished, see Hunger 1990a, 72–73.

<sup>45</sup> See above, n. 21, n. 22 and the corresponding text.

<sup>46</sup> Beck 1959, 737–738; Glykofridou-Leontsini 1975, 429–432.

<sup>47</sup> J. A. Demetracopoulos 2005, 83–118.

<sup>48</sup> J. A. Demetracopoulos 1995–1996, 113–117.

<sup>49</sup> See Tinnefeld 1981, 70 (Anselm 2.7.1: *De processione Spiritus Sancti*; 2.7.2: *De azymo et fermentato epistula*).

<sup>50</sup> See the survey of titles in Tinnefeld 2002, 517–520.

of Aquinas, *DEE* (along with a commentary translated by Scholarios); 2) *Ἐπιτομή τοῦ βιβλίου κατὰ ἔθνικων*, an epitome of Demetrios Kydones' translation of the *SG*; 3) *Ἐπιτομή τοῦ πρώτου βιβλίου τῶν θεολογικῶν*, an epitome of Kydones' translation of *ST Ia*.

To sum up: Whereas the number of Byzantine translators from Latin is, as we have seen, quite small, the number and especially the volume of their translations is substantial. However, it is not so much the existence of the translations itself that matters but their role in Byzantine intellectual history. The importance of their reception may to some extent be measured by the number of extant manuscript copies but to a much greater extent by the documented reaction of the readers. As described, for instance, by Gerhard Podskalsky, scholasticism entered the Orthodox world through the translations of Aquinas.<sup>51</sup> In the whole context of Byzantine aloofness and distrust towards the Latin West after 1204, it is all the more remarkable that Byzantines like Planudes and the Kydones brothers sought and acquired such an impressive expertise in the Latin language and in Western thought and literature. On the one hand we find an opening up of new contacts between East and West, on the other a shutting down of the contacts between them, especially amid the distrust and hostility under the rule of Andronikos II.<sup>52</sup> The effects of the Fourth Crusade were truly contradictory.

## Abbreviations and Bibliography

### Abbreviations

cod. gr.	codex graecus
DEE	De ente et essentia
ed.	edidit, ediderunt
et al.	and others
f.	folio
ff.	folios
n.	note
no.	number
SG	Summa contra gentiles
ST	Summa theologiae
tr.	translation
vol.	volume

<sup>51</sup> Podskalsky 1977a, 173–239.

<sup>52</sup> As shown in the splendid monography of Laiou 1972.

## Primary Sources

- “Proverbial passages taken from Vincent of Beauvais' *Speculum doctrinale*, translated into Medieval Greek” (1986). In: *Medievalia Groningiana* 7. Ed. by W. J. Aerts, pp. 141–187.
- “Manuel Calecas' translation of Boethius' *De Trinitate*. *Introduction*, new critical edition, index graecolatinitatis” (2005). In: *Synthesis Philosophica* 39. Ed. by J. A. Demetracopoulos, pp. 83–118.
- Demetrios Kydones, Briefe, übersetzt und erläutert* (1981–2003). Trans. by F. Tinnefeld. Vol. I/1: 1981; I/2: 1982; II: 1991; III: 1999; IV: 2003. Stuttgart.
- Ganchou, T. (2002). “Dèmètrios Kydônès, Les frères Chrysobergès et la Crète (1397–1407) de nouveaux documents”. In: *Bisanzio, Venezia e il mondo franco-greco*. Ed. by C. A. Maltesou and P. Schreiner. Venezia, pp. 435–493.
- “Μαξίμου Πλανούδη μετάφραση τοῦ περὶ τῶν δώδεκα βαθμῶν τῆς παραχρήσεως τοῦ Ψευδο-Αὐγουστίνου” (1974). In: *Δωδώνη* 3. Ed. by G. N. Giannakes, pp. 217–258.
- Hunger, H., ed. (1984b). *Prochoros Kydones, Übersetzung von acht Briefen des Hl. Augustinus*. Wien.
- Hunger, H., ed. (1990a). *Prochoros Kydones' Übersetzungen von S. Augustinus, De libero arbitrio I 1-90 und Ps.-Augustinus, De decem plagis Aegyptiorum (lateinisch-griechisch)*. Wien.
- Koltsiou-Niketa, A. K., ed. (2005). *Μετάφραση του ψευδοαυγουστινείου Soliloquia (Τί αν εἶποι ψυχὴ μόνη προς μόνον τον θεόν)*. Athenai.
- Loenertz, R.-J., ed. (1956–1960). *Démétrius (=Dèmètrius) Cydonès, Correspondance*. 2 vols. Città del Vaticano.
- Megas, A. C., ed. (1995). *Μαξίμου Πλανούδη (1255–1305) τοῦ ὑπομνήματος εἰς τὸ Ὀνειρον τοῦ Σκιπίωνος τοῦ Μακροβίου μετάφραση*. Thessalonike.
- Mercati, G., ed. (1931e). *Notizie di Procoro e Demetrio Cidone, Manuele Kaleka, Teodoro Meliteniota ed altri appunti per la storia della teologia e della letteratura bizantina del secolo XIV*. Città del Vaticano.
- Nikephoros Gregoras, Rhomäische Geschichte* (2007). Trans. by F. Tinnefeld. Vol. 6.
- “Η βυζαντινὴ μετάφραση του έργου του Βοηθίου De differentiis topicis ἀπὸ τον Πρόχορο Κυδώνη” (1984). In: *Ελληνικά* 35. Ed. by D. Niketas, pp. 275–315.
- Ortoleva, V., ed. (1992). *Maximus Planudes. Disticha Catonis in Graecum translata*. Roma.
- Papathomopoulos, M., ed. (1999). *Ἀννιτίου Μαλλίου Σεβηρίνου Βοηθοῦ βίβλος Περί παραμυθίας τῆς φιλοσοφίας, ἣν μετήνεγκεν εἰς τὴν ἐλλάδα διάλεκτον Μάξιμος ὁ Πλανούδης*. Copy of the Latin text and, in parallel position, critical edition of the Greek translation. Athenai.
- Papathomopoulos, M., ed. (2009). *Κάτωνος γνῶμαι παραινετικαὶ δίστιχοι ἃς μετήνεγκεν ἐκ τῆς Λατίνων φωνῆς εἰς τὴν ἐλλάδα διάλεκτον Μάξιμος μοναχὸς ὁ Πλανούδης*. Copy of the Latin text and, in parallel position, critical edition of the Greek text. Athenai.
- Papathomopoulos, M. and I. Tsabare, eds. (2002). *Ὀβιδίου περὶ μεταμορφώσεων ὁ μετήνεγκεν ἐκ τῆς Λατίνων φωνῆς εἰς τὴν ἐλλάδα Μάξιμος μοναχὸς ὁ Πλανούδης*. Copy of the Latin text and, in parallel position, critical edition of the Greek text in prose. Athenai.
- Papathomopoulos, M., I. Tsabare, and G. Rigotti, eds. (1995). *Αὐγουστίνου Περί Τριάδος βιβλία πεντεκαίδεκα, ἅπερ ἐκ τῆς Λατίνων διαλέκτου εἰς τὴν ἐλλάδα μετήνεγκεε Μάξιμος ὁ Πλανούδης. Εἰσαγωγή, ἑλληνικὸ καὶ λατινικὸ κείμενο, γλωσσάριο*. Copy of the Latin text and, in parallel position, critical edition of the Greek text. Athenai.
- Pavano, A., ed. (1992). *Maximus Planudes, M. Tullii Ciceronis Somnium Scipionis in Graecum translatum*. Roma.
- “El libro de actor. Una traducción bizantina del *Speculum doctrinale* de Beauvais (Vat. gr. 12 y 1144)” (1997a). In: *Revue des Etudes Byzantines* 55. Ed. by I. Pérez Martín, pp. 81–136.

## Secondary Sources

- Beck, H. G. (1959). *Kirche und theologische Literatur im byzantinischen Reich*. München.
- Berschlin, W. (1980). *Griechisch-lateinisches Mittelalter*. Bern.
- Bydén, B. (2004). “‘Strangle them with these meshes of syllogisms!’ Latin philosophy in Greek translations of the thirteenth century”. In: *Interaction and isolation in late Byzantine culture*. Ed. by J. O. Rosenqvist. Uppsala, pp. 133–165.
- Demetracopoulos, J. A. (1995-1996). “A critical note on the text of St. Anselm's *Cur Deus homo* 1, 21”. In: *Byzantina* 18, pp. 113–117.
- Demetracopoulos, J. A. (2006d). “The *Sitz im Leben* of Demetrios Cydones' translation of Pseudo-Augustine's Soliloquia. Remarks on a recent edition”. In: *Quaestio* 6, pp. 191–258.
- Failler, A. (2002). “La mission du moine Sophonias en Italie et le mariage de Michel IX Palaiologos”. In: *Revue des Etudes Byzantines* 60, pp. 151–166.
- Fisher, E. (1990). *Planudes' Greek translation of Ovid's Metamorphoses*. New York and London.
- Geanakoplos, D. (1959). *Emperor Michael Palaeologus and the West, 1258–1282*. Cambridge.
- Gigante, M. (1981a). “Il latino a Bisanzio”. In: *Scritti sulla civiltà letteraria bizantina*. Napoli, pp. 65–101.
- Gigante, M. (1981b). “Massimo Planude interprete di Cicerone”. In: *Scritti sulla civiltà letteraria bizantina*. Napoli, pp. 105–130.
- Glycofridou-Leontsini, A. (1975). “La traduzione in Greco delle opere di Tommaso d'Aquino”. In: *Nicolaus* 3.2, pp. 429–432.
- Kazhdan, A. P., ed. (1991). *Oxford Dictionary of Byzantium*. 3 vols.
- Laiou, A. E. (1972). *Constantinople and the Latins. The foreign policy of Andronicus II 1282–1328*. Cambridge/Mass.
- Plested, M. (2012d). *Orthodox Readings of Aquinas*. Oxford.
- Podskalsky, G. (1977a). *Theologie und Philosophie in Byzanz*. München.
- Rigotti, G. (1994). “Massimo Planude traduttore del De Trinitate di S. Agostino”. In: *La traduzione di testi religiosi*. Ed. by C. Moreschini and G. G. Menestrina. Brescia, pp. 185–196.
- Roberg, B. (1990). *Das zweite Konzil von Lyon [1274]*. Paderborn.
- Rochette, B. (1997). *Le latin dans le monde grec. Recherches sur la diffusion de la langue et des lettres latines dans les provinces hellénophones de l'empire romain*. Bruxelles.
- Schmitt, W. O. (1967a). “Cato in Byzanz”. In: *Klio* 48, pp. 325–334.
- Schmitt, W. O. (1967b). “Lateinische Literatur in Byzanz. Die Übersetzungen des Maximus Planudes und die moderne Forschung”. In: *Jahrbuch der Österreichischen Byzantinischen Gesellschaft* 16, pp. 127–147.
- Searby, D. (2016). “Sophonias”. In: *Dictionnaire des philosophes antiques*. Ed. by R. Goulet. Vol. 6. Paris, pp. 473–477.
- Sternbach, L. (1900/1901). “De Vincentii Bellovacensis excerptis graecis”. In: *České Museum Filologické* 6/7, pp. 401–416, 1–28.
- Tinnefeld, F. (1985). “Freundschaft und Παιδεία. Die Korrespondenz des Demetrios Kydones mit Rhadenos (1375–1387/8)”. In: *Byzantion* 55, pp. 210–244.
- Tinnefeld, F. (2002b). “Georgios Gennadios Scholarios”. In: *La théologie byzantine et sa tradition*. Ed. by C. G. Conticello and V. Conticello. Turnhout, pp. 477–549.
- Todt, K.-P. (1991). *Kaiser Johannes VI. Kantakuzenos und der Islam. Politische Realität und theologische Polemik im palaiologenzeitlichen Byzanz*. Würzburg.





Marcus Plested

## Reconfiguring East and West in Byzantine and Modern Orthodox Theology

The overarching theme of this volume touches upon a question that has been at the heart of my own research and teaching agenda for the last fifteen years or more – the conception of “East” and “West” in theology and Church history. Many if not all readers of this volume, even the younger ones, will have been brought up on the notion that “East” and “West” are clearly delineated theological and ecclesial categories. We all know (or think we know) what we mean when we speak of Eastern or Western Christianity. Writing this at my desk in Milwaukee I see on my bookshelves volume after volume perpetuating, at least implicitly, the idea of East and West as meaningful and self-evident theological and ecclesial categories: Vladimir Lossky’s *Mystical Theology of the Eastern Church*; Philip Sherrard’s *Greek East and Latin West* (and Andrew Louth’s book of the same name); Deno Geanakoplos’ *Byzantine East and Latin West*, Christos Yannaras’ *Orthodoxy and the West*; Jaroslav Pelikan’s *Spirit of Eastern Christendom*; the Pelikan Festschrift *Orthodoxy and Western Culture*; Nicholas Zernov’s *Eastern Christendom*; Adrian Fortescue’s *The Orthodox Eastern Church* – the list stretches on. A random selection of course but not, I think an atypical one. And without suggesting that all these works are equally blithe or unsubtle in the assumptions they make about East and West they give an idea of the sheer normality of the East-West dichotomy in the modern theological arena.

Not that this is an entirely bad thing. Before the vast upheavals and population movements of the twentieth century, the life and theology of the Orthodox Churches was a matter of supreme indifference to much of the Catholic and Protestant world. This has changed – Orthodox theology has gained some limited purchase and respect in many of the theological arenas of Western Europe and North America. But this has come at a cost, most notably in terms of a dialectical construct of Orthodox (i. e. Eastern) identity vis-à-vis a Western other (whether the Catholic/Protestant West or, more recently, the liberal secular West). Such dialectical constructions of identity drastically homogenise both East and West and greatly over-simplify the relations obtaining between them.

But first a brief word on the much-maligned poet Rudyard Kipling who was well aware that his comment on the otherness and separation of East and West was something of a sweeping statement, warning his literary epigones (if they wished to avoid sackfuls of post) to avoid such “glittering generalisations”:

Long ago I stated that “East was East and West was West and never the twain should meet”. It seemed right, for I had checked it by the card, but I was careful to point out circumstances under which cardinal points ceased to exist. Forty years rolled on, and for a fair half of them the

excellent and uplifted of all lands would write me, apropos of each new piece of broad-minded folly in India, Egypt, or Ceylon, that East and West had met—as, in their muddled minds, I suppose they had. Being a political Calvinist, I could not argue with these condemned ones. But their letters had to be opened and filed.<sup>1</sup>

Kipling's "glittering generalisation" has frequently been used to speak of the theological divide between East and West in recent decades – I myself used it (with a question mark) in an article on grace in Macarius and Augustine back in 2004.<sup>2</sup> It seems to me that as far as Kipling is concerned East and West do indeed remain poles apart for all the exceptional instances of bridging – such as the "two strong men" of the poem "The Ballad of East and West". But Kipling of course had little notion of Byzantium or Eastern Orthodoxy – his East was pre-eminently the Raj, that is, British India. This is a salutary reminder that one man's East is by no means necessarily another's.

East and West are of course in the first instance geographical denominators, denoting the direction in which the sun rises and sets – of course this comes over rather better in Greek – ἀνατολή καὶ δύσις. The areas we denote in common parlance as East and West correspond to the sun's setting and rising from a European and more specifically a Roman perspective. Indeed much of what we understand (theologically speaking) by "East" and "West" dovetails rather neatly with Diocletian's division of the Empire in 284 AD. But while that division corresponded in some measure to cultural and linguistic divisions (especially between Latin and Greek intellectual cultures), it had no impact on the overall unity of the patristic theological enterprise. The emergence of a distinctly Latin theological culture in Tertullian, Cyprian, Jerome, Augustine, and others no more created two rival theological traditions than did the emergence of the distinct theological culture of the Syriac-speaking orient – Aphrahat, Ephrem, Jacob of Serrugh, and others. Indeed one of the most helpful developments in recent scholarship on the Trinitarian debates of the fourth century onwards has been to review misleading presuppositions as to the distinctness of the theological trajectories of East and West at this time – and here I think especially of the work of Lewis Ayres and my colleague Michel Barnes. Barnes' work on the pervasiveness of the *de Regnon* paradigm – contrasting West and East as particularly alive to divine threeness and divine oneness, respectively, is perhaps especially pertinent.<sup>3</sup> Even within the long process of inter-Christian estrangement we call the East-West schism, signs of any perceived fundamental opposition between Greek and Latin theological traditions are few and far between. For example, the Frankish attempts to demonstrate the "kako-doxo" of the Empire of the Greeks as a way of burnishing the theological credentials of their "new and improved" Holy Roman Empire make a serious effort to appropriate the Greek theological tradition to their advantage – witness for example the *Decretum*

---

<sup>1</sup> Kipling 1991, 128.

<sup>2</sup> Plested 2004.

<sup>3</sup> See Barnes 1995a and Barnes 1995b.

*Aquisgranense* issued by the Council of Aachen in 809. Even Photius with his spirited resistance to Frankish missionary expansionism can scarcely credit the idea that there might be any fundamental incompatibility between Latin and Greek accounts of the Trinity. Skipping over the unfortunate but limited exchange of anathemas in 1054, a disreputable event scarcely noticed at the time, we come to 1204 and the Latin occupation of Constantinople (1204–61). This shameful episode did little to endear the Latins to the Byzantines – as, still less, did the vexatious commercial stranglehold gained by Latin powers in the Palaiologan period. As Barlaam of Calabria famously put it in 1339: “That which separates the Greeks from you is not so much a difference in dogma as the hatred of the Greeks for the Latins provoked by the wrongs they have suffered”.<sup>4</sup> Throughout the various theological debates and developments of the Palaiologan era this estimation held true – precious few were the voices prepared to affirm a fundamental incompatibility between the theological traditions of the Latin West and Greek East. On the contrary, a presupposition of harmony and compatibility remained the mainstream view even among avowed Palamites and ardent anti-unionists – sections of the Byzantine theological spectrum we might expect to have adopted a thorough-going anti-Western platform. But why should we expect Palamites and anti-unionists (or indeed anyone in Byzantium) to be instinctively anti-Western? Why should we assume the twain were never going to meet? To answer this we need to look at some of the theological developments of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries.<sup>5</sup>

It seems to me that the first signs of instinctive anti-Westernism within Orthodox theology are to be found within the Russian Slavophile movement. Emerging as a counter to the policy of Westernisation favoured by Peter the Great and his successors, the Slavophiles posited a fundamental dichotomy between the Greco-Slavic East and the Latin West, whether Catholic or Protestant. Nurtured (ironically) by German Idealism and Romanticism, the Slavophiles looked back rather to Russia’s past for the tools with which to resist creeping Westernization, one prominent sign of which was the dominance of the scholastic tradition in the theological schools of the Russian Empire. Ivan Kireevsky (1806–1856), denounces western scholasticism in these terms:

This endless, tiresome juggling of concepts over seven hundred years, this useless kaleidoscope of abstract categories spinning unceasingly before the mind’s eye, was bound in the end to blind it to those living convictions that lie above the sphere of rationalistic understanding and logic – convictions to which people do not attain through syllogisms, but whose truth, on the contrary, people can only distort, if not utterly destroy, through syllogistic deduction.

What Kireevsky proposes instead is a theology based on the collective wisdom of the Slav peoples and nourished by a retrieval of the patristic and ascetic inheritance of

---

<sup>4</sup> Barlaam, *Orat.* PG 151, 1336B (the passage is translated in Geanakoplos 1966, 91).

<sup>5</sup> This and subsequent sections reprise in condensed and adapted form material presented in Plested 2012b.

the Church. Similar sentiments abound in Alexei Khomiakov (1804–1860) who singles out excessive rationalism as a defect common to all Western confessions, whether supplemented by papal authoritarianism or Protestant individualism – Protestantism and Catholicism being simply two sides of the same coin. To counter this Khomiakov proposes an ecclesiology founded on the innately conciliar nature of the Slav peoples with their instinct for love, unity, and freedom. This model of unity-in-freedom is held up as an antidote to the excessive rationalism of the West of which Thomas Aquinas is a prime example.

All of this anti-Westernism is deeply shaped by dialogue with Western sources including Schlegel, Schelling, Möhler, Hegel, and Fichte. More to the point, it is also something rather new: a dialectical or oppositional construct of Orthodoxy. Orthodoxy is defined by the Slavophiles as non-Western, non-rationalistic, non-authoritarian, non-individualistic – in other words not by what it is but by what it is *not*. Romantic appeals to a mythical past cannot hide the fact that this is a conception of Orthodoxy governed and conditioned by that which it proposes to reject. Having presented rationalistic scholasticism as the defining feature of Western theology (and of course of the Western-leaning theology of the Russian Theological Academies), the only truly Orthodox theology, for the Slavophiles, is one that is anti-scholastic and anti-rational – and so anti-Thomist. Fuming against the Latinate scholasticism of establishment Russian theology, the Slavophiles conjure a phantom of Orthodox theology in which the traditional rational and, yes, scholastic dimension is missing.

The Slavophiles had little immediate impact and indeed were roundly ignored by the Russian theological and ecclesiastical establishment.<sup>6</sup> Nor did they have any immediate impact on the Greek thought-world. They were also much despised by that mesmerising genius Vladimir Soloviev (1853–1900) who decried their dialectical Orthodoxy, attacking those “who suppose the orthodoxy or religion of the Greco-Russian Church in opposition to the Western communions to be the very essence of our national identity”.<sup>7</sup> But the Slavophiles did bequeath a significant legacy, most notably to the theology of the Russian diaspora following on from the Bolshevik Revolution. Here the dominant figure is Sergius Bulgakov (1871–1944), Orthodoxy’s most constructive theologian of the twentieth century. Bulgakov articulated, or attempted to articulate an extraordinary and all-encompassing vision of the world in God and God in the world, a vision in which Sophia (Wisdom) is the link-piece of a vast theological synthesis uniting Trinitarian theology, Christology, pneumatology, cosmology, ecclesiology, Mariology – not to mention economics, politics, and culture. Thomas Aquinas emerges as something of a bogeyman for Bulgakov. In his essay on “The Eucharistic Dogma”, Bulgakov presents Aquinas to be the archetypal exponent of Western eucharistic theology, assent to whose teachings is incumbent upon all Roman Catholics.

---

<sup>6</sup> See Shezov 2012.

<sup>7</sup> Soloviev 1889, 14–15.

Protestant teachings on the eucharist conversely represent little more than dissent to this doctrine. “In other words, the whole of Western eucharistic theology is a positive or negative Thomism.” And this is not simply a matter affecting the non-Orthodox: “The influence of Aquinas’ doctrine also spread to the East; recent Orthodox theology concerning this question is still under the indirect and insufficiently understood influence of Thomism, an influence that must be completely overcome”.

Bulgakov concludes that Aquinas’ teaching in the matter of the high mystery of the eucharist represent the abject enslavement of theology to philosophy – and to a very particular and outmoded philosophy at that. Even in purely philosophical terms, transubstantiation is “an outright coercion of reason, a completely unnecessary and unjustified archaism”. He does not think that Orthodoxy has yet “said its word” on the matter. To do so it needs to “return to the theology of the Fathers (one thousand years into the past), to the patristic doctrine, and to use it as a true guide, to unfold it creatively and apply it to our time [...] By relying on the patristic doctrine, we can exit the scholastic labyrinth and go out into the open air, although an exertion of thought will be necessary to assimilate the patristic doctrine. Such, in general, is the path of Church tradition: it is always not only conservative but also creative.” In all this, Thomas Aquinas stands as representative of a rationalistic and impersonal Western theology diametrically opposed to Orthodoxy. In so far as he has infiltrated the theology of the Christian East, Thomas represents an “influence that must be completely overcome” through a creative retrieval of the Fathers.

Vladimir Lossky (1903–58) adopts an uncannily similar approach despite being an implacable opponent of Bulgakov’s sophiology. Although intimately acquainted with some of most exciting developments of the Thomist revival of the early twentieth century (not least as a student of Étienne Gilson), Lossky betrays little sympathy for Aquinas. For Lossky, it is not so much the doctrine of transubstantiation but that of the *filioque* that most aptly encapsulates the rationalist excesses of Western theology. Originating in Augustine and reaching some sort of crescendo moment in Aquinas, the doctrine of the *filioque* is decried as an unwarranted intrusion into the mystery of the Trinity and a direct progenitor of modern secularism. In his chef d’oeuvre, *Essai sur la théologie mystique de l’Église d’Orient*, Lossky contrasts the mystical and experiential character of Orthodox theology with the rationalism of Latin theology typified by Aquinas.<sup>8</sup> Thomas is presented as an incorrigible rationalist even when appropriating Dionysius. Unlike Palamas, who fully grasps the radical character of Dionysius’ apophaticism, Aquinas is accused of reducing apophatic theology to simple negation.<sup>9</sup> All this brings Lossky to the depressing conclusion that between the cataphatic and rationalizing approach of the West (represented by Augustine and Aquinas) and

<sup>8</sup> See, for example, Lossky 1944, 24, 56, 90 [ET 26, 57, 95].

<sup>9</sup> Lossky 1974e, 53. Cf. also Lossky 1974a, 26.