

Augustine in the Byzantine World to 1453

Introduction

The fundamental studies on the tradition of Aug. in the Byzantine Church remain those by Rackl (1924) and Altaner (1952), the first still useful for the manuscript sources, the second for its detailed analysis of the dogmatic florilegia (now indexed in ACO). Rackl's enthusiasm for Byzantine interest in Aug. as 'a friend of the East' contrasts with Altaner's conclusion that there was a fundamental lack of knowledge of Aug. in the Greek Church. The reasons for the scarcity of references to Aug. in the early Byzantine sources have been explored by Nichols (1987) from the perspective of church politics, while Lössl (2001) suggests that the very success of Aug. as a western theologian placed him on the Greeks' blacklist until an unexpected revival in the thirteenth century.

As Altaner predicted, little addition can be made to the number of Greek translations listed by him. Nevertheless the weight of evidence is appreciable in establishing Aug. as a patristic authority in the view of the Greek Church. Where evidence does not firmly support a possible wider knowledge of Aug.'s works, blanket scepticism need not be the definitive position. A deeper investigation of Byzantine biblical exegesis, and the history of Latin manuscripts at Constantinople, are avenues that may be fruitfully explored in seeking Aug.'s elusive imprint in the East.

Aug.'s reputation, established through the sixth- to eighth-century councils, secured the return to his works by the Greek scholars Maximos Planudes (*c.*1280–1305), and the brothers Demetrios (*c.*1324–1397/8) and Prochoros Kydones (*c.*1333–1369/70?). Their translations have benefited from recent editions, philologically important, and impacting on our understanding of the late medieval Byzantine Church.

I. Aug. and the Greek Church

Aug.'s role in the Pelagian controversy first brought him centre-stage for Greek-speaking bishops, exposing the dangers of the linguistic division between Greek and Latin as a breeding-ground for misunderstandings in the Church. Divjak discovered two letters addressed to Eastern prelates: Letters 4* to Cyril of Alexandria, and 6* to Atticus of Constantinople (Chadwick 428–9). Both were inspired by the presence of groups of Latin-speaking Pelagians in those Greek communities: Aug. needed to clarify the grounds of their condemnation to his Eastern colleagues, so that their error would not pass unnoticed in the new context, explaining his arguments on the remission of sins and on the correct attitude to concupiscence, which had been obscured by the language transfer.

Letter 4* provides 'an important link in the chain of evidence which explains why of all the many writings of Aug. the *De gestis Pelagii* was probably the only one available in Greek translation' (Bonner 158; Bouhot). The book reached Alexandria through Aug.'s emissary Justus, and was translated there for the benefit of bishop Cyril, who in turn had provided Aug. with a copy of the acts of the Council of Diospolis (415). This translation is mentioned four centuries later in Photios' *Bibliotheca* 1.54:

Αὐγουστῖνος ἐν τοῖς πρὸς Αὐρήλιον τὸν Καρταγένης πάπαν διέξεισι, 'Aug. reported [on Diospolis] in his letters to Aurelius, bishop of Carthage' (*Photius, Bibliothèque* I, p. 44; Altaner 73–4). The probable identification of this reference with *De gestis Pelagii* has been questioned by Dekkers, who considers these 'letters' simply part of the documents from the anti-Pelagian council described by Photios in Codex 54 (Dekkers 209–10; cf. *Thesaurus Photii Constantinopolitani*, authors' index).

Against this lack of evidence that any work of Aug. was wholly translated into Greek stands → Possidius' claim that translations into Greek had indeed been made during Aug.'s lifetime: *libros editos atque in Graecum sermonem translatos* (*V. Aug.* 11.5). Possidius' use of the plural is usually considered a rhetorical hyperbole compared to the sole presumed translation of *De gestis Pelagii*. If even Photios' witness is uncertain, however, then the very reliability of Possidius is questionable, despite his account being well-documented and sober (Hamilton), and the context of *V. Aug.* 11 presenting this remark somewhat incidentally. Perhaps Possidius referred to oral translations, such as those of Aug.'s letters to Eastern prelates (*ep.* 179 to John of Jerusalem; cf. Fürst 295, 301–2), or he may be reporting a wider phenomenon that has left no trace.

II. Latin Texts in the East

The possibility that Aug.'s works circulated in the East in their original language cannot be discarded. While Jerome acted as one intermediary, the anti-Pelagian work directed at → Julian of Eclanum, the *Opus imperfectum*, reached Julian while he was at Mopsuestia, taking refuge with Bishop Theodore (Marius Mercator, *Symboli Theodori M. et eius refutatio*, praef. 2, cited Cipriani 365; for refs to Aug. see ACO IV.3, Index Generalis I, s.v. Iulianus Aeclan.; cf. Lössl 270–1). Latin monks at Constantinople, such as John Maxentius (→ Scythian Monks), also brought Aug.'s writing to the Byzantine capital throughout the fifth and sixth centuries. Maxentius used quotations from *De trinitate*, *Enchiridion*, *Contra Maximinum Arrianum*, *De civitate dei*, *De dono perseverantiae* and *De Genesi ad litteram* (texts in ACO IV. 2 and CCL 85A; Carcione 67 and n. 37).

Of particular interest is a mid sixth-century manuscript, now MS Lyons 478 (408), containing *De consensu evangelistarum* (fols 10–197). On palaeographical grounds, it is associated with a group of important legal manuscripts copied at a major centre of Byzantine book production, possibly in the capital itself (Lowe; Cavallo/Magistrale 50; Kaiser 218; Radiciotti).

This evidence must be borne in mind when assessing how far Latin was still a viable language in the East. When Pope Vigilius wrote to Patriarch Eutychios of Constantinople, on 8 December 553, encouraging him to change his mind on the question of the two natures of Christ by citing Aug.'s *Retractationes* as a noble precedent, one may not, as Altaner does, entirely discard the possibility that his subtle reference was picked up by the Greeks, simply because we lack evidence for a translation (PL 69, 123; Altaner 1967, 88 n. 1). Correspondents tend to gauge the level of their audience, and it is clear in Vigilius' case that he did not doubt Eutychios' knowledge of, and respect for, Aug.'s theological evolution. Since opinions vary widely concerning the question of the level of knowledge of Latin in the East, it is reasonable not to exclude *a priori* the possibility of some knowledge of Aug.'s works in the original, possibly on occasion translated orally by professionals for the benefit of a specific audience (cf. Dekkers 210 n. 3).

Among the Latin texts containing Aug. which must have been translated for reception by the Greek Church are the documents of the Trinitarian controversy under Patriarch Photios. The corpus of works by Carolingian theologians, largely based on Aug. and including 'numerous lengthy quotations from *De Trinitate*', reached Constantinople, where they became available to the patriarch probably in the form of summaries in Greek

(Haugh 35–6, 121). Photios’ response, in a letter to the patriarch of Aquileia (883/4) and in his *Mystagogia*, declares valid the authority of the Latin Fathers (Ambrose, Jerome and Aug.), while rejecting their assent to the *Filioque* as a pardonable mistake, which had better be passed over in silence (Haugh 136, 151–3). Paradoxically, Photios contends that there would be no point in condemning these Fathers posthumously for their error, ‘since one who is dead is present neither through himself nor through others who would undertake his defence [...]’ (PG 102, 816B). Photios is here disagreeing with the method of *post mortem* condemnation adopted by the councils, which had been sanctioned with the help of Aug. since the sixth century (see III below).

Another significant document in the contacts between the Latin and Greek Churches is the florilegium on the Holy Spirit prepared by Cardinal Humbert of Silva Candida for the Emperor Constantine Monomachos against Patriarch Keroullarios in 1054. It draws on *trin.* (ed. Michel, I: 102–108) as an authority evoking respect for the theses maintained there. Among Humbert’s sources Michel identifies the pseudo-Augustinian *Praedestinatus* (→ Arnobius Junior), which shaped his presentation of heresy (Michel, II: 410–15).

III. Augustine as Patristic Authority: Controversies and Church Councils

The Παράστασις περὶ τοῦ μακαρίου Ἀγούστίνου, ὅπως παρὰ τῶν συνόδων ἐξοχώτατος διδάσκαλος καὶ ἅγιος ἀνακερύττεται (‘Display of the blessed Aug., how he was proclaimed the most outstanding teacher and saint by the councils’) from MS Vat. gr. 606, fols 312v–313r, published by Rackl (2–4), is a fourteenth-century witness to contemporary Aug. translations by the Kydones brothers. A similar text may be contained

in the fifteenth-century theological miscellany, MS Vind. theol. gr. 190, fols 196r–197r. Unstinting praise of Aug. and the use of his works as proof texts against heresy occurred at Ephesus (431), Constantinople III (680), Nicaea II (787), and at a synod under Manuel Komnenos (1166).

At Ephesus, the letter from the bishop of Carthage, Capreolus, recalls the invitation to the council sent by the Emperor Theodosius to Aug., which however arrived after his death (ACO I.I.2, p. 64, ll. 11-14). Aug. is introduced as ‘ὁ ἐν ἁγίοις Ἀ.’ (‘holy’/‘saint’) in Justinian’s writings (ed. Schwartz 1973, 124), ‘ἁγιωτάτου ἐπισκόπου’ (‘the holiest bishop’) in → Leo’s florilegium (ACO II.1, p. 23, l. 30-31), ‘ὁ μακάριος Ἀ. ὁ ἐξοχώτατος διδάσκαλος’ (‘the blessed Aug., the most outstanding teacher’), ‘ὁ σοφώτατος τῆς ἀληθείας κῆρυξ ὁ μακάριος Ἀ.’ (‘the wisest herald of truth, the blessed Aug.’) and ‘τὸν ἅγιον καὶ ἑκκριτον Ἀ.’ (‘the holy and orthodox Aug.’) at Constantinople III (ACO Ser. 2, II.1, p. 70, l. 27–8; p. 78, l. 1; p. 216, l. 21). Aug. appears in the list of orthodox (ἑκκριτοί) Church Fathers proclaimed by the fifth ecumenical council, Constantinople II, in 553: (ACO IV.1, p. 37, ll.17–18, 24; cf. Murphy/Sherwood 288) and reiterated by the Lateran Council of 649 (ACO Ser. 2, I, p. 254, l. 36–256, l. 3 (Greek text), cited by Alexakis 4).

Aug.’s experience in handling the memory of the Donatist bishop Caecilianus is taken as paradigmatic when addressing the right procedure for the posthumous condemnation of Theodore of Mopsuestia at the second Council of Constantinople (553). At the fifth session, Sextilianus, bishop of Tunis, offers three excerpts from Aug.’s anti-Donatist writings (*ep.* 185; *De unitate ecclesiae*; *Contra Cresconium*), with an unidentified passage inserted within the first quotation, together with a ruling by Aug. at

the African synod of Carthage in 411 (ACO IV.1, p. 102, l. 20–103, l. 8; cf. Alexakis 14). The focus is on Aug.’s view of the Church as a Spirit-led institution which survives beyond the fate of individual sinners, whose predicament may be more clearly judged *post mortem*. The first quotation, from *ep.* 185 (*De correctione Donatistarum*), had already appeared in Justinian’s writings against the Three Chapters (549–50), and it is from these that a shorter Greek version of the passage is preserved (ed. Schwartz, p. 68, ll. 14–17; p. 108, ll. 26–33, paraphrased). Justinian attributes two further passages on the Creed and the Incarnation to Aug., but these were not picked up in dogmatic florilegia and are now considered spurious.

It is really only with the Acts of the Lateran Council of 649 that we have the possibility of comparing a good portion of identified Latin quotations with their Greek translation (parallel texts in ACO Ser. 2, I, pp. 88–91, 260–61, 276–83). These acts have the peculiarity of having had a Greek original, from which the Latin translation was made. Both versions, moreover, were authored by the famous Greek monk, Maximos the Confessor (c. 580–662), with a group of collaborators at Constantinople and in Rome (Alexakis 16–21). The quotations from Latin authorities are thought to have been contributed by Latin monks (Sansterre 119). However, while the Latin text of Aug. was lifted unchanged from his works, the translations into Greek were adapted to suit the focus of the Council’s discussions, the monothelete heresies (cf. ACO Ser. 2, I, p. 278, ll. 9–10). For example, the quotation from the *Tractatus in Iohannem* 22.15 introduces the concept of ὁμοούσιον in a sentence on the unity of will in the Trinity. A passage from *ep.* 140 (*De gratia testamenti novi*) makes explicit the statement that Christ did not have two (distinct) wills (οὐδὲ δίχα ψυχῆς; p. 90, l. 19); where this passage is repeated in another

session of the Council, the two wills become ‘οὐδὲ δίχα ψυχῆς λογικῆς’ (p. 280, l. 35). Further, the Greek version unpacks the rationale behind the scriptural use of ‘flesh’ rather than ‘person’ in referring to Christ, indicating here the rhetorical trope of naming the part for the whole (*synechdoche*) as its explanation. In one of two passages from *civ.* 14, on the veracity of the Scriptures, such truthfulness is stressed as an utter defence of their content with an additional phrase (p. 280, ll. 8–9): οὐ γάρ ἀπατελῶς γέγραπται (Lat.: *non falsa utique referuntur*), ἢ κατὰ ψευδῆν τινα φαντασίαν, ἀλλ’ὀμολογουμένως καὶ ἀληθῶς· (‘it is not written falsely or according to some deceitful appearance, but orthodoxly and truly’). Further evidence of reworking is found in the translation of two quotations in the second session of the Council, where identical conclusions are added to Aug.’s passages from *Contra sermonem Arrianorum* 16. This homogeneity may reveal a conscious effort at harmonization between different quotations for this specific compilation in Greek.

Against this hypothesis stands a passage from the *Enarrationes in Psalmos* 93.19, ll. 64–71 (CCL 39, p. 1321), the only one that can be compared to an earlier translation. While the addition of the clause ὅπερ οἱ αἰρετικοὶ νομίζουσι (‘as the heretics believe’) appears to identify those who believe that Christ did not really suffer with the heretics against whom the council is pronouncing (p. 276, l. 34), the same clause was already present in a sixth-century catena containing this passage in Greek (ed. Poussines, 319). The continuation of this passage also appears slightly different from the original Latin, as the metaphorical ‘worm of corruption’ (*vermiculus putredinis*) is changed into the more specific ‘corrupting power of heresy’ (σκώληκος τῆς αἰρετικῆς σηπεδόνοϋ: p. 278, l. 4), which is the cause for doubting Scripture. However, this part of the text cannot be

compared, as the more ancient version is shorter than that in the Lateran documents. This excludes the possibility of direct dependence, opening that of a common source, perhaps a longer portion of *en. Ps.* translated into Greek (see also below, IV).

Further bilingual passages are offered by the letter of Pope Agathon, also discussing the two natures of Christ, which was read out at the fourth session of the Third Council of Constantinople in 680 (Altaner 90–2). Both the quotation from *c. Max.* 2.20 (ACO Ser. 2, II.1, p. 70, l. 27–p. 72, l. 15) and the Pope’s hortatory commentary to it are translated word for word, the Greek mirroring the Latin word-order (p. 72, ll. 15–21; p. 73, ll. 12–17). Note that *cor* (‘heart’) is here translated, predictably, as καρδιά, unlike the more daring choice of κρίσιν ὀρθή (‘correct judgement’) for *rectum cor* in Maximos’ translations of the Lateran Council (ACO Ser. 2, I, p. 280, l. 19; p. 281, l. 18). Similarly, the mosaic of quotations from *c. Iul. imp.*, and the Pope’s explanations of its meaning, were translated literally (ACO Ser. 2, II.1, pp. 76–9). The same lines from *c. Iul. imp.* 40, are repeated later in the Acts of Constantinople III (pp. 248–9, 336–7). None of these passages overlaps with the two extracts of the same work found in the Lateran Council documents, even though the first one comes from the same paragraph (ACO Ser. 2, I, pp. 348–51). Here too a translation of the whole work as source is a possibility. During the tenth session, the quotations from Aug. are said to have been collated against the original manuscripts by the Latin interpreter, the presbyter and *grammaticus* Constantine (336–7).

There is also a small number of unidentified quotations, which may have come from works of Aug. now lost, or represent highly paraphrased passages that cannot be pinpointed any longer (Constantinople II: ACO IV.1, p. 102, l. 26–p. 103, l. 6 (Latin only); Constantinople III: ACO Ser. 2, II.1, p. 216, ll. 19–21 in Greek, p. 217, ll. 18–20 in

Latin; Pope Pelagius II's letter: ACO IV.2, p. 110, ll. 27–34). Another unidentified fragment comes from Pope Hadrian I's letter to the Second Council of Nicaea (787): the complex textual history of this document, due to the controversial context of ecclesiastical politics during iconoclasm, may have resulted in some textual corruption (Mansi XII, 1065C and 1066A quoted by Wallach 31; Italian trans. in *Vedere l'invisibile*, 20; Altaner 94–5; Alexakis 40, 214; Nichols 117–18).

The disappointment of not finding more of Aug.'s texts quoted as authorities on the matter of the Procession of the Holy Spirit, and therefore on the understanding of the Trinity, may in fact reflect the chances of survival of these dogmatic florilegia, whose transmission is often difficult to retrace, rather than demonstrate the unlikely situation of Aug. being ignored whilst being the most important authority for this topic. Although it is generally assumed that Photios did not have first-hand texts of Aug. at his disposal, Alexakis argues that a Trinitarian florilegium which included Augustinian material was circulating at Constantinople from the mid-eighth century. This early material was copied in codex Paris. gr. 1115 in 1276, but the reversal of imperial policy between the death of Michael VIII in 1282 and the accession of the anti-Latin Andronicus II caused the 'loss' of at least 83 folios, whose content must have included works of Aug. and → Gregory I, as mentioned in the letter of Michael VIII to Pope Urban IV written in the spring of 1263/4. Alexakis (249) considers this lacuna eloquent. Accidents of preservation are not always accidental.

In the text published by Rackl, the synod of 1166, convened by the Emperor Manuel, is recalled as another instance of praise for Aug. The quotation from *Io. ev. tr.* 78.3, already known through Leo the Great's *Florilegium* (ACO II.4, p. 128, ll. 5–6),

epitomizes the Latin position on the interpretation of Jn 14:28, ‘The Father is greater than I’. Aug. explains the divine substance of Christ as equal to the Father, but his human substance as inferior to the Father’s. The Emperor had the support of Patriarch Luke Chrysoberges in imposing the Latin interpretation of this passage as an *ekthesis*, sculpted in the narthex of St Sophia, to which the Greek clergy had to consent (ed. Mai, *Veterum scriptorum nova collectio* IV, 16). This quotation was picked up by Niketas Choniates (c. 1155–1215) in his *Dogmatic Panoply* (cf. PG 140, 286 and n. 3).

IV. Aug. as Exegete: Scattered Evidence

The vexing question of whether the short quotations from Aug.’s works may in some cases come from more extensive translations, now lost, is not only raised for the documents of the Lateran Synod produced by Maximos the Confessor, but also teased out at the recurrence of certain passages and ideas, mostly connected to Aug.’s exegetical works. For example, the *Tractatus in Iohannis evangelium* was an exegetical essay of special value at the time it was composed (Borghesi 5), and it is not unlikely that its circulation reached the East. It is true that it is mostly the same quotation that occurs in Pope Leo’s florilegium as well as in Leo of Byzantium’s appendix of texts to the *Contra Nestorianos et Eutyrianos* (cf. ed. Dell’Osso 90), and again in a shorter form in the anonymous *De sectis* (pr. Mai, *Patrum Nova Bibliotheca* II, 596; Schermann 26; Altaner 79–80; Nichols 117). However, a different passage is signalled by Schermann (91) in a Trinitarian florilegium, MS Paris. gr. 1305, fol. 89r (inc.: τὸ σωματικὸν), which remains unpublished. Another is found in the acts of the Lateran Council of 649 (ACO Ser. 2, I, p. 260, ll. 29–33 (Greek), p. 261, ll. 29–32 (Latin); Altaner 89–90). Even if each translation

was made *ad hoc*, one must at the very least postulate a reasonable circulation of Latin manuscripts. Indeed a large section of this text survives as a Renaissance translation (see part V).

It is also possible that *en. Ps.* may have been known in Byzantium more extensively than the immediate evidence suggests. A quotation from *en. Ps.* 93.19 is preserved in a tenth-century codex, Vaticanus graecus 1692, which transmits a sixth-century catena to the Gospels (Reuss 18, 144, 146). This passage is also quoted in the Lateran Council, but more extensively, and the quotation of *en. Ps.* 100.6 is also added there (see part III). A further reference to Aug.'s exegesis of Ps. 100:3 emerges behind the pictorial commentary to this psalm found in a group of eleventh-century illuminated psalters produced at the monastery of St John Stoudios (Crostiti 2007, 169–70). Aug.'s exegesis may in this case have been known indirectly through the letter of Pope Nicholas I to Emperor Michael III (*ep.* 88, 28 Sept. 865: *MGH Epistolae Karolini aevi* IV, 477–8). The same point was made by reference to Aug.'s *Contra Faustum* 12–13, in the pope's letter to prince Boris of Bulgaria on how to adopt Christian customs (Simeonova 206–7). The evidence appears sporadic, but one gains the impression that Aug.'s commentary on the Psalms was widely regarded as a very important work in Byzantium also.

A similar case may be made concerning the references to *civ.*, very numerous in the sources preserved in Latin only, including councils, but also cropping up unexpectedly on two separate occasions. The first similarity of content was observed by Munitiz while editing the *Quaestiones* of Anastasius of Sinai: the notion that men supply the number of angels expelled from Paradise in Qu. 94.4 (ed. Richard/Munitiz, p. 150, ll. 4–8) is found most precisely at *civ.* 22.1, as well as *Enchiridion* 9.29. Anastasius attributes it

generically to the ‘holy fathers’ and cites a further similarity in a passage from ‘Gregory’ (Greg. Naz., *Orat.* 38.2, ed. Moerschini/Gallay 106). The Greek text of *ench.* 9 is also found in the twelfth-century work by Andronikos Kamateros, the *Sacred Arsenal* (Bucossi, II, no. 148, p. 152, from MS Monacensis Graecus 229, fols 79v–81r). A later, anonymous occurrence of another passage from *civ.* 5.1, where Aug. is mentioned by name, was discovered by Linos Benakis (Benakis 37; Fürst 309).

V. Aug. as Theologian: the Renaissance Translations

Addressing the question of church unity in his *Opus tripartitum*, the Master of the Dominican order, Humbert of Romans (c.1200–77), advocated a path for reconciliation through reciprocal understanding, achieved by the undertaking of translations of Greek works into Latin, and vice versa (cf. Brett 190; Nichols 118–19). Aug.’s reputation, firmly established by the ecumenical councils, naturally made him the focus of study when the dialogue between the Greek and Latin Churches resumed around the union sanctioned at the Council of Lyons II (1274). The political advocate of the pro-Latin party was the Emperor Michael VIII Paleologos (1259–82), while the Dominican order, through its house at Constantinople, clearly played some part in initiating and sustaining the spate of translations produced from the third quarter of the thirteenth century. The actual translations were made by some remarkable Greek scholars and monks, who displayed their mastery of Latin in secular, as well as theological, texts. However, at the advent of the anti-Latin Emperor Andronikos II in 1282, the polemic between the opposing factions sharpened once more (Constantinides). Nevertheless, translations of Latin fathers into Greek continued: unlike the fragments in dogmatic florilegia,

transmitted by a few official copies, these modern, extensive translations circulated more widely, favoured by the reduced cost of paper codices. Their influence thus underpins the ecclesiastical debates in deeper ways than those dictated by contingent political allegiances.

Maximos Planudes (1255–1305)

Debate over the *Filioque* clause of the Creed periodically flared up between Greeks and Latins, so that it is significant that the first work by Aug. to be selected for a full-length translation was the key text on this topic, *De trinitate* (ed. Papathomopoulos et al. 1995). Maximos Planudes may have been commissioned to this difficult task by the Emperor himself, so a *terminus ante quem* is usually fixed at the end of Manuel's reign in 1282. If so, the translation, dated between 1274 and 1282, must be considered a youthful work, perhaps coming from a non-committal rather than decidedly pro-Latin viewpoint, as Planudes had not yet entered monastic life (1995 ed., p. LIV; Congourdeau 489). However attractive this hypothesis of imperial patronage, not all translation efforts need have ceased with the accession of the anti-Latin Andronikos, as the continuation of Latin studies in fourteenth-century Constantinople demonstrates. The accuracy of Planudes' translation proves the intellectual honesty of a scholar *super partes*, engaged by a challenging text, whilst early criticism from Dominican sources in the East, to the effect that the wording was changed in places to serve anti-Latin polemics, may reflect the contemporary perception that Planudes undertook this work as a monk who had already taken sides with the anti-unionists (Schmitt 1968, 131–2; Delacroix-Besnier 246, 248). But perhaps such stark oppositions are just simplified projections from the scant

evidence, skewed by controversy, casting the protagonists as caricatures. In the view of contemporaries like Bessarion and George Metochites, Planudes stands out as more decidedly anti-Latin than perhaps he ever intended to be (Möhler I, 220–1). The translation of *trin.* may have served a genuine attempt, on either side, at furnishing the shallow Union of Lyons with deeper theological roots, or at least at preparing texts on which further discussions could be founded (cf. Constantinides 92). Aug.’s ideas, made fully available in Greek by Planudes, remained central for all later debates on the procession of the Holy Spirit (*contra* see Meyendorff 399), as well as on other epistemological issues, as evidenced by the use of extracts in an anonymous fourteenth-century treatise (Schrenk 451–6; Fürst 308). Planudes’ translation of *trin.* became widely known, as testified by the over thirty extant copies dating between 1342 (Oxford, Bodleian Library, MS Laud 71) and the sixteenth century (listed in 1995 ed., lxxxi–lxxxiv).

Gregory Palamas (1296–1359)

For discussion of → Gregory Palamas, see the separate article on this author.

Demetrios Kydones (1324–97)

The activity of the Kydones brothers as translators of a range of Latin theological works developed in a climate in which interest in the West assumed even sharper political edges, still fluctuating according to each emperor’s sympathies, but exacerbated by the Palamite controversy within the Eastern Church. The personality and intellectual vigour of Demetrios tower against this uncertain backdrop, steering a course towards

reconciliation with Rome which began with his instruction in Latin by a Dominican friar from the Pera, passed through his reading of Aquinas and his probable conversion to Catholicism by 1357 (Demetracopoulos 196 n. 20), and culminated in his accompanying Emperor John V on his voyage to Rome to make profession of faith to Pope Urban V in 1369 (Loenertz 10; Kianka 1995, 104; Delacroix-Besnier 277–80). Demetrios worked through his original writings and translations to underpin what he perceived as the essential unity of the faith by re-establishing reciprocal knowledge and respect between Greeks and Latins (Rigotti 276–8).

Kydones wrote a lengthy and heartfelt passage praising Aug. in a letter to the Empress Helena Kantakouzene Palaiologina, singling him out for his account of the compatibility of Plato and Aristotle with Christianity (Fryde 189, 368), for his opposition to heresy, and for the monastic rules which he wrote, and stating: ‘I offer you the works of this man in place of my own, [... like] heaven in place of earth’ (Letter 25, dated 1371–4?, ed. Loenertz I, 54–5; Kianka 1992, 157). The epistle acted as covering letter for a translation of Aug., perhaps of the *Soliloquia* (Demetracopoulos 197, 216–8; the *Liber sententiarum* for Mercati 1931a, 206), dedicated by Kydones to his once-cherished pupil. It is significant that although the empress did not share Demetrios’ pro-Latin stance, she remains the privileged and tolerant addressee of such high praise for Aug.

The mention of Aug.’s rule for monastic life attests Demetrios’ acquaintance with this text, perhaps through its being adopted by the Dominican order, although the extant Greek translation is much later (Salaville 1931b; Fürst 306, nn. 58–9). This letter also famously complains about the scarcity and poor quality of the Latin books available, which were ‘not many’ and ‘written unclearly [so that] I [...] had rather to guess at the

letters'. This situation appears astonishing, when Demetrios had access to Latin manuscripts both in Italy and at the Byzantine court, with imperial scribes at his disposal (Jugie 391–2).

Poor book circulation is often used as an explanation for the odd selection of Augustinian and → pseudo-Augustinian texts that Demetrios translated. The autograph manuscript, Vat. gr. 1096 (Gamillscheg/Harlfinger/Eleuteri 74, no. 164), still contains unpublished material at fols 171–222v: an incomplete version of the *Liber sententiarum ex operibus sancti Augustini*, by → Prosper of Aquitaine, a fragment of *c. Iul. imp.*, and further extracts from the *Io. ev. tr.*, not overlapping with those of earlier translations, circulating under the title Λόγοι περὶ τοῦ ἁγίου Πνεύματος ('Discourses on the Holy Spirit') (Demetracopoulos 198). Demetrios also translated there the *De fide ad Petrum*, then attributed to Aug., but really by → Fulgentius of Ruspe (Koltsiou-Niketa 1999). Demetrios' translation of pseudo-Augustine's *Soliloquia* became especially popular, as attested by forty manuscripts, of which fourteen are Athonite (Koltsiou-Niketa 2005, 84*–85*); to these may be added an early fragment, Oxford, Bodleian Library, MS. Gr. liturg. e. 8, fols 232v–237r, dated 1474 (Crostiti 2003, 119) and two manuscripts at Yale (Demetracopoulos 192, n. 4). Such diffusion is especially significant if the work is seen as pointedly anti-Palamite, as Demetracopoulos maintains.

The publication in progress of Demetrios' translation of Aquinas's *Summa* contains ample references to Aug. (Kalokairinou; cf. Mercati 1931a, 458 and n. 1). Another work perhaps attributable to Demetrios and extant in the autograph manuscript of his disciple Manuel Kalekas (Vat. gr. 1879) argues for the equal authority of Latin Church Fathers by addressing different issues. That of authenticity of attribution is

tackled by specific reference to Aug.: as the same concepts recur in different works, confirmation of attribution and clarification of each point can be obtained through cross-checking. Moreover, the beauty of Aug.'s writing proclaims its author to a sensitive reader (Kianka 1983; Koltsiou-Niketa 2000).

Prochoros Kydones (1330–69)

Demetrios' younger brother, Prochoros, entered the Great Lavra on Athos as a child, where he must also have learnt Latin. As a monk and ecclesiastic who shared his brother's passion for and dedication to Latin theology, Prochoros more directly bore the brunt of the hesychast controversy, being condemned as a heretic at the Synod of Constantinople in 1368 (Rigo 99–134).

Prochoros translated a collection of letters of Aug. (Hunger 1984; Lössl 289–90) and bk 1 of the *De libero arbitrio* together with the pseudo-Augustinian *De decem plagis Aegyptiorum* (Hunger 1990). A fragment of *De vera religione* 1–15 is found in MS. Vat. gr. 1096, fols 149r–156r (part. pr. Mai, *Patrum Nova Bibliotheca* I, 429–30), while *De beata vita* 4–8, from MS. Vat. gr. 609, fol. 173r–v, remains unpublished. Because these fragments break off abruptly, Gilliland suggests that there may be faults in the manuscript transmission, which need further investigation (Gilliland 30). Indeed, for both Kydones brothers, accidents of preservation probably result in the limited list of translations now extant (Fürst 304–6).

Some of the texts selected by Prochoros have a direct bearing on the question of the beatific vision, a theme which concerned the contemporary Athonite debates (cf. Candal 253; Demetracopoulos, 201). The Tome that Patriarch Philotheos Kokkinos wrote

to condemn Prochoros contained reference to *trin.* cited from Planudes' translation (Rigo 119–20; Mondrain, 263–4). The text is preserved in Prochoros' autograph manuscript, Vat. gr. 609, fol. 211r (Gamillscheg et al., 200, no. 564). The events of Prochoros' condemnation contribute to creating for posterity the impression of a more drastic cleavage between Aug. and the post-Palamite Byzantine church than was the case on the eve of that controversy.

VI. Aug. in Byzantine Devotion

So far, no traces of a cult of Aug. have been found in the East, with the exception of a devout mention of his name in the diptychs (or commemorations) of the Liturgy of Saint James (ed. Mercier, 102). This version of the liturgy is considered of great antiquity, and the recension containing Aug.'s name is preserved by the earliest witness, the ninth-century MS Vat. gr. 2282. All the manuscripts in which Aug.'s name is included come from the Jerusalem area. Salaville (1950) compares the list in this liturgy with that of Constantinople II, remarking on its display of catholicity in juxtaposing Greek and Latin fathers, including a number of popes. An early Georgian version, from Sinai, appears to connect this recension of the liturgy with Pope Gregory the Great (Tarchnisvili 49, 72). Although its Greek use fell into decline, the Liturgy of Saint James was employed in all the Syriac churches and was translated into many languages. For practical purposes of shortening the text, the litany of saints is sometimes omitted from modern translations and with it Aug.'s presence forgotten.

Barbara Crostini

→ Church Councils; → Gregory Palamas; → Julian of Eclanum; → Leo I; → Orthodox Church since 1453; → Pseudo-Augustinian Writings

Bibliography

Primary Sources

Acta Conciliorum Oecumenicorum (ACO):

I.1–5: Concilium Ephesinum (431), ed. E. Schwartz (Berlin 1924–30)

II.1–6: Concilium Chalcedonense (451), ed. E. Schwartz (Berlin 1933–38)

IV.1–2: Concilium Constantinopolitanum II (553), ed. J. Straub and E. Schwartz (Berlin 1914–71)

IV.3 Index generalis tom. I–IV, ed. R. Schieffer (Berlin 1972–83)

Series 2, I: Concilium Lateranense (649), ed. R. Riedinger (Berlin 1984)

Series 2, II.1–3: Concilium Constantinopolitanum III (681), ed. R. Riedinger (Berlin 1990–92).

Series 2, Index generalis tom. I–IV, ed. R. Schieffer (Berlin 1984)

Anastasioi Sinaitae Quaestiones et Responsiones, ed. M. Richard/J.A. Munitiz, CCG 59 (2006).

Αὐγουστίνου Περὶ Τριάδος· Βίβλια πεντεκαίδεκα, ed. M. Papatomopoulos/I. Tsavare/G. Rigotti (Athens 1995).

Catena on the Gospel of Mark, ed. P. Poussines, *Catena Graecorum Patrum in Marcum* (Rome 1672).

Demetrios Kydones, Τὸ κύρος τῶν Πατέρων. Μιά ανέκδοτη ἐπιστολική πραγματεία, ed. A. Koltsiou-Niketa (Thessaloniki 2000).

Δημητρίου Κυδώνη Μετάφραση τοῦ Ψευδο-Αὐγουστείου *Soliloquia*, ed. A. Koltsiou-Niketa, *Corpus philosophorum medii aevi 11: Philosophi Byzantini* (Athens 2005).

Δημητρίου Κυδώνη Σοῦμμα θεολογικῆ ἐξελληνισθεῖσα *II,18*, ed. E.M. Kalokairinou, *Corpus philosophorum graecorum recentiorum* (Athens 2002).

Démétrius Cydonès, Correspondance, ed. R.J. Loenertz, 2 vols, *Studi e Testi 186*, 208 (Vatican City 1956, 1960).

Drei dogmatische Schriften Justinians, ed. E. Schwartz (Munich 1939; 2nd ed., Milan 1973).

Φουλγεντίου πρὸς Πέτρον περὶ πίστεως ἐρμηνεῦθεν παρὰ Δημητρίου τοῦ Κυδώνη, ed. A. Koltsiou-Niketa (Thessaloniki 1999).

Gregory Nazianzen, *Discours 38–41*, ed. Cl. Moreschini/P. Gally, SC 358 (1990).

‘Hadrianum’, Italian trans. in *Vedere l’invisibile: Nicea e lo statuto dell’immagine*, ed. L. Russo (Palermo 1997).

Humbert of Silva Candida, ‘De sancti spiritus processione a Patre et Filio...’, in A. Michel, *Humbert und Keroullarios: Studien*, 2 vols (Paderborn 1925–30), I: 97–117.

Leonzio di Bisanzio, *Opere*, ed. Carlo Dell’Osso (Rome 2001).

Marius Mercator, *Symboli Theodori Mopsuesteni et eius refutatio*, PL 48, 213-32.

Maxentii aliorumque Scytharum monachorum necnon Ioannis Tomitanae urbis Episcopi Opuscula, ed. Fr. Glorie, CCL 85A (1978).

Pope Nicholas I, *Ep. 88, MGH Epistolae Karolini aevi IV* (Berlin 1912) 454-87.

Liturgy of Saint James, ed. B.-Ch. Mercier, ‘La Liturgie de Saint Jacques’, *Patrologia Orientalis* 26 (1950 [1944]), 119–256.

A. Mai, *Patrum Nova Bibliotheca*, 10 vols (Rome 1852–1905).

—, *Veterum scriptorum nova collectio*, 10 vols (Rome 1825–38).

Photius, Bibliothèque, ed. R. Henry, 9 vols (Paris 1959–91).

—, ‘Letter to the Patriarch of Aquileia’, PG 102, cols 794–822.

—, *Mystagogia*, PG 102, cols 279–400.

Possidius, *Vita Augustini*, ed. W. Geerlings (Paderborn 2005).

Prochoros Kydones, Übersetzung von acht Briefen des Hl. Augustinus, ed. H. Hunger (Vienna 1984).

Prochoros Kydones: Übersetzungen von S. Augustinus, De libero arbitrio i. 1–90 und Ps.-Augustinus, De decem plagis Aegyptiorum, ed. H. Hunger (Vienna 1990).

Thesaurus Photii Constantinopolitani. Bibliotheca, ed. J. Schamp, B. Kindt and CENTAL (Turnhout 2004).

Secondary literature

A. Alexakis, *Codex Parisinus Graecus 1115 and its Archetype* (Washington 1996).

B. Altaner, ‘Augustinus in der griechischen Kirche bis auf Photius’, *Historisches Jahrbuch* 71 (1952) 37–76, repr. *Kleine patristische Schriften*, ed. G. Glockman (Berlin 1967) 75–98.

L.G. Benakis, ‘Lateinische Literatur in Byzanz. Die Übersetzungen philosophischer Texte’, in *Philellen. Studies in Honour of Robert Browning*, ed. C.N. Constantinides et al. (Venice 1996) 35–42.

- G. Bonner, 'Some Remarks on Letters 4* and 6*', in *Les Lettres de Saint Augustin découvertes par J. Divjak* (Paris 1983) 155–64.
- F. Borghesi, *La libertà del Verbo incarnato: i commentari al Vangelo di Giovanni di Teodoro di Mopsuestia, Cirillo di Alessandria e Agostino di Ippona* (Rome 2000).
- J.-P. Bouhot, 'Une Lettre d'Augustin d'Hippone à Cyrille d'Alexandrie (Epist. 4*)', *Les Lettres de Saint Augustin découvertes par J. Divjak* (Paris 1983) 147–54.
- E.T. Brett, *Humbert of Romans: his life and views of thirteenth-century society* (Toronto 1984).
- A. Bucossi, *Prolegomena to the critical edition of Hiera hoplotheke – Sacred Arsenal by Andronikos Kamateros* (DPhil thesis, Oxford University 2006).
- M. Candal, 'El libro iv de Prócoro Cidonio (Sobre la luz tabórica)', *Orientalia Christiana Periodica* 20 (1954) 247–97.
- F. Carcione, 'La controversia tra Ormisda e i monaci sciti sulla formula "Unus de Trinitate passus est carne": Calcedonismo integralista e Calcedonismo integrato a confronto', in *Atti del Convegno su Papa Ormisda (514–523): magistero, cura pastorale ed impegno ecumenico*, ed. C. Noce (Frosinone 1993) 57–73.
- G. Cavallo/F. Magistrale, 'Libri e scritture del diritto nell'età di Giustiniano', in *Il mondo del diritto nell'epoca giustiniana, caratteri e problematiche. Congresso internazionale, Ravenna 30 IX - 1 X 1983*, ed. G.G. Archi (Ravenna 1985) 43–58.
- H. Chadwick, 'New Letters of St. Augustine', *Journal of Theological Studies* 34 (1983) 425–52.

- N. Cipriani, 'La presenza di Teodoro di Mopsuestia nella teologia di Giuliano d'Eclano', in *Cristianesimo latino e cultura greca sino al sec. IV: XXI incontro di studiosi dell'antichità cristiana* (Rome 1993) 365–78.
- M.H. Congourdeau, 'Planudes, Manuel', in *Catholicisme, hier, aujourd'hui, demain XI* (Paris 1988) 488–90.
- C.N. Constantinides, 'Byzantine Scholars and the Union of Lyons (1274)', in R. Beaton/C. Roueché (eds), *The Making of Byzantine History: Studies Dedicated to Donald M. Nicol* (Aldershot 1993) 86–93.
- B. Crostini, *A Catalogue of Greek Manuscripts acquired by the Bodleian Library since 1916* (Oxford 2003).
- , 'What Was Kosher in Byzantium?', in L. Brubaker (ed.), *Eat, Drink and Be Merry: food and wine in Byzantium* (Aldershot 2007) 165–73.
- E. Dekkers, 'Les Traductions grecques des écrits patristiques', *Sacris Erudiri* 5 (1953) 193–233.
- C. Delacroix-Besnier, *Les Dominicains et les Grecs aux XIVe et XVe siècles* (Rome 1997).
- J.A. Demetrapoulos, 'The *Sitz im Leben* of Demetrius Cydones' Translation of Pseudo-Augustine's *Soliloquia*. Remarks on a Recent Edition', *Quaestio* 6 (2006) 191-258.
- E. Fryde, *The Early Palaeologan Renaissance* (Leiden 2000).
- A. Fürst, 'Augustinus im Orient', *Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte* 110 (1999) 293–314.
- E. Gamillscheg/D. Harlfinger/P. Eleuteri, *Repertorium der griechischen Kopisten 800–1600, t. III: Handschriften aus dem Bibliotheken Roms mit dem Vatikan* (Vienna 1997).

- J. Gilliland, *The Career and Writings of Demetrius Kydones: a Study of Byzantine Politics and Society, c.1347-c.1373* (DPhil thesis, Oxford University 2006).
- L.I. Hamilton, 'Possidius' Augustine and Post-Augustinian Africa', *Journal of Early Christian Studies* 12 (2004) 85–105.
- R. Haugh, *Photius and the Carolingians: the Trinitarian Controversy* (Belmont 1975).
- M. Jugie, 'Démétrius Cydonès et la théologie latine à Byzance aux XIVe et XVe siècles', *Échos d'Orient* 27 (1928) 385–402.
- W. Kaiser, 'Schreiber und Korrektoren des Codex Florentinus', *Zeitschrift der Savigny-Stiftung für Rechtsgeschichte. Romanistische Abteilung* 118 (2001) 133–219.
- F. Kianka, 'A Late Byzantine Defense of the Latin Church Fathers', *Orientalia Christiana Periodica* 49 (1983) 419–25.
- , 'The Letters of Demetrios Kydones to Empress Helena Kantakouzene Palaiologina', *Dumbarton Oaks Papers* 46 (1992) 155–64.
- , 'Demetrios Kydones and Italy', *Dumbarton Oaks Papers* 49 (1995) 99–110.
- R.J. Loenertz, 'Démétrius Cydonès II. De 1373 à 1375', *Orientalia Christiana Periodica* 37 (1971) 5–39.
- J. Lössl, 'Augustine in Byzantium', *Journal of Ecclesiastical History* 51 (2000) 267–95.
- E. Lowe, 'Greek Symptoms in a Sixth-Century Manuscript of St Augustine', in *Didascaliae. Studies in Honour of Anselm M. Albareda*, ed. S. Prete (New York 1961) 279–89.
- G. Mercati, *Notizie di Procoro e Demetrio Cidone, Manuele Caleca e Teodoro Meliteniota ed altri appunti per la storia della teologia e della letteratura bizantina del secolo XIV* (Vatican City 1931). [= 1931a]

- , ‘Per l’epistolario di Demetrio Cidone’, *Studi bizantini* 3 (1931) 201–30. [= 1931b]
- J. Meyendorff, ‘Theology in the Thirteenth Century: Methodological Contrasts’, in *Kathegetria. Essays Presented to Joan Hussey on her 80th Birthday* (Cambridge 1988) 395–407.
- A. Michel, *Humbert und Keroullarios: Studien*, 2 vols (Paderborn 1925–30).
- L. Möhler, *Kardinal Bessarion als Theologe, Humanist und Staatsmann: Funde und Forschungen*, 3 vols (Paderborn 1923–42).
- B. Mondrain, ‘L’Ancien Empereur Jean VI Cantacuzène et ses copistes’, in *Gregorio Palamas e oltre. Studi e documenti sulle controversie teologiche del XIV secolo bizantino*, ed. A. Rigo (Florence 2004) 249–92.
- F.X. Murphy/P. Sherwood, *Constantinople II et Constantinople III* (Paris 1974).
- A. Nichols, ‘The Reception of St Augustine and his Work in the Byzantine-Slav Tradition’, *Angelicum* 64 (1987) 437–52.
- M. Rackl, ‘Die griechischen Augustinusübersetzungen’, in *Miscellanea in onore di Francesco Ehrle: Scritti di storia e paleografia*, vol. 1 (Vatican City 1924) 1–38.
- P. Radiciotti, ‘Manoscritti digrafici grecolatini e latinogreci nella tarda antichità’, *Papyrologica Lupiensia* 7 (1998); repr. in *Da Ercolano all’Egitto. Ricerche varie di papirologia*, ed. M. Capasso (Galatina 1999) 153–85.
- J. Reuss, *Matthaeus-, Markus- und Johannes-Katenen nach den handschriftlichen Quellen untersucht* (Münster 1941).
- A. Rigo, ‘Il Tomo sinodale del 1368’, in *Gregorio Palamas e oltre. Studi e documenti sulle controversie teologiche del XIV secolo bizantino*, ed. A. Rigo (Florence 2004) 55–134.

- G. Rigotti, 'I Padri latini a Bisanzio: traduzioni di Agostino nel sec. XIV', in *Tradizioni patristiche nell'Umanesimo*, ed. M. Cortesi/C. Leonardi (Florence 2000) 273–82.
- S. Salaville, 'Saint Augustin et l'Orient', *Angelicum* 8 (1931) 3–25. [= 1931a]
- , 'Une version grecque de la règle de Saint Augustin', *Hellenika* 4 (1931) 81–110. [= 1931b]
- , 'Une Mention de Saint Augustin dans les diptyques de la liturgie grecque de Saint Jacques', *L'Année théologique augustinienne* 11 (1950) 52–6.
- J.-M. Sansterre, *Les moines grecs et orientaux à Rome aux époques byzantine et carolingienne (milieu du VIe s. - fin IX s.)*, 2 vols (Brussels 1983).
- T. Schermann, *Die Geschichte der dogmatischen Florilegien vom V.–VIII. Jahrhundert*, (Leipzig 1905).
- W.O. Schmitt, 'Lateinische Literatur in Byzanz: die Übersetzungen des Maximos Planudes und die moderne Forschung', *Jahrbuch des Österreichischen Byzantinistik* 17 (1968) 127–47.
- , 'Pseudo-Cyprians "De duodecim abusivis seculi" in der Übersetzung des Maximos Planudes', *Sitzungsberichten der Berliner Akademie des Wissenschaften. Philosophisch-historische Klasse* (Berlin 1973) 13–36.
- L.P. Schrenk, 'Augustine's *De trinitate* in Byzantine skepticism', *Greek, Roman and Byzantine Studies* 30 (1989) 451–6.
- L. Simeonova, *Diplomacy of the Letter and of the Cross: Photios, Bulgaria and the Papacy, 860s–880s* (Amsterdam 1998).
- M. Tarchnisvili, 'Eine neue georgische Jakobosliturgie', *Ephemerides liturgicae* 62 (1948) 49–82.

L. Wallach, *Diplomatic Studies in Latin and Greek Documents from the Carolingian Age*
(Ithaca 1977).

7206 words