

THE OXFORD GUIDE
TO THE HISTORICAL
RECEPTION OF
AUGUSTINE

Volume 3

EDITOR-IN-CHIEF:
KARLA POLLMANN

EDITOR:
WILLEMEN OTTEN

CO-EDITORS:

JAMES A. ANDREWS, ALEXANDER ARWEILER, IRENA BACKUS,
SILKE-PETRA BERGJAN, JOHANNES BRACHTENDORF, SUSANN EL KHOLI,
MARK W. ELLIOTT, SUSANNE GATZEMEIER, PAUL VAN GEEST,
BRUCE GORDON, DAVID LAMBERT, PETER LIEBREGTS, HILDEGUND MÜLLER,
HILMAR PABEL, JEAN-LOUIS QUANTIN, ERIC L. SAAK, LYDIA SCHUMACHER,
ARNOUD VISSER, KONRAD VÖSSING, JACK ZUPKO.

OXFORD
UNIVERSITY PRESS

- , *Entwicklungsgeschichte des Erbsündendogmas seit der Reformation*, *Geschichte des Erbsündendogmas. Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte des Problems vom Ursprung des Übels* 4 (Munich 1972).
- P. Guilluy, 'Péché originel', *Catholicisme* 10 (1985) 1036–61.
- P. Henrici, 'The Philosophers and Original Sin', *Communio* 18 (1991) 489–901.
- M. Huftler, 'Libre arbitre, liberté et péché chez saint Augustin', *Recherches de théologie ancienne et médiévale* 33 (1966) 187–281.
- M. F. Johnson, 'Augustine and Aquinas on Original Sin', in B. D. Douthett, B. David, and M. W. Levering (eds), *Aquinas the Augustinian* (Washington 2007) 145–58.
- A. Kasujja, *Polygenism and the Theology of Original Sin Today* (Rome 1986).
- J. D. Kormeyer, *Evolution and Eden. Balancing Original Sin and Contemporary Science* (New York 1998).
- H. Köster, *Urstand, Fall und Erbsünde. Von der Reformation bis zur Gegenwart*, *Handbuch der Dogmengeschichte* 2/3c (Freiburg 1982).
- M. Lamberigts, 'Julien d'Éclane et Augustin d'Hippone. Deux conceptions d'Adam', in B. Bruning, M. Lamberigts, and J. Van Houtem (eds), *Collectanea Augustiniana. Mélanges T. J. van Bavel* (Louvain 1990) 373–410.
- , 'Iulianus Aeculanensis', *Augustinus-Lexikon* 3 (Basel 2004–10) 836–47.
- and L. Kenis (eds), *L'Augustinisme à l'ancienne Faculté de théologie de Louvain* (Louvain 1994).
- O. Lottin, 'Les Théories sur le péché originel de Saint Anselme à Saint Thomas d'Aquin', in id. (ed.), *Psychologie et morale aux XII^e-XIII^e siècles*, vol. 4/1 (Louvain 1954) 11–280.
- J. MacEvoy, 'Eriugena, John Scottus', in A. D. Fitzgerald (ed.), *Augustine through the Ages. An Encyclopedia* (Grand Rapids, MI 1999) 315–16.
- G. Madec, *Jean Scot et ses auteurs. Annotations érégénienne* (Paris 1988).
- J.-M. Maldamé, *Le Péché originel. Foi chrétienne, mythe et métaphysique* (Paris 2008).
- N. Merlin, *Saint Augustin et les dogmes du péché originel et de la grâce. Analyses détaillées de ses ouvrages sur ces matières, complétées par d'importantes explications de sa pensée, et suivies de conclusions théologiques* (Paris 1931).
- D. Oglari, *Gratia et certamen. The Relationship between Grace and Free Will in the Discussion of Augustine with the so-called Semipelagians* (Louvain 2003).
- H. Rondet, *Le Péché originel dans la tradition patristique et théologique* (Paris 1967).
- L. Scheffczyk, *Urstand, Fall und Erbsünde. Von der Schrift bis Augustinus*, *Handbuch der Dogmengeschichte* 2/3a, pt 1 (Freiburg 1982).
- K. Schelkens and M. Gielis, 'From Driedo to Bellarmine. The Concept of Pure Nature in the Sixteenth Century', *Augustiniana* 57 (2007) 425–48.
- M. Schrama, 'Nachwirkung der jüngeren Augustinerschule im Denken Blondels', in A. Zunkeller and A. Krümmel (eds), *Traditio Augustiniana. Studien über Augustinus und seine Rezeption. Festgabe für Willigis Eckermann OSA zum 60. Geburtstag* (Würzburg 1994) 259–90.
- R. Schwager, *Erbsünde und Heilsdrama im Kontext von Evolution, Gentechnologie und Apokalyptik* (Münster 1997).
- M. Sticklebroeck, *Urstand, Fall und Erbsünde. In der nachaugustinischen Ära bis zum Beginn der Scholastik. Die lateinische Theologie*, *Handbuch der Dogmengeschichte* 2/3a, pt 3 (Freiburg 2007).
- C. Straw, 'Gregory I', in A. D. Fitzgerald (ed.), *Augustine through the Ages. An Encyclopedia* (Grand Rapids, MI 1999) 402–5.
- M. Strohm, 'Der Begriff der *natura vitiosa* bei Augustin', *Theologische Quartalschrift* 135 (1955) 184–203.
- G. Vandervelde, *Two Major Trends in Contemporary Roman Catholic Reinterpretation* (Amsterdam 1975).
- J. P. van Dooren, *Michael Baius. Zijn leer over de mens* (Assen 1958).
- A. Vanneste, 'Le Décret du Concile de Trente sur le péché originel', *Nouvelle Revue théologique* 87 (1965) 688–726.
- , *The Dogma of Original Sin* (Brussels 1975).
- , 'Le *De prima hominis iustitia* de M. Baius', in *Nature et grâce dans la théologie occidentale. Dialogue avec H. de Lubac* (Louvain 1996a) 185–228.
- , *Pour une relecture critique de l'Augustinus de Jansénius*, in *Nature et grâce dans la théologie occidentale. Dialogue avec H. de Lubac* (Louvain 1996b) 229–50.
- A. de Villamonte, *El pecado original. Veinticinco años de controversia (1950–75)* (Salamanca 1978).
- S. Visser and T. Williams, *Anselm* (Oxford 2009).
- N. Wentzel, *Natuur en genade. Een introductie in en confrontatie met de jongste ontwikkelingen in de Rooms-katholieke theologie inzake dit thema* (Kampen 1970).
- T. Wiley, *Original Sin. Origins, Developments, Contemporary Meanings* (Mahwah, NJ 2002).

Orthodox Church (since 1453)

The fall of Constantinople in 1453 is one of the key moments in the history of the Orthodox Church. When the Mother Church of Constantinople (see *BYZANTINE WORLD*) became dependent on Muslim rule, it ceased to serve as a pillar of truth for many orthodox Christians. The status of supreme authority over doctrinal issues that the Church of Constantinople had held for more than a thousand years was already challenged at the time of the Union of Ferrara-Florence (1439) when, for the sake of Western political and military help, the Byzantine emperor and court theologians were ready to make compromises over religious matters. For many non-Greek Orthodox Christians the Greek 'apostasy' in Florence was the justification for proclaiming ecclesiastical independence from Constantinople, and the fall of Constantinople was seen as an apocalyptic token and testimony (Florovsky 1981, 11). The Russian Church gained its ecclesiastical independence during the years between Florence and the

fall of Constantinople, while the Bulgarian and the Serbian Church already had patriarchates at that time.

In such a complex situation, when there was no centre of visible unity among Orthodox Christians and consequently no supreme authority in religious matters (because the right to convene a general and ecumenical council belonged only to the emperor in Constantinople), the local churches continued to live their own lives. It is therefore hard to speak of a single reception of Aug. in the Orthodox Church. Many local churches with different national and liturgical languages had different approaches to Aug. These so-called 'national' approaches did not differentiate in many points and all of them had the common attitude of appreciation for Aug., but disagreement with some of his teachings.

It remains difficult to speak of a single reception of Aug. in the Orthodox tradition in spite of the agreement of Orthodox theologians from different national and ethnic backgrounds over the defects of Aug.'s theology. The frequent deviations from the Orthodox standpoint caused by inclinations toward scholasticism and the Counter-Reformation on the one side, or *Luther and *Calvin on the other, are the main reason for the lack of a single reception. The Orthodox reception of Aug. has wavered between Roman Catholic and Protestant receptions depending on which side Orthodox theologians have inclined. The tradition that celebrated Aug. as a saint of the Universal Church in spite of his doctrinal discordance with the Orthodox faith shaped by the Eastern early Christian writers is the third and most genuine stream in the Orthodox reception of Aug. This tradition was more concerned with preserving the memory of Aug. as a saint of the Church than to criticize his doctrinal failures. The Orthodox Church has therefore kept the memory of Aug. primarily by mentioning his name in the calendars of saints, or dedicating the service to him.

I. SERVICE AND LIFE OF AUGUSTINE

Within the Greek Orthodox tradition Aug.'s name is mentioned from the time of the Fifth Ecumenical Council in 553 (see CHURCH COUNCILS). However, from the eighth to the thirteenth century his name is not mentioned in Byzantine menologies. The name of Aug. is only mentioned in diptychs of the eleventh-century edition of the Liturgy of St James, the brother of the Lord, but it is absent from the *textus receptus* (Brightman 55–7).

In modern times, it was St Nikodemos of the Holy Mountain (Nikodemus Hagiorites) (1749–1809) who placed Aug.'s name in the Greek *Synaxaristes* (Galadza 118–19; for a full bio-bibliography of Nikodemos, see Citterio), under the date 15 June (Nikodemos, *Synaxaristes*, 3:108–9; see also Nikodemos 1957). St Nikodemos included in his *Synaxaristes* the troparion written to Aug. by Michael Kritovoulos (text: Rackl 38). The Greek patrologists of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries continued to mention Aug. as a saint of the Orthodox Church. Iakovos the Athonite composed the service to Aug. in 1861 (Galadza 119–20). Konstantinos Doukakes (1845–1908) included Aug. in the tenth volume of his *Synaxaristes* in 1893. Fr Ioannes Dan-

ielides wrote a service to Aug. in 1914 (Galadza 120–2), Victor Matthaios, from the Holy Transfiguration Monastery in Kroniza Kouvara Attiki, placed a memorial and a more extensive life of Aug. in his *Synaxarion* (1950), and Metropolitan Sophronios Eustratiadis (1872–1947) included the life of Aug. in his *Lives of the Saints of the Orthodox Church* (*Hagiologion*). Since 1968, Aug. has been included in the official menology of the Greek Church (Galadza 124).

It is difficult to speak of a single Slavonic reception, because when Slavonic was a common liturgical and spoken language among the broad group of Orthodox Slavs (ninth to fourteenth centuries), the name of Aug. was not mentioned. Aug.'s name appeared in the Russian Orthodox tradition as a consequence of its encounter with the West. Dimitri of Rostov (1651–1709) mentioned Aug., prelate of the Church of Hippo, and his contemplations over the Nativity in his compilation *From the Great Collection of the Lives of the Saints*, vol. 4, in the Homily of the Nativity of Christ on 25 December. His compilation was heavily based on Western sources. Archbishop Filaret Gumilevsky of Chernigov (1805–66) mentions Aug.'s name, the date of his feast (15 June), and the troparion in his menology and patrology (Gumilevsky 3:16). The name of Aug. appeared in the menology compiled by Kosolapov and published in 1880 (Kosolapov 277); this is mainly based on the Greek *Menaion* and Russian menology and patrology of Gumilevsky. The service to Aug. did not exist in the Slavonic *Menaion*, until hieromonk Ambrose Pogodin in 1955 wrote the Church Slavonic Canon to Aug. (trans. Rose 117–38), commissioned by Archbishop John Maximovitch (Rose 117; Galadza 122–4).

In Serbian patrologies Aug. is mentioned for the first time by Bishop Nikolai Velimirovic (1880–1956) in *The Prologue of Ochrid* (15 June), where Aug. is designated as 'an influential writer but with certain unapproved extremes in his teaching'. Fr Justin Popović (1894–1979) repeats the same description of Aug. in his twelve-volume *Zitija Svetih* ('Lives of the Saints') (Popović 400).

II. TRANSLATIONS OF AUGUSTINE

The translation of Aug.'s works into Greek was commenced in the thirteenth century (see BYZANTINE WORLD). After the fall of Constantinople, translations continued to be produced by a succession of sixteenth- and seventeenth-century authors, though these usually circulated only in manuscript. They included translations of *De gratia et libero arbitrio*, the *Regula*, and cp. 147 (*De videndo deo*), as well as shorter extracts from Aug.'s writings and various pseudo-Augustinian works (Rackl 31–7). Eugenios Voulgaris (Bulgaris) (1716–1806), a major figure of the Modern Greek Enlightenment and a Greek prelate at the court of the Russian Empress Catherine II (Batalden; Stiernon), translated into Greek a collection of Augustinian writings (in fact all 'pseudo-Augustinian'), the *Kekragarian tou theiou kai hierou Augoustinou*, printed at Leipzig in 1804 and reprinted at Moscow in 1824 (Stiernon 745, 826–8). Voulgaris had been trained mainly in Germany, and was head of the theological school at Mount Athos, reinstated in 1753 by the Patriarch Cyril, where he tried to introduce

the Western theological curriculum, including the study of Aug. Accused of modernism and intellectualism, he was expelled from Mount Athos a few years later, and in 1771 accepted Catherine's invitation to move to Russia.

Greek translations of the *Confessions* and *De civitate Dei* (both by A. Dalezios) did not appear until the twentieth century (Biedermann 615).

Translation of Aug. into Russian was initiated by Feofan Prokopo- vich (1681–1736), Dean of the Kiev Academy, where Latin theologians were studied from 1689 onwards. Selected works of Aug. in Russian appeared in Moscow around 1788 from the Typographical Company, opened in Moscow in 1784. Makarii Glukharev (1792–1847) was the translator of the *conf.* Finally a large number of Aug.'s works were translated into Russian between 1866 and 1908, and published by the Kiev Academy under the supervision of Professors A. Bulgakov and A. J. Chekanovsky (complete list: Tretter/Patock 659–60), including the *conf.* (1866–9), *civ.* (1880–7), and *De Genesi ad litteram* (1890–5). The translators used the Benedictine edition of Aug. as the basis for their translations (Jugie 389–90). The planned continuation of the series until all Aug.'s works were translated was halted by the Russian Revolution.

III. STUDIES OF AUGUSTINE'S WORK

a. Greek tradition

In the Greek Orthodox Tradition from Patriarch Photius onwards, the name of Aug. was frequently mentioned in regard to the controversy over the clause of *filioque*. Greeks, following the Greek early Christian writers and especially the Cappadocians, claimed that the Father is the sole source and the principle of the Trinity, and that he begets the Son, and the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Father, while Latins, mostly relying on Aug., claimed that the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Father and the Son as from one principle. There were many attempts to negotiate the question of *filioque* from the time when Constantinople fell under Latin rule in 1204. Two councils were summoned by Roman Catholics with the intention of solving the theological problem that divided the two churches and ending the schism. The first was the Council of Lyons in 1274 when Greeks agreed to accept *filioque* (Document of Union: Denzinger 850). Byzantine Christians opposed the Union of Lyons, and the death of the Byzantine Emperor Michael VIII in 1282 put an end to this initiative. According to Runciman, some Greeks accepted the dogmatic explanation of *filioque* because they found the rationalism of the Latins over this question more sympathetic than the Greek apophatic tradition (Runciman 96). Nicephorus Blemmydes (1197–1272) was one of the Byzantine philosophers who in his work the *Procession of the Holy Spirit* adopted the Augustinian position that the Holy Spirit proceeded from the Father and the Son as from one principle, but he added that originally or principally the Holy Spirit proceeded from the Father alone (PG 142:533 ff.; Runciman 97). This was an attempt to reconcile Latin and Greek stances on this point.

The Second Council was convened in Ferrara in 1438 and ended in 1445 in Florence with the signing of the agreement of union (Document of Union: Denzinger, 1300–8). Forced by the Ottoman invasion to turn to the West for help, Greeks accepted the *filioque* and entered again in a doctrinal union with the Latins. A member of the Greek delegation, Bishop Markos Eugenikos of Ephesus, opposed the union. A few years later, the main proponent of the Union of Florence, Gennadios George Scholarios (1405–1472), the first Patriarch of Constantinople under Ottoman rule, who had signed the agreement, started to oppose the union (for a full account of Scholarios, see Tinnefeld). In the time preceding the Union, Scholarios' attitude toward Aug. was very favourable. In his *Prologomena to the Physics of Aristotle* (1431), Gennadios quoted Aug. extensively. He adopted the idea that the Father and the Son are one principle from which the Holy Spirit proceeds, evoking Aug.'s *De Trinitate*. More than a decade later, Gennadios wrote the first of his three treatises *On the Procession of the Holy Spirit* (1444), in which he relied to a great extent on Aug.'s Trinitarian theology from *Trin.* In his *Obstacles to Religious Peace*, Gennadios blamed the Council of Ephesus (431) for not adding the *filioque* in the Nicæan-Constantinopolitan Creed. Nevertheless, after the death of Mark of Ephesus, the opponent of the Union of Florence, Gennadios changed his course, adopting an Orthodox position about the procession of the Holy Spirit from only one source, the Father.

Maximos Margounios (1549–1602), Bishop of Cythera and a Venetian citizen, was a proponent of the union between the two churches (on Margounios: Geanakoplos 165–93; Podskalsky 135–51). Among other works dedicated to the question of *filioque*, Margounios wrote commentaries on Aug.'s position on the procession of the Holy Spirit, entitled *Elucidatio librorum divi Augustini De Trinitate (Diasphesis eis ta peri triados biblia tou hierou Augoustinou)*; text: Fedalto 121–256). The point he wanted to make is that already in Aug.'s thought it is possible to discern the doctrine of the double procession. This doctrine includes two premisses. In the first procession (Fedalto 138–40), the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Father so that he exists in his own subsistence (*propria subsistentia*), while in the second procession the Holy Spirit proceeds from both the Father and Son as a gift to the creation (Fedalto 146–60). The purpose of the first, theological procession is the existence of the Holy Spirit and the purpose of the second, economical procession from the Father and the Son or from the Father through the Son (*per filium*) is the sanctification of the creature. Margounios interpreted Aug.'s famous passage in which the Holy Spirit proceeds *principaliter* from the Father (*Trin.* 15.17.29; cf. 15.26.47) as a proof of the eternal procession from the Father alone. According to Margounios, by the second procession of the Holy Spirit Aug. wanted to prove the consubstantiality of both the Son and the Holy Spirit with the Father. Margounios maintained that for Aug. both processions are eternal, while the second is also in time.

Margounios' theological attempt to offer an acceptable solution to the debate over *filioque* was welcomed neither by the Greek nor by the Latin side. Pope Clement VIII wanted to put Margounios on trial for

heresy, but the Venetian government refused to extradite him, because as a Greek under Venetian rule he exercised all the rights to practise his own Orthodox religion. The Greek community of Venice led by Gabriel Severus, titular Metropolitan of Philadelphia, who maintained the traditional Orthodox view that the Holy Spirit proceeds only from the Father, found Margounios' position unacceptable. It is worth mentioning that Margounios left a legacy of nine boxes of books in Latin, which included the books of Aug. and other Latin patristic writers, to the Iviron monastery on Mount Athos (Geanakoplos 180, 185).

Margounios' younger countryman and his protégé during the studies in the University of Padua, the future Patriarch of Constantinople, Cyril Loukaris (1572–1638), known as the Calvinist patriarch, took a different stance from his older colleague (on Cyril, see Hadjiantoniou; Todt). The bitter experience with Roman Catholics at the Union of Brest (1596), where he was a delegate of the patriarchate of Constantinople, made him look for allies among Protestants in order to combat the Latin influence on the Orthodox Church under the Ottoman rule. His anti-Latin stance led him to write his *Eastern Confession of the Christian Faith*, first published in Latin in 1629 (Todt 634; trans. Hadjiantoniou 141–5), where he presented many Protestant attitudes. Although it is hard to claim direct influence of Aug. on Loukaris, it is evident that Augustinian ideas of predestination, grace, and original sin incorporated in Protestant doctrine are introduced in the *Confession*. Thus, in the first chapter Loukaris writes that the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Father through the Son; in the third chapter, that the God predestined his elect and they depend on *sola gratia*, and in the sixth chapter that from Adam's fall original sin sprang up in humanity. Six local councils between 1638 and 1691 condemned Loukaris' *Confession* (Ware 11). Loukaris appointed Theophilus Korydalleas (1570–1646), the neo-Aristotelian scholar and his fellow-student from Padua, as director of the Patriarchal Academy in Constantinople (Podskalsky 194–9). Korydalleas established a new curriculum, which introduced the study of Aug. into the traditional academy.

The next in the series of Greek intellectuals and clergymen who were acquainted with Aug.'s work was Dositheos (1641–1707), Patriarch of Jerusalem (for full information and bibliography on Dositheos, see Todt). In his own *Confession of Faith* (*Homologia tes Orthodoxou Pisteos*), he rejected the Augustinian ideas on free will, grace, and predestination employed by Cyril Loukaris. Dositheos maintained that Aug.'s works had been corrupted by the editing of Jesuits and Dominicans. This argument appeared for the first time in St Photius, who believed that Aug.'s 'errors' were trickeries of an unknown Latin redactor. The distrust towards new editors of the printed editions not only of Aug.'s works, but also of those of other early Christian writers, some even in Greek, was due to the fact that only Latins and Protestants owned printing presses. Therefore, Patriarch Dositheos established a press at Iași in Moldavia, out of Ottoman reach. Nevertheless, he considered Aug. blessed and used Aug.'s writings to support his view on Orthodoxy (Dositheos 147, 156).

Eustratios Argenti (1687?–1758?), a lay theologian (on Argenti: Ware; Podskalsky 331–5), in his work *Treatise against Unleavened Bread* (*Syntagma kata Azymon*) referred to Aug. as a Father of the Church and frequently used his authority to support some of the attitudes on Epiclesis, but also warned readers to approach carefully Aug.'s doctrine of the procession of the Holy Spirit (Argenti 155–8, 227–41; Ware 108–69, especially 126, 128).

b. Russian tradition

The authority of Aug. was also respected in the Russian Orthodox tradition, even on issues regarded as controversial from the traditional Orthodox standpoint. The reception of Aug. in Russia, as in the Greek tradition, depended mainly on Western confessional influence. If Roman Catholic influence prevailed, as was the case with Peter Mogila (1596–1647) and Stefan Yavorsky (1658–1722), Aug. was presented through the themes relevant for Catholics such as *filioque*, original sin, and immaculate conception. When Protestant influence prevailed Aug. was used as an authority in scriptural reading and the theological matters of grace, free will, and predestination. The best example for this stream within Russian Orthodoxy was Feofan Prokopovich (1681–1736).

Peter Mogila (Petro Mohyla), Metropolitan of Kiev, was a propagator of the 'universal' union with Rome (on Mogila: Podskalsky 229–36). Although he did not mention Aug. in his writings, it was obvious that he relied on Aug.'s authority concerning the questions of *filioque* (which he used alternatively with *per filium*) and original sin. His *Orthodox Confession* was a sort of Roman reply to the pro-Calvinist leanings in the *Confession* of Cyril Loukaris. The successors of the 'Romanized' Orthodoxy of Mogila were Dimitry of Rostov and Stefan Yavorsky. Their interpretations of the Augustinian idea of original sin led Russian divines to accept the doctrine of the immaculate conception of the Mother of God. The idea of the immaculate conception was not only the logical consequence of the exclusion of the Mother of God from sharing the guilt of original sin, but it was also rooted in the psychology of Western Baroque, favoured among Russian intellectuals. St Dimitri of Rostov, who introduced Aug. in his *Lives of Saints*, belonged to an Orthodox Brotherhood of the Immaculate Conception, for which he was called before an Orthodox Synod to give account. Stefan Yavorsky (1658–1722), a *locum tenens* of the patriarchal see of Moscow, who was educated under Jesuits in Lvov and Lublin, in his polemical treatise against Protestantism *Rock of Faith* (*Kamen' very*) dealt with Augustinian ideas (on Yavorsky: Podskalsky 308–12). Feofan Prokopovich (1681–1736), Dean of Kiev Academy and the mastermind of the church reform under Peter the Great, acted against Roman influence within the Russian Church (on Prokopovich: Podskalsky 324–7). However, he was more grounded in Protestantism than in traditional Orthodox beliefs. In his treatise *The Dispute of Peter and Paul on the Unbearable Yoke* (*Raspria Pavla i Petra o ige neadobsonom*), published in 1774, Prokopovich emphasized the Augustinian themes that human actions have no power to achieve salvation and that 'justification is only the action of divine grace.

The influence of Aug. continues to be traceable in works by eighteenth-century authors, such as the *Spiritual Treasury Gathered from the World* (*Sokrovishche dukhovoie ot mira sobiraemoe*) by the mystic Tikhon of Zadonsk (1724–82), a student and teacher in the Latin schools in Novgorod and Tver, and the lessons for the Grand Duke Paul entitled *Orthodox Teaching or a Brief Christian Theology* (*Pravoslavnoe uchenie ili sokrashchennaya khristianskaya bogosloviya*), by Platon Levshin, Metropolitan of Moscow (1737–1811). In the fashion of contemporary Lutheranism, Metropolitan Platon was interested only in the Scripture as a source of living theology and therefore referred to Aug. only as a commentator on scriptural texts.

The process of the Westernization of Russia initiated by the Petrine reforms affected theological seminaries. From the beginning of the seventeenth century until the second decade of the eighteenth the language of instruction was Latin. Having access to Aug.'s work in the original, the generation of Russian theologians such as Metropolitan Mikhail, Archimandrite Evgraf, Innokentii Smirnov, Metropolitan of Kiev Filaret Amfiteatrov, and others were educated in the spirit of scholasticism. Aug.'s *conf.* occupied a respected place among Orthodox spiritual books in nineteenth-century Russia. It had a decisive influence on George of Zadonsk's decision to become a monastic solitary (Rose 77).

The influence of Aug. was also evident in ecclesiology because many Orthodox theologians maintained Aug.'s doctrine of the validity of sacraments, and the Russian Church from 1667 applied economy and considered Roman Catholic baptism valid.

Twelve different studies of Aug. were published in Russia between 1870 and 1914 and most of them were sympathetic toward his theology. One of the most significant was Konstantin Skvortsov's monograph *Augustine of Hippo as Psychologist* (*Avustin Ipponiskii kak psikholog*) published in 1870 (Tataryn 15). The first article which systematically explored Aug.'s reception in the Russian tradition appeared in 1904 under the title 'Augustine' in *The Encyclopedia of Orthodox Theology* (Lopukhin).

IV. MODERN ORTHODOX THEOLOGY

The reception of Aug. in modern Orthodox theology is everything but unanimous and it can be generally divided into five areas of immediate concern to Orthodox theologians. The first is Aug.'s Trinitarian theology (including the question of the *filioque*), the second is his theological method, the third is his rejection of the distinction between essence and energies in God, the fourth is sacramental theology, and the fifth issue comprises his notions of grace and free will, original sin and predestination. Depending on these theological areas Aug.'s contribution was considered differently. The first three issues excluding *filioque* have gained supporters and critics in contemporary Orthodox theology, his sacramental theology has been widely appreciated, while his anti-Pelagian stance was severely criticized.

a. Trinitarian theology and the *filioque* issue

Some elements of Aug.'s Trinitarian theology have gained appreciation among Russian Sophiologists (theologians of God's Wisdom).

Thus Fr Pavel Florensky (1882–1937), Orthodox priest and a new martyr, applied Aug.'s so-called 'love analogy' to his Trinitarian theology. Commencing from Aug.'s definition of love as 'a kind of life that couples' one who loves and one who is loved (*Trin.* 8.10.14), Florensky developed the concept of intra-Trinitarian love as the essence of divinity (Florensky 69, 237). Similarly to Aug. for whom the Holy Spirit is the consubstantial love between the Father and the Son (*Trin.* 6.5.7), for Florensky the Holy Spirit 'communes with the dyad's consubstantiality in God and the dyad becomes a trinity' (Florensky 69). Florensky used Aug.'s love analogy (*Trin.* 8.10.14) in order to explain why there are Three Divine Hypostases in the Holy Trinity and not another number. This love of the intra-Trinitarian life extends out of the Holy Trinity through the Holy Spirit's life-creating activities, manifested in illumination of the righteous by the inaccessible light of the ineffable divine glory, which is partially perceived only by the eye of the soul (Florensky 79 uses Aug.'s expression *oculus animae* from *conf.* 7.10.16). The divine-creative love which Florensky defines as a creaturely Sophia becomes the essence of the deified person, by which the one enters into inter-Trinitarian life.

Fr Sergei Bulgakov (1871–1944), a Russian émigré in Paris and the Dean of the Orthodox Institute of St Serge, was another great Sophiologist who used Aug.'s Trinitarian analogy of *amans, quod amatur and amor* (*Trin.* 8.10.14) and the identification of the Holy Spirit with the love in the Holy Trinity (*Trin.* 15.19.37) in order to develop his teaching of the Sophia (Bulgakov 2004, 42; Tataryn 71–5; Demacopoulos/Papanikolaou 21–4). Bulgakov preferred Aug.'s insistence on the unity of *ousia* (*Trin.* 1.2.4; 1.4.7) over the Cappadocians' emphasis on the trinity of the hypostases (Bulgakov 2004, 41; 1993, 24–5). Therefore Aug.'s doctrine of the unity of *ousia* and especially the identification of the *ousia* with the Wisdom of God (*Trin.* 7.3.4–5) helped Bulgakov to conceptualize his idea of the Sophia as a life of the Holy Trinity or Ousia-Sophia. Bulgakov's preference for Aug.'s view of wisdom as an original unity of the divinity, and not the personal attribute of the Son as in the Eastern tradition (Bulgakov 2002, 42; 1993, 34), differentiated him from Florensky's position towards Sophia, because the latter did not consider the consubstantial aspect of Sophia as clearly separated from creaturely Sophia (Graves 168; Tataryn 50, 74). While both authors considered that love permeates the life of the Holy Trinity, Bulgakov introduced a distinction between the nature and the life of the Holy Spirit that permits a distinction between the *hypostatic* nature of the Spirit and the life of the Spirit as the impersonal and un-*hypostatic* living principle or *ousia*-wisdom (Bulgakov 1993, 57). Thus, the *ousia*-wisdom as impersonal divine love is God's self-revelation, and the Wisdom-Glory is the divine revelation to the creation (Bulgakov 1993, 54) in the form of love.

Aug.'s love analogy is also used by the Orthodox theologian of Romanian origin Fr Dumitru Staniloae, in his Trinitarian theology. Staniloae does not refer to Aug., but to Florensky and his explanation that the fullness of God is in the three divine persons (Staniloae 260–71; Demacopoulos/Papanikolaou 36).

Another Russian émigré in Paris and a critic of the Orthodox Sophiology, Vladimir Lossky (1903–58), observes that the positions of Aug. and the Russian Sophiologists differ in one crucial point. While for Aug. the creation accords with eternal and static paradigms contained in the divine essence, for Sophiologists the dynamic divine *ousia* introduces creation to its ontological root, which is in the Trinity (Lossky 1957, 75–6). Lossky also adopted a negative stance toward Aug.'s love analogy, defining it as 'Trinitarian psychologism' (Lossky 1957, 81).

A completely different approach to Aug.'s Trinitarian theology could be found in the Greek theologian Metropolitan of Pergamon John Zizioulas (b. 1931). Zizioulas relies on De Régnon's paradigm (1892, 33) that the general tendency of Western theology was to prioritize the unity of divine essence rather than the plurality of the divine persons. Therefore, he has attacked Aug. for introducing the principle that the oneness of God is safeguarded not by the monarchy of the Father as the principle and source of the Trinity, but by the unity of the essence (Zizioulas 1985, 88; 2006, 5). In Zizioulas' view, Aug., by his recourse to the Greek Platonic ontology, made multiplicity and otherness secondary to the oneness of the substance and departed from the biblical notion of God (Zizioulas 2006, 33, 106). For Zizioulas the greatest achievement of the Cappadocian writers such as Basil the Great, Gregory the Theologian, and Gregory of Nyssa was identification of the *hypostasis* with person (*prosopon*), which means that everything subsists not with reference to itself, but with reference to otherness. Thus, the person of the Father as a principle of the other two persons safeguards the unity of the Trinity, and each divine person subsists with reference to the other two persons (Zizioulas 1985, 36–49; 2006, 13–36).

It is only to be expected that there is no Orthodox theologian who would appreciate Aug.'s contribution to the doctrine of the procession of the Holy Spirit from both the Father and the Son, but there are different views on Aug.'s Filioquism. The focus of Bulgakov's criticism of Aug. is not so much on the *filioque* clause, but rather on the three main features that led to it. The first feature is Aug.'s interpretation of the Holy Trinity in terms of relations that *arise* in the one nature (*Trin.* 15), and not in terms of three hypostases *having* one nature; the second feature is the failure of Aug. (and of Western theology in general) to equate the Father with the divine essence (*Trin.* 4.20.29); and the third feature is Aug.'s claim (*Trin.* 5.14–15) that if the Holy Spirit unites by hypostatic love the Father and the Son, then the Holy Spirit proceeds from both (Bulgakov 2004, 88). Lossky, basing his stance on De Régnon's paradigm, saw the *filioque* as a logical consequence of the Western Trinitarian position that prioritized the unity of nature, because the monarchy of the Father would be undermined by introducing the second principle in the Trinity (Lossky 1957, 58).

Acknowledging Aug.'s substantialism as the main reason for the derivation of the *filioque*, Zizioulas attempts to save Aug. from the charge of introducing the second principle in the Trinity. Insisting on *principaliter* (*Trin.* 15.17.29) Aug., according to Zizioulas, did not support two *archai* in God, even if he did not develop the concept of *aition* as the Cappadocians had done (Zizioulas 2006, 196–200).

b. Theological method

It is a general charge of Orthodox theologians against Aug.'s theology that it is based more on reason than on the Mystery of God. The Greek theologian Fr John Romanides (1926–2001) accused Aug. of employing 'philosophy in order to understand the dogma of the Holy Trinity' (Romanides 2004, 35). Christos Yannaras (b. 1935), another Greek theologian, pursued the critique of Aug.'s method further. His charge against Aug. is that he identified truth with its formulation and knowledge as possession of truth with the individual understanding of this formulation (Yannaras 1991, 155). By his undertaking Aug. raised logic as a final authority even in the matters of dogma. Lossky, who proclaimed apophaticism as the ultimate theological method in matters of the mystery, did not have such severe criticism of Aug. on this point. For Lossky, Aug. recognized that by speaking about divine ineffability one necessarily falls into contradiction (Lossky 1977, 71). Therefore Aug., according to Lossky, appreciated the concept of learned ignorance, which is knowledge gained from the Spirit of God, who heals our infirmities (*doctr. Chr.* 1.6.6). Florensky went a step further, not only by appreciating Aug.'s negative theology, but by using the idea of antinomies as *contentio legum contrariorum* from the (in fact presumably pseudo-Augustinian) *De rhetorica* (Halm, *Rhetores lat. min.*, 143; Florensky 41) to substantiate his idea of truth as self-contradictory judgement that is 'not deductible, but only demonstrable in experience' (Florensky 107).

c. The distinction between essence and energies in God

The theological issue emphasized many times by Orthodox theologians of so-called neo-Palamite provenance is the lack of distinction between essence and energies in Aug.'s teaching of God. Aug.'s rejection of this distinction has been seen as a direct consequence of his philosophical methods, for which an acceptance of the antinomy of a simultaneous existential identity and otherness in the case of God jeopardizes the idea of simplicity in the divine essence (Yannaras 1975, 242). Fr Georges Florovsky (1893–1979), another Russian émigré in Paris, was among the first theologians who pinpointed Aug. as the source of rejection of the essence–energy distinction. Aug.'s affirmative assertion about God left room neither for the distinction between the essence and energies nor for the distinction between apophatic and cataphatic theology (Florovsky 1976, 67). For Romanides, Aug.'s reliance on Platonism not only prevented him grasping the essence–energies distinction, but also led him to identify the *telos* of Christian life with Platonic eudaemonism and consequently to claim the possibility of the apprehension of the divine essence (Romanides 2004, 34 ff.). Romanides also argued that by rejecting the essence–energy distinction Aug. lost the tool to bridge the ontological gulf between God and creation. Thus, the introduction of created affects of divine activity was the consequence of the abolishment of divine energies as a form of uncreated grace.

The contemporary Orthodox thinker David Bradshaw has argued that Aug.'s identification of God's essence with the divine attributes

(*civ.* 8.6.10), including the divine will (*conf.* 7.4.11), is due to his reception of Plotinian metaphysics. While the Greek early Christian writers, according to Bradshaw, identified God with the Plotinian One which is 'beyond being' and 'beyond intellect', for Aug. there was no hierarchical difference between One, Intellect, and Being and they are all applicable to God (Bradshaw 338–44). Fr Michael Azkoul has pressed the thesis of Aug.'s Neo-Platonism to the extreme, ascribing to Aug. many heresies that derive from it (Azkoul 128–79).

Interestingly, Lossky, who adopted a positive attitude toward Aug.'s apophaticism, did not ascribe the rejection of this distinction to Aug., but rather to the subsequent Western tradition, particularly Thomas Aquinas (Lossky 1957, 96). However, there are also voices in the Orthodox world nowadays which attempt to save Aug. from this charge by pointing to similarities between him and the Cappadocian Fathers (Bentley Hart 191–226).

d. Sacramental theology

Orthodox theologians undoubtedly most appreciated Aug.'s sacramental theology. St Nektarios of Aegina (1846–1920), who published a new edition of the *Kekragorion* of Voulgaris (Stiernon 745, 828), was in favour of Aug.'s teaching about the validity of the sacraments of schismatics and heretics, and therefore he insisted on this approach of economy (*oikonomia*) to the Western Church, rather than the approach of 'strictness' (*akribeia*) according to which the non-Orthodox sacraments are null and void. For such an attitude, Nektarios has been accused by some ultra-conservative Orthodox circles of being *latinophron kai oikoumenistes* ('Latin-minded and ecumenist') (Dragas 20). Bulgakov was also sympathetic toward Aug.'s teaching on the validity but ineffectiveness of the sacraments of the Donatists (*Cresc.* 1.24.29), which he used to distinguish between the effective sacraments of the Orthodox and the valid but ineffective sacraments of other Christians (Bulgakov 2002, 311–12). Florovsky followed closely Aug.'s position that the Holy Spirit still breathes in sects, but that grace that operates outside the sacramental boundaries of the Church does not save (Florovsky 1933, 124). Florovsky also criticized the economic approach, as a late and controversial private theological opinion which is not applicable in dealing with sectarians, because they have to pass the strictest *akribeia* in order to experience the salvific power of the sacraments.

e. Augustine's anti-Pelagian writings and Orthodox theology

The stumbling block for the Orthodox fully to accept Aug. as a church father is his doctrines that derive from the Pelagian controversy, or to be precise his doctrine of *grace and free will, the doctrine of *predestination, and the doctrine of *original sin. Orthodox theologians in general found Aug.'s teaching on these issues unacceptable, because in his doctrine of grace and free will he 'overstates' the role of divine grace, and 'understates' the role of human will and spiritual labour. According to the Orthodox position, Aug. by the doctrine of predestination distorted the understanding of free will (Bulgakov 2002, 190, 215–17, 213; Florovsky 1926, 38–48), and by the doctrine of original sin

he made each human being responsible for the guilt of Adam's sin in addition to sharing its consequences (Bulgakov 2002, 167, 307; Romanides 1998, 155–75; Meyendorff 66–7).

EVALUATION

The reception of Aug. in modern Orthodox theology was constructed mainly in opposition to the post-Byzantine theological wavering between the Roman Catholic and the Protestant Aug. The theological enterprises of the Russian émigrés in Paris in the 1920s and 1930s, followed by the revival of Greek theology in the 1960s, inevitably led to the rejection of every kind of imitation of Western theology and to the return to the authority of the Greek Christian writers of the Byzantine period. Thus, Aug. started to be evaluated in accordance with the Greek writers, and everything that did not coincide with Eastern and specifically the Palamite tradition was severely criticized. However, there are also appeals today for a more moderate approach to Aug., which stresses no more the polemical and controversial side of Aug., but reveals the 'hidden Aug.', known by his service as bishop of the particular community of Hippo (Rose 83–9; Louth 291–4), because of which he became worthy of sanctification.

VLADIMIR CVETKOVIĆ

BYZANTINE WORLD; CALVIN, JOHN; CHURCH COUNCILS; GRACE; GREGORY PALAMAS; JUSTIFICATION; LUTHER, MARTIN; PREDESTINATION; PSEUDO-AUGUSTINIAN WRITINGS; SACRAMENTAL THEOLOGY; TRINITY

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Primary literature: Greek

- Eustratios Argenti, *Syntagma kata Azymon* (Leipzig 1760).
 Dositheos of Jerusalem, *He homologia tes orthodoxou pisteos tou Patriarkhou Ierosolymon Dositheou*, ed. I. N. Karmiris, *Theologia* 20 (1949) 464–94, 657–702.
 Nicephorus Blemmydes, *De processione Spiritus Sancti*, PG 142:533–81.
 K. Doukakes (ed.), *Megas synaxaristes*, vol. 10 (Athens 1893).
 S. Eustratiadis, *Hagiologion tes orthodoxou ekklesias* (Athens 1948).
 Gennadius Scholarios, *Oeuvres complètes*, ed. L. Petit, X. A. Siderides, and M. Jugie (Paris 1928–36).
 V. Matthaïos, *Ho megas Synaxaristes tes Orthodoxou Ekklesias*, vol. 6 (Athens 1950).
 Nikodemos Hagiorites, *Synaxaristes ton dodeka menon tou eniautou*, 3 vols (Zakynthos 1868 [Venice 1819]).
 —, *Pedalion tes noetes neos* (Leipzig 1800); trans. D. Cummings, *The Rudder* (Chicago 1957).
 Eugenios Voulgaris, *To Kekragorion tou theiou kai ierou Augoustinou episkopou Ipponos* (Leipzig 1804).

Primary literature: Russian, Serbian, and Bulgarian

- Dimitri of Rostov, *Zhitiya Svyatikh na russkom yazike, izlozheniye po rukovodstvu Chetiri-Minei Sv. Dimitriya Rostovskogo* (1944).
- G. Flororovskii, 'Metafizicheski predposylki utopizma, Put 4' (1926) 27–53.
- Filaret Gumilevsky, *Istoricheskoe uchenie ob otzakh tserkvi*, 3 vols (St Petersburg 1859).
- I. Kosolapov (ed.), *Myesyatsoslov pravoslavnoi kafolicheskoi tserkvi* (2nd edn, Simbirsk 1880).
- P. Levshin, *Pravoslavnoe uchenie ili sokrashchennaya khristianskaya bogosloviya* (Moscow 1765).
- A. P. Lopukhin, 'Augustine', in *Pravoslavnaya bogoslovskaya entsiklopediya nin bogoslovskii entsiklopedicheskii slovar*, vol. 1 (St Petersburg 1904) 102–12.
- P. Mogila, *La Confession orthodoxe de Pierre Moghila*, ed. A. Malvy and M. Viller (Rome 1927).
- J. Popović, *Zitija Svetih* (Belgrade 1975).
- Tikhon of Zadonsk, *Sokrovishche dukhnoe ot mira sobiraemoe* (St Petersburg 1796).
- S. Yavorsky, *Kamen' verii*, ed. I. Morev (St Petersburg 1904).

Primary literature in English

- M. Azkoul, *The Influence of Augustine of Hippo on the Orthodox Church* (Lewiston, NY 1990).
- S. Bulgakov, *Sophia, the Wisdom of God. An Outline of Sophiology* (Hudson, NY 1993).
- , *The Bride of the Lamb* (Grand Rapids, MI 2002).
- , *The Comforter* (Grand Rapids, MI 2004).
- P. Florensky, *The Pillar and Ground of the Truth*, trans. B. Jakim (Princeton 1997).
- G. Florovsky, 'The Limits of the Church', *Church Quarterly Review* 233 (1933) 117–31.
- , 'Creation and Creaturehood', in *The Collected Works of Georges Florovsky*, vol. 3 (Belmont, MA 1976) 43–78.
- , *Ways of Russian Theology*, in *The Collected Works of Georges Florovsky*, vols 5–6 (Belmont, MA 1979, 1987).
- V. Lossky, *The Mystical Theology of the Eastern Church* (London 1957).
- , 'Elements of "Negative Theology" in the Thought of St Augustine', *St Vladimir's Theological Quarterly* 21 (1977) 67–75.
- J. Meyendorff, *Catholicity and the Church* (New York 1983).
- J. Romanides, *The Ancestral Sin* (Ridgewood, NJ 1998).
- , *An Outline of Orthodox Patristic Dogmatics* (Rollinsford, NH 2004).
- D. Staniloae, *The Experience of God* (Brookline, MA 1994).
- N. Velimirovic, *The Prologue from Ochrid* (Birmingham 1985).
- C. Yannaras, 'The Distinction between Essence and Energies and its Importance for Theology', *St Vladimir's Theological Quarterly* 19 (1975) 232–45.
- , *Elements of Faith. An Introduction to Orthodox Theology* (Edinburgh 1991).

J. N. Zizioulas, *Being as Communion* (New York 1985).

—, *Communion and Otherness* (London 2006).

Secondary literature

- S. K. Batalden, *Catherine II's Greek Prelate. Eugenios Voulgaris in Russia, 1771–1806* (New York 1982).
- D. Bentley Hart, 'The Hidden and the Manifest. Metaphysics after Nicaea', in G. E. Demacopoulos and A. Papanikolaou (eds), *Orthodox Readings of Augustine* (Crestwood, NY 2008) 191–226.
- H. M. Biedermann, 'Augustinus in der neueren griechischen Theologie', in A. Zumkeller (ed.), *Signum Pietatis. Festgabe für Cornelius Petrus Mayer OSA zum 60. Geburtstag* (Würzburg 1989) 609–43.
- D. Bradshaw, 'Augustine the Metaphysician', in G. E. Demacopoulos and A. Papanikolaou (eds), *Orthodox Readings of Augustine* (Crestwood, NY 2008) 227–51.
- F. E. Brightman, *Liturgies Eastern and Western* (Oxford 1896).
- E. Citterio, 'Nicodemo Agiorita', in C. G. Conticello and V. Conticello (eds), *La Théologie byzantine et sa tradition (XIII–XIX^e s.)* (Turnhout 2002) 905–78.
- C. G. Conticello and V. Conticello (eds), *La Théologie byzantine et sa tradition (XIII–XIX^e s.)* (Turnhout 2002).
- T. de Régnon, *Études de théologie positive sur la Sainte Trinité* (Paris 1892–98).
- G. E. Demacopoulos and A. Papanikolaou (eds), *Orthodox Readings of Augustine* (Crestwood, NY 2008).
- , 'Augustine and the Orthodox. "The West" in the East', in G. E. Demacopoulos and A. Papanikolaou (eds), *Orthodox Readings of Augustine* (Crestwood, NY 2008) 11–40.
- H. Denzinger, *Kompendium der Glaubensbekenntnisse und kirchlichen Lehrentscheidungen* (37th edn Freiburg 1991).
- G. D. Dragas, 'A Contemporary Greek Saint. Saint Nektarios (1846–1920)', *Mount Carmel* 27 (1979) 15–24.
- G. Fedalto, *Massimo Margurio e il suo commento al 'De Trinitate' de S. Agostino* (1588) (Brescia 1967).
- P. Galadza, 'The Liturgical Commemoration of Augustine in the Orthodox Church. An Ambiguous *Lex orandi* for an Ambiguous *Lex credendi*', *St Vladimir's Theological Quarterly* 52 (2008) 111–30.
- D. J. Geanakoplos, *Byzantine East and Latin West. Two Worlds of Christendom in Middle Ages and Renaissance* (Oxford 1966).
- C. L. Graves, *The Holy Spirit in the Theology of Sergius Bulgakov* (Geneva 1972).
- G. A. Hadjiantoniou, *Protestant Patriarch. The Life of Cyril Lucaris (1572–1638), Patriarch of Constantinople* (Richmond, VA 1961).
- M. Jugie, 'Saint Augustin dans la littérature théologique de l'Église russe', *Échos d'Orient* 29 (1930) 385–95.
- A. Louth, ' "Heart in Pilgrimage". St Augustine as Interpreter of the Psalms', in G. E. Demacopoulos and A. Papanikolaou (eds), *Orthodox Readings of Augustine* (Crestwood, NY 2008) 291–304.
- G. Podskalsky, *Griechische Theologie in der Zeit der Türkenherrschaft (1453–1821)* (Munich 1988).

M. Rackl, 'Die griechischen Augustinusübersetzungen', in *Miscellanea Francesco Ehrle. Scritti di storia e paleografia* vol. 1 (Vatican 1924) 1–38.

S. Rose, *The Place of Blessed Augustine in the Orthodox Church* (Platina, CA 1986).

S. Runciman, *The Great Church in Captivity* (Cambridge 1968).

D. Stiernon, 'Eugène Boulgaris', in C. G. Conticello and V. Conticello (eds), *La Théologie byzantine et sa tradition (XIIIe–XIXe s.)* (Turnhout 2002) 721–837.

M. Tataryn, *Augustine and Russian Orthodoxy* (Lanham, MD 2000).

F. Tinnefeld, 'Georgios Gennadios Scholarios', in C. G. Conticello and V. Conticello (eds), *La Théologie byzantine et sa tradition (XIIIe–XIXe s.)* (Turnhout 2002) 477–541.

K.-P. Todt, 'Dositheos II. von Jerusalem', in C. G. Conticello and V. Conticello (eds), *La Théologie byzantine et sa tradition (XIIIe–XIXe s.)* (Turnhout 2002) 658–711.

—, 'Kyrillos Lukaris', in C. G. Conticello and V. Conticello (eds), *La Théologie byzantine et sa tradition (XIIIe–XIXe s.)* (Turnhout 2002) 617–51.

H. Tretter and C. Patock, 'Russische Augustinus-Übersetzungen und Literatur russischer Autoren über Augustinus', in A. Zumkeller (ed.), *Signum Pietatis. Festgabe für Cornelius Petrus Mayer OSA zum 60. Geburtstag* (Würzburg 1989) 659–63.

T. Ware, *Eustratios Argenti. A Study of the Greek Church under Turkish Rule* (Oxford 1964).

Otfrid of Weissenburg (c.800–c.870)

In c.807, O. came to the monastery of Weissenburg (Wissembourg, Alsace) as a *puer oblatus*. Around the year 830, he was ordained as a priest, and he probably stayed in the monastery of Fulda some time after 830 to study. This period was possibly followed by employment in the court chapel of Louis the German. From c.847, O. is attested to have been in Weissenburg as a teacher in the monastery school, a librarian, and a writer of charters and manuscripts. Especially noteworthy are the catena commentaries of the so-called *Weissenburger Bibelwerk* (WBW) as well as O.'s Bible poetry, the Old High German *Evangelienbuch* (Ev.). The Ev. is the reason for O.'s literary reputation: he is the first poet to write in a German idiom who is known by name.

O.'S USE OF AUGUSTINE

O.'s reception of Aug. can be examined under three aspects.

a. Source-based

This pertains to the Ev. and the WBW. All statements about the Ev. are subject to O. drawing from memory on his thorough patristic education. Yet once in the Ev. (Ev. 5.13.25–9) there is an authoritative recourse to Aug. that is not specified in sources, and also to *Gregory

the Great. Here, O. explains the earlier (Ev. 5.13) detailed incidents from Jn 21. The unnamed work is either Gregory the Great's *Homiliae in evangelia* 24, or Aug.'s *In Iohannis evangelium tractatus* 21.11. In fact, though, Gregory has recourse to Aug. here. His homilies are contained in the *Codex Wolfenbüttel*, made in Weissenburg (Herzog-August-Bibliothek = HAB 43 Weiss, from the first half of the ninth century; Butzmann 166; Hellgardt 91). Apparently, O. had both works in front of him, or at least remembered both well, because he comments on his sources that both authors discuss the events depicted by John and make them easy to understand for the reader (Ev. 5.14.29). O. remarks concerning Aug., whom he mentions explicitly after Gregory, that he deals with this passage from John very carefully and reveals a lot of good things (Ev. 5.14.27–9).

A parallel to *De civitate Dei* 5.16 can, perhaps, be seen in Ev. 5.23.261, where the author and title of the work remain unnamed. Apart from that, only one passage can be directly ascribed to Aug. as a source with any probability (Ev. 4.20.40. cf. *en. Ps.* 53.4), but perhaps a reminiscence from the Psalm verse itself is sufficient here.

Apart from this, the Ev. only contains Aug.'s thought indirectly, especially through the commentary on John by *Alcuin, whose main source is Aug.'s *Io. ev. tr.* The exegetical/homiletic works of *Bede, *Hrabanus Maurus (summarized in Hellgardt 1–5, 89–94), and the still unedited commentary on John by Erkanbert of Fulda (cf. Hellgardt 229–55, with excerpts) also comprise intermediate sources for the ideas of Aug.

From the WBW, seven manuscripts with texts of biblical books and marginal excerpts from exegetical patristic writings remain (Kleiber 142–5; Hellgardt 98–109). The excerpts can mostly be recognized as O.'s autographs (Kleiber 104–6; Hellgardt 97–8). The Gospel of Matthew is the only edited part of the Gospel manuscript Cod. Wolfenbüttel = HAB 26 Weiss. (Butzmann 134–6). Only a few excerpts from Aug., including one in O.'s hand, are there. Of the 22 attested source texts (see CCCM 200:882–92), only two are from Aug.'s *De diversis quaestionibus octoginta tribus*, *Sermo* 101 and *Quaestiones evangeliorum*. Aug. is much less represented than Hilary of Poitiers, Hrabanus Maurus, and *Smaragdus of St Mihiel. *Div. qu.* is most represented with six examples, while the other two works only occur once (see CCCM 200:382). In detail these passages are: glossary of Mk 1:1 (CCCM 200:47, ll. 50–2; cf. Hellgardt 100), cf. *div. qu.* 61.97–9; glossary of Mk 1:16 (ibid., 200:50, ll. 135–55, cf. Hellgardt 101), cf. *div. qu.* 44.1–22; glossary of Mk 14:26 (ibid., 200:203, ll. 231–4), cf. *div. qu.* 14.1–3; glossary of Mk 20:6 (ibid., 200:255, ll. 59–81), cf. *div. qu.* 58.52–82; glossary of Mk 24:36 (ibid., 200:305, ll. 259–71), cf. *div. qu.* 60.2–16; glossary of Mk 25:12 (ibid., 200:312, ll. 61–74), cf. *div. qu.* 59.131–46; glossary of Mk 10:10 (ibid., 200:146, ll. 104–14), cf. s. 101.50.11–20.

The name of the authority is referred to with the abbreviation AG in the margins, except for the last example of *div. qu.* However, the example in the glossary of Mt 1:11 (CCCM 200:49, ll. 105–9) is different: *qu. ev.* 46.14–5 is not excerpted, but instead O. alludes to the name of Aug. Wolfenbüttel manuscript 26 Weiss. of the WBW is not a model for O.'s Ev. (Hellgardt 116–18).