

GEORGIOS GENNADIOS SCHOLARIOS' *ON THE DIFFERENCE OF VENIAL AND MORTAL SINS* AND ITS THOMISTIC BACKGROUND*

Panagiotis Ch. ATHANASOPOULOS

I. – INTRODUCTION

Georgios Gennadios Scholarios' (ca 1400-ca 1472)¹ *On the difference of venial and mortal sins*² is part of his ethical-pastoral output.³ In fact, the *On the difference* is a set of notes (σημειώσεις)⁴ composed for an unknown addressee.⁵ The text is preserved in more than twenty manuscripts, dated from the 15th until the 18th/19th centuries.⁶

The *editio princeps* was prepared in 1806 by Sergios Macraios⁷ († 1819),⁸ on the basis of an unidentified manuscript.⁹ In 1816, Prokopios Nazianzenos (born 1776/1777)¹⁰ edited a paraphrase of the text to post-Byzantine vernacular Greek under the title *Διδασκαλία εὐσύννοπος περὶ τῶν θανασίμων καὶ συγγνωστῶν*

* I would like to express my gratitude to Prof. Antonio Rigo (Venice), Assist. Prof. John A. Demetracopoulos (Patras) and Dr. Marie-Hélène Blanchet (CNRS) for their useful remarks. This research is conducted under the auspices of the TASTGCEP project, which constitutes part of the *Thomas de Aquino Byzantinus* project (see *infra* n. 48). This project (TASTGCEP) has received funding from the European Union's Horizon 2020 research and innovation programme under the Marie Skłodowska-Curie grant agreement No. 703595. Hereafter *Summa Theologiae* will be abbreviated as *ST*, I^a/I^a II^{ae}/II^a II^{ae}/III^a respectively; q. stands for *quaestio*, a. for *articulus*, arg. for *argumentum*, pr. for *prologus*, s. c. for *sed contra* and co. for *corpus*.

¹ For Scholarios, see *PLP*, n° 27304; F. TINNEFELD, Georgios Gennadios Scholarios; M.-H. BLANCHET, *Georges-Gennadios Scholarios (vers 1400-vers 1472). Un intellectuel orthodoxe face à la disparition de l'Empire byzantin* (AOC 20), Paris 2008. For Scholarios' date of birth and death, see M.-H. BLANCHET, *ibidem*, p. 15-16.

² GENNADIOS SCHOLARIOS, *On the difference of venial and mortal sins* (Περὶ διαφορᾶς τῶν συγγνωστῶν καὶ θανασίμων ἁμαρτημάτων σύντομον καὶ σαφές), ed. L. PETIT, X. A. SIDERIDES, M. JUGIE, *Œuvres complètes de Gennade Scholarios*, IV, Paris 1935, p. 274-284 (hereafter abbreviated as *On the difference*).

³ According to F. Tinnefeld's classification: cf. F. TINNEFELD, Georgios Gennadios Scholarios, cited n. 1, p. 505-506.

⁴ Cf. SCHOLARIOS, *On the difference*, p. 281³⁴⁻³⁵: Ταῦτα μὲν περὶ τῶν θανασίμων καὶ συγγνωστῶν ἁμαρτημάτων ἀποσημαίεται καθόλου.

⁵ Cf. *ibidem*, p. 282²⁻³: ...σύντομόν σοι καὶ περὶ αὐτῶν παρέχομεν εἶδησιν, καὶ διὰ σοῦ τοῖς ἐντευξομένοις.

⁶ See <http://pinakes.irht.cnrs.fr/notices/oeuvre/2444/> (date of access: 20/03/2018); cf. also L. PETIT, X. A. SIDERIDES, M. JUGIE (eds), *Œuvres complètes de Georges Scholarios*, I, Paris 1928, p. XL.

⁷ Γεναδίου (sic) ἀρχιεπισκόπου Κωνσταντινουπόλεως τοῦ Σχολαρίου, *Διδασκαλία περὶ τῶν θανασίμων, καὶ συγγνωστῶν ἁμαρτημάτων*, in S. MACRAIOS, *Διδασκαλία εὐσύννοπος τοῦ μακαρίου Πατριάρχου Κωνσταντινουπόλεως τοῦ Σχολαρίου ἡ Νόμος Εὐαγγελικὸς ἐν ἐπιτομῇ σαφῶς καὶ εὐλήπτως ἐκτεθείς*, Constantinople 1806, p. 63-80.

⁸ G. PODSKALSKY, *Griechische Theologie in der Zeit der Türkenherrschaft (1453-1821)*, Munich 1988, p. 73, n. 273.

⁹ However, this cannot be identified with the manuscript used in Jugie's edition, i. e. Paris, BNF, gr. 1289. See L. PETIT, X. A. SIDERIDES, M. JUGIE, *Œuvres complètes*, IV, cited n. 3, p. 274-284, *appar. crit.*, *passim*.

¹⁰ A. PAPAPOPOULOS-KERAMEUS, *Ἀνάλεκτα Τεροσολυμιτικῆς σταχυολογίας*, III, St. Petersburg 1897, p. 368, n. 1.

ἀμαρτημάτων,¹¹ adding also a phonetic transliteration to the contemporary Turkish language.¹² Lastly, in 1935, M. Jugie prepared the edition of the text¹³ on the basis of Paris, BNF, gr. 1289 (Diktyon 50898), which preserves an autograph copy of the text by Scholarios in ff. 130^v-137^r.¹⁴

Macraios' and Nazianzenos' editions lack any mention to the sources of the *On the difference*, while Jugie has traced only five sources, all of them Biblical.¹⁵ Yet, he remarked that "la doctrine de Scholarios sur le sujet traité s'accorde en général avec celle des théologiens catholiques".¹⁶ More significantly, G. Podskalsky has noted that Scholarios has drawn some material from Thomas Aquinas' *ST*, II^a II^{ae},¹⁷ while J. A. Demetracopoulos has recently remarked that there are some parallels between this text and Scholarios' sermon *On almsgiving*,¹⁸ which is based on certain passages of *ST*, II^a II^{ae}.¹⁹ In the following pages, I will expound Scholarios' view on the topic of sin, in order to show that the *On the difference* is heavily indebted to Thomas Aquinas'²⁰ (1224/1225-1274)²¹ ethics,²² as expounded in his *ST*,

¹¹ PROKOPIOS NAZIANZENOS, *Διδασκαλία εὐσύνοπτος περὶ τῶν θανασίμων καὶ συγγνωστῶν ἀμαρτημάτων*. Γενναδίου ἀρχιεπισκόπου Κωνσταντινουπόλεως τοῦ Σχολαρίου, Constantinople 1816, p. 3-30.

¹² *Ibidem*, p. 33-64: Ἰσταμπὸλ Πατριγῆ ὀλὰν Γεννάδιος Σχολάριος, Χαζρετλερινῆν χατίε μουμίτε. Βὲ γεῖρ μουμίτε, γιάνι ἰνσαῖν τζανινὰ ὀλοῦμ βεριτζῆ βὲ ὀλοῦμ βέρμεῖτζῆ γκιουναχλερὲ δαῖρ τααλίφ εἰλερδικλερῆ τααλίμι μουχτασαρινῆν γιουνανιδὲν λισάνι τουρκιγὲ τερτζουμσεῖ διρ.

¹³ See *supra* n. 3.

¹⁴ H. OMONT, *Inventaire sommaire des manuscrits grecs de la Bibliothèque Nationale*. I, *Ancien fonds grec*, Paris 1886, p. 288; L. PETIT, X. A. SIDERIDES, M. JUGIE, *Œuvres complètes*, IV, cited n. 3, p. 274, *apparatus crit.*; <http://pinakes.irht.cnrs.fr/notices/cote/50898/> (date of access: 20/03/2018).

¹⁵ *Mt.* 22, 37; *Jn.* 15, 10; *Gen.* 4, 10; *Jac.* 1, 20; *Phil.* 3, 19. As known, from 1929 onwards Jugie worked alone on the edition of Scholarios' works, which nevertheless was accomplished rather quickly (L. PETIT, X. A. SIDERIDES, M. JUGIE [eds], *Œuvres complètes de Gennade Scholarios*, I-VIII, Paris 1928-1936; cf. J. A. DEMETRACOPOULOS, *Échos d'Orient – Résonances d'Ouest*. In Respect of: C. G. CONTICELLO and V. CONTICELLO (eds), *La Théologie byzantine et sa tradition*. II, XIII^e-XIX^e s., *Nicolaus* 37/2, 2010, p. 67-148, here p. 85-86). Thus, despite his commitment to such an impressive enterprise, his edition suffers from certain insufficiencies (J. A. DEMETRACOPOULOS, *ibidem*, p. 85-91; P. C. ATHANASOPOULOS, *Scholarios vs. Pletho on Philosophy vs. Myth*, in M. KNEŽEVIĆ [ed.], *The Ways of Byzantine Philosophy* [Contemporary Christian Thought Series 32], Alhambra 2015, p. 401-427, here p. 422, n. 118).

¹⁶ L. PETIT, X. A. SIDERIDES, M. JUGIE, *Œuvres complètes*, IV, cited n. 3, p. xvii.

¹⁷ G. PODSKALSKY (Die Rezeption der thomistischen Theologie bei Gennadios II. Scholarios [ca. 1403-1472], *Theologie und Philosophie* 49, 1974, p. 305-323, here p. 311, n. 34-35) remarked that there are also parallels to *ST*, I^a II^{ae}, yet he noted parallels solely to *ST*, II^a II^{ae}, providing rather generic references; namely: a) *On the difference*, p. 275 sqq. (i. e. chapter 1, 19 sqq.) = *ST*, II^a II^{ae}, q. 72 a. 2; q. 73 a. 2; q. 75 a. 1; q. 76 a. 3; b) *On the difference*, p. 276 sqq. (i. e. chapter 2, 22 sqq.) = *ST*, II^a II^{ae}, q. 25 a. 1 & a. 8; q. 103 a. 3; c) *On the difference*, p. 282⁴⁻¹⁵ (i. e. chapter 8, 9-20) = *ST*, II^a II^{ae}, q. 162 a. 7; d) *On the difference*, p. 282¹⁶⁻²¹ (i. e. chapter 8, 21-26) = *ST*, II^a II^{ae}, q. 162 a. 4; e) *On the difference*, p. 282²²⁻²⁶ (i. e. chapter 8, 27-31) = *ST*, II^a II^{ae}, q. 36 a. 4; f) *On the difference*, p. 282^{33-283²} (i. e. chapter 8, 38-45) = *ST*, II^a II^{ae}, q. 35 a. 4 (cf. also A. A. ROBIGLIO, *L'impossibile volere: Tommaso d'Aquino, i tomisti e la volontà*, Milan 2002, p. 207, n. 22). Nevertheless, Podskalsky's references a, b and c (cf. *supra*) are false.

¹⁸ J. A. DEMETRACOPOULOS, *Scholarios' On Almsgiving, or How to Convert a Scholastic "Quaestio" into a Sermon*, in D. SEARBY (ed.), *Never the Twain Shall Meet? Latins and Greeks learning from each other in Byzantium* (Byzantinisches Archiv, Series Philosophica 2), Berlin-Boston 2017, p. 129-178, here p. 152 (and n. 115).

¹⁹ *Ibidem*, p. 134-152.

²⁰ The bibliography on Thomas Aquinas is vast. For his life and works, see J. WEISHEIPL, *Friar Thomas d'Aquino. His Life, Thought, and Works*, Washington 1983; N. KRETZMANN and E. STUMP, *Aquinas, Thomas*, in E. CRAIG (ed.), *The Routledge Encyclopedia of Philosophy*, I, London-New York 1998, p. 326-350; J.-P. TORRELL, *Saint Thomas Aquinas*. I, *The Person and His Work*, English transl. R. ROYAL, Washington 2005 (1996¹); J.-P. TORRELL, *Aquinas's Summa. Background, Structure, and Reception*, Engl. transl. B. M. GUEVIN, Washington 2005, p. 1-16.

I^a II^{ae} and II^a II^{ae}.²³ Additionally, I will examine its relation to another set of Thomistic *Notes* of Scholarios, which has not yet attracted the interest of scholars,²⁴ namely the *Necessary questions*.²⁵ Moreover, given that Scholarios not only had access to Demetrios Kydones' (ca 1320/1325-1397)²⁶ Greek translation of Thomas' *ST*, I^a II^{ae} and II^a II^{ae},²⁷ but also that he himself composed a *Compendium of ST*, I^a II^{ae} and partly abbreviated the text of II^{ae} II^{ae},²⁸ I will attempt to trace which versions of Thomas' text were on Scholarios' desk during the composition of the *On the difference*. Lastly, I will provide new evidence for its dating.

This paper aims to reveal another case of Scholarios' Thomism and thus to shed more light on the research of intellectual dialogue between East and West in 15th c. On the other hand, it will provide useful data for the inquiry into sin in the Eastern tradition, since to my knowledge a comprehensive study on sin in Byzantium is still a *desideratum*. At this point, a remark should be made for the reader's convenience. "Schemes" or lists of sins²⁹ (with

²¹ J.-P. TORRELL, *Aquinas's Summa*, cited n. 20, p. 1, 16.

²² For Thomas' ethics, see E. GILSON, *Le thomisme. Introduction à la philosophie de Saint Thomas d'Aquin* (Études de philosophie médiévale 1), Paris 1997 (7th reprint of 1964^e; Strasbourg 1919¹), p. 313-460; S. J. POPE, *The Ethics of Aquinas* (Moral Traditions Series), Washington 2002; J. PILSNER, *The Specification of Human Actions in St Thomas Aquinas* (Oxford Theological Monographs), Oxford 2006; D. SCHWARTZ, *Aquinas on Friendship* (Oxford Philosophical Monographs), Oxford 2007; R. MINER, *Thomas Aquinas on the Passions. A Study of Summa Theologiae Ia2ae 22-48*, Cambridge 2009.

²³ For the reader's convenience, here is a brief overview of each part. *ST*, I^a II^{ae} exhibits Thomas' general principles on ethics: q. 1-5: beatitude (viz. man's ultimate end); q. 6-89: human acts (formally human acts [q. 6-21], passions [q. 22-48], habits in general [q. 49-54], virtuous habits [q. 55-70], vice and sin [q. 71-89]); q. 90-108: law (reconciliation of law and freedom [q. 90-97], *Old law* [q. 98-105], *New law* [q. 106-108]); q. 109-114: grace. *ST*, II^a II^{ae} exhibits Thomistic ethics in particular, namely: q. 1-46: the theological virtues (faith [q. 1-16], hope [q. 17-22], charity [q. 23-46]); q. 47-170: the cardinal virtues (prudence [q. 47-56], justice [q. 57-122], fortitude [q. 123-140], temperance [q. 141-170]); q. 171-189: particular cases (charisms [q. 171-178], diverse forms of life [q. 179-182], diverse ministries and states of life [q. 183-189]). For more on this structure, see J.-P. TORRELL, *Aquinas's Summa*, cited n. 2020, p. 30-36, 42-48.

²⁴ Actually, this is the case with many ascetic-spiritual works of Scholarios (A. RIGO, *Alcune opere asceticospirituali di Gennadio Scholarios*, in T. CREAZZO, C. CRIMI, R. GENTILE, G. STRANO (eds), *Studi Bizantini. In onore di Maria Dora Spadaro* [Orpheus 2], Rome 2016, p. 369-376, here p. 369).

²⁵ SCHOLARIOS, *Necessary questions* (Αναγκαῖα ζητήματα), ed. L. PETIT, X. A. SIDERIDES, M. JUGIE, *Œuvres complètes*, IV, cited n. 3, p. 306-309.

²⁶ J. A. DEMETRACOPOULOS, *Cydones, Demetrius*, in E. G. FARRUGIA (ed.), *Encyclopedic Dictionary of the Christian East*, Rome 2015², p. 577-582, here p. 577; T. GANCHOU, *Dèmetrios Kydônes, les frères Chrysobergès et la Crète (1397-1401). De nouveaux documents*, in C. A. MALTEZOU and P. SCHREINER (eds), *Bisanzio, Venezia e il mondo franco-greco (XIII-XV secolo)*, Venice 2002, p. 435-493, here p. 479.

²⁷ Kydones translated works of several Latin authors as Anselm of Canterbury, Thomas Aquinas, Bernard Gui, and others (J. A. DEMETRACOPOULOS, *Cydones*, cited n. 26, p. 580-581; IDEM, *Latin Philosophical Works Translated into Greek*, in R. PASNAU and C. VAN DYKE [eds], *The Cambridge History of Medieval Philosophy*, II, Cambridge 2014² [2010¹], p. 822-826, here p. 823, 825).

²⁸ J. A. DEMETRACOPOULOS, *Scholarios' On Almsgiving*, cited n. 18, p. 157-161. See SCHOLARIOS, *Compendium of ST, I^a II^{ae}*, ed. L. PETIT, X. A. SIDERIDES, M. JUGIE (eds), *Œuvres complètes de Gennade Scholarios*, VI, Paris 1933, p. 1-153.

²⁹ For such classifications and medieval views on sins, see I. HAUSHERR, *L'origine de la théorie orientale des huit péchés capitaux*, *OCP* 30, 1933, p. 164-175; A. VÖGTLE, *Woher stammt das Schema der Hauptsünden?*, *Theologische Quartalschrift* 122, 1941, p. 217-237; M. W. BLOOMFIELD, *The Seven Deadly Sins. An Introduction to the History of a Religious Concept, with Special Reference to Medieval English Literature* (Studies in Language and Literature), Michigan 1967 (repr.; 1952¹); S. WENZEL, *The Seven Deadly Sins: Some Problems of Research*, *Speculum* 43, 1968, p. 1-22; A. GUILLAUMONT and C. GUILLAUMONT, *Évagre le Pontique. Traité pratique ou Le moine*, I (SC 170), Paris 1971, p. 63-84, 90-93; C. CASAGRANDE and S. VECCHIO, *La classificazione dei peccati tra settenario e decalogo (secoli XIII-XV)*, *Documenti e studi sulla tradizione filosofica medievale* 5, 1994, p. 331-395; C. CASAGRANDE, *Sistema dei sensi e classificazione dei peccati (secoli XII-XIII)*, *Micrologus* 10, 2002, p. 33-53; R. NEWHAUSER (ed.), *In the Garden of Evil. The Vices and Culture in the Middle Ages* (Papers in Mediaeval Studies 18), Toronto 2005, *passim*; IDEM, *Sin. Essays on the Moral Tradition in the Western Middle Ages* (Variorum Collected Series 869), Aldershot 2007, *passim*; IDEM (ed.), *The Seven Deadly Sins. From Communities to Individuals* (Studies in Medieval and Reformation

several subdivisions) derive from lists of λογισμοί (i. e. those mental activities from which the relevant sins spring out),³⁰ which were conducted in the context of early Egyptian monasticism and later formatted to a “scheme” of eight sins.³¹ As known, Evagrius of Pontus (ca 345-399)³² adopted and further developed Origen’s (185/186-254/255)³³ lists of vices³⁴ into the following eight λογισμοί: gluttony, fornication, avarice, sorrow/despair, anger, sloth/acedia, vainglory, and arrogance.³⁵ Henceforth, the “scheme” of eight sins became traditional in Byzantine Christianity and was adopted by several theologians,³⁶ including John Damascene (ca 655-ca 745).³⁷ In the West, Evagrius’ list passed to Cassian³⁸ (ca 360-430/435)³⁹ as following: gluttony, fornication, avarice, anger, sorrow, sloth/acedia, vainglory, and arrogance.⁴⁰ Later on, this list was transformed by Pope Gregory the Great (ca 540-604)⁴¹ into the seven (capital/deadly) sins: pride, envy, anger, sloth, avarice/covetousness, gluttony, and lust.⁴² Thomas Aquinas adopts Gregory’s “scheme” of seven sins; still, in his *ST* he follows a different order,⁴³ the one most commonly used in his era: pride/arrogance, envy, anger, avarice, spiritual sloth (acedia), gluttony, and lust.⁴⁴

II. – THE THOMISTIC BACKGROUND OF SCHOLARIOS’ *ON THE DIFFERENCE*⁴⁵

Traditions. History, Culture, Religion, Ideas 123), Leiden-Boston 2007, *passim*; R. G. NEWHAUSER and S. J. RIDYARD (eds), *Sin in Medieval and Early Modern Culture. The Tradition of the Seven Deadly Sins*, York 2012, *passim*.

³⁰ A. GUILLAUMONT and C. GUILLAUMONT, *Évagre le Pontique*, cited n. 29, p. 63-64.

³¹ R. NEWHAUSER, Introduction: Cultural Construction and the Vices, in R. NEWHAUSER, *The Seven Deadly Sins*, cited n. 29, p. 1-17, here p. 4.

³² A. GUILLAUMONT, *Un philosophe au désert. Évagre le Pontique* (Textes et Traditions 8), Paris 2004, p. 25, 63. For more on the date of Evagrius’ death, see *ibidem*, p. 63 (and n. 6).

³³ H. CROUZEL, *Origen. The Life and Thought of the First Great Theologian*, transl. A. S. WORRALL, San Francisco 1989, p. 2.

³⁴ A. GUILLAUMONT and C. GUILLAUMONT, *Évagre le Pontique*, cited n. 29, p. 68-73.

³⁵ *Ibidem*, p. 64. For more, see C. STEWART, Evagrius Ponticus and the ‘Eight Generic Logismoi’, in R. NEWHAUSER, *In the Garden of Evil*, cited n. 29, p. 3-34.

³⁶ A. GUILLAUMONT and C. GUILLAUMONT, *Évagre le Pontique*, cited n. 29, p. 67-68.

³⁷ V. S. CONTICELLO, Jean Damascene, in R. GOULET (ed.), *Dictionnaire des philosophes antiques. III, D’Eccélos à Juvénal*, Paris 2000, p. 989-1012, here p. 989. Yet, S. W. ANTHONY (Fixing John Damascene’s Biography: Historical Notes on His Family Background, *Journal of Early Christian Studies* 23/4 [2015], p. 607-627) provided new data for a later date of John Damascene’s life. On the problem of the exact dating of John Damascene’s life, see A. LOUTH, *St John Damascene: Tradition and Originality in Byzantine Theology* (Oxford Early Christian Studies), Oxford 2002, p. 5.

³⁸ For Evagrius’ influence on Cassian, see S. MARSILI, *Giovanni Cassiano ed Evagrio Pontico* (Studia Anselmiana 5), Rome 1936; A. GUILLAUMONT and C. GUILLAUMONT, *Évagre le Pontique*, cited n. 29, p. 65-66.

³⁹ B. RAMSEY, *John Cassian. The Conferences* (Ancient Christians Writers 57), New York-Mahwah 1997, p. 5-6; A. M. C. CASIDAY, *Tradition and Theology in St John Cassian* (Oxford Early Christian Studies), Oxford 2007, p. 1.

⁴⁰ A. GUILLAUMONT and C. GUILLAUMONT, *Évagre le Pontique*, cited n. 29, p. 66.

⁴¹ R. A. MARKUS, *Gregory the Great and His World*, Cambridge 1999 (repr.: 1997¹), p. 1, 3; J. MOORHEAD, *Gregory the Great* (The Early Church Fathers), London-New York 2005, p. 6.

⁴² A. GUILLAUMONT and C. GUILLAUMONT, *Évagre le Pontique*, cited n. 29, p. 67.

⁴³ E. C. SWEENEY, Aquinas on the Seven Deadly Sins: Tradition and Innovation, in R. G. NEWHAUSER and S. J. RIDYARD, *Sin*, cited n. 29, p. 85-106, here p. 85-88.

⁴⁴ R. G. NEWHAUSER, ‘These Seven Devils’: The Capital Vices on the Way to Modernity, in R. G. NEWHAUSER and S. J. RIDYARD (eds), *Sin*, cited n. 29, p. 157-188, here p. 159.

⁴⁵ For brevity’s sake, I will concentrate on Thomistic material that forms the core of Scholarios’ text. For more Thomistic passages in the *On the difference*, see the Appendix at the end of the present paper.

As early as in the title, Scholarios adopts the Latin distinction of sins between venial and mortal. This division is far too common among Catholic authors; yet, Scholarios' source is very specific: Thomas' *ST*, I^a II^{ae}, q. 88 (*De peccato veniali et mortali*). As will be shown below, Scholarios exploits this *quaestio* extensively.⁴⁶

On the difference, p. 274¹²⁻¹³ 47

Περὶ διαφορᾶς τῶν συγγνωστῶν καὶ θανάσιμων ἁμαρτημάτων σύντομον καὶ σαφές

ST, I^a II^{ae}, q. 88 pr.⁴⁸

Ἐφεξῆς θεωρητέον ἂν εἴη περὶ τοῦ ἁμαρτήματος τοῦ συγγνωστοῦ καὶ τοῦ θανάσιμου, διακρινομένων κατὰ τὴν ἐνοχίην.

Scholarios sets out by justifying the utility of his text: almost everybody lacks even the elementary knowledge of the issue at hand. Thus, Scholarios will exhibit the nature and the kinds of sins briefly and explicitly.⁴⁹ In this respect, the first issue to address is the attribution of the terms *συγγνωστός* and *θανάσιμος* to sins: exactly as some illnesses are curable, while some others are not and hence lead the human body to death, likewise some sins are forgivable, while some others are not and as such result in death. This interpretation of the metaphor derives from Thomas' *ST*, I^a II^{ae}, q. 88 a. 1 co.

On the difference, p. 274¹⁹⁻²²

Καθάπερ τοίνυν τῶν σωματικῶν ἄρρωστιῶν ἢ πληγῶν αἱ μὲν εἰσιν ιάσιμοι, αἱ δὲ ἀνίατοι καὶ θανάσιμοι, οὕτω δὲ καὶ ἐπὶ τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν ἔχει, αἰτινες ψυχικαὶ ἄρρωστίαί ἢ πληγαί εἰσιν, ὅτι αἱ μὲν αὐτῶν εἰσι θανάσιμοι, αἱ δὲ ἀφέσιμοι καὶ συγγνωσταί.

ST, I^a II^{ae}, q. 88 a. 1 co.⁵⁰

Εἰ δὲ μεταφορικῶς λαμβάνοιτο τὸ θανάσιμον, καθὸ λέγεται ἐν τοῖς ἁμαρτήμασιν, ἀντίκειται τούτῳ τὸ συγγνωστόν. Ἐπεὶ γὰρ ἡ ἁμαρτία ἀσθένειά τις ἐστὶ τῆς ψυχῆς, [...] καθ' ὁμοίότητα τῆς νόσου λέγεται τὸ θανάσιμον ἢ λέγεται εἶναι θανάσιμος καθόσον ἐπάγει στέρησιν ἀδιόρθωτον δι' ἀναίρεσιν τινος ἀρχῆς [...]. Καὶ διὰ τοῦτο τὰ τοιαῦτα ἁμαρτήματα θανάσιμα λέγονται ὡς ἂν ἀδιόρθωτα. Τὰ δὲ ἁμαρτήματα ἃ περὶ τὰ πρὸς τὸ τέλος ἔχει τὴν ἀταξίαν σφζομένης τῆς πρὸς τὸ ἔσχατον τέλος τάξεως, διόρθωσιν δέχεται. Καὶ ταῦτα λέγονται συγγνωστά. [...] Κατὰ τοῦτο τοίνυν τὸ θανάσιμον ἀντίκειται τῷ συγγνωστῷ, ὡς τὸ διόρθωτὸν καὶ ἀδιόρθωτον.

After this introductory remark, Scholarios proceeds to examine mortal sins. Such sins are those that corrupt the dual love owed to God and neighbour. Scholarios keeps drawing

⁴⁶ Hereafter underlines point out verbal (or other significant) textual concordances, while double underlines indicate the opposite.

⁴⁷ Some minor errors are tacitly corrected; cf. *infra* n. 201.

⁴⁸ Venezia, Biblioteca Nazionale Marciana, gr. Z 147 (coll. 1044), f. 320^{r20-21} (Diktyon 69618). Except a part of *ST*, II^a II^{ae}, Demetrios Kydones' translation of Thomas' *ST* is unedited. The *editio princeps* of the Greek translation of *ST*, I^a II^{ae} is being prepared by me under the *Thomas de Aquino Byzantinus* project (Series prima: *Thomas de Aquino Graecus*, vol. II: *Summa Theologiae*; Pars 2: pars I^a II^{ae}). For more on the *Thomas de Aquino Byzantinus* project, see J. A. DEMETRACOPOULOS, The Influence of Thomas Aquinas on Late Byzantine Philosophical and Theological Thought: À propos of the *Thomas de Aquino Byzantinus* Project, *Bulletin de philosophie médiévale* 54, 2012, p. 101-124; <http://www.labarts.upatras.gr/dimitr/index1.html>; <https://www.royalholloway.ac.uk/hellenic-institute/research/thomas.aspx> (date of access: 20/03/2018).

⁴⁹ SCHOLARIOS, *On the difference*, p. 274¹⁶⁻¹⁸.

⁵⁰ *Marc. gr. Z 147*, f. 320^{v22}-f. 321^{r4}.

from Thomas' *ST*, I^a II^{ae}, q. 88, this time from a. 2 co. Noteworthy, the *corpus* of this *articulus* is not preserved in Scholarios' *Compendium of ST*, I^a II^{ae}.⁵¹ Therefore this abbreviated version cannot be Scholarios' source. Most probably, Scholarios consulted a manuscript containing the entire text of *ST*, I^a II^{ae}.

On the difference, p. 274²⁴⁻²⁶

Καθόλου μὲν οὖν πρὸς θάνατον ἀμαρτία ἐστὶ πᾶσα ἐνέργεια τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ἐν τῇ ζωῇ ταύτῃ, ἐν ᾗ ἐνεργεῖα φθείρεται ὁ λόγος τῆς διπλῆς ἀγάπης, τῆς τῷ Θεῷ δηλονότι ὀφειλομένης καὶ τῷ πλησίον.

ST, I^a II^{ae}, q. 88 a. 2 co.⁵²

Ὅταν γὰρ ἡ θέλησις φέρεται ἐπὶ τι ὁ καθ' αὐτὸ τῇ ἀγάπῃ ἐναντιοῦται, δι' ἧς ὁ ἄνθρωπος εἰς τὸ ἔσχατον τάττεται τέλος, τότε τὸ ἀμάρτημα θανάσιμὸν ἐστὶ κατὰ τὸ ἀντικείμενον αὐτοῦ. Ὅθεν θανάσιμὸν ἐστὶν, εἴτε τῇ τοῦ Θεοῦ ἀγάπῃ ἐναντιοῦται [...] ἢ τῇ τοῦ πλησίον ἀγάπῃ...

There follows the introduction of mortal sin as a human action lacking love, within the context of the aforementioned metaphor, which ends in the following conclusion: as the body lives by the soul,⁵³ so the soul lives by love. In the same vein, as the body dies without the soul, so the soul dies without love.⁵⁴ For this reason, the entire divine law and the prophets depend upon the “two great commandments”, i. e. the commands to love God and neighbour.⁵⁵ In this respect, every law aims at the adherence of human soul to God, who is love according to the Apostle,⁵⁶ and constitutes the ultimate end and the ultimate object of desire. This teleological view of God derives clearly from Thomas' *ST*, I^a II^{ae}, q. 2 (*De his in quibus hominis beatitudo consistit*).

On the difference, p. 275⁷⁻⁸

Ὁς [i. e. ὁ Θεός] ἐστὶν [...] ἔσχατον τέλος καὶ ἔσχατον ἐφετόν.

ST, I^a II^{ae}, q. 2 a. 8 co.⁵⁷

Ἡ γὰρ μακαριότης ἐστὶ τέλειον ἀγαθόν, τὸ ποιοῦν τὴν ἔφεσιν παντάπασιν ἡρεμεῖν. ἄλλως γὰρ οὐκ ἂν ἦν ἔσχατον τέλος, εἴ τι ὑπελείπετο ἔξωθεν ἐφετόν [...]. Μόνος τοίνυν ὁ Θεός δύναται τὴν θέλησιν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου πληροῦν [...]. Ἐν μόνῳ ἄρα τῷ Θεῷ συνίσταται ἡ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου μακαριότης.

Union of human soul to the Divinity is possible only via love for God, as expressed in the obedience to His commands.⁵⁸ These commands prescribe the dual love for God and

⁵¹ SCHOLARIOS, *Compendium of ST*, I^a II^{ae}, cited n. 28, p. 104¹⁹⁻²⁰: Δεύτερον, ὅτι τὸ συγγνωστὸν καὶ τὸ θανάσιμον ἀμάρτημα διαφέρει γένει. See THOMAS, *ST*, I^a II^{ae}, q. 88 a. 2 arg. 1: Δόξειεν ἂν τὸ συγγνωστὸν καὶ τὸ θανάσιμον ἀμάρτημα μὴ διαφέρει γένει; *ibidem*, q. 88 a. 2 s. c.: Ἀλλὰ τούναντίον ὁ Αὐγουστίνος ἐν τοῖς *Περὶ τοῦ καθαρτηρίου* λόγοις ἀριθμεῖ τινὰ γένη ἀμαρτημάτων συγγνωστών, καὶ τινὰ γένη ἀμαρτημάτων θανασίμων (*Marc. gr. Z* 147, f. 321^{r27-28}, f. 321^{v10-12}). Scholarios transforms the objection of argument 1 to its opposite thesis, on the basis of the *sed contra* of the *articulus*.

⁵² *Marc. gr. Z* 147, f. 321^{v23-26}.

⁵³ For Thomas, body and soul constitute a *compositum* (viz. human), in which body functions as matter and soul as form. See THOMAS, *ST*, I^a, q. 3 a. 2 arg. 1; q. 29 a. 2 ad 3 (*Sancti Thomae Aquinatis opera omnia iussu Leonis XIII P. M. edita. IV, Pars Prima Summae Theologiae, a quaestione I ad quaestionem XLIX*, Rome 1888, p. 37, 330).

⁵⁴ SCHOLARIOS, *On the difference*, p. 274²⁶⁻³⁰.

⁵⁵ *Ibidem*, p. 275³⁻⁵. Scholarios refers to *Mt.* 22, 37-40.

⁵⁶ SCHOLARIOS, *On the difference*, p. 275⁵⁻⁷; *I Jn.* 4, 8: ὁ Θεός ἀγάπη ἐστίν.

⁵⁷ *Marc. gr. Z* 147, f. 25^{v18-25}.

neighbour, since every human action is directed a) either to God or b) directly to neighbour and thereafter indirectly to God.⁵⁹ Such a view is built upon the Thomistic order of beings: insofar as God is the primal being, every sin against humans is subject to the genus of sin against God.⁶⁰ The criterion for identifying the quality of an action is love. This specifies an action as a virtuous one, whereas its lack causes the aversion from God (viz. the ultimate end) – undoubtedly a vice. Once again, Scholarios exhibits Thomistic views.

On the difference, p. 275¹³⁻¹⁵

Καὶ εἰδοποιουμένη [i. e. πᾶσα ἐνέργεια τοῦ ἀνθρώπου] μὲν διὰ τῆς ἀγάπης ἀρετῆ ἐστὶ καὶ λέγεται· ἐστερημένη δὲ τῆς ἀγάπης, καὶ οὕτω τοῦ Θεοῦ καὶ τοῦ πλησίον ἀπεστραμμένη, ἀμαρτία καὶ πονηρία.

ST, II^a II^{ae}, q. 23 a. 8 co.⁶¹

...ἀνάγκη ἐν τοῖς ἠθικοῖς τὸ διδόν τῆ ἐνεργείᾳ τὴν πρὸς τὸ τέλος τάξιν διδόναι τούτου καὶ τὸ εἶδος καὶ τὴν μορφήν. Φανερόν δὲ [...] ὅτι διὰ τῆς ἀγάπης τάττονται πασῶν τῶν ἄλλων ἀρετῶν εἰς τὸ ἐσχάτον τέλος. Καὶ κατὰ τοῦτο αὐτὴ δίδωσι τὸ εἶδος ταῖς ἐνεργείαις πασῶν τῶν ἄλλων ἀρετῶν. Καὶ κατὰ τοῦτο λέγεται εἶναι μορφή τῶν ἄλλων ἀρετῶν· καὶ γὰρ καὶ αὐταὶ αἱ ἀρεταὶ λέγονται ἐν τῇ πρὸς τὰς εἰδοποιημένας ἐνεργείας τάξει.

ST, I^a II^{ae}, q. 72 a. 5 co.⁶²

Ὅθεν ὅταν ἡ ψυχὴ μέχρι τοσοῦτου διὰ τῆς ἀμαρτίας ἀτακτῆ ὥστε καὶ τοῦ ἐσχάτου τέλους ἀποστραφῆναι, τουτέστι τοῦ Θεοῦ, ᾧ ζῶμεν δι' ἀγάπης, τότε τὸ θανάσιμον ἀμάρτημα γίνεται.

Once the nature of mortal sin is revealed, Scholarios sets out to define its kinds in chapter 2, on the premise that the transformation of a venial sin to a mortal one is in fact its transition from potentiality to actuality within the genus of sin. This is a Thomistic view exhibited in *ST, I^a II^{ae}, q. 88 a. 6 co.* Scholarios' argument unfolds as follows: Given that every human activity may be mental, oral or corporeal, there are three kinds of vices (whether venial or mortal). The agent that actualises a potential virtue or vice defines each kind, e.g. the actions completed in mind are virtues or vices of mind. The same applies to the actions of mouth and body respectively. Still, every corporeal sin entails a certain oral one and this in turn a mental one. In the same vein, every oral sin requires a mental one. If a sin is complete in terms of its nature, it is a mortal one; otherwise it is venial. Yet, a mental sin can be either venial or mortal. Jugie has pointed out the divergence between Scholarios' text and the traditional Catholic view.⁶³ In fact, Scholarios' classification of corporeal sins according to the degree of their completeness and the relevant argumentation is based on Thomas' *ST, I^a II^{ae}, q. 72 (De distinctione peccatorum)*. Yet, Scholarios applies this model to mental and oral

⁵⁸ SCHOLARIOS, *On the difference*, p. 275⁸⁻¹⁰.

⁵⁹ *Ibidem*, p. 275¹⁰⁻¹³. Note the continuous allusion to *Mt. 22, 37-40*.

⁶⁰ THOMAS, *ST, I^a II^{ae}, q. 72 a. 4 ad 1*: ...τὸ ἀμαρτάνειν εἰς τὸν Θεόν, καθόσον ἢ πρὸς τὸν Θεὸν τάξις πᾶσαν ἀνθρωπίνην περιέχει τάξιν, ἐστὶ κοινὸν παντὶ ἀμαρτήματι (*Marc. gr. Z 147, f. 254^{v7-9}*).

⁶¹ P. A. DEMETRACOPOULOS, *Δημητρίου Κυδώνη, Θωμᾶ Ἀκυινάτου. Σοῦμμα Θεολογικῆ ἐξελληνισθεῖσα* (*Corpus Philosophorum Graecorum Recentiorum II/17A*), Athens 1980, p. 42²¹⁻²⁷.

⁶² *Marc. gr. Z 147, f. 255^{r26-28}*.

⁶³ L. PETIT, X. A. SIDERIDES, M. JUGIE, *Œuvres complètes*, IV, cited n. 3, p. XVIII.

sins, as well.⁶⁴ Apparently, Scholarios uses his source freely, not to mention that he alters Kydones' vocabulary.

On the difference, p. 275¹⁷-276⁵

...ὅπερ ἂν ἐνεργήσειεν ἄνθρωπος ἐν τῇ ζωῇ ταύτῃ ἢ νόημά ἐστιν, ἢ λόγος, ἢ ἔργον· [...] πᾶσα κακία, [...], ἢ ἐν τῷ νοήματι ἐστίν, ἢ ἐν τῷ λόγῳ, ἢ ἐν τῷ ἔργῳ, ὥστε καὶ ἡ διαφορὰ τῶν συγγνωστῶν καὶ θανάσιμων ἁμαρτημάτων διὰ τῶν τριῶν τούτων διέρχεται· πᾶν γὰρ ἁμάρτημα θανάσιμον ἢ τῆς διανοίας ἐστίν, ἢ τῆς γλώττης, ἢ τοῦ σώματος· ὁμοίως δὲ καὶ ἅπαν συγγνωστόν. Ἐπεὶ δὲ τῶν ἀνθρωπίνων ἐνεργειῶν αἱ μὲν τελειοῦνται ἐν τῇ διανοίᾳ, ὅπου καὶ φύονται τὴν ἀρχὴν, αἱ δὲ, ἀρχόμεναι ἐν τῇ διανοίᾳ, ὡς εἰκός, τελειοῦνται ἐν τῇ γλώττῃ, αἱ δὲ τελειοῦνται διὰ τοῦ σώματος, εὐλόγως πᾶσαι λαμβάνουσι τὸ εἶδος καὶ τὴν ἐπωνυμίαν ἐξ ἐκείνου τοῦ μέρους ἐν ᾧ τελειοῦνται. [...] καὶ διὰ τοῦτο πᾶσα πρὸς θάνατον ἁμαρτία, ὡσαύτως δὲ καὶ συγγνωστή, ἢ τῆς ψυχῆς ἐστίν, ἢ τῆς γλώττης, ἢ τοῦ σώματος. Προϋποτίθησι δὲ τὸ μὲν ἁμάρτημα τοῦ σώματος ἁμαρτίαν τινὰ ἐν τῇ γλώττῃ καὶ ἐν τῇ ψυχῇ· τὸ δὲ ἁμάρτημα τῆς γλώττης ὁμοίως προϋποτίθησιν ἁμαρτίαν τινὰ ἐν τῇ ψυχῇ, οὐ μὴν τὸ ἀνάπαλιν· καὶ διὰ τοῦτο ἡ τις ἁμαρτία πέφυκε τελειοῦσθαι διὰ τοῦ σώματος, ἐὰν θανάσιμος ᾖ, [...], ἐν μὲν τῷ ἔργῳ ἐστὶ θανάσιμος· μὴ προβᾷσα δὲ καὶ εἰς ἔργον, ἀλλὰ μέχρι τῆς γλώττης προσελθοῦσα ἀπὸ τῆς διανοίας, ἐστὶ συγγνωστή· ἢ δὲ διὰ τῆς γλώττης τελειουμένη ἐν μὲν τῷ λόγῳ ἐστὶ θανάσιμος· μὴ προβᾷσα δὲ καὶ εἰς λόγον ἀλλ' ἐν τῇ διανοίᾳ μείνασα μόνον, συγγνωστή ἐστίν· ἢ δὲ ἐν ψυχῇ μόνῃ τελειοῦσθαι δυναμένη, ἐν αὐτῇ τῇ ψυχῇ μόνῃ θανάσιμός ἐστι.

ST, I^a II^{ae}, q. 72 a. 7 s. c.⁶⁵

...τρία εἰσὶ καθόλου ἁμαρτήματα οἷς τὸ ἀνθρώπινον ὑπόκειται γένος· ἢ γὰρ λογισμῶ ἢ λόγῳ ἢ ἔργῳ ἁμαρτάνομεν.

ST, I^a II^{ae}, q. 72 a. 7 co.⁶⁶

Οὕτω τοίνυν εἰς τὰ τρία ταῦτα διαιρεῖται ἡ ἁμαρτία, τουτέστι τὸ τῆς καρδίας, τοῦ στόματος καὶ τοῦ ἔργου οὐχ ὡς εἰς διάφορα καὶ τετελεσμένα εἶδη· ἢ γὰρ τῆς ἁμαρτίας συμπλήρωσις ἐν τῷ ἔργῳ ἐστίν· ὅθεν τὸ τοῦ ἔργου ἁμάρτημα ἔχει τὸ τετελεσμένον εἶδος. Ἡ δὲ πρώτη τούτου ἀρχὴ ὡσπερ τις θεμελίος ἐστίν ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ. Ὁ δὲ δεῦτερος τούτου βαθμός ἐστίν ἐν τῷ στόματι, καθόσον ὁ ἄνθρωπος ῥαδίως προάγεται πρὸς τὸ δημοσιεύειν τὸν τῆς ἑαυτοῦ καρδίας λογισμὸν. Ὁ δὲ τρίτος βαθμός ἐστίν ἐν τῇ συντελείᾳ τοῦ ἔργου. Καὶ οὕτω τὰ τρία ταῦτα διαφέρουσι κατὰ τοὺς διαφορούς τῆς ἁμαρτίας βαθμούς. Φανερόν μέντοι τὰ τρία ταῦτα εἰς ἐν εἶδος ἁμαρτίας τέλειον ἀνήκειν διὰ τὸ ἀφ' ἐνὸς κινητικοῦ προΐεναι.

ST, I^a II^{ae}, q. 88 a. 6 co.⁶⁷

...τὸ συγγνωστὸν καὶ θανάσιμον διαφέρουσιν ὡσπερ τέλειον καὶ ἀτελές ἐν τῷ τοῦ ἁμαρτήματος γένει. Τὸ δὲ ἀτελές προσθήκη δύναται ἐλθεῖν εἰς τὴν τελειότητα. Ὅθεν καὶ τὸ συγγνωστὸν διὰ τοῦ προστίθεσθαι τούτῳ αἰσχρός τι εἰς τὸ γένος ἀνήκον τοῦ θανάσιμου ἁμαρτήματος γίνεται θανάσιμον, ὡσπερ ὅταν τις λέγῃ λόγον ἀργόν, ἐφ' ᾧ πορνεῦσαι.

⁶⁴ Cf. ST, I^a II^{ae}, q. 72 a. 7 ad 3: Ἡ τῆς καρδίας ἁμαρτία καὶ τοῦ στόματος οὐ διακρίνονται τῆς ἁμαρτίας τοῦ ἔργου, ὅταν ὡς ἅμα συνεζευγμένα, ἀλλὰ καθόσον τούτων ἕκαστον εὐρίσκεται καθ' αὐτό (Marc. gr. Z 147, f. 257¹⁹⁻²¹).

⁶⁵ Marc. gr. Z 147, f. 256^{v24-25}.

⁶⁶ Ibidem, f. 256^{v31}-f. 257^{r7}.

⁶⁷ Ibidem, f. 324^{v17-20}.

Still, the mental sin needs some elucidation. Therefore in chapter 3, Scholarios defines three grades of mental sins: the first grade is the birth of a sinful thought in the soul; the second is the fight of this thought against human mind, as the relevant passion⁶⁸ (viz. ἡδονῆ in Kydones' text) ignites this thought. These grades constitute a venial sin. The third grade is the consent to the actualisation of the relevant vice. This is a mortal sin, e.g. when a human assents to perform fornication. The application of this gradual model to mental sins, as well as the example of fornication are clearly Thomistic.

On the difference, p. 276⁶⁻¹²

Ἐπεὶ γὰρ τὸ πονηρὸν καὶ ἐμπαθὲς νόημα ἐν τῇ ψυχῇ ἄρχεται μὲν ἐν τῷ προσβάλλειν, προβαίνει δὲ ἐν τῷ παλαίειν τὸν λογισμὸν μετὰ τοῦ πάθους, τελειοῦται δὲ ἐν τῇ συγκαταθέσει, ἐν τῇ συγκαταθέσει μόνῃ ἐστὶ θανάσιμον τὸ τῆς διανοίας ἀμάρτημα· ἐν δὲ τῇ πάλῃ ἢ τῇ προσβολῇ συγγνωστόν ἐστι· παραδείγματος χάριν, ἡ πορνεία φύεται μὲν πρῶτον ἐν τῇ τῆς διανοίας συγκαταθέσει.

ST, I^a II^{ae}, q. 72 a. 7 ad 1⁶⁹

Πρὸς τὸ πρῶτον τοίνυν λεκτέον· πᾶν ἀμάρτημα καρδίας κοινωνεῖ ἐν τῷ λόγῳ τοῦ λανθάνοντος, καὶ κατὰ τοῦτο κεῖται εἰς βαθμὸς. Ὅς εἰς τρεῖς βαθμοὺς διαιρεῖται, τουτέστι λογισμοῦ, ἡδονῆς καὶ συγκαταθέσεως.

ST, I^a II^{ae}, q. 74 a. 8 co.⁷⁰

Τὸ δὲ λογιζόμενόν τινα περὶ πορνείας ἡδεσθαι ἐπ' αὐτῇ τῇ ἐνεργείᾳ περὶ ἧς ἐλογίζετο συμβαίνει⁷¹ ἐκ τοῦ τὴν ἐκείνου διάθεσιν ἐπὶ ταύτην τὴν ἐνέργειαν ῥέπειν. Ὅθεν τό τινα τῇ ἡδονῇ ταύτῃ συγκατατίθεσθαι οὐδὲν ἄλλο ἐστὶν ἢ συγκατατίθεσθαι τῷ τὴν αὐτοῦ διάθεσιν ῥέπειν ἐπὶ τὴν πορνείαν [...]. Ὅθεν ἡ τοιαύτη πρὸς τὸ θανάσιμον ἀμάρτημα συγκατάθεσις θανάσιμόν ἐστιν ἀμάρτημα...

The example of fornication is further explained and followed by more examples: mendacity, blasphemy, pride, and envy. All these sins may be either venial or mortal, depending on the grade of actualisation of each vice.⁷² As a conclusion, Scholarios reiterates Thomas' theses:⁷³ a) mortal sin consists of the corruption of love for either God or neighbour, or both, and b) a sin is mortal, only if the natural agent actualizes the relevant vice in its perfect form.⁷⁴

Still, the relation of love for God and for neighbour has to be deciphered. Thus, in chapter 4, Scholarios asserts that love for God can be independent from love for neighbour. On the contrary, love for neighbour always includes love for God, given that it constitutes one of the divine commands. This view in conjunction with the allusion to the second

⁶⁸ Aquinas attributes a significant role to passions. If passions are subject to reason, they contribute to morally good actions; otherwise, they urge humans to commit sin. In this respect, passions define the morality of actions (ST, I^a II^{ae}, 24 a. 3 co., in *Sancti Thomae Aquinatis opera omnia iussu Leonis XIII P. M. edita*. VI, *Prima Secundae Summae Theologiae, a quaestione I ad quaestionem LXX*, Rome 1891, p. 181; cf. R. MINER, *Thomas Aquinas on the Passions*, cited n. 22, p. 91-92).

⁶⁹ *Marc. gr.* Z 147, f. 257^{r10-12}.

⁷⁰ *Ibidem*, f. 272^{r31}-f. 272^{v6}.

⁷¹ συμβαίνειν codex, correxi.

⁷² SCHOLARIOS, *On the difference*, p. 276¹²⁻²⁷.

⁷³ THOMAS, ST, I^a II^{ae}, q. 72 a. 7 co. and q. 88 a. 6 co.; q. 88 a. 2 co.

⁷⁴ SCHOLARIOS, *On the difference*, p. 276²⁷⁻³⁰.

command⁷⁵ derives from Thomas' relevant argumentation on the dual love in *ST, II^a II^{ae}, q. 27 a. 8 (Utrum sit magis meritorium diligere proximum quam diligere eum)*.

*On the difference, p. 276*³¹⁻³⁴

...ἢ μὲν ἀγάπη τοῦ Θεοῦ κεχώρισται ποτε τῆς τοῦ πλησίον ἀγάπης κατ' ἐνέργειαν, εἰ καὶ μὴ ἐν τῇ διαθέσει· ἢ δὲ τοῦ πλησίον ἀγάπη, κατὰ νόμον οὔσα, οὐδέποτε τῆς πρὸς Θεὸν ἀγάπης κεχώρισται.

*ST, II^a II^{ae}, q. 27 a. 8 co.*⁷⁶

...ἢ τοῦ πλησίον ἀγάπη περιλαμβάνει ἐν ἑαυτῇ καὶ τὴν θεϊαν ἀγάπην, ἢ δὲ τοῦ Θεοῦ ἀγάπη οὐ περιέχει τὴν τοῦ πλησίον. [...] ταύτην γὰρ ἔχομεν τὴν ἐντολὴν παρὰ τοῦ Θεοῦ, ἵνα ὁ τὸν Θεὸν ἀγαπῶν ἀγαπᾷ καὶ τὸν ἀδελφὸν αὐτοῦ (= *I Jn. 4, 21*).

By the same token, Scholarios utilised this view in his sermon *On almsgiving, 2, 35-39*, in order to demonstrate the great significance of love for neighbour.⁷⁷

καὶ ταύτης [i. e. τῆς ἀγάπης] εἰς δύο μεριζομένης, εἰς τε τὴν τοῦ Θεοῦ καὶ τοῦ πλησίον, ἢ τοῦ πλησίον μείζων ἐστίν· αὕτη γὰρ καὶ τὴν εἰς τὸν Θεὸν ἀγάπην προὑποτίθησιν· ὁ γὰρ τὸν πλησίον ἀγαπῶν νόμον καὶ ἐντολὴν πληροῖ τοῦ Θεοῦ, ὁ δὲ τὰς ἐντολὰς τηρῶν τοῦ Θεοῦ, τὸν Θεὸν ἀγαπᾷ.⁷⁸

Accordingly, certain actions express only love for God (e.g. fasting, chastity, and prayer for oneself),⁷⁹ whereas the alms deeds integrate love for neighbour as well. Scholarios keeps drawing from the same source, this time from q. 32 a. 4 (*Utrum eleemosynae corporales habeant effectum spiritualem*).

*On the difference, p. 277*⁵⁻⁹

Ἡ δὲ ἐλεημοσύνη, καρπὸς οὔσα τῆς πρὸς τὸν πλησίον ἀγάπης ἀμέσως, οὐδὲν ἔλαττον καὶ τὴν πρὸς τὸν Θεὸν ἀγάπην πληροῖ, καθόσον δηλονότι καὶ τῷ περὶ ἐλεημοσύνης τοῦ Θεοῦ νόμῳ δουλεύει ὁ τὴν ἀρετὴν ταύτην ποιῶν καὶ ἄλλοις πλείοσι τρόποις.

*ST, II^a II^{ae}, q. 32 a. 4 co.*⁸⁰

...ἢ σωματικὴ ἐλεημοσύνη [...] δύναται θεωρεῖσθαι κατὰ τὴν αἰτίαν αὐτῆς, καθόσον δηλονότι τὴν σωματικὴν ἐλεημοσύνην δίδωσί τις διὰ τὴν τοῦ Θεοῦ καὶ τοῦ πλησίον ἀγάπην· καὶ κατὰ τοῦτο φέρει καρπὸν πνευματικὸν [...].

Alms deeds are more significant than fasting, since the latter expresses only love for God, but not for neighbour.⁸¹ Consequently, when in doubt, one should choose the more virtuous among two actions, i. e. the one that expresses the dual love. In this respect, we neglect fasting and praying in favour of giving alms deeds or doing justice. Scholarios echoes Thomas' exposition of the conditions on which one may break the fast, in *ST, II^a II^{ae}, q. 147 (De ieiunio)*. Noteworthily, Scholarios draws from a. 4 ad 3, a passage that is not preserved in

⁷⁵ *Mt. 22, 39; I Jn. 4, 21.*

⁷⁶ P. A. DEMETRACOPOULOS, *Θωμᾶ Ἀκυινάτου. Σοῦμμα Θεολογική*, cited n. 61, p. 144¹⁵⁻²⁰.

⁷⁷ J. A. DEMETRACOPOULOS, *Scholarios' On Almsgiving*, cited n. 18, p. 152, n. 115; 163.

⁷⁸ L. PETIT, X. A. SIDERIDES, M. JUGIE, *Œuvres complètes*, I, cited n. 7, p. 93¹⁵⁻¹⁹.

⁷⁹ SCHOLARIOS, *On the difference*, p. 277¹⁻⁵.

⁸⁰ P. A. DEMETRACOPOULOS, *Θωμᾶ Ἀκυινάτου. Σοῦμμα Θεολογική*, cited n. 61, p. 193²³⁻¹⁹⁴.

⁸¹ SCHOLARIOS, *On the difference*, p. 277¹⁰⁻¹¹.

Paris, BNF, gr. 1237 (Diktyon 50844),⁸² his own manuscript of *ST*, II^a II^{ae}. This indicates that Scholarios draws material from another manuscript, most probably one that preserves the entire text of *ST*, II^a II^{ae}.

***On the difference*, p. 277¹¹⁻¹⁸**

...χρείας παρισταμένης ποτὲ πληροῦν τὴν μείζονα ἀρετῆν, παρατεῖσθαι συγχωρούμεθα τὴν ἐλάττω, ἐάν μὴ δυνατὸν ἤ καὶ ἄμφω τελείως πληροῦν. κάν μὴ οὕτω ποιῶμεν, [...] διὰ τὸ παριδεῖν τὴν μείζω κατακρινόμεθα. παραβαίνομεν γὰρ τὴν νηστείαν καὶ τὴν προσευχὴν ποτὲ καὶ τὰ τοιαῦτα ὑπὲρ τοῦ πληρῶσαι ἐλεημοσύνην καὶ δικαιοσύνην τότε, ἢ ἄλλην τινὰ ἀρετῆν ἧτινι συνέζευκται ἢ πρὸς τὸν πλησίον ἀγάπη.

***ST*, II^a II^{ae}, q. 147 a. 4 ad 3⁸³**

Εἰ δ' ἀνάγκη ἐπίκειται [...], ἢ καὶ διὰ τι ἀναγκαῖον πρὸς τὰ πνευματικά, οἷς ἄμα ἀδύνατον καὶ τὰς τῆς Ἐκκλησίας νηστείας τηρεῖσθαι, οὐκ ἐνοχος γίνεται τις νηστεύειν. οὐ γὰρ τῆς νομοθετοῦσης Ἐκκλησίας νηστεύειν τοῦτον εἶναι σκοπόν, τὸ διὰ τῶν νηστειῶν κωλύειν ἄλλας εὐσεβεῖς καὶ ἀναγκαϊοτέρας αἰτίας. Δεῖ μέντοι ἐν τοῖς τοιούτοις ἀνατρέχειν εἰς τὴν τοῦ ὑψηλοτέρου οἰκονομίαν...

Subsequently, Scholarios proceeds to examine the opposite vices under the scope of their aversion from love, since this aspect defines the gravity of each vice. For example, gluttony opposes love for God, whereas injustice and obtuseness to mercy, which are opposed to alms deeds, constitute an aversion from love for God and neighbour; therefore, they are more severe than gluttony. In other words, sins against neighbour are much graver than sins against God,⁸⁴ given that to Thomas and Scholarios, as already seen, love for neighbour includes love for God.⁸⁵

Scholarios justifies this a) by restating Thomas' thesis that love for God may exist independently from love for neighbour, while love for neighbour entails love for God;⁸⁶ b) by noting that reconciliation with God via penitence is much easier than with neighbour, because the latter requires the recompense for the injustice. In fact, Scholarios considers Thomas' doctrine of satisfaction⁸⁷/recompense for sin, as unfolded in *ST*, I^a II^{ae}, 87 a. 6 co. Noteworthy, Scholarios uses the term *ἀντισήκωσις* for *recompensatio*. So reads Demetrios Kydones' translation⁸⁸ – another indication that Scholarios draws his material from the Greek text of Thomas.

***On the difference*, p. 277²⁸-p. 278²**

...ἀλλὰ καὶ ὅτι μετανοήσαντος τοῦ ἀνθρώπου καὶ ἐπιστραφέντος ἀπὸ ἐνεργείας μένει ἢ ἐνοχῆ ἐν πᾶσι τοῖς

***ST*, I^a II^{ae}, q. 87 a. 6 co.⁸⁹**

...παυσαμένης τῆς τοῦ ἁμαρτήματος

⁸² An abbreviated version of *ST*, II^a II^{ae}, q. 147 a. 4 is preserved in f. 273^{v10-16}.

⁸³ Vaticano, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, Vat. gr. 611 (Diktyon 67242), f. 51^{v38}-f. 52^{r4}.

⁸⁴ SCHOLARIOS, *On the difference*, p. 277¹⁸⁻²⁵.

⁸⁵ THOMAS, *ST*, II^a II^{ae}, q. 27 a. 8 co. For the text, see *supra* n. 76.

⁸⁶ SCHOLARIOS, *On the difference*, p. 277²⁵⁻²⁸.

⁸⁷ For the use of the term "satisfaction" by several authors of the medieval-early modern world, see A. FIREY, *A New History of Penance* (Brill's Companions to the Christian Tradition 14), Leiden-Boston 2008, *passim*.

⁸⁸ *Marc. gr. Z* 147, f. 318^{r7-8, 11, 19}.

⁸⁹ *Ibidem*, f. 318^{r5-21}.

τῆς ἀγάπης τοῦ ἁμαρτάνειν πρὸς τὴν θείαν ἀγάπην, ἢ μὲν φθορὰ τῆς πρὸς τὸν Θεὸν ἀγάπης ῥαδίως θεραπεύεται τῇ ἀγαθότητι τοῦ Θεοῦ ἐν ὀλίγῳ τε δηλονότι χρόνῳ καὶ εὐκόλοις ἀντισηκώσεσιν· ἢ δὲ φθορὰ τῆς πρὸς τὸν πλησίον ἀγάπης οὐκ εὐχερῶς θεραπεύεται. Ἡ μὲν γὰρ θεία ἀγαθότης τὴν ἐπιστροφὴν μόνην τοῦ ἡμαρτηκότου σκοπεῖ ἐν τῷ μισῆσαι μὲν τὴν ἁμαρτίαν, ἀγαπῆσαι δὲ τὸν Θεὸν θερμότεροις ἔργοις ἀγάπης συνισταμένην· ἢ δὲ θεία δικαιοσύνη, τῶν εἰς τὸν πλησίον ἁμαρτημάτων ἐπίσκοπος οὔσα, οὐ τοῦτο μόνον σκοπεῖ, ἀλλὰ καὶ τὴν ἱκανοποίησιν τοῦ ἀδικηθέντος· [...] διὸ καὶ ἀδύνατόν ἐστι τὸν ἀδικήσαντα τὸν πλησίον συγγνώμης τυχεῖν μετανοήσαντα, ἂν μὴ πρότερον ἱκανοποιήσῃε τῷ ἀδικηθέντι...

κατ' ἐνέργειαν ἁμαρτήμασιν. Ἡ γὰρ τοῦ ἁμαρτήματος ἐνέργεια ἐνοχον ποιεῖ τὸν ἄνθρωπον τιμωρίας, καθόσον παραβαίνει τὴν τάξιν τῆς θείας δικαιοσύνης, εἰς ἣν οὐκ ἐπάνεισιν ἄνευ τινὸς ἀντισηκώσεως διὰ τιμωρίας, ἥτις πρὸς τὴν τῆς δικαιοσύνης ἰσότητα ἐπανάγει [...]. Ὁ δὲ καὶ ἐν ταῖς εἰς ἀλλήλους ἀδικίαις τῶν ἀνθρώπων τηρεῖται, ὥστε δι' ἀντισηκώσεως τῆς τιμωρίας ἐπανασφῆσθαι τὴν ἰσότητα τῆς δικαιοσύνης. [...] Ὅθεν τὴν τῆς ἁμαρτίας κηλῖδα ἀναιρεθῆναι ἀδύνατον, εἰ μὴ τὴν τάξιν τῆς θείας δικαιοσύνης ἢ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου προσδέξαιτο θέλησις, ὥστε δηλονότι ἢ αὐτὸν ἐκόντα τὴν τιμωρίαν ἀναλαβεῖν εἰς τὴν τῆς γενομένης ἁμαρτίας ἀντισηκώσιν ἢ παρὰ τοῦ Θεοῦ ἐπενεχθεῖσαν ὑπομείνειε μακροθύμως· καθ' ἑκάτερον γὰρ τρόπον ἢ κόλασις λόγον ἀντισηκώσεως ἔχει. Ἡ δὲ ἱκανοποιητικὴ τιμωρία ἐλαττοῖ τὸν λόγον τῆς τιμωρίας.

Accordingly, Scholarios numbers cases in which injustice can be restored via satisfaction, and defines in which cases this is impossible. In the latter instances, a sinner may hope for God's mercy. Afterwards, Scholarios addresses the significance of alms deeds for sinners' reconciliation with God, concluding that alms deeds replenish love for God, but not for neighbour.⁹⁰

In chapter 5, Scholarios examines the criteria by which the order of sins is defined. As will be shown, Scholarios adopts Thomas' dual classification, i. e. according to the order of gravity and the order of cardinality.⁹¹ The chapter begins in a Thomistic flavour, as the introductory formula coincides with Demetrios Kydones' translation – another indication that Scholarios' Thomistic material derives from Kydones' text.

On the difference, p. 278¹⁵

Ἐφεξῆς θεωρητέον ἂν εἶη...

*ST, I^a II^{ae}, q. 73 pr.*⁹²

Ἐφεξῆς θεωρητέον ἂν εἶη...

Scholarios remarks that the corruption of love for God may precede or follow the corruption of love for neighbour. For example, the aversion from love for God comes first in the case of adultery, since this sin is a kind of lust (*luxuria*), as is also the fornication. There follows the sin against neighbour, i. e. the usurpation of a husband/wife.⁹³ Each part of

⁹⁰ SCHOLARIOS, *On the difference*, p. 278²⁻¹³. It seems that Scholarios has still in mind THOMAS, *ST*, II^a II^{ae}, q. 32 a. 4 co. For Scholarios' recourse to the same *articulus* in his *De eleemosyna*, see J. A. DEMETRACOPOULOS, Scholarios' *On Almsgiving*, cited n. 18, p. 140-141.

⁹¹ E. C. SWEENEY, Aquinas on the Seven Deadly Sins, cited n. 4343, p. 97-98.

⁹² *Marc. gr.* Z 147, f. 258^{v10}.

⁹³ SCHOLARIOS, *On the difference*, p. 278¹⁵⁻²¹.

Scholarios' argument echoes specific Thomistic passages; namely *ST*, II^a II^{ae}, q. 151 pr.;⁹⁴ q. 154 a. 1 arg. 1;⁹⁵ I^a II^{ae}, q. 72 a. 2 ad 4.⁹⁶ On the contrary, stealing money corrupts love for neighbour first and consequently love for God.⁹⁷

For Thomas and Scholarios the first criterion for defining the gravity of sins is the worth of the abstracted good. Scholarios uses Thomas' text quite freely.

On the difference, p. 278²⁴⁻²⁷

Ἐν τούτοις οὖν ἀπασιν ἢ βαρύτης κρίνεται [...] κατὰ τὸ βάρος τοῦ ἀφαιρεθέντος, ὥστε δηλονότι μείζον εἶναι ἀμάρτημα ἐν ᾧ μείζονος ἀγαθοῦ τὸν πλησίον ἀποστεροῦμεν...

ST, I^a II^{ae}, q. 73 a. 3 co.⁹⁸

...κατὰ τὴν διαφορὰν τῶν ἀντικειμένων ἐστὶ καὶ ἡ διαφορὰ τῆς βαρύτητος ἐν ταῖς ἀμαρτίαις. [...] Ὅθεν τὸ ἀμάρτημα τὸ περὶ αὐτὴν τὴν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου οὐσίαν, ὥσπερ ὁ φόνος, βαρύτερόν⁹⁹ ἐστὶ τοῦ περὶ τὰ ἐξωθεν πράγματα ἀμαρτήματος· καὶ ἐστὶ βαρύτερον τὸ ἀμέσως κατὰ τοῦ θεοῦ γινόμενον, ὥσπερ ἡ ἀπιστία καὶ ἡ βλασφημία καὶ τὰ τοιαῦτα.

Moreover, the gravity of a sin may be defined by its effect,¹⁰⁰ i. e. depending on the object of sin. For example, according to the order of cardinality, stealing is a graver sin than insobriety. However, according to the order of gravity, insobriety is greater. Stealing is just the effect of greed and as such is limited only to the abstraction of neighbour's belongings.¹⁰¹ Yet, insobriety may give birth to every sin, as it causes an intense defect of mind. Scholarios' argument is based on Thomas' *ST*, I^a II^{ae}, q. 88 a. 5 ad 1.¹⁰²

On the difference, p. 278³⁵⁻³⁷

Ἡ δὲ μέθη τῷ τῆς ἀρχῆς λόγῳ πᾶσιν ἀμαρτήμασι

ST, I^a II^{ae}, q. 88 a. 5 ad 1¹⁰³

Περὶ δὲ τῆς μέθης ῥητέον ὅτι κατὰ τὸν αὐτῆς λόγον ἔχει τὸ εἶναι θανάσιμον ἀμάρτημα· τὸ γὰρ

⁹⁴ THOMAS, *ST*, II^a II^{ae}, q. 151 pr.: Ἐφεξῆς θεωρητέον ἂν εἴη περὶ ἀγνείας. [...] τρίτον, περὶ ἀκολασίας, ὅπερ ἐστὶ πάθος ἀντικείμενον τῇ ἀγνεΐᾳ (*Vat. gr.* 611, f. 60^{v36-38}). Note that castity is a virtue serving love for God (cf. *ST*, II^a II^{ae}, q. 151 a. 2 co.: εἰ γὰρ ὁ νοῦς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ἡδοίτο πνευματικῆ συναφείᾳ συναπτόμενος ἐκείνῳ ᾧ δέον συνάπτεσθαι, ἡγουν τῷ θεῷ, ἀπέχοιτο δὲ ὥστε μὴ μεθ' ἡδονῆς τοῖς ἄλλοις συνάπτεσθαι ἐναντίως τῇ θεΐᾳ τάξῃ, λεχθήσεται πνευματικῆ ἀγνεΐα [*Vat. gr.* 611, f. 61^{v6-9}]).

⁹⁵ THOMAS, *ST*, II^a II^{ae}, q. 154 a. 1 arg. 1: ...ἀποδίδοσθαι ἐξ ἀσελγείας εἶδη, τουτέστι πορνείαν ἀπλῶς, μοιχείαν, αἰμομιξίαν, παρθένων φθοράν, ἀρπαγὴν, καὶ τὸ παρὰ φύσιν πάθος (*Vat. gr.* 611, f. 69^{r26-28}).

⁹⁶ THOMAS, *ST*, I^a II^{ae}, q. 72 a. 2 ad 4: Ἡ δὲ πλεονεξία, ἐν τοῖς σαρκικοῖς ἀμαρτήμασιν ἀριθμουμένη, ἀντὶ τῆς μοιχείας κεῖται, ἢ ἐστὶν ἄδικος ἀρπαγὴ τῆς ἀλλοτρίας γυναικός (*Marc. gr.* Z 147, f. 253^{r13-14}).

⁹⁷ SCHOLARIOS, *On the difference* p. 278²¹⁻²³; Scholarios continues alluding to THOMAS, *ST*, II^a II^{ae}, q. 27 a. 8 co. For the text, see *supra* n. 76.

⁹⁸ *Marc. gr.* Z 147, f. 260^{v24-29}.

⁹⁹ βαρύτερος codex, correxi.

¹⁰⁰ Cf. THOMAS, *ST*, I^a II^{ae}, q. 73 a. 3 co.: ...ἀνάγκη καὶ τὸ ἀμάρτημα τοσοῦτον εἶναι βαρύτερον ὅσον καὶ ἡ ἀταξία συμβαίνει περὶ τινὰ ἀρχὴν ἢ ἐστὶ πρότερον ἐν τῇ τάξει τοῦ λόγου. Ὁ δὲ λόγος πρὸς τὸ τέλος καὶ ἀπὸ τοῦ τέλους τάττει πάντα ἐν τοῖς πρακτοῖς (*Marc. gr.* Z 147, f. 260^{v19-21}).

¹⁰¹ SCHOLARIOS, *On the difference*, p. 278³¹⁻³⁵.

¹⁰² Cf. also THOMAS, *ST*, I^a II^{ae}, q. 76 a. 4 ad 4: Ὁ μεθύων διπλῆς μὲν ἐπιτιμῆσεως ἀξιοῦται δι' ἃς ποιεῖ δύο ἀμαρτίας, τουτέστι τὴν μέθην καὶ τι ἄλλο τῇ μέθῃ ἐπόμενον (*Marc. gr.* Z 147, f. 280^{v8-9}).

¹⁰³ *Marc. gr.* Z 147, f. 324^{r18-21}.

κοινωνεῖ· δύναται γὰρ ἐξ ἄνευ τινὸς ἀνάγκης τοιοῦτον ἑαυτὸν αὐτῆς ἅπαν ἁμάρτημα ἀποδεικνύναι τινὰ ὡστ' ἀδύνατον εἶναι χρῆσθαι ἀποτίκτεσθαι, καθόσον τῷ λόγῳ, δι' οὗ πρὸς θεὸν ὁ ἄνθρωπος τάττεται, ἐστὶν ἔκστασις ἰσχυροτάτη καὶ πολλὰ τῶν ἁμαρτημάτων ἐπιόντα φυλάττεται τοῦ λογισμοῦ. διὰ μόνην τὴν ἐν τῷ οἴνῳ ἡδονὴν, διαρρήδην τῆ ἀρετῆ ἐστὶν ἐναντίον.

Scholarios justifies this view by attributing every sin to a certain mental defect, when the mind succumbs to passion. This mental disorder may be intentional or unintentional. Still, insobriety is a voluntary act and as such it intentionally opens the door to every sin. Scholarios utilizes specific passages of *ST*, I^a II^{ae}, q. 77 (*De causa peccati ex parte appetitus sensitivi*).

On the difference, p. 278³⁷-279¹⁵

Ἔστι [...] πᾶν ἁμάρτημα δι' ἔκστασιν ὁμολογουμένως τοῦ λογισμοῦ, ὅταν ἐνδῶ τῷ πάθει καὶ ἠττηθῆ· ἀλλ' αὕτη ἢ ἔκστασις ὠρισταί τε πρὸς ἐν ἁμαρτήματος εἶδος οἰκεῖον τῷ κινήθῃντι καὶ κρατήσαντι πάθει, ἢ πρὸς πλειῶ μὲν, ἐκ τῆς αὐτῆς δὲ ῥίζης ἀνίσχοντα, καὶ πῆ μὲν ἐκούσιός ἐστι, πῆ δὲ ἀκούσιος· ἢ δὲ μέθη ἔκστασις μὲν ἐστὶ τελεία τοῦ λογισμοῦ τῷ θᾶττον ἐπαναφέρειν μόνῳ, τῆς χαλεπωτάτης διαφέρουσα παραφροσύνης, καὶ διὰ τοῦτο δυνατὸν ἐστὶν ἀπ' αὐτῆς παντὸς γένους ἁμάρτημα ἀποβαίνειν· ἐκούσιος δὲ καθάπαξ ἐστίν. [...] ὅθεν, εἰ καὶ τὰ διὰ τὴν μέθην ἁμαρτιανόμενα ἀκούσιά ἐστίν, ὡς ἐν ἐκστάσει τοῦ λογισμοῦ τελείως γεγεννημένα οὐχ ἠττωμένου ἀλλ' ἐφθαρμένου, τῆ γοῦν ἀρχῆ ἐκούσιά ἐστίν, ἐκούσιου τῆς ἐκστάσεως οὔσης.

ST, I^a II^{ae}, q. 77 a. 2 co.¹⁰⁴

Ἐπεὶ γὰρ ὁ ἄνθρωπος πρὸς τὸ ὀρθῶς ζῆν διπλῆ ἐπιστήμη ἰθύνεται, τουτέστι καθόλου καὶ μερικῆ, ἢ ἐκατέρας ἀσθένεια ἀρκετή ἐστὶ πρὸς τὸ κωλύειν τὴν ὀρθότητα τοῦ λόγου καὶ τῆς θελήσεως [...]. Καὶ τοῦτον τὸν τρόπον ὁ ἐν πάθει ὢν οὐ θεωρεῖ ἐν τῷ μερικῷ ὅπερ καθόλου ἐπίσταται, καθόσον τὸ πάθος κωλύει τὴν τοιαύτην θεωρίαν. [...] ὕπνος καὶ μέθη μεταβολῆ τινι σωματικῆ γενόμενα δεσμοῦσι τὴν χρῆσιν τοῦ λόγου.

ST, I^a II^{ae}, q. 77 a. 7 co.¹⁰⁵

Ὅθεν εἰ τοιοῦτόν ἐστὶ τὸ πάθος ὡστε παντελῶς ἀκούσιον εἶναι ἀποδιδόναι τὴν ἐπομένην ἐνέργειαν, παντελῶς ὑπὲρ τοῦ ἁμαρτήματος παραιτεῖται· εἰ δὲ μή, οὐ παντάπασι. Περὶ ὁ δύο δοκεῖ δεῖν θεωρηθῆναι. Πρῶτον, ὅτι τὸ ἐκούσιον δύναται εἶναι ἢ καθ' αὐτό, ὡσπερ ὅταν ἢ θέλησις ἐπ' αὐτὸ κατὰ προηγούμενον φέρηται λόγον, ἢ κατὰ τὴν αὐτοῦ αἰτίαν, ὅταν ἢ θέλησις φέρηται ἐπὶ τὴν αἰτίαν, ἀλλ' οὐκ ἐπὶ τὸ ἀποτέλεσμα, ὡσπερ ἐπὶ τοῦ ἐκουσίως μεθύοντος· κατὰ ταύτην γὰρ λογιζόμεθα ἐκεῖνῳ, τὸ διὰ τὴν μέθην γινόμενον ὑπ' αὐτοῦ. Δεύτερον, ὅτι ἐκούσιον λέγεται τι κατὰ προηγούμενον λόγον καὶ οὐχ ὡσάυτως. Κατὰ προηγούμενον μὲν λόγον, ἐφ' ὃ ἢ θέλησις φέρεται. Οὐ κατὰ προηγούμενον δὲ λόγον, ὃ δύναται κωλύειν ἢ θέλησις καὶ οὐ κωλύει. Κατὰ ταῦτα τοίνυν δεῖ διακρίνειν ὅτι τὸ πάθος ποτὲ μὲν ἐστὶ τοσοῦτον ὡστε παντελῶς ἀναιρεῖν τὴν χρῆσιν τοῦ λόγου· ὡσπερ ἐπὶ τῶν [...] μαινομένων. Καὶ οὕτως εἰ τὸ τοιοῦτον πάθος ἐξ ἀρχῆς ἐκούσιον ἦν, ἁμάρτημα λογιζόμεθα τὴν ἐνέργειαν διὰ τὸ εἶναι ἐκούσιον ἐν τῆ ἑαυτοῦ αἰτίᾳ.

¹⁰⁴ *Ibidem*, f. 282^{v7-26}.

¹⁰⁵ *Ibidem*, f. 285^{v14-26}.

The chapter ends with Scholarios' comparison of detraction and murder. Although murder is graver than detraction (order of cardinality), detraction may be worse than murder in the case of famous people (order of gravity).¹⁰⁶

This comparison makes the transition to chapter 6. Here Scholarios addresses the circumstances as a criterion for evaluating the gravity of sins. In fact, this criterion is set in Thomas' *ST*, I^a II^{ae}, q. 73 (*De comparatione peccatorum ad invicem*).

On the difference, p. 279²⁹⁻³²

...ἀλλὰ καὶ τὸ αὐτὸ εἶδος τοῦ ἁμαρτήματος ποικίλλεται κατὰ τὰς συνεζευγμένους αὐτῶν περιστάσεις, καὶ ἑαυτοῦ βαρύτερον ἢ κουφότερον γίνεται καὶ κρίνεται ἄλλη καὶ ἄλλη περιστάσει παραβαλλόμενον...

ST, I^a II^{ae}, q. 73 a. 7 co.¹⁰⁷

...τὸ ἁμάρτημα αἴτιον ἔχει ἔλλειψίν τινος περιστάσεως [...]. τὸ ἁμάρτημα πέφυκε βαρύτερον γίνεσθαι διὰ τῶν περιστάσεων.

ST, I^a II^{ae}, q. 73 a. 7 ad 1¹⁰⁸

Ὡσπερ γὰρ τὴν τοῦ πράγματος ἀρετὴν οὐκ ἐκ μόνου τοῦ εἴδους αὐτοῦ κρίνομεν, ἀλλὰ καὶ ἐξ ἄλλου τινὸς συμβεβηκότος, οὕτω καὶ τὴν τῆς ἐνεργείας πονηρίαν οὐκ ἐκ τοῦ εἴδους τῆς ἐνεργείας μόνον κρίνομεν, ἀλλὰ καὶ ἐκ τῆς περιστάσεως.

Subsequently, Scholarios provides several examples, some of which echo Thomas' text.

On the difference, p. 279³²⁻³⁵

...ὁ καταλαλῶν βαρύτερον ἁμαρτάνει, ἂν [...] καταλαλῆ [...] κατὰ ἄρχοντος, ἢ ἰδιώτου.

On the difference, p. 280⁴⁻⁷

Ὡσαύτως καὶ ἀκολασταίνων ἥτιτον μὲν ἁμαρτάνει ἄζυγος ἄζυγῶ συγγινόμενος, ὁ κυρίως πορνεία ἐστίν· βαρύτερον δὲ ὑπὸ γυναικὸς ἄζυγῶ· ἐπέκεινα δὲ ἄζυγος ὑπάνδρω, καὶ τούτου πλεον ὑπὸ γυναικὸς ὑπάνδρω, ἃ μοιχεῖαι καλοῦνται.

ST, I^a II^{ae}, q. 73 a. 9 co.¹⁰⁹

...τὸ εἰς δημόσιον πρόσωπον γινόμενον ἁμάρτημα, οἷον νόμον ἢ ἄρχοντα, τὸ τοῦ ὄλου πλήθους πρόσωπον φέροντα, βαρύτερόν ἐστιν ἢ τὸ ἁμάρτημα τὸ εἰς ἓν πρόσωπον ἰδιώτου γινόμενον...

ST, I^a II^{ae}, q. 73 a. 7 co.¹¹⁰

Ὡσπερ τὸ τῆς πορνείας ἁμάρτημα ἐν τούτῳ συνίσταται, ἐν τῷ τὸν ἄνθρωπον πλησιάζειν τῇ μὴ ἰδίᾳ, εἰ δὲ προστεθεῖ ἡ περίστασις αὕτη, τὸ ἕτερου εἶναι γυναῖκα ἐκείνην ἢ πλησιάζει, μεταγεται ἤδη εἰς ἄλλου ἁμαρτήματος γένος, τουτέστιν εἰς τὸ τῆς ἀδικίας, καθόσον ὁ ἄνθρωπος νοσφίζεται τὸ ἀλλότριον πρᾶγμα. Καὶ κατὰ τοῦτο ἡ μοιχεῖα βαρύτερόν ἐστιν ἁμάρτημα ἢ ἡ πορνεία.

¹⁰⁶ SCHOLARIOS, *On the difference*, p. 279¹⁷⁻²⁷.

¹⁰⁷ *Marc. gr. Z* 147, f. 263³⁰⁻³².

¹⁰⁸ *Ibidem*, f. 263²⁰⁻²³.

¹⁰⁹ *Ibidem*, f. 265²⁴⁻²⁶.

¹¹⁰ *Ibidem*, f. 263²⁻⁶. Cf. also *ST*, I^a II^{ae}, q. 88 a. 5 co.: Τοῦτο δὲ συμβαίνει ἐν τοῖς ἁμαρτήμασιν, ὅταν ἡ περίστασις προστιθῆ αἴσχος ἄλλου γένους, ὡσπερ ὅταν πλησιάζῃ τῇ μὴ ἑαυτοῦ, ἐστὶν ἐνέργεια αἰσχρὰ αἰσχει ἀντικειμένῳ τῇ σωφροσύνη· εἰ δὲ πλησιάζοι τῇ μὴ ἑαυτοῦ, καὶ ἕτερου προστίθεται αἴσχος ἀντικείμενον τῇ δικαιοσύνη, καθ' ἧς ἐστὶ τὸ ἀρπάζειν τινὰ τὰ ἀλλότρια· καὶ κατὰ τοῦτο ἡ τοιαύτη περίστασις συνίστησι νέον εἶδος ἁμαρτήματος, ὃ λέγεται μοιχεῖα (*Marc. gr. Z* 147, f. 323²⁵⁻²⁹).

In chapter 7, Scholarios turns to venial sins. First, he defines their essence in comparison to mortal sins, by presenting certain examples, once again on the basis of Thomas' *ST*, I^a II^{ae}, q. 88 a. 2 co. Noteworthily, the example of adultery requires the transition from an incomplete sin to its perfectiveness, as shown in *ST*, I^a II^{ae}, q. 72 a. 7 co. and q. 88 a. 6 co.,¹¹¹ whereas detraction is a sin corrupting love, which in fact means that it is a mortal sin, as stated in *ST*, II^a II^{ae}, q. 73 a. 2 co.¹¹²

***On the difference*, p. 280²⁰⁻²⁹**

Εἰ γὰρ θανάσιμόν ἐστιν ἐν ᾧ ἔφθαρται ἢ πρὸς τὸν Θεὸν ἀγάπη, ἢ πρὸς τὸν πλησίον ἅμα καὶ τὸν Θεὸν αὐτόν, συγγνωστόν ἐστιν ἐν ᾧ οὐκ ἔφθαρται αὐτή, οἷόν ἐστιν ἢ ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ μόνη μοιχεία ἐκ τοῦ ἐμβλέψαι γυναικὶ κατὰ πρόθεσιν ὥστε ἐπιθυμῆσαι, ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ συλλαμβανομένη· ἢ γὰρ πρόθεσις τοῦ πρὸς ἐπιθυμίαν ἰδεῖν σαλεύει μὲν τὴν πρὸς Θεὸν ἀγάπην, οὐκ ἐκβάλλει δὲ τῆς ψυχῆς, ὡς ἢ ἐν τῷ ἔργῳ μοιχεία. Τοιοῦτον καὶ ὁ ἀργὸς λόγος, τῷ μὲν μὴ καθαίρειν ὡς ἢ καταλαλιά, οὐκ ἀναιρῶν τὴν ἀγάπην, τῷ δὲ μὴ οἰκοδομεῖν ὑφαιρῶν τι τῆς ὀφειλομένης αὐτῇ τελειότητος.

***ST*, I^a II^{ae}, q. 88 a. 2 co.**¹¹³

Ὅταν γὰρ ἡ θέλησις φέρεται ἐπὶ τι ὁ καθ' αὐτὸ τῇ ἀγάπῃ ἐναντιοῦται δι' ἧς ὁ ἄνθρωπος εἰς τὸ ἔσχατον τάττεται τέλος, τότε τὸ ἀμάρτημα θανάσιμόν ἐστὶ κατὰ τὸ ἀντικείμενον αὐτοῦ. Ὅθεν θανάσιμόν ἐστιν, εἴτε τῇ τοῦ Θεοῦ ἀγάπῃ ἐναντιοῦται [...] ἢ τῇ τοῦ πλησίον ἀγάπῃ, ὡσπερ ὁ φόνος, ἢ μοιχεία καὶ τὰ ὅμοια. [...] Ἐνίστε δὲ ἡ τοῦ ἀμαρτάνοντος θέλησις φέρεται ἐπ' ἐκεῖνο ὅπερ ἐν ἑαυτῷ περιέχει ἀταξίαν τινά, οὐ μὴν ἐναντιουμένην τῇ τοῦ Θεοῦ ἢ τῇ τοῦ πλησίον ἀγάπῃ, ὡσπερ ὁ ἀργὸς λόγος...

A close parallel to this passage is spotted in Scholarios' *On the Destiny of Souls and Bodies*,¹¹⁴ 3, 1-8. Scholarios bolsters his argumentation by making a reference to the satisfaction of divine justice.¹¹⁵

Ἐπεὶ δ' οὐκ ὀλίγοι τῶν ἀνθρώπων πρὸς θάνατον μὲν ἀμαρτήμασιν οὐκ ἐντελευτῶσι, δι' ἃ καὶ ὑπὸ γῆν ἂν ἐφέροντο εὐθύς, συγγνωστοῖς δὲ κωλύμασι τῆς αἰωνίου ζωῆς ἐνέχονται· ταῦτα δ' ἂν εἴη ἢ ἐν τῷ γένει αὐτῶν συγγνώμης ἄξια πταίσματα, ὡσπερ ὁ ἀργὸς ἐστὶ λόγος, καὶ ἢ ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ μοιχεία, καὶ τὰ τοιαῦτα, ἐν οἷς ὁ τῆς διττῆς ἀγάπης λόγος οὐκ ἔφθαρται τῆς τὸν ἔνδον ζωοποιούσης ἀνθρώπων, ἢ ἐνοχαι μεγίστων ἀμαρτημάτων τοῖς μετανοήσασιν μὲν καλῶς ἐπ' αὐτοῖς, οὐκ ἱκανοποιήσασιν δὲ ἐνταῦθα τῇ θεῖᾳ δικαιοσύνῃ ὑπὲρ αὐτῶν.

To get us back to the *On the difference*, Scholarios proceeds with the Thomistic examples of envy-zeal and wrath-jocose speech/lie. Zeal is a venial sin, since it falls under

¹¹¹ For the text, see n. 66 and 67.

¹¹² THOMAS, *ST*, II^a II^{ae}, q. 73 a. 2 co.: Ὅθεν ἢ καταλαλιά καθ' αὐτὴν θανάσιμόν ἐστὶν ἀμάρτημα (E. M. KALOKAIRINOU, *Δημητρίου Κυδώνη, Θωμᾶ Ἀκυινάτου. Σοῦμμα Θεολογικῆ ἐξελληνισθεῖσα* [Corpus Philosophorum Graecorum Recentiorum II/18], Athens 2002, p. 241¹⁸⁻¹⁹).

¹¹³ *Marc. gr.* Z 147, f. 321^{v23-29}.

¹¹⁴ The text is edited in L. PETIT, X. A. SIDERIDES, M. JUGIE, *Œuvres complètes*, I, cited n. 7, p. 521-531, here p. 523³³-524².

¹¹⁵ An allusion to Thomas' *ST*, I^a II^{ae}, q. 87 a. 6 co. For the text, see *supra* n. 89.

the kind of envy, yet it is confined to the lack of a desirable good. On the other hand, jocose speech/lie is a certain movement of wrath, yet it does not aim to hurt someone gravely.

On the difference, p. 280³⁰⁻³³

Τοιοῦτον ὁ φθόνος ὁ ἐπὶ τοῖς εὐτυχήμασι τοῦ πλησίον ἀνευ λύπης δριμείας καὶ μίσους ἐνοχλῶν τῇ ψυχῇ κατὰ πάροδον, ὅς καὶ ζῆλος ἰδίως κατονομάζεται. τοιοῦτον ἢ μετὰ χαριεντισμοῦ κίνησις τῆς ὀργῆς, οὐκ ἐπὶ τῷ βλάψαι ἀλλ' ἐπὶ παιδιᾷ γινομένη· τοιοῦτον τὸ παιγνιῶδες ψεῦδος.

ST, II^a II^{ae}, q. 36 a. 2 co.¹¹⁶

...ὁ φθόνος λύπη τίς ἐστὶ ἐπ' ἄλλοτρίοις ἀγαθοῖς. [...] Ἐτερον δὲ τρόπον, δύναται τις ἐπὶ τοῖς ἑτέρου ἀγαθοῖς ἄχθεσθαι, οὐχ ὅτι τις ἀγαθὸν κέκτηται, ἀλλ' ὅτι ἡμεῖς ἐνδέομεν τοῦ ἀγαθοῦ, ὅπερ ἐκεῖνος ἔχει. Καὶ τοῦτ' ἐστὶ κυρίως ὁ ζῆλος [...]. Καὶ εἰ μὲν περὶ τὰ σεμνὰ ἀγαθὰ ὁ ζῆλος οὕτως εἶη, ἐπαινείτος ἐστὶ...

ST, I^a II^{ae}, q. 88 a. 5 ad 1¹¹⁷

Εἰ δ' ἡ βλάβη εἰς ἡν ἡ τῆς ὀργῆς φέρεται κίνησις, ἐστὶ συγγνωστὸν κατὰ γένος, οἷον ὅταν τις ἐπὶ τούτῳ κατὰ τινος ὀργίζεται ὥστ' εἰπεῖν αὐτῷ βουληθῆναι λόγον τινὰ κοῦφον καὶ παιγνιῶδη, καὶ βραχὺ τοῦτον λυπῆσαι δυνάμενον, οὐκ ἐστὶ ἡ ὀργὴ θανάσιμον ἀμάρτημα...

ST, II^a II^{ae}, q. 110 a. 2 co.¹¹⁸

Κουφοτέρα δὲ γίνεται ἡ τοῦ ψεύδους ἀμαρτία, εἰ τάττοιτο πρὸς τι ἀγαθὸν ἢ ἡδύ. καὶ οὕτως ἐστὶ τὸ παιγνιῶδες ψεῦδος...

Scholarios asserts that merciful God can forgive all cases of venial sins even without recompense – a view truly alien to the Catholic tradition on sin, as pointed out by Jugie.¹¹⁹ In fact, for Scholarios, forgiveness is possible through two sacraments of the Church, namely unction and penitence, the latter being able to cure even mortal sins.¹²⁰ Certainly, penitence is effective, if it includes contrition of the heart, confession and satisfaction. Yet, in particular cases contrition is sufficient, i. e. if confession and satisfaction cannot take place. On the premise of penitence all the goods displaced by sin, as well as the lost friendship between God and man can be restored.¹²¹ Given the extensive use of Thomistic material by Scholarios, one may assume that the tripartite model of penitence, as well as the restoration of human love for God derives from Thomas' *ST*, III^a, q. 90 (*De partibus poenitentiae in generali*).

On the difference, p. 281³⁻¹³

cf. ST, III^a, q. 90 a. 2 co.¹²²

¹¹⁶ S. I. SIDERI and P. PHOTOPULOU, *Δημητρίου Κυδώνη, Θωμᾶ Ἀκυινάτου. Σοῦμμα θεολογικῆ ἐξελληνισθεῖσα* (Corpus Philosophorum Graecorum Recentiorum II, 17/B), Athens 1982, p. 54¹²-55².

¹¹⁷ *Marc. gr.* Z 147, f. 324^{r13-16}.

¹¹⁸ Vaticano, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, Vat. gr. 612 (Diktyon 67243), f. 401^{v32-34}.

¹¹⁹ M. JUGIE, *Theologia Dogmatica Christianorum Orientalium ab Ecclesia Catholica dissidentium. III, Theologiae dogmaticae Graeco-Russorum expositio de sacramentis*, Paris 1930, p. 356, n. 2.

¹²⁰ SCHOLARIOS, *On the difference*, p. 280³⁹-281⁴.

¹²¹ For Thomas, the friendship between God and man proceeds via the three theological virtues (faith, hope and charity). In terms of Aristotle's classification of friendship into utilitarian, pleasing and virtuous, Aquinas' friendship between God and man can be seen as utilitarian, as far as humans aim to be benefited by God, and virtuous, since these benefits are certain spiritual goods (D. SCHWARTZ, *Aquinas on Friendship*, cited n. 22, p. 14-16).

¹²² *Sancti Thomae Aquinatis opera omnia iussu Leonis XIII P. M. edita. XII, Tertia pars Summae Theologiae, a quaestione LX ad quaestionem XC*, Rome 1906, p. 335. *ST*, III^a was not translated into Greek, apart from four

Δραστηριώτατον δὲ καὶ κατὰ τῶν
θανασίμων ἀμαρτημάτων ἢ
μετάνοια φάρμακον, ἂν ἀληθῆς ᾖ
καὶ βεβαία ἐν συντριβῇ καρδίας
καὶ ἐξαγορεύσει καὶ
ἱκανοποιήσει συνισταμένη. Ὅπου
δὲ ὁ θάνατος ἐπιών, ἢ ἄλλη τις
ἀνάγκη τὴν ἐξαγόρευσιν καὶ τὴν
ἱκανοποίησιν εἴργει, ἢ τῆς
καρδίας συντριβῆ ἐξαρκεῖ ἀληθῆς
οὔσα. [...] τούτων [i. e. τῶν
ἀμαρτιῶν] δὲ ἀφιεμένων,
ἀναλαμβάνονται πάντα τὰ ἀγαθὰ
τὰ διὰ τῆς ἀμαρτίας ἀπολωλότα
πρότερον καὶ ἀναχωρήσαντα. Καὶ
ἐπειδὴ, τῆς ἀμαρτίας
ἐνεργουμένης, γίνεται μὲν
ἐχθρὸς τοῦ Θεοῦ ὁ ἄνθρωπος· οὐ
γὰρ οἷόν τε ὁμοῦ τῆς ἀμαρτίας
εἶναι φίλον καὶ τοῦ Θεοῦ.

...in poenitentia fit recompensatio offensae secundum
voluntatem peccantis, et secundum arbitrium Dei, in quem
peccatur; quia [...] quaeritur [...] magis reconciliatio
amicitiae, quod fit dum offendens recompensat secundum
voluntatem eius quem offendit. [...] Et ideo contritio,
confessio et satisfactio ponuntur partes poenitentiae.

cf. *ST*, III^a, q. 90 a. 2 ad 4¹²³

...ad perfectionem tamen poenitentiae requiritur et contritio
cordis, et confessio oris, et satisfactio operis.

Nevertheless, Scholarios had gained no access to *ST*, III^a/*Supplementum*,¹²⁴ as he remarks in his autograph note in manuscript Hagion Oros, Monê Batopediou, 254 (Diktyon 18398), f. 1^v.¹²⁵

4. Ἐν δὲ τῷ τετάρτῳ καὶ τελευταίῳ [i. e. III^a and *Supplementum*]¹²⁶ τῆς τοιαύτης πραγματείας "περὶ τοῦ" Θεοῦ θεωρεῖ, "ὅς, καθόσον ἐστὶν ἄνθρωπος, ὁδός ἐστὶν ἡμῖν τῆς ἐπὶ τὸν Θεὸν ἀνόδου". Ἐν ᾧ καὶ περὶ τῆς θείας οἰκονομίας, ὡς φασι, θαυμασίως διέξεισι καὶ περὶ τῶν μυστηρίων τῆς Ἐκκλησίας καὶ κοινῶς καὶ ἰδίως.

5. Τούτων τοῖς τρισὶ μόνοις ἡμεῖς ἐνετύχομεν. Τὸ δὲ τέταρτον καὶ τελευταῖον, πολλὰ σπουδάσαντες, οὐκ ἠδυσήθημεν ἰδεῖν οὔτε ἐλληνικῶς (δοκεῖ γὰρ μὴ ἠρμηνεῦσθαι)¹²⁷ οὔτε λατινικῶς, ἐπεὶ παρὰ τοῖς ἐνταῦθα Λατίνοις ἢ ὀλίγα ἢ οὐδὲν τῶν τοιοῦτων κειμηλίων εὑρίσκεται.

Scholarios devoted considerable effort to track down a copy of *ST*, III^a and *Supplementum*, but the results of this research seem to be limited only to a few information about the contents of these texts. Yet, Scholarios mentions that his search included the libraries of Latins; no doubt, that of the Dominicans of Pera was essential (if not the unique

quaestiones, which were translated by Prochoros Kydones (J. A. DEMETRACOPOULOS, Latin Philosophical Works Translated into Greek, cited n. 27 **Errore. Il segnalibro non è definito.**, p. 825).

¹²³ *Sancti Thomae opera omnia*, XII, cited n. 122, p. 336.

¹²⁴ For more on this part's inaccessibility to Scholarios, see J. A. DEMETRACOPOULOS, Scholarios' *On Almsgiving*, cited n. 18, p. 161-162.

¹²⁵ Text according to the edition of J. A. DEMETRACOPOULOS, *ibidem*, p. 173³⁻¹⁰.

¹²⁶ Thomas did not succeed to complete the *ST*, III^a by the time of his death. His disciples took over to complete his task by conducting the *Supplementum* (q. 1-99), on the basis of Thomas' *Scriptum super Sententiis* (J.-P. TORRELL, *Aquinas's Summa*, cited n. 20, p. 62).

¹²⁷ Cf. *supra* n. 122.

one) for his purpose, given that Scholarios had ties with the Dominican fraternity of Pera.¹²⁸ Therefore one may assume that the friars provided Scholarios with more information on fundamental views expounded in *ST*, III^a, as the tripartite model of penitence and its effect on humans.¹²⁹

However, Scholarios was aware of the fact that certain Scholastic authors had addressed the parts of penitence.¹³⁰ True, as C. Kappes has recently shown,¹³¹ here Scholarios rejects certain parts of Peter Lombard's tripartite penance,¹³² by reducing the necessity of confession and recompense *in extremis*, in accordance with Duns Scotus' *Ordinatio IV*, dist. 20.1.3.¹³³ In this respect, Scholarios underscores the importance of satisfaction/recompense as a basic premise on which the theory of Purgatory is developed.¹³⁴ Yet, whether he was also aware of Thomas' view on the issue remains questionable.

Afterwards, Scholarios examines the value of penitence as a remedy for sin's effects, emphasizing the need of satisfaction for the removal of its stain. In this context, Scholarios draws again from *ST*, I^a II^{ae}, q. 87 a. 6 s. c. and co.

On the difference, p. 281¹⁴⁻²⁵

τὸν αὐτὸν ῥύπον δὲ καὶ αἴσχος ἐπισύρεται τῇ ἀμαρτίᾳ ἀνάλογον, ἐπειδὴν

ST, I^a II^{ae}, q. 87 a. 6 s. c.¹³⁵

Κολάζεται τις ἄρα παρὰ θεοῦ καὶ μετὰ τὸ αὐτῷ τὴν ἀμαρτίαν συγχωρηθῆναι. Καὶ οὕτως ἡ τῆς δίκης ἐνοχῆ μένει καὶ τῆς ἀμαρτίας

¹²⁸ M.-H. BLANCHET and T. GANCHOU, Les fréquentations byzantines de Lodisio de Tabriz, dominicain de Péra († 1435) : Géorgios Scholarios, Iōannēs Chrysolōras et Théodōros Kalékas, *Byzantion* 75, 2005, p. 70-103, here p. 71-77 and 89-93; M.-H. BLANCHET, *Georges-Gennadios Scholarios*, cited n. **Errore. Il segnalibro non è definito.**, p. 302-303; cf. J. A. DEMETRACOPOULOS, Scholarios' *On Almsgiving*, cited n. 18, p. 162.

¹²⁹ Cf. Scholarios' phrase in his note above: ὧς φασι. Note that Mark Eugenikos, Scholarios' mentor, had access to certain non-translated to Greek passages of *ST*, *Suppl.* (J. A. DEMETRACOPOULOS, *Palamas Transformed. Palamite Interpretations of the Distinction between God's 'Essence' and 'Energies' in Late Byzantium*, in M. HINTERBERGER and C. SCHABEL [eds], *Greeks, Latins, and Intellectual History 1204-1500* [Recherches de théologie et philosophie médiévales. Bibliotheca 11], Leuven-Paris-Walpole 2011, p. 263-372, here p. 369, n. 327).

¹³⁰ E.g. Peter Abelard, Peter Lombard, and certain theologians in Paris towards the end of 12th c. (M. W. F. STONE, *The Care of Souls and 'Practical Ethics'*, in R. PASNAU and C. VAN DYKE, *The Cambridge History*, I, cited n. **Errore. Il segnalibro non è definito.**, p. 517-535, here p. 531, where certain bibliography is cited in n. 71-73).

¹³¹ C. KAPPES, *A Narrative for the Reception of Seven Sacraments into Orthodoxy: Peter Lombard's Sentences in Nicholas Cabasilas and Symeon of Thessalonica and the Utilization of John Duns Scotus by the Holy Synaxis, Nova et Vetera* (English Edition) 15/2, 2017, p. 465-501, here p. 495-498.

¹³² PETRUS LOMBARDUS, *Sententiae*, IV, dist. 16, 1³⁻⁴ (*De tribus in poenitentia considerantibus, scilicet compunctione, confessione, satisfactione*): "In perfectione autem poenitentiae tria observanda sunt, scilicet compunctio cordis, confessio oris, satisfactio operis" (PP. Collegii S. Bonaventurae, *Petri Lombardi Libri IV Sententiarum*. II, [Libri III et IV], Ad Claras aquas 1916², p. 839⁵⁻⁶).

¹³³ DUNS SCOTUS, *In IV Sent.*, d. 20.1.3¹⁻¹³: "Poenitentia vera, sive interior sola, sive exterior cum susceptione Sacramenti Poenitentiae sufficit ad salutem alicuius in extremis. [...] quoniam Deus semper potens est etiam in morte praemiare, quibus placet: cum ergo opus sit non hominis, sed Dei, fructuosa poenitentia, inspirare potest eam quandocunque vult sua misericordia: et per rationem patet, quia sive poenitentia interior sola per modum meriti de congruo, disponat ad iustificationem, sive Sacramentum Poenitentiae per modum Sacramenti operetur ad eandem; si ab aliquo in extremis habeatur haec, vel illa, habetur eadem ratio perceptionis gratiae, quae et in alio poenitente, et per consequens gratia percipitur, et sic salus" (L. WADDING, *Johannes Duns Scotus. Opera omnia*, IX, Hildesheim 1968 [repr.: Lyon 1639¹], p. 403¹¹⁻²³). For the value of Wadding's edition of Duns Scotus, see C. KAPPES, *A Narrative for the Reception of Seven Sacraments*, cited n. 131, p. 496, n. 130.

¹³⁴ Cf. C. KAPPES, *ibidem*, p. 495-498. For the concordance of Scholarios' specific passage to the Holy Synaxis, *Ἐκθροσις* (1452), see C. KAPPES, *ibidem*, p. 495.

¹³⁵ *Marc. gr.* Z 147, f. 318^{r1-2}.

παύηται τοῦ ἀμαρτάνειν [...]· ὁ δὲ ῥύπος μένων τῆς ἀμαρτίας τῆ ἱκανοποιήσει ἀπαλείφεται [...], τοῦ δὲ ῥύπου τῆ ἱκανοποιήσει καθαιρουμένου ἢ ἐν τῆ ζωῆ ταύτῃ ὑπ' αὐτοῦ ἢ ὕστερον διὰ τῶν τῆς Ἐκκλησίας φαρμάκων. Τὸν δὲ ἐν τῆ ἐνεργείᾳ τῆς πρὸς θάνατον ἀμαρτίας ἀποχωροῦντα τοῦ ζῆν ἀνάγκη πᾶσα μὴ μόνον τὸν ῥύπον τῆς ἀμαρτίας ἀλλὰ καὶ τὴν ἐχθραν ἐπιφερόμενον ἀπιέναι...

ἀναιρεθείσης.

ST, I^a II^{ae}, q. 87 a. 6 co.¹³⁶

Εἰ δὲ λέγοιμεν περὶ τῆς τοῦ ἀμαρτημάτος ἀναιρέσεως ὅσον πρὸς τὴν κηλῖδα, καὶ οὕτω φανερόν ὅτι ἡ τῆς ἀμαρτίας κηλῖς οὐ δύναται τῆς ψυχῆς ἀφαιρεθῆναι πλὴν διὰ τοῦ συναφθῆναι τῷ θεῷ, οὗ τῆ διαστάσει τῆ περὶ τὴν ιδίαν καθαρότητα ζημίᾳ προσεπέλασεν, ὅπερ ἐστὶν ἡ κηλῖς, καθὼς εἴρηται. [...] τὴν τῆς ἀμαρτίας κηλῖδα ἀναιρεθῆναι ἀδύνατον, εἰ μὴ τὴν τάξιν τῆς θείας δικαιοσύνης ἢ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου προσδέξαιτο θέλησις [...]· καθ' ἐκάτερον γὰρ τρόπον ἡ κόλασις λόγον ἀντισηκώσεως ἔχει.

The chapter ends with an exposition of the diverse fate of penitent and unrepentant sinners in the afterlife.¹³⁷

In chapter 8, Scholarios addresses the capital sins and their kinds, following Thomas' order of cardinality. Scholarios sets out by listing the seven capital sins in the following order: pride, envy, anger, sloth, avarice/covetousness, gluttony, and lust. From these sins springs up every other sin, just as sprouts from the root. This is in part a *verbatim* citation of *ST, I^a II^{ae}, q. 84 a. 4 arg. 1 and co.*, yet Scholarios feels free to alter slightly Kydones' terms. Noteworthy, Scholarios equates pride to vainglory in accordance with Thomas.¹³⁸

On the difference, p. 281³⁵-282¹

Ὅτι δὲ ρίζαι πάντων τῶν ἀμαρτημάτων ἐπτά· ὑπερηφανία, φθόνος, ὀργή, ἀκηδία, φιλαργυρία, γαστριμαργία καὶ ἀκολασία· καὶ πόσα μὲν εἶδη αὐτῶν ἐκάστης, πόσοι δὲ ἄπ' αὐτῶν ἀνίσχουσιν ἀμαρτημάτων βλαστοί, πάντες νέκρωσιν ἐπιφέροντες ψυχικὴν τοῖς ὑπ' αὐτῶν ἐξηπατημένοις...

ST, I^a II^{ae}, q. 84 a. 4 arg. 1³⁹

ἐπτά εἶναι πάθη κορυφαῖα, ἃ εἰσι κενοδοξία, φθόνος, ὀργή, λύπη, φιλοχρηματία, γαστριμαργία, φιληδονία...

ST, I^a II^{ae}, q. 84 a. 4 co.¹⁴⁰

κορυφαῖα πάθη λέγονται ἐξ ὧν τὰ ἄλλα ἀνίσχουσι μάλιστα κατὰ τὸν λόγον τῆς τελικῆς αἰτίας. [...] ἡ γὰρ εὐδαιμονία διηνεκές ἐστὶν ἀγαθὸν εἰς ὅπερ ἀνήκει ὑπεροχὴ τις ἢ περιφάνεια, ἧς ἐφίεται ἡ ὑπερηφανία ἢ ἡ κενὴ δόξα.

Henceforth, Scholarios exposes capital vices one by one, drawing heavily (certain times *verbatim*) from Thomas' *ST, II^a II^{ae}*. For brevity's sake, I will present just two indicative cases.¹⁴¹

¹³⁶ *Ibidem*, f. 318^{r13-20}.

¹³⁷ SCHOLARIOS, *On the difference*, p. 281²⁶⁻³³.

¹³⁸ Cf. also THOMAS, *ST, II^a II^{ae}*, q. 132 a. 4 co.: Οἱ μὲν γὰρ τιθέασιν τὴν ὑπερηφανίαν ἐν τῶν γενικῶν παθῶν, οὗτοι δὲ οὐ τιθέασιν τὴν κενοδοξίαν ἐν τοῖς γενικοῖς πάθεσιν. Ὁ δὲ Γρηγόριος ἐν τῷ τριακοστῷ πρώτῳ τῶν *Ἠθικῶν* τὴν ὑπερηφανίαν τίθησι δέσποιναν τῶν ἄλλων παθῶν, τὴν δὲ κενοδοξίαν ἄμεσον ὑπ' αὐτοῦ λεγομένην γενικὸν τίθησι πάθος· καὶ τοῦτο εὐλόγως (*Vat. gr.* 611, f. 24^{r16-20}).

¹³⁹ *Marc. gr.* Z 147, f. 307^{r11-13}.

¹⁴⁰ *Ibidem*, f. 307^{r29-v22}.

¹⁴¹ For more concordances, see the Appendix at the end of the present paper.

The first example is related to the vice of pride. According to Scholarios, pride is the root of every sin,¹⁴² giving birth to disobedience, arrogance, hypocrisy, contention, obstinacy, discord, and desire for novelties. Scholarios draws partly *verbatim* from Thomas' relevant *articulus* of *ST*, II^a II^{ae}, q. 132 (*Utrum convenienter assignetur filiae inanis gloriae*).

On the difference, p. 282⁵⁻⁷

...ιδίως δὲ ἀνίσχουσιν ἀπ' αὐτῆς [scil. τῆς ὑπερηφανίας / κενοδοξίας] καρποὶ κακιῶν οὗτοι· ἀνυποταξία, ἀλαζονεία, ὑπόκρισις, ἀκρασία, πεῖσμα, διχόνοια καὶ νεωτερισμός.

ST, II^a II^{ae}, q. 132 a. 5 arg. 1¹⁴³

...λέγεσθαι θυγατέρας τῆς κενῆς δόξης εἶναι τὴν παρακοήν, τὴν καύχησιν, τὴν ὑπόκρισιν, τὴν ἔριν, τὴν ἐνστασιν, τὴν διχόνοϊαν, τὴν τῶν καινῶν ἐλπίδα.

Noteworthy, *Paris. gr.* 1237 preserves the following list of the offspring of vainglory in the marginal note of f. 271^v: αἱ τῆς κενοδοξίας θυγατέρες εἰσὶν αὗται· παρακοή, καύχησις, ὑπόκρισις, ἔρις, ἐνστασις, νεότης, διχόνοια. Yet, as seen above, Scholarios lists *praesumptio novitatum* (νεωτερισμός / τῶν καινῶν ἐλπίς / νεότης) last, in concordance with *Vat. gr.* 611. This indicates that Scholarios draws material from a manuscript other than *Paris. gr.* 1237.

Subsequently, Scholarios numbers the offspring of pride and offers definitions of each one.¹⁴⁴ Moreover, he distinguishes four types of pride. This time he paraphrases Thomas' *ST*, II^a II^{ae}, q. 162 a. 4 co., as G. Podskalsky has remarked.¹⁴⁵ Scholarios ends by restating that all the offspring and kinds of pride constitute mortal sins.¹⁴⁶

On the difference, p. 282¹⁶⁻²¹

Εἶδη δὲ τῆς ὑπερηφανίας τέσσαρα· πρῶτον, τὸ μὴ εὐχαριστεῖν τῷ θεῷ πρεπόντως ἐπὶ τοῖς ἀγαθοῖς αὐτοῦ, ἀλλὰ νομίζειν ἀφ' ἑαυτοῦ ἔχειν αὐτά· δεύτερον, τὸ ἀπὸ θεοῦ μὲν ταῦτα νομίζειν, ἔχειν δὲ μισθὸν τῶν οἰκείων ἔργων· τρίτον, τὸ οἶεσθαι ἔχειν ἄπερ οὐκ ἔχει· τέταρτον, τὸ καταφρονεῖν τῶν ἰσῶν, ἢ βελτιόνων δι' αὐτά, καὶ μόνος δοκεῖν ἀγαθὸς εἶναι σπουδάζειν· καὶ εἰσὶ πάντα καὶ οἱ καρποὶ καὶ τὰ εἶδη θανάσιμα.

ST, II^a II^{ae}, q. 162 a. 4 co.¹⁴⁷

Καὶ τοῦτ' ἐστὶ τὸ τρίτον τῆς ὑπερηφανίας εἶδος, ὅταν τις ὁ οὐκ ἔχει ἀλαζονεύηται ἔχειν. [...] Καὶ κατὰ ταῦτα λαμβάνονται αἱ πρῶται δύο ὑπερηφανίαι· ἢ ὅταν τις παρ' ἑαυτοῦ ἔχειν ὑπολαμβάνη ὅπερ ἔλαβε παρὰ τοῦ θεοῦ, ἢ ὅταν ἀνωθεν αὐτῷ δεδόσθαι τοῦτο πιστεύη μισθὸν τῶν ἰδίων ἔργων. [...] Καὶ κατὰ τοῦτο λαμβάνεται τὸ τρίτον (intel. τέταρτον) εἶδος τῆς ὑπερηφανίας, ὅπερ ἐστίν, ὅταν τις παροφθέντων τῶν ἄλλων θεατὸς σπουδάζει δοκεῖν.

The second example is related to the vice of covetousness/avarice. Scholarios sets out to justify the term “second idolatry”, attributed metaphorically to covetousness. To do so, he

¹⁴² An allusion to THOMAS, *ST*, II^a II^{ae}, q. 132 a. 4 co. For the text, see *supra* n. 138.

¹⁴³ *Vat. gr.* 611, f. 24^{v2-4}.

¹⁴⁴ SCHOLARIOS, *On the difference*, p. 282⁷⁻¹⁵. Scholarios is inspired by Thomas' relevant exposition in *ST*, II^a II^{ae}, q. 132 a. 5 co., which he uses quite freely.

¹⁴⁵ G. PODSKALSKY, *Die Rezeption*, cited n. 17, p. 311, n. 34.

¹⁴⁶ This is one more allusion to THOMAS, *ST*, I^a II^{ae}, q. 88 a. 1 co. For the text, see *supra* n. 50.

¹⁴⁷ *Vat. gr.* 611, f. 99^{r30-v3}.

draws a parallel between idols and money by alluding to *Eph. 5* via Thomas' *ST*, II^a II^{ae}, q. 118 a. 5 arg. 4.

On the difference, p. 283³⁻⁵

...ἡ φιλαργυρία εἴτουν πλεονεξία, ἥτις καὶ δευτέρα εἰδωλολατρεία ἐστίν, ἐφ' ὅσον ὁ φιλάργυρος ἀγαπᾷ καὶ θεραπεύει τὸ ἀργύριον ὡς οἱ πολύθεοι τὰ εἰδῶλα ποτέ, ἃ ἔλεγον θεοῦς.

ST, II^a II^{ae}, q. 118 a. 5 arg. 4¹⁴⁸

...ὁ ἀπόστολος ἐν τῷ ε' τῆς πρὸς Ἐφεσίους φησὶ τὴν φιλαργυρίαν δευτέραν εἰδωλολατρείαν εἶναι. Ἀλλ' ἡ εἰδωλολατρεία ἐν τοῖς βαρυτάτοις ἀμαρτήμασιν ἀριθμεῖται· ὥστε καὶ ἡ φειδωλία.

In the same vein, Scholarios enumerates seven offspring of covetousness; namely, treachery, fraud, falsehood, perjury, restlessness, violence/rapine, and insensibility to mercy. Once again, he draws *partim verbatim* from q. 118 a. 8 (*Utrum sit avaritiae filiae quae dicuntur*).

On the difference, p. 283⁵⁻¹³

Καρποὶ δὲ αὐτῆς [i. e. τῆς φιλαργυρίας]· προδοσία [...]· δόλος [...]· ἀπάτη [...]· ἐπιорκία, ταραχὴ τῆς διανοίας, βία ἡγουν ἀρπαγή, πῶρσις τῆς διανοίας πρὸς οἴκτιον.

ST, II^a II^{ae}, q. 118 a. 8 arg. 1¹⁴⁹

...εἶναι τῆς φειδωλίας θυγατέρας τὰς λεγομένας, ἡγουν τὴν προδοσίαν, τὴν δολιότητα, τὴν ἀπάτην, τὴν ἐπιорκίαν, τὴν ταραχήν, τὴν βίαν, καὶ τὴν πρὸς τὸν οἴκτιον πῶρσιν.

Scholarios concludes with some more offspring of avarice; namely (illegal) raise of prices, usury,¹⁵⁰ bribe, and theft.¹⁵¹

In chapter 9, Scholarios addresses the relation of some sins to capital sins of different genus. In fact, he keeps drawing from *ST*, II^a II^{ae}, q. 118.

On the difference, p. 283³²⁻³³

Ἰστέον δὲ ὅτι ἐνια ἄμαρτήματα ἐπικοινωνοῦσι πλείοσι ἀμαρτήμασιν...

ST, II^a II^{ae}, q. 118 a. 8 ad 1¹⁵²

...λεκτέον· οὐκ ἀνάγκη τὰς θυγατέρας τινὸς ἀμαρτήματος γενικοῦ πρὸς τὸ αὐτὸ τοῦ πάθους πρὸς τὸ τέλος ἐνὸς πάθους δυνατὸν πολλὰ τάττεσθαι ἀμαρτήματα ἄλλου γένους ὄντα.

To support this thesis, Scholarios offers several examples, some of which derive directly from Thomas' *ST*. Specifically, murder is a mortal sin, as it deprives somebody of

¹⁴⁸ *Vat. gr.* 612, f. 417^{v6-8}.

¹⁴⁹ *Ibidem*, f. 418^{v39}-f. 419^{r1}.

¹⁵⁰ For the condemnation of usury by Scholarios in his *On almsgiving* and the Thomistic passages he consulted, see J. A. DEMETRACOPOULOS, Scholarios' *On Almsgiving*, cited n. 18, p. 149-152.

¹⁵¹ SCHOLARIOS, *On the difference*, p. 283¹³⁻¹⁴. This passage echoes to a certain extent THOMAS, *ST*, II^a II^{ae}, q. 118 a. 8 ad 4: Ποτέ δὲ λέγεται τις ἀνελευθερος ἢ φειδωλὸς διὰ τὸ ὑπερβάλλειν ἐν τῷ λαμβάνειν. [...] Ἐνα μὲν τρόπον, εἰ αἰσχροῦς κερδαῖνοι ἢ τῷ φαῦλά τινα καὶ δουρικὰ ἔργα ποιεῖν δι' ἀνελευθέρων τινῶν πράξεων, ἢ διὰ τὸ μεθ' ἀμαρτίας γινομένης τισὶ πράξεσι κερδαίνειν, [...] ἢ διὰ τὸ κερδαίνειν ἐξ ἐκείνου ὃ ἔδει προῖκα δίδόναι, ὡσπερ οἱ τοκογλύφοι [...]. Ἐτερον δὲ τρόπον, εἰ ἀδίκως κερδαίνουεν ἢ τοὺς ζῶντας βιαζόμενοι, ὡσπερ οἱ λησταί... (*Vat. gr.* 612, f. 419^{v3-10}).

¹⁵² *Vat. gr.* 612, f. 419^{r30-32}.

life, the most precious good of humans.¹⁵³ At the same time, this is an action against God, since it destroys one of his creatures.¹⁵⁴ Moreover, false witness, which is a kind of fraud, springs from covetousness, yet it is sometimes related to anger, envy or lust. So does perjury.

On the difference, p. 283³⁸-284² ST, II^a II^{ae}, q. 118 a. 8 ad 3¹⁵⁵

Ωσαύτως ἢ τὸ μὲν ψεῦδος καὶ ἡ ψευδομαρτυρία περιέχεται ὑπὸ
ψευδομαρτυρία τὴν ἀπάτην.
 προηγουμένως μὲν ἐκ Cf. also **ST, II^a II^{ae}, q. 118 a. 8 arg. 1¹⁵⁶** and **ST, II^a II^{ae}, q. 118**
τῆς πλεονεξίας **a. 8 ad 1¹⁵⁷**.
 ἀνίσχει, ἔχει δὲ ποτε
 συνημμένην καὶ τὴν
 ὀργὴν ἢ τὸν φθόνον ἢ
 τὴν ἀκολασίαν. Καὶ ἡ
ἐπιорκία ὁμοίως.

In the same vein, adultery falls under the genus of lust (*luxuria*); yet, it is also a certain kind of rapine or theft, which falls under the genus of covetousness. Scholarios recalls specific Thomistic passages.

On the difference, p. 284²⁻⁴ ST, II^a II^{ae}, q. 154 a. 8 s. c.¹⁵⁸

Καὶ ἡ μοιχεία κατὰ τὸ γένος μὲν ἐστὶν ἄκολασία, ἔχει δὲ συνεζευγμένην τὴν πλεονεξίαν. ἀρπαγὴ γὰρ ἐστὶν ἢ κλοπὴ. ὁθεν καὶ κλεψιγάμους τοιοῦτους καλοῦσι.
 Ἡ μοιχεία ἄρα ὠρισμένον τι εἶδος ἀσελγείας ἐστίν.
ST, II^a II^{ae}, q. 66 a. 3 co.¹⁵⁹
 ...πρὸς τὸν τῆς κλοπῆς λόγον τρία συντρέχουσιν. [...] Δεύτερον δὲ ἐστὶν ἐν τῷ τῆς κλοπῆς λόγῳ, καθὸ διακρίνεται τῶν ἄλλων ἀμαρτημάτων τῶν κατὰ τινος γινομένων προσώπου, ὡπερ τοῦ φόνου ἢ τῆς μοιχείας. καὶ κατὰ τοῦτο ἀρμόζει τῇ κλοπῇ τὸ περὶ τὰ κτήματα εἶναι. Εἰ τις γὰρ τὸ ἀλλότριον λάβοι, ὅπερ οὐ κτημὰ μέλος, ἢ ὡς πρόσωπον αὐτῷ συνημμένον, οἷον εἰ γυναῖκα ἢ θυγατέρα ἀφείλετο, οὐκ ἔχει ἴδιον λόγον κλοπῆς.
ST, II^a II^{ae}, 118 a. 4 co.¹⁶⁰
 ...φειδωλίας ἐστὶν ἀδίκως τινὰ λαμβάνειν τὰ ἀλλότρια ἢ κατέχειν, ὃ ἐστὶν ἀρπαγῆς ἢ κλοπῆς, ἃ εἰσι πρὸς θάνατον ἀμαρτήματα...

Scholarios remarks that the seven capital vices and their offspring can be cured by their opposite virtues and their offspring.¹⁶¹ The examples he offers fall mostly under Thomas' classification. It will suffice to present just two of them.

¹⁵³ SCHOLARIOS, *On the difference*, p. 283³³⁻³⁴. This echoes THOMAS, *ST*, I^a II^{ae}, q. 73 a. 3 co. For the text, see *supra* n. 98 and 100.

¹⁵⁴ SCHOLARIOS, *On the difference*, p. 283³⁴⁻³⁵.

¹⁵⁵ *Vat. gr.* 612, f. 419^{r35}.

¹⁵⁶ *Ibidem*, f. 418^{v39}-f. 419^{r1}. For the text, see *supra* n. 149.

¹⁵⁷ *Ibidem*, f. 419^{r30-32}. For the text, see *supra* n. 152.

¹⁵⁸ *Vat. gr.* 611, f. 75^{r16-17}.

¹⁵⁹ E. M. KALOKAIRINOY, *Θωμᾶ Ἀκυινάτου. Σοῦμμα Θεολογική*, cited n. 112, p. 171³⁻¹¹.

¹⁶⁰ *Vat. gr.* 612, f. 417^{r17-19}.

¹⁶¹ SCHOLARIOS, *On the difference*, p. 284¹⁰⁻¹². Thomas includes the seven deadly sins into an Aristotelian scheme, in which virtues are seen as moderate habits, whereas vices constitute habits lacking moderation (E. C. SWEENEY, *Aquinas on the Seven Deadly Sins*, cited n. 43, p. 85, 88, 90-94).

First, sobriety (or vigilance) and abstinence both oppose gluttony, since they constitute parts of temperance.

On the difference, **ST, II^a II^{ae}, q. 146 pr.**¹⁶²

p. 284¹⁵

τῆ γαστριμαργία
[viz.
ἀντίκειται]
νῆψις
ἐγκράτεια.

Ἐφεξῆς θεωρητέον ἂν εἶη περὶ τῶν εἰδικῶν μερῶν τῆς σωφροσύνης. Καὶ πρῶτον, περὶ ἐκείνων ἃ εἶσι περὶ τὰς τῶν σιτίων ἡδονάς. [...] Περὶ τὸ πρῶτον θεωρητέον ἂν εἶη περὶ τῆς ἐγκρατείας τῆς περὶ τὰ σιτία καὶ ποτά. [...] Δεύτερον, περὶ τῆς ἐνεργείας αὐτῆς, ἣ ἐστὶ νηστεία. Τρίτον, περὶ τοῦ ἀντικειμένου ταύτη πάθους, ὅπερ ἐστὶν ἡ γαστριμαργία.

ST, II^a II^{ae}, q. 149 a. 2 s. c.¹⁶³

...ὁ Μακρόβιος τίθησι τὴν νῆψιν εἰδικὸν μέρος σωφροσύνης.

Second, subjugating desires, and purity both oppose lust.

On the difference, **p. 284**¹⁵⁻¹⁶ **ST, II^a II^{ae}, q. 151 pr.**¹⁶⁴

τῆ ἀκολασία
[viz.
ἀντίκειται]
δούλωσις
τῶν ἐπιθυμιῶν
καὶ
καθαρότης.

Ἐφεξῆς θεωρητέον ἂν εἶη περὶ [...] παρθενίας, ἣ ἐστὶ μέρος ἀγνείας. Τρίτον, περὶ ἀκολασίας, ὅπερ ἐστὶ πάθος ἀντικείμενον τῆ ἀγνεία.

ST, II^a II^{ae}, q. 151 a. 1 co.¹⁶⁵

...τὸ τῆς ἀγνείας ὄνομα εἰληπται ἐκ τοῦ τὴν ἐπιθυμίαν διὰ τοῦ λόγου σωφρονίζεσθαι.

However, once a vice is committed, penitence is the only cure. This time Scholarios modifies the tripartite model of penitence exhibited above.¹⁶⁶ In this case, humility in spirit substitutes confession as a *sine qua non* for a true confession of sins. On the other hand, satisfaction is analysed to endurance towards temptations and mercy for neighbour; both of these “tasks” must be performed within soul as well as in deeds. The result of penitence is threefold: reconciliation with God, forgiveness of sin and grace for the penitent.¹⁶⁷ At this point, Scholarios’ analysis is complete. The text ends with a typical doxology to God.¹⁶⁸

III. – DATE OF SCHOLARIOS’ *ON THE DIFFERENCE*

M. Jugie dated the *On the difference* in the period 1457-1470,¹⁶⁹ noting that “il aura sans doute été composé au monastère du Prodrome, à une date qu’il nous est impossible de

¹⁶² *Vat. gr.* 611, f. 48^{v13-18}.

¹⁶³ *Ibidem*, f. 58^{r7}.

¹⁶⁴ *Ibidem*, f. 60^{v36-37}.

¹⁶⁵ *Ibidem*, f. 61^{r12}.

¹⁶⁶ See *supra*, p. 000.

¹⁶⁷ SCHOLARIOS, *On the difference*, p. 284¹⁶⁻²².

¹⁶⁸ *Ibidem*, p. 284²²⁻²³.

¹⁶⁹ L. PETIT, X. A. SIDERIDES, M. JUGIE (eds), *Œuvres complètes de Gennade Scholarios*, VIII, Paris 1936, p. 18*.

fixer présentement”.¹⁷⁰ Accordingly, F. Tinnefeld assumed that the *On the difference* has possibly been composed during Scholarios’ stay at Prodromos monastery.¹⁷¹ Most recently, C. Kappes attempted a conjecture by dating the text ca. 1457-1460/1464.¹⁷²

However, Jugie’s remark is much too vague to set the basis for dating the text. Moreover, Tinnefeld’s and Kappes’ conjectures seem to be mostly based on the fact that Scholarios’ *On the primal worship of God*,¹⁷³ which follows the *On the difference* in *Paris. gr. 1289*,¹⁷⁴ was written at the Prodromos Monastery in 1458, according to Scholarios’ autograph note: ἐν τῇ μονῇ τοῦ Προδρομοῦ ἐν τῷ ὄρει τοῦ Μενοικέως: ς, λ ξ ς´ (= 1458).¹⁷⁵ Still, the aforementioned note refers exclusively to the *On the primal worship of God*. In fact, the manuscript preserves Scholarios’ works produced at different times and in various places,¹⁷⁶ while several works (including the *On the difference*) bear no relevant information. Thus, the connection of the *On the difference* with Prodromos monastery is not sustainable on such evidence.

On the other hand, Scholarios has divided his Πίναξ τῶν ἐμπεριεχομένων τῷ βιβλίῳ τούτῳ συγγραμμάτων in f. I^v into works before and after the fall of Constantinople; the *On the difference* is classified into the latter. This indicates that the text was composed after 1453. Yet, the text of the *On the difference* in *Paris. gr. 1289* is copied by another manuscript, since it bears text written *supra lineam*¹⁷⁷ or supplemented in *marginē*.¹⁷⁸ Such a case is not a *unicum* in *Paris. gr. 1289*.¹⁷⁹ To put forth an example, Scholarios’ *Excerpts from Theodoret’s Remedy for the Greek Maladies*, preserved in the ff. 195^v-197^v of this exact manuscript, is a copy, the archetype of which was composed between 1443/1444 and 1453/1454 or (less probably) between 1439 and 1443/1444 as part of

¹⁷⁰ L. PETIT, X. A. SIDERIDES, M. JUGIE, *Œuvres complètes*, IV, cited n. 2, p. XVI.

¹⁷¹ F. TINNEFELD, Georgios Gennadios Scholarios, cited n. **Errore. Il segnalibro non è definito.**, p. 506. Scholarios’ first stay at the Monastery of Prodromos (1457/1458) was temporary, while the second one was definitive (M.-H. BLANCHET, *Georges-Gennadios Scholarios*, cited n. **Errore. Il segnalibro non è definito.**, p. 189, 217, 467).

¹⁷² C. KAPPES, A Narrative for the Reception of Seven Sacraments, cited n. 131131, p. 495 (and n. 127).

¹⁷³ Greek title: Περὶ τῆς πρώτης τοῦ Θεοῦ λατρείας, ἡ νόμος εὐαγγελικὸς ἐν ἐπιτομῇ, in L. PETIT, X. A. SIDERIDES, M. JUGIE, *Œuvres complètes*, IV, cited n. 2, p. 236-264.

¹⁷⁴ *Paris. gr. 1289*, ff. 138^r-155^v.

¹⁷⁵ L. PETIT, X. A. SIDERIDES, M. JUGIE, *Œuvres complètes*, IV, cited n. 2, p. XVI, 236, *apparat. crit.*

¹⁷⁶ E.g. *Paris. gr. 1289*, f. 19^r: Ἀνεγνώσθη ἐν βασιλείοις [...] ἐπὶ Ἰωάννου βασιλέως; f. 37^r: Ἐγράφη ὅτε ἀνεχώρησε τοῦ παλλατίου καὶ τῆς μονῆς τοῦ Παντοκράτορος, ἐν ᾗ πρότερον ᾤκει κοσμικὸς καὶ [...] ἠτοιμάζετο πρὸς τὸ μοναχικὸν σχῆμα; f. 45^r: Ἀνεγνώσθη ἐν τῇ μονῇ τῆς Περιβλέπτου τὸ πρῶτον, παρόντος τοῦ Βασιλέως Κωνσταντίνου; f. 81^r: Ἐγράφη ἐν τῇ μονῇ τῆς Παμμακαρίστου ἐν Κωνσταντινουπόλει; f. 95^r: Ἐν τῇ μονῇ τοῦ Τιμίου Προδρομοῦ; f. 103^r: Ἐγράφη ἐν τῷ ὄρει τοῦ Μενοικέως τῷ πρὸς ταῖς Φερραῖς; f. 118^r: Γενναδίου μοναχοῦ καὶ Πατριάρχου τῶν τοῦ Χριστοῦ πενήτων Περὶ τῆς μόνης ὁδοῦ πρὸς τὴν σωτηρίαν τῶν ἀνθρώπων. Συνεγράφη δὲ καὶ ἄρραβικῶς ἠρμηνεύθη μετὰ τὰς [...] διαλέξεις ἐν τῷ πατριαρχεῖῳ γενομένας; f. 138^r: Γενναδίου μοναχοῦ [...] ἐν τῷ ἰδίασμῷ αὐτοῦ – ἐν τῇ μονῇ τοῦ Προδρομοῦ ἐν τῷ ὄρει τοῦ Μενοικέως ς, λ ξ ς´ (= 1458).

¹⁷⁷ *Paris. gr. 1289*, f. 132^r.

¹⁷⁸ *Ibidem*, ff. 132^r, 133^r, 134^r, 135^r.

¹⁷⁹ Cf. also Scholarios’ autograph note on his *Sermon on the Transfiguration of Jesus Christ* (Λόγος εἰς τὴν ἀγίαν τοῦ Κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ μεταμόρφωσιν) in the lower margin of f. 19^r: εὔρηται ἐν τῇ Θεσσαλονίκῃ ἐν βιβλίῳ μετὰ τὴν ἄλωσιν καὶ μετεγράφη ἐκεῖθεν.

Scholarios' arsenal against Plethon.¹⁸⁰ Still, it is classified into the post-1453 works in Scholarios' list. Though, it lacks any specific information on the date and place of its composition, as in the case of the *On the difference*. In this respect, it is questionable whether Scholarios' criteria of classification include transcription or revision of texts, as well. Therefore I tend to accept 1453 as a *terminus post quem* for the composition of the *On the difference*, but with some hesitation.

On the other hand, the sources of the *On the difference* have to be taken into account. As J. A. Demetracopoulos has shown,¹⁸¹ Scholarios composed his *Compendium of ST, I^a II^{ae}* at a certain time between 1443/1445 and 1458/1459. Given that the production of this *Compendium* aimed to facilitate Scholarios' access to *ST, I^a II^{ae}*, it seems less plausible to assume that he continued to use his undoubtedly grand manuscript of *ST, I^a II^{ae}*,¹⁸² if an abbreviated and much more "user friendly" text was already available. Yet, in the *On the difference*, Scholarios did not use his *Compendium of ST, I^a II^{ae}*, but a (still unidentified) manuscript preserving the entire, as it seems, text of *ST, I^a II^{ae}*. Consequently, 1458/1459 may constitute a *terminus ante quem* for the *On the difference*.

Nevertheless, one may raise the possibility that Scholarios returned to some Scholastic material he had gathered in his youth, given that he had gained access to Thomistic and Scotistic material very early, before the Council of Florence. True, Scholarios' interest in Thomas' works is attested already in the first half of 1430's,¹⁸³ and as early as 1436 or shortly after¹⁸⁴ he obtained a copy of *ST, II^a II^{ae}* (*Paris. gr. 1237*).¹⁸⁵ On the other hand, the first traces of Scotus' arguments in Scholarios' works are dated before the Council of Florence.¹⁸⁶ It was a time when Mark Eugenikos, Scholarios' mentor, utilized Scotus against Thomas in his *Capita Syllogistica*,¹⁸⁷ in the context of his preparation for the Council.¹⁸⁸ In such a context, Scholarios' use of Scotistic arguments regarding the tripartite penitence may be directly related to Mark Eugenikos' "conciliar arguments that satisfaction is not absolutely part of penance".¹⁸⁹ This in conjunction with the use of Scotus by both Scholarios and Mark

¹⁸⁰ P. C. ATHANASOPOULOS, *Scholarii Excerpta ex Theodoreti Episcopi Cyrensis 'Graecarum Affectionum Curatione'*: editio princeps, *REB* 73, 2015, p. 161-188, here p. 166-172, *apparatus crit.*, *passim*; 180-186.

¹⁸¹ J. A. DEMETRACOPOULOS, *Scholarios' On Almsgiving*, cited n. 18, p. 157-161, 167.

¹⁸² The entire text of the Greek translation of THOMAS, *ST, I^a II^{ae}* covers more than 470 ff. in the impressive manuscript *Marc. gr. Z 147* (415 × 300 mm; 32-35 l.); cf. E. MIONI, *Bibliothecae Divi Marci Venetiarum Codices Graeci Manuscripti. I, Thesaurus Antiquus, Codices 1-299*, Rome 1981, p. 207-208.

¹⁸³ L. PETIT, X. A. SIDERIDES, M. JUGIE, *Œuvres complètes*, VIII, cited n. 169, p. 16^{*}; J. A. DEMETRACOPOULOS, *Latin Philosophical Works Translated into Greek*, cited n. 27, p. 826; IDEM, *Scholarios' On Almsgiving*, cited n. 18, p. 166.

¹⁸⁴ J. A. DEMETRACOPOULOS, *Scholarios' On Almsgiving*, cited n. 18, p. 159, 167.

¹⁸⁵ This manuscript preserves a full version of Demetrius Kydones' translation of THOMAS, *ST, II^a II^{ae}* up to q. 65 a. 2 (end of f. 222^v). From that point onwards Scholarios abbreviated the text, beginning from q. 65 a. 1 (cf. J. A. DEMETRACOPOULOS, *Scholarios' On Almsgiving*, cited n. 18, p. 159, 167).

¹⁸⁶ J. MONFASANI, *The Pro-Latin Apologetics of the Greek Émigrés to Quattrocento Italy*, in A. RIGO, P. ERMILOV, M. TRIZIO (eds), *Byzantine Theology and its Philosophical Background* (ΒΥΖΑΝΤΙΟΣ 4), Turnhout 2011, p. 160-186, here p. 165-168.

¹⁸⁷ See P. C. ATHANASOPOULOS, *Bessarion of Nicaea vs. Mark Eugenikos: On the Thomistic principium individuationis in material composites*, in D. SEARBY (ed.), *Never the Twain*, cited n. 18, p. 77-91, here p. 80-82.

¹⁸⁸ J. MONFASANI, *The Pro-Latin Apologetics*, cited n. 186, p. 167-168.

¹⁸⁹ C. KAPPES, *A Narrative for the Reception of Seven Sacraments*, cited n. 131, p. 497.

as part of their preparation for the Council of Florence, may indicate that some Scholastic material used in the *On the difference* predates the Council.

On the basis of the available data, it seems more probable that the *On the difference* was composed after 1453 and quite probably before 1458/1459. Whether Scholarios relied on some already existing notes of his own on the topic of sin or he read some “new” Thomistic manuscripts remains a riddle.

IV. – SCHOLARIOS’ *NECESSARY QUESTIONS* AND *ON THE DIFFERENCE*

As shown, the *On the difference* is a “treatise” (a set of notes) on ethics, based on Thomas’ *ST* and amplified by Scholarios’ interpretation and examples. Such a case is not unique in Scholarios’ *corpus*. As has been pointed out,¹⁹⁰ another set of notes under the title *Necessary questions* contains Thomistic material deriving from *ST*, I^a II^{ae}. Strikingly enough, there are several concordances between the two texts of Scholarios.¹⁹¹ For example, the aforementioned Thomistic exposition of the seven capital sins and their offspring appears in Scholarios’ *Necessary questions*, as well.

On the difference, p. 281³⁵⁻³⁷

Ὅτι δὲ ρίζαι πάντων τῶν ἀμαρτημάτων ἐπτά· ὑπερηφανία, φθόνος, ὀργή, ἀκηδία, φιλαργυρία, γαστριμαργία καὶ ἀκολασία.

Necessary questions, p. 308⁴⁻²³

Τίνες καὶ πόσαι αἱ ρίζαι ἢ κορυφαὶ τῶν ἀμαρτημάτων; Πρῶτον ἀμαρτημὰ ἐστὶν ὑπερηφανία [...]. Δεύτερον, ὁ φθόνος [...]. Τρίτον, ἡ ὀργή [...]. Τέταρτον, ἡ ἀκηδία [...]. Πέμπτον, ἡ φιλαργυρία [...]. Ἑκτον, ἡ γαστριμαργία [...]. Ἑβδομον, ἡ ἀκολασία.

Here are two more examples relevant to the vices of pride and covetousness, respectively.

On the difference, p. 282⁴⁻⁷

Καὶ ἐστὶ μὲν αὕτη [scil. ἡ ὑπερηφανία] ἀρχὴ παντὸς ἀμαρτήματος, ιδίως δὲ ἀνίσχουσιν ἀπ’ αὐτῆς καρποὶ κακιῶν οὗτοι· ἀνυποταξία, ἀλαζονεΐα, ὑπόκρισις, ἀκρασία, πεῖσμα, διχόνοια καὶ νεωτερισμός.

On the difference, p. 283⁵⁻¹³

Καρποὶ δὲ αὐτῆς· προδοσία [...]· δόλος [...]· ἀπάτη [...]· ἐπιορκία, ταραχὴ τῆς διανοίας, βία ἡγουν ἀρπαγή, πώρωσις τῆς διανοίας πρὸς

Necessary questions, p. 308⁵⁻⁷

Πρῶτον ἀμαρτημὰ ἐστὶν ὑπερηφανία καὶ ρίζα μὲν παντὸς ἀμαρτήματος, μήτηρ δὲ ιδίως ἐπτά τινων κακιῶν· εἰσὶ δὲ αὗται· ἀνυποταξία, ἀλαζονεΐα, ὑπόκρισις, ἀκρασία, πεῖσμα, διχόνοια καὶ νεωτερισμός.

Necessary questions, p. 308¹⁷⁻¹⁹

Πέμπτον, ἡ φιλαργυρία, ἧς θυγατέρες εἰσὶν ἐπτά, αὗται· προδοσία, δόλος, ἀπάτη, ἐπιορκία, ταραχὴ διανοίας, βία καὶ πώρωσις διανοίας πρὸς οἶκτον.

¹⁹⁰ See SCHOLARIOS, *Necessary questions*, cited n. 25, and L. PETIT, X. A. SIDERIDES, M. JUGIE, *Œuvres complètes*, IV, cited n. 2, p. XIX; F. TINNEFELD, Georgios Gennadios Scholarios, cited n. **Errore. Il segnalibro non è definito.**, p. 506.

¹⁹¹ G. PODSKALSKY (Die Rezeption, cited n. 17, p. 311, n. 34) drew a parallel between *On the difference*, p. 282 sqq. (8, 6 sqq.) and *Necessary questions*, p. 307²⁰-308³⁹, which is only partly true.

The astonishing coincidence of such passages¹⁹² indicates a relation between the *On the difference* and *Necessary questions*. However, both texts preserve their own Thomistic material, as well. For example, only the *Necessary questions*¹⁹³ preserves Bernard of Clairvaux's (1090-1153)¹⁹⁴ twelve degrees of pride,¹⁹⁵ as cited in Thomas *ST*, II^a II^{ae}, q. 162 a. 4 arg. 4.¹⁹⁶ On the other hand, the Thomistic argumentation on circumstances as a criterion for defining the gravity of sins, which is expounded in the *On the difference*,¹⁹⁷ is absent from the *Necessary questions*. This precludes the dependence of these texts in either direction. Besides, there are slight differences in the Thomistic text they share in common, as well.

On the difference, p. 282²³⁻²⁴

...ἡδονῆ ἐν τοῖς συμβαίνουσι τῷ πλησίον δυσκόλοις καὶ λύπη ἐπὶ καλῶς αὐτῷ συμβαίνουσιν.

Necessary questions, p. 308⁹⁻¹⁰

ἡδονῆ ἐν τοῖς συμβαίνουσι τῷ πλησίον δυσκόλοις καὶ θλίψεις ἐν τοῖς εὐτυχεῶς αὐτῷ συμβαίνουσιν.

On such evidence, the connection between the two texts is rather loose. Therefore it is more plausible to assume that in both cases Scholarios has drawn material from a common source, i. e. the Greek translation of Thomas' *ST*, I^a II^{ae},¹⁹⁸ instead of speculating about a direct partial dependence of the one text upon the other. Yet, which text was composed first is still questionable.¹⁹⁹

¹⁹² Additionally, the *On the difference*, p. 282²²⁻²⁴; p. 282²⁷⁻³¹; p. 282³³⁻³⁷; p. 283¹⁵⁻¹⁸; p. 283²⁶⁻²⁸ corresponds to SCHOLARIOS, *Necessary questions*, cited n. 25, p. 308⁸⁻¹⁰; p. 308¹¹⁻¹²; p. 308¹³⁻¹⁶; p. 308²⁰⁻²²; p. 308²³⁻²⁶ respectively.

¹⁹³ SCHOLARIOS, *Necessary questions*, cited n. 25, p. 308²⁷⁻³⁹.

¹⁹⁴ G. LOBRICHON, Chronologie des œuvres de saint Bernard de Clairvaux, in *Bernard de Clairvaux. Histoire, mentalités, spiritualité, Colloque de Lyon-Cîteaux-Dijon* (SC 380), Paris 1992, p. 32-41, here p. 32, 40; R. PASNAU and C. VAN DYKE, Appendix C: Biographies of Medieval Authors, in R. PASNAU and C. VAN DYKE, *The Cambridge History*, II, cited n. 27, p. 833-996, here p. 856.

¹⁹⁵ BERNARD DE CLAIRVAUX, *Liber de gradibus humilitatis et superbiae*, 10-21, ed. J. LECLERCQ and H. M. ROCHAIS, *Bernard de Clairvaux. Tractatus et opuscula* (Sancti Bernardi opera 3), Rome 1963, p. 13-59, here p. 38-55.

¹⁹⁶ *Vat. gr.* 611, f. 99^{r16-21}: Ἐτι εὕρισκονται καὶ ἄλλαι διαιρέσεις ὑπερηφανίας· διαιρεῖ γὰρ ὁ Ἄνσέλμος (sic) τὸ τῆς ὑπερηφανίας ὕψωμα λέγων ὅτι ἡ μὲν ἐστὶν ἐν τῇ θελήσει, ἡ δὲ ἐν λόγῳ, ἡ δὲ ἐν πράξει. Ἀλλὰ καὶ ὁ Μπερνάρδος τίθησι δώδεκα βαθμοὺς ὑπερηφανίας οἱ εἰσι περιεργία, διανοίας κουφότης, ἀνάρμοστος εὐφροσύνη, ἀλαζονεία, ἰδιορρυθμία, οἴησις, ἀπόνοια, ἐκδίκησις τῶν ἀμαρτημάτων, πεπλασμένα ἐξομολόγησις, ἀποστασία, ἄδεια τοῦ ἀμαρτάνειν, ἔθος <...>.

¹⁹⁷ See *supra* p. 000.

¹⁹⁸ Yet, Jugie remarked that several passages of the *Necessary questions* derive from Scholarios' *Compendia* of Thomas' *Summae* (L. PETIT, X. A. SIDERIDES, M. JUGIE, *Œuvres complètes*, IV, cited n. 2, p. XIX). However, given that this is not the case with the *On the difference*, the provenance of Thomistic sources in the *Necessary questions* has to be scrutinized.

¹⁹⁹ F. TINNEFELD (Georgios Gennadios Scholarios, cited n. **Errore. Il segnalibro non è definito.**, p. 506) dated the *Necessary questions* after 1464, considering Jugie's remark on the source of Scholarios' *Necessary questions* (see n. 190 and n. 198) and the dating of Scholarios' *Compendium of ST*, I^a II^{ae} in 1464 (L. PETIT, X. A. SIDERIDES, M. JUGIE, *Œuvres complètes*, VIII, cited n. 169, p. 19*). Nevertheless, such a dating entails that Scholarios could not have access to any other version of *ST*, I^a II^{ae}, apart from his relevant *Compendium*. However, this is not the case with the *On the difference*, as shown. Thus, the aforementioned assumption has to be verified. Moreover, if Scholarios utilized his *Compendium of ST*, I^a II^{ae}, the new dating proposed by

V. – EPILOGUE

The available data suggest that the *On the difference* belongs most probably to the period after the fall of Constantinople. The text is heavily indebted to Thomas' arguments on the venial and mortal sins as expounded in his *ST*, I^a II^{ae} and II^a II^{ae}. Certainly, the case of the *On the difference* is not a *unicum*; Scholarios integrated Thomistic ethics in certain of his texts, as the *Necessary questions* and the sermons *On almsgiving* and *On fasting*.²⁰⁰ Scholarios drew his Thomistic material from some undefined manuscripts, which most probably preserved the entire text of *ST*, I^a II^{ae} and II^a II^{ae}. Moreover, the Dominicans of Pera may have offered Scholarios material relevant to penitence; still, it is uncertain whether such material includes information on the Thomistic view on penitence expounded in *ST*, III^a. In any case, Scholarios' reception of Thomistic material is adapted to the needs of his argumentation. In this respect, the mode of reception may be an allusion, abbreviation, paraphrase or even *verbatim* citation in certain cases. However, Scholarios felt free to deploy, interpret or even adapt Thomas' arguments on the premise that the produced text will not oppose the Orthodox faith. Accordingly, he adopted Scotistic arguments in the case of penitence, in order to tacitly refute the doctrine of Purgatory. To the best of my knowledge, Scholarios is the first Byzantine author to adopt a Thomistic in core (and in a certain case Scotistic) hamartiology.

To argue that Scholarios' works need a new critical edition seems trivial.²⁰¹ Yet, it should be remarked that Procopios Nazianzenos' paraphrase of Scholarios' *On the difference* into post-Byzantine Greek along with the phonetic transcription of its Turkish translation constitute peculiar cases of the indirect tradition (reception) of Demetrios Kydones' Greek translation of Thomas Aquinas' *ST*.

APPENDIX

THOMISTIC SOURCES IN SCHOLARIOS' *ON THE DIFFERENCE*

J. A. DEMETRACOPOULOS (Scholarios' *On Almsgiving*, cited n. 18, p. 157-161, 167) transposes the *terminus post quem* for the *Necessary questions* many (or at least several) years before.

²⁰⁰ J. A. DEMETRACOPOULOS, Scholarios' *On Almsgiving*, cited n. 18, p. 134-152.

²⁰¹ The *On the difference* is no exception. Apart from the significant number of manuscripts, which were not used in Jugie's edition, and the untraced sources, the text suffers from certain misreadings and erroneous punctuation, as well. A few examples: p. 274²⁵⁻²⁶] ἐν ἧ ἐνεργείᾳ φθείρεται ὁ λόγος τῆς διπλῆς ἀγάπης<, > τῆς τῷ Θεῷ δηλονότι ὀφειλομένης...; p. 277¹⁹] μὲν γὰρ codex: μὲν Jugie; p. 278¹⁵] Ἐφεξῆς θεωρητέον ἂν εἶη[,] ὅτι... To a certain extent the same holds true for the *Necessary questions*.

This is a list of Thomistic passages used in Scholarios' *On the difference*.²⁰² Given that there are continuous allusions to Thomas' text, the following list cannot be exhaustive. Enriching this list is up to the next editor of the *On the difference*.

SCHOLARIOS, <i>On the difference</i>		THOMAS AQUINAS, <i>ST</i>	
		I^a II^{ae}	II^a II^{ae}
Title	1-2, p. 274 ¹²⁻¹³	q. 88 pr.	
Chapter 1	6-9, p. 274 ¹⁹⁻²²	q. 88 a. 1 co.	
	11-13, p. 274 ²⁴⁻²⁶	q. 88 a. 2 co.	
	25-26, p. 275 ⁷⁻⁸	q. 2 a. 8 co.	
	29-31, p. 275 ¹¹⁻¹³	q. 72 a. 4 ad 1	
	31-33, p. 275 ¹³⁻¹⁵	q. 72 a. 5 co.	q. 23 a. 8 co.
Chapter 2	2-6, p. 275 ¹⁷⁻²¹	q. 72 a. 7 s. c.	
	5, p. 275 ²⁰	q. 88 a. 2 co.	
	6-26, p. 275 ²¹ -p. 276 ⁵	q. 72 a. 7 co.	
		q. 72 a. 7 ad 3	
	9-26, p. 275 ²⁴ -p. 276 ⁵	q. 88 a. 6 co.	
	20-21, p. 275 ³⁵⁻³⁶	q. 88 a. 2 co.	
Chapter 3	1-7, p. 276 ⁶⁻¹²	q. 72 a. 7 ad 1	
		q. 74 a. 8 co.	
	7-19, p. 276 ¹²⁻²⁴	q. 72 a. 7 co.	
	8-9, p. 276 ¹³⁻¹⁴	q. 88 a. 2 co.	
	19-22, p. 276 ²⁴⁻²⁷	q. 72 a. 7 ad 1	
	23-24, p. 276 ²⁸⁻²⁹	q. 88 a. 2 co.	
	24-25, p. 276 ²⁹⁻³⁰	q. 72 a. 7 co.	
		q. 88 a. 6 co.	
Chapter 4	1-4, p. 276 ³¹⁻³⁴		q. 27 a. 8 co.
	11-15, p. 277 ⁵⁻⁹		q. 32 a. 4 co.
	17-24, p. 277 ¹¹⁻¹⁸		q. 147 a. 4 ad 3
	25-26, p. 277 ¹⁹⁻²⁰		q. 148 a. 2 ad 2
	26-27, p. 277 ²⁰⁻²¹		q. 59 a. 4 co.
			q. 118 a. 8 arg. 1
			q. 118 a. 8 s. c.
	28-34, p. 277 ²²⁻²⁸		q. 27 a. 8 co.
	34-46, p. 277 ²⁸ -p. 278 ²	q. 87 a. 6 co.	
	51-57, p. 278 ⁷⁻¹³		q. 32 a. 4 co.
Chapter 5	1, p. 278 ¹⁵	q. 73 pr.	
	1-2, p. 278 ¹⁵⁻¹⁶	q. 88 a. 2 co.	
	3-4, p. 278 ¹⁷⁻¹⁸		q. 151 pr.
			q. 151 a. 2 co.
	4-5, p. 278 ¹⁸⁻¹⁹		q. 154 a. 1 arg. 1
	5-7, p. 278 ¹⁹⁻²¹	q. 72 a. 2 ad 4	
	7-9, p. 278 ²¹⁻²³		q. 27 a. 8 co.
	9-10, p. 278 ²³⁻²⁴		q. 67 pr.
			q. 70 pr.
			q. 71 pr.
			q. 72 pr.
			q. 77 pr.
			q. 118 a. 4 co.

²⁰² The indication (P) points out Thomistic passages traced by G. PODSKALSKY (Die Rezeption, cited n. 17, p. 311, n. 34).

	10-13, p. 278 ²⁴⁻²⁷	q. 73 a. 3 co.	
	17-18, p. 278 ³¹⁻³²	q. 73 a. 3 co.	
	21-23, p. 278 ³⁵⁻³⁷	q. 76 a. 4 ad 4	
		q. 88 a. 5 ad 1	
	23-39, p. 278 ³⁷ -p. 279 ¹⁵	q. 77 a. 2 co.	
		q. 77 a. 7 co.	
	40-41, p. 279 ¹⁶⁻¹⁷	q. 88 a. 2 co.	
	41-51, p. 279 ¹⁷⁻²⁷	q. 73 a. 3 co.	
Chapter 6	2-5, p. 279 ²⁹⁻³²	q. 73 a. 7 co.	
		q. 73 a. 7 ad 1	
	5-8, p. 279 ³²⁻³⁵	q. 73 a. 9 co.	
	17-20, p. 280 ⁴⁻⁷	q. 73 a. 7 co.	
		q. 88 a. 5 co.	
	27-29, p. 280 ¹⁴⁻¹⁶	q. 73 a. 10 s. c.	
		q. 73 a. 10 co.	
Chapter 7	4-13, p. 280 ²⁰⁻²⁹	q. 88 a. 2 co.	
	7-10, p. 280 ²³⁻²⁶	q. 72 a. 7 co.	
		q. 88 a. 6 co.	
	10-12, p. 280 ²⁶⁻²⁸		q. 73 a. 2 co.
	14-16, p. 280 ³⁰⁻³²		q. 36 a. 2 co.
	16-17, p. 280 ³²⁻³³	q. 88 a. 5 ad 1	q. 110 a. 2 co.
	21-22, p. 280 ³⁷⁻³⁸	q. 87 a. 6 co.	
	38-49, p. 281 ¹⁴⁻²⁵	q. 87 a. 6 co.	
		q. 87 a. 6 ad 1	
Chapter 8	2-6, p. 281 ³⁵ -p. 282 ¹	q. 84 a. 4 arg. 1	
		q. 84 a. 4 co.	
	5-6, p. 281 ³⁸ -p. 282 ¹	q. 88 a. 1 co.	
	9-10, p. 282 ⁴⁻⁵		q. 132 a. 4 co.
	10-12, p. 282 ⁵⁻⁷		q. 132 a. 5 arg. 1
	12-20, p. 282 ⁷⁻¹⁵		q. 132 a. 5 co.
	21-26, p. 282 ¹⁶⁻²¹		q. 162 a. 4 co. (P)
	26, p. 282 ²¹		
	27-30, p. 282 ²²⁻²⁵	q. 88 a. 1 co.	
	33-36, p. 282 ²⁸⁻³¹		q. 36 a. 4 ad 3 (P)
			q. 158 a. 7 arg. 1
	38-42, p. 282 ³³⁻³⁷		q. 158 a. 7 co.
			q. 35 a. 4 arg. 2 (P)
	42-45, p. 282 ³⁷ -p. 283 ²		q. 35 a. 4 ad 2 (P)
	46-48, p. 283 ³⁻⁵		q. 35 a. 4 ad 3 (P)
	48-56, p. 283 ⁵⁻¹³		q. 118 a. 5 arg. 4
	56-57, p. 283 ¹³⁻¹⁴		q. 118 a. 8 arg. 1
	59-61, p. 283 ¹⁶⁻¹⁸		q. 118 a. 8 ad 4
	61-67, p. 283 ¹⁸⁻²⁴		q. 148 a. 6 arg. 1
	68, p. 283 ²⁵		q. 148 a. 4 arg. 1
	69-71, p. 283 ²⁶⁻²⁸		q. 148 a. 6 co.
			q. 153 a. 5 arg. 1
	72-74, p. 283 ²⁹⁻³¹		q. 153 a. 5 ad 1
			q. 154 pr.
Chapter 9	1-2, p. 283 ³²⁻³³		q. 154 a. 1 arg. 1
	2-3, p. 283 ³³⁻³⁴		q. 118 a. 8 ad 1
	7-9, p. 283 ³⁸ -p. 284 ²		q. 73 a. 3 co.
			q. 118 a. 8 arg. 1
			q. 118 a. 8 ad 1

9-10, p. 284²⁻³
10-11, p. 284³⁻⁴

19, p. 284¹²
20, p. 284¹³
20-21, p. 284¹³⁻¹⁴
21, p. 284¹⁴

21-22, p. 284¹⁴⁻¹⁵

22, p. 284¹⁵

22-23, p. 284¹⁵⁻¹⁶

q. 118 a. 8 ad 3
q. 154 a. 8 s. c.
q. 118 a. 4 co.
q. 66 a. 3 co.
q. 161 pr.
q. 34 pr.
q. 158 pr.
q. 35 a. 3 ad 2
q. 35 a. 4 arg. 2
q. 117 a. 2 ad 3
q. 118 a. 4 co.
q. 146 pr.
q. 149 a. 2 s. c.
q. 151 pr.
q. 151 a. 1 co.

Panagiotis Ch. ATHANASOPOULOS
Dipartimento di Studi Umanistici
Università Ca' Foscari
Venezia