

THE NOTION OF EROS (LOVE) AND THE PRESENCE OF ST AUGUSTINE IN THE WORKS OF ST GREGORY PALAMAS REVISITED

ALEXANDROS CHOULIARAS

PhD Candidate,

Vrije Universiteit, Amsterdam Centre for Orthodox Theology

‘Since one of the wise and apostolic men says...’¹

The article revisits the use of certain Augustinian expressions and passages in the works of St Gregory Palamas, mainly regarding the Trinitarian reflections in man, the *imago Dei*, and the notion of *eros* (love). First, we present Palamas’ theology regarding the *eros* of the *nous* (intellect) for its *logos*. Second, we provide a brief review of the literature regarding the Augustinian presence in Palamas, and then continue with our assessment of this presence. We demonstrate that Gregory does indeed borrow phrases from Augustine, but he does not always use or incorporate the latter’s ideas; sometimes (e.g., in the case of the *Filioque*) he even comes to the opposite conclusion. In other words, despite similarities, one also finds crucial differences between Augustine’s and Palamas’ relevant approaches. Finally, four possible reasons—not often stressed in scholarship; the third probably mentioned for the first time—are proposed to explain why Palamas takes up the notion of *eros* from the Bishop of Hippo: a) the ‘eternal rest’ (ἀίδιος ἐπανάπαυσις) of the Holy Spirit on the Son; b) his willingness to oppose the *Filioque*; c) the appeal to a major notion in Palamas’ anthropology, namely the ‘vivifying power’ (ζωοποιὸς δύναμις) of the human soul; and d) the Holy Spirit’s ‘eternal resplendence’ (ἀίδιος ἑκλαμψις/ἐκφανσις). In conclusion, it is argued that this endeavour of Palamas could nowadays also inspire Orthodox theology in its effort to engage in dialogue with Western thought and in its attempt to articulate a genuine and persuasive voice in our era.

The Eros of the Nous (intellect) for its Logos²

A very contentious subject in the recent literature has been the presence, or lack thereof, of St Augustine in St Gregory Palamas’ writings,³ and especially in his

¹ *Contra Gregoras* II, 43.10–4, ed. Panagiotis Christou, *Γρηγορίου τοῦ Παλαμᾶ Συγγράμματα* (=ΠΣ), vol. 4 (Θεσσαλονίκη: Κυρομάνος, 1988), 296: ‘...ἐπεὶ καὶ τις τῶν σοφῶν καὶ ἀποστολικῶν ἀνδρῶν φησιν...’ (St Gregory Palamas referring, indirectly, to St Augustine).

² I am grateful to Revd Prof. Andrew Louth, Revd Dr Demetrios Bathrellos, and Archim. Dr Maximos Constatas for having read earlier drafts of this text and providing important feedback, and to Mr Vincent DeWeese for proofreading my English; moreover, to the anonymous peer reviewer, whose remarks helped me improve the article and bring it to its final form. Of course, for all possible shortcomings, the author alone is responsible.

³ For an overview of the recent literature and some remarks that carry the discussion further, see Reinhard Flogaus, ‘Inspiration–Exploitation–Distortion: The Use of St Augustine in the Hesychast Controversy’.

theology concerning the image of God.⁴ In his *imago Dei* theology, Palamas identifies *nous*, *logos*, and *pneuma* as a reflection of the Trinity in man.⁵ He also stresses that the Holy Spirit is ‘the ineffable love (*ἔρως*) of the Begetter towards the ineffably begotten Word himself’. Moreover, the Son also has this love for the Father and ‘also experiences this love towards the Begetter, but he does so inasmuch as he possesses this love as proceeding from the Father together with him and as resting⁶ connaturally in him.’⁷ From the Incarnate Word we have learnt that the Holy Spirit is a

sy’, in Aristotle Papanikolaou and George E. Demacopoulos, eds, *Orthodox Readings of Augustine* (Crestwood, NY: SVSP, 2008), 63–80. See also John Demetracopoulos, *Αύγουστίνος καὶ Γρηγόριος Παλαμᾶς: τὰ προβλήματα τῶν ἀριστοτελικῶν κατηγοριῶν καὶ τῆς τριαδικῆς ψυχοθεολογίας* [Augustine and Gregory Palamas: the problems of Aristotle’s categories and of the triadic psychotheology] (Ἀθήνα: Παρουσία, 1997), 83–85. Michele Trizio, “Un uomo sapiente ed apostolico”. Agostino a Bizanzio: Gregorio Palamas lettore del De Trinitate, *Quaestio* 6 (2006): 131–89. For the general reception of Augustine in Byzantium, see M. Trizio, ‘Alcune osservazioni sulla ricezione Bizantina del De Trinitate di Agostino’, in Antonio Rigo and Pavel Ermilov, eds, *Byzantine Theologians. The Systematization of their own Doctrine and their Perception of Foreign Doctrines*, Quaderni di *Néa Pólymē* 3 (Roma: Università ‘Tor Vergata’, 2009), 143–68. Joseph Lössl, ‘Augustine’s “On the Trinity” in Gregory Palamas’ “One Hundred and Fifty Chapters”’, *Augustinian Studies* 30.1 (1999): 69–81. Idem, ‘Augustine in Byzantium’, *Journal of Ecclesiastical History* 51.2 (2000): 267–95. For two interesting recent approaches, see Marcus Plested, *Orthodox Readings of Aquinas*, Changing Paradigms in Historical and Systematic Theology (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013): 29–44. Viorel Coman, ‘Le Saint-Esprit comme liaison de l’amour éternel entre le Père et le Fils: un cas de « sobornicité ouverte » dans la théologie orthodoxe moderne’, *Irenikon* 89.1 (2016): 25–51.

⁴ For Augustine’s *imago Dei*, see Gerald P. Boersma, *Augustine’s Early Theology of Image: A Study in the Development of Pro-Nicene Theology*, Oxford Studies in Historical Theology (New York: Oxford University Press, 2016), and Luigi Gioia, *The Theological Epistemology of Augustine’s De Trinitate*, Oxford Theological Monographs (New York: Oxford University Press, 2008), 232–97.

⁵ What is, in fact, a ‘Trinitarian reflection in man’? In broad terms we could say that it is an element or condition in the human person—usually in the human soul or intellect—that resembles the Holy Trinity. It is a point that permits us to make an analogy between man and the Trinity. Many things could be said here regarding Palamas’ relevant approach, which is very important indeed, but this goes beyond the scope of our article. Let us only note that Palamas draws mainly on Gregory Nazianzen, Maximus the Confessor, and John Damascene. For a basic approach to Palamas’ Trinitarian reflections in man, see Robert E. Sinkewicz, *The One Hundred and Fifty Chapters: A Critical Edition, Translation and Study*, Studies and Texts 83 (Toronto: Pontifical Institute of Medieval Studies, 1988), 16–34. A detailed analysis of Gregory’s thought, as presented in his *Chapters*, has been attempted by Jeremy D. Wilkins, “The Image of this Highest Love”: the Trinitarian Analogy in Gregory Palamas’ *Capita* 150’, *SVTQ* 47.3–4 (2003): 383–412. Cf. also Edmund Hussey, ‘The Palamite Trinitarian Models’, *SVTQ* 16.2 (1972): 83–89. Alexandros Chouliaras, ‘The *Imago Trinitatis* in St Symeon the New Theologian and Niketas Stethatos: Is this the Basic Source of St Gregory Palamas’ own Approach?’, in Markus Vinzent, ed., *Studia Patristica XCVI: Papers presented at the Seventeenth International Conference on Patristic Studies held in Oxford 2015 : The Second Half of the Fourth Century; From the Fifth Century Onwards (Greek Writers); Gregory Palamas’ Epistula III*, volume 22 (Leuven-Paris-Bristol, CT: Peeters, 2017): 493–503.

⁶ Cf. John Damascene, *Expositio fidei*, 8.173, in P. Bonifatius Kotter, OSB, ed., *Expositio fidei* [Ἐκδοσις ἀκριβῆς τῆς ὀρθοδόξου πίστεως; *On the Orthodox Faith*], *Die Schriften des Johannes von Damaskos*, vol. 2, Patristische Texte und Studien 12 (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1973), 25: καὶ ἐν Υἱῷ ἀναπαυόμενον [i.e., the Holy Spirit].

⁷ Palamas, *Capita* 36.11–5, ed. Sinkewicz, 122 [=ed. P. Christou, ΠΣ 5 (Θεσσαλονίκη: Κυρομάνος, 1992), 54.25–29; for the English translation of the *Capita* we have generally used the Sinkewicz’s edition, although we have replaced the term ‘mind’ with ‘intellect’ (for the Greek word ‘νοῦς’): Ἐκεῖνο δὲ τὸ πνεῦμα τοῦ ἀνωτάτω λόγου οἷόν τις ἔρως ἐστὶν ἀπόρρητος τοῦ γεννήτορος πρὸς αὐτὸν τὸν ἀπορρήτως γεννηθέντα λόγον, ᾧ καὶ αὐτὸς ὁ τοῦ πατρὸς ἐπέραστος λόγος καὶ υἱὸς χρήται πρὸς τὸν γεννήτορα, ἀλλ’ ὡς ἐκ τοῦ πατρὸς ἔχων αὐτὸν συμπροελθόντα καὶ συμφυῶς ἐν αὐτῷ ἀναπαυόμενον. In order to have an adequate view of Palamas’ approach, one has to also take into consideration *Capita* 35 and 37–39.

distinct hypostasis who belongs both to the Father and the Son.⁸ Furthermore, the Holy Spirit owes his being only to the Father, but is sent forth (in the context of the divine *economy*) from both the Father and the Son to those who are worthy.⁹

For Palamas, the idea of the Holy Spirit as love provides the most suitable analogy for the *imago Dei* in man. He explains this in *Chapter 37*, describing the relation of the human intellect to its immanent knowledge (λόγος)¹⁰ as love and yearning (ἔρως and ἔφρεσις): ‘Our intellect too, since it is created in the image of God, possesses the image of this highest love in the relation of the intellect to the knowledge which exists perpetually from it and in it, in that this love is from it and in it and proceeds from it together with the innermost word.’¹¹

In other words, it is precisely because our intellect is created *kat’ eikona* that it also possesses an ‘ineffable love’ like the Divine Intellect—i.e., God the Father—possesses the Holy Spirit. Moreover, ‘The insatiable desire of men for knowledge is a very clear indication of this even for those who are unable to perceive their own innermost being.’¹² That is to say, man’s lust for knowledge is a clear proof of the

⁸ As Sinkewicz (*The One Hundred*, 123, n. 58–59) indicates, Palamas refers here to the biblical passages John 15:26: ‘The Spirit of Truth, who proceeds from the Father’ and Prov 8:30: ‘I was the one (i.e., Wisdom) who rejoiced together with him’ (ἐγὼ ἡμην ἢ προσέχαιρεν). Regarding the second passage, Hussey (‘The Palamite Trinitarian Models’, 85) notes the following: ‘Gregory’s quotation is: ἐγὼ ἡμην ἢ συνέχαιρον αὐτῷ. This is probably a free citation of Proverbs 8:30b—ἐγὼ ἡμην ἢ προσέχαιρεν. The context of the passage in Proverbs celebrates the excellence of wisdom and its presence with God before creation. Gregory’s alteration of the prepositional prefix does some violence to the original text.’

⁹ *Capita* 36.28–31, ed. Sinkewicz, 122 (ed. Christou, 55.13–5): ...διὸ παρ’ ἀμφοτέρων καὶ πρὸς τοὺς ἀξίους πέμπεται, μόνου δὲ τοῦ πατρὸς καθ’ ὑπαρξιν ὑπάρχον· διὸ καὶ παρ’ αὐτοῦ μόνου ἐκπορεύεται καθ’ ὑπαρξιν. Gregory here stresses the fact that the Holy Spirit derives his existence only from God the Father, but is sent to the creation from the Father through the Son. This is the standard opinion of the Byzantine Fathers and the Orthodox Church. As is well known, Gregory was a fervent opponent of the *Filioque*. His most representative texts are his two *Apodictic Discourses* [ed. Boris Bobrinsky, ΠΣ 1 (Θεσσαλονίκη: Κυρομάνος, 1988), 23–153]. For a recent and succinct summary of his approach, with some insightful remarks and useful bibliography, see A. E. Siecienski, *The Filioque: History of a Doctrinal Controversy* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2010), 145–47. For Palamas’ stance on the *Filioque*, see the important analysis of Jean-Claude Larchet, in his ‘Introduction’ to *Saint Grégoire Palamas, Traités apodictiques sur la procession du Saint-Esprit*, traduction et notes par Emmanuel Ponsoye, Collection l’Arbre de Jessé (Paris-Suresnes: Les Éditions de l’Ancre, 1995), 14–104. Cf. section (d) of this article. On the matter of the *Filioque* in general, see Peter Gemeinhardt, *Die Filioque-Kontroverse zwischen Ost- und Westkirche im Frühmittelalter*, Arbeiten zur Kirchengeschichte 82 (Berlin and New York: Walter de Gruyter, 2002); Siecienski, *The Filioque*; Theodoros Alexopoulos, *Der Ausgang des thearchischen Geistes: Eine untersuchung der Filioque-Frage anhand Photios’ ‘Mystagogie’, Konstantin Melitiniotes’ ‘Zwei Antirrhetic’ und Augustins ‘De Trinitate’* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht unipress, 2009).

¹⁰ See *Capita* 34–35. Cf. the second section of the current article, where we discuss Edmund Hussey’s paper.

¹¹ *Capita* 37.1–4, ed. Sinkewicz, 122 (ed. Christou, 55.16–9): Τούτου τοῦ ἀνωτάτω ἔρωτος τὴν εἰκόνα καὶ ὁ κατ’ εἰκόνα τοῦ Θεοῦ κτισθεὶς ἡμῶν ἔχει νοῦς πρὸς τὴν παρ’ αὐτοῦ καὶ ἐν αὐτῷ διηλεκῶς ὑπάρχουσαν γνῶσιν, παρ’ αὐτοῦ καὶ ἐν αὐτῷ καὶ τοῦτον ὄντα καὶ συμπρωϊόντα παρ’ αὐτοῦ τῷ ἐνδοτάτῳ λόγῳ.

¹² *Capita* 37.5–7, ed. Sinkewicz, 122 (ed. Christou, 55.19–22): Καὶ τούτου δείγμα ἐναργέστατον καὶ τοῖς μὴ τὰ ἐνδοτάτω ἑαυτῶν δυναμένοις καθορᾶν ἢ πρὸς τὸ εἶδέναι τῶν ἀνθρώπων ἀκόρεστος ἔφρεσις. Demetracopoulos (*Αὐγουστίνος καὶ Γρηγόριος Παλαμάς*, 88) points out that Palamas here alludes to the well-known first line of Aristotle’s *Metaphysics*: πάντες ἀνθρώποι τοῦ εἶδέναι ὀρέγονται φύσει (see *Τῶν μετὰ τὰ φυσικὰ A* 980a, Oxford Classical Texts, ed. Werner Jaeger [New York: Oxford University Press, 1957], 1).

intellect's love towards its immanent knowledge (λόγος). Therefore, the love of the νοῦς for its λόγος images the ἔρως of the Father for the Son, i.e., the Holy Spirit.

Reviewing the literature

The well-known Roman Catholic scholar Martin Jugie was the first to open the debate regarding the Augustinian presence in the works of St Gregory. In 1932 he argued that Palamas, in his theology of the divine processions, and specifically in his *Chapters*,¹³ has a theory identical to that of Augustine and Thomas Aquinas. Jugie regards Palamas' use of the triad *nous-logos-pneuma*, as well as his notion of *eros*,¹⁴ as quite 'curious and unusual' for a fourteenth-century Byzantine theologian. He believes that Gregory borrowed them either from Augustine's *De Trinitate*, translated by Maximus Planoudes around 1280,¹⁵ or from Aquinas' *Contra Gentiles*, translated by Demetrios Cydones in 1354.¹⁶

Additionally, in 1959, Fr John Meyendorff expressed surprise to find a psychological image rather like that of St Augustine in Palamas' thirty-sixth *Chapter*.¹⁷ Moreover, in another context, he characterizes Gregory as 'l'un des auteurs les plus "augustiniens" de l'Orient chrétien'.¹⁸ Gregory's point of view here is the doctrine of

¹³ Meaning the important work of Palamas, *Capita 150* (Κεφάλαια ἑκατὸν πενήκοντα...). See the critical editions of Christou, ΠΣ 5, and Sinkewicz, *The One Hundred*.

¹⁴ For a brief analysis of these points, according to Palamas, see the first section of the current article.

¹⁵ For the critical edition, see Maximus Planoudes, *Ἀγιοσύνην Περὶ Τριάδος βιβλία πεντεκαίδεκα ἄπερ ἓκ τῆς Λατίνων διαλέκτου εἰς τὴν Ἑλλάδα μετένευκε Μάξιμος ὁ Πλανούδης*, ed. Manolis Papathomopoulos, Isabella Tsabari, Gianpaolo Rigotti. *Editio Princeps*, 2 vols (Ἀθήνα: Ἀκαδημία Ἀθηνῶν, Κέντρον Ἑκδόσεως Ἔργων Ἑλλήνων Συγγραφέων, 1995). On this translation, see Elizabeth Fisher, 'Planoudes' *De Trinitate*, the Art of Translation, and the Beholder's Share', in Papanikolaou and Demacopoulos, eds., *Orthodox Readings of Augustine*, 41–61. For an important critical evaluation of this edition, with some very useful remarks and corrections, see Dimitrios K. Raïos, 'Ἡ editio princeps τῆς πλανούδειας μετάφρασης τοῦ *De Trinitate*: προβληματισμοὶ καὶ προτάσεις' (The *editio princeps* of the Planoudean Translation of *De Trinitate*: Questionings and Suggestions), in Βελλά: Επιστημονικὴ Επετηρίδα [Vella: Scientific Anniversary] (Βελλά: Ἀνωτάτη Ἐκκλησιαστικὴ Σχολὴ Βελλὰς Ἰωάννινων, 2001): 49–109.

¹⁶ Martin Jugie, 'Palamas Grégoire', *Dictionnaire de théologie catholique* 11.2 (1932): 1735–76; at 1766–77. For the *imago Dei* according to Thomas Aquinas, see D. Juvenal Merriell, *To the Image of the Trinity: A study in the Development of Aquinas' Teaching* (Toronto: Pontifical Institute of Mediaeval Studies, 1990). In this book, Merriell regards Augustine to be the foundation of Aquinas' relevant teaching. However, recent scholarship rejects the possibility of an influence of Aquinas—or any other Scholastic theologian—on Palamas, regarding the *imago Dei*. See Demetracopoulos, *Ἀγιοσύνης καὶ Γρηγόριος Παλαμάς*, 83 and 154, n. 222. Cf. Georgios Martzelos, 'Τὸ Ἅγιο Πνεῦμα ὡς "ἔρως ἀπόρρητος" μεταξύ Πατρός καὶ Υἱοῦ κατὰ τὸν Ἅγιο Γρηγόριο Παλαμᾶ' ['The Holy Spirit as "ineffable love" between the Father and the Son according to Saint Gregory Palamas'], *Θεολογία* 86.3 (2015): 7–21; at 14–15 [initially presented at *The International Conference 'St Gregory Palamas: The Theological and Philosophical Significance of his Work'*, Thessaloniki 7–15.3.2012].

¹⁷ John Meyendorff, *Introduction à l'étude de Grégoire Palamas*, *Patristica Sorbonensia* 3 (Paris: Seuil, 1959), 316 [=partial English translation by George Lawrence: *A Study of Gregory Palamas*, second edition (New York: Faith Press, 1974), 232].

¹⁸ Meyendorff, *Introduction*, 175 (=A *Study*, 118: '...one of the most "Augustinian" writers of the Christian East').

grace: Palamas, as Augustine had already done in his anti-Pelagian writings,¹⁹ insists on man's incapability of reaching God by his own power alone.

A reaction comes from Edmund Hussey, in a paper of his in 1972.²⁰ Initially he presents his English translation of *Chapters* 35–37, and then he discusses them in detail. He admits that Jugie's and Meyendorff's observation of a 'psychological' trinitarian model is, at first glance, justified. This applies especially to *Chapter* 36. 'But', in Hussey's words, 'the unexplained and abrupt transition from "word" to "knowledge" in *Chapter* 35, and the equally abrupt and unexplained transition from "breath" to "love" in *Chapter* 36, suggest that Gregory has interwoven an "ontological" word-breath figure and a "psychological" knowledge-love figure.'²¹

Hussey tries to prove that Gregory's models are mainly ontological and not psychological.²² The reason for this position is Hussey's effort to stress the difference between Palamas' and Augustine's psychological models. This effort is justified, because there is indeed a divergence.²³ Thus, he argues that Palamas does speak about the word which is expressed externally in sounds (*προφορικὸς λόγος*), as well as the mental image of the sounds of a word before it is expressed externally (*ἐνδιάθετος λόγος*), and the mental concept that comes before the expression in a word and is gradually shaped in the intellect (*λόγος ἐν διανοίᾳ*). However, the only suitable analogy he finds to express the relation of the second person of the Trinity to God the Father is the *λόγος ἐμφύτως ἐν ἡμῖν ἐναποκείμενος τῷ νῷ*, the naturally inherent *λόγος*, that is, 'a word in the sense of the knowledge latent or immanent in the intellect', a 'word naturally stored up within our intellect'.²⁴ Hussey underlines that this is not just a psychological model, constructed according to human measures. We have to understand the *logos* not only as a word or thought, but primarily as our point of communion with God. This is the type of *logos* which reflects the second person of the Trinity, who is generated from the Father.²⁵

¹⁹ On this subject, see the relevant study of Dominic Keech, *The Anti-Pelagian Christology of Augustine of Hippo*, 396–430 (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012).

²⁰ Hussey, 'The Palamite Trinitarian Models', 83–89.

²¹ *Ibid.*, 85–86.

²² By 'psychological', we refer to elements that have to do with human psychology, such as thought, love, soul, etc., whereas by 'ontological', to points related to the ontology-existence, such as the constitution of the intellect. From my point of view, Jeremy D. Wilkins provides a more worked and well-grounded—though a little bit sophisticated and sometimes difficult to apprehend—interpretation of Palamas' *Capita* 34–38 than Hussey's (see Wilkins, "'The Image of this Highest Love'"). Moreover, Wilkins tries to prove in a more adequate way the balance between the ontological and the psychological character of these chapters, contrary to Hussey who gives a clear priority to ontology. Here again, it seems that Wilkins is more objective. It is noteworthy that Wilkins, in this article, traces some interesting similarities and divergences, between Palamas', Aquinas', and Augustine's teaching (divine goodness-unity, communion with God, etc.).

²³ As Hussey ('The Palamite Trinitarian Models', 89) writes, 'there is no question here of constructing a theology of the Trinity out of any model, as Western theology has tended to do with the so-called psychological model.' Wilkins ('"The Image of this Highest Love"', 402) notes that the two most known triads of Augustine are 'memory, understanding, and will' (*memoria, intelligentia, voluntas*), and 'mind, knowledge, and love' (*mens, notitia, amor*).

²⁴ Cf. Palamas, *Capita* 35.1–16, ed. Sinkewicz, 118–120 (ed. Christou, 53.22–54.6).

²⁵ Hussey, 'The Palamite Trinitarian Models', 86. A very interesting topic for further research would

Robert Sinkewicz offers a significant commentary on Palamas' *Chapters*. As far as the presence of Augustine is concerned, he does accept the existence of similarities between the *Chapters* and Augustine's Trinitarian analogies at first.²⁶ Nevertheless, he argues that, in virtue of these parallels, there is a temptation to conclude that Palamas really assimilated some of Augustine's ideas. However, Sinkewicz is totally opposed to such an idea. He believes that, while Gregory speaks of the knowledge immanent in the intellect, he does not equate this with *the intellect's knowledge of itself (notitia sui)*.²⁷ Moreover, Palamas mentions the relation of the intellect to the knowledge naturally inherent in it, but he does not depict this as *the intellect's wanting its self-knowledge (amor sui and voluntas sui)*.²⁸ Last, but most important for Sinkewicz, Palamas never concludes that the Holy Spirit is the *relation of love* between the Father and the Son:

Faithful to the Church's tradition, Palamas maintained that the Holy Spirit is identical in every way with the divine goodness (i.e. the divine nature) and with the Father and the Son, except in hypostasis. The Spirit has his own perfect hypostasis, which is defined by its derivation from the Father by procession.²⁹

Several years later, Jacques Lison shared the same hesitation with Sinkewicz in seeing a direct influence of Augustine on Palamas, but unlike Sinkewicz did not want to exclude the possibility of some 'indirect' influence. However, he also argued

be to examine whether the theology of the *λόγοι τῶν ὄντων* is present here; but this cannot be pursued in the current article.

²⁶ Sinkewicz, *The One Hundred*, 18.

²⁷ Sinkewicz refers to Augustine, *De Trinitate*, IX.4.4 and XV.6.10; for a translation, see Gareth B. Matthews, ed., *Augustine: On the Trinity. Books 8–15*, Cambridge Texts in the History of Philosophy, trans. Stephen McKenna (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002), 27–28 and 176–78.

²⁸ Cf. Augustine, *De Trinitate*, X.11.18 and XV.3.5 [ed. Matthews (trans. McKenna), 58–59 and 171 respectively].

²⁹ Sinkewicz, *The One Hundred*, 18. Wilkins ("The Image of this Highest Love", 387–88) criticises Sinkewicz's stance, reminding that Augustine, in his *De Trinitate*, regards the Holy Spirit as a person, exactly in the same way as the Father and Son, stressing the equality of the divine persons. Wilkins indicatively refers to *De Trinitate*, VII.4.6; VII.6; V.9; I.7.13; VI.7. As it seems Wilkins is correct here, but one finds his claim too strict (ibid., 388) that 'despite Sinkewicz's erudition it is difficult to detect in his remarks the kind of deep understanding of Augustine that would be required to assess whether in fact Palamas' ideas bear any important resemblance to them; rather they perpetuate a dubious and thoroughly apologetic caricature'. However, for a more grounded rejection of Sinkewicz's specific argument, see Demetracopoulos, *Αὐγουστίνος καὶ Γρηγόριος Παλαμάς*, 157–58, n. 230. Cf. Lössl, 'Augustine's "On the Trinity"', 70. Idem, 'Augustine in Byzantium', 280–81.

that the relevant teaching of Palamas is not the same as Augustine's.³⁰ For this reason, he believes that if there really is an Augustinian influence, it is merely superficial.³¹

However, in 1996–97 we have the first documented proofs about Palamas' borrowings from Augustine. In particular, Reinhard Flogaus³² and John Demetracopoulos,³³ almost simultaneously but independently, identify a number of parallels between the Greek translation of Augustine's *De Trinitate* by Maximus Planoudes and Palamas' *oeuvre*.³⁴ After these discoveries, a direct Augustinian influence on Palamas cannot be denied.³⁵ However, let us now make some comments about what exactly this influence may be.

Assessment: Augustine and the Notion of Eros

To summarise, we may draw the following conclusions. There is indeed a parallel in Palamas' and Augustine's conceptions of the *imago Dei*.³⁶ Nevertheless, one can find some crucial differences. First, in order to express his triadic analogies, Augustine seems to base his ideas on human psychology.³⁷ He finds Trinitarian reflections present in the functions of the soul: initially in the triad 'intellect, under-

³⁰ See the important book of Jacques Lison, *L'Esprit répandu: la pneumatologie de Grégoire Palamas* (Paris: Les Éditions du Cerf, 1994 [repr. 2009]), 89. Idem., 'L'Esprit comme amour selon Grégoire Palamas: une influence augustinienne?', *Studia Patristica* 32 (1997): 325–32. In this paper (p. 331), referring to Sinkewicz's thesis, Lison rightly declared that 'Aucun argument ne nous semble en tout cas infirmer la possibilité d'une influence augustinienne' ('In any case, it seems to us that no argument is able to [definitively] rule out the possibility of an Augustinian influence').

³¹ Lison, 'L'Esprit comme amour selon Grégoire Palamas', 330.

³² See mainly his *Theosis bei Palamas und Luther: Ein Beitrag zum ökumenischen Gespräch* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1997), 98–109, 140, 143–53, 155–57, 238–61. Idem., 'Der heimliche Blick nach Westen. Zur Rezeption von Augustins *De Trinitate* durch Gregorios Palamas', *Jahrbuch der Österreichischen Byzantinistik* 46 (1996): 275–97, and 'Palamas and Barlaam Revisited: A Reassessment of East and West in the Hesychast Controversy of Fourteenth Century Byzantium', *SVTQ* 42.1 (1998): 1–32.

³³ *Αὐγουστίνος καὶ Γρηγόριος Παλαμᾶς*, specifically 13–17, 52–54, 83–94, 115. For all the parallels between Palamas' *Chapters* and Planoudes' translation of Augustine's *De Trinitate*, see pp. 183–93.

³⁴ Mainly in Palamas' *Chapters*, *Homily 16: On the Incarnation*, *Contra Beccos*, and *Ad Xenam*.

³⁵ This is admitted also by Sinkewicz, in his latest and very important work on Palamas, i.e., 'Gregory Palamas', in Carmelo Giuseppe Conticello and Vassa Conticello, eds, *La théologie byzantine et sa tradition*, *Corpus Christianorum*, vol. 2 (*XIIIe–XIXe s.*) (Turnhout: Brepols, 2002), 131–88; at 163–64.

³⁶ But why doesn't Palamas ever mention his source, i.e., Augustine's *De Trinitate*? For an interesting justification and some plausible reasons, see Demetracopoulos, *Αὐγουστίνος καὶ Γρηγόριος Παλαμᾶς*, 107–10. In general, a possible explication would be that some Byzantines were facing Augustine with suspicion due to his support for the *Filioque*; this fact may have prevented Palamas from explicitly mentioning his source. Cf. Plested, *Orthodox Readings of Aquinas*, 59. However, it did not prevent him from indirectly referring—in another work—to Augustine as 'one of the wise and apostolic men...' ('ἐπεὶ καὶ τις τῶν σοφῶν καὶ ἀποστολικῶν ἀνδρῶν φησιν...'); see Palamas, *Contra Gregoras II*, 43.10–4, ed. P. Christou, ΠΣ 4 (Θεσσαλονίκη: Κυρομάνος, 1988), 296.

³⁷ For how Augustine, through his reading of the Scripture, decides to call the Holy Spirit 'Love' and 'Gift' (and for some connections with contemporary Christian theology), see Matthew Levering, 'The Holy Spirit in the Trinitarian Communion: "Love" and "Gift"?', *International Journal of Systematic Theology* 16.2 (2014): 126–42.

standing, will, and then in the more developed form of ‘memory, understanding, and love.’³⁸

On the contrary, Palamas most probably draws on a common patristic tradition, though not much developed, which finds a Trinitarian image in the intellect (*nous*), word or reason (*logos*), and spirit (*pneuma*).³⁹ It seems that Palamas, having read Planoudes’ translation, found some useful tools, which he exploited in order to elaborate his views more fully.⁴⁰ Therefore, we should speak instead of a ‘borrowing of words’, not of ideas as such.⁴¹ As has been remarked, ‘Gregory’s borrowings do not extend to what is the live nerve of Augustine’s reflections—the Spirit as “something common”, *commune aliquid*, to the Father and the Son.’⁴² Alexander Golitzin calls this ‘a quietly selective appropriation’ and argues that

³⁸ Andrew Louth, ‘The Reception of St Augustine in Late Byzantium’, in Charalambos Dendrinos and John Demetracopoulos, eds, *When East met West: the Reception of Latin Philosophical and Theological Thought in Late Byzantium*, Acts of the Institute of Classical Studies International Byzantine Colloquium, London, 11–12 June 2012, *Nicolaus, Rivista di Teologia Ecumenico-patristica*, vol. 40, Fasc. 1 (Bari: Istituto di Teologia Ecumenica San Nicola di Bari, 2013), 115–23; at 118.

³⁹ As already stated, this tradition is mainly carried by Gregory Nazianzen, Maximus the Confessor, and John Damascene.

⁴⁰ In another text of his (*Contra Beccum*), Palamas once refers to the Holy Spirit as ‘the communion and love of the Father and the Son’ (*κοινωνίαν και ἀγάπην... τοῦ Πατρὸς καὶ τοῦ Υἱοῦ τὸ Πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον*). See Panagiotis Papaevangelou, ed., ΠΣ 1 (Θεσσαλονίκη: Κυρομάνος, 1982), 164.14–5. Here Gregory speaks of the procession of the Holy Spirit from the Father alone.

⁴¹ Flogaus agrees with this, ‘Palamas and Barlaam Revisited’, 31. Amphilochios Radović, in his study on Palamas’ Triadology, does recognise that Gregory’s psychological triad is an Augustinian one, but he stresses the different way Palamas uses it. In particular, he comments that Augustine, based on this triad, concludes by supporting the *Filioque*, whereas Palamas concludes the opposite. See A. Radović, *Τὸ μυστήριον τῆς Ἁγίας Τριάδος κατὰ τὸν Ἅγιον Γρηγόριον Παλαμᾶν* (Θεσσαλονίκη: Πατριαρχικὸν Ἰδρυμα Πατερικῶν Μελετῶν, 1973 and 1991), 53–54. Flogaus mentions something similar (‘Palamas and Barlaam Revisited’, 20–21) about Augustine’s understanding of Father and Son as *one* principle of the Spirit: Palamas uses Augustine’s passage, but comes to the opposite conclusion, viz. that the Father is the sole principle of both the Son and the Spirit. Flogaus refers to Augustine, *De Trinitate* V, 13, 14 and Palamas, *Capita* 132. Nevertheless, it should be noted that Augustine’s treatment of the procession of the Holy Spirit is entirely unpolemical. He did not know that the Eastern Fathers did not accept the *Filioque*; he thought that they also supported the same belief. Were he aware of their stance, it is very possible that he would not have insisted so much on it, or that he would even have expressed the opposite position. Cf. Louth, ‘The Reception of St Augustine in Late Byzantium’, 119–20: ‘Augustine does not argue for the *Filioque* against those who reject it, rather he takes for granted an understanding of the Spirit who proceeds *ex utroque*, from both [cf. Brian Daley, ‘Revisiting the “Filioque” (Part I): Roots and Branches of an Old Debate’, *Pro Ecclesia* 10 (2001): 31–62]. Someone convinced of the doctrine of the procession of the Holy Spirit from the Father alone might well have read these affirmations of the procession *ex utroque* as referring to the procession of the Spirit in the Divine Economy, not within the Trinity itself. Augustine does not work with a sharp distinction between *theologia* and *economia* in the way the Greeks did, and continue to, nor did he know a creed that affirmed that the Spirit *ex Patre procedit*—proceeds from the Father.’ Therefore, one would agree with Demetracopoulos that we cannot know for sure what exactly Palamas believed about whether Augustine supported the *Filioque* or not (*Ἀὐγουστίνος καὶ Γρηγόριος Παλαμᾶς*, 156–57, n. 227).

⁴² Louth, ‘The Reception of St Augustine in Late Byzantium’, 118. Cf. Plested, *Orthodox Readings of Aquinas*, 43–44. As Metr. Kallistos Ware points out, the analogy of the ‘mutual love’ that St Augustine uses is developed by some Latin authors of the Middle Ages, mainly Richard of St Victor (twelfth century). Moreover, it has a central place in the Trinitarian theology of some Russian religious-philosophical thinkers, in the end of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, such as Vladimir Solovyov, Fr Pavel Florensky, Fr Sergius Bulgakov, Nicolas Berdiaev, and Paul Evdokimov (‘Τὸ ἀνθρώπινο πρόσωπο ὡς εἰκόνα τῆς Ἁγίας Τριάδος: Ἀπὸ τὸν ἱερό Ἀὐγουστίνου στὸν Ἅγιο Γρηγόριο τὸν Παλαμᾶ’ [‘The Human Person as an Image of

It is very clear that Palamas quite liked much of what he had read in *De Trinitate* and, moreover, found that those sections which he particularly liked, all of them from the latter part of Augustine's work, could be easily and naturally engrafted into already existing elements within Greek Christian literature in such a way as to enrich and deepen the whole. In this regard, Gregory was a good deal bolder and more confident of the strength of his tradition than are many modern Orthodox theologians... Palamas did not then accept the whole of Augustine on the Trinity, but only that (and it seems to have been quite a lot) which he appears to have felt could be enfolded without rupture or strain into the already existent theological *Gestalt* of the Greek East.⁴³

That is why, from our point of view, one should not be puzzled by Palamas' endeavour, as often happens in recent scholarship.⁴⁴

the Holy Trinity: from St Augustine to St Gregory Palamas'], speech at the Honorary Degree Nomination of Metr. Kallistos Ware, Thessaloniki, 3 June 2015, accessed 6 June 2015, <http://www.pemptousia.gr/author/kallistos-ware/>).

⁴³ Alexander Golitzin, 'Dionysius the Areopagite in the Works of Gregory Palamas. On the Question of a "Christological Corrective" and Related Matters', *SVTQ* 46.2 (2002): 163–90; at 183–84.

⁴⁴ Flogaus ('Palamas and Barlaam', 1–5 and idem, 'Inspiration', 68–73) mentions some examples of scholars (not only Orthodox) who thought that the theology of the Bishop of Hippo had many problems, and, for this reason, tried to omit the possibility of an Augustinian influence on Palamas. For an interesting relevant presentation, see also Plested, *Orthodox Readings of Aquinas*, 29–34, 44. In general, a very critical stance towards the theology of St Augustine is held by the late Fr John Romanides. For instance, see his *Ρωμαῖοι ἢ Ρωμηοὶ Πατέρες τῆς Ἐκκλησίας. Τόμος Ι. Γρηγορίου Παλαμᾶ ἔργα 1: Ὑπὲρ τῶν Ἱερῶς Ἑσυχάζόντων Τριάς Α΄* (Θεσσαλονίκη: Πουρναράς, 1991), 5–194 (passim). There, in many points (see, for example, pp. 17–18, 56–59), he argues that a great part of Western theology has been influenced, through the centuries, by some erroneous points of the theology of St Augustine and, for this reason, led to numerous problems. For instance, Romanides finds a great problem in Augustine's interpretation of the Old Testament theophanies (see, for example, p. 58). It should be noted that David Bradshaw argues something similar (see 'The innovations of Augustine', in his *Aristotle East and West: Metaphysics and the Division of Christendom* [Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004], 222–29). This whole stance of Romanides, though perhaps somehow exaggerated, is very interesting. However, a detailed assessment of it and the arguments he brings to support it, go beyond the scope of this article. For several objections to the relevant positions of Romanides and Bradshaw, and also Christos Yannaras, who seems to walk on this same line of thought, see some of the contributions in Papanikolaou and Demacopoulos, eds, *Orthodox Readings of Augustine* (e.g., pp. 208–9, 212–13, etc.). For Bradshaw's response, see pp. 244–51 in the same book, and for his contribution, where he again approaches critically some points in Augustine's teaching, see *ibid.*, 227–43. Recently, Hierotheos Vlachos (Metropolitan of Nafpaktos) ('Τὰ ἑκατὸν πενήκοντα κεφάλαια τοῦ Ἁγίου Γρηγορίου τοῦ Παλαμᾶ' [The One Hundred and Fifty Chapters of Saint Gregory Palamas], *Θεολογία* 80.1 (2009): 5–25) has maintained something similar. He finds many incompatibilities between *De Trinitate* and Palamas' teaching; he therefore finds it very unlikely (almost impossible) for Gregory to have borrowed some lines from it (see mainly pp. 7–9, 12–14, 16, 18, 19–20 of the aforementioned article). In particular, he supports that Palamas could not possibly have used Augustine, because Barlaam, Palamas' opponent, was relying heavily on the Bishop of Hippo. However, as we mentioned, Palamas is sometimes only using the words, not exactly the ideas of Augustine. Moreover, Metr. Hierotheos presents three hypotheses: first, that a specific abstract from the *Chapters* (*Capita* 133.1–3: *Θέσεις καὶ ἔξεις καὶ τόποι καὶ χρόνοι καὶ εἴ τι τοιοῦτον οὐ κυρίως ἐπὶ τοῦ Θεοῦ λέγονται, ἀλλὰ μεταφορικῶς. τὸ δὲ ποιεῖν καὶ ἐνεργεῖν ἐπὶ μόνου τοῦ Θεοῦ ἀληθέστατα ἂν λέγοιτο*), which is taken from the fifth chapter of *De Trinitate*, is interpolated: someone other than Gregory has added it. Second, that the major part of the text was indeed written by Palamas, but a posterior theologian, who knew the teaching of Augustine, added whole paragraphs. Third,

Why Does Palamas Borrow the Notion of Eros?

We have left the most important question for the end: why, at last, does Palamas borrow the notion of *eros* from Augustine? To what end? Georgios Martzelos gives two plausible reasons: first, Palamas, through *eros*, merely refers to the patristic teaching of the ‘eternal rest’ (αίδιος ἐπανάπαυσις) of the Holy Spirit on the Son, in the context of the intra-Trinitarian relationships.⁴⁵ Second, Palamas tries to preclude any possible interpretation of Augustine’s teaching supporting the *Filioque* (because, as shown, Gregory uses this idea of *eros* to oppose the *Filioque*).⁴⁶

Furthermore, it seems to me that there are two other important reasons, which are rarely—if ever—stressed in the scholarly literature.⁴⁷ Initially, through the notion of *eros* Palamas is guided to the idea of the ‘vivifying power’ (ζωοποιὸς δύναμις) of the human soul, namely the power of the soul that grants life to the body. Many things could be said here. For the purposes of this article, let us only mention that for St Gregory it is a basic means of explaining how man bears the image of God to a greater extent than the angels. Moreover, it is closely connected with the human body and occupies a major place in Palamas’ anthropology.⁴⁸

More specifically, St Gregory articulates this idea in his thirty-eighth and thirty-ninth *Chapters*. Initially he mentions that,

the intellectual and rational nature of the angels also possesses intellect, and word from the intellect, and the *love* of the intellect for the word, which *love* is also from the intellect and ever coexists with the word and the intellect, and which could be called spirit since it accompanies the word by nature.⁴⁹

and most probable according to Metr. Hierotheos, the *Chapters* is a work of a later theologian, who knew the teaching of both Palamas and Augustine and made a synopsis of those. Here, he makes two suggestions: either Theophanes of Nicaea (ca. 1315/20–ca. 1380/1) or Gennadios Scholarios (ca. 1398/1405– after 1472). However, from our point of view, these hypotheses are not likely to be true, because both critical editors of the *Chapters* (i.e., Sinkewicz and Christou) have accepted the authenticity of this text. Moreover, as we have seen, Palamas also exploits Augustinian expressions in other texts, which undoubtedly derive from his pen (for instance in *Contra Beccum*). For a brief response to Metr. Hierotheos’ paper, see Georgios Martzelos, ‘Τὸ Ἅγιο Πνεῦμα ὡς “ἔρως ἀπόρρητος”’.

⁴⁵ See, for instance, the relevant quotation from St John Damascene mentioned above: *Expositio fidei* 8.173, ed. Kotter, 25: καὶ ἐν Υἱῷ ἀναπαυόμενον [i.e., the Holy Spirit].

⁴⁶ See Martzelos, ‘Τὸ Ἅγιο Πνεῦμα ὡς “ἔρως ἀπόρρητος”’, mainly 11, 18–21.

⁴⁷ The following reason (i.e., the third one), as far as I know, has never before been proposed in scholarship to explain why Palamas borrows the topic of *eros*. It is, most likely, underlined for the first time in this article.

⁴⁸ This is what Sinkewicz calls the pneumatological aspect of the *imago Dei* (‘Gregory Palamas’, 171). In general, for the soul’s ζωοποιὸς δύναμις according to Palamas, see his *Capita* 38–9. Idem, *Homily* 60, *On the Holy Feast of Theophany*, critical ed. Vasileios St. Pseftogas, *Ὁμιλίες [Homilies]*, ΠΣ 6 (Θεσσαλονίκη: Κυρομάνος, 2015), 645–56 (=Γρηγορίου τοῦ Παλαμᾶ Ἀπαντα τὰ Ἔργα 11, in ed. Panagiotis K. Christou et al., *Ἕλληνες Πατέρες τῆς Ἐκκλησίας* 79 (Θεσσαλονίκη: Πατερικαὶ Ἐκδόσεις «Γρηγόριος ὁ Παλαμᾶς», 1986), 506–34). Cf. Sinkewicz, ‘Gregory Palamas’, 168–70.

⁴⁹ *Capita* 38.1–5, ed. Sinkewicz, 124 (ed. Christou, 56.9–12; emphasis added): Ἐχει μὲν οὖν καὶ ἡ τῶν ἀγγέλων νοερά καὶ λογικὴ φύσις νοῦν τε καὶ λόγον ἐκ τοῦ νοῦ καὶ τὸν πρὸς τὸν λόγον ἔρωτα τοῦ νοῦ, ὃς καὶ αὐτὸς ἐστὶν ἐκ τοῦ νοῦ καὶ σύνεστιν αἰεὶ τῷ τε λόγῳ καὶ τῷ νῷ καὶ πνεῦμα ἂν καλοῖτο, ὡς τῷ λόγῳ φύσει συμπαρομαρτῶν.

That said, Palamas argues that the angels⁵⁰ also have the *imago Dei*, and that reflections of the Trinity can also be found in the angels, as happens in man—and as analysed in section (a) of this article. However, there is a crucial difference. The spirit of the angels is not life-giving (ζωοποιόν); it has no vivifying power, because the angels have no body. On the other hand, the intellectual and rational human soul was created in conjunction (συνεκτίσθη) with an earthly body. For this reason, the soul has received from God a spirit which is also ζωοποιόν, ‘through which it [i.e., the soul] conserves and gives life to the body joined to it.’⁵¹

With this observation, Palamas explains the lofty value of the human soul: without the soul’s energy, the body has no life. He continues by arguing that the human spirit, ‘the life-giving power in his [i.e., man’s] body, is intellectual love (νοερός ἔρως); it is from the intellect and the word, and exists in the word and the intellect, and possesses both the word and the intellect within itself’.⁵² Obviously this view helps Gregory to stress the likeness of the human spirit to the Holy Spirit, who, as already analysed above in section (a), is ‘the ineffable love of the Begetter towards the ineffably begotten Word himself’.⁵³ Moreover, this spirit is the soul’s loving bond with its own body, which is so intense that the soul never wishes to leave and be separated from the body ‘and will not do so at all unless force is brought to bear on it externally from some very serious disease or trauma’.⁵⁴

Palamas concludes, in *Chapter 39*: ‘The intellectual and rational (λογική) nature of the soul, alone possessing intellect and word and life-giving spirit, has alone been created more in the image of God than the incorporeal angels’.⁵⁵ From all the above evidence, it is shown that, very likely, Palamas borrows the notion of *eros* from Augustine in order to exalt the rank of the human person, via his *imago Dei* theology.

Last, but not least, one further reason could be invoked as to why St Gregory borrows the notion of *eros* from Augustine. It has been maintained that Palamas, in

⁵⁰ For an interesting recent book on the teaching of some Christian writers about the angels, see Ellen Muehlberger, *Angels in Late Ancient Christianity* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2013).

⁵¹ *Capita* 38.5–10, ed. Sinkewicz, 124 (ed. Christou, 56.13–18; emphasis added): ‘Ἄλλ’ οὐκ ἔχει καὶ ζωοποιόν τὸ πνεῦμα τοῦτο, οὐδὲ γὰρ συνημμένον εἴληφεν ἐκ γῆς παρὰ Θεοῦ σῶμα, ἵνα καὶ ζωοποιόν τε καὶ συνεκτικὴν λάβῃ πρὸς τοῦτο δύναμιν. ἡ δὲ νοερά καὶ λογικὴ φύσις τῆς ψυχῆς, ἐπεὶ γηίνῳ συνεκτίσθη σώματι καὶ ζωοποιόν ἔλαβε τὸ πνεῦμα παρὰ τοῦ Θεοῦ, δι’ οὗ συνέχει καὶ ζωοποιεῖ τὸ συνημμένον σῶμα...’ On another occasion, it would be very interesting to research the roots of Palamas’ approach.

⁵² *Capita* 38.10–14, ed. Sinkewicz, 124 (ed. Christou, 56.18–21; emphasis added): ‘παρ’ οὗ καὶ δείκνυται τοῖς συνιοῦσιν, ὅτι νοερός ἐστιν ἔρως τὸ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου πνεῦμα, τὸ τοῦ σώματος ζωοποιόν, ὅπερ ἐκ τοῦ νοῦ ἐστι καὶ τοῦ λόγου ἐστί, καὶ ἐν τῷ λόγῳ καὶ τῷ νῷ ἐστι καὶ ἐν ἑαυτῷ ἔχει τὸν τε λόγον καὶ τὸν νοῦν’. As Sinkewicz explains, ‘This human spirit or life-giving power in the body is an extension of the intellectual love (νοερός ἔρως)’ (*The One Hundred*, 19). For the ‘intellectual love’ and its relation to the Holy Spirit, cf. sections (a–b) of the current article.

⁵³ *Capita* 36.11–13, ed. Sinkewicz, 122 (ed. Christou, 54.25–27).

⁵⁴ *Capita* 38.14–17, ed. Sinkewicz, 124 (ed. Christou, 56.21–25): ‘τοσοῦτο γὰρ ἐρασμίαν ἔχει δι’ αὐτοῦ φυσικῶς τὴν πρὸς τὸ οἰκεῖον σῶμα ἢ ψυχὴ συνάφειαν, ὥς μηδέποτε ἀπολιπεῖν τοῦτο θέλειν, μηδ’ ἀπολείπειν ὅλως, μὴ βίας ἐπενεχθείσης ἐκ νόσου δὴ τινος μεγίστης ἢ πληγῆς ἔξωθεν’.

⁵⁵ *Capita* 39.1–4, ed. Sinkewicz, 126 (ed. Christou, 56.26–28): ‘Ἡ νοερά καὶ λογικὴ φύσις τῆς ψυχῆς, μόνη νοῦν ἔχουσα καὶ λόγον καὶ πνεῦμα ζωοποιόν, μόνη καὶ τῶν ἀσωμάτων ἀγγέλων μᾶλλον κατ’ εἰκόνα τοῦ Θεοῦ παρ’ αὐτοῦ δεδημιούργηται’.

his theology regarding the procession of the Holy Spirit, was likely influenced by the views that Gregory of Cyprus had developed approximately fifty years earlier.⁵⁶ The latter argued two important things. First, one can say that the Holy Spirit is ‘of the essence of the Son’ and thus refer to their consubstantiality, but the Father remains the sole cause of the hypostatic existence of the Holy Spirit, in the same way as the Father is the only source of the divinity; namely, the Spirit derives his existence *only* from the Father.⁵⁷ Second, however, the manifestation of the Holy Spirit from the Son (ἐκ Πατρὸς δι’ Υἱοῦ) should not be taken only as the Spirit’s temporal mission (ἀποστολή; i.e., in the *economy*), but also as the Spirit’s ‘eternal resplendence’ (αἰδῖος ἔκλαμψις or ἔκφανσις; that is, at the level of theology).⁵⁸ For this reason, according to Gregory of Cyprus, one may say that the Holy Spirit *is* (or *exists*) from the Father through the Son (ἐκ Πατρὸς δι’ Υἱοῦ; or even *of the Father* and *of the Son*), without, however, admitting that the Spirit derives his existence from both the Father and the Son.⁵⁹ In particular, the expression αἰδῖος δι’ Υἱοῦ ἔκλαμψις signifies the *property* (or: *capability*), which the Son eternally has, of sending the Holy Spirit within the context

⁵⁶ Jean-Claude Larchet, ‘Introduction’, 97, 99. Cf. Meyendorff, *Introduction*, 25–26 (=A *Study*, 13). Panagiotis Christou, ΠΣ 1, 17. Marcus Plested also sees Palamas as following this same line of thought (*Orthodox Readings of Aquinas*, 36–40). For a good analysis of this topic, perhaps the best at this time, see Larchet, ‘Introduction’, 94–103. For Gregory of Cyprus and his theology, see Jean-Claude Larchet, ed., *La vie et l’œuvre théologique de Georges/Grégoire II de Chypre (1241–1290) patriarche de Constantinople*, Théologie Byzantine (Paris: Les Éditions du Cerf, 2012). Chrysostomos Savvatos, *Ἡ Θεολογικὴ ὀρολογία καὶ προβληματικὴ τῆς Πνευματολογίας Γρηγορίου Β΄ τοῦ Κυπρίου* [*The Theological Terminology and Speculation of the Pneumatology of Gregory II the Cypriot*] (Κατερίνη: Ἐπέκταση, 1997). Aristeides Papadakis, *Crisis in Byzantium. The Filioque Controversy in the Patriarchate of Gregory II of Cyprus (1283–1289)* (New York: Fordham University Press, 1983). Siecienski, *The Filioque*, 140–43. Theodoros Alexopoulos, ‘Die Argumentation des Patriarchen Gregorios II. Kyprios zur Widerlegung des Filioque-Ansatzes in der Schrift *De processione Spiritus Sancti*’, *Byzantinische Zeitschrift* 104.1 (2011): 1–38.

⁵⁷ See, for example, Gregory of Cyprus, *On the procession of the Holy Spirit*, 270D–271A: ‘Ἐπεὶ δὲ οὕτω, παντὶ που δῆλον ὡς τὸ Πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον ἐκ τῆς οὐσίας λεγόμενον τοῦ Πατρὸς, καλῶς ἂν ἔχη καὶ εὐσεβῶς καὶ ἐκ τῆς τοῦ Υἱοῦ λέγεσθαι. Μία γάρ, καὶ ὡς οὐσία οὐκ ἔστιν ὅπως ποτὲ διαίρεσιν δέχοιτο... Διότι δὲ μία, τὸ ἐκ τῆς οὐσίας ὁμολογούμενον τοῦ Πατρὸς Πνεῦμα, καὶ ἐκ τῆς οὐσίας τοῦ Υἱοῦ ὑπάρχον ὁμολογεῖται. Πλὴν οὐ διὰ τοῦτ’ ἤδη καὶ ἐκ τῆς τοῦ Υἱοῦ ὑποστάσεως τὸ Πνεῦμα...’ For other relevant references to this text of the Cypriot, see Larchet, ‘Introduction’, 97–98, n. 164.

⁵⁸ For instance, see Gregory of Cyprus, *On the procession of the Holy Spirit*, 290C: ‘καὶ ἡκεῖ [the Holy Spirit] δι’ αὐτοῦ [i.e., the Son] καὶ ἀπολάμπει καὶ πέφηνε κατὰ τὴν προαιώνιον αὐτοῦ καὶ αἰδῖον ἔκλαμψιν...’ For similar references to the works of the Cypriot, see Larchet, ‘Introduction’, 98–99, n. 165. For an in depth theological analysis of the αἰδῖος ἔκλαμψις according to the Cypriot, see Savvatos, *Ἡ Θεολογικὴ ὀρολογία*, 180–228.

⁵⁹ Cf. Siecienski, *The Filioque*, 141–3. The theology of the Cypriot influenced greatly the *Council of Constantinople (Blachernae)* in 1285. See, for example, the relevant *Synodal Tome*, which, besides, he himself authored: ‘Ἐκθεσις τοῦ τόμου τῆς πίστεως κατὰ τοῦ Βέκκου’ (PG 142:240C): ‘δι’ Υἱοῦ γὰρ ὁμολογουμένως αὐτὸς αἰδίως ἐκλάμπει καὶ ἀναδείκνυται ὁ Παράκλητος... δηλοῖ δὲ καὶ τὴν εἰς ἡμᾶς χορηγίαν καὶ δόσιν καὶ ἀποστολήν...’ For a good and succinct discussion of the eternal ἔκφανσις of the Holy Spirit, with references both to Church Fathers and modern theologians, see Demetrios Bathrellos, *Σχεδιάσμα Δογματικῆς Θεολογίας. Μὲ βάση τὸ συγγραφικὸ ἔργο τοῦ Ἁγίου Συμεὼν Θεσσαλονίκης (†1429)* [Orthodox Dogmatics at the End of Byzantium: the Case of St. Symeon of Thessalonica] (Ἀθήνα: Ἐν Πλῶ, 2008), 140–47 and 153–57.

of the divine *economy*, as an expression referring to the eternal life and communion of the divine persons.⁶⁰

Palamas takes up these two ideas in his *Apodictic Discourses*, though the second one in a much more moderate way, and definitely not as explicitly as the Cypriot.⁶¹ In general, as far as I know, nowhere does Palamas in his *oeuvre* explicitly refer to the *αίδιος ἔκλαμψις* or *ἔκφανσις*, about which Gregory of Cyprus speaks at length, or at least to the extent and with the clarity of the latter. Although Palamas often uses the word *ἔκφανσις* or its derivatives, it is not in the same context we are writing about now (usually, he uses it in reference to the uncreated activities or to the vision of the divine light).⁶²

Nevertheless, it seems to me possible that Palamas, using the notion of *eros*, has in the back of his mind the arguments of Gregory of Cyprus mentioned above.⁶³ The

⁶⁰ Savvatos, *Ἡ Θεολογική ὁρολογία*, 234.

⁶¹ For the first one, see mainly *Apodictic Discourse* II, 30, 62–68, 73, ed. Bobrinsky, ΠΣ 1, 105, 133–40, 144–5 respectively; for similarities to the second one, see *Apodictic Discourse* II, 65, 69, 75–76, ΠΣ 1, 136–7, 141–2, 146–7 respectively. Cf. Larchet, ‘Introduction’, 99, n. 167. It seems, therefore, that both Gregory of Cyprus and St Gregory Palamas establish a connection between *theology* and *economy*, as far as the procession of the Holy Spirit is concerned. However, there are two reasons why this connection is not of the same type as that of which Latin theologians of their epoch spoke. First, the latter ignored or rejected the distinction between essence and energies. Second, it conceived the procession of the Spirit based on his manifestation in the *economy* (for the above, see Larchet, ‘Introduction’, 102). Nevertheless, there is indeed a relation between *theology* and *economy*. But, as Larchet notes, what is important, is to distinguish the energy of the Holy Spirit from his hypostasis, both in *theology* and *economy*. Because, in both cases, what is manifested is not the *hypostasis* of the Spirit, but his *energy*, the divine uncreated energy, ‘which, in reality, is the energy which shines forth or radiates from the common essence of the three divine hypostases, from the Father, through the Son, in the Spirit’ [ἐκ Πατρός, δι’ Υἱοῦ, ἐν Ἁγίῳ Πνεύματι] (‘Introduction’, 102). Cf. Plested, *Orthodox Readings of Aquinas*, 38. Consequently, Gregory of Cyprus and Gregory Palamas show that there is indeed a relation between, on the one hand, the eternal manifestation and resplendence of the Holy Spirit from the Son, and, on the other hand, the manifestation or mission of the Spirit from the Son to humanity (or to creation). Larchet stresses a crucial theological reason for this: ‘the energy, of the Spirit, which is sent, manifested, breathed forth [*insufflée*] and given to human beings, is nothing else than the divine uncreated energy; it is somehow included [*incluse*] with the latter, which would radiate even if the world was not created and there were no humans to receive it.’ Thus, in the Fathers one can find ‘two modes of energetic manifestation of the Spirit’, the eternal and temporal, if such a distinction can be drawn (‘Introduction’, 101).

⁶² Reinhard Flogaus is correct in arguing that Palamas never refers to the Cypriot. However, Flogaus’s stance on this matter does not seem to me very plausible, because he bluntly rejects the possibility of Palamas being influenced by Gregory of Cyprus. In particular, Flogaus writes that Palamas ‘explicitly repudiated the possibility of eternal revelation as a Latin impiety and understood revelation, like creation, to be a temporal effect (*ἀποτέλεσμα*) of the eternal energy. Obviously, Palamas’ stance on the *Filioque* question was much more traditional, inflexible and unyielding to the Latin position than that of the Cypriot. Very likely, he saw in the Patriarch’s attempt to mediate between East and West in this crucial question a betrayal of the Orthodox position’ (‘Palamas and Barlaam’, 17). On the other hand, Kallistos Ware notes that Palamas, in general, was not hostile to the Latin West (‘*Τὸ ἀνθρώπινο πρόσωπο ὡς εἰκόνα τῆς Ἁγίας Τριάδος*’).

⁶³ If this is true, it is a very important point, because, it is generally acknowledged that this position of Gregory of Cyprus, if it were accepted by all sides, could be a solution to the vexing problem of the *Filioque*. As Larchet has argued, Gregory of Cyprus and Gregory Palamas developed ‘une théologie orthodoxe du *Filioque*’ (‘Introduction’, 102). Plested, referring to Palamas, uses the same expression, namely ‘an Orthodox *filioque*’ (*Orthodox Readings of Aquinas*, 38–9). Cf. Savvatos, *Ἡ Θεολογική ὁρολογία*, 224–28, 235. Siecienski (*The Filioque*, 147) makes a very interesting comment, which is directly related to our discussion: ‘While the Latin doctrine remained heterodox, there was thus a sense in which the *filioque* could

reason is that Palamas uses some expressions which at times resemble the Cypriot's approach. In particular, as shown above in section (a), for Palamas the Son possesses *eros* (i.e., the Holy Spirit) as, first, '*proceeding from the Father together with him* [i.e., the Son]', and, second, '*as resting connaturally in him*'.⁶⁴ This may indicate the fact that, according to Palamas, the Spirit is manifested from the Father through the Son, not only in *economy*, but also in *theology*.⁶⁵

Consequently, it is possible that Palamas borrows his concept of *eros* from Augustine, among other reasons, in order to underline the reality of the eternal manifestation and resplendence of the Holy Spirit. But, even if this is true, he makes this connection in a rather obscure way; he does not give us enough clues to state our case in stronger terms.

Concluding Remarks

This article dealt with the presence of St Augustine in St Gregory Palamas' *oeuvre*, with special attention given to reflections of the Trinity in man and the notion of *eros*. It was hinted at that Palamas did indeed use some of Augustine's own words, but without fully incorporating his ideas.⁶⁶ In particular, he cannot have borrowed his triad *nous-logos-pneuma* from the Bishop of Hippo, because Augustine's triads are always some variant of mind-word-will or love.⁶⁷ Undoubtedly, though, Palamas located some parallels between his own thinking about the Triadic image and that of

be interpreted in an orthodox manner and not simply in reference to the economy. Palamas thus offered the Byzantines a constructive alternative to the prevailing unionist and conservative tendencies of his contemporaries, keeping alive the *via media* established by Maximus the Confessor and Gregory of Cyprus. However, while Gregory's theology was accepted by no fewer than three local councils (often referred to as the Palamite councils of 1341, 1347, and 1351), it remained controversial enough that at Ferrara-Florence its introduction was forbidden by the emperor. Nevertheless, in my view, it is a subject open for debate—namely whether Palamite theology was absent from Ferrara-Florence because it was controversial among the Byzantines, or for diplomatic and political reasons; but we do not have space to treat the subject in this article.

⁶⁴ *Capita* 36.11–5, ed. Sinkewicz, 122 (ed. Christou, ΠΣ 5, 54.25–9; emphasis added): 'Εκεῖνο δὲ τὸ πνεῦμα τοῦ ἀνωτάτω λόγου οἶόν τις ἔρωσ ἐστὶν ἀπόρρητος τοῦ γεννήτορος πρὸς αὐτὸν τὸν ἀπορρήτως γεννηθέντα λόγον, ᾧ καὶ αὐτὸς ὁ τοῦ πατρὸς ἐπέραστος λόγος καὶ υἱὸς χρήται πρὸς τὸν γεννήτορα, ἀλλ' ὡς ἐκ τοῦ πατρὸς ἔχων αὐτὸν συμπροελθόντα καὶ συμφυῶς ἐν αὐτῷ ἀναπανόμενον'.

⁶⁵ Cf. Plested, *Orthodox Readings of Aquinas*, 36–37, where it is mentioned that 'There are antecedents for this kind of language in the Byzantine tradition: Maximus the Confessor's intuition of the fundamental congruity of procession "through" and "from the Son"; John of Damascus' eternal "resting" of the Spirit in the Son; or Gregory of Cyprus' eternal "shining forth" of the Spirit through the Son.' For St Maximus the Confessor, see his *Letter to Marinus* (PG 91:136AD). For St John and Gregory of Cyprus, see above in this article.

⁶⁶ As Wilkins ('"The Image of this Highest Love"', 410) puts it, 'this thunderbolt from the Augustinian sky seems but a passing squall in the total pattern of Gregory's thought.'

⁶⁷ Cf. Louth, 'The Reception of St Augustine in Late Byzantium', 118: 'Augustine's triadic analogies seem to be derived from his understanding of human psychology; he is looking for reflections on the Trinity in the operations of the souls, moving from mind, understanding and will to the more adequate memory, understanding and love.'

Augustine, and found rather attractive the way in which Augustine gives *love* (ἔρως) a central place.⁶⁸

The reader, however, at this point, cannot help but wonder: how does this article's interpretation differ from those of J. Demetracopoulos, R. Flogaus, and R. Sinkewicz? As shown, the article builds on the findings of Demetracopoulos and Flogaus concerning the use of certain Augustinian passages from Palamas; something that scholarship, in general, nowadays accepts.⁶⁹ However, it seems that the aforementioned scholars, despite their important contributions on the topic, did not discover the deeper reasons and aims that motivate Palamas' endeavour. This is the gap that our article has tried to fill; it can be considered something of a theological *supplementum* to their work.

To this end, we first referred to Martzelos's relevant analysis and suggestion, namely a) the 'eternal rest' (αἰδῖος ἐπανάπαυσις) of the Holy Spirit on the Son and b) the rejection of the *Filioque*. Second, we proposed two other reasons as a probable solution to the question at hand, namely c) the 'vivifying power' (ζωοποιὸς δύναμις) of the human soul, a major notion in Palamas' anthropology, and d) the Holy Spirit's 'eternal resplendence' (αἰδῖος ἔκλαμψις).⁷⁰ These are the four possible reasons (a–d) suggested in this article as to why Palamas takes up Augustine's notion of *eros*, and, as far as the third reason is concerned, it is likely the first time that this has been mentioned in scholarly literature.

In conclusion, if we may add a final word, we would note the following: what is important for us today is to think about how Palamas' endeavour could inspire Orthodox theology in our own era. We saw that Palamas borrowed an important notion from what most would consider a 'heterodox' environment. Does this entail that Orthodox theology nowadays, being deeply based on its rich tradition (dogmatic, liturgical, canonical, etc.), could indeed, at the same time, trace useful points in *loci* that may seem 'foreign' at first sight? If so, what exactly would this mean? How could it be achieved? Would there not be certain hazards involved? And how could they be overcome?⁷¹ Undoubtedly, St Gregory's example has much to teach us, but what exactly this entails will require further and more thorough examination.

⁶⁸ In Sinkewicz's words, 'Although Palamas is wholly traditional in seeking a Trinitarian analogy in the human person's νοῦς, λόγος, πνεῦμα, he appears to develop this analogy further through the influence of his reading of Augustine's *De Trinitate*' ('Gregory Palamas', 170, n. 121).

⁶⁹ As far as Sinkewicz is concerned, we mentioned that, he initially, in his early writings on Palamas, rejected the possibility of an Augustinian influence, either direct or indirect; but he changed his opinion in his later article in *La theologie byzantine* (2002). However, let us not forget that Sinkewicz has rightly indicated some points of divergence between Palamas' theology and that of Augustine; cf. section (b) of the current article.

⁷⁰ As far as I could know, reasons (c) and (d) have not been proposed by Demetracopoulos, Flogaus, or Sinkewicz.

⁷¹ For the moment, it suffices to say that a great Father and spiritual teacher of the Orthodox Church, St Nikodimos the Hagiorite (†1809), despite being deeply rooted in Eastern spirituality, wrote some of his most well-known texts (e.g., *Unseen Warfare* [Ὁ Ἀόρατος Πόλεμος]) by drawing heavily on western theologians.