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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 εὐσύνοπτος περὶ τῶν θανασίμων καὶ συγγνωστῶν

---

1 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 Sklodowska-Curie grant agreement No. 703595. Hereafter *Summa Theologiae* will be abbreviated as *ST*, I/I1 II2/II1 II3/III1 respectively; q. stands for *quaestio*, a. for *articulus*, arg. for *argumentum*, pr. for *prologus*, s. c. for *sed contra* and co. for *corpus.*


5 Cf. ibidem, p. 28223: ἀντιμόνοι σοι καὶ περὶ αὐτῶν παρέχομεν εἴδησιν, καὶ διὰ σοῦ τοῖς ἐντευξομένοις.

6 See http://pinales.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 Γενάδιος (sic) ἄρχιπεισάκον τοῦ Κωνσταντινουπόλεως τοῦ Σχολαρίου, Διδασκαλία περὶ τῶν θανασίμων, καὶ συγγνωστῶν ἀμαρτημάτων, in S. MACRAIOS, Διδασκαλία εὐσύνοπτος τοῦ μακαρίου Πατριάρχου Κωνσταντινουπόλεως τοῦ Σχολαρίου ἡ Νόμος Εὐαγγελικὸς ἐν ἐπιτιμίᾳ σαφῶς καὶ εὐλήπτως ἐκτεθεῖς. Constantinople 1806, p. 63-80.


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, apparat. crit., passim.

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

Macraios’ and Nazianzenos’ editions lack any mention to the source of the On the difference, while Jugie has traced only five sources, all of them Biblical. Yet, he remarked that “la doctrine de Scholarios sur le sujet traité s’accorde en général avec celle des théologiens catholiques.” More significantly, G. Podskalsky has noted that Scholarios has drawn some material from Thomas Aquinas’ ST, IIa IIae, while J. A. Demetacropoulos has recently remarked that there are some parallels between this text and Scholarios’ sermon On almsgiving, which is based on certain passages of ST, IIa IIae. 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 as expounded in his ST,
Iª IIae and IIª IIae. Additionally, I will examine its relation to another set of Thomistic Notes of Scholarios, which has not yet attracted the interest of scholars, namely the Necessary questions. Moreover, given that Scholarios not only had access to Demetrios Kydones’ (ca 1320/1325-1397) Greek translation of Thomas’ ST, Iª IIae and IIª IIae, but also that he himself composed a Compendium of ST, Iª IIae and partly abbreviated the text of IIae IIae, 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 sins (with

---

21 J.-P. TORRELL, Aquinas’s Summa, cited n. 20, p. 1, 16.
23 For the reader’s convenience, here is a brief overview of each part. ST, Iª IIae exhibits Thomas’ general principles on ethics: q. 1-5: beauty (viz. man’s ultimate end); q. 6-8: 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, IIª IIae 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. 171-189], 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. 20, p. 30-36, 42-48.
24 Actually, this is the case with many ascetic-spiritual works of Scholarios (A. RIGO, Alcune opere ascetico-spirituali 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).
several subdivisions) derive from lists of λογισμοί (i.e. those mental activities from which the relevant sins spring out),\textsuperscript{30} which were conducted in the context of early Egyptian monasticism and later formatted to a “scheme” of eight sins.\textsuperscript{31} As known, Evagrius of Pontos (ca 345-399)\textsuperscript{32} adopted and further developed Origen’s (185/186-254/255)\textsuperscript{33} lists of vices\textsuperscript{34} into the following eight λογισμοί: gluttony, fornication, avarice, sorrow/despair, anger, sloth/acedia, vainglory, and arrogance.\textsuperscript{35} Henceforth, the “scheme” of eight sins became traditional in Byzantine Christianity and was adopted by several theologians,\textsuperscript{36} including John Damascene (ca 655-ca 745).\textsuperscript{37} In the West, Evagrius’ list passed to Cassian\textsuperscript{38} (ca 360-430/435)\textsuperscript{39} as following: gluttony, fornication, avarice, anger, sorrow, sloth/acedia, vainglory, and arrogance.\textsuperscript{40} Later on, this list was transformed by Pope Gregory the Great (ca 540-604)\textsuperscript{41} into the seven (capital/deadly) sins: pride, envy, anger, sloth, avarice/covetousness, gluttony, and lust.\textsuperscript{42} Thomas Aquinas adopts Gregory’s “scheme” of seven sins; still, in his ST he follows a different order,\textsuperscript{43} the one most commonly used in his era: pride/arrogance, envy, anger, avarice, spiritual sloth (acedia), gluttony, and lust.\textsuperscript{44}

II. – THE THOMISTIC BACKGROUND OF SCHOLARIO’S ON THE DIFFERENCE\textsuperscript{45}


30 A. GUILLAUMONT and C. GUILLAUMONT, Évagre le Pontique, cited n. 29, p. 63-64.
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).
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.
40 A. GUILLAUMONT and C. GUILLAUMONT, Évagre le Pontique, cited n. 29, p. 66.
42 A. GUILLAUMONT and C. GUILLAUMONT, Évagre le Pontique, cited n. 29, p. 67.
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^e II^e, q. 88 (De peccato veniali et mortali). As will be shown below, Scholarios exploits this quaeestio extensively.46

On the difference, p. 27412-13 47

On the difference, p. 27419-22

ST, I^e II^e, q. 88 pr. 48

ST, I^e II^e, q. 88 a. 1 co. 49

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^e II^e, q. 88 a. 1 co.

On the difference, p. 27419-22

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.
from Thomas’ ST, Iª IIæ, q. 88, this time from a. 2 co. Noteworthily, the corpus of this articulus is not preserved in Scholarios’ Compendium of ST, Iª IIæ. Therefore this abbreviated version cannot be Scholarios’ source. Most probably, Scholarios consulted a manuscript containing the entire text of ST, Iª IIæ.

On the difference, p. 274-276

ST, Iª IIæ, q. 88 a. 2 co.

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, Iª IIæ, q. 2 (De his in quibus hominis beatiudum consistit).

On the difference, p. 275-278

ST, Iª IIæ, q. 2 a. 8 co.

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

---


52 Marc. gr. Z. 147, f. 321v23-26.

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

54 SCHOLARIOS, On the difference, p. 274-276.


56 SCHOLARIOS, On the difference, p. 275-278; I Jn. 4, 8: ὁ Θεὸς ἀγάπη ἔστιν.

57 Marc. gr. Z. 147, f. 25v12-25.
neighbour, since every human action is directed a) either to God or b) directly to neighbour and thereafter indirectly to God. 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. 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. 275\[13\]-\[15\]  
Kai ἐιδοποιομένη [i.e. πᾶσα ἐνέργεια τοῦ ἀνθρώπου] μὲν διὰ τῆς ἁγάπης ἁρετή ἐστι καὶ λέγεται ἐστερημένη δὲ τῆς ἁγάπης, καὶ οὔτω τὸ θέμα καὶ τὸ πλησίον ἀπεστραμμένη, ἁμαρτία καὶ πονηρία.

On the difference, p. 275\[13\]-\[15\], q. 23 a. 8 co.\[61\]  
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\[ª\], 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\[ª\], q. 72 (De distinctione peccatorum). Yet, Scholarios applies this model to mental and oral

---

58 SCHOLARIOS, On the difference, p. 275\[8\]-\[10\].
59 Ibidem, p. 275\[10\]-\[13\]. Note the continuous allusion to Mt. 22, 37-40.
60 THOMAS, ST, I\[ª\] II\[ª\], q. 72 a. 4 ad i: ...τὸ ἁμαρτάνειν εἰς τὸν Θεόν, καθόσον ἢ πρὸς τὸν Θεόν τάξις πᾶσαν ἀνθρωπίνην περιέχει τάξιν, ἐστὶ κοινὸν παντὶ ἁμαρτήματι (Marc. gr. Z 147, f. 254\[9\]-\[9\]).
61 P. A. DEMETRACOPOULOS, Δημητρίου Κυδώνη, Θωμᾶ Ακινάντου. Συμμαθη θεολογική ἐξελλήνισθείσα (Corpus Philosophorum Graecorum Recensitorum II/17A), Athens 1980, p. 42\[21\]-\[27\].
62 Marc. gr. Z 147, f. 255\[26\]-\[28\].
63 L. PETIT, X. A. SIDERIDES, M. JUGIE, Œuvres complètes, IV, cited n. 3, p. XVIII.
On the difference, p. 275\textsuperscript{7}, 276\textsuperscript{8}

...where an energesein anathemos in the soul taute he sumpma estin, he logos, he ergon. [...] pása kai [...], he en tò vòmati estin, he en tò lýgo, he en tò ergo, 

On the difference, p. 72 a. 7 s. c.\textsuperscript{9}

...tria eisai katholou òmarrhìmatas ois to anathròponin upokeitei génos: he gar logos, he lángh, he ergo òmarrhànomen.

ST, P\textsuperscript{10}, q. 72 a. 7 co.\textsuperscript{11}

Ouòtò toin en eis tò tría tauta diaireitai he òmarrhìa, toutesthai tò tès kardias, tò stòmatos kai to tò ergou ouòn òws eis diaphora kai teteleusmena eidoi: he gar tòn òmarrhías sumploφríasin en tò ergo estin. Òhein to tò ergo òmarrhìma èhei tòn teteleusmenon eidos. 

On the difference, p. 88 a. 6 co.\textsuperscript{12}

...tò synngnavstòn kai thànásmion diapherousin òpò télleia kai átelleia en tò tò òmarrhìmatos génnei. Tò de átelleia prosoχh dénunata elthei eis tìn télleití. 

---

\textsuperscript{64} Cf. ST, P\textsuperscript{10}, q. 72 a. 7 ad 3: Òhe tòn kardias òmarrhìa kai to tò stòmatos ou diakrínontai tès òmarrhías tò ergou, ouèi òsi àmà sunezeugyménà, allìa kathóson toin ouèi òkastos eurísketai kath' autò (Marc. gr. Z 147, f. 257\textsuperscript{18}, 22). 

\textsuperscript{65} Marc. gr. Z 147, f. 256\textsuperscript{24}, 28. 

\textsuperscript{66} Ibidem. f. 256\textsuperscript{31}, f. 257\textsuperscript{b}. 

\textsuperscript{67} Ibidem. f. 324\textsuperscript{17}, 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 passion (viz. ἡδονή 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. 276-12

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, Iª IIæ, 24 a. 3 co., in Sancti Thomae Aquinatis opera omnia iussu Leonis XIII P. M. edita. VI, Prima Secundae Summare 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. 257v-12.


71 συμβαίνειν codex, correcxi.

72 SCHOLARIOS, On the difference, p. 276-27.

73 THOMAS, ST, Iª IIæ, q. 72 a. 7 co. and q. 88 a. 6 co.; q. 88 a. 2 co.

74 SCHOLARIOS, On the difference, p. 276-30.
command derives from Thomas’ relevant argumentation on the dual love in ST, IIa IIae, q. 27 a. 8 (Utrum sit magis meritorium diligere proximum quam diligere eum).

On the difference, p. 276\(^{31-34}\)

...のではないでしょうか to teχεω κεχώρισται ποτε τάς τοῦ πλησίον ἀγάπης κατ᾽ ἐνέργειαν, εἴ και μὴ ἐν τῇ διαθέσει. ἢ δὲ τοῦ πλησίον ἀγάπης, κατὰ νόμον οὖσα, οὐδὲνοι τῆς πρὸς θεοῦ ἀγάπης κεχώρισται.

ST, IIa IIae, q. 27 a. 8 co.\(^{76}\)

...ὁ τοῦ πλησίον ἀγάπη περιλαμβάνει ἐν ἑαυτῇ καὶ τὴν θείαν ἀγάπην, ἢ δὲ τοῦ θεοῦ ἀγάπη οὐ περιέχει τὴν τοῦ πλησίον. [...] ταύτῃ γὰρ ἔχουμεν τὴν ἐντολὴν παρὰ τοῦ θεοῦ, ἵνα ὁ τὸν θεὸν ἀγαπῶν ἄγαπη καὶ τὸν ἄδελφον 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 ἁγάπης] εἰς δύο μερισμένης, εἰς τὴν τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ τοῦ πλησίον, ἢ τοῦ πλησίον μεῖζον ἐστὶν: αὕτη γὰρ καὶ τὴν εἰς τὸν θεὸν ἁγάπην προϋποτίθησιν: ἢ γὰρ τὸν πλησίον ἁγαπῶν νόμον καὶ ἐντολὴν πληροῖ τοῦ θεοῦ, ὃ δὲ τὰς ἐντολὰς τηρῶν τοῦ θεοῦ, τὸν θεὸν ἁγαπᾷ.\(^{78}\)

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\(^{5-8}\)

Ἡ δὲ ἑλπισμοῦνη, καρπός οὖσα τῆς πρὸς τὸν πλησίον ἁγάπης ἁμέσως, οὐδὲν ἔλαττον καὶ τὴν πρὸς τὸν θεὸν ἁγάπην πληροῖ, καθόσον ἑλπισμοῦνη δίδωσι τις διὰ τὴν τοῦ δηλοῦτι καὶ περὶ ἑλπισμοῦνης θεοῦ καὶ τοῦ πλησίον ἁγάπην καὶ τοῦ θεοῦ νόμῳ δουλεύει ὁ τὴν κατὰ τούτο φέρει καρπὸν πνευματικὸν ἀρέτην ταύτην ποιῶν καὶ ἀλλοις [...] πλείσσοι τρόποις.

ST, IIa IIae, q. 32 a. 4 co.\(^{80}\)

Ἀλμς 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, IIa IIae, q. 147 (De ietumio). 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 Ακουινάτου. Σωματική Θεολογική, cited n. 61, p. 144\(^{15-20}\).
77 J. A. Demetracopoulos, Scholarsio’s 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. 93\(^{15-19}\).
79 Scholarsio, On the difference, p. 277\(^{15}\).
80 P. A. Demetracopoulos, Θωμᾶ Ακουινάτου. Σωματική Θεολογική, cited n. 61, p. 193\(^{23-194}\).
81 Scholarsio, On the difference, p. 277\(^{10-11}\).
On the difference, p. 277\textsuperscript{11-18}

...χρείας παρισταμένης ποτὲ πληροῦν τὴν μείζονα ἀρετήν, παρατηθεῖσα συγχωρούμεθα τὴν ἐλάττω, ἐὰν μὴ δυνατὸν ἢ καὶ ἄμφω τελείως πληροῦν· κἂν μὴ οὕτω ποιῶμεν, [...] διὰ τὸ παραβαίνειν τὴν μείζω κατακρινόμεθα· παραβαίνομεν γὰρ τὴν νηστείαν καὶ τὴν προσευχὴν ποτὲ καὶ τὰ τοιαύτα ὑπὲρ τοῦ πληρώσαι ἐλεημοσύνην καὶ δικαιοσύνην τότε, ἢ ἄλλην τινά ἀρετήν ἢνιν συνέξευκται ἢ πρὸς τὸν πλησίον ἁγάπη.

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,\textsuperscript{84} given that to Thomas and Scholarios, as already seen, love for neighbour includes love for God.\textsuperscript{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;\textsuperscript{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 satisfaction\textsuperscript{87}/recompense for sin, as unfolded in ST, I\textsuperscript{r} II\textsuperscript{ae}, 87 a. 6 co. Noteworthy, Scholarios uses the term ἀντισήκωσις for recompensatio. So reads Demetrios Kydones’ translation\textsuperscript{88} – another indication that Scholarios draws his material from the Greek text of Thomas.

}\textsuperscript{82} An abbreviated version of ST, II\textsuperscript{e} II\textsuperscript{ae}, q. 147 a. 4 is preserved in f. 273\textsuperscript{v}10-16.
\textsuperscript{83} Vatican, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, Vat. gr. 611 (Diktyon 67242), f. 51\textsuperscript{r}38-f. 52\textsuperscript{v}4.
\textsuperscript{84} SCHOLARIOS, On the difference, p. 277\textsuperscript{23}-25.
\textsuperscript{85} THOMAS, ST, I\textsuperscript{r} II\textsuperscript{ae}, q. 27 a. 8 co. For the text, see supra n. 76.
\textsuperscript{86} SCHOLARIOS, On the difference, p. 277\textsuperscript{23}-28.
\textsuperscript{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.
\textsuperscript{88} Marc. gr. Z 147, f. 318\textsuperscript{v}7-8, 11-19.
\textsuperscript{89} Ibidem, f. 318\textsuperscript{v}5-21.
tēs ἀγάπης τοῦ ἀμαρτάνειν πρὸς τὴν θείαν ἄγαπην, ὂς οἷος ἐνθάδε ἄγαπῃ πρὸς τὸν θεὸν ἄγαπής ραδίως ἑρμηνεύεται τῇ ἀγαθότητι τοῦ θεοῦ ἐν ὅλῳ τε δηλοῦσι χρόνῳ καὶ εὐκλόώς ἀντισηκώσεσιν· ἢ δὲ φθορά τῆς πρὸς τὸν πλῆθος ἄγαπῆς οὐκ εὐχεράς ἑρμηνεύεται. Η μὲν γὰρ θεία ἀγαθότης τὴν ἐπιστροφὴν μόνην τοῦ ἀμαρτηκότος σκοπεῖ ἐν τῷ μισῆσαι μὲν τὴν ἀμαρτίαν, ἀγαπᾶσαι δὲ τὸν θεὸν θερμότεροις ἐργοῖς ἀγάπης συνισταμένη· ἢ δὲ θεία δικαιοσύνη, τὰς εἰς τὸν πλῆθος ἀμαρτημάτων ἐπίσκοπος ὀδασαί, οὐ τοῦτο μόνον σκοπεῖ, ἀλλὰ καὶ τὴν ἰκανοποίησιν τοῦ ἀδικηθέντος· [...] διὸ καὶ ἀδυνάτων ἐστὶ τὸν ἀδικησάντα τὸν πλῆθος συγγνώμης τιχοῦ ἐμπανάσαντα, δὲν μὴ πρότερον ἰκανοποίησις τῷ ἀδικηθέντι... κατ’ ἐνεργείαν ἀμαρτήματι. Η γάρ τοῦ ἀμαρτήματος ἐνεργεία ἐνοχοῦ ποιεῖ τὸν ἀνθρώπων τιμωρίας, καθόσον παραβαίνει τὴν ταξιν τῆς θείας δικαιοσύνης, εἰς ὅν ςἐπάνειν ἄνευ τινὸς ἀντισηκώσεως διὰ τιμωρίας, ὡς πρὸς τὴν τῆς δικαιοσύνης ισότητα ἐπανάγει [...]. Ο δὴ καὶ ἐν ταῖς εἰς ἄλλης ἀδικίας τῶν ἀνθρώπων τηρεῖται, ὡς δὲ ἀντισηκώσεως τῆς τιμωρίας ἐπανασφέξεσθαι τὴν ισότητα τῆς δικαιοσύνης. [...] Θεοῦ τῆς ἀμαρτίας κηλίδα ἀναιρεθήναι ἀδύνατον, εἰ μὴ τὴν ταξιν τῆς θείας δικαιοσύνης ἢ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου προσδέξατο θέλησις, ὡς δηλοῦσι, αὕτων ἐκόντα τὴν τιμωρίαν ἀναλαβένις εἰς τὴν τῆς γενομένης ἀμαρτίας ἀντισηκώσεως ἢ παρὰ τὸν θεὸν ἐπενεχθέαν ὑπομένειε μαρτύρως· καὶ ἐκάτερον γὰρ τρόπον ἢ κάλλος λόγον ἀντισηκώσεως ἔχει. Η δὲ ἰκανοποιητικὴ τιμωρία ἑλάττω 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 τεθρητέον ἕν εἰ... ST, Π Ιν, q. 73 pr.92 Εφεξῆς τεθρητέον ἕν εἰ...

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. 27812-13. It seems that Scholarios has still in mind THOMAS, ST, Π Ιν, 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. 258108.
93 SCHOLARIOS, On the difference, p. 27815-21.
Scholarios’ argument echoes specific Thomistic passages; namely ST, IIa IIae, q. 151 pr.;94 q. 154 a. 1 arg. 1,95 P IIae, 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.

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, Ia IIae, q. 88 a. 5 ad 1.102

On the difference, p. 27834-27

On the difference, p. 27935-37

94 Thomas, ST, Ia IIae, q. 151 pr.: Ἡμείς θεωρήσαμεν ἂν εἰς περὶ ἁγνείας. [...] τρίτον, περὶ ἀκόλουθος, ὅπερ εἰς πάθος ἀντικειμένου τῇ ἁγνείᾳ (Vat. gr. 611, f. 60v6-35). Note that castity is a virtue serving love for God (cf. ST, IIa IIae, q. 151 a. 2 co.: εἰ γάρ ὁ νοῦς τοῦ ἁνθρώπου ἑαυτοῦ πνευματικῆς συναφείας συναπτόμενος ἐκείνην ὧ δέον συνάπτεσθαι, ἴτιν τῇ θεῷ, ἀνέχεται δὲ ὡς μὴ μὴ μηθ' ἄδειας τοῖς ἄλλοις συνάπτεσθαι ἄνωτάς τί θεία τάξη, λεικάρσεται πνευματικὴ ἁγνεία (Vat. gr. 611, f. 61v6-9)).
95 Thomas, ST, Ia IIae, q. 154 a. 1 arg. I: Ἀποδοθεῖσας ἐξ ἁστυγίας εἶδος, τούτης παραγενόμενος ἀνάλλος, μοιχαεῖν, αἰμομαίνειν, παρθένων φθοράν, ἀρπαγήν, καὶ τὸ παρὰ φύσιν πάθος (Vat. gr. 611, f. 69v26-28).
96 Thomas, ST, Ia IIae, q. 72 a. 2 ad 4: Ἡ δὲ πλεονεξία, ἐν τοῖς σαρκικοῖς ἁμαρτήμασιν ἄρθρομενη, ἀντὶ τῆς μοιχείας κεῖται, ἢ ἀπὸ τῆς ἄλλος ἀρπαγής τῆς ἄλλοτρίας γυναικὸς (Marc. gr. Z 147, f. 253r13-14).
97 Scholarios, On the difference p. 27821-23; Scholarios continues alluding to Thomas, ST, Ia IIae, q. 27 a. 8 co. For the text, see supra n. 76.
98 Marc. gr. Z 147, f. 260v24-29.
99 βαρύτερος codex, copexi.
100 Cf. Thomas, ST, Ia IIae, q. 73 a. 3 co.: ἡ ἁμαρτία τὸ τού παθοῦν ἐνεῖναι βαρύτερον δέον καὶ ἢ ἀταξία συμβαίνειν περὶ τινα ἁρχήν ἢ ἑστὶ πρότερον ἐν τῇ ἁμαρτίᾳ τοῦ λόγου. ὡς δὲ λόγος πρὸς τὸ τέλος καὶ ἀπὸ τοῦ τέλους τάττει πάντα ἐν τοῖς πράκτοις (Marc. gr. Z 147, f. 260r18-21).
101 Scholarios, On the difference, p. 27833-35.
102 Cf. also Thomas, ST, Ia IIae, q. 76 a. 4 ad 4: ὁ μεθύον διηλίθης μὲν ἐπιτιμήσεως ἄξιος ἐστὶ δι', ἀς ποιεῖ δύο ἁμαρτίας, τούτης τῇ μέθῃ καὶ τῷ ἄλλῳ τῇ μέθῃ ἑπόμενον (Marc. gr. Z 147, f. 280r6-9).
103 Marc. gr. Z 147, f. 324v18-21.
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, P II\textsuperscript{ae}, q. 77 (De causa peccati ex parte appetitus sensitivii).

*On the difference*, p. 278\textsuperscript{37}-279\textsuperscript{15}

On the difference, p. 278 279. Scholarios, the Stoic, would argue that specific passages of ST, P II\textsuperscript{ae}, q. 77 (De causa peccati ex parte appetitus sensitivii).

104 Ibidem, f. 282 286.

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).  

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. 279^29-32  
...ἀλλὰ καὶ τὸ αὐτὸ εἴδος τοῦ ἀμαρτήματος ποικίλλεται κατὰ τὰς συνεξευγμένας αὑτῷ περιστάσεις, καὶ ἐαυτοῦ βαρύτερον ἢ κουφότερον γίνεται καὶ κρίνεται ἀλλή καὶ ἀλλὴ περιστάσει παραβαλλόμενον...

ST, I^a II^ae, q. 73 a. 7 co.  
...τὸ ἀμαρτήμα τοῦ οίκον ἐλλειψάνει τίνος περιστάσεως [ ...] τὸ ἀμαρτήμα πέφυκε βαρύτερον γίνεσθαι διὰ τῶν περιστάσεων.

On the difference, p. 280^4-7  
...ὡς καὶ ἀκολούθανος ἔτοι μὲν ἀμαρτάνει ἡγούμενος ἢ ἐνεργειάς καὶ ἐβαρυτέρον δὲ ὑπογείηὸς ἢ ἐπέκεινα ἢ ἐνεργειάς ὑπάρχουσα ἔτοι καὶ τούτου πλέον ὑπογείης ὑπάρχουσα, ὅποις μοιχείαι καλοῦσθεν.

On the difference, p. 280^19-21  
...ὁ καταλαλὸς ἀμαρτάνει, ἀν [...] καταλαλῇ [...] κατὰ ἀρχοντος, ή ἐνιότου.

On the difference, p. 280^4-7  
...ὣς καὶ ἀκολούθανος ἐτοι μὲν ἁμαρτάνει ἠγοοῦμενος ἢ ἐνεργειάς καὶ ἐβαρυτέρον δὲ ὑπογείης ἢ ἐπέκεινα ἢ ἐνεργειάς ὑπάρχουσα ἔτοι καὶ τούτου πλέον ὑπογείης ὑπάρχουσα, ὅποις μοιχείαι καλοῦσθεν.

On the difference, p. 280^24-26  
...ὁ καταλαλὼς ἀμαρτάνει, ἀν [...] καταλαλῇ [...] κατὰ ἀρχοντος, ή ἐνιότου.

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

On the difference, p. 279^32-35  
...ὅ καταλαλῶν βαρύτερον ἀμαρτάνει, ἀν [...] καταλαλῇ [...] κατὰ ἀρχοντος, ή ἐνιότου.

ST, I^a II^ae, q. 73 a. 9 co.  
...τὸ εἰς δημόσιον πρόσωπον γινόμενον ἀμαρτήμα, οἶς νόμον ἢ ἀρχοντα, τὸ τοῦ ἁλου πλῆθους πρόσωπον φέροντα, βαρύτερον ἐστιν ή τὸ ἀμαρτήμα τὸ εἰς τὸ πρόσωπον ἑνιότου γινόμενον...

ST, I^a II^ae, q. 73 a. 7 co.  
...ὅποι τῆς πορνείας ἀμαρτήμα ἐν τούτω συνίσταται, ἐν τῇ τῶν ἄνθρωπων πλησίασθαι τῇ μη ἑιδε, εἰ δὲ προστεθείη ἡ περίστασις αὐτῆ, τὸ ἐπέκεινα ἢ ἐνεργειάς ἢ πλησίασθαι, μεταγενέσθαι ήθε εἰς ἄλλου ἀμαρτήματος γένος, τούτωσιν εἰς τῇ τῆς ἀδικίας, καθόθεν ὁ ἄνθρωπος νοσεῖται τὸ ἀλλότριον πρόμα. Καὶ κατὰ τούτο ἢ μοιχείας ἀμαρτάνει, ἀμαρτήματος, ή πορνείας.

106 SCHOLARIOS, On the difference, p. 279^17-27.
107 Marc. gr. Z 147, f. 263^30-32.
108 Ibidem, f. 263^20-21
109 Ibidem, f. 265^24-26
110 Ibidem, f. 263^22-26. Cf. also ST, I^a II^ae, q. 88 a. 5 co.: Τούτῳ δὲ συμβαίνει ἐν τοῖς ἀμαρτήμασιν, ὅταν ἡ περίστασις προστεθῇ ἄλεος ἄλλου γένους, ὅποι κατὰ τὴν πλησίασθα τῇ μη ἑαυτῷ, ἐστὶν ἐνέργεια αἰσχρά ἀισχείς ἀντικειμένης τῇ σωφρόσυνῃ εἰ δὲ πλησίασθαι τῇ μη ἑαυτῷ, καὶ ἐπέκεινα προστεθῆται ἄλεος ἀντικειμένον τῇ δικαιοσύνῃ, καθ’ ὄς ἐστὶ τὸ ἀρπάζειν τίνα τὰ ἀλλότρια καὶ κατὰ τοῦτο ή τοιαύτη περίστασις συνίστηται νέον εἴδος ἀμαρτήματος, ὁ λέγετα μοιχεία (Marc. gr. Z 147, f. 323^25-29).
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* IIae, 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* IIae, 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* IIae, q. 73 a. 2 co.\(^{112}\)

**On the difference, p. 280\(^{20-29}\)**

Ὁτὲ γὰρ ἡθλεὶς σιλάσις φέρεται ἐπὶ τὸ καθ’ αὐτὸ τῆς ἀνάπη ἐνιαοτιοῦται δι’ ὑπὸ οὖ ἀνθρωπος εἰς τὸ ἐσχατόν τάσσεται τέλος, τότε τὸ ἀμαρτήμα τὸν ἡθλεὶς ἐστὶ καθ’ τὸ ἀντικείμενον αὐτοῦ. Ὁθὲν ἡθλεὶς ἐστὶ, εἶτε τῇ τοῦ θεου ἀνάπη ἐνιαοτιοῦται [...] ἢ τῇ τοῦ πλησίον ἀνάπη, ὅπερ ο ὕπος, ὡς μοιχεῖα καὶ τὰ ὁμία. [...] ἐνιούς δὲ ἢ του ἀμαρτάνοντος θέλης σιλάσις φέρεται ἐπ’ ἐκεῖνο ὅπερ ἐν ἑαυτῷ περιέχει ἀπαίζων τίνα, οὐ μὴ ἐναντιομενὴ τῇ τοῦ θέου ἢ τῇ τοῦ πλησίον ἀνάπη, ὅπερ ο ἀργός λόγος...

A close parallel to this passage is found 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.\(^{115}\)

Τοῦτο δ’ οὐκ ἁλίγχει τῶν ἀνθρώπων πρὸς τὸν καθανόν μὲν ἁμαρτήμασιν οὐκ ἐντελῶς, δι’ ὑπὸ γῆν ἄν ἐφέρων εὐθὺς, συγγνώμον τέ θυμήθηκει τῆς σιδήνιος ἄνθρωπος ἀπὸ τὴν ἀμαρτήματος, ὁπερ ο ἄργος ἐστί λόγος, καὶ ἐν τῇ καθαρδὶ μοιχεῖα, καὶ τὰ τοιαῦτα, ἐν οἷς ο τῆς δίκης ἀγάθης λόγος οὐκ ἔφθασε τῆς τῶν ἓνην ὑποκοίτες ἀνθρωπον, ἢ ἕνη αὐτὴν ἀμαρτήματος τοῖς ἀναφνοήσαι μὲν καλὸς ἐπ’ αὐτοῖς, οὐκ ἱκανοποιηθείς δὲ ἐνταῦθα τῇ ἑκατοσούν 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, I* IIae, q. 73 a. 2 co.: ὃθεν ἡ καταλαλία καθ’ αὐτὴν ἡθλεὶς ἐστίν ἀμαρτήμα τα (E. M. Kalokairinou, Ἀμαρτήμα Ἰχθυόν, Ἰωάννη ἡ Ἀκαδημία. Σύνθεσις Θεολογική ἐξελκίσεως, [Corpus Philosophorum Graecorum Recentiorum II/18], Athens 2002, p. 241\(^{18-19}\)).

\(^{113}\) *Marc. gr. Z* 147, f. 321\(^{20-29}\).

\(^{114}\) The text is edited in L. Petit, X. A. Siderides, M. Jugie, *Œuvres complètes*, I, cited n. 7, p. 521-531, here p. 523\(^{33-524}\).

\(^{115}\) An allusion to Thomas’ *ST, I* IIae, 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.

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. 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. 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. 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, IIIa, q. 90 (De partibus poenitentiae in generali).

On the difference, p. 2813-13  
cf. ST, IIIa, q. 90 a. 2 co.22

On the difference, p. 28030-33  

ST, II* IIa, q. 36 a. 2 co.116

On the difference, p. 28114-15  

ST, II* IIa, q. 110 a. 2 co.118


Marc. gr. Z 147, f. 324r15-16.

Vaticanico, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, Vat. gr. 612 (Diktyon 67243), f. 401v32-34.


SCHOLARIOS, On the difference, p. 28019-2814.

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).

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. 355. ST, IIIa was not translated into Greek, apart from four


117 Marc. gr. Z 147, f. 324r15-16.

118 Vatianico, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, Vat. gr. 612 (Diktyon 67243), f. 401v32-34.


120 SCHOLARIOS, On the difference, p. 28019-2814.

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. 355. ST, IIIa was not translated into Greek, apart from four
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Nevertheless, Scholarios had gained no access to *ST, IIIª/Supplementum*, as he remarks in his autograph note in manuscript Hagion Oros, Monê Batopediou, 254 (Diktyon 18398), f. 1v.125

4. *En de τῇ τετάρτῳ καὶ τελευταίῳ [i. e. IIIª and Supplementum] tῆς τοιαύτης πραγματείας “περί τοῦ” θεοῦ θεωρεῖ, “δει, καθόσον έστίν άνθρωπος, όδος έστιν ημῖν τῆς ἐπί τοῦ θεοῦ ἀνόδου”. Εν ή καὶ περί τῆς θείας οἰκονομίας, ός φασί, Θεομακίων διέξεισι καὶ περί τῶν μυστηρίων τῆς ἕκκλησιας καὶ κοινός καὶ ἰδίως.

5. Τούτων τοῖς τρισὶ μόνοις ἡμῖν ἐνετύχομεν. Τὸ δὲ τέταρτον καὶ τελευταῖον, πολλὰ σπουδάσαντες, οὐκ ἤδυνθημεν ἢείν οὔτε ἐλληνικὸς (δοκεῖ γὰρ μη ἡμυνέσθαις)127 οὔτε λατινικάς, ἐπεὶ παρὰ τοῖς ἐνταθα λατίνοις ή ολίγα ή οὔδεν τῶν τοιούτων κειμηλίων εὑρίσκεται.

Scholarios devoted considerable effort to track down a copy of *ST, IIIª* 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 omnìa*, 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.


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

127 Cf. supra n. 122.
Therefore one may assume that the friars provided Scholarios with more information on fundamental views exposited in *ST*, III, 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, II\(^ {ae}\), q. 87 a. 6 s. c. and co.

---


133 DUNS SCOTUS, *In IV Sent.*, d. 20.1.3\(^ {133}\): “Poenitentia vera, sive interior sola, sive exterior cum susceptione Sacramenti Poenitentiae sufficit ad salutem alcuibus in extremis. [...] quoniam Deus semper potens est etiam in morte praemieari, quisumquae: cùm 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 meritï de congruo, disponat ad justificationem, 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 percipietur, et sic salus” (L. WADDING, *Johannes Duns Scotos. Opera omnia*, IX, Hildesheim 1968 [repr.; Lyon 1639\(^ {1}\)], p. 403-20). 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, *'Ektōnēs* (1452), see C. KAPPEs, *ibidem*, p. 495.

135 Marc. gr. Z 147, f. 318\(^ {11}\).
The chapter ends with an exposition of the diverse fate of penitent and unrepentant sinners in the afterlife.\textsuperscript{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 \textit{ST, I\textsuperscript{1} II\textsuperscript{a}, 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.\textsuperscript{138}

\textit{On the difference, p. 281}\textsuperscript{135-282}\textsuperscript{1}

\begin{quote}
Ότι δὲ ρίζαι πάντων τῶν ἀμαρτιματών ἐπιτὰ ὑπερφανία, φθόνος, ὀργή, ἀκηδία, φιλορυψία, γαστριμαργία καὶ ἀκολογία· καὶ πᾶσαι μὲν εἰδὴ αὐτῶν ἐκάστης, πάσοι δὲ ἀπὸ αὐτῶν ἀνικοσουσιν ἀμαρτιματών βλαστοῖ, πάντως νέκρωσιν ἐπιφέροντες ψυχικὴν τοῖς ὑπ’ αὐτῶν ἔξοπημενοις...
\end{quote}

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

\begin{quote}
\textit{ST, I\textsuperscript{1} II\textsuperscript{a}, q. 84 a. 4 arg. 1}\textsuperscript{139}

ἐπὶ δὲ λέγοιμεν περὶ τῆς τοῦ ἀμαρτήματος ἀναίρεσιμης ὅσον πρὸς τὴν κηλίδα, καὶ ὅσῳ φανερὸν ὅτι ἡ τῆς ἀμαρτίας κηλίς ὑπὸ δύναται τῆς ψυχῆς ἀφαιρεθῆναι πλὴν δίᾳ τοῦ συναρθηκίας τῆς θεοῦ, οὐ δὲ διαστάσει τῇ περὶ τὴν ἰδίαν καθαρότητα ζημία προσεπέλασεν, ὥσπερ ἐστὶν ἢ κηλίς, καθώς ἔρημαι. [...] τὴν τῆς ἀμαρτίας κηλίδα ἀναιρεθῆναι ἀδύνατον, εἰ μὴ τὴν ταξίν τῆς θεῖας δικαιοσύνης ἢ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου προσδέξαιτο θέλησις [...] καθ’ ἐκάτερον γὰρ τρόπον ἢ κόλασις λόγον ἀντισκόποσι ἔχει.
\end{quote}

\begin{quote}
\textit{ST, I\textsuperscript{1} II\textsuperscript{a}, q. 84 a. 4 co.}\textsuperscript{140}

κορυφαὶ πάθη λέγονται ἐξ ἃν τὰ ἀλλὰ ἀνικόσουσι μάλιστα κατὰ τὸν λόγον τῆς τελικῆς αἰτίας. [...] ὥσπερ ἐνδαιμονία διηνέκει ἐστὶν ἀγαθὸν τὸν ἀνήκει ὑπεροχή τις ἢ περιφάνεια, ἢς ἔφειται ἢ ὑπερφανία ἢ κενὴ δόξα.
\end{quote}

\textsuperscript{136} Ibidem, f. 319\textsuperscript{113-20}.

\textsuperscript{137} SCHOLARIOS, \textit{On the difference, p. 281}\textsuperscript{281-33}.

\textsuperscript{138} Cf. also THOMAS, \textit{ST, I\textsuperscript{1} II\textsuperscript{a}, q. 132 a. 4 co.}: Οἱ μὲν γὰρ τιθέασι τὴν ὑπερφανίαν ἐν τοῖς γενικοῖς παθεῖσιν, δόθηκε δὲ τῷ τιθέασι τὴν κενοδοξίαν ἐν τοῖς γενικοῖς πάθοις. Ο δὲ Θεογόριος ὑπὲρ τριακοστὰ τῶν Θεών τὴν ὑπερφανίαν τιθέασι δισεκατομμυρίους τῶν ἀλλῶν παθησιν, τὴν δὲ κενοδοξίαν ἀμέσως ὑπὸ αὐτῶν λογισμένην γενικὸν τιθέασι πάθος. καὶ τοῦτο εὐλόγει (\textit{Vat. gr. 611, f. 24}\textsuperscript{f})

\textsuperscript{139} Marc. gr. Z 147, f. 307\textsuperscript{113-13}.

\textsuperscript{140} Ibidem, f. 307\textsuperscript{292-22}.

\textsuperscript{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, giving birth to disobedience, arrogance, hypocrisy, contention, obstinacy, discord, and desire for novelties. Scholarios draws partly verbatim from Thomas’ relevant articulus of ST, IIa IIae, q. 132 (Ulrum convenienter assignetur filiae inanis gloriae).

On the difference, p. 2825-7
...idias de anagogia in aput authe [scil. tis uperphaniai / kenothei] karpoi kaiw ousto: anupstasia, alazonia, upokriseis, akraasia, petaisma, diKHonia kai neoterismos.

ST, IIa IIae, q. 132 a. 5 arg. 1
...legeotai thevatepas tis kevheis doxeis einai tis paraqhein, tis kaukhesin, tis upokrisein, tis erin, tis enastasin, tis diKHovesan, tis twn kaiwv elipida.

Noteworthily, Paris. gr. 1237 preserves the following list of the offspring of vainglory in the marginal note of f. 271: αι της κενοθεις τυγατερες εισιν αυτα: παρακοη, καυχησις, υποκρισις, έρις, ένστασις, νεατης, διKHonia. Yet, as seen above, Scholarios lists praeemption novitatum (neoterismos / twn kaiwv elipic / neotetis) 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. Moreover, he distinguishes four types of pride. This time he paraphrases Thomas’ ST, IIa IIae, q. 162 a. 4 co., as G. Podskalsky has remarked. Scholarios ends by restating that all the offspring and kinds of pride constitute mortal sins.

On the difference, p. 28216-21
Eidē de tis uperphaniaias tēsappa: προτόν, tō μη ευχαριστείν τῷ Θεῷ προπόντως εἶναι τοις ἁγαθοῖς αὐτῷ, ἀλλὰ νομίζειν ἄφεν ἑαυτὸν ἔχειν αὐτῷ: δευτέρον, τῷ ἀπὸ θεοῦ μὲν ταῦτα νομίζειν, ἔχειν δὲ μισθὸν τῶν οἰκείων ἔργων τρίτον, τῷ οἴεσθαι ἔχειν ἄφεν ὁμοῖα ἔχειν τέταρτον, τῷ καταφρονεῖν τῶν ἱσων, ἢ βελτιών δι᾽ αὐτᾶ, καὶ μόνος δοκεῖν ἄγαθος εἶναι σπουδάζειν καὶ εἰσὶ πάντα καὶ οἱ καρποὶ καὶ τὰ εἰδή θανάσιμα.

On the difference, p. 28216-21
Kai tovτι’ εστὶ τὸ τρίτον τῆς uperphaniaias eldos, ὅταν τις δ’ σύν ἔχει ἀλαζονεύεται ἔχειν. [...] Kai kata tauta lamhánontai αἱ προτα δῷ uperphaniai, ἢ ὅταν τις παρ’ ἑαυτόν εἶχεν ὑπολαμβάνει ὅπερ ἔλαβε παρὰ τοῦ Θεοῦ, ἢ ὅταν ἀναθεῖν αὐτῷ διδόθηθαι τοτε πιστεύῃ μισθὸν τῶν εἰδῶν ἐργῶν. [...] Kai kata tovτο λαμβάνεται τὸ τρίτον (intel. τέταρτον) eldos tῆς uperphaniaias, ὥστε ἔστι, ὅταν τις παροφθέντος τῶν ἄλλων θεοτὸ 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, IIa IIae, q. 132 a. 4 co. For the text, see supra n. 138.
143 Vat. gr. 611, f. 24v-4.
144 SCHOLARIOIS, On the difference, p. 2827-15. Scholarios is inspired by Thomas’ relevant exposition in ST, IIa IIae, q. 132 a. 5 co., which he uses quite freely.
145 G. PODSKALSKY, Die Rezeption, citad n. 17, p. 311, n. 34.
146 This is one more allusion to THOMAS, ST, Ia IIae, q. 88 a. 1 co. For the text, see supra n. 50.
147 Vat. gr. 611, f. 99r-3.
draws a parallel between idols and money by alluding to Eph. 5 via Thomas’ ST, IIa IIae, q. 118 a. 5 arg. 4.

On the difference, p. 283\textsuperscript{5-8}…\(\text{ἡ\ φιλαργυρία\ eίτου\ πλεονεξία,\ ἂ\ ς\ καὶ\ δευτέρα\ εἰδικλολατρεία\ ἐστίν,\ ἕ\ ρ’}\ ὁ\ φιλάργυρος\ ἀγαθή\ καὶ\ ὑπομενεῖ\ τὸ\ ἄργυριν\ ὡς\ οἱ\ πολυθέοι\ τὰ\ εἰδώλα\ ποτέ,\ ἀ\ ἡ\ ελεγον\ θεούς.

On the difference, p. 283\textsuperscript{5-13}...ἐίναι\ τῆς\ φιλαργυρίας\ ἄμαρτήματα\ ἀπὸ\ προδοσία\ [...].

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

In chapter 9, Scholarios addresses the relation of some sins to capital sins of different genus. In fact, he keeps drawing from ST, IIa IIae, q. 118.

On the difference, p. 283\textsuperscript{32-33}...τισεν\ δὲ\ ὅτι... ἐκλεκτέα\ τῷ\ ἄνοιξα\ γενεικοῦ\ ἀμαρτήματι... ὑποµενεῖ\ τῆς\ ἁπλικοῦ***

ST, IIa IIae, q. 118 a. 8 ad 1\textsuperscript{152}...

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

\textsuperscript{148} Vat. gr. 612, f. 417v-6-8.
\textsuperscript{149} Ibidem, f. 418r-33r, f. 419v-1.
\textsuperscript{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.
\textsuperscript{151} SCHOLARIOS, On the difference, p. 283\textsuperscript{33-14}. This passage echoes to a certain extent THOMAS, ST, IIa IIae, q. 118 a. 8 ad 4: ἕν ὅτι ἐκλεκτέα τοις ἀνελευθέρως ἢ φειδωλὸς δία τὸ ὑπερβάλλει ἐν τῇ λαμβάνειν [...]. Ἔνα μὲν τρόπον, εἰ αἰσχρὰς κερδαινοῦ ἢ τῷ φαῦλα τὸν καὶ δουλικὰ ἔργα πολείν δι᾿ ἀνελευθέρων τινῶν πράξεων, ἢ διὰ τὸ μεθὰ ἀμαρτίας γινομέναι τις ἀνελεύθερον [...]. Ἐτερὸν δὲ τρόπον, εἰ Δίκαιας κερδαινοῖν ἢ τοὺς ζάντας βιαζόμενοι, ὡσπερ οἱ λησταί... (Vat. gr. 612, f. 419r-13r).
\textsuperscript{152} Vat. gr. 612, f. 419v, 30-32.
life, the most precious good of humans. At the same time, this is an action against God, since it destroys one of his creatures. 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. 284\textsuperscript{2} \textsuperscript{2}

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. 284\textsuperscript{4}

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

\textsuperscript{153} Scholarios, On the difference, p. 283\textsuperscript{33-34}. This echoes Thomas, ST, I\textsuperscript{a} II\textsuperscript{ae}, q. 73 a. 3 co. For the text, see supra n. 98 and 100.

\textsuperscript{154} Scholarios, On the difference, p. 283\textsuperscript{34-35}.

\textsuperscript{155} Vat. gr. 612, f. 419\textsuperscript{v}.

\textsuperscript{156} Ibidem, f. 419\textsuperscript{v}-f. 419\textsuperscript{v}. For the text, see supra n. 149.

\textsuperscript{157} Ibidem, f. 419\textsuperscript{v}-f. 419\textsuperscript{v}. For the text, see supra n. 152.

\textsuperscript{158} Vat. gr. 611, f. 75\textsuperscript{v}16-17.

\textsuperscript{159} E. M. Kalokairinou, Θωμᾶς Ακυβέρνητος. Σωματική Θεολογική, cited n. 112, p. 171\textsuperscript{-11}.

\textsuperscript{160} Vat. gr. 612, f. 417\textsuperscript{v}-17-19.

\textsuperscript{161} Scholarios, On the difference, p. 284\textsuperscript{10-12}. 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, II² Iae, q. 146 pr.¹⁶²

Ἐφεξῆς θεωρητέον ἄν ἐι περὶ τῶν εἰδικῶν μερῶν τῆς σωφροσύνης. Καὶ πρῶτον, περὶ ἑκείνων ἡ εἰς περὶ τὰς τῶν σιτίων ἡδονάς. [...] Περὶ τὸ πρῶτον θεωρητέον ἄν ἐι περὶ τῆς ἐγκρατείας τῆς περὶ τὰ σιτία καὶ ποτά. [...] Δεύτερον, περὶ τῆς ἐνεργείας αὐτῆς, ἡ ἐστὶ νηστεία. Τρίτον, περὶ τοῦ ἀντικειμένου ταύτη πάθους, ὑπερ ἐστὶν ἡ γαστριμαργία.

Second, subjugating desires, and purity both oppose lust.

On the difference, ST, II² Iae, q. 151 pr.¹⁶⁴

ἐφεξῆς θεωρητέον ἄν ἐι περὶ [...] παρθενίας, ἡ ἐστὶ μέρος ἀγνείας. Τρίτον, περὶ ἀκολογίας, ὑπερ ἐστὶ πάθος ἀντικειμένου τῇ ἀγνείᾳ.

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. 48v13-18.
¹⁶³ Ibidem, f. 58v7.
¹⁶⁴ Ibidem, f. 60r16-37.
¹⁶⁵ Ibidem, f. 61r12.
¹⁶⁶ See supra, p. 000.
¹⁶⁷ SCHOLARIOS, On the difference, p. 284v6-22.
fixer préséntment”. Accordingly, F. Tinnefeld assumed that the *On the difference* has possibly been composed during Scholarios’ stay at Prodromos monastery. Most recently, C. Kappes attempted a conjecture by dating the text ca. 1457-1460/1464.

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*, which follows the *On the difference in Paris. gr. 1289,* was written at the Prodromos Monastery in 1458, according to Scholarios’ autograph note: ἐν τῇ μονῇ τοῦ Προδρόμου ἐν τῇ ὅρει τοῦ Μενοικέως: χιλιάδες (= 1458). 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, 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’ 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 or supplemented in margin. Such a case is not a unicum in *Paris. gr. 1289.* To put forth an example, Scholarios’ *Excerpts from Theodoret’s Remedy for the Greek Maladies*, preserved in the ff. 195°-197° 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

---

172 C. KAPPE, A Narrative for the Reception of Seven Sacraments, cited n. 131131, p. 495 (and n. 127).
174 *Paris. gr. 1289*, ff. 138°-155°
177 *Paris. gr. 1289*, f. 132°.
179 Cf. also Scholarios’ autograph note on his *Sermon on the Transfiguration of Jesus Christ* (λόγος εἰς τὴν ἁγίαν τοῦ Κυρίου ἤμων Θησαυρὸς Ἁγίου Χριστοῦ μεταμόρφωσιν) in the lower margin of f. 19°: εὐρηται ἐν τῇ Θεοσαλονίκῃ ἐν βιβλίῳ μετὰ τὴν ἁλώσιν καὶ μετεγγραφή ἐκείθεν.
Scholarios’ arsenal against Plethon.\textsuperscript{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 \textit{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 \textit{terminus post quem} for the composition of the \textit{On the difference}, but with some hesitation.

On the other hand, the sources of the \textit{On the difference} have to be taken into account. As J. A. Demetracopoulos has shown,\textsuperscript{181} Scholarios composed his \textit{Compendium of ST, I\textsuperscript{a} II\textsuperscript{ae}} at a certain time between 1443/1445 and 1458/1459. Given that the production of this \textit{Compendium} aimed to facilitate Scholarios’ access to \textit{ST, I\textsuperscript{a} II\textsuperscript{ae}}, it seems less plausible to assume that he continued to use his undoubtedly grand manuscript of \textit{ST, I\textsuperscript{a} II\textsuperscript{ae}},\textsuperscript{182} if an abbreviated and much more “user friendly” text was already available. Yet, in the \textit{On the difference}, Scholarios did not use his \textit{Compendium of ST, I\textsuperscript{a} II\textsuperscript{ae}}, but a (still unidentified) manuscript preserving the entire, as it seems, text of \textit{ST, I\textsuperscript{a} II\textsuperscript{ae}}. Consequently, 1458/1459 may constitute a \textit{terminus ante quem} for the \textit{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,\textsuperscript{183} and as early as 1436 or shortly after\textsuperscript{184} he obtained a copy of \textit{ST, I\textsuperscript{a} II\textsuperscript{ae}} (\textit{Paris. gr. 1237}).\textsuperscript{185} On the other hand, the first traces of scotus’ arguments in Scholarios’ works are dated before the Council of Florence.\textsuperscript{186} It was a time when Mark Eugenikos, Scholarios’ mentor, utilized Scotus against Thomas in his \textit{Capita Sylllogistica},\textsuperscript{187} in the context of his preparation for the Council.\textsuperscript{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”.\textsuperscript{189} This in conjunction with the use of Scotus by both Scholarios and Mark

\textsuperscript{181} J. A. DEMETRACOPOULOS, Scholarios’ On Almsgiving, cited n. 18, p. 157-161, 167.
\textsuperscript{182} The entire text of the Greek translation of \textit{Thomas, ST, I\textsuperscript{a} II\textsuperscript{ae}} covers more than 470 ff. in the impressive manuscript \textit{Marc. gr. Z 147} (415 x 300 mm; 32-35 l.); cf. E. MONI, \textit{Bibliothecae Divi Marci Venetiarum Codices Graeci Manuscripti. I. Thesaurus Antiquus, Codices I-299}, Rome 1981, p. 207-208.
\textsuperscript{183} L. PETIT, X. A. SIDERIDES, M. JUGIE, \textit{Œuvres complètes}, VIII, cited n. 169, p. 16; J. A. DEMETRACOPOULOS, Latin Philosophical Works Translated into Greek, cited n. 27, p. 826; \textit{DEM}, Scholarios’ On Almsgiving, cited n. 18, p. 166.
\textsuperscript{184} J. A. DEMETRACOPOULOS, Scholarios’ On Almsgiving, cited n. 18, p. 159, 167.
\textsuperscript{185} This manuscript preserves a full version of Demetrios Kydones’ translation of \textit{Thomas, ST, I\textsuperscript{a} II\textsuperscript{ae}} up to q. 65 a. 2 (end of f. 222'). 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).
\textsuperscript{186} J. MONFASANI, The Pro-Latin Apologetics of the Greek Émigrés to Quattrocento Italy, in A. RIGO, P. ERMILIO, M. TRZIO (eds), \textit{Byzantine Theology and its Philosophical Background (Ευαγγελική 4)}, Turnhout 2011, p. 160-186, here p. 165-168.
\textsuperscript{188} J. MONFASANI, The Pro-Latin Apologetics, cited n. 186, p. 167-168.
\textsuperscript{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, another set of notes under the title *Necessary questions* contains Thomistic material deriving from *ST*, I*Ⅱε*. Strikingly enough, there are several concordances between the two texts of Scholarios. 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. 281*35-37*  
*Necessary questions*, p. 308*5-23*

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

*On the difference*, p. 282*4-7*  
*Necessary questions*, p. 308*5-7*


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. 307*20-308*39, which is only partly true.
The astonishing coincidence of such passages\(^{192}\) 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*, I\(^{2}\) 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. 282\(^{23-24}\)**

...δονὴ ἐν τοῖς συμβαίνουσι τῷ ἡδονὴ ἐν τοῖς συμβαίνουσι τῷ πλησίον δυσκόλοις καὶ λύπῃ ἐπὶ τοῖς πλησίον δυσκόλοις καὶ ἑλίψῃ ἐν καλῶς αὐτῆ συμβαίνουσιν.

**Necessary questions, p. 308\(^{9-10}\)**

...Necessary questions, cited n. 25, p. 308\(^{8-10}\); p. 308\(^{11-12}\); p. 308\(^{13-16}\); p. 308\(^{20-22}\); p. 308\(^{23-26}\) respectively.


\(^{193}\) SCHOLARIOS, *Necessary questions*, cited n. 25, p. 308\(^{27-39}\).


\(^{196}\) Vat. gr. 611, f. 99\(^{16-21}\); Ετι εὐρύσκονται καὶ ἄλλαι διαιρέσεις ὑπερφανίας· διαιρεῖ γάρ ὁ ἀνοέλμος (sic) τὸ τῆς ὑπερφανίας ὅψιμα λέγων ὅτι ἢ μέν ἔστιν ἐν ἑ ἡθέλει, ἢ δὲ ἐν λόγῳ, ἢ δὲ ἐν πράξει. Ἀλλὰ καὶ ὁ Ἰππονάρδος τίθησι δύδεκα βαθμοὺς ὑπερφανίας οἱ εἰς περιεργία, διανοίας κουφότης, ἀνάρμοστος εὐφροσύνη, ἀλαζονεία, ἰδιορρυθμία, ὀίσιος, ἀπόνοια, ἐκδίκησις τῶν ἀμαρτημάτων, πεπλασμένη ἐξομολογήσις, ἀποστασία, ἀδεία τοῦ ἀμαρτάνειν, ἔθος λέοντος.<...>

\(^{197}\) 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*, *P* *II*\(^{ae}\) in 1464 (L. PETIT, X. A. SIDERIDES, M. JUGIE, *Œuvres complètes*, VIII, cited n. 169, p. 199). Nevertheless, such a dating entails that Scholarios could not have access to any other version of *ST*, *P* *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*, *P* *II*\(^{ae}\), the new dating proposed by
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*, Iª IIªæ and IIª IIªæ. 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*. Scholarios drew his Thomistic material from some undefined manuscripts, which most probably preserved the entire text of *ST*, Iª IIªæ and IIª IIªæ. 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*, IIIª. 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. 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.


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. 274[15-26] ἐν Ἡ ἐνεργείᾳ φθείρειται ὁ λόγος τῆς διπλῆς ἀγάπης ἀνεπικατάστατο τῆς τῷ θεῷ διαλογής ὑπερτεροῦσαν... p. 277[17] μὲν γὰρ κώδικι: μὲν Jugie: p. 278[14] Ἐφεξῆς θεωρητέου ἢ σιὰ... 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*.

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*.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SCHOLARIOS, <em>On the difference</em></th>
<th>THOMAS AQUINAS, ST I* IIae</th>
<th>II* IIae</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Title</strong></td>
<td>q. 88 pr.</td>
<td>q. 23 a. 8 co.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chapter 1</td>
<td>q. 88 a. 1 co.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-9, p. 27419-22</td>
<td>q. 88 a. 2 co.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-13, p. 27424-26</td>
<td>q. 2 a. 8 co.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-26, p. 2757-8</td>
<td>q. 72 a. 4 ad 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29-31, p. 27511-13</td>
<td>q. 72 a. 5 co.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31-33, p. 27513-15</td>
<td>q. 72 a. 7 s. c.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chapter 2</td>
<td>q. 88 a. 2 co.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-6, p. 27517-21</td>
<td>q. 72 a. 7 co.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5, p. 27520</td>
<td>q. 72 a. 7 ad 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-26, p. 27521-p. 2765</td>
<td>q. 88 a. 6 co.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9-26, p. 27524-p. 2765</td>
<td>q. 88 a. 2 co.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-21, p. 27535-36</td>
<td>q. 72 a. 7 ad 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chapter 3</td>
<td>q. 74 a. 8 co.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-7, p. 2766-12</td>
<td>q. 72 a. 7 co.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-19, p. 27612-24</td>
<td>q. 88 a. 2 co.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8-9, p. 27613-14</td>
<td>q. 72 a. 7 ad 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19-22, p. 27624-27</td>
<td>q. 88 a. 2 co.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23-24, p. 27628-29</td>
<td>q. 72 a. 7 co.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24-25, p. 27629-30</td>
<td>q. 88 a. 6 co.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chapter 4</td>
<td>q. 27 a. 8 co.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-4, p. 27611-34</td>
<td>q. 32 a. 4 co.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-15, p. 2775-9</td>
<td>q. 147 a. 4 ad 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17-24, p. 27711-18</td>
<td>q. 148 a. 2 ad 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-26, p. 27719-20</td>
<td>q. 59 a. 4 co.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26-27, p. 27720-21</td>
<td>q. 118 a. 8 arg. 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28-34, p. 27722-28</td>
<td>q. 118 a. 8 s. c.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34-46, p. 27728-p. 2782</td>
<td>q. 27 a. 8 co.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51-57, p. 2781-13</td>
<td>q. 32 a. 4 co.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chapter 5</td>
<td>q. 73 pr.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1, p. 27815</td>
<td>q. 88 a. 2 co.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-2, p. 27815-16</td>
<td>q. 151 pr.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-4, p. 27817-18</td>
<td>q. 151 a. 2 co.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-5, p. 27818-19</td>
<td>q. 154 a. 1 arg. 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-7, p. 27819-21</td>
<td>q. 27 a. 8 co.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-9, p. 27821-23</td>
<td>q. 67 pr.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9-10, p. 27823-24</td>
<td>q. 70 pr.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>q. 71 pr.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>q. 72 pr.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>q. 77 pr.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>q. 118 a. 4 co.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

q. 88 a. 5 ad 1
q. 87 a. 6 co.
q. 87 a. 6 co.
q. 87 a. 6 ad 1
q. 84 a. 4 arg. 1
q. 84 a. 4 co.
q. 88 a. 1 co.

q. 132 a. 4 co.
q. 132 a. 5 arg. 1
q. 132 a. 5 co.
q. 162 a. 4 co. (P)
q. 88 a. 1 co.

q. 36 a. 4 ad 3 (P)
q. 158 a. 7 arg. 1
q. 158 a. 7 co.
q. 35 a. 4 ad 2 (P)
q. 35 a. 4 ad 3 (P)
q. 118 a. 5 arg. 4
q. 118 a. 8 arg. 1
q. 118 a. 8 ad 4
q. 148 a. 6 arg. 1
q. 148 a. 4 arg. 1
q. 148 a. 6 co.
q. 153 a. 5 arg. 1
q. 153 a. 5 ad 1
q. 154 pr.
q. 154 a. 1 arg. 1
q. 118 a. 8 ad 1
q. 73 a. 3 co.
q. 118 a. 8 arg. 1
q. 118 a. 8 ad 1
9-10. p. 284\textsuperscript{2-3}
10-11. p. 284\textsuperscript{3-4}

19. p. 284\textsuperscript{12}
20. p. 284\textsuperscript{13}
20-21. p. 284\textsuperscript{13-14}
21. p. 284\textsuperscript{14}

21-22. p. 284\textsuperscript{14-15}
22. p. 284\textsuperscript{15}
22-23. p. 284\textsuperscript{15-16}

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.
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