

PURCHOTIUS GRÆCUS I:
VIKENTIOS DAMODOS' CONCISE ETHICS

JOHN A. DEMETRACOPOULOS

University of Patras
Department of Elementary Education
Rion – 26 504
Greece
jdimitrako@upatras.gr

Abstract: Most of the writings produced during the 18th century in one of the regions peripheral to the centers of philosophical, theological, and scientific development in Europe, namely, Greece, were but translations or adaptations of various works written in Latin, French, Italian, German, or English. Even some of the texts signed by their authors as produced by themselves are translations or adaptations, too. This is the case with most, if not all, of the philosophical (and theological) writings of Vikentios Damodos (1700–1754), a private teacher of Philosophy in Kefallenia (Ionian Islands, Greece), who had studied in Venice and Padova. His *Concise Ethics*, which forms part of his huge *Concise Philosophy*, is just a selective translation or adaptation (enriched only by few trivially didactic or confessional comments) of passages from the respective volume (*Ethics*) of Edmond Pourchot's (1651–1734) *Institutiones philosophicæ* as well as from the homonymous part (*Compendium Ethicæ*) of Vol. V (*Exercitationes Scholasticæ*) of the same textbook. Damodos, by plagiarizing Pourchot, transmitted to Greece a potentially progressive eclectic philo-Cartesianist Christian philosophy taught at the time in France, Italy, Ukrainia and elsewhere.

Keywords: Edmond Pourchot, Thomistic Ethics, Vikentios Damodos, Modern Greek Enlightenment, translation activity

Modern Greek Enlightenment is “but a pale reflection of the European one”¹
This basically correct statement, which holds true both for the precursors (vaguely before 1750) and the mature bearers (vaguely after 1750) of this

¹Kondylis (1988: 9–10).

intellectual trend of the Balkan Peninsula, obviously establishes a center-periphery relation between late 17th and 18th century European philosophical literature written in Latin, French, Italian, German, and English and the philosophical, theological, and scientific texts written in Modern Greek during that period. However, unless the authors of these texts explicitly reveal the original text they worked on, modern scholars usually do not embark upon searching for the original European books; instead, the Modern Greek pieces are often taken for ‘authored’ in the contemporary sense of the term. Consequently they not only call them ‘philosophical’ on account of their content (which, for all its vagueness, is correct) but also go even further and classify their authors as ‘philosophers’ on account of their very having produced these texts. By so blurring the character of these writings, the distance between philosophical center and periphery is reduced or even disappears—but only apparently so.

A case in point is one of the most prolific Modern Greek writers of the early Modern Greek Enlightenment, i.e., Vikentios Damodos (1700–1754).²

The few contemporary scholars who occupy themselves (more occasionally than not) with Damodos (hereafter: D.) seem, at least in principle, to be aware of the trivial truth that, as far as his literary production is concerned, the *Quellenfrage* is still unanswered.³ However, they optimistically take for granted that D. had, as a “philosopher” and teacher, his own “method” or “process of thought,” “development of arguments,” “positions,” “proofs,” “method of teaching” and “way of treating” the other authors’ positions and arguments⁴ and “try to evaluate his place in Modern Greek philosophy.”⁵ D. seems to have done his best to make things appear like that. In most of the titles of the texts he produced, he either declared or implied that he “authored” (“συγγράφειν”), “composed” (“συντιθέναι”), “created” (“ποιεῖν”) or “elaborated” (“διαπονεῖν”) them.⁶ The result, to my knowledge, was that no scholar has thus far suspected what can easily impose itself as a hard liter-

² A provisional account of his life and writings is offered by Bobou-Stamati (1998). The majority of Damodos’ writings remain unedited.

³ “A systematic research into and comparison [of D.’s writings] with the by then current works and handbooks” is necessary (Bobou-Stamati, 1998 : 224). V. Bobou-Stamati (1998 : 332–338) has noticed another case of plagiarism by Damodos; his unedited *Dogmatic Theology* is but a latent adaptation of Denis Petau’s monumental *Dogmata Theologica* (1644–1650), enriched by some Orthodox polemics.

⁴ Bobou-Stamati (1998 : 264; 2007 : 80–81).

⁵ Bobou-Stamati (1998 : 346).

⁶ See Bobou-Stamati (1998 : 81–217 *passim*).

ary fact, namely, that most, if not all, of D.'s philosophical (and theological) 'writings' are not originals, but latent yet close translations or adaptations of some Latin writings by well-known European authors who lived shortly before or at virtually the same time as D., Edmond Pourchot (1651–1734), an Eclectic Catholic philo-Cartesianist philosopher who taught in Paris, being the principal among them.⁷

Due to the limited space of this study, I will confine myself to just one of D.'s edited philosophical 'writings', namely, the *Concise Ethics* (Σύνοψις ἠθικῆς φιλοσοφίας).⁸ As will be seen, this text is a translated collage of passages from the respective volume (*Tomus quartus, Continens Ethicam seu Moralem Disciplinam*) of Pourchot's (hereafter: P.) best-seller textbook *Institutiones philosophicæ* as well as from the homonymous part (*Compendium Ethicæ*) of Vol. V (*Exercitationes Scholasticæ*) of the same textbook.

I. The Literary Fact

P.'s *Institutiones philosophicæ*, first published in 1695 in Paris and republished several times (in some of them slightly re-elaborated) in various places in Europe, include five volumes. The arrangement of its material in the Venice edition of 1712 is as follows: Vol. I: Logic and Metaphysics (preceded by a "Præfatio" to the entire handbook and a "Proœmium" on philosophy); Vol. II: Geometry and General Physics; Vol. III: Special Physics; Vol. IV: Ethics;

⁷ What has only been suspected thus far is that P.'s *œuvre* "was known" to D. (Petsios 2007: 42; cf. Bobou-Stamati 1998: 139). This vague suspicion did not prevent scholars from editing D.'s texts as original (in the philological sense) writings (see, e.g., Bobou-Stamati 2002; 2007) and studying them as allegedly being such. To confine myself to D.'s *Concise Ethics*, focused on here, see, e.g., Papanoutsos (1959: 27) (D.'s "thought" is presented as an amalgam of Christianity and heathen philosophy); Henderson (1977: 50–52) ("an evaluation of the quality of D.'s thought" is made "on the basis" of the *Concise Ethics*); Petsios (1997 *in toto*, esp. 152–162), where an analysis of D.'s alleged conception of happiness as well as of free will is offered); Terezis (1997: 37) (where the way D. supposedly combined Christianity with Aristotelianism is described and D.—in fact P.—is presented as adhering to "the ideas of Christian East about the human person"; cf. *infra*, n. 52).

⁸ Damodos (1940: 30–91) (footnotes are by the editors, not by D.). The first half of this text (Damodos 1940: 30–65) is reproduced in: Papanoutsos (1959: 121–136), whereas a small part of it (Damodos 1940: 66; 71–82) in: Psemmenos (1989: 75–86) (the editor, unaware of the provenance of Damodos' text and its Thomist tenor, arbitrarily skipped some paragraphs, apparently on account of their appearing more theological than philosophical in content). A new edition of this text (apparently as an original writing by Damodos) has been announced as forthcoming in a series of *Texts of Modern Greek Philosophers*; see Damodos (2002: 133).

Vol. V (first published in 1700 in Paris): *Exercitationes scholasticæ*, which are preceded by a *Compendium Philosophiæ* divided into four parts, practically an abridgment of each of the four main volumes.⁹

“Le *Institutiones* di Pourchot avranno numerose edizioni e dei lettori anche fuori della Francia, in Italia,¹⁰ as well as in Germany,¹¹ Spain, Portugal,¹² Poland,¹³ Ukrainia,¹⁴ Turkey,¹⁵ Hungary¹⁶ and elsewhere.¹⁷ Thanks to D., who studied for years in Italy,¹⁸ this statement can be expanded so as to include—in regard to both of its parts—18th century Greece. D., to produce the *Σύνοψις ἠθικῆς φιλοσοφίας*, used two books, namely, Vol. IV of P.’s *Institutiones philosophicæ*¹⁹ and Vol. V, pp. 102–124, where the *Compendium Ethicæ* occurs.²⁰ As the very title shows, D.’s intention was to create a Greek version

⁹ In the first edition, the work was entitled *Institutio philosophica*. All the volumes of the *Institutiones philosophicæ* are easily accessible on-line at the Google Books data-base.

¹⁰ Belgioioso (1999 : 21). P. was a point of reference in the context of some intense Italian discussions on the rationality of the animals (see, e.g., Sulpizio 2002 : 244–245; 254–258; 260).

¹¹ P.’s *Logic* and *Metaphysics* were plagiarized by the Benedictine Andreas Gordon (1712–1751), as his enemy, the Jesuit Lucas Opfermann (1690–1750), observed (see Blum 1999 : 83–84; cf. Werner 1866 : 162–163).

¹² P.’s work was there a point of reference concerning the issue of the rationality of the soul of the animals; see, e.g., Miguel Pereira de Castro Padraõ’s *Propugnación de la racionalidad de los brutos. Carta apologetica...*, Lisbon: F. L. Ameno, 1753 : 47–48; 71; 189; 193; 216 (§§ 51; 76; 192; 195; 218); cf. Rodríguez Pardo (2008 : 150).

¹³ See, e.g., Janaczek (1999 : 44).

¹⁴ P.’s *Logic and Metaphysics* was taught there by G. Szszerbavkj and his successor D. Naszszinski (see Szszimcic 2009 : 143; 229).

¹⁵ P.’s *Institutiones philosophicæ* became known to the Turkish-speaking regions thanks to the Westernizer Ibrahim Mütefferika (1674–1747) (see Berkes 1964 : 46; Gunergun 2006 : 85; Ziyade & Baş 2003 : 311–312; İ. Kalaycıoğulları & Y. Unat: ‘Kopernik Kurami’nin Türkiye’deki Yansimaları’—see <http://tiny.cc/bor6g>, pp. 3–6; cf. Show 1988 : 237; 242).

¹⁶ See Blum (2004 : 527–528), where it is shown that Bernard Sartori (1735–1801) plagiarized P.’s *Logic*.

¹⁷ To judge from the geographical distribution, it seems that P. was plagiarized in countries whose *lingua* was not *franca*.

¹⁸ See note 20.

¹⁹ I am using the Paris edition of 1730 (E. Pourchot: *Institutiones philosophicæ... Tomus quartus, continens Ethicam seu Moralem Disciplinam, apud Joannem Manfrè*), which is available on-line (<http://tiny.cc/vy8gh>).

²⁰ I am using the 1711 edition (Lyon), which is available on-line (Pourchot 1711b). Since this edition shows pretty well the way D. produced “his” *Concise Ethics*, I will not spend here any line to dig out the edition of the copy or copies used by D. (see a list of the editions in Schmutz 2010; cf. Blum 2008). Granted that he had studied in Venice and Padova from about 1713 to 1723 (Bobou-Stamati 1998 : 21–30; 378), he had easy access to the Venice editions of 1712, 1713, 1715, and 1724 and to the Padova edition of 1720. It seems that Damodos used a rather

of the latter. Thus he copied its frame as well as a large part of its content, which he substantially enriched by verbatim drawing much material from the former. He also inserted occasionally some words or lines of his own, at times to facilitate the non-erudite reader of the Greek-written textbook (thereby implicitly taken to be a disciple) to grasp its content, and at other times to make some anti-Catholic propaganda.

The following comparing of the List of Contents of D.'s *Concise Ethics*²¹ with the List of Contents of P.'s *Compendium Ethicæ*²² is more than telling. The Prologue of the *Compendium Ethicæ* is replaced by the "Præfatio" or "Procœmium" of Vol. IV of the *Institutiones philosophicæ*, because, as will be seen, D. reproduced not the Prologue of the *Compendium* but the "Proœmium" of Vol. IV:

Pourchot, *Compendium Ethicæ* / Damodos, *Σύνοψις ἠθικῆς φιλοσοφίας*

Procœmium / Εἰσαγωγή

1. De natura scientiæ moralis / Τί εἶναι ἡ ἠθικὴ φιλοσοφία, τί θεωρεῖ, καὶ...

2. Ordo pertractandæ moralis / ... ποῖα τὰ μέρη της

Pars Prima Ethicæ: De summo hominis bono, sive de actu humanorum fine / Μέρος Α': Περὶ τοῦ μεγίστου καλοῦ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου, ἦγουν περὶ τοῦ ἐσχάτου τέλους τῶν ἀνθρωπίνων πράξεων

Cap. I. De bono generatim / Κεφ. α': Περὶ τοῦ καλοῦ κοινῶς

Cap. II. De fine / Κεφ. β': Περὶ τοῦ τέλους κοινῶς

Cap. III. De beatitudine / Κεφ. γ': Περὶ τῆς μακαριότητος καὶ εὐτυχίας

Pars Secunda Ethicæ: De actibus humanis eorumque regulis / Μέρος Β': Περὶ τῶν ἀνθρωπίνων πράξεων καὶ τῶν κανόνων αὐτῶν

Cap. I. Quid sit actus humanus et quotuplex / Κεφ. α': Τί εἶναι ἀνθρωπίνη πράξις καὶ πόσα τὰ εἶδη αὐτῆς

Cap. II. An omnis actus humanus sit voluntarius / Κεφ. β': Ἀνίσως καὶ κάθε ἀνθρώπινος πράξις λέγεται θεληματικὴ

Cap. III. An omnis actus humanus sit liber / Κεφ. γ': Ἀνίσως καὶ κάθε ἀνθρώπινος πράξις εἶναι ἐλευθέρη

Cap. IV. Quæ sint regulæ bonitatis ac malitiæ actu humanorum / Κεφ. δ': Περὶ τῆς ἀγαθότητος καὶ κακίας τῶν ἀνθρωπίνων πράξεων καὶ περὶ τῶν κανόνων αὐτῶν

early edition. For example, the famous *arbor Purchotiana* in his *Minor Logic* (Greek MS 1141 of the National Library of Greece (Athens), pp. 65–66, διὰταξις τῶν ὄντων) reproduces P.'s paragraph "Series entium" of the 1711 edition (pp. 82–85), which in the edition of 1733 became "Arbor Purchotii ad mentem Platonis et Cartesianorum" and was represented figuratively (on the difference see Sina 2004: 714, note 37). In any case, this issue can be settled only as part of the task of a proper edition of Damodos' texts.

²¹ Damodos (1940: 7–8).

²² Pourchot (1711b: iii–iv).

Cap. V. Utrum affectus animi legibus Ethicæ subjiciantur, et quis eorum sit usus / Κεφ. στ': Περὶ τῆς χρήσεως τῶν παθῶν τῆς ψυχῆς

Κεφ. ε': Περὶ τῶν θετικῶν νόμων (IV 150,33)

α'. Περὶ τοῦ θεϊκοῦ νόμου / De lege divina (Vol. IV, Pars II, cap. 8)

β'. Περὶ τοῦ ἀνθρωπίνου νόμου / De legibus humanis (Vol. IV, Pars II, cap. 9)

Pars Tertia Ethicæ: De virtutibus et vitiis / Μέρος Γ': Περὶ τῶν ἀρετῶν καὶ ἐλαττωμάτων

Cap. I. Quid sit virtus, quid vitium / Κεφ. α': Τί εἶναι ἀρετὴ καὶ τί ἐλάττωμα

Cap. II. De virtutibus et vitiis sigillatim / Κεφ. β': Περὶ τῶν ἀρετῶν κατ' ἰδίαν.

Κεφ. γ': Περὶ τῶν ἀμαρτιῶν

Pars Quarta Ethicæ: De variis vitæ officiis / Μέρος Δ': Περὶ τῶν διαφόρων τῆς ζωῆς καθηκόντων

Cap. I. De hominis tum erga Deum tum erga seipsum officiis / Κεφ. α': Περὶ τῶν καθηκόντων τοῦ ἀνθρώπου σιμὰ εἰς τὸν Θεὸν καὶ τὸν ἑαυτὸν του

Cap. II. De hominis officiis erga familiam / Κεφ. β': Περὶ τῶν καθηκόντων σιμὰ εἰς τὴν οἰκίαν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου

Cap. III. De variis hominis officiis erga rempublicam / Κεφ. γ': Περὶ τῶν καθηκόντων σιμὰ εἰς τὴν πολιτείαν.

P. prefaced his *Concise Ethics* with just one page (V 102,23–103,28). To D.'s eyes, this looked poor; and for that reason he turned to the Proem of *IV* (3–11). Since, however, the Proem was excessively long, he abridged it. The full list of correspondences²³ runs as follows:²⁴

IV 3,3–9 = 30,5–12 (Ethica sive Moralis disciplina a moribus, quos dirigit, appellationem sumpsit. Mores autem sunt propensiones aliquæ in bonum aut in malum morale, quæ vel nobiscum natæ, vel usu ac repetitis actibus sunt comparatæ... / Ἡ Ἠθικὴ Φιλοσοφία ὠνομάσθη ἀπὸ τὰ ἦθη, τὰ ὁποῖα διορθῶνται... Ἡθὴ ἄλλο δὲν εἶναι παρὰ διάφοροι κλίσεις εἰς τὸ ἡθικὸν καλὸν ἢ κακόν, τὰς ὁποῖας κλίσεις ἢ ἐλάβομεν ἀπὸ τὴν φύσιν ἢ τὰς ἀποκτήσαμεν ἡμεῖς μὲ τὴν συνήθειαν τῶν κακῶν ἢ ἀγαθῶν πράξεων, ὁποῦ πολλάκις ἐκάμαμεν...)

[30,6–7 derives verbatim from the Prologue of P.'s *Compendium Logicæ*; I, 5,37–39.]

[In 30,12–31,2, D., using second person singular, adds some trivial didactic examples of what natural inclination and acquired habit mean.]

IV 3,10–22 summatim = 31,2–16 (Actum humanum vocant eum, qui fit ab homine humano modo agente, id est agente ex consilio et deliberatione... Sunt enim aliquæ actiones hominis, quæ non sunt humanæ; ... v. gr. cum aliquis sine atten-

²³ By Latin numbers I denote the number of volume; bare Arabic numbers refer to page and lines of the Greek text.

²⁴ To let the reader get an accurate idea of how closely D. follows P, I am adding the line numbers of each page. I also cite, just as a sample, the opening words of each paragraph of the Introduction of the Greek text along with some telling sentences of the rest of the paragraph.

tione vel pedem vel manum movet... / Ἄλλη εἶναι πράξις ἀνθρώπινος καὶ ἄλλη τοῦ ἀνθρώπου. Πράξις τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ἀπλῶς εἶναι ὅταν γίνεται δίχως στοχασμὸν ἢ συμβουλήν, ὡσάν ὅταν τινὰς ἀστόχαστα κινή τὸ χέρι... Ἄνθρώπινος πράξις εἶναι ἐκεῖνη ὅπου γίνεται ἀπὸ τὸν ἄνθρωπον, ὅταν ἐργάζεται ὡς ἄνθρωπος, ἤγουν μὲ τὸν στοχασμὸν καὶ τὴν συμβουλήν... [In 31,10-II, D. adds on his own two trivial examples of deliberate act.]

IV 3,33-36 = 31,17-20 (Quare definiri potest Ethica sive Moralis Disciplina “scientia practica aut prudentia, quae circa actus humanos, quatenus ad honestatis regulas aeternae felicitatis intuitu conformandos occupatur” / Ὅρίζεται λοιπὸν ἡ Ἠθικὴ Φιλοσοφία “ἐπιστήμη πρακτικὴ ἢ φρόνησις, ἢ ὁποῖα θεωρεῖ τὰς ἀνθρωπίνους πράξεις, εἰς ὅσον διορθώνει αὐτὰς κατὰ τοὺς κανόνας τοῦ ὀρθοῦ λόγου διὰ τὴν ἀπόλαυσιν τῆς αἰωνίου μακαριότητος καὶ εὐτυχίας”)

IV 4,17-21 = 31,21-24 (Dicitur “scientia practica”... / Λέγεται “ἐπιστήμη πρακτικὴ”...)

IV 3,25-32 summam = 31,25-28 (Materia igitur Ethicæ subjecta sive, ut loquuntur, ‘objectum materiale’ Ethicæ, sunt actiones humanæ... / Θεωρεῖ τὰς ἀνθρωπίνους πράξεις ὡς ‘ὕλικὸν ἀντικείμενον’...)

IV 3,37-4,8 = 31,29-32,9 (Dicitur “scientia”, quia conclusiones certas ex principiis certis deducit. V.g., ex hoc principio, “alteri ne feceris, quod tibi fieri non vis”, colligit non esse furandum, non calumniandum, non occidendum et c. ... Primorum huiusmodi principiorum intelligentia in moralibus ‘synderesis’ dicitur, seu melius ‘synteresis’... , qua... / Λέγεται “ἐπιστήμη” ἢ Ἠθικὴ, διότι συμπεραίνει προτάσεις ἀληθεῖς καὶ φανεράς ἐξ ἀρχῶν βεβαίων καὶ φανερῶν. Ἀ.χ. δείχνει ὅτι δὲν πρέπει νὰ κάνωμεν φόνον οὔτε κλοπὴν, διότι θεμελιώνει τοῦτο εἰς τὴν κοινὴν ἀρχὴν ὅπου λέγει· “ὅ, τι δὲν θέλεις νὰ σοῦ κάμουν, μὴ κάμης τοῦ πλησίον”. Ἡ γνῶσις ὅπου ἔχομεν φυσικῶς εἰς τὰς πρώτας τούτας ἠθικὰς ἀρχὰς λέγεται ‘συντήρησις’ ἢ ‘συνείδησις’, δι’ ἧς...)

[By going back to p. 3 and drawing again some material, D. made a mess of the well-ordered explanation of P.’s definition of Ethics in 3,33-36.]

IV 4,22-24 = 32,9-13 (Dicitur “prudentia”... / Λέγεται “φρόνησις”...)

[In 32,14-31, D., using once more second person singular, explains in didactic tenor what the terms “materiale” et “morale” mean when applied to an action.]

IV 5,1-6,11 summam = 33,1-26 (... Scholastici triplicem distinguere solent Moralem, nempe Monasticam..., Œconomicam..., et Politicam... Ergo triplex Moralis species... non est distinguenda. Ea sane mens est Aristotelis... / Τὰ μέρη τῆς Ἠθικῆς φιλοσοφίας εἶναι τρία κατὰ τὸν Ἀριστοτέλη: μοναχικόν, οἰκονομικόν καὶ πολιτικόν. ... Λοιπὸν περιέχεται εἰς τὴν πολιτικὴν ἢ μοναχικὴ καὶ οἰκονομικὴ ἠθικὴ καὶ εἶναι μέρη ἐκεῖνης, ὅχι εἶδη...)

[D. omits the typically Scholastic *objecta* and *responsiones ad objecta* on the question whether Individual Ethics, Economics, and Politics are parts or species of the Moral Science.]

IV 7,39-8,13 summam = 33,27-29 (Opus est Œconomica patrifamilias, ut familiae suae non tantum bonum morale procuret, verum etiam bonum physicum...)

Item Politica... est necessaria non tantum ut subditorum mores componant, sed ut... quoque omnium... rerum, quas natura desiderat, abundantem copiam suppeditent / ... ἡ Οἰκονομικὴ ἀποκτίζει καὶ τὰ φυσικὰ ἀγαθὰ, ὡσάν τὰ πλοῦτη διὰ τὴν κυβέρνησιν τοῦ οἴκου, καὶ ἡ Πολιτικὴ πάλιν διὰ τὴν κοσμικὴν εὐτυχίαν τῆς πόλεως.)

IV 10,24–41 summam = 33,29–34,2 (Ex quo liquet totum illud Aristotelis corpus Ethico-politicum 31. Libris comprehendi, scilicet decem libris *ad Nicomachum*, novem *ad Eudemum*, duobus *Magnorum Moraliū*, octo *Politicorum*, et duobus *Œconomicorum* / Ὅθεν ὅλα τὰ βιβλία ἀπὸ τὰ ὁποῖα συνίσταται ἡ φιλοσοφία ἡ ἠθικὴ τοῦ Ἀριστοτέλους εἶναι τριάκοντα ἕν· δέκα βιβλία τῆς Μοναχικῆς ἠθικῆς πρὸς Νικόμαχον τὸν υἱὸν του, δύο βιβλία τῶν Μεγάλων ἠθικῶν, ἑπτὰ [sic] πρὸς τὸν Εὐδήμιον τὸν φίλον του, ὀκτώ βιβλία τῶν Πολιτικῶν, καὶ δύο βιβλία τῶν Οἰκονομικῶν).

IV 10,42–II,38 summam = 34,3–35,17 (Quod vero spectat ad Divum Thomam, quem sanior pars Theologorum et Philosophorum, præsertim in moralibus, ducem sequitur... ..II^a Pars *Summæ theologicæ* Sancti Thomæ tota moralis est, in eaque disputat de ultimo hominis fine, tum de ipsius actibus, postea de habitibus et virtutibus et cætera, quibus homo ad finem ultimum perducitur. Ac de iis quidem primo generatim agit I^a Parte II^a Partis, deinde speciatim II^a Parte II^a Partis; nam II^a Pars *Summæ theologicæ* Sancti Thomæ in duas Partes subdividitur, in I^{am} II^a et II^{am} II^a. Quam ob rem Aristoteles et Divus Thomas diversa ratione bonitatem moralem seu rectitudinem aut perfectionem actuum humanarum spectant. Nam Aristoteles eam considerat prout est hominis finis... Sed Sanctus Thomas actuum humanorum honestatem quasi viam, sive, ut loquuntur, medium ad ultimum finem... Nos iisdem vestigiis insistentes, sed ad Sancti Thomæ methodum magis accedentes, Moralem nostram in quattuor Partes dividemus. Quarum Prima de summo hominis bono sive de actuum humanorum fine futura est; Secunda de actibus humanis eorumque regulis; Tertia, de virtutibus et vitiis; Quarta denique de variis vitæ officiis, quibus homines tum erga Deum, tum erga seipsos tum demum erga alios homines tenentur / Ἡμεῖς οὖν ἀκολουθοῦντες σχεδὸν τὴν μέθοδον τοῦ Ἀριστοτέλους διαιροῦμεν εἰς τέσσερα μέρη τὴν ἠθικὴν φιλοσοφίαν. Εἰς τὸ Πρῶτον θεωροῦμεν τὸ μέγιστον ἀγαθόν, ὁποῦ εἶναι τὸ ὕστερον τέλος τῶν ἀνθρωπίνων πράξεων, ἡγουν θεωροῦμεν τὴν εὐτυχίαν καὶ μακαριότητα· εἰς τὸ Δεύτερον θεωροῦμεν τὰς ἀνθρωπίνους πράξεις καὶ τοὺς κανόνες μὲ τοὺς ὁποίους διορθώνονται· εἰς τὸ Τρίτον θεωροῦμεν τὰς ἀρετὰς καὶ τὰ ἐλαττώματα ὡς ἀρχὰς τῶν πράξεων· εἰς τὸ Τέταρτον θεωροῦμεν τὰ διάφορα καθήκοντα τῆς ἀνθρωπίνης ζωῆς σχετικῶς πρὸς τὴν ἀπόλαυσιν τῆς μακαριότητος. Διαφέρομεν ἐδῶ ἡμεῖς ἀπὸ τὸν Ἀριστοτέλη, εἰς ὅσον ἐκεῖνος, ὄντας Ἐθνικός, ἐθεώρει τὴν φυσικὴν εὐτυχίαν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου, ὁποῦ εἶναι ἡ πρᾶξις τῆς ἀρετῆς κατὰ τὸν ἴδιον καὶ ἡ θεωρία τῆς ἀληθείας, ὅθεν ὕστερον τέλος τῶν ἀνθρωπίνων ἐνεργειῶν ἔλεγεν πῶς εἶναι τὰ ἐνάρετα ἔργα, ἡμεῖς δέ, ὄντες Χριστιανοί, θεωροῦμεν τὴν ὑπερφυσικὴν μακαριότητα, ἡγουν τὴν ἀπόλαυσιν τοῦ Θεοῦ, ὅθεν τὰ ἐνάρετα ἔργα εἶναι μέσα μὲ τὰ ὁποῖα ἀπολαμβάνομεν τὸν Θεὸν ὡς ὕστερον τέλος τῶν ἀνθρωπίνων πράξεων).

Let us now fully compare the body of the Latin original texts with their Greek rendering.

IV 12,5-18 = 36,5-12

V 104,18-105,1 = 36,15-20 (In 36,21-24, D. adds the example of war as a "relatively bad thing" and ignorance as a case of an "absolutely bad thing")

V 105,2-11 plus *IV* 12,34-13,11 = 37,1-9 (In 37,9-14, D. adds some didactic examples of his own.)

V 105,12-20 = 37,15-26

V 105,21-31 plus *IV* 15,1-4 = 38,1-16 (In 38,6-7, D. adds the didactic example of erudition (μαθήσις) as an instance of "honestum")

V 105,32-33 plus *IV* 15,15-19 = 38,16-23

IV 20,4-24 = 38,24-39,13

IV 21,9-22,7 = 39,14-40,7 (In 40,7-8, D. adds the example of a person who accumulates riches as an instance of self-noxious behaviour.)

IV 22,23-25,15 summatis = 40,11-41,31

V 107,1-30 = 42,3-43,2

IV 27,4-26 summatis = 43,3-13

IV 28,4-8 = 43,14-17

IV 28,24-28 = 43,17-19

IV 30,16-23 summatis = 43,20-44,3

IV 31,42-32,2 = 44,4-6

IV 32,7-3,33 = 44,6-46,8 (In 46,5-6, D. adds Solon's famous dictum that one should not be deemed as happy unless the way he is going to die has been taken into account.)

V 108,4-7 = 46,8-9

IV 35,11-18 = 46,10-14

IV 36,5-8 = 46,14-16

IV 27,4 (tit.) = 46,16-17

IV 38,14-30 = 46,17-26

IV 38,31-39 = 46,26-31

V 88,8-34 summatis = 47,4-15

V 89,1-90,27 = 47,18-49,32

V 110,4-14 = 50,1-12

V 110,15-27 = 50,16-51,1

IV 114,31-35 plus *V* 95,28-29 = 51,1-5

IV 95,32-43 = 51,6-12

V 111,4-6 = 51,13-14

IV 96,10 = 51,15-16

V 111,8-10 = 51,16-18

IV 100,7-9 = 51,18-21

IV 99,32-100,6 = 51,21-24 (In 51,24-27, D. adds the didactic example of the drunk as morally responsible for their acts in terms of their being responsible for putting themselves in the position to be effectively unable to control their acts.)

- IV* 105,5-9 = 52,4-7
IV 109,9-21 = 52,7-13
IV 105,9-19 = 53,1-6 (In 53,6-8, D. offers an easy to digest description of the difference between external violence and internal necessity.)
IV 112,10-13 = 53,9-10
IV 112,14-20 = 53,10-14
IV 112,21-24 = 53,15-18
IV 112,25-27 = 53,19-21
IV 112,28-113,7 = 53,21-54,10
V 113,11-13 plus *IV* 131,9-12 = 54,15-18
V 113,14-16 plus *IV* 131,13 = 54,19-21
V 113,20-22 plus *IV* 150,28-32 and *IV* 15,15-19 = 54,22-55,7
IV 157,19-23 (paraphrased) = 55,7-9
IV 150,33-34 plus *V* 113,23-24 = 55,10-12
V 113,26-29 = 55,12-14
IV 151,17-24 = 55,15-21
IV 151,29 plus 151,36-43 summamim = 55,22-27 (In 56,1-4, D., based on the definition of positive law, notes (“σημείωσαι. . .”) that a law should not be respected if not based on reason.)
IV 131,16-20 = 56,5-10
IV 131,21-23 = 56,11-13
IV 131,24-36 summamim = 56,13-20
IV 131,37-132,139 summamim = 56,20-57,3 (In 56,21, D. specifies P’s example of “icon” as “the icon of Christ?”)
IV 132,40-133,31 summamim = 57,4-30
IV 132,40-133,31 summamim = 57,31-58,4 (In 58,4-14 D. sets forth some examples.)
IV 135,10-12 = 58,14-19
58,21 = 55,10
IV 198,37 = 58,22
IV 198,37 = 58,25
58,23-25 = 55,10-12
58,25-27 = 55,12-14
IV 214,26-29 = 58,27-59,1
IV 214,29 = 59,1a
IV 214,30-31 = 59,1b
IV 214,27-29 = 59,2-3
IV 214,29-31 = 59,3-5
IV 214,31-39 = 59,5-15
IV 214,40-215,5 = 59,16-19
IV 212,4-5 = 59,20-21
IV 223,9-10 paraphr. = 59,21-23
IV 207,41-208,2 plus 212,21-22 = 59,24-27 (In 59,27-30, “δηλαδή. . .”; D. explains P’s words.)

- IV* 208,4-6 = 59,30-31 (In 59,31-32, “ἤγουν...” ; D. explains P.’s words.)
IV 213,17-31 = 59,32-60,10
IV 212,32-33 = 60,10-12
IV 212,7-8 plus 212,23-25 = 60,12-14 (In 59,31-32, “ἤγουν...” ; D. explains P.’s words by means of the words in *IV* 213,18-19.)
IV 212,6 = 60,15-16
IV 212,6 = 60,15-16 (In 60,17-18, D. rephrases P. by means of Gal. 3,24-26, which is the continuation of Gal. 3,11, 3,19, and 3,23 cited and commented upon by P. in *IV* 212,42-213,1, 213,1-3, and 213,9-12.)
IV 207,43-208,1 = 60,18-20
IV 213,21-23 = 60,20-22 (In 60,22-25, D. rephrases P. by means of Gal. 3,24-26 and I Joh. 4,18.)
IV 222,4 = 61,1
IV 222,38-229,4 = 61,2-6
IV 223,6-17 = 61,7-16 (D. omits “Summus Pontifex” from the list of the persons invested with the “potestas Ecclesiæ”)
IV 224,6-8 = 61,16-18
IV 224,11-12 = 61,18-19
IV 224,17-18 = 61,19-20
IV 224,18-20 = 61,20
IV 224,22 = 61,20-21
IV 224,24-40 = 61,22-62,6 (In 62,6-9, D. concludes from P.’s words that the secular branch of the Papal authority is superfluous.)
IV 232,22-32 = 62,10-15
IV 233,27-28 = 62,15-16
IV 232,32-233,2 = 62,16-63,3
IV 234,12-15 = 63,4-6
IV 234,21-22 = 63,6-7
IV 234,32-39 = 63,7-14 (In 63,14-16, D. concludes from P.’s words that the Pope’s exclusive claim on the priests’ subjection to him is false.)
IV 234,12-13 = 63,17
IV 235,18-19 plus 235,39-41 plus 236,9-10 = 63,17-19 (In 63,19-20, D. adds a reference to the *translatio imperii* from Rome to Constantinople into P.’s brief exposition of the history of Roman law.)
IV 236,39-42 = 63,20-21
IV 237,9-10 = 63,22 (D. speaks of “δέκα βιβλία τοῦ Κώδικος” instead of P.’s “duodecim libri *Codicis*.”)
IV 237,5-6 = 63,22-23
IV 236,22-24 = 63,23-24
IV 236,39-41 = 63,24-26
*III*²⁵ 335,28-30 = 64,3-5

²⁵ Pourchot (1760).

- IV* 311,36–37 plus *V* 115,4–5 = 64,5–6
V 115,7–11 = 64,6–9
IV 312,17 = 64,9–10
IV 312,23 plus *V* 115,10–11 = 64,10
IV 312,34–37 = 64,11–15
IV 312,32–33 = 64,15–16
IV 312,41–313,1 = 64,16–17 (64,17–20 sounds as a concise account of the moral status of the passions by D.)
V 115,15–18 plus *IV* 316,40–317,2 and 317,20–23 = 64,20–25
IV 313,24–27 = 64,26–27
IV 313,12–20 summam = 64,27–30
IV 313,35–40 summam = 64,30–65,1
IV 312,6 and 313,29 = 65,1–2
IV 313,24–27 = 65,2–6
IV 318,7–12 and 320,10–12 = 65,6–9
IV 317,24–30 and 320,15–24 summam = 65,9–12
IV 322,3–13 = 66,3–22 (In 66,7–9 and 66,13–15, D. adds some trivial examples.)
IV 322,14–15 = 67,3–4
IV 322,16–24 = 67,6–10
IV 322,25–31 = 67,11–13
IV 322,33–35 = 67,13–16
IV 322,8–21 = 67,16–25
IV 322,22–25 = 67,26–28
IV 322,28–32 summam = 67,28–29
IV 323,33 = 68,1–2
IV 323,35–41 = 68,3–6
IV 324,4–8 = 68,6–8
IV 325,17–30 paraphr. = 68,9–11
IV 326,40–327,10 = 68,12–21
IV 326,40–327,10 = 68,12–21
IV 327,11–12 = 68,21–22
IV 327,13–18 = 68,23–30 (In 68,27–28, D. adds: “Ὅρα ὅσα εἶπομεν εἰς τὴν Μεταφυσικήν”; “See what we have said in the *Metaphysics*”; this is a rendering of P.’s “ut... definitum est in *Metaphysica*... ut ibidem exposuimus”; *IV* 329,15–16, which is a reference to his long treatment of the nature and the effects of the divine grace in *Metaphysics*, II,1,8; I 430–467. This chapter was abridged by D. in “his” *Concise Metaphysics* II,1,7;²⁶ however, nothing in this abridgment corresponds to the content of 68,21–28.)
IV 327,24–26 = 68,30–69,1 (In 69,1–5, D. adds the trivial example of “white” as a quality of “man,” and expresses his repudiation of the Scholastic theological doctrine of the divine grace as a real entity.)
IV 327,33–328,23 summam = 69,6–10

²⁶ Bobou-Stamati (2002 : 39,32–40,24).

IV 328,14–28 summam = 69,11–17 (In 69,17–19, he attacks once more the afore-said Scholastic doctrine.)

IV 328,31–329,33 summam = 69,20–70,26

IV 329,34–38 = 70,27–31

IV 329,39 = 71,1

IV 322,17–18 = 71,2–4

IV 329,40–41 or *V* 117,13–14 = 71,4–7 (In 71,7–10, D. produces an example.)

IV 329,40–41 = 71,10–11 or *V* 117,14

IV 330,1–8 = 71,12–16 (In 71,15–16, D. refers to ‘his’ *Logic*, which is but a translation of a reference in *IV* 330,7–8: “... de quibus dictum est in Proœmio Philosophiæ”, ch. 2.²⁷ D. had not failed to render this chapter into Greek in ‘his’ *Logic*, too.)²⁸

IV 330,9–10 = 71,17–18

IV 330,21–24 = 71,18–20 (In 71,20–72,2, D. produces an example and notes (“σημείωσαι...”) that intellectual and moral perfection do not coincide.)

IV 330,29–43 = 72,3–13

IV 331,6–8 = 72,13–14

IV 331,10–12 = 72,14–16

IV 331,19–29 = 72,16–27

IV 331,30–37 = 72,27–73,3

IV 331,38–44 = 73,3–5 (In 73,5, D. cites ‘his’ *Metaphysics*, which is but a rendering of *IV* 331,43–44: “... ut capite ultimo *Metaphysicæ*, quod est de habitibus, ostendimus.”²⁹ D., in his abridgment of *I*, which he labeled *Συνταγματίων Μεταφυσικῆς*,³⁰ omitted this chapter. Nevertheless, a relevant passage occurs in q. 10 of the *Συνταγματίων*; this is probably the reason why D. referred not to some specific chapter of ‘his’ *Metaphysics* but indeterminately to “his” *Metaphysics*.)

IV 333,5–8 = 73,8–9 (In 73,9–14, D. restates 73,8–9 with simpler words: “τὸ ὁποῖον θέλει νὰ εἰπῆ...”)

IV 333,8–9 = 73,14–15

IV 333,10–33 summam plus *V* 117,34–118,2 = 73,16–22

IV 333,17–27 = 73,23–74,3

V 118,8–12 = 74,4–9

IV 335,34–40 = 74,12–17

IV 335,34–336,5 = 74,12–26

IV 337,4–39 = 74,26–75,27

IV 338,12–18 summam = 75,28–76,1 (In 76,1–5, D., probably inspired by the latent citation of Jesus’ saying in Matth. 23,3 in *IV* 338,36–37, refers to the wide and narrow Scriptural use of the terms ‘wisdom’ and ‘prudence’).

IV 338,15–19 = 76,5–8

²⁷ Pourchot (1711a: 16–23).

²⁸ See, e.g., MS 1141 of the National Library of Greece (Athens), ff. 339r–342r.

²⁹ Pourchot (1711a: 540–543).

³⁰ Ed. Bobou-Stamati (2002).

- IV* 338,33–339,9 *summatim* = 76,9–14
IV 339,39–340,7 = 76,15–21
IV 340,10 and 340,18–37 = 76,21–77,6
IV 340,39–341,2–6 = 77,7–13
IV 341,23 = 77,13–14
IV 341,25 and 341,30–34 = 77,14–16
IV 341,37–342,11 *summatim* = 77,16–18
IV 342,16–27 *summatim* = 77,19–78,2 (In 78,2–4, D. clarifies the moral aspect of the terms ‘holy’ and ‘saint.’)
IV 342,30–33 *summatim* = 78,5–9
IV 343,22–25 = 78,10–11
IV 343,26–28 = 78,11–13
IV 344,4–11 = 78,14–19
IV 343,29–32 = 78,20–22 (In 78,22–27, D. produces the example of the difference in gravity between a lustful act committed by a layman and by a bishop; he only then goes on to mention the non-scandalous example in the next lines.)
IV 345,21–25 = 79,4–6
IV 346,5–347,36 *summatim* = 79,7–31
IV 348,23–349,1 *summatim* = 79,7–33
IV 348,23–349,1 *summatim* = 79,33–80,6
IV 350,4–9 = 80,7–12 (In 80,12–13, D. produces two familiar examples of “active fortitude”, i.e. martyrdom for the sake of one’s nation and religion.)
IV 350,22–25 = 80,13–15
IV 351,24–35 = 80,15–20 (D. ascribes the content of this passage to Aristotle, whereas in *IV* 351,26 it is explicitly stated that it derives from Thomas Aquinas’ *Summa theologiæ*, II^a II^æ, q. 123, a. 6.)
IV 350,35–351,22 *summatim* = 80,21–26
IV 351,32–35 = 80,26–27
IV 352,25–30 = 80,28–30 (In 80,31–81,4, D. produces three examples of “excessive” or “defective fortitude”, one from Aristotle’s *Nicomachean Ethics* III15a35–b6, and two regarding Christian martyrdom.)
IV 353,24–32 *summatim* = 81,5–8
IV 353,3–6 *summatim* = 81,8–10 (In 81,10–13, D. produces some examples of voluptuousness.)
IV 354,1 and 354,8–13 = 81,17–22
IV 354,32–36 = 81,23–25 (Curiously, D. omits the one of the two parts of “temperantia”, namely, “honestas.”)
IV 355,2 = 81,26
IV 355,6–7 = 81,26–27
IV 355,8–9 = 81,27–28
IV 355,16–17 = 81,28–29
IV 355,17–19 = 81,30–82,2 (In 81,28–29, D. remarks, probably from his recollections from his student life in Italy, that excessive fun is called in Italian “goffaggine”.)

- IV 355,21 = 82,2
 IV 355,22-41 summam = 82,2-11
 IV 356,1 = 82,12 (In 82,12-18, D. summarizes in a didactic tenor (“...ὡς βλέπεις...”) the doctrine of virtue as a mean.)
 IV 356,5-8 = 82,21-24
 IV 356,9-13 = 82,25-28 (In 82,28-83,10, D. explains with some simple examples the opposition between loving God and loving creatures.)
 IV 356,13-14 = 83,10-11
 IV 356,15-19 = 83,11-14
 IV 356,24-27 = 83,14-17³¹ (In 83,17-21, “ἤγουν...”, D. rephrases P.’s lines.)
 IV 356,27-28 = 83,22-23
 IV 356,29-34 summam = 83,23-26 (D. renders John the Baptist’s as well as Jesus Christ’s famous exhortation “Μετανοεῖτε” (Matth. 3,2; 4,17; Marc. 1,15) as “ποιήσατε μετάνοιαν”, which is just a literal translation of the relevant citation from the *Vulgate* (“poenitentiam agite”) by P.)
 IV 356,35-358,40 = 83,26-86,1
 IV 360,8-361,1 summam = 86,1-87,2
 IV 361,14-9 summam = 87,3-9 (In 87,9-12, D. refers to his comments on the Roman Catholic “indulgentiæ” in his book *On the Differences Between the Two Churches*.)³²
 IV 361,14-16 and 21-24 summam plus V 120,4-6 = 88,3-6
 IV 363,4 plus V 120,10-12 = 88,10-12
 IV 364,20-24 summam plus V 120,13-15 = 88,12-14
 IV 364,37-41 summam plus V 120,16-18 = 88,15-19
 V 120,22-121,2 = 88,20-22
 IV 367,4-9 = 88,23-89,2
 V 121,5-7 = 89,3-5
 IV 368,23-30 = 89,5-11
 V 121,8-20 = 89,11-17
 V 121,21-25 = 89,18-22 (In 89,22-24, D. observes that one should rather abstain from becoming a priest, if this profession is not what one really wants to do in one’s life.)
 V 121,28-122,3 = 89,28-90,4
 IV 374,9 = 90,4 (In 90,5-8, D. compares man’s restricted authority over woman with the churchmen’s restricted authority over Christian folk.)
 V 122,6-7 plus IV 377,32-379,14 summam = 90,9-10
 IV 379,22-24 = 90,10-11
 IV 381,28-35 paraphrased and summam = 90,12-13

³¹ Most probably, the editors misread “προαιρετική” (which makes no sense here) instead of “πραγματική”. P. has “actuale”.

³² Written earlier than 1737 (see Bobou-Stamati 1998 : 343). An *editio princeps* of this writing is about to come out by Dr. P. Yphantis (Thessaloniki).

V 122,10–12 = 90,14–17

V 122,19–20 plus IV 388,3–5 = 90,18–19

IV 385,25–28 summam = 90,19–21

IV 387,20–21 = 90,21–22

IV 387,34–36 summam = 90,22

IV 387,36–38 paraphrased = 90,23

IV 388,5–13 summam = 90,23–24 (a latent paraphrase of Eph. 6,5–7)

V 123,4–8 = 90,27–29

V 123,11–13 = 90,29–91,4

V 123,14–18 = 91,5–7

V 123,19–27 summam = 91,8–10

V 123,28–124,2 = 91,11–13 (D. transfers in his Greek version even the typographical error in P's reference to Deut. 1,16 as Deut. I cap. I. v. 16: “Δευτερονόμιον, βιβλ. α', κεφ. α', ἐδάφιον ιστ'”;³³ the reference is correct in IV 410,30, which shows that D., when writing 91,11–13, had before his eyes only V 123,28–124,2.)

V 124,3–9 summam = 91,14–15

V 124,10–17 summam = 91,15–18 (In 91,19, D. concludes with the trivial words that “these are, briefly speaking, the duties of men”; and in 91,20–21, he ends by saying that he completed his *Concise Philosophy*.)

2. Brief remarks on Damodos as a translator

In Neo-Latin literature, the book-title ‘*Institutiones philosophicae*’ et sim. go at least as far back as 1587.³⁴ From then onwards, the number of works with this title increased in proportion with the increase of the high educational institutions in Europe. In the 18th century, this title, which normally covered Logic (closely connected with Metaphysics), Physics, and Ethics, was more than common.³⁵

D., conforming himself to the nature of his original, tried to offer an abridged version of it adapted to his Greek Orthodox students. To use a term, he produced what might be called a “didactic translation.”³⁶ What did this

³³ Reproduced in Bobou-Stamati's summary of the work (1998 : 360).

³⁴ Guisianus (1587).

³⁵ See, e.g., the six-volumes *Institutiones philosophicae* (Rome, 1757) by François Jacquier (1711–1788), which were very successful until the early 19th century. This sort of title was used for other disciplines or sub-disciplines, too, in the sense of ‘Introduction to...’—to say, for theology and physics (see, e.g., *Institutiones theologicae, quas ad usum seminariorum breviori forma contraxit P. Collet*, Lugduni: apud J. M. Bruyset (1767); *Institutiones theologicae, quas ad usum scholarum auctore ac magistro divo Thoma Aquinate composuit Fr. Thomas Maria Cerboni*, Rome, 1768; D. Beck: *Institutiones physicae praelectionibus publicis destinatae*, Parts I–II, Salzburg, 1779). Cf. the rich list of titles collected in Friedmann (2010).

³⁶ Instead of “didactic work” (Bobou-Stamati 1998 : 253), which implies authorship.

adaptation consist in? D.'s primary concern was to be understandable. To do so, he not only translated the original into the ordinary Greek language³⁷ but also inserted from time to time some short explanations, usually produced by means of examples. Further, D. took seriously into account that, as an author and teacher, he addressed Orthodox readers and students. Thus, on the one hand, he skipped whatever he found in P. to be unacceptable from his and his compatriots' confessional point of view (such as the primacy of pope and the pope's secular power, the indulgences etc.) or might raise some suspicion of Catholic sympathies (such as mentioning Thomas Aquinas by name).³⁸ On the other hand, he attacked some Catholic doctrines or practices.³⁹ However, this does not alter the fact that he decided to render into Greek this specific textbook (out of several other ones) for "Christian philosophers"⁴⁰ and that he did carry this project out. As he himself had once noted, what rendered him useful for his compatriots was that he, in contrast with most of them (a prophetic saying), knew Latin and had thereby access to some intellectual treasures they had not.⁴¹

As far as one can say from the Greek rendering of the Latin philosophical and theological terms as well as from his critical insertions, D. fully mastered his original. Furthermore, no traces of having recourse to the sources cited by P. (such the Holy Scripture, Aristotle and Aquinas) are discernible,⁴² which means that the citations were rendered by D. on the basis of the form in which they occurred in P.'s work.⁴³

³⁷ See, e.g., his Proem to "his" *Φυσιολογία αιτιολογική* (ed. Bobou-Stamati 1998: 396,23–397,13). See also, *inter alia*, his Proem to the *Θεολογία δογματική* (ed. Bobou-Stamati 1998: 334). Cf. Metallinos (1980: 102–105).

³⁸ D. was imitated by Eugenios Boulgaris in the latter's translation of P.'s *Metaphysics* (Petsios 2007: 44–49). This has nothing to do with D.'s or Boulgaris' stand towards Aquinas, who, his confessional identity set apart, was admired by both (Demetracopoulos, 2004: 178–183), as by most Greek scholars from the time of the translation of some major and minor Thomistic writings by Demetrios Cydones, Prochoros Cydones and George Scholarios—Gennadios II (14th–15th century) on; rather, it is related only with Aquinas' being the emblematic author of arguments for *Filioque* set forth by the Catholic Church in its official discussions with the Orthodox Church from late 13th century onwards (see Demetracopoulos forthcoming).

³⁹ D.'s insertions amount to 173 lines or roughly six pages (out of roughly sixty).

⁴⁰ Pourchot (1730: 27,40).

⁴¹ Proem to "his" *Φυσιολογία αιτιολογική* (ed. Bobou-Stamati 1998: 395,14–19).

⁴² With only one probable exception; see 80,28–30.

⁴³ Needless to say, this issue as well as many other concerning D. as translator cannot adequately be dealt with till D.'s writings be some time properly edited.

3. The potential importance of Damodos' transmission of Pourchot's *Ethics* in the Greek-speaking world

The revelation of the identity of D.'s text renders it for the first time possible to accurately identify the sort of the moderate Christian Enlightenment transmitted by him through the Ionian Islands in the Greek-speaking world. P.'s thought is an eclectic mix of a traditional trend, i.e. Thomism (for all his occasional disagreements),⁴⁴ and a modern one, i.e. Cartesianism (for all his partial disagreements),⁴⁵ the latter being more obvious is his Metaphysics and Physics (which D. did not fail to transmit in his country either), whereas the former in Ethics.

As we saw above (p. 48), P. himself states in advance that he intends to follow Aquinas' pattern of division of moral philosophy. Furthermore, the very content of P.'s *Ethics* and *Compendium Ethicæ* shows that they are preponderantly Thomistic. Of the hundreds of references in Vol. IV, which vary from the Holy Scripture to Hobbes and from Boethius to Grotius, ninety-two are made to Thomas' *Summa theologiæ* (mostly to the II^a Pars, on Ethics, but also to the I^a Pars), a score second only to the Holy Scripture (three hundred twenty-three times) and Augustine (one hundred fifty-two times) and higher than Aristotle (sixty times).⁴⁶ This, granted that the volume counts 424 pages (normally of 44 lines), means that there is one Thomistic reference each fourth or fifth page. With reference to the *Compendium Ethicæ*, out of the just eight references in sum, two are made to Aquinas, and D. did not fail to integrate both of the relevant passages into his Greek version of the Latin text.⁴⁷ Now D., when rendering into Greek P.'s declaration⁴⁸ that, in arranging the material of his *Ethics*, he followed the method of the II^a Pars of the *Summa theologiæ* of Aquinas,⁴⁹ substituted for Aquinas the

⁴⁴ See, e.g., Spink (1974 : 223). Cf. Boileau's *Arret burlseque* (1701), in: Boileau (1772 : 431–433).

⁴⁵ See, e.g., Brockliss (2006 : 265).

⁴⁶ I would in advance beg the reader's pardon if, due to the blurring of the old-printed form of P.'s text, my eyes missed few (only few, if any) citations.

⁴⁷ The first one is P.'s reproduction (*Institutiones philosophicæ*, Vol. IV, Part II, Ch. 1 *in toto*; pp. 109,10–110,3) of Aquinas' classification of the internal acts of the human will (*Summa theologiæ*, I^a II^a, q. 8–17), which was summarized in V 89,22–90,27. As was seen, D. reproduced the extended Pourchotian exposition of this Thomistic doctrine. As for the second, V 112,11–13 and IV 106,19–21 (Thomas' definition of free will in the *Summa theologiæ*, I^a, q. 83, a. 4; see also IV 109,34–36) fully correspond to D.'s 49,16–18.

⁴⁸ IV 10,42–11,38.

⁴⁹ Granted that "the writings of Thomas Aquinas proved the most enduring source of inspi-

name of Aristotle. Most probably, he did so in order to prevent his Orthodox audience from recalling the traditional Roman Catholic use of Aquinas' arguments for the *Filioque* against the Orthodox Church.⁵⁰ Besides, "Aris-

ration to scholastic philosophers in early modern times" (Stone 2006: 304), this declaration makes no surprise.

⁵⁰ Aquinas' philosophy, and especially its moral part, P. stresses, is adopted by the sane theologians and philosophers. Granted that "the writings of Thomas Aquinas proved the most enduring source of inspiration to scholastic philosophers in early modern times" (Stone 2006: 304), this declaration makes no surprise. This is a comparison of the List of Contents of the first three (out of four) Parts of P.'s text with the II^a Pars of the *Summa theologiæ*: Pars Prima Ethicæ: De ultima actuum humanorum fine, sive de summo hominis bono (I^a II^æ q. 1: De ultimo fine hominis); Cap. I. De bono generatim; Cap. II. De fine; Cap. III. De beatitudine naturali; Cap. IV. De beatitudine supernaturali (I^a II^æ q. 2: De his in quibus hominis beatitudo consistit; q. 3: Quid sit beatitudo; q. 4: De his quæ ad beatitudinem exiguntur); Cap. V. Qui sint ii, qui ad æternam felicitatem perveniunt: ubi de præcipuo humilitatis Christianæ fundamento (I^a II^æ q. 5: De adeptione beatitudinis); Cap. VI. Satisfit quæstionibus quibusdam cum tradita superius doctrina de beatitudine connexis. Pars Secunda Ethicæ: De actibus humanis eorumque regulis. Cap. I. Quid sit actus humanus et quotuplex (I^a II^æ q. 7: De circumstantiis humanorum actuum); Cap. II. An omnis actus humanus sit voluntarius (I^a II^æ q. 6: De voluntario et involuntario); Cap. III. An omnis actus humanus sit liber (I^a II^æ q. 13, a. 6: Utrum homo ex necessitate eligat an libere; cf. I^a, q. 83, a. 1: Utrum homo sit liberi arbitrii); Cap. IV. De bonitate et malitia actuum humanorum (I^a II^æ q. 18: De bonitate et malitia humanorum actuum in generali); Cap. V. De regulis bonitatis et malitiæ moralis (I^a II^æ q. 19: De bonitate et malitia actus interioris voluntatis); Cap. VI. De lege æterna et naturali (I^a II^æ q. 91, a. 1: Utrum sit aliqua lex æterna; a. 2: Utrum sit in nobis aliqua lex naturalis; q. 93: De lege æterna; q. 94: De lege naturali); Cap. VII. De conscientia (I^a q. 79, a. 13: Utrum conscientia sit aliqua potentia intellectivæ partis; cf. I^a II^æ q. 19, a. 5; a. 6; q. 96, a. 4); Cap. VIII. De lege divina (I^a II^æ q. 91, a. 4: Utrum sit aliqua lex divina/æterna); Cap. IX. De legibus humanis (I^a II^æ q. 91, a. 3: Utrum sit aliqua lex humana; q. 95: De lege humana); Cap. X. Selectæ juris notiones ex Imperatoris Justiniani *Institutionibus* desumptæ, cum variis observationibus ad scientiam morum spectantibus. Pars Tertia Ethicæ: De virtutibus et vitiis (II^a II^æ q. 58: De virtutibus moralibus; II^a II^æ q. 71: De vitiis et peccatis); Cap. I. Quid sit virtus, quid vitium (I^a II^æ q. 71: De vitiis et peccatis secundum se); Cap. II. De divisione virtutum moralium (I^a II^æ q. 60: De distinctione virtutum moralium ad invicem; II^a II^æ q. 55, a. 3: De divisione virtutum); Cap. III. De prudentia (II^a II^æ q. 47: De prudentia secundum se; q. 48: De partibus prudentiæ; q. 49: De singulis prudentiæ partibus quasi integralibus; q. 50: De partibus subjectivis prudentiæ; q. 51: De virtutibus adjunctis prudentiæ); Cap. IV. De justitia (II^a II^æ q. 57: De justitia); Cap. V. De fortitudine (II^a II^æ q. 123: De fortitudine); Cap. VI. De temperantia (II^a II^æ q. 141: De temperantia); Cap. VII. De peccatis (I^a II^æ q. 71: De vitiis et peccatis secundum se; cf. qq. 72–79). As for Part IV, whose title is: "De variis vitæ officiis" (cf. II^a II^æ q. 183: De officiis et statibus hominis in generali), P. seems to have been based, at least in part, on Christian Thomasius' *Institutiones jurisprudentiæ divinæ*, as the subsequent comparison shows: Sectio I: De hominis tum erga Deum tum erga seipsum officiis; Cap. I: De officiis hominis erga Deum (II,1: De officiis hominis erga Deum); Cap. II: De hominis officiis erga seipsum (II,2: De officio hominis erga seipsum); Sectio II: De hominis officiis erga familiam; Cap. I: De officiis conjugum (III,2: De officio hominis intuitu societatis conjugalis); Cap. II: De officiis paren-

totelianists” and “Scholastics” (both Medieval and Modern) were used by P. interchangeably.⁵¹ Of course, this does not alter the fact that D. did reproduce the core of P.’s declaration, especially by qualifying that, to Aristotle, moral act serves natural happiness, whereas to Christians it is a means for attaining the supernatural goal of “Deo frui”. D. just abridged P.’s description of the difference between Aristotle’s and Aquinas’ ethics by substituting “Christian” for “Thomas” and leaving everything else *al posto*.

Thus, D., by producing an abridged version of P.’s *Ethics*, latently transmitted in Greece a manual of Thomistic ethics.⁵² This is not as conservative as would be seen through any kind of Enlightenment or post-Enlightenment lenses; for speaking of natural happiness side by side with the supra-natural one and ascribing an irreducible degree of autonomy to the former was indeed philosophical and, to this extent, potentially revolutionary. Besides, as is well-known, 17th- and 18th-century Modernity sprung from ascribing absolute value to the secular elements of some Medieval intellectual syntheses rather than from straightforwardly attacking the religious and theological ones.

Further, Cartesian methodology, *grosso modo* adopted by P., was potentially subversive, too. Indeed, “Pourchot... scrive e detta agli studenti una filosofia nuova, fondata sulla retta ragione e il *bon sens* che libera la filosofia di tutte le ridicole sottigliezze che la componevano... I suoi corsi susci-

tum et liberorum (III,4: De officiis parentum et liberorum); Cap. III: De officiis dominorum et servorum (III,5: De officiis dominorum et servorum); Sectio III: De variis hominum officii erga rempublicam (III,6: De officiis viventium in civitate); Cap. I: De officio principis et optimatum; Cap. II: De officiis sacerdotum et ministrorum ipsi subditorum; Cap. III: De officiis magistratum et judicum; Cap. IV: De privatorum officiiis (Chr. Thomasius, *Institutionum jurisprudentiæ divinæ libri tres, in quibus fundamenta juris naturalis secundum hypotheses illustris Pufendorfi perspicue demonstrantur... Editio secunda...*, Halæ: Chr. Salfeldii, 1694: 145; 154; 437; 533; 546; 552). However, since Thomasius was explicitly based on Samuel Pufendorf’s *De officiis hominis et civis, prout ipsi præscribuntur lege naturali, libri duo* (Giessæ: I. P. Krieger, 1728; 1673), which resulted in P.’s writing being very close to Pufendorf’s work (I,1–6; II,1–4; 18) as well (cf. S. Pufendorf, *op.cit.* : 1–141; 268–299; 379–384), one should widen the range of the texts that should be identified as the sources of P.’s Part IV. This is not the place to further investigate P.’s sources.

⁵¹ See, e.g., *Institutiones metaphysicæ*, Vol. III : 64.

⁵² P. Kondylis (1998 : 153–154), like all scholars who have so far studied the 18th century Greek philosophical literature, offers some citations from D.’s *Concise Ethics* and comments upon them, being unaware of the fact that what he was reading was just a translation. Nevertheless, he did not fail to perceive the Thomistic character of what he was reading; for instance, when commenting on ch. II,6 (on the morally neutral character of the passions of the soul), he refers to Aquinas’ *Summa theologiæ*, I^a II^æ, q. 51, aa. 1 and 2.

tano le reazioni dei suoi colleghi dell'Università, che lo denunciano al Parlamento come empio”⁵³ Although P. did not suffer any official sanction, in the early eighteenth century France “*un purchotiste* was a philosophical radical”⁵⁴ P.'s *Institutiones* were often attacked by several Scholastico-Aristotelian (both Thomist and Scotist) theologians.⁵⁵

The importance of D.'s transmission of P.'s *Ethics* in Greece can also be evaluated in view of the fact that, almost three centuries after his time, his *Concise Ethics* remains the only printed Greek text where Thomistic ethics is expounded and that even this fact has passed hitherto unnoticed.

4. Further research

4.1. Pourchot's *Institutiones philosophicæ* as the original of Damodos' Entire *Concise Philosophy*

D.'s self-reference to *Physics*, which, as we saw (p. 51), has a precise correspondence in Vol. III (*Physica specialis*) of P.'s *Institutiones philosophicæ*, implies that D.'s *Physics* is but another instance of *Purchotius Græcus*.

Further, D. concludes the *Concise Ethics* with the subsequent words: “Here is it! With God's help, I have just finished my *Concise Philosophy*”⁵⁶ Since the Ethical part is the last one in P.'s *Compendium Philosophiæ*, this is evidently a reference to P.'s *Compendium* and amounts to a declaration that D. rendered it into Greek in its entirety. This is why in p. 30,6–7, D. paralleled the etymological definition of Ethics with the etymological definition of Logic in the opening words of P.'s *Compendium Logicæ*; in fact, D. was taking it for granted that this definition was already known to the reader of the last Part (the Moral one) of his *Concise Philosophy*. Unfortunately, D.'s *Logic* (like most of his texts as well as a vast amount of the Greek texts of his time) is unedited. Until it is edited by someone in the future,⁵⁷ one can turn to his

⁵³ Belgioioso (1999: 20); Armogathe (2008: 82). Cf. Weiss (1823: 557a). Cf. Boileau's artistic piece *Larret burlesque* (1701), in: Boileau (1772: 430–444, esp. 431–433).

⁵⁴ Brockliss (2006: 264). Cf. *supra*, n. 34.

⁵⁵ See, e.g., V. Gufl: *Philosophia Scholastica universa...*, §§ 788; 1040–1041; 1525; 1619; 1628 (Gufl 1753: 344; 468–470; 721; 775–776; 780); Ferrarius de Modoetia: *Philosophia Peripatetica...* (Ferrarius de Modoetia 1754; cf. Czerkowski 1999: 34–38).

⁵⁶ “Ἰδοὺ Θεοῦ βοηθείᾳ ἔχαμα τέλος τῆς ἡμετέρας Συνοπτικῆς Φιλοσοφίας” (Damodos 1940: 91,20–21).

⁵⁷ See the list of the relevant manuscripts in: Bobou-Stamati (1998: 96–217) *passim*.

Concise Metaphysics (Συνταγμάτιον τῆς μεταφυσικῆς), recently edited⁵⁸ as an allegedly original writing by D. and inaugurating a series of “Texts of Modern Greek Philosophers”. Having established the fully Pourchotian provenance of D.’s *Concise Ethics*, we can assume that comparing D.’s *Concise Metaphysics* with the relevant parts of P.’s *Institutiones philosophicæ* will result in a *déjà-vu*.⁵⁹ Yet, for many reasons, one should not fail to observe this comparison, too, carried out in a forthcoming paper.

4.2. In search of the Latin originals of the philosophical pieces of the Modern Greek Enlightenment

In general, identifying the European originals of the Greek philosophical, scientific, and theological texts (both printed books and manuscripts) from the end of Byzantium until the middle 20th century and comparing word by word the former with the latter is a *conditio sine qua non* for a proper literary classification of the latter to be achieved. This task, if ever carried out, will no doubt result in radically revising some recent scholars’ optimistic description of the people traditionally called “διδάσκαλοι τοῦ γένους” (teachers of the [Modern Greek] nation) as “Modern Greek philosophers.”⁶⁰ I intend to publish some results of this ‘detective’ work with reference to some of the thus far regarded as major writings of Modern Greek authors of the 18th century (such as the *Logic* of Eugenios Boulgaris).⁶¹ To state in advance the main point: in the European world, translations of philosophical, scientific, and theological writings played a role subsidiary to the various trends of Enlightenment, which was expressed by important original writings by national authors all over Europe. By contrast, in the Greek-speaking world, original (not in content, but even in the very wording) writings can scarcely be detected at

⁵⁸ Ed. Bobou-Stamati (2002).

⁵⁹ This accounts for the fact that D. usually inserts into ‘his’ writings some philosophical terms in Latin, “even in the case of terms purely Aristotelian”, which could be written only in Greek (Bobou-Stamati 1998: 376–377; 2007: 89–102). The reason was not that “he intended to make himself clearer” (Bobou-Stamati 1998: 377); indeed, how could this help him to make himself clearer before an audience and a readership ignorant, as he himself said (cf. *supra*, p. 57), of Latin, which thereby needed his Greek-written pieces? His noting of Latin words “even in cases of purely Aristotelian terms” (Bobou-Stamati 1998: 376) derives from the very nature of the work he was carrying out—translation.

⁶⁰ Cf. *supra*, n. 5; *infra*, n. 65.

⁶¹ See Demetracopoulos (forthcoming), where the lines of the Latin original writings that lie behind almost every line of the Greek text are detected.

all; instead of original writings,⁶² the main (bordering on exclusive) vehicle of illumination was the translation activity (in the wide sense of the term: literal translation, adaptation, abridgment, etc.). To quote a study of one of the few scholars who have so far become aware of the above fact, it was “translators rather than authors of original works” who “played a leading role in affecting education.”⁶³ True, one can occasionally find some words, phrases, sentences or even paragraphs inserted by the Greek scholars into the European texts they translated. The nature of these Greek writings, then, calls for patiently locating these cases and seeing through them as if through some small windows what these scholars probably thought themselves with regard to the content of the texts they transmitted in their national peripheral language.

Therefore, for reasons partly similar to and partly different from (yet stronger and more fundamental than) those described by P. Kondylis,⁶⁴ Modern Greek Enlightenment stands vis-à-vis the European one as a periphery point vis-à-vis the intellectual center. To put it in non-metaphorical terms, the Greek philosophical, theological, and scientific works produced in the 18th century should not be naively taken as documents of the history of Greek philosophy but rather, more modestly and truly, as monuments of the history of Modern Greek education and culture. This is not so because these documents do not testify to any hopefully original ideas conceived by

⁶² Eugenios Boulgaris, who probably had been a disciple of D., certainly knew the origins of D.'s volumes of *Concise Philosophy* from first hand; indeed, having translated (probably inspired by D.'s own *Concise Philosophy*) P.'s *Metaphysics* in 1750 (Petsios 2007), he would have hardly failed to do so. As has been noted (Henderson 1977: 53), Boulgaris did not include D. in the list of post-Byzantine Greek scholars he produced in his short history of philosophy entitled “Ἀφήγησις προεισοδιώδης περι ἀρχῆς καὶ προόδου τῆς κατὰ τὴν φιλοσοφίαν ἐνστάσεως, καὶ περι τῶν ἐν φιλοσοφίᾳ γενομένων αἰρέσεων καὶ τῶν κατ' αὐτάς μάλιστα εὐδοκιμηκότων” (Boulgaris, 1766: 40-44). Yet, this omission should not be taken as an implicit repudiation of Damodos. In fact, B., in writing this “Dissertatio” slavishly (i.e., word by word, even in regard to the title and even with regard both to the essential and unessential mistakes) followed J. J. Brucker's *Historia critica philosophiæ* (Leipzig, 1742-1744), P.'s “Præfatio” to the *Institutiones philosophicæ* (Pourchot 1711a), and, as far as the post-Byzantine Greek scholars were concerned, Demetrius Procopius Moschopolites' *Σχεδίασμα*, where D. could not be included just because of the very date of Moschopolites' piece (1721).

⁶³ Petrou (2006: 837-838).

⁶⁴ Kondylis (1988: 9-10; 32). In view of Kondylis' own statement that “the philosophical production of the Modern Greek Enlightenment” consists of “pitch-patches and miscellaneous copies” (*op.cit.*: 10) one should hardly allow for embarking upon “a purely [i.e., independent from the philological] philosophical research” into this literature (*op.cit.*: 12).

their authors;⁶⁵ this would be a pardonable sin as far as a lot of philosophers throughout history are concerned. Rather, this is so because the philological genre these documents fall under is not ‘writings’ but, in fact, ‘translations’^{66, 67}

References

- Armogathe, J.-R. (2008): L'enseignement de la philosophie à l'Université de Paris au XVIII^{ème} siècle: éléments de recherche. *Alvearium* 1: 79–87.
- Belgioioso, G. (1999): *La variata immagine di Descartes. Gli itinerari della metafisica tra Parigi e Napoli (1690–1733)*. Lecce: Milella.
- Berkes, N. (1964): *The Development of Secularism in Turkey*. Montreal: McGill University Press.
- Blum, P. R. (1999): Humanistische Argumente in der Aufklärung. Andreas Gordon OSB über Utilitas und Futilitas der Scholastischen Philosophie. *Verbum* 1: 79–89.
- Blum, P. R. (2004): Filozófia magyar nyelven: Bertalanffi Pál, Sartori Bernát és a XVIII. század egyetemi filozófiája. In: I. Bitskey & S. Oláh (eds.) *Religió, retorika, nemzettudat régi irodalomunkban*. Budapest: Egyetemi Kiadó. 513–529. (= P. R. Blum: ‘Philosophie auf Ungarisch Pál Bertalanffi SJ, Bernard Sartori OFM und die Schulphilosophie des 18. Jahrhunderts’, forthcoming.)
- Blum, P. R. (2008): Pourchot Edmund. In: L. Foisneau (ed.) *Dictionary of Seventeenth-Century French Philosophers*. London: Thoemmes. 1029–1031.
- Bobou-Stamati, V. (1998): *‘Ο Βικέντιος Δαμιόδος. Βιογραφία – έργογραφία (1700–1754)*. Athens: Μορφωτικό Ίδρυμα Έθνικης Τραπέζης.

⁶⁵ This is taken for an obvious fact even by most of those scholars who face Modern Greek Enlightenment in a favourite spirit. See, e.g., Demos (1958: 523; 541): “[...] The philosophic thought was not particularly original—not striking out new paths but mostly consisting in the transmission of both ancient and recent Western thought. [...] The philosophical thinking was largely derivative. [...] The figures [...] were more sages than professional philosophers, teachers rather than original thinkers, embodying the modern scientific temper rather than articulating it? Cf., *inter alia*, Henderson (1955: 164). Besides, textbooks (instead of treatises) is a place where philosophical originality is normally not expected to be seen.

⁶⁶ In this respect, producing bilingual editions of these documents—preferably in electronic form, which allows for visualizing (e.g., by means of different colours or raster backdrop) and thus distinguishing between passages literally translated, paraphrased, omitted etc.—would revolutionize scholarship in this field. What, *inter alia*, one should without fail focus on with the aid of such editions is the terminology used by Damodos and the other Modern Greek authors of the 18th century in their effort to transmit philosophy, theology, and sciences from the European center to the Greek periphery.

⁶⁷ My sincere thanks to Prof. Dr. Paul Richard Blum (Loyola University, Maryland) for our interesting discussions on Pourchot as well as to Prof. Dr. Anikó Ádám (Pázmány Péter Catholic University, Piliscsaba) and Dr. Zoltán Kiss (Eötvös Loránd University, Budapest) for their valuable suggestions on some nuances of this article.

- Bobou-Stamati, V. (2007): Ἐνα μάθημα φιλοσοφίας 'Περὶ χρόνου' (Κεφαλληνία, 1739). *Κάτοπτρον νεοελληνικῆς φιλοσοφίας*, Vol. 1: 79–104.
- Boileau Despréaux (1772): *Œuvres. Avec des éclaircissemens historiques donnés par lui-même et rédigés par M. Brossette... Nouvelle édition... Tome troisième*. Amsterdam.
- Boulgaris, E. (1766): *Ἡ Λογικὴ ἐκ παλαιῶν τε καὶ νεωτέρων συνερανισθεῖσα, ἧς προτέτακται περὶ ἀρχῆς καὶ προόδου τῆς κατὰ τὴν Φιλοσοφίαν ἐνστάσεως καὶ προδιατριβῆς τέτταρες εἰσαγωγικαί, εἰς ἅπασαν τὴν Φιλοσοφίαν προτελεστικά*. Leipzig: Breitkopf.
- Brucker, J.J. (1742–1744): *Historia critica philosophiæ...* (six vols.). Leipzig: Breitkopf. (Repr. Hildesheim/New York, 1975).
- Brockliss, L. (2006): The Moment of No Return: The University of Paris and the Death of Aristotelianism. *Science and Education* 15: 259–278.
- Castro Padraõ, Miguel Pereira de (1753): *Propugnación de la racionalidad de los brutos. Carta apologetica...* Lisbon: F.L. Ameno.
- Czerkawski, J. (1999): Die Franziskanische philosophische Schule im 18. Jahrhundert. *Verbum* 1: 29–38.
- Damodos, V. (1940): Σύνοψις ἠθικῆς φιλοσοφίας. In: T. Chr. Zeses & L. N. Depountes (eds.) *Ἀνέκδοτα ἔργα Βικεντίου Δαμοδοῦ. Α': Σύνοψις ἠθικῆς φιλοσοφίας*. Athens.
- Damodos, V. (2002): Συνταγματίων τῆς μεταφυσικῆς. In: V. Bobou-Stamati (ed.) *Βικέντιος Δαμοδός. Συνταγματίων τῆς μεταφυσικῆς. Κριτικὴ ἔκδοσις – ἐπιμέλεια – εἰσαγωγή* ("Κείμενα νεοελλήνων φιλοσόφων", 1), Ioannina: University of Ioannina.
- Demetracopoulos, J. A. (2004): Φιλοσοφία καὶ θρησκεία στὴ σκέψη τοῦ Εὐγένιου Βούλγαρη. Ἐνα θωμικὸ ἐπιβίωμα στὴ χριστιανικὴ σκέψη τοῦ νεοελληνικοῦ Διαφωτισμοῦ. *Κεφαλληνιακά χρονικά* 10: 129–202.
- Demetracopoulos, J. A. (forthcoming): *Philosophus plagiarius: οἱ πηγές τῆς "Λογικῆς" τοῦ Εὐγένιου Βούλγαρη*. Athens: Parousia.
- Demetrius Procopius Moschopolita (1721): Ἐπιτετημένη ἀπαρίθμησις τῶν κατὰ τὸν παρελθόντα αἰῶνα λογίων Γραικῶν, καὶ περὶ τινῶν ἐν τῷ νῦν αἰῶνι ἀνθούτων. *Succincta eruditorum Græcorum superioris et præsentis sæculi recensio*. In: J. A. Fabricius: *Bibliotheca Græca sive notitia scriptorum veterum Græcorum...* Editio nova... curante G.C. Harles... , Vol. XI, Hamburgi 1808 (repr. Hildesheim, 1967), cols. 769–808.
- Demos, R. (1958): The Neo-Hellenic Enlightenment (1750–1821). *Journal of the History of Ideas* 19: 523–541.
- Ferrarius de Modoetia, J. A. (1754): *Philosophia Peripatetica adversus veteres et recentiores præsertim philosophos firmioribus propugnata rationibus Johannis Dunsii Scoti subtilium principis. Editio secunda...* Tomus secundus, in quo prior Physicæ pars, hoc est Physica Generalis, explicatur, Venice: Th. Bettinelli.
- Friedmann, J. S. (2010): Philosophy and the Liberal Arts in the Early Modern Period. http://www.idcpublishers.com/pdf315_titlelist_Philosophy.pdf. IDC Publishers. (Accessed: 30.01.2010.)
- Guff, V. (1753): *Philosophia Scholastica universa suis principiis firmata et adversus Neotericos præcipue adornata. Tomus III. Physica universalis. Elementa geo- et hydrostatices*. Monachii et Pedeponti: J. Gastl.
- Guilianus, N. A. (1587): *Methodicæ institutiones philosophiæ rationalis, naturalis, moralis*. Paris.

- Gunergun, F. (2006): Science in the Ottoman World. In: G. N. Vlahakis et al. (eds.) *Imperialism and Science: Social Impact and Interaction*. Santa Barbara: ABC-Clío. 71–117.
- Henderson, G. P. (1955): Greek Philosophy from 1600 to 1850. *The Philosophical Quarterly* 5: 157–165.
- Henderson, G. P. (1970): *The Revival of Greek Thought, 1620–1830*. New York: State University of New York Press. (Greek translation by Ph. K. Voros, Athens: The Academy of Athens, 1977.)
- Janaczek, S. (1999): Der Streit und die Rolle des Wolffianismus in der polnischen Aufklärung. *Verbum* 1: 39–52.
- Kondylis, P. (1988): *Ἡ Νεοελληνικὸς Διαφωτισμὸς: οἱ φιλοσοφικὲς ἰδέες*, Athens: Γνώση.
- Metallinos, G. D. (1980): *Vikentios Damodos (1679/1700–1752): Θεολογία δογματική κατὰ συντομίαν ἢτε Συνταγμάτιον θεολογικόν. Prolegomena – Kritische Ausgabe – Kommentar (Inaugural-Dissertation zur Erlangung des Doktorgrades der Philosophischen Fakultät der Universität zu Köln)*, Athens. (Reprinted with some cuttings: *Βικεντίου Δαμοδοῦ Θεολογία δογματική κατὰ συντομίαν ἢτε Συνταγμάτιον θεολογικόν. Εἰσαγωγή – κριτική ἔκδοση – σχόλια*, Holy Mountain: Holy Monastery of Vatopedion, 2008).
- Metallinos, G. D. (1986): Βικέντιος Δαμοδός: προσπάθεια διασύνδεσης Ὁρθόδοξης καὶ Δυτικῆς θεολογίας τὸν ΙΗ' αἰώνα. In: *Παράδοση καὶ ἀλλοτρίωση*, Athens: Δόμος. 45–84.
- Papanoutsos, E. P. (1959²): *Νεοελληνικὴ φιλοσοφία*, Vol. I. Athens: I. Zacharopoulos.
- Petrou, G. (2006): Translation Studies and the History of Science: The Greek Textbooks on the 18th Century. *Science and Education* 15: 823–840.
- Petsios, K. (1997): Ἡ ἔννοια τῆς ἐλευθερίας στὸ ἔργο τοῦ Βικεντίου Δαμοδοῦ. In: *Ἡ ἔννοια τῆς ἐλευθερίας στὸ νεοελληνικὸ στοχασμὸ*, Vol. II. Athens: Academy of Athens. 145–162.
- Petsios, K. (2007): Ἡ χειρόγραφη μετάφραση τῆς *Μεταφυσικῆς* τοῦ Edmondus Purchotius (1651–1734) ἀπὸ τὸν Εὐγένιο Βούλγαρι (1716–1806). *Κάτοπτρον νεοελληνικῆς φιλοσοφίας* 1: 11–78.
- Podskalsky, G. (1988): *Griechische Theologie in der Zeit der Türkenherrschaft (1453–1821). Die Orthodoxie im Spannungsfeld der nachreformatorischen Konfessionen des Westens*, München: C. H. Beck'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung.
- Pourchot, E. (1711a): *Institutiones philosophicae... Tomus primus, complectens Logicam et Metaphysicam*. Lugduni: apud Antonium Boudet.
- Pourchot, E. (1711b): *Exercitationes scholasticae in varias partes Philosophiae, praesertimque in Aristotelis metaphysicam: sive Series disputationum ontologicarum naturali ordine dispositarum, quibus praemissum est breve Compendium Philosophiae*. Paris: apud Antonium Boudet.
- Pourchot, E. (1760): *Institutiones philosophicae... Tomus tertius, qui Physicam specialem comprehendit*. Paris: apud Johannem Manfrè.
- Pourchot, E. (1730): *Institutiones philosophicae... Tomus quartus, continens Ethicam seu Moralem Disciplinam*. Paris: apud Joannem Manfrè.
- Psemmenos, N. K. (1989): *Ἡ νεοελληνικὴ φιλοσοφία ἀπὸ τὸ 1453 ὡς τὸ 1821. Τόμος Β': ἡ ἐπικράτηση τῆς νεωτερικῆς φιλοσοφίας (μετακορυφαϊκὴ περίοδος)*. Athens: Γνώση.
- Rodríguez Pardo, J. M. (2008): *El alma de los brutos en el entorno del Padre Feijoo*. Oviedo: Fundación Gustavo Bueno.

- Schmutz, J. (2010): Pourchot, Edmond. In: *Scholasticon*, Nomenclator, s.v. (http://scholasticon.ish-lyon.cnrs.fr/Database/Scholastiques_fr.php?ID=1040)
- Show, S. J. (1988): *History of the Ottoman Empire and Modern Turkey*, Vol. I. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Sina, M. G. Z. (2004): Il volto cartesiano dell'analogia in alcune pagine di Pourchot, F. Lamy e Fénelon. *Rivista di storia della filosofia* 3: 707-735.
- Sulpizio, F. A. (2002): 'Parlar filosofice' – 'Parlar medice'. *Erudizione, filosofia, medicina nell'abate Giacinto Gimma (1668-1735). Dottorato di ricerca*. Lecce: Conte Editore.
- Spink, J. S. (1960): *French Free Thought from Gassendi to Voltaire*, London: The Athlone University Press. Italian translation by L. Roberto Sacerdoce, *Il libero pensiero in Francia da Gassendi a Voltaire. Introduzione N. Badaloni*, Firenze: Vallecchi, 1974.
- Stone, M. W. F. (2006): Scholastic Schools and Early Modern Philosophy. In: D. Rutherford (ed.) *The Cambridge Companion to Early Modern Philosophy*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 299-327.
- Szszimcic, M. (2009): *Philosophia rationalis. A Comparative Analysis of the Courses of Logic at the Kiev-Mogilianskij Academy from Late 17th through Mid-18th Century* (in Ukrainian). Vinnicya.
- Terezis, Ch. (1997): 'Η συνάντηση τῆς ἀρχαίας ἐλληνικῆς μετὰ τῆ χριστιανικῆ ἠθικῆ στὸ ἔργο τοῦ Βικέντιου Δαμοδοῦ. *Κεφαλληνιακὰ χρονικὰ* 7: 33-41.
- Weiss, Ch. (1823): Pourchot (Edme). In: *Biographie universelle ancienne et moderne...*, tome trente-cinquième, Paris: M. Michaud. 556-558.
- Werner, K. 1866 (²1889): *Geschichte der katholischen Theologie seit dem Trienter Konzil bis zur Gegenwart*. Munich/Leipzig: R. Oldenburg.
- Ziyade, H. & E. Baş (2003): Osmanlı Devleti'nin Laikleşmesinde Bürokratların Rolü. *Ankara Üniversitesi İlahiyat Fakültesi Dergisi* 44/2: 301-323.

