

M.-ANNE VANNIER, (dir), **Maître Eckhart, Lecteur des Pères Grecs**, Paris, Beauchesne, coll. « Mystiques chrétiens d'Orient et d'Occident », 2020, 233 p.

The Eckhart project is part of a collection within the framework of La Maison des sciences de l'homme Lorraine as well as *l'Encyclopédie des mystiques rhénans* or *l'Apogée de la théologie mystique de l'Église d'Occident* (Paris, Cerf, 2011). It introduces Eckhart's mystical theology of the Western Church, similarly promulgated by Vladimir Lossky in his « *théologie mystique de l'Église d'Orient* », one of the major pioneers of Eckhartian studies. Focussing on this study, conducted particularly by the Rhine Mystic Research Team (ERMR), this collection is open to research on Christian mystics of the East and the West, who by their extensive experience and their theology, attempt to distill his thoughts. More broadly, this collection embraces research in mystical theology in both the Eastern and Western churches. This volume is based on the symposium *Master Eckhart: reader of the Greek Fathers* within the framework of the ANR FRAL TEAPREA project titled: *Teaching and preaching under patristic authority. Master Eckhart, the link between France and Germany, yesterday and today*. It follows the previous volume, *Master Eckhart, reader of the Latin Fathers*¹. Vannier begins by asking how did Eckhart reference the Greek Fathers? She suggests that he did not content himself with templates of select pieces, rather he sought sources freely². The Church Fathers' commentaries on Scripture, in particular the Gospel of John served him well. He borrows and reinterprets certain elements from Origen's commentary on the Gospel of John, to the homilies of John Chrysostome, and on the Latin side, the commentaries by Augustine. He also looked closely at the reflections on divinity by the Damascene (*Ἰωάννης ὁ Δαμασκηνός*) and Maximus the Confessor (*Μάξιμος ὁ Ὁμολογητής*)³ as demonstrated by J. Kakkaramattathl (p.137-144). However he did not seem to be aware of the commentary on John by Cyril of Alexandria (*Κύριλλος Ἀλεξανδρείας*) although he had access to other writings by Cyril. So why did Eckhart reference the Greek Fathers? He wanted a comprehensive understanding of Scripture employing all possible resources available to him, including Hebraic and patristic commentaries in order to get to the very essence of the text. This positioned him well for inter-religious and ecumenical dialogue⁴. It's not known whether Eckhart had access to Cappadocian texts other than Gregory of Nyssa's *De divisione naturae* as Molac points out in his research (p.89-108). Eckhart does have a similar view of *ἐπέκτασις* to that of Nyssa. It is evident that he had read and was inspired by Burgundio of Pisa's translation of Damascene's, *Ἐκδοσις ακριβῆς της ορθοδόξου πίστεως, (Exposition of the Orthodox faith)*⁵. This is a new trajectory in Eckhartian studies because it demonstrates that he did not take the apophatic approach of Dionysius⁶ but more so the Damascene's view as Getcha demonstrates (p.177-191). In concert with Damascene, this Thuringian asserts that "God is beyond being" (Lagarrigue p.193-209). He also reinterprets Damascene, opening the way to a whole study on the concept of image by the two authors. While Eckhart advocates for a reimagining of unnecessary images, and a return to the sole image of the Son, explaining that "the honor rendered to an image passes to its prototype"⁷ resuming Damascene's polemics against the iconoclasts who rejected all idolatry. Vannier suggests looking into the *Sacra Parallela* attributed to Damascene, not just because of its rich structure as a florilegium of the Bible but also because the illustrations add new perspective to the text. It is therefore necessary to note that Eckhart appreciated new and rare findings in the works of the Greek Fathers permitting him to not only deepen his understanding of objects of worship (divinization) but to present a Western version for the inception of God in the soul, underscoring his theology on Grace, his reflections on the Image, etc., many topics that require a revisit as presented in this book and of course in further studies.

¹ Paris, Beauchesne, coll.« Mystiques d'Orient et d'Occident », n°5, 2020.

² Of course he was not the first to reference the Greek Fathers. A few hundred years earlier, the *Periphyseon* or *De divisione naturae*, the magnum opus of JOHN SCOTUS ERIUGENA, a synthesis of Boethian and Augustinian with the major Greek sources namely Maximus the Confessor, Dionysius the Areopagite and Gregory of Nyssa, demonstrated his deep knowledge of the works by these Greek Fathers.

³ See, Maximus the Confessor on the Structural Dynamics of Revelation, A. G. COOPER *Vigiliae Christianae* Vol. 55, No. 2 (2001), pp. 161-186, Brill.

⁴ M.-A. VANNIER, « Maître Eckhart et le Judaïsme », in : *Judaïsme et christianisme au Moyen Âge*, Turnhout, Brepols, 2020, p. 107-118.

⁵ See *Exposition of the Orthodox Faith*, translated by the REV. SDF SALMOND, in *Select Library of Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers*. 2nd Series vol 9. (Oxford: Parker, 1899) [reprint Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1963.]

⁶ See Acts 17: 22-34 and Apophatic Theology: Denys the Areopagite, A. LOUTH in *Hermathena* No. 165 (Winter 1998), pp.71-84, Trinity College Dublin.

⁷ BASIL, *De Spiritu Sancto* 18, 45: PG 32, 149C; Council of Nicaea II: DS 601; cf. Council of Trent: DS 1821-1825; Vatican Council II: SC 126; LG 67.

In the chapter on the *Catena Aurea* and Eckhart's familiarity with the Greek Fathers, BELLAMAH states that through the *Sancti Thomae Aquinatis Expositio continua super quatuor Evangelistas* commonly known as the *Catena Aurea*, (a compilation of commentaries on excerpts from earlier Greek and Latin Patristic commentators), Eckhart was able to access several Greek exegetical works. Among these, three figure prominently; namely *Ὠριγένους τῶν εἰς τὸ κατὰ Ἰωάννην Εὐαγγέλιον ἐξηγητικῶν* (Origen's Commentary on the Gospel of John) and the homilies of Chrysostome on the Gospels of Matthew⁸ and John⁹. In his own sermons and commentaries on the Gospel of John, he refers to corresponding passages in the *Catena* without citing, and often quoting them briefly without further explanation. Although he's quite favorably disposed to Thomas' sources, using these as a propaedeutic which were remarkably unconstrained. Bellamah posits that Eckhart's ostensible deference shown to Thomas by his use of the *Catena* does not easily reconcile his unconventional method or discrepancies relative to his predecessor. Readers of Eckhart's work are left wondering why would such a brilliant writer leave discrepancies in his work. The question remains whether his aim was to help his students in matters of scriptural exegesis and sermon writing thus serving pastoral goals for which Thomas produced the *Catena*, or were these references intended to show that he was adhering to the sound theological tradition, as a form of protection against threats of criminal prosecution, which in Eckhart's case was only too real? Bellamah concludes that there is no reason to assume they would be entirely incompatible.

In the chapter by KOBUSCH, *Die Gottesgeburt in der Seele* he states the idea of the birth of God in the human soul comes from Origen. This is a question of the "inner man"¹⁰. It's about moral will and action, not theoretical knowledge. It is metaphysical, not in the Aristotelian sense, but in the sense of a metaphysical inner man or a metaphysics of mores. The birth of God adopted by Origen is of central importance in Eckhart's Latin and German works on the theoretical doctrine of transcendence and on the doctrine of practical transformation of the soul. The birth of God is not an accidental event, but something that necessarily follows the moral act, in the sense of moral necessity, even something that can perhaps be exerted. The percipience of God in man means the basic recognition of God, the definition of « ursprünglichen, unabhängigen Erkenntnisgrundes des Guten mir »¹¹, in practical consideration. As Origen and Eckhart understood the aspect of God as the sole way of being sentient, Jacobi also gained a practical insight into Kant's sense of « Nur durch sittliche Veredlung erheben wir uns zu einem würdigen Begriffe des höchsten Wesens. Es gibt keinen andern Weg »¹². That is precisely the same sense that is also based on the traditional lesson on the aspect of God in the heart of man. For Origen, from whom this lesson comes and for Eckhart who makes it a fundamental ontological principle, both understood the aspect of God in the moral sense, insofar as it takes place and manifests itself in every good act¹³.

The chapter titled, *La source Origénienne de la naissance du Verbe en l'âme et le traitement Eckhartien* by BONCOUR posits that the eternal begottenness of the Son *in divinis* and in the soul, is an Origenian theological question that came down to Eckhart from Pierre Lombard¹⁴ who asks whether it should be said, "the Son *is* forever begotten" or "*was* forever begotten." If Origen opted for the present, Augustine chose the past, employing the adverb *semper*. Eckhart combines these two interpretations of past and present stressing spontaneity since the birth of the Word in the soul has no temporal significance. In his own way, Eckhart treats the theme of eternal begetting of

⁸ See C. BAUR and A. NÄGLE, *Des heiligen Kirchenlehrers Johannes Chrysostomus Erzbischofs von Konstantinopel Kommentar zum Evangelium des Hl. Matthäus; Sechs Bücher über das Priestertum* (Bibliothek der Kirchenväter NS 27), München: Kösel, 1916.

⁹ See J. CHILDERS (ed., trans.), *The Syriac Version of John Chrysostome's Commentary on John. I. Mêmre 1-43* (Corpus Scriptorum Christianorum Orientalium 652, Scriptorum Syri 250-251), Louvain-la-Neuve: Peeters, 2013; A. DEL ZANNA, *Commento al Vangelo di Giovanni*, 3 vols, Roma: Città nuova Ed., 1969-1970; J. DE PENTHOS, *Jean Chrysostome. Commentaire sur l'Évangile selon saint Jean. édition abrégée, établie et présentée par, Perpignan: Artège, 2012; I. GARZÓN BOSQUE, Homilías sobre el Evangelio de San Juan* (Biblioteca de patristica 54), vol. 2, Madrid: Ciudad Nueva, 2001.

¹⁰ See *Patrologiae cursus completus, series graeca* Volume 12 of *Patrologiae cursus completus: omnium SS patrum, doctorum scriptorumque ecclesiasticorum, ΤΟΜΟΥ Α' ΤΩΝ ΕΙΣ ΤΗΝ ΓΕΝΕΣΙΝ*, Jacques-Paul Migne, 1862, Harvard University.

¹¹ Original, independent reason for understanding the good in me, transl. mine.

¹² Only through moral admiration do we rise to a worthy concept of the highest being, translation mine. See F. H. JACOBI, *Von den göttlichen Dingen*, (1822), *Werke Bd. 3*, Hamburg, W. JAESCHKE, 2000, p.42.

¹³ H. RAHNER, « Die Gottesgeburt. Die Lehre der Kirchenväter von der Geburt Christi im Herzen des Gläubigen », *Zeitschrift für Katholische Theologie* 59, 1935, p.33-418.

¹⁴ See PETRUS LOMBARDES, *Sententiae in quatuor libris distinctae, in particular to what is referred to as the Mysterium Trinitatis*. In his discussions on of the Son's relation to the Father, he references namely Chrysostome, Augustine, and Gregory.

the Son in the divine and in the Soul relative to the patristic and theological tradition which he inherits¹⁵. When he refers to eternally begotten Word in the Soul, particularly in sermons 101 through 105¹⁶, it is made against the backdrop of a sharp epistemological focus. She concludes by stating that its quite difficult to precisely pin his theological thinking, even though his aim was clearly to see a path to reconcile Origen and Augustine. It's therefore not possible to retain a vague mysticism because the theme is suitable for it, albeit a double theological requirement; to think as adequately as possible of the intradivine life and to associate the supernatural destiny of man by commitment to renounce himself in order to be one with divinity.

In the chapter by BANCEL, *Maître Eckhart, Lecteur des homélies sur la Genèse d'Origène*, she focuses on how Origen's Homilies on Genesis¹⁷ inspired Eckhart to read and cite these seventeen times. He employs metaphors (divine seed within us; the well and spring of living water) to justify the essential image of God in every human being, as he shifts from ethical to ontological orientation. For Eckhart, Origen's contribution is quite significant, attributing great authority to him, and maintaining his views without fear, even during his defense in Cologne.

P. MOLAC writes in his contribution to this book, *Une éventuelle réception de la pensée des Cappadociens chez Maître Eckhart*, that after his study, he's disappointed by Eckhart's use of Cappadocian sources, specifically that he doesn't seem to be aware of the Cappadocian texts even though there are hints that he has borrowed from their theology; his approach to the Trinitarian Mystery, angelology and relationships between anthropology and the mystical experience found in the writings of the IVth century Fathers. Molac states that the subtle changes Eckhart makes to his predecessor Aquinas could have easily come from *Ἅγιος Βασίλειος ὁ Μέγας* or the two Gregorys and perhaps *Μάξιμος ὁ Ὁμολογητής* or *Ἰωάννης ὁ Λαμασκηνός*. Ultimately we do know Eckhart quotes Origen and Chrysostome but it does appear that he has not delved into the Cappadocian writings. This study does reveal that some of the features in Eckhart's work could be described as "inherited." Molac asks whether they are not more so by virtue of their theological development situated in the dogmatic structuring of Christian Revelation and as such essential? This seems especially convincing as regards the enactment of the Trinitarian Mystery. On other points Molac has shown evidence of borrowing; angelology, the unfathomable mystery of the soul, an anthropology of distancing from Augustine's despair to a hopeful theology of Light and Image. It is possible to argue that if Eckhart adapted Cappadocian theological and spiritual developments, it would have ultimately been through their two main interpreters *Μάξιμος ὁ Ὁμολογητής* and *Ἰωάννης ὁ Λαμασκηνός*. Being a disciple of Aquinas, Eckhart would not have risked ignoring them, as they are quoted by the *Doctor Angelicus*.

J. DEVRIENDT looks into Eckhart's use of Chrysostome's commentary on the *Gospel of John*. Eckhart lived and wrote his commentaries after the Second Council of Lyon (31 March 1272) but before the Council of Ferrara-Florence (where Latin and Greek churches attempted to reach agreement on their doctrinal differences and end the schism between them, 1431 and 1449), an era ripe with interest in the Greek Fathers. Were the editors of the critical apparatus of Eckhart's Latin works correct in systematically favoring the reference to Chrysostome with the *Glossa Thomae*? Detailed analysis of the explicit quotes from Chrysostome highlights an unbroken succession of explicit references to Chrysostome in Jesus' dialogue with Nicodemus (John 3:14) where Eckhart outlines how the baptism of Jesus reveals the eternal begetting of the Son and the deification of Man. He avoids debates on the recently honored Greek term, *περιχώρησις* which translates to "Circumincension" by Eckhartian concept of grace, also called *bullitio*. Thus Eckhart relies on Chrysostome for select passages to establish one of the central points of his mystical theology.

J. KAKKARAMATTATHIL writes in his chapter, *L'Incarnation, pierre d'angle de la divinisation : une lecture parallèle entry Maxime le Confesseur et Maître Eckhart*, that the Christological spirituality and mysticism of Eckhart leads us to deepen the question of the figure of Christ in his writings. The figure of Christ constitutes (together with

¹⁵ Eckhardus Theutonicus, *homo doctus et sanctus. Nachweise und Berichte zum Prozeß gegen Meister Eckhart*, édité par H. Stirmmann, avec la collaboration de R. Imbach, Fribourg (Suisse), Universitätsverlag Freiburg/Schweiz, 1992, p. 97-105.

¹⁶ See, Meister Eckhart. Die deutschen und lateinischen Werke, *Textkritische Ausgabe Herausgegeben im Auftrag der Deutschen Forschungsgemeinschaft*. Verlag W. Kohlhammer, Stuttgart: Bei den Predigten 101-104 handelt es sich um einen „Predigtzyklus“. Nach dem liturgischen Ort gehören sie in den Festkreis von Weihnachten: „Der Predigtzyklus 'Von der ewigen Geburt' ist einzigartig unter Eckharts Predigten und Traktaten. Alle Predigten, die wir von Eckhart kennen, sind individuelle Predigten. Einige unter ihnen lassen sich (...) bei bestimmten Aussagen zueinander in Verbindung setzen; aber es gibt nicht einmal zwei, geschweige denn mehrere, die untereinander so eng verknüpft sind, daß sie als 'literarische Einheit' (...) verstanden werden dürften," and Meister Eckhart, Georg Steer (Hrsg.). Deutsche Werke Band 4,1: Predigten Band 4,1 Herausgegeben und übersetzt von Georg Steer unter Mitarbeit von Wolfgang Klimanek und Freimut Löser.

¹⁷ See, ORIGENES, *In Genesim homiliae* XI, 3, ed. H. de Lubac, L. Doutreleau, Sch 7 bis, Paris: Cerf, 1996 and ORYGENES, *Homilie o Księdze Rodzaju*, transl. S. Kalinkowski. PSP 31/1, Warsaw: Academy of Catholic Theology Press, 1985.

the question of the Trinity) the intrinsic particularity of Christianity. The crux of all the philosophical exegesis of Eckhart is the Incarnation of the Word made flesh. He points out that the Incarnation is also a central act in the theological thought of *Μάξιμος ὁ Ὁμολογητής*. The Christological synthesis of Maximus the Confessor, according to Balthasar “contains in itself the solution of all the enigmas: the union of God and the world, of the eternal and the temporal, of the Infinite and the finite in the hypostasis of the Man-God”¹⁸. Kakkaramattathil attempts to understand through Eckhart and Maximus, how the Incarnation is at the centre of the whole Christological basis and illustrates the theology of divinization as the destiny of man.

In his article, *Jean Damascène, ou l'apport des Pères Grecs pour l'interprétation Eckhartienne de l'Évangile de Jean*, M. VINZENT notes that until recently, the link between Eckhart and Damascene has rarely been brought to light, but states that on several occasions Eckhart does indeed refer to this scholar in certain essential passages of his work. He probably only knew his book: *De fide orthodoxa*, in the Latin translation of Burgundio of Pisa. But Eckhart's reading of Damascene, especially in connection with the Gospel of John, is worth studying, because on the one hand Damascene is one of the sources and authorities of Eckhart's negative theology, and on the other (and through him the Pseudo-Cyril of Alexandria and Maximus the Confessor) he establishes a bridge for one of the idioms, which not only refers to Christology as we are used to, and to the Trinity seen in later Byzantine times, but to God and to man. Eckhart clearly took advantage of this opportunity paved by the elevation of the Latin authors Ambrose, Jerome, Augustin and Gregory the Great, to the title of *Doctor of the Church* by Boniface VIII. The great theologians of the Greek world receiving this ecclesiastical honor were Athanasius, Basil, *Γρηγόριος ὁ Ναζιανζηνός* (Gregory of Nazianzus) and John Chrysostome by Pius V (pope from 1566–1572), and in 1890 Damascene was added to this list. Undoubtedly, Eckhart had just seen John Damascene's spiritual relationship with *KATA ΙΩΑΝΝΗΝ* and had used it for his own reading. In doing so, moving forward, he addressed in particular the complication of Christological and Trinitarian thought of John Damascene and merged them into his own Christological doctrine of the Trinity.

J. GETCHA states in his article, *Jean Damascène, Maître Eckhart et la question de la Théologie Négative*, that by negative (apophatic) theology, he employs a theological approach, influenced by Platonism, which consists of not describing what God is but in affirming what he is not, and emphasizes the transcendence of the Transcendent. Damascene insists on the fact that it is impossible to say what God is in essence, and Eckhart emphasizes that God is unspeakable, that no one can speak of him, because he is beyond being named, he is a negation of any name. Recent research has underscored how central the confrontation with iconoclasm was in Damascene's work. Against iconoclasm, he placed the proclamation of God made flesh, that underscored the immanence of the Transcendent, unlike the Old Testament prohibition of the image and negative theology. This explains why his *De fide orthodoxa* begins with the quotation from the Gospel of John 1: 18 (*Θεὸν οὐδεὶς ἑώρακεν πώποτε; μονογενὴς Θεὸς, ὁ ὢν εἰς τὸν κόλπον τοῦ Πατρὸς, ἐκεῖνος ἐξηγήσατο*), subsequently taken up by Eckhart in his commentary on John's Prologue. For the Damascene, God remains completely transcendent, unknowable and inaccessible as to his essence, but because of his incarnation, he makes himself known, he makes himself seen, and whoever believes in him can participate in him and in divine life. Eckhart insists that our knowledge of God is based on the Incarnation.

In the contribution titled, *Jean Damascène ou la « Source Arabe » oubliée de Maître Eckhart*, J.-C. LAGARRIGUE argues Kurt Flasch failed to include John Damascene among the Arabic sources for Eckhart¹⁹. This choice is a criticism, because the study of Eckhart's texts reveals the strategically important place of Damascene. Anxious to underscore the difference with Islam, Damascene defends the nature of the created or the created as nature, which implies recognizing causality, substantiality and systematicity. In reference to God, this implies thinking of the Creator beyond reality, beyond being; Eckhart then allows himself to think of grace as second nature.

¹⁸ H.-U. Von BALTHASAR, *Liturgie Cosmique, Maxime le Confesseur, (LC)* Aubier, Paris, 1947, 2^e éd. remaniée 1961, p. 174. Trad. de l'allemand par L. LHAUMET et H.-A. PRENTOUT, *Kosmische Liturgie. Maximus des Bekenner : Hehe und Krise de griechischen Weltbilds*, Freiburg im Breisgau, Herder, 1941.

¹⁹ In his chapter titled Meister Eckhart and Moses Maimonides: From Judaeo-Arabic Rationalism to Christian Mysticism (In A Companion to Meister Eckhart, Series: Brill's Companions to the Christian Tradition, Volume: 36, p. 389–414) Yossef SCHWARTZ writes Eckhart's thought represents a rather unique kind of “mysticism,” one that is deeply rooted in the scholastic rationalistic tradition, somewhere between the German Dominican school established by Albert the Great „Albertschule“ (See K. Flasch, „Von Dietrich zu Albert,“ *Freiburger Zeitschrift für Theologie und Philosophie* 32 (1985), 7–26; A. de Libera, *Introduction à la mystique rhénane* (Paris: 1984); and de Libera, *Maître Eckhart et la mystique Rhénane* (Paris: 1999), and L. Sturlese, *Die deutsche Philosophie im Mittelalter; Von Bonifatius bis zu Albert dem Großen* (Munich: 1989) and the Parisian scholastic theological tradition (K. Flasch, „Meister Eckhart—Versuch, ihn aus dem Mystischen Strom zu retten,“ in *Gnosis und Mystik in der Geschichte der Philosophie*, ed. Peter Koslowski (Zürich: 1988), 94–110; Flasch, „Zum Ursprung der neuzeitlichen Philosophie im späten Mittelalter,“ *Philosophisches Jahrbuch* 85 (1978), 1–18.). Also note that Maimonides's Guide of the Perplexed דְּלֵאֵת אֱלֹהֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל Hebrew, *Dux neutrorum seu perplexorum* Latin, دلالة الحائرين Arabic, was written in the Arabic in Cairo during the last decade of the 12th century.

It would be folly to overlook the importance of John Damascene in Eckhart's work. His insistence on defending (long before Averroes) the naturalness of creation against the Islamic theologians of his time, should indeed encourage us not to read too much into Rhenish mysticism and Sufism, by turning Eckhart towards Avicennian Augustinianism. For Eckhart, to maintain the substance–accident alternative, seeing creatures as accidents in relation to God, misses the supercorporeal character of divinity for Eckhart. Eckhart strives to rise above the notions that we use to think of “being” to a cause producing an effect capable of efficiency and sustenance. For that, he must think of the relationship of God *to* the created as a relationship of nature to nature *beyond* being. However by endeavoring to think of this link of nature to nature as a natural process, namely as a boiling over (*ebullitio*), Eckhart gives creation and grace an expounding exceeding the intentions of Damascene. By taking this step, the sacred account for him ceases to be just an account of divine miracles but also the natural history of divine effusions in the souls of men.

In the final chapter, *Die Handschrift Wartburg–Stiftung, MS. 1361-50 und die Frage nach die Quellensuche* by J. ILNICA states that the manuscript found in Wartburg, consisting of philosophical, theological and pastoral texts in Middle High German, mainly by Eckhart, raises the question of theoretical principles of a search for sources. In fact, unlike other academic manuscripts (Latin), very few names of authors are given (in particular the Greek patristic authors used). Unlike the usual pastoral texts (sermons), this lack of information represents a deficiency which can make it difficult to understand the texts. So it is important to research possible sources—but what is a source in this case? There are almost no directly identifiable quotes in the text as they have already had at least one translation (from Latin to Middle High German)—in many cases one cannot identify a thesis without an exact wording. Some of these theses can be found in various works by several authors. Should we understand that the source is the patristic author who was the first to express a certain thesis, or the medieval author, in a dispute with whom this thesis most likely came to the author of our texts? How sure can we be that even identifiable sources were also true sources for the author? In her final analysis, she states the analysis of the three texts from the Wartburg manuscript from the point of view of the use of the Greek patristic sources allows for the following conclusions:

1. In terms of content, these texts of the Wartburg manuscript consistently reflect Eckhart's thoughts, which are formulated in a “discussion” with the texts of Thomas Aquinas and as answers to his theses.
2. There are implicit references to the works of the Greek patristic authors that are necessary for understanding the content of the text, as in the first of the analyzed texts. Although the lack of these references is more likely to be unintentional rather than deliberate omission, these supplementary quotations cannot be added to the text itself in an edition, but can only be identified as an omitted passage in the commentary. Nevertheless, these should be listed in the index of the sources for the text.
3. There are implicit references to authorities who seem to be in the background and play a major role in inspiring the theses, but not to the understanding of the text. Sometimes this can be used to identify an “intermediate stage” that would be a recent source. However, since it is not always possible to clearly identify this intermediate level, the initial source should also be located and cited in the edition both in the text and in index.
4. The third text is an extraordinary situation in which a quoted passage *bonum diffusivum sui* (loosely translated, goodness always tends to spread) has already been ascribed elsewhere by other authors to an authority, although it is not a quotation but a summary of an idea of this authority. In this case it is clear that the source is not the authority, but its use. Nevertheless, there are similar quotes without indication of the source, where the only difficulty is to recognize the quote in the Middle High German translation. These passages should be identified and included in the text and in the index.

With the exception of a few typographical errors in the editing, this truly is a remarkably well researched book under the meticulous guidance of Marie-Anne Vannier. The team of expert contributors make this book all the more necessary for Eckhartian studies going forward.

Jonathan von Kodar