

Central European University

**THE INTERPRETER OF THE POPES.
THE TRANSLATION PROJECT OF ANASTASIUS BIBLIOTHECARIUS**

PhD dissertation in Medieval Studies

by

RÉKA FORRAI

Budapest, Hungary

2008

I, the undersigned Réka FORRAI, candidate for the PhD degree in Medieval Studies declare herewith that the present dissertation is exclusively my own work, based on my research and relies only on such external information as properly credited in notes and bibliography. I declare that no unidentified and illegitimate use was made of the work of others, and no part of the dissertation infringes on any person's or institution's copyright. I also declare that no part of the dissertation has been submitted in this form to any other institution of higher education for an academic degree.

Budapest, March 26, 2008

signature

TABLE OF CONTENTS

List of Tables	iii
Abbreviations	iv
Acknowledgements	v
PROLEGOMENA	2
Introduction	2
Review of literature	10
Anastasius: Life and Portrait	15
The political and cultural landscape: Rome, Byzantium and the Franks	25
<i>The Sacred Nectar of the Deceitful Greeks.</i>	
<i>Perceptions of Greekness in the Ninth Century West</i>	30
THE TRANSLATIONS	47
Catalogue	47
<i>Excursus: his own works</i>	60
Genres and authors	62
Composition and layout	70
<i>Excursus: Anastasius and the Papal Library – A Research Question</i>	89
Translation Methods, Theories and Inconsistencies	95
<i>Tools</i>	95
<i>Methods</i>	99
<i>Theories</i>	104
<i>Conclusions</i>	113
A Case Study: The Notes of Anastasius on Eriugena’s Translation of the Corpus Dionysiacum	115
<i>Transliteration</i>	121
<i>Semantic Alternatives</i>	122
<i>Compounds</i>	124
<i>Corrections</i>	126
<i>Anastasius’s instruments and sources</i>	129
<i>Some Problematic Notes</i>	133
<i>Conclusions</i>	135
<i>Excursus: Three Eusebian Fragments Translated by Anastasius?</i>	137

Translation as Gift. Literary Dedications and Social Networks	148
<i>Patrons</i>	<i>152</i>
<i>Colleagues</i>	<i>160</i>
<i>John the Deacon</i>	<i>166</i>
<i>Conclusions</i>	<i>168</i>
Case Study: The Emperor and the Translator: the Dedication of the Passion of Saint Demetrius	170
CONCLUSIONS: ANASTASIUS THE HISTORIAN	190
<i>Epitaph</i>	<i>194</i>
APPENDICES	195
The passion of Saint Demetrius	195
The Eusebian fragments	200
The main protagonists	205
BIBLIOGRAPHY	207
Sources	207
<i>Anastasius' works</i>	<i>207</i>
<i>Anastasius' translations</i>	<i>208</i>
<i>Others</i>	<i>212</i>
Secondary Literature	214

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1: The Translations of Anastasius Bibliothecarius	50
Table 2: The Structure of the Collectanea.....	74
Table 3: Latin Manuscripts with the Eusebian Fragments	141
Table 4: Greek Manuscripts with the Eusebian Fragments	142
Table 5: Passion and Miracles of Saint Demetrius: the Latin Tradition.....	171

ABBREVIATIONS

Apart from the following, all works are cited in full at the first reference and subsequently in short title form (full details may also be found in the *Bibliography*).

AASS – *Acta Sanctorum*

AB – *Analecta Bollandiana*

Anastasius, *Epistolae* – Perels, E. and G Laehr, “Anastasio Bibliothecarii Epistolae sive Prefationes.” MGH *Epistolae 7 Karolini Aevi* 5. Berlin: Weidmann, 1928.

BHG – F. Halkin, *Bibliotheca Hagiographica Graeca*, Subsidia Hagiographica 8a, 3rd edition, Brussels, 1957.

BHL – *Bibliotheca Hagiographica Latina*, Subsidia Hagiographica 6, Brussels, 1898-1901.

CPG – M. Geerard, *Clavis Patrum Graecorum*, 5 vols., Turnhout: Brepols, 1974-1987.

DBI – *Dizionario Biografico degli Italiani*, Rome: Istituto della Enciclopedia Italiana, 1960-

EP – *Enciclopedia dei Papi*, 3. vols., Rome: Istituto della Enciclopedia Italiana, 2000.

LP – *Liber Pontificalis*

Mansi – I. D. Mansi, ed. *Sacrorum conciliorum nova et amplissima collectio*, 16 vols., Florence, 1759-1971.

MGH – *Monumenta Germaniae Historica*

ODB – A. Kazhdan, ed. *Oxford Dictionary of Byzantium*, New York-Oxford, 1991.

PG – *Patrologiae cursus completus, series graeca*, ed. J.-P. Migne, 161 vols, Paris, 1857-1866.

PL – *Patrologiae cursus completus, series latina*, ed. J.-P. Migne, 221 vols, Paris, 1844-1864.

TeTra 2 – Chiesa and L. Castaldi (ed.), *La trasmissione dei testi latini del medioevo. Mediaeval Latin Texts and Their Transmission. TeTra. 2.*, Firenze: SISMEL, 2005.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

There could have been places where libraries and specialists would have better suited my topic. Nevertheless, I feel the CEU Medieval Studies was a perfect place for writing my dissertation: the atmosphere in which we work here, both demanding and friendly, stimulating and supportive, is a most inspiring setting, for which I will always be grateful.

First and foremost, of course, I am grateful to my supervisor, György Geréby: he directed my interest from the issue of Pagan Greek to that of the Christian Greek heritage in the West, and helped me choosing my topic properly and then he trusted me with it throughout these years. Professor István Perczel's fresh way of looking at old research questions, his exigence and his learning were a great example for me. Professor Niels Gaul's extremely efficient assistance makes me think how this thesis would look like, would he arrived earlier to our department. I am grateful to my opponents, Mircea Duluş and Divna Miladinova, whose critical remarks and fresh prespective on my text have facilitated me a great deal the final rewriting of the thesis. Csilla Dobos has made my (and not only my) defence her care to an admirable extent. Alice Choyke and Judith Rasson has corrected my English, and László Veszprémy some of my Latin texts.

The generous scholarships offered by CEU and by the SISMEEL in Florence allowed me to carry out extensive research in the libraries of Rome and Florence. Mostly it was due to these grants, that I had the opportunity to work with the best specialists of the field.

Professor Paolo Chiesa has followed my work from the very beginning. Without his valuable studies and without consulting him on the most problematic matters, this research simply could not have been completed.

I am also grateful to professor Bronwen Neil, who, without ever seeing me, indulged with me in long email conversations, sharing with me many of the results of her work.

The consultations I have had with professors Girolamo Arnaldi, Claudio Leonardi and Édouard Jauneau, just as my correspondence with professor Erich Lamberz, were at the same time encouragement and inspiration, just as my discussions with the new generation of the Italian researchers, Ilaria Bonaccorsi and Mathilde Cupiccia.

My special thanks to my sister Nyuszi, for reading the entire text and correcting its English; to Piroska Nagy, for her Saturday letters, which helped me avoiding the worst stages of the phd-psychosis; and to Sylvain Piron for all his help, but above all, for the method, the model and the inspiration.

. . . . He decided to anticipate the vanity awaiting all man's efforts; he set himself to an undertaking which was exceedingly complex and, from the very beginning, futile. He dedicated his scruples and his sleepless nights to repeating an already extant book in an alien tongue. [...]

It is a revelation to compare Menard's Don Quixote with Cervantes'. The latter, for example, wrote (part one, chapter nine): . . . "truth, whose mother is history, rival of time, depository of deeds, witness of the past, exemplar and adviser to the present, and the future's counsellor". Written in the seventeenth century, written by the "lay genius" Cervantes, this enumeration is a mere rhetorical praise of history. Menard, on the other hand, writes: . . . "truth, whose mother is history, rival of time, depository of deeds, witness of the past, exemplar and adviser to the present, and the future's counsellor." History, the mother of truth: the idea is astounding. Menard, a contemporary to William James, does not define history as an inquiry into reality but as its origin. Historical truth, for him, is not what has happened; it is what we judge to have happened. The final phrases - exemplar and adviser to the present, and the future's counsellor – are brazenly pragmatic.

Jorge Louis Borges, *Pierre Menard, Author of the Quixote*

PROLEGOMENA

INTRODUCTION

vir sapiens et fortis est et vir doctus robustus et validus

(Proverbs 24:5)

Knowledge is power.

When I chose this provocative truism as the framework conferring coherence on the subsequent investigations, I was not only thinking about the power knowledge confers upon individuals, but also about the ways power exploits knowledge – that is to say cultural politics and the ideological¹ resources knowledge can provide for the self-legitimization of an institution. I will present the career of a medieval translator at the intersection of these two lines: the way knowledge of Greek put Anastasius Bibliothecarius in a monopoly position at the papal court of the second half of the ninth century, and the way the institution itself exploited his translating skills. I intend to draw the profile of a very sophisticated diplomat, who employed his language skills for his own political purposes and for the institution he represented. Apart from the intrinsic value of such a monographic study, these historico-philological

¹ While historians cautiously use modern terms such as ideology and propaganda for earlier periods, nevertheless they do admit that the phenomenon of the creation of a system of ideas serving the political agenda of an institution or a ruler did exist even in early medieval times. Cf. P. Riché, “Les clercs carolingiens au service du pouvoir,” in *Idéologie et propagande en France*, ed. by Myriam Yardeni (Paris: Picard, 1987), reprinted in P. Riché, *Education et culture dans l’Occident médiéval* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 1993), 17. According to him, the two outstanding ideologies sustaining the early medieval papacy’s interests are the ideas of pontifical supremacy and the ideology of holy war.

investigations will also provide a more thorough insight into Greek-Latin cultural interactions of the ninth century.

Anastasius Bibliothecarius, rough contemporary of Eriugena, Photios and al-Kindi, was active in the second part of the ninth century, a culturally productive period everywhere in the medieval world, whether papal Rome or the Western Frankish Kingdom, Byzantine Constantinople or the Baghdad of the Abbasid caliphate. Born approximately between 800 and 817 and died probably before 877, he was the most prolific translator of the ninth century. His stormy life is one worthy of interest to the historian. He entered historical records rather problematically - excommunicated and anathematised by Pope Leo IV (847-855), and anti-pope of Benedict III (855-858) – we encounter him afterwards again under slightly different circumstances, as a close collaborator of three ninth century popes: Nicholas I (858-867), Hadrian II (867-872), and John VIII (872-882). He was acquainted with all the significant actors in late-ninth century political and cultural life - the popes, the Frankish rulers Louis II (825-875) and Charles the Bald(823-877), Hincmar of Rheims (ca. 806-882), Eriugena (ca. 810-870) and Photios(ca. 810-893), are all in one way or the other parts of his worldwide spider web. One of the main reasons he is so often encountered on the Byzantium-Rome-Frankish court axis is that he possessed a precious diplomatic skill, rare at that time in the West: knowledge of Greek. His translations, featuring a wide range of literary genres, provide ample proof of this knowledge.

The texts he chose for translation are exclusively drawn from the Christian literary heritage, and consist mainly of late antique and early Byzantine literature, comprising genres such as hagiography, theology, and historiography. While the sheer literary value of his selection of works from the Greek patrimony may not excite much attention, I argue that a contextual examination of his translations can reveal a well-defined agenda that served

political purposes, being embedded in the very practical aims and interests of the Roman pontiffs.

Walter Berschin in the eighties called attention to the lack of a comprehensive survey analysing Anastasius' achievements:

A comprehensive evaluation of Anastasius Bibliothecarius' work, the most significant achievement in translation between Dionysius Exiguus in the sixth century and Burgundio of Pisa in the twelfth, is still to be written.²

The same was pointed out again still in 2002 by Paolo Chiesa:

A monograph that would deal with Anastasius the translator in a systematic manner is still needed.³

It was my original plan to write it, as I could not resist the adventures of accounting both for the literary and political activity of such a fascinating character, but, though this has remained my main intention throughout, I am aware that many aspects remain to be investigated. For such a complex agenda, the traditional settings of a monograph seemed too narrow a frame. I have decided to follow rather the current trend of non-linear biographies, where lives are reconstrued in a mosaic-like manner, focusing on distinctive moments of a protagonist's activity, on scenes which are at the crossway of the particular and the general, the individual and the society he is part of.

The premise, that Anastasius' endeavours were not the result of mere erudite curiosity, by now has been accepted by many scholars. Nevertheless, the complete picture accounting for this activity - through identifying the multiple overlapping layers of motivations contributing to the genesis of the translations still needs to be developed. Claudio Leonardi, while warning about the

² W. Berschin, *Greek Letters and the Latin Middle Ages. From Jerome to Nicolaus of Cusa*, trans. Jerold C. Frakes (Washington: The Catholic University of America Press: 1988), 168.

³ Manca ancora una monografia che prenda in considerazione in modo sistematico l'Anastasio traduttore... P. Chiesa, "Traduzioni e traduttori a Roma nell'alto medioevo," in *Roma fra Oriente e Occidente*, Settimane 49 (Spoleto: CISAM, 2002), 478.

difficulties of such an approach, in fact provided the first classification of the possible reasons:

A plurality of occasions that seem to resist classification, since at their origins one finds requests of friends, literary interests, political intentions, and, above all, cultural choices or necessities that cannot be uncovered in their particulars.⁴

Taking issue with Leonardi's concession, my study intends to analyse all these categories in detail, focusing first on the broad cultural framework and all translations in general and some in particular. It assesses the craft of a medieval translator not only by reading the texts translated, but also by examining other, para- as well as extra-textual elements (such as his prologues, their political and cultural context) to reconstruct a deeply erudite and at the same time politically engaged project. By calling this pursuit 'project' I suggest that his translations are not results of random selection, reflecting his literary taste but an assortment of works chosen using a logic which confers unity to it.

Translation studies have by now gone beyond the realm of linguistics. "Translation is not primarily 'about' language. Rather, language as the expression (and repository) of a culture is one element in the cultural transfer known as translation."⁵ Literary canons are rooted in the social system, and in such circumstances it is justified to approach this translation project as an

⁴"Una pluralità di occasioni che non pare classificabile, in quanto alla loro origine si trovano richieste di amici, curiosità letterarie, volontà politiche, soprattutto necessità o scelte culturali, che non è agevole precisare nei particolari." C. Leonardi, C, "L'agiografia romana nel secolo IX," in *Hagiographie, cultures et sociétés, IVe-XIIIe siècles* (Paris: Institut d'Études Augustiniennes, 1981), 476. Cf. also Arnaldi: "L'attività di traduttore di Anastasius, anche se cronologicamente la troviamo concentrata in anni che seguano forse una contrazione dei suoi impegni politico-diplomatici (del resto, abbiamo già visto come egli fosse capace di sfruttare le sue missioni per fini di studio), non va considerata separatamente da quelli, come se fosse stata un'attività di studio disinteressato, che completerebbe solo esternamente il profilo della sua personalità. La sua opera rappresenta invece le forze consapevoli di mettere la Chiesa di Roma in grado di sostenere, anche culturalmente, il confronto con Bisanzio." G. Arnaldi, "Anastasio Bibliotecario" in *DBI* 3 (Rome: Istituto della Enciclopedia Italiana, 1961), 34.

ideological apparatus that served the expansion of the cultural identity of the papacy.

It is not only genuine new literary products that can serve such ends: translation as well can be very well be used for such purposes.

Translating, [...] an obvious way of producing texts quickly and in quantity [...] is one important way of demonstrating the potentials of a new cultural paradigm, even its very existence.⁶

Greek culture as appropriated by the Latins derived from a complicated set of motifs, an “act of self fashioning”⁷. The dynamics of the transmission of cultural values are on full display here, and it is for this reason I have found it fruitful to apply the methods and results of the branch of socio-cultural history which studies the ‘transmission of culture.’ Research on agents and modes of translations indeed shows that

Changes in an original form, text, an idea were charged with meaning unless the contrary can be proved – [...] they normally represent conscious artistic and intellectual decisions rather than failures to reproduce a primal truth.⁸

The role of Greek in early modern Western societies as studied by Simon Goldhill has flagrant parallels in the early medieval world. As he noticed

Reception is too blunt, too passive a term for the dynamics of resistance and appropriation, recognition and self-aggrandisement that make up this drama of cultural identity.⁹

⁵ A. Lefevere, *Translation, Rewriting and the Manipulation of Literary Fame* (London and NY: Routledge, 1992), 57.

⁶G. Toury, “Translation and reflection on translation. A skeletal history of for the uninitiated,” in R. Singerman, *Jewish Translation History. A bibliography of bibliographies and studies* (Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 2002), xx.

⁷ S. Goldhill, *Who Needs Greek? Contests in the Cultural History of Hellenism* (Cambridge: CUP, 2002), 297.

⁸ A. Grafton “Notes from Underground on Cultural Transmission,” in A. Grafon and A. Blair, ed. *The Transmission of Culture in Early Modern Europe* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1990), 2.

⁹ S. Goldhill, *Who Needs Greek?*, 297.

And indeed, if one follows Anastasius' project unfolding, one sees no trace of passivity, of acceptance of a hegemonic foreign culture, but rather an active, conscious and manipulative selection from the items offered by this other culture. And reasons governing this selection are manifold.

At the ninth century papal court Greekness meant several things in relation to Latinness – this is the reason why I use these prefabricated abstract expressions instead of 'Greek' and 'Latin': they are in my terminology umbrella-terms covering just about all the cultural and political aspects contemporaries associated with the Greek or Latin languages. Greek was not only a language, and not only an ancient cultural heritage, but a contemporary political entity, "a site of contention and difference as well as value and authority."¹⁰ Attitudes towards different facets of this Greekness differed greatly, and they were all conditioned by the definition of one's own cultural identity. "Promoting and resisting Greek was fully and dramatically a mainstay in the exercise of power in society."¹¹ The way the texts were used reveal strategies of building up cultural identity: appropriation of items of the Greek heritage via translation in fact reflected the rivalry with the political entity of Byzantium. Also, by claiming the role of mediator between Latin and Greek culture exclusively for the papacy uncovers an anxious attempt to impose cultural control on the Western Christian literary production. "The story of knowing Greek is also the story of building of scholarly and institutional walls around Greek knowledge."¹² Anastasius' texts were there to populate the cultural landscape of the pontifical court, and there they signalled competences and jurisdictions.¹³

¹⁰ Goldhill, *Who Needs Greek?*, 296.

¹¹ Goldhill, *Who Needs Greek?*, 5.

¹² Goldhill, *Who Needs Greek?*, 8.

¹³ Cf. also T. Habinek, who, for the case of the ancient Romans states that "literature [...] carries with it various sorts of power: the power to enforce status differentiation, to constrain human belief and conduct, and to finesse disputes over value. Greek literature is for the Romans especially effective as a means of social dominance precisely because it is alien and access to it

To illustrate these points, I will embark on an interdisciplinary investigation of the historical and philological aspects of Anastasius' translating activity. My approach will in a certain sense resemble the methodology of the ancient *accessus ad auctores*, in the sense that it "only" has to address the seven *circumstantiae* questions: starting with Anastasius' life (*quis*) and work (*quid*) in Rome, the mediator city between East and West, at the papal court (*ubi*), in the second part of the ninth century (*quando*), times of great expansion of the papacy, I intend to describe how his knowledge of Greek (*quibus facultatibus*) made it possible for him to carry out translation activities using particular medieval methods and theories (*quomodo*) with which he could culturally assisting the papacy in its ambitions (*cur*).

Initially my plans were more committed to philology, focusing on the techniques of textual transformations. But as all texts I started to read continued to point beyond themselves, I ended up - in a serendipitous way - with a city's history interwoven with an institution's history, and all these through a translator's life-story, which is interwoven with his texts' history. The presence of a Greek text in the canon of a given translator has its cultural, political and social reasons and aims. While looking for the inherent logic of the collection, I ended up finding it through the external factors that determined its genesis and coherence. In the special case of Anastasius it is papal patronage which sets forth the main lines defining both the canon of texts to be translated and the uses of such a literary patrimony.

Two main problems halted me often in my attempt to describe Anastasius' activity as a whole. The first hindrance was the lack of critical editions, repeatedly mentioned by scholars – even if in the last few years there have been

can be regulated." T. Habinek, *The Politics of Latin Literature. Writing, Identity, and Empire in ancient Rome* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1998), 62.

notable advancements in this field.¹⁴ If not the Latin, then the Greek text is accessible only in manuscripts. The second problem is the great variety of literary genres found in Anastasius' translations, all requiring different research methods.

Thus, within the limitations set by the above-mentioned difficulties, I will examine Anastasius' project moving in concentric circles from the inner logic to the outer logic of its constitution. First, the philological context: that is to say the texts and their nature; second the historical context, mainly its social and ideological setting: the network Anastasius constructed with these translation-gifts; last but not least what I would call the final means and motivation of such a project: that is, the role of translations in shaping cultural identity.

Consequently, my thesis comprises the following main parts: after the introductory part presenting Anastasius' life and literary activity comes an exhaustive and detailed catalogue of his works as well as the context of the translations' genesis, problems of composition and layout, genres and authors preferred, and finally the methods and theories applied. This is followed by the general historical frame, the social and ideological setting which called for the existence of such a translation project. Illustrating some of my most important points, two major case studies assist the general investigation, analysing two different types of texts that have received little attention so far: the passion of Saint Demetrius and the notes of Anastasius to Eriugena's translation of the *Corpus Dionysiacum*.

¹⁴ See catalogue and bibliography.

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

In 1885 the doctoral thesis of the Jesuit scholar Arthur Lapôte, entitled *De Anastasio Bibliothecario Sedis Apostolicae* appeared at the Picard publishing house in Paris.¹⁵ This is the first comprehensive monograph dedicated to Anastasius, a work which definitely establishes, based on historical arguments, that the antipope to Benedict III and the most famous librarian of the ninth century papal see are one and the same person: before this identification, the controversial elements of Anastasius' biography led to a differentiation between the demonic politician and the angelic intellectual. By proving that the above mentioned two characters were one and the same person, Lapôte dissolved a historically false distinction, but nevertheless, he introduced a different, actually methodologically false distinction, stating in his introduction, that he was interested in *hominem, non scriptorem*,¹⁶ drawing thus a sharp dividing-line between historical and philological trends in the scholarship. These two trends have only recently begun to be considered together.

A few years after Lapôte's thesis, in the twenties of the twentieth century Anastasius came into the centre of attention of two collaborators on the *Monumenta Germaniae Historica*, Ernst Perels and Gerhard Laehr. The most important result of the monumentists' activity concerning Anastasius was the critical edition of his dedicatory letters.¹⁷ In parallel, Laehr prepared an

¹⁵ Arthur Lapôte, "De Anastasio Bibliothecario Sedis Apostolicae," in *Études sur la papauté au IXe siècle*, ed. by Girolamo Arnaldi and André Vauchez (Torino: Bottega d'Erasmus, 1978), 121-466, originally published in Paris at Picard, in 1885. About the author see the two introductory studies to his reedited works by Paul Droulers SJ "La père Arthur Lapôte (1844-1927) et les vicissitudes de son oeuvre", *ibidem* VII-XLII, and G. Arnaldi "L'opera di p. Lapôte" *ibidem* XLIII-LXIII, and idem "Il papato della seconda metà del secolo IX nell'opera di p. Lapôte sj.," *La cultura* 1978 (16): 185-217.

¹⁶ "Hominem, non scriptorem considero." Lapôte, "De Anastasio", 128.

¹⁷ E. Perels, Ernst and G. Laehr, ed., "Anastasio Bibliothecarii epistolae sive praefationes," in *Monumenta Germaniae Historica, Epistolae 7 Karolini aevi* 5 (Berlin: Weidmann, 1928), henceforth Anastasius, *Epistolae*.

extensive review of Anastasius correspondence,¹⁸ a study which remains even today the most detailed analysis of this group of Anastasian sources. Perels concentrated on the relationship between Nicholas I and Anastasius Bibliothecarius, highlighting the important role Anastasius played in the redaction of the papal letters. In his study on the pontificate of Nicholas, he devoted extensive pages to identifying the hand of our librarian in the papal letters, present mostly in the pontifical correspondence concerned with issues of “foreign affairs”.¹⁹ Similar research was conducted by Dietrich Lohrmann in 1968 focusing on the participation of Anastasius in the correspondence of Pope John VIII.²⁰ These two studies established the considerable part he played composing the papal letters, and thus his deep involvement in pontifical diplomacy.

Apart from the *MGH*, another distinguished scholarly community devoting much attention to Anastasius were the Bollandists. Since a considerable part of the translations of Anastasius have a hagiographical character, this inevitably attracted the Bollandists interest, resulting in essential contributions to the field: a series of articles were published in the *Analecta Bollandiana* from the 1950s and 1960s that contain important references and text editions relevant to the present investigation, notably those of P. Devos, R. Devresse and P. Peeters, but also W. Telfer and Raymond Loenertz.²¹

¹⁸ G. Laehr, Gerhard, “Briefe und Prologe des Bibliothekars Anastasius,” *Neues Archiv* 47 (1928): 457-463.

¹⁹ E. Perels, *Papst Nikolaus I und Anastasius Bibliothecarius* (Berlin: Weidmann, 1920).

²⁰ D. Lohrmann, *Das Register Papst Johannes VIII* (Tubingen: M. Niemeyer, 1968). He also wrote an article written in 1971 that contributed to the study of one of the most important translations of the librarian, the acts of the eighth ecumenical council: D. Lohrmann, “Eine Arbeitshandschrift des Anastasius Bibliothecarius und die Überlieferung der Akten des 8. Ökumenischen Konzils,” *Quellen and Forschungen aus Italienischen Archiven und Bibliotheken* 50 (1971): 420-431.

²¹ For detailed references, see the bibliography.

Some important critical editions of Anastasian translations date from the same period date. They were written by scholars who also contributed to the analysis of the translation methods of the librarian: Here I refer to Charles de Boor's edition of the *Chronographia tripartita* (of Nikephoros, George the Synkellos and Theophanes Confessor) and the edition by Ulla Westerbergh of the *Sermo de Sancto Bartholomeo*.

The next important phase in the research concerning Anastasius was dominated by Italian scholars: Girolamo Arnaldi's contributions to early medieval papal history in general and to the microhistory of Anastasius' activity in particular represent landmarks research for all future investigation. Arnaldi's biography of Anastasius is the most complete reconstitution of the latter's adventures, after the pioneering research of Lapotre. He complemented this biographical sketch with numerous studies on various aspects of Anastasius' activities and of the political and cultural history of the papacy. He already had noticed that just as politics and culture cannot be separated in pontifical history, so they were also closely interrelated also in Anastasius' life. That his translations are of major importance not so much as literary achievements, but as manifestations of a cultural-political agenda is supported also by the research of Claudio Leonardi as well. His major study was an article from 1967, in which he demonstrated that one of the early examples of the Latin text of the eighth ecumenical council is the "working copy" of the translator himself. Leonardi continued to contribute to the scholarship on Anastasius in his articles from the 1980s, focusing this time on the translation project of Anastasius as a whole and its possible interpretations in the context of current papal policies.

The foremost philological expert of these translations is Paolo Chiesa, who not only edited several of his hagiographical translations but who also dealt

extensively with the phenomenon of early medieval translation theory and practice.²²

The Italian school is also represented by a new generation: Girolamo Arnaldi's student Ilaria Bonaccorsi has specialised on the *Collectanea*, while Paolo Chiesa's student Matilde Cupiccia has dealt with the Amphilochian sermons and with the *Corpus Dionysiacum*. Also, several minor critical editions have appeared in form of dissertations, the majority of them still unpublished.²³

Recently, interest in Anastasius has extended not only beyond the borders of Italy, but also even beyond the borders of Europe; one of the most well-respected specialists now being from Australia. Bronwen Neil had published several critical editions (mainly parts of the *Collectanea*) and notable studies dealing with Anastasius' translations.²⁴

Currently, two major text editions are under preparation: the translations of the seventh ecumenical council by Erich Lamberz and that of the eighth ecumenical council by Claudio Leonardi.²⁵

All in all, a lot has been done on Anastasius' literary and political activity. Nevertheless, there are many aspects remains untold, many texts not examined. Also, the framework has changed in the meantime. Further research has been

²² For a complete list of his works see the bibliography.

²³ A. Galli, *Studi sul testo e sulla tradizione della Vita Basilio latina (versione di Anastasio Bibliothecario)* (University of Milano, Faculty of Letters, 1992); E. Tognella, *La versione latina della Vita di Giovanni Elemosiniere ad opera di Anastasio Bibliothecario. Edizione critica* (BA thesis, University of Milano, Faculty of Letters, 1997); Ilaria Bonaccorsi, *Il sermo de S. Bartholomeo apostolo, interprete Anastasio Bibliothecario: tradizione manoscritta e culto cittadino nei secoli IX - XI* (BA thesis, University of Rome La Sapienza, 1998). Idem, *La crisi monotelita e il culto di Martino 1 papa in Occidente: la traduzione dei Collectanea di Anastasio bibliothecario* (PhD thesis, University of Rome La Sapienza, 2004). For Mathilde Cupiccia's contributions, see bibliography.

²⁴ For a complete list of her works, see the bibliography.

²⁵ For Erich Lamberz's related publications see the bibliography.

carried out about the papal library,²⁶ about the knowledge of Greek²⁷ and about Roman literary production in general.

²⁶ See for example T. F. X. Noble, "The Intellectual Culture of the Early Medieval Papacy," in *Roma nell'alto Medioevo*, Settimane 48 (Spoleto: CISAM, 2001), and A. Alexakis, *Codex Parisinus Graecus 1115 and its Archetype*, *Dumbarton Oaks Studies* 34 (Washington: Dumbarton Oaks, 1996).

²⁷ B. Kaczynski, *Greek in the Carolingian Age. The St. Gall Manuscripts* (Cambridge, Mass: The Medieval Academy of America, 1988); A. C. Dionisotti, "Greek Grammars and Dictionaries in Carolingian Europe", in *The Sacred Nectar of the Greeks: The Study of Greek in the West in the Early Middle Ages*, eds. M. W. Herren and S. A. Brown (London: King's College, 1988), 1-56.

*ANASTASIUS: LIFE AND PORTRAIT*²⁸

In contemporary sources there are disproportionate quantities of information about various periods of Anastasius' life: whereas the second part of his career is well documented, relatively little is known about his early years. His date of birth is uncertain: most probably he was born between 800 and 817. One can only conjecture about his place of birth: two elements argue for Roman aristocratic origins. First, his only known family tie was being nephew of Arsenius, bishop of Orte, a very influential Roman aristocrat.²⁹ The two of them constituted a true family of royal and papal diplomats (the fact that both have Greek name, does not weaken this thesis: it was a widespread practice of Roman aristocracy to use such names³⁰). In the only passage in which he referred to his childhood, he affirmed that he had been in Rome from already an early age.³¹

Concerning his educational background it is difficult to unearth substantial evidence – for that matter the whole issue of ninth century education in Rome remains a relatively unknown territory. The *Liber Pontificalis* offers a glimpse into the education of at least that stratum of Roman aristocracy that was to end up at the top of the ecclesiastical hierarchy. Almost all lives of the eighth and ninth century popes contain some short reference (unfortunately, rarely more than one sentence) about learning. From these references, it seems that Roman aristocratic children could acquire knowledge in three major ways: from family

²⁸ The most exhaustive account of his life remains G. Arnaldi, *Anastasio Bibliotecario*, in *DBI* (Roma: Istituto della Enciclopedia Italiana, 1961) vol. 3, 25-37, and more recently his *Anastasio Bibliotecario, antipapa*, in *EP* 1, 735-746. The ideas in the following pages owe a great debt to his studies.

²⁹ A. Petrucci, "Arsenio," *DBI* 4 (Roma: Istituto della Enciclopedia Italiana, 1962), 339-342.

³⁰ J. M. Sansterre, *Les moines grecs et orientaux à Rome aux époques byzantine et carolingienne (milieu du VIe s. – fin du IXe s.)* (Brussels: Académie Royale de Belgique, 1983) vol. 1, 86 and vol. 2, 79.

³¹ "Passionem sancti ieromartyris Dionysii [...] Romae legi, cum puer essem." *Anastasius, Epistolae*, 440, 8-9.

members (mother, father, uncle)³², at monasteries in Rome³³ and at the Lateran school.³⁴ All children who seemed promising invariably ended up at the Lateran, and soon began their ecclesiastic careers by being nominated subdeacons. Had Anastasius been a child in Rome, he would have followed one of these paths, if not all of them. What seems probable is that if he was educated in a monastery, to account for his knowledge of Greek,³⁵ one has to conclude that most probably this monastery must have been a Greek one. Jean Marie Sansterre argues that he might have learned Greek in the monastery of Saint Sabas.³⁶ Roman monastic education had two major foci, just as contemporary monasteries elsewhere in Europe: chanting and reading the Scriptures. At that time, the Lateran cubiculum concentrated not so much on forming men of letters, but rather good bureaucrats for the church, offering a thorough liturgical and administrative education.³⁷ Anastasius' practice of epistolography employing the *cursus* may have resulted from such training. It is hard to conclude anything on the basis of his Latin literary references. For example his few references to Jerome and Augustine are not sufficient to indicate a familiarity with their works.

His presence in historical records from the beginning of his ecclesiastical career only testifies to problems. During the papacy of Leo IV, around 847-848 he became the cardinal priest at Saint Marcellus in Rome; however, for unknown reasons he abandoned this position without permission of the pope, retreating

³² E. g. Paulus (LP I, 463), Hadrianus (LP I, 486), Sergius II (LP II, 86), Benedictus III (LP II, 140)

³³ E. g. Stephanus III (LP I, 468), Leo IV (LP II, 106)

³⁴ E. g. Gregorius II (LP I, 396), Stephanus II (LP, I, 440), Leo III (LP II, 1), Stephanus IV (LP, II, 49), Paschalis (LP II, 52).

³⁵ For further discussion of his Greek education and knowledge see chapter *Methods, Theories and Inconsistencies*.

³⁶ Sansterre, *Les moines grecques*, 69.

³⁷ P. Riché, *Écoles et enseignements dans le Haut Moyen Âge* (Paris: Aubier-Montaigne, 1979), 105, 177 and T. F. X. Noble, "Literacy and the papal government in late antiquity and the early

to Aquileia and Chiusi. He was excommunicated in Rome on 16 December 850, and anathematized in Ravenna on 29 May 853; in December 854 he even lost his *sacerdotium*.

When Leo IV died on 17th of July 855, the Church elected Benedict III pope. However, he could only be consecrated on 29 September, because in the meantime there was an attempt to elect an anti-pope in the person of Anastasius; he managed to remain pope for three entire days, between 21 and 24 September 855. He was supported by his uncle Arsenius, who in Gubbio convinced the papal legates Nicolaus (bishop of Anagni), and Mercurius (*magister militum*) that instead of announcing the new pope's election to the emperor, Louis II, they should support Anastasius' candidacy. They obeyed, also convincing others, like Radoaldus, bishop of Porto; they entered Rome and Saint Peter with armed forces, destroying the wall-painting in the basilica representing the synod of 853 (which condemned him). But the imperial support did not suffice against the Roman aristocracy and clergy, unanimously backing Benedict.

In spite of this failed attempt Anastasius did not disappear from the high clerical scene of Rome. Maybe already by the time of Benedict III, but certainly under Nicholas I he became abbot of the monastery of Saint Maria in Trastevere. This later pope realized the importance of Anastasius' knowledge of Greek. The first testimony of the presence of Anastasius at the court of Nicholas I is in the autumn of 863; from that time onwards he gradually became an indispensable secretary to Nicholas I and subsequent pontiffs.

On the 14th of December 867, the very day Hadrian II was consecrated, Anastasius was appointed *bibliothecarius Romanae ecclesiae*: this office implies work including chancellery duties, preserving acts of councils, composing

middle ages" in R. McKitterick, *The Uses of Literacy in Early Mediaeval Europe* (Cambridge:

letters, taking care of the pope's books. He became the institutional memory of the papacy. But, while memory implies only a passive storage, Anastasius was active in creating the tradition that was to be memorized thereafter.

Just when Anastasius' career seems well established and developing, another crisis set him back for a short period. On the 10th of March 869, Pope Hadrian II's wife and daughter (he established a family before his ordination) were killed, after being kidnapped by Arsenius' son Eleutherius, with the intention to force the pope to enter a marriage alliance, but Hadrian II's opposition let the affair end in this tragic way. Anastasius was accused of taking part in the plot and was deposed by a synod held in the church of Santa Prassede in October the same year. But it seems that he was able to free himself of these charges, since in the next year he reenters the political scene as legate to Constantinople for Louis II, to negotiate the marriage of the emperor's daughter Ermengarda with Constantine, the eldest son of the Byzantine emperor Basil I (867-886). At the right place, at the right time: he had arrived just in time to participate in the last session of the eighth ecumenical council, held on 28 February 870. Since the official papal legates (Donatus of Ostia, Stephanus of Nepi and a certain deacon Marinus) knew no Greek, there was a great need for Anastasius' skills. For example, he spotted that the text the legates received, was not complete, so they refused to sign it. On his way back from Constantinople, he went to report to the emperor; in the meantime, pirates stole the original documents of the council from the official legates, who, unlike Anastasius, had travelled by sea. Thus, the only remaining version which reached the West was Anastasius' personal copy that he almost immediately translated into Latin. From the fact that he translated and commented on the acts of this council for Hadrian II, and that he continued to compose some letters for the pope, it can be assumed that

Cambridge University Press, 1990), 104.

he once again held the position of papal librarian. On his return, after a year, he was sent on another diplomatic mission, this time to Naples, to negotiate with southern bishops who, despite the threat of excommunication by the pope, continued to support Duke Sergius II in his conflict with his exiled uncle, the archbishop Athanasius I. When John VIII was elevated to the papal throne on 14 December 872, Anastasius was still librarian, but seemingly less influential at the papal court; though he is entrusted with a further diplomatic mission to Mantova in 874-875, the scope of which remains unknown. He dedicated himself further to translations: the acts of the council of Nicea (787), the *Chronographia tripertita* (compiled from Nikephoros, George the Synkellos and Theophanes Confessor), the *Collectanea* (a collection regarding monothelitism), Dionysius the Aeropagite, Maximus Confessor and many hagiographical writings date to this period.

The date of his death is not known, but it is very likely that it occurred at the end of 878 or beginning of 879, since the first signature of the next papal librarian, Zachary of Anagni dates from 29 March 879.³⁸

But what sort of man is he likely to have been? The sudden change from an opportunistic, highly ambitious cleric into a wise and learned diplomat was so unexpected, that for a long time scholars thought of the antipope and the librarian as two different persons. His 'double face' is also transparent in the testimonies of his contemporaries.

Hincmar of Rheims for example, in his annals, when narrating the episode of entering Saint Peter with armed men, describes him as "a savage and a barbarian":

³⁸ Paul Devos, "Anastase le Bibliothécaire. Sa contribution à la correspondance pontificale. La date de sa mort," *Byzantion* 32 (1962): 97-115.

Seduced by diabolical trickery and caught in a fog, in the manner of a brigand, he invaded this church which he ought not to have entered at all, and like a savage and a barbarian, to the perdition of his own soul and the danger of this venerable synod, along with his most villainous accomplices and followers he destroyed and threw down that picture in the dust.³⁹

But then later in another of his letters, a slightly more flattering epithet appears: *ab Anastasio utriusque linguae perito et undecunq̄ue doctissimo, apostolicae sedis bibliothecario*⁴⁰.

It is not known, whether they ever met, so Hincmar's impressions may be second hand impressions. But the popes with whom, or against whom he worked, were given the opportunity to learn about Anastasius' character. In addition to Hincmar's opinion, *The Annals of St. Bertin* have also conserved the points of view of the popes Leo IV and Hadrian II.

For Leo IV, Anastasius appeared to be a wandering sheep, a victim of the devil's instigations⁴¹, or a dangerous man, governed by foolish presumptuousness⁴² always with ambitions above his position, retaining a mist of error around himself.⁴³ With a good intuition, he already seems to have feared Anastasius' attempts to become a pope:

and all who may wish to offer him help either in an election – which Heaven forefend! – to the pontificate or in the pontifical office, or any comfort whatsoever, let them be under the same anathema.⁴⁴

Hadrian II seems to have had great difficulty in judging Anastasius: in one of his letters to Hincmar, dated 8 March 868, he refers to him as *dilectissimi filii mei*

³⁹ J. Nelson, *The Annals of Saint-Bertin* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1991), 148.

⁴⁰ Hincmar, *Epistola* 23, PL 126, 153. This description occurs later also in the *Annales Bertiniani*, see Nelson, 178.

⁴¹ Nelson, 146: "like the wandering sheep he was dwelling in secret in foreign regions, at the devil's instigation" and again on page 147: "at the devil's instigation and persuasion, like a lost sheep."

⁴² Nelson, 148.

⁴³ Nelson, 147.

⁴⁴ Nelson, 147.

sanctae sedis apostolicae bibliothecarii Anastasii.⁴⁵ Then, when he suspected Anastasius of taking part in the conspiracy against his family, he judged him with harsh words, condemning his overweening ambitions,⁴⁶ which caused him to fall back into a recurrent faithlessness,⁴⁷ to sew discords⁴⁸ and to plan secret machinations.⁴⁹

Further testimonies to the papal viewpoint can be found in the *Liber pontificalis*, most notably in the life of Benedict III, his rival for the papal throne. His attempt to plunder Saint Peter was said to supersede the Saracen attempts⁵⁰ – so again, he was being compared to pagan barbarians, like above. He was termed an intruder who succeeded in turning all the people against him.⁵¹

The tone changed once again, this time in the life of Hadrian II. Anastasius is not mentioned at all in the context of the family tragedy of the pope, the life probably being written after he managed to free himself from the accusations. The recurrent positive descriptions evoke him as a most eloquent and wise librarian.⁵² The writer of the *vita* affirmed that it was common belief that Anastasius was sent to the eighth ecumenical council by God's providence, so that he carry out enormous services to the Latin church by carefully examining the Greek documents.⁵³

Eloquence and wisdom, these are also the two recurrent characteristics that made a significant impression on the Neapolitans. Guarimopus, hagiographer

⁴⁵ MGH *Epistolae* 6, *Karolini Aevii* 4, 711, 2-3.

⁴⁶ Nelson, 149.

⁴⁷ Nelson, 148.

⁴⁸ Nelson, 149.

⁴⁹ Nelson, 149.

⁵⁰ Duchesne, *Liber Pontificalis*, vol. 2, 142, 13-14. English translation: R. Davis, R., ed. *The Lives of the Ninth-Century Popes (Liber Pontificalis)* (Liverpool: Liverpool University Press, 1995), 172: "the extent and nature of the evil and hapless activities he carried out were such as even a Saracen horde had not presumed or thought to carry out therein".

⁵¹ Duchesne, 143, 27; English translation: Davis, *LP*, 175.

⁵² Duchesne, 181, 25 and 182, 8-9; English translation: Davis, *LP*, 282, 289.

⁵³ Duchesne, 181, 24; English translation: Davis, *LP*, 279-280.

of Anastasius I, bishop of Naples, describing his visit to Naples, said he was a *vir eloquentissimus et ad exortandum idoneus*.⁵⁴ These concepts in fact described those perfect diplomatic skills, which, coupled with his knowledge of Greek, made him an indispensable secretary to the popes of the second half of the ninth century. Strangely, however, he always failed to accomplish the task he was charged with, such as arranging the marriage of Ermengarda, or calming down the southern Italian bishops. However, he then always managed to put such missions to other uses including interfering in the council or impressing his prestige as a man of letters upon the Neapolitans.

Extreme opinions are to be expected when judging a career rich in radical metamorphoses. But it seems that finally the *utriusque linguae peritus* reputation slowly eclipsed all the negative epithets he managed to collect throughout his troubled life.

He himself never discussed his early, adventurous years, except perhaps for a brief reference in a letter to Pope Nicholas I which sounded like a sort of recantation of his past saying *nec rursus illa arriperem, quae ingenioli mei vires excedunt*.⁵⁵ There are only very few personal remarks of any kind in his letters, even these are most of the time epistolary *topoi*: he mentioned his childhood only once,⁵⁶ and sometimes he can be found deploring his old age, poor health and the imminence of death⁵⁷. He is delighted in translating, on occasion even pretends to be “possessed” by the challenge: *arrepto interpretandi certamine*,⁵⁸ was the way he described the process for Charles the Bald. He also seemed to be exceedingly satisfied and proud of his position as a librarian. In one of his glosses to the translation of the acts of the eighth ecumenical council, when

⁵⁴ *Vita Anastasii*, ed. Waitz, *MGH Script. Rer. Lang.*, 447.

⁵⁵ Anastasius, *Epistolae* 396.

⁵⁶ Anastasius, *Epistolae* 440, 9.

⁵⁷ Anastasius, *Epistolae* 421, 9-10; 416, 23.

⁵⁸ Anastasius, *Epistolae* 440, 11.

presenting the office of the Byzantine *chartophylax*, he was most probably describing in fact his own jurisdiction.⁵⁹ Here he stressed the importance of his office through the rhetoric of prohibition – he presented his duties as rules imposed on others, in fact implying a boundless authority for himself in cultural matters.⁶⁰ The other hint about great prestigiousness of his position was the analogy he made with Jerome, calling him *caelestis bibliothecae cultor* or *divinae bibliothecae cultorem*.⁶¹ Obviously, the parallel was made as a way of strengthening his own reputation, as the head of the opposite pole, the earthly library. It is well known that the *bibliotheca divina* was considered a metaphor of the Bible for Jerome – but since it echoes Anastasius' function, is an allusion difficult to miss.⁶² Another, seemingly humble epithet he applied to himself, the *exiguus*, recalled the name of another famous translator, Dionysius Exiguus. Anastasius was someone who consciously built his image on the earlier figures of influential translators such as Jerome and Dionysius, but also Rufinus and Cassiodorus, presenting himself as their heir and adherent to their efforts. His share in medieval mythology has a last, peculiar aspect worth mentioning: he was one of the candidates who could be identified with the Papess Johanna. The first source which located the legend of the papess in a concrete time-period is the *Chronica de Romanis pontificibus et imperatoribus* by Martinus Polonus from 1277: he posited the events after the papacy of Leo IV, that is to say exactly the period of the (anti)papacy of Anastasius, even if this rule was shorter in length than the alleged pontificate of Johanna. Perhaps it is due to

⁵⁹ P. Chiesa, "Traduzioni e traduttori a Roma nell'alto medioevo," in *Roma fra Oriente e Occidente*, Settimane 49 (Spoleto: CISAM, 2002), 487.

⁶⁰ C. Leonardi, "Anastasio Bibliotecario e l'ottavo concilio ecumenico", *Studi medievali* 8 (1967): 59-192, at pages 174-175. See my chapter *Anastasius and the Papal Library*, p. 91-92.

⁶¹ Anastasius, *Epistolae* 442, 400.

⁶² As Jerome is a model for Anastasius, so becomes Anastasius idol of Platina, librarian of the Renaissance Vatican library from 1475. Cf. G. Arnaldi, "Come nacque la attribuzione ad Anastasio del *Liber Pontificalis*?" in *Bullettino dell'Istituto Storico Italiano per il Medio Evo e Archivio Muratoriano* 75 (1963): 321-343.

this overlapping coincidence that the figure of Johanna was enriched with the quality of *utriusque linguae peritus*.⁶³

⁶³ G. Arnaldi, "Qualche novita sulla legenda della papessa Giovanni nella versione di Martino Polono," in *Ovidio Capitani: Quaranta anni per la Storia Medioevale*, ed. by M. C. De Matteis (Bologna: Patron Editore, 2003).

THE POLITICAL AND CULTURAL LANDSCAPE: ROME, BYZANTIUM AND THE FRANKS

In the ninth century the city of Rome is the city of popes and the aspirations of these popes (re)define its role in history. This role of the papal city can be best grasped in its relations with the other two main political forces of the period, Byzantium and the Frankish Empire. Rivalry with one, alliance with the other – if we are to generalise, these are the simplest definitions of the respective relationships. This was a period when the continuous challenging of traditionally acknowledged authorities, obligations, rights and jurisdictions resulted in several major tensions with long-lasting consequences.

Judith Herrin ends her *The Formation of Christendom* with the year 843, which marks both the official restoration of orthodoxy in Byzantium and the division of the Carolingian realms between Lothar I (795-855), Louis the German (817-876) and Charles the Bald(823-877) in Western Europe. Moreover, she claims that actually the year 800, moment of the coronation of Charlemagne, was a decisive event in the history of Europe to which the later ninth and tenth centuries did not have much to add. The major power constellations remain as set by this event: the papacy tied together with the Franks in an alliance promising mutual support (spiritual in case of the former, and military in case of the latter), while the rivalry with Byzantium continues, increasingly polarising Greek and Latin Christianity: it was in this period that Rome entered one of its most serious conflicts with Constantinople, which, despite the reconciliations, caused an irreparable break.

This rivalry with Constantinople has complex roots: imperial and ecclesiastical ambitions often get confused. On ecclesiastical level, in the early church they were equal members of the so called pentarchy, the five leading patriarchates of the Christian world together with Alexandria, Antioch and Jerusalem. Within

the setting of the pentarchy, nothing granted primacy to any of them over the others, but the historical circumstances facilitated the birth of such pretensions: first of all, they both were imperial seats; second, with the Arab invasion of Antioch, Alexandria and Jerusalem, they became the two main poles of Christianity. The power of the Byzantine patriarchate was accentuated through the fact that the city of the patriarch was also the actual capital of the empire; while the basis for the claims of Rome were based on the idea of the Petrine primacy. The great papal move of “creating” a Western empire as new ally is a long story many times told. By the second part of the ninth century, the Frankish-Papal alliance had endured already over several generations of popes and emperors. But then it witnessed from both papal and Carolingian side a growing difficulty to remain faithful to the ideals of the pact as set by Leo III and Charlemagne. They kept trying to impose themselves upon each other: Nicholas I not once interfered with interior church conflicts of the Franks: he contested for example the deposition of Rothard of Soissons by Hincmar of Rheims and emperor Lothar’s divorce from his wife. On the other hand, Frankish leaders tried to gain considerable influence in electing the pope: the anti-papacy of Anastasius was the result of such an imperially supported attempt. Moreover, both entities had to deal with interior and exterior threats, such as the Arab invasion of Italy and the internal fights of the heirs of Louis II in the Frankish realms. With John VIII and Charles the Bald, both papacy and Frankish Empire lost the last the strong ruler for a long time to come. The end of this period meant the end of most of the political entities involved: with the death of Charles the Bald nothing halted anymore the dissolution of the Frankish empire, just as with the replacement of John VIII with Formosus, the papacy became the toy of the Roman aristocracy.

This period, coinciding with the life-span of Anastasius Bibliothecarius, was a problematic one for the city of Rome, and thus difficult to evaluate in all its

main aspects: ecclesiology, politics and culture. The scene was dominated by Popes Nicholas I and John VIII. Arguably the pope with the most striking vision about papal authority and power was Nicholas I: he was busy designing an elaborate ideology to sustain the papacy's temporal and spiritual power. How much influence this had on the actual course of the events, is another question; his interference in both Frankish and Constantinopolitan church affairs caused many protests. Actually, the case of pope John VIII shows that there was not much ground to apply such an ideology: no matter how hard he tried to follow the line of Nicholas I's politics, he was eventually constrained by the circumstances to major compromises - seeing the Frankish empire weakening and dissolving, unable to assist him in overcoming dangers such as the Arab threat, he was compelled to conduct a more conciliatory policy towards Byzantium, hoping to gain military assistance from there. The foreign policies of Rome in this period were governed predominantly by these military interests, since it was under constant Arabic threat, thus it continuously needed help from both empires.

In issues of ecclesiology, Rome had two main conflicts with Byzantium: the so-called Photian schism and the "battle for the soul of Bulgaria".⁶⁴ At the deposition of Ignatios and election of the layman Photios in 857 as patriarch of Constantinople, Nicholas I contested the procedure; this eventually resulted in a mutual excommunication, in 863 and 867 respectively. The same year, however, Michael III was murdered, and Basil I became the sole emperor, deposing almost immediately Photios and restoring Ignatios. Nicholas I also dies in the same year, not arriving to see the council of 869/870 condemning Photios. This, however, was still not the last sequence of these events, since in 877 Ignatios died, and Photios was once more elevated to the patriarchal seat.

The other bitter conflict of Rome with the Constantinopolitan church was over the conversion of the Bulgarians. Boris, prince of the Bulgarians, was baptized in 864, having emperor Michael III as his godfather. But since Constantinople would not allow him to have his own patriarch, he would turn to Rome. Nicholas I's support of such an initiative was severely disapproved in Constantinople. But since he was also reluctant to nominate archbishop the candidate of Boris, Formosus, once again Boris turned back to Constantinople. Thus, no matter how vigorously Nicholas I represented the papal authority, several years later John VIII was forced eventually to accept Photios and to concede defeat on the Bulgarian mission.

In cultural matters a curiously contemporaneous renewal dominated in all three realms: the second wave of the Carolingian renaissance, the first phase of the so-called "Macedonian renaissance" of Byzantium and the "late and tired Carolingian renaissance of the Italian territories."⁶⁵ Arnaldi defines the cultural circle constituted by John the Deacon, Gauderic of Velletri and Anastasius Bibliothecarius as the centre of the small-scale Roman Renaissance,⁶⁶ sibling of the great Frankish revival. Now, if this is understood as a revival of classical Greek (and Latin) learning, then, of course, translations of Byzantine hagiography do not qualify as such, nor was it the intention of Anastasius to achieve anything of that sort. But if, on the other hand, one considers the definition of J. J. Contreni about the Carolingian renaissance, there are striking similarities with the Roman preoccupations:

⁶⁴ Judith Herrin, "The Pentarchy: Theory and Reality in the Ninth Century," in *Cristianità d'Occidente e Cristianità d'Oriente* (Spoleto: CISAM, 2004), 608.

⁶⁵ G. Arnaldi, "Giovanni Immonide," 46.

⁶⁶ G. Arnaldi, "Giovanni Immonide e la cultura a Roma al tempo di Giovanni VIII" *Bullettino dell'Istituto Storico Italiano per il Medio Evo e Archivio Muratoriano* 68 (1956): 33-89.

The Carolingian renaissance formed part of a program of religious renewal that Carolingian political and clerical leaders sponsored and encouraged in the hope that it would lead to the moral betterment of the Christian people. As a conscious effort to improve man through knowledge of the Scriptures, the renaissance emphasised study, books, script, and schools. Although conceived and initially executed by an elite group of scholars, the first generation of which was largely foreign-born, the renaissance was aimed at society as a whole.⁶⁷

Perhaps lacking the didactical dimension, and more focused on an institution (the papacy), than society as a whole, nevertheless the Roman Renaissance was a program of religious renewal by promoting knowledge, constituted around great power-centres, sponsored by the highest of the clerical leaders. Also, it shared other important characteristics of the Carolingian Renaissance, that is its high self-consciousness, awareness of the importance of their cultural project and skilful image-building. The same features were emphasised by Cyril Mango when comparing the Byzantine and Carolingian culture of the period:

If we confine ourselves to the two European revivals, we find a close parallelism: both were animated by a vision of the renovation of the Roman state, meaning not the pagan, but the Christian empire of Constantine and his successors; both promoted the cultivation of a correct, ie. ancient, linguistic idiom, which entailed, on the one hand, the assemblage of the relics of 'classical' literature for purposes of imitation and, on the other, the compilation of manuals, compendia, and other aids to learning; both were accompanied by the introduction of a more compact script, the minuscule, for book production; both saw the establishment of a palace school; both extended into the visual arts, more particularly the precious arts. There were differences, too. The Carolingian Renaissance laid particular emphasis on the reform and education of the clergy, which does not appear to have been a major concern in Byzantium.⁶⁸

⁶⁷ Cf. J. J. Contreni, "The Carolingian Renaissance," in W. Treadgold, *Renaissances before the Renaissance. Cultural Revivals of Late Antiquity and the Middle Ages* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1984), 59. Cf. G. Brown, "Introduction: the Carolingian Renaissance" in *Carolingian Culture: Emulation and Innovation*, ed. R. McKitterick (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994), 1-51.

⁶⁸ Cyril Mango, "The Revival of Learning," in *The Oxford History of Byzantium*, ed. by C. Mango (Oxford: OUP, 2002), 214-229, at page 215.

THE SACRED NECTAR OF THE DECEITFUL GREEKS. PERCEPTIONS OF GREEKNESS IN THE NINTH CENTURY WEST

Graecia capta ferum victorem cepit et artes

Intulit agresti Latio.

(Horace, Ep. II.1, 156-157)

Medieval Rome was not at all as readily disposed to acknowledging Greek cultural supremacy as was Horace.⁶⁹ Since Horace's times, his neat differentiation between Greece upholding cultural hegemony and Rome dominating the political scene had become a little more complicated: Byzantium and Rome in the ninth century were two independent and rival political entities; by that time the Latin cultural heritage had become as solidly founded as the Greek, both cultures being essentially Christian and both having their problems with their pagan origins.

T. F. X. Noble says that the reasons for the decline in knowledge of Greek in Rome in the eighth and ninth centuries were not "intellectual sloth" or "barbarism," but rather the result of intentional abandonment. In order to validate his argument he emphasised the following facts: the language of administration was no longer Greek but Latin, central Italy had liberated itself from Byzantium, and the Latins identified Greekness with Greek religious thought, which "was condemned on the basis of its heretical tendencies", a phenomenon which goes together with the very competitive rise of Latin theology. Thus, says Noble

⁶⁹ For a more nuanced view of this rough generalisation see T. Habinek, *The Politics of Latin Literature. Writing, Identity and Empire in ancient Rome* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1998), especially pages 60-68.

Greek, but more so the language than the culture, was abandoned. Greek thought had itself so permeated Latin Christian culture that a future place for Greek thought, even in the absence of Greek itself, was assured. Perhaps in the end the question of the knowledge of Greek in papal Rome, or anywhere else in the early medieval West, is either a false question, or else a question falsely put. It might be better to speak in terms consonant with Augustine's image of spoiling the Egyptians, that is, the Greeks.⁷⁰

This is a very inspired insight, an imagery which indeed occurred to the translators themselves as well: *magna sibi Graeciae spolia deferentem*, in Rufinus' formulation.⁷¹

Now this was exactly what Anastasius does as well. If his translation project is described in one sentence, despoiling the treasures of the Greeks would be the most adequate metaphor.

But before discussing Anastasius' approach to Greek culture, there is a more general question to be answered: what did Greek mean for an early medieval Latin scholar?

Greek was not only a holy language, but a culture, or, to be more precise, several cultures: ancient pagan and late antique and Byzantine Christian. The latter was a Christian community, too, but at the same time a source of countless heresies and depository of many of Christianity's treasures. Moreover, it was also a contemporary rival political entity. The overlapping of these strata often results in an ambivalent attitude in the acceptance, reception or acquisition and appropriation of elements pertaining to "Greekness". The concept of spoiling synthesises the perfect strategy for resolving the problem caused by this schizophrenic approach of a Western Latin medieval culture towards Greeks. One has to spoil Greeks of their past treasures, and make a

⁷⁰ T. F. X. Noble, "The Declining Knowledge of Greek in 8th- and 9th c. Papal Rome," *Byzantinische Zeitschrift* 78 (1985): 56-62, at page 62.

⁷¹ Simonetti, M. ed., *Tyrannii Rufini Opera*, CCSL 20 (Turnhout: Brepols, 1961), 281.

good, orthodox use of them, something they themselves were incapable of doing. This position is all the more justifiable, since, in a way, Latins could also justly feel like the heirs to such a patrimony.

It is not by chance that in Judith Herrin's *The Formation of Christendom* the subchapter dealing with Anastasius' period has the title *The Three Heirs of Rome*.⁷² During Anastasius' political career at the papal court, the symbolic order of things was in a rather confused stage. This is to say, that the "original" setting of Rome as the centre of the world, was destabilised by the fact that together with the weakening of the old Rome, there appeared new Romes on the horizon, each claiming the same central position for themselves. Obviously, one of these new Romes was Constantinople, already with a tradition of several centuries of claiming such a status. The other candidate, the Frankish empire, was in fact an entity which did not really have an urban structure or an architectural reality for such an allegation (except perhaps the town of Aachen)⁷³, but all the more it intended to inherit the power prerogatives which were implied. Because of the historical reality of the Frankish-papal liaison, those in old Rome demonstrated more hostility towards the other usurper of the title, Byzantium. Pope Nicholas I affirmed in one of his letters, that nothing good was to be expected from people who thought that along with the move of the emperors the primary seat of the church was also transferred to Constantinople.⁷⁴ Besides the ecclesiastical, the political primacy of Byzantium

⁷² J. Herrin, *The Formation of Christendom* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1987).

⁷³ Cf. W. Hammer, "The Concept of the New or Second Rome in the Middle Ages." *Speculum* 19 (1944): 50-62.

⁷⁴ Sed quid mirum, si haec isti praetendunt, cum etiam gloriantur atque perhibeant, quando de Roma urbe imperatores Constantinopolim sunt translati, tunc et primatum Romanae sedis ad Constantinopolitanam ecclesiam transmigrasse et cum dignitatibus regiis etiam ecclesiae Romanae privilegia translata fuisse, ita ut eiusdem invasor ecclesiae Photios etiam ipse se in scriptis suis archiepiscopum atque universalem patriarcham appellet. *Letter 100, MGH Epistolae 6, Karolini Aevi 4*, 600-609.

was also continuously being contested. One wonderful illustration of this attitude is the letter of Louis II to the Byzantine emperor Basil I from 871. Since the letter was composed by Anastasius, a Roman aristocrat and a papal official, it would obviously have reflected the views of the Romans themselves.⁷⁵ All the more the two could be easily fused, because, beyond common political interests, they shared the common culture of Latinity and the language of the Roman empire. No wonder then that the linguistic argument was tantamount in the argumentation of Louis, in his defence of his right to use the title *basileus*:

The Greeks for their 'cacodoxy', that is, wrong thinking, have ceased to be Emperors of the Romans – not only have they deserted the city and the capital of the Empire, but they have also abandoned Roman nationality and even the Latin language. They have migrated to another capital and taken up a completely different nationality and language.⁷⁶

If Roman equals Latin, very simply, a Greek could not be Roman, even if they called themselves Romans and Constantinople the new Rome. The same idea recurred in a letter of Pope Nicholas I to the Byzantine emperor Michael III (842-867), from 28 September 865.

Now, if you call Latin a barbarian tongue because you do not understand it, consider how ridiculous it is to call yourself emperor of the Romans and not to know the Roman tongue.⁷⁷

The opposition between the two Romes reoccurred in another of Anastasius' translations, the life of Saints John and Cyrus by Sophronios of Jerusalem. In

⁷⁵ For an analysis and an Italian translation see G. Arnaldi, "Impero d'Occidente e Impero d'Oriente in una lettera di Ludovico II," *La cultura* 1 (1963): 404-424.

⁷⁶ Graeci propter kacodosiam, id est malam opinionem, Romanorum imperatores existere cessaverunt, deserentes videlicet non solum urbem et sedes imperii, set et gentem Romanam et ipsam quoque linguam penitus amittentes atque ad aliam urbem sedem gentem et linguam per omnia transmigrantes. *MGH, Epistolae 7 Karolini Aevi* 5, 390, 11-15. English translation in B. Neil, *Seventh Century Popes and Martyrs*, 64.

⁷⁷ Iam vero, si ideo linguam Latinam barbaram dicitis, quoniam illam non intelligitis, vos considerate, quia ridiculum est vos appellare Romanorum imperatores et tamen linguam non nosse Romanam. Letter 88, *MGH, Epistolae 6, Karolini Aevi* 4, 459. English translation in B. Neil, *Seventh Century Popes and Martyrs*, 17.

Sophronios' text there is a miracle performed upon a Roman, the blind John,⁷⁸ chance for the author in indulging in a little eulogic digression about Rome: he emphasized that he was referring to the 'true Rome', as opposed to the second Rome, which owed tribute to the Romans: οὐ πόλεως ὑποφόρου Ῥωμαίοις ὀρμώμενος, ἀλλὰ Ῥώμην αὐτὴν τὴν πρώτην αὐτῶν βασιλεύσασαν, πατρίδα καὶ πόλιν κτησάμενος⁷⁹ which next to its earthly fame now longs for celestial glory. At a guess, it might have been a real pleasure for Anastasius to translate such a remark, which in fact reflected the opinion of the eastern provinces of the empire - Sophronios was patriarch of Jerusalem, hostile to Constantinople and faithful to Rome.

Another telling episode in these intricate Greek-Latin relations was the response of the Frankish clergy to a letter from 23 October 867 by Pope Nicholas I, sent to Hincmar of Rheims. In this, after a detailed lamentation concerning recent conflicts with the Greek Church, the pope asked for the assistance of Hincmar and all the other Frankish bishops, who are requested to combat the errors of the Greeks by writing treatises refuting them.⁸⁰ Nicholas presented his case as a self-defence against the attacks of the Greeks, *odio et invidia contra nos inflammati*. As he further explained, this hatred was related to the conflict over Photios' patriarchate, which the papacy refused to acknowledge, and the envy was due to the preference shown the Bulgarians for the Latin Church. However he listed problems of more general interest, too, and then again he passed to the

⁷⁸ PG 87/3, 3659-3663.

⁷⁹ PG 87/3, 3660C. In the translation of Anastasius: Romanus enim erat, non civitatis oriundus Romanis sub tributo redactae, sed ipsam Romam, quae prima in eis imperat, urbem et patriam possidens.

⁸⁰ Letter 100, MGH, *Epistolae 6, Karolini Aevi 4*, 600-609. Cf. Kennedy, Kevin, "The Permanence of an Idea: Three Ninth Century Frankish Ecclesiastics and the Authority of the Roman See," in H. Mordek, ed. *Aus Kirche und Reich. Studien zu Theologie, Politik und Recht im Mittelalter* (Sigmaringen: Jan Thorbecke Verlag, 1983).

accusations of the Latins, more urgent and more plainly political conflicts than the previous ones: the *libellus fidei* was refused, the *invasor constantinopolitani ecclesiae*, Photios went from a layman state to high clerical positions, and the Greek emperor mistreated the apostolic legates. He considered any criticism of Rome a judgement on the whole of the Latin Church. By showing that Greeks not only question the Romans, but, by extension, Western Christian practices in general, he involved the Frankish clergy in the conflict, and asked their support.⁸¹ Upon receiving the letter, Hincmar read it to the bishops present in the palace of the king at Corbeny.⁸² Also on 29 December 867 he forwarded the message to those who had not been present at the common reading: Odo of Beauvais, John of Cambrai, Rothad of Soissons, and Herard of Tours.⁸³ Hincmar's letter, just as the one from Nicholas I, presented the request as a defence, and the Greeks as the ones attacking the Latins; he adopted all the accusations levelled in the papal epistle⁸⁴ At the end, Hincmar repeated Nicholas' request to stand up against the Greeks *tramitem scripturarum et traditionem maiorum*. It is impossible to guess at the real dimensions of this pan-Latin conspiracy, since it is not known how many of the bishops reacted (in a satisfactory manner): what has survived may be the whole thing, or it may also be just a small part of it. I am referring to the *Liber adversus Graecos* of Aeneas

⁸¹ The identification of Roman and Frankish Christianity is present in Anastasius' own letters, too: *...tamen pene omnia, quia sedes apostolica non approbavit, tota Latinitas reprobavit*. Anastasius, *Epistolae* 424, 37.

⁸² *Annales Bertiniani*, anno 867, see J. Nelson, *The Annals of Saint-Bertin* (Manchester: MUP, 1991), 141-142.

⁸³ Letters 201-204, *MGH, Epistolae 8, Karolini Aevi 6*, 225-228. The letters are the same, but only those of Odo and John survive, the other two are known to us from the regesta of Flodoardus. Flodoardus Remensis, *Historia Remensis Ecclesiae* (*MGH Scriptorum* 36), 276.

⁸⁴ Fasting on Saturdays; the filioque; celibacy of priests; no chrism on the forehead of the baptised, moreover preparing chrism out of river-water; eating meat during the eight weeks before Easter, eating cheese and eggs for seven of those eight weeks; at Easter, in Jewish fashion, offering a sheep on the altar; clerics shaving their beards; a deacon being ordained a bishop without having received the office of priesthood.

bishop of Paris⁸⁵ and the *Contra Graecorum errores* by Ratramnus of Corbie.⁸⁶ Apart from these treatises another document of the Frankish reaction are the synodal acts of the council of Worms from 868.⁸⁷

The dossiers of Aeneas and Ratramnus are for the most part compilations from all sorts of sources, both Latin and Greek, as if they wished to stress the way they could use Greek authority against Greek heresy, to demonstrate that the tradition of the Greek Church fathers was on their side. Ratramnus commented on all his excerpts, organised according to the accusations, while Aeneas only presented a florilegium, complete however, with an extensive prologue. He reacted to what he perceived as a provocation on the part of the Greeks with vehement verbal aggression:

Haec deliramenta versutiarum Graecalis industria supercilioso ambitu per Romanum spargit imperium, et dominicis aciebus insistens, astu calliditatis scaturriens, contendit lacesire quietos.⁸⁸

But he was confident, that *defensio Patrum, concordia canonum, auctoritas et victoria excellentissimorum antistitum*⁸⁹ are on his side. In his case, an important biblical quote is I Cor. 1, 22, where Paul says *Judaei signa petunt, et Graeci sapientiam*. Obviously, here, Paul refers to the pagan Greeks, but to Aeneas this was the starting point of all the troubles. Byzantium considered herself *matrem verborum et genitricem philosophorum, et omnium liberalium artium fautricem*,⁹⁰ and now believed herself to be able to judge everything rightly: *putans se posse*

⁸⁵ Text in *PL* 121, 685-762, prologue also in *MGH Epistolae* 6, *Karolini Aevi* 4, 171-175.

⁸⁶ Text in *PL* 121, 225-346.

⁸⁷ Cf. W. Hartmann, *Die Synoden der Karolingerzeit im Frankreich und in Italien* (Paderborn: Ferdinand Schöningh, 1989), 301-309 and W. Hartmann, *Das Konzil von Worms 868. Überlieferung und Bedeutung* (Abhandlungen der Akademie der Wissenschaften in Göttingen, phil.-hist. Klasse 105, 1977).

⁸⁸ *MGH Epistolae VI, Karolini Aevi* 4, 175, 9-11; *PL* 121, 690A.

⁸⁹ *PL* 121, 690B.

⁹⁰ *MGH, Epistolae VI, Karolini Aevi* 4, 172, 25; *PL* 121, 686A.

*veraciter distinguere vera a falsis.*⁹¹ However, he said, on the contrary, it was the birthplace of the most dangerous heresies:

genimina viperarum, id est, quamplurimi inventores perversorum dogmatum, veluti fuerunt, ut ex multis memoremus aliquos, Arrius, Eunomius, Fotinus, Marcion, Chaerintus, Manicheus, Hebion, Nestorius Constantinopolitanus episcopus...⁹²

Behind all the delicate theological divergences, of course, as it was emphasised in Pope Nicholas I's letter, lay two serious political conflicts: the un-recognized patriarchate of Photios and the conversion of the Bulgars. How important these two factors were is obvious from the fact that even John VIII, while conducting reconciliatory politics with Byzantium, accepting Photios, used this aggressive tone everywhere where rivalry was still ongoing, that is, during the case of the Bulgarian mission.

In his letter dated 16 April, 878 to the prince of the Bulgars, Boris I Michael (852-889), he said:

Spiritualibus te visceribus edito gaudebamus et pro salvatione tua gratias agebamus, sed nunc astutia malignorum decepto tristamur et ingemescimus verentes et pertimescentes, ne, si forte Grecos secuti fueritis, eum illi in diversas hereses et scismata solito more ceciderint, vos quoque cum ipsis in erroris profunda ruatis et, "sicut serpens seduxit Evam astutia sua, ita sensus vestri corrumpantur et excedant a simplicitate et castitate, que est in Christo Iesu. (2 Cor.11, 3)" Nam te fili, Mosaicis rogo verbis "interoga patrem tuum et annuntiabit tibi, seniores tuos et dicent tibi (Deut. 32, 7)", si aliquando Greci sine hac vel illa heresi fuerint et, cum non inveneris eos ab aliqua heresi aliquando liberos extitisse, illi ad blasphemiam versi fuerint, et vos etiam fidei recte blasphematores inveniamini.⁹³

⁹¹ MGH, *Epistolae VI, Karolini Aevi 4*, 172, 30-31; PL 121, 686A.

⁹² MGH, *Epistolae VI, Karolini Aevi 4*, 172, 46-173,3; PL 121, 686C-D.

⁹³ MGH *Epistolae 9, Karolini Aevi 7*, 58-59.

This tone reoccurs in two other letters, in another, earlier one (dated 872-873) to Michael, he speaks of the *Grecorum perfidia*,⁹⁴ and in yet another, to Domagoi, prince of the Croats, he lamented about *Greca falsitas*⁹⁵.

Similar mistrust can be found in the *Liber Pontificalis*' account of the eighth ecumenical council. The author said that the legates entrusted the text of the council to Anastasius, sent there by divine providence⁹⁶ to examine it carefully, "in case Greek fickleness should swinishly interpolate anything false."⁹⁷

A xenophobic and hostile climate emerges from these cases, fuelled by a rivalry for political and religious supremacy. No wonder then, that Anastasius was not any exception. only at the first glance does his translation project appear to go against this stream, in reality it served it. Just as Ratramnus and Aeneas used Greek authorities to refute the Byzantines, Anastasius accumulated Greek texts to achieve the cultural monopoly the papacy wished to acquire.

For him as well, the Greeks were overwhelmingly cunning and deceitful people, always deeply involved in secret machinations.⁹⁸ In this respect, Photios

⁹⁴ *Ibidem*, 277.

⁹⁵ *Ibidem*, 278.

⁹⁶ Duchesne, 181, 24; English translation: Davis, *LP*, 270.

⁹⁷ Duchesne, 181, 22; English translation: Davis, *LP*, 270.

⁹⁸ See for example the following expressive passage: *Sic igitur, sic Greci accepta occasione celebratorum universalium conciliorum frequenter egisse clarescunt et nunc minuendo, nunc addendo vel mutando, nunc in absentia sociorum, nunc in abscondito angulorum, nunc extra synodum, nunc post synodum astutia sua immo fraude communibus sactionibus abutuntur et ad suos libitus cuncta, quae sibi visa fuerint, etiam violenter inflectunt. Itaque quicquid in Latino actionum octavae synodi codice reperitur, ab omni est fuco falsitatis extraneum. Quicquid vero amplius sive de dioecesi Vulgarica sive aliunde in Greco eiusdem synodi codice forsitan inveniatur, totum est mendacii venenis infectum. Denique disceptatio, quam coram imperatore vicariis et Vulgaribus tantum super Vulgarum terra supra fuisse significavimus actam, post synodum consumatam canonesque in viginti prolatos et septem tantum capitulis atque terminum fidei depromptum et omnia haec in quinque codicibus scripta sive compacta et omnium subservatoribus traditos patriarchalibus sedibus deferendos effecta est. ne ergo Grecorum suatim astutia, quin potius dolositas, etiam circa praesentem synodum agat, haec me admonendi causa dixisse sufficiat. Ceterum bene novi, quod iuxta proverbiatorem frustra iactetur rete ante oculos pennatorum (Prov. 1, 17). Unde quisquis sapientiae ac prudentiae pennis ad alta sustollitur, omnia insidiarium muscipula, quae a Grecis in infimis tendi poterunt, alto contemplationis saltu transcendet. Anastasius,*

was an emblematic Greek for Anastasius, incorporating all the negative characteristics of his kind. Among other things, he characterised Photios using the following expressions: *alia inquiring eum in corde tenere, alia in opere demonstrare*⁹⁹, *versutius lupi crudelitatis furit*,¹⁰⁰ *falsarius falsidicorum*,¹⁰¹ *ipsum antichristum*,¹⁰² *perversorum dogmatum cultor*,¹⁰³ *inventor malorum*.¹⁰⁴ One can find here more or less all the coeval commonplaces about the Greeks: they were deceitful, untrustworthy, and heretic, the cunning politician to be treated with mistrust.

At the other extreme of 'Greekness', there was for example Maximus the Confessor, emblematic in a contrary sense: he was a great theologian, a defender of orthodoxy, a martyr of the faith. But also, let us not forget, he was friend to the Roman pontiffs (exiled for supporting the same theological position as Pope Martin I), and adversary of a heresy which had Byzantine imperial support. Thus, he was a Greek who proved the Greeks wrong. Another Greek held in high esteem by Anastasius was Constantine the Philosopher (Cyril), whom he had the occasion to know personally. Since Constantine was a Romano-phile, too, it is impossible to tell, to what extent the official and personal views of Anastasius might have been divergent on the subject of the profile of Greeks in general. In fact, his attempt to reconcile with Photios was also synchronised with the official papal acceptance of the Byzantine patriarch. When he discussed Greek culture, Anastasius used a respectful tone, at least as concerns those literary products which he himself translated. He considered the

Epistolae 415, 6-11, 19-21. Note that his friend, John the Deacon uses a similar expression in his *Life of Gregory: astuta Grecorum perversitas* (PL 75, 225B).

⁹⁹ Anastasius, *Epistolae* 404, 19-20.

¹⁰⁰ Anastasius, *Epistolae* 405, 16.

¹⁰¹ Anastasius, *Epistolae* 406, 26-27.

¹⁰² Anastasius, *Epistolae* 406, 32.

¹⁰³ Anastasius, *Epistolae* 406, 34.

¹⁰⁴ Anastasius, *Epistolae* 406, 36.

two literary traditions to be equally important in the sense that everything pertaining to the spiritual patrimony of Christianity was recorded in these two languages: *his enim duabus linguis praecipue quae in ecclesia gesta sunt enarrantur*¹⁰⁵ - affirmed for example in one of his letters. Anastasius' concept of Christian culture was, I believe, rooted in *utriusque linguae* - so that he saw these two traditions, the Greek and the Latin, as complementary. It is true that represented by Constantinople and Rome, they were opposing and competitive, but in the end both were heirs to a once common heritage - and when he wanted to recover something of this heritage, he turned to both traditions with familiarity.

This familiarity served him for well-defined purposes. Already the types of documents in question - church history, council acts, hagiography of church leaders - reflected the interests of a papal official, indicating that there was an immediate, practical aim behind these translations, as opposed to pure literary interests.¹⁰⁶ These texts were not intended, to be read, but to be used. Thus, some of these texts were to be applied and modified by other people - for instance, the *Chronographia tripartita* (nr. 7 in the catalogue) and the *Collectanea* (nr. 8 in the catalogue) were meant to be incorporated in a Latin ecclesiastic history. Closely connected with this was the addition of new prologues to the texts, sometimes by removing the original (in the case of the *Chronographia tripartita* and the liturgical commentaries), thus de-contextualising and re-contextualising the documents according to the needs of the new linguistic, cultural and political milieu. They were meant to assist the papacy in its self-definition, and the propagation of this image, either by filling documentary

¹⁰⁵ Anastasius, *Epistolae* 419, 15-16.

¹⁰⁶ This is an observation valid for all his translations. Cf. C. Leonardi, *Agiografia romana nel secolo IX*, in *Hagiographie cultures et sociétés. IVe-XIIIe siècles* (Paris: Études augustiniennes, 1981), 471-490 and Idem, *Anastasio Bibliothecario e le traduzioni dal Greco nella Roma altomedievale* in M. Herren (ed.), *The Sacred Nectar of the Greeks* (London: King's College, 1988), 277-296.

gaps or by emphasising papal primacy in certain areas, such as the theological and liturgical literature.

A recurrent motif in his prologues was the emphasis on enriching the Latin patrimony through translations from the Greek. His most expressive metaphor for this was: *dummodo Latinitas se tanto non doleat esse sale privatam, quo Grecia se gaudet optime conditam*.¹⁰⁷ From this, and from the other, numerous examples it is not hard to detect a certain competitive spirit: *Non tantum Greco sermone, verum etiam Latino eloquio*,¹⁰⁸ or *apud Latinos quemadmodum apud Grecos*¹⁰⁹ *non solum Grece sed et Latine accedentes*¹¹⁰ or *Indecorum et inconueniens arbitratus sum septimam universalem synodum... non habere Latinos*¹¹¹ – all these affirmations underline the necessity of taking over from Greek literature everything of value. *Latinos de die in diem donis replet quibus se Greci ditatos olim magnopere gloriantur*¹¹² – this concluding sentence in his last letter, which can pass as his *ars poetica*, underlined the same idea again. It is then important to stress, that he did not have any tendency of “Hellenizing” the Latin culture, but on the contrary, “Latinizing” the Greek heritage.

Moreover, Anastasius often maintained that he was not simply taking text from the Greeks, but taking them *back*. This curious *reconquista* again served to establish the authority of the Latin tradition through retroversions, that is Latin re-translations of texts which allegedly were formerly composed in Latin, now only survived in Greek versions. Speaking for example about the letters of Popes John and Theodore, he affirmed:

The style of their letters [...] is redolent of Latin eloquence from which it is clear that they were dictated not in Greek but in Latin. From this fact it is

¹⁰⁷ Anastasius, *Epistolae* 398, 3-4.

¹⁰⁸ Anastasius, *Epistolae* 397, 3-4.

¹⁰⁹ Anastasius, *Epistolae* 399, 14-15.

¹¹⁰ Anastasius, *Epistolae* 426, 28-29.

¹¹¹ Anastasius, *Epistolae* 416, 13-17.

¹¹² Anastasius, *Epistolae* 442, 22-23.

notable that some which were published in Latin, Latinity would have wept for as being totally destroyed by the power of oblivion, if it had not recovered them from the source of Greek books, afterwards drained by its thirsting breast, such as the letter of blessed pope Felix bringing a sentence against Peter of Antioch. Indeed, even such a one as Clement himself, whom Rufinus affirmed when he wrote to Gaudentius as having been given back to our language as one restored and returning, and he showed clearly that it had been written in Latin and lost, and received again.¹¹³

Also, by dedicating the life of John the Calybite (a Byzantine saint “Romanised” by Anastasius, nr. 4 in the catalogue)¹¹⁴ to Formosus, he said that it would be most unfortunate for a Roman saint “that one whom a foreign language preaches is completely unknown in his own tongue.”¹¹⁵ In the same letter he gave another example, that of Saint Clement:

Verum hoc Latinitas etiam in magno Clemente perpressa est, quem nisi a Graecis voluminibus postea redditum gauderet, nunc procul dubio perditum utpote tanto munere privata defleret.¹¹⁶

He suspected that the text of the passion of Demetrius (nr. 20 in the catalogue) also had something in it which mirrors the Latin style: *notandum vero, quod Latino passio eius stilo retineat.*¹¹⁷

One can talk also about a kind of repatriation (or reappropriation) in cases where it could not be claimed that the text had originally been Latin, but since it concerned the history of the Western Church, it was considered worth

¹¹³ Anastasius, *Epistolae* 426, 1-8: *stilus epistolarum Latina redolet eloquentia, ex quo liquido constat non Grece illas, sed Latine fuisse dictatas. Unde notandum, quod nonnulla, quae Latine fuerunt edita, Latinitas funditus mole oblivionis obruta deplorasset, nisi ex Grecorum post fonte librorum haec hausta sitibundo pectore resumpsisset, sicut epistolam beati papae Felicis in Petrum sententiam proferentem Antiochenum damnationis, quin immo sicut et ipsum quoque Clementem quem Rufinus nostrae linguae redditum restitutum et redeuntem ad Gaudentium scribens innuit, et quod Latine scriptus fuerit et amissus rursusque receptus, signanter ostendit.*

¹¹⁴ See my chapter about the dedications. English translation by B. Neil, *Seventh Century Popes and Martyrs. The Political Hagiography of Anastasius Bibliothecarius* (Leiden: Brill, 2006), 161.

¹¹⁵ ... *quem peregrina lingua praedicat, a propria penitus ignorari.* Anastasius, *Epistolae* 402, 13. English translation in B. Neil, *Seventh Century Popes and Martyrs*, 47.

¹¹⁶ Anastasius, *Epistolae* 402, 13-15.

¹¹⁷ Anastasius, *Epistolae* 439, 13-14.

recovering. That was the case of the two miracles of Pope Gregory the Great taken from the *Pratum Spirituale* of John Moschos (nr. 23 in the catalogue),¹¹⁸ and included in John the Deacon's life of Gregory.

Furthermore, he often referred to a twofold provenance of the Greek text: Rome and Constantinople.¹¹⁹ This may have served him a double end: first, to reinforce the authority and authenticity of the text and second to emphasise the equality of Rome with Constantinople even in the field of the accessibility of Greek texts, i.e. of culture and learning.

In addition, another rivalry is revealed in his letters, the one between Rome and the Frankish empire. An important aspect of it comprised access to Greek texts which Rome is keen on to monopolize. When he described early testimonies of the Dionysian writings, he wrote the following:

... priusquam Romani pontifices, Gregorius videlicet Martinus et Agatho, dictorum eius <referring to Pseudo-Dionysius> conscripsit suis mentionem fecerint et ea per hoc probabilia iudicantes admiserint, Gregorius scilicet in homelia capituli evangelici de centum ovibus et decem dragmis, Martinus in synodo sua, quam Romae contra hereticos celebravit, et Agatho in epistola, quam ad sextam sinodum destinavit.¹²⁰

It is of major importance that all the listed testimonies are by Roman pontiffs including Gregory the Great (590-604), Martin (649-655) and Agatho (678-681). But Rome's importance goes even further: he claimed that since heretics had hidden these texts in the East, for a long time Rome was the only place where Dionysian writings could be found.¹²¹ It is clear that Anastasius' intention was to emphasize the key role that Rome supposedly played in the preservation and

¹¹⁸ *Vita Gregorii Magni*, II, 45 and IV, 63 (PL 75, col. 106, 213).

¹¹⁹ Cf. Anastasius *Epistolae* 440.

¹²⁰ Cf. Anastasius *Epistolae* 433.

¹²¹ Cf. Anastasius *Epistolae* 433. For a comparison of the presence of Dionysian writings in both the East and West in the Early Middle Ages see E. Patlagean, "Le Stoudites, l'empereur et Rome: figure byzantine d'un monachisme réformateur," in *Bisanzio, Roma e l'Italia nell'Alto Medioevo*, Settimane 34 (Spoleto: CISAM, 1988), vol. 1, 429-460, at pages 431-435.

transmission of the manuscripts of the Areopagite. Thus we are witnesses to a rivalry between Frankish and Roman cultural and political primacy: whereas Eriugena tried to transform Dionysius into a local saint, Anastasius stressed Rome's privileges in the textual tradition of Dionysius' writings.

The way he used terms for the two languages, is also instructive. For Latin, he uses the words *lingua latina* or *propria lingua, in Latinum stilum, latino eloquio*, but also *Romanum sermonem*, just as he uses *Romanos* for *Latinos*. There seems to have been a conscious attempt to emphasise Roman primacy in cultural matters, identifying Romans with Latins and referring to Latin as the Roman language.

For Greek, on the other hand he used *peregrina lingua, ex Achivo, Achivo sermone, Grai, pollentes Pelasgarum, lingua Pelasga, atthicam locutionem*. Again, I would argue that this variety of synonyms, all rather archaic denominations of the Greek language, had the scope to separate the cultural artifacts of a tradition from the heirs of this tradition, the Greek-speaking Byzantines.

For knowledge of Greek in the Early Medieval West, scholars have come to use the expression "the Greek element" in the early medieval Western world.¹²² But I would suggest, in the light of the previous pages, that rather than knowledge of Greek, contemporary concepts of 'Greek' and 'Greekness' should be first subject to analysis, and knowledge of Greek (or lack of it, for that matter) treated as a consequence of it. True, there was not much knowledge of Greek language and Greek literary resources were lacking, but there is in that period a constant preoccupation in Rome with the Greeks. Now, on the other hand, as Paolo Chiesa affirms, there were places where the pre-conditions of a

¹²² B. Bischoff, "Das griechische Element in der abendlandischen Bildung des Mittelalters," In B. Bischoff, *Mittelalterliche Studien*, vol. 2 (Stuttgart: Anton Hiersemann, 1967); W. Berschin, "Elementi greci nella cultura letteraria medievale," *Aevum* 68 (1984): 131-143.

translation activity existed, but, due to lack of motivation it did not develop. “In Francia esistono le capacità tecniche ma non si sente l’urgenza di far giungere ai latini testi prodotti in Oriente.”¹²³ This happened precisely because motivations are mainly extra-literary, and are conditioned by ideologies of politico-cultural identities: Rome needed to define herself in relationship with the Byzantines, with whom she was in a state of constant conflict and rivalry, whereas for the Franks this was not such a pressing force. Eriugena’s interest, in contrast with that of Anastasius, was not so much contaminated by politics - for him, Greek was only pure sacred nectar.¹²⁴ For Anastasius on the other hand, it represented a kind of bounty which would enable Latin to celebrate the superiority of Latin Christianity over the Greeks. Such concern with repatriation of cultural values is a peculiarity of the Anastasian prologue, I did not find it in the agenda of any other translator. When examining Anastasius’ attitude, he seems to be claiming hereditary rights over the patrimony of the Greeks. Here, it might be useful to evoke the connections Rita Copeland recognized between translation theories and property rights, using the example of Lollard Bible translations: she affirms that claiming *ad sensum* methodology is to exercise property rights over the text translated.¹²⁵

¹²³ P. Chiesa, “Traduzioni e traduttori dal greco nel IX secolo: sviluppi di una technical,” in *Giovanni Scoto nel suo tempo: l’organizzazione del sapere in età carolingia* (Spoleto: CISAM, 1989), 183.

¹²⁴ “Sacro Graecorum nectare” is an expression from his preface to the Dionysian translations, a dedicatory poem to Charles the Bald. M. W. Herren, ed. *Iohannis Scotti Eriugena Carmina, Scriptorum Latini Hiberniae* 12 (Dublin: Institute for Advanced Studies, 1993), nr. 20, 108-109. A corollary to this attitude might be the fact also noted also Vircillo-Franklin, that Frankish scholars’ Greek is more bookish and academic. Cf. C. Vircillo-Franklin, *The Latin Dossier of Anastasius the Persian. Hagiographic Translations and Transformations*, Studies and Texts 147 (Toronto: PIMS, 2004), 112.

¹²⁵ “The controversy about translation and textual circulation is, of course, an area in which the battle over political and economic privilege is played out. But the commonplaces about translation – word for word, sense for sense, style, sentence, truth and all their attendant values – are never politically innocent. A genealogy of their reconfiguration reveals how they can stand in for and mark out the terrain of those social pressures which constitute the textual invisible, and how in turn, in their conceptual complexity and slipperiness, they reshape the

Books were essential for “inventing traditions of a politico-religious nature that helped to secure and consolidate their regional dominance.”¹²⁶ That Carolingian libraries were not simple “repositories of learning”, but held the written records of a culture assimilated in order to strengthen a developing sense of identity, was convincingly demonstrated by Rosamond McKitterick’s research on history and memory in the Carolingian world.¹²⁷ I suppose that this must have been the case with the papal library too, and Anastasius’ project of despoiling the Greek literary heritage served to reinforce the Latin Christian identity the papacy wished to propagate.

form that discourses of communality take.” Rita Copeland, “Toward a Social Genealogy of Translation Theory: Classical Property Law and Lollard Property Reform,” in J. Beer, *Translation Theory and Practice in the Middle Ages* (Kalamazoo, Michigan: Medieval Institute Publications, 1997), 183.

¹²⁶ J. Herrin, *The Formation of Christendom* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1987), 297.

¹²⁷ R. McKitterick, *History and Memory in the Carolingian World* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004), *passim*.

THE TRANSLATIONS

Some twenty translated texts of different types and different dimensions correspond to Anastasius' approximately twenty year career as papal official. The dimensions of the documents vary significantly, thus it is difficult to give a quantitative estimate of his oeuvre. In volume 129 of the *PL* (which is far from being a complete edition, lacking for example the rendering of the *Scholia* to the *Corpus Dionysiacum* and major parts of the *Chronographia tripartita*) his translations occupy 367 pages (734 columns) – an impressive amount for a busy diplomat. In the following pages I will first present a catalogue of his translations, following, as much as is possible, an approximate chronological order, giving all possible bibliographic references and also, when considered relevant, providing data on manuscript evidence.¹²⁸ I will then try to draw a profile of the corpus, based on the indications such as the preferred genres and authors, composition and layout, methods and theories of translation.

*CATALOGUE*¹²⁹

One important group that must be mentioned prior to presenting the translations, are Anastasius' dedicatory letters. These were edited in the *MGH* series by the monumentists Ernst Perels and Gerhard Laehr, as a sort of *Appendix* to the volume which contains the letters of Pope John VIII.¹³⁰ There are

¹²⁸ Probably due to this strong connection of the translations with immediate and practical wants, as soon as these needs ceased to exist, favourable conditions for further stages of reception did not replace them. What was safe, was the hagiographical material which entered legendaries, but even that not so much in Roman, as transalpine ones. Also, the *scholia* to the *Corpus Dionysiacum* kept being copied and recopied throughout the Middle Ages.

¹²⁹ For another similar survey of Anastasius' translations see B. Neil, *Seventh Century Popes und Martyrs*, 42-85.

¹³⁰ E. Perels and G. Laehr, ed., "Anastasii Bibliothecarii epistolae sive praefationes," in *Monumenta Germaniae Historica, Epistolae 7 Karolini aevi* 5 (Berlin: Weidmann, 1928).

18 letters in this appendix. With the exception of one (communicating the death of Nicholas I to bishop Ado of Vienne), all are dedications in epistolary format, serving as prologues for his translations. Perels and Laehr, however, did not succeed in gathering them all: Paolo Chiesa later discovered another one together with a life of Amphilochios (nr. 3 in the catalogue)¹³¹, and also, Walter Berschin discovered a more complete version of the letter accompanying a life of Saint Cyrus and John (nr. 10 in the catalogue).¹³²

¹³¹ P. Chiesa, "Una traduzione inedita di Anastasio Bibliotecario? Le 'vitae' latine di sant'Anfilochio," *Studi medievali* 28 (1987): 879-903.

¹³² W. Berschin, "Bonifatius Consiliarius. Ein römischer Übersetzer in der byzantinischen Epoche des Papsttums," in Albert Lehner and Walter Berschin, ed., *Lateinische Kultur im VIII. Jahrhundert* (St. Ottilien: EOS Verlag, 1990), 25-40.

Nr.	Author	Title	Date	Dedicatee	Oldest Latin ms.
1.	Leontios of Neapolis	<i>Vita Johanni Eleemosynarii</i>	858-862	Pope Nicholas I	Vendôme 213, 10 th century
2.	(Falsely attributed to) Amphilochios of Ikonion	<i>Vita Basilii</i>	858-867	Ursus	Rome, Bibl. Nazionale 1443, 11 th century
3.		<i>Vita Amphilochii</i>	858-868	unknown	Mantova 457, 13 th century
4.		<i>Vita Johanni Calybite</i>	868	Formosus of Porto	Mantova 457, 13 th century
5.		<i>Acta concilii VIII</i>	871	Pope Hadrian II	Vat. Lat. 4965, 9 th century
6.		<i>Acta concilii VII</i>	873	Pope John VIII	Vat. Reg. 1046, 10 th century
7.	Nikephoros, George the Synkellos and Theophanes Confessor	<i>Chronographia tripertita</i>	871-874	John the Deacon	Vat. Palat. lat. 826
8.		<i>Collectanea</i>	874	John the Deacon	BNF lat. 5095
9.		<i>Acta Martini</i>	874	Martin of Narni	BNF lat. 5095
10.	Sophronius of Jerusalem	<i>Narratio miraculorum SS. Cyri et Johannis</i>	875	unknown	Chartres 63, 9 th century
11.	Amphilochios of Ikonion	<i>Sermo super Anna et Symeone</i>	874-875	Landulf of Capua	Karlsruhe, Augiensis LXXX, 10 th century
12.		<i>Translatio Sancti Stephani</i>	874-875	Landulf of Capua	Bern 48, 10 th century

13.		<i>Passio Sancti Petri Alexandrini</i>		Peter of Gabii?	Vat. Lat. 622, 10 th century
14.		<i>Passio sanctorum martyrum in monte Ararat occisorum</i>	876	Peter of Gabii	Bourges BM 122, 11 th century
15.	Maximus Confessor and John of Scythopolis	<i>Scholia</i>	875	Charles the Bald	Berlin Phill. 1668, 9 th century
16.	Maximus Confessor	<i>Mystagogia</i>	875	Charles the Bald	Cambrai BM 711, 9 th century
17.	Germanos I, patriarch of Constantinople	<i>Historia mystica ecclesiae catholicae</i>	875	Charles the Bald	Cambrai BM 711, 9 th century
18.	Nilus	<i>Epistola ad Nemertium</i>	875	Charles the Bald	Cambrai BM 711, 9 th century
19.	Constantine the Philosopher	<i>De inventione reliquiarum S. Clementis</i>	875	Gauderic of Velletri	Lost
20.		<i>Passio et miracula Sancti Demetrii</i>	876	Charles the Bald	BNF lat. 15436, 11 th century
21.		<i>Passio S. Dionysii Areopagitae</i>	876	Charles the Bald	BNF lat. 05569, 11 th century
22.	Theodore of Stoudios	<i>Sermo de sancto Bartholomeo</i>	870-879	Aio of Benevento	Chartres 63, 9 th century
23.	John Moschos CEU eTD Collection	<i>Pratum Spirituale (II/45; IV/63)</i>		John the Deacon?	*cf. L. Castaldi, ed. <i>Iohannes Hymmonides diaconus Romanus Vita Gregorii I papae (BHL 3641-3642). I. La tradizione manoscritta</i> (Florence: Sismel, 2004).

Table 1: The Translations of Anastasius Bibliothecarius

Nr. 1. As indicated in the first letter, between 858-862 Anastasius dedicated to Pope Nicholas I his first hagiographic translation which has come down to us. It is the *Vita Johanni Eleemosynarii* by Leontios of Neapolis. The Greek original (BHG3 886) was critically edited by J. Festugière and L. Rydèn,¹³³ which superseded the *PG* version¹³⁴. The Latin version (*BHL* 4388) still lacks a critical edition, although it is described shortly in another edition of the Greek text by H. Gelzer.¹³⁵ Also, the textual problems of the Latin translation were tackled in a study by Vincent Déroche.¹³⁶ While waiting for the critical edition, it is possible to use the old editions of Migne and of the *AASS*¹³⁷ and consult the short exposition on the textual tradition to be found in the in the *TeTra* 2.¹³⁸

Nr. 2. The *Vita Basilii* (*BHL* 1022), falsely attributed to Amphilochios of Ikonion was probably translated between 858 and 867 and dedicated to a certain Ursus subdeacon, *medicus* of Nicholas I. In printed form it is extant now in *AASS*¹³⁹ and *PL*¹⁴⁰. The textual tradition of the Latin version is presented in the *TeTra* 2.¹⁴¹

Nr. 3. He also translated another text connected to Amphilochios of Ikonion: the *Vita Amphilochii*¹⁴² discovered and published by Paolo Chiesa.¹⁴³ It also has a

¹³³ J. Festugière and L. Rydèn, *Leontios de Neapolis. Vie de Syméon le Fou et Vie de Jean de Chypre* (Paris: Librairie orientaliste Paul Geuthner, 1974), 255-637.

¹³⁴ *PG* 93, 1617-1660.

¹³⁵ H. Gelzer, *Leontios von Neapolis, Leben des heiligen Johannes des Barmherzigen, Erzbischofs von Alexandrien* (Freiburg-Leipzig: Mohr-Siebeck, 1893) XXXV-XL.

¹³⁶ V. Déroche, *Études sur Léontius de Néapolis* (Uppsala: Acta Universitatis Upsalensis, 1995), 73-75.

¹³⁷ *PL* 73, coll. 337-384, *PG* 93, coll. 1613 sqq. and *AASS*. 23 January III, 111 sqq.

¹³⁸ Cf. *TeTra* 2, 87-89.

¹³⁹ 14 Iun. III, 416-436.

¹⁴⁰ *PL* 73, 293 sqq.

¹⁴¹ Cf. *TeTra* 2, 89-92.

¹⁴² The edition is based on one manuscript, Mantova 354, folios 48r-49v, but afterwards the editor discovered a new one, Mantova 457, folios 58v-60r. P. Chiesa, "Una traduzione inedita di

letter of dedication, unfortunately not entirely conserved, so the dedicatory person it can not be identified. Chiesa reasoned that, the text can be dated to approximately between 858-868, that is to say it belongs to the same group as the lives of Basil, John Calybita and John the Almsgiver. The Greek original is BHG 73 a, not yet edited, and extant in three manuscripts.¹⁴⁴

Nr. 4. The *Vita Johanni Calybite* (BHL 4358) has an edition of the Greek original (BHG 868) completed by O. Lampsides¹⁴⁵, replacing the PG edition.¹⁴⁶ The first edition of the Latin text, based on one manuscript¹⁴⁷, was completed by the Bollandist Poncelet.¹⁴⁸ In 2003 Paolo Chiesa completed a critical edition of the Latin version of Anastasius, based on four surviving manuscripts.¹⁴⁹ According to the letter of dedication, it was accomplished in 868 for Formosus, at that time bishop of Porto.

Nr. 5. The next document belongs to another type: it is the **Acta concilii VIII** (Constantinople IV, 869-870). Dedicated to Hadrian II, it was written in 871.

Anastasio Bibliotecario? Le 'vitae' latine di sant'Anfilochio," *Studi medievali* 28 (1987): 879-903. Cf. Also *TeTra* 2, 94-95.

¹⁴³ P. Chiesa, "Traduzioni e traduttori a Roma", in *Roma fra Oriente e Occidente* (Spoleto: CISAM, 2002), 479.

¹⁴⁴ Escorial Ω IV. 32 (M 580), from 1034-1035, ff. 149r-152r, Vat. Barber. 318 (= III. 37), 12-13th centuries, ff. 97v-109v, Paris, Bibl. Nat. Gr. 468 (11th century, incomplete).

¹⁴⁵ O. Lampsides, "Άγιος Ιωάννης ο Καλυβίτης (Άνέκδοτα κείμενα έκ παρισίνων κώδικων)", in *Πλάτων* 16 (1964): 259-303; "Βίος καί πολιτεία άγίου Ιωάννου του Καλυβίτου, λανθάνων εις έλληνικόν παραμύθιον του Πόντου" in *Άρχεϊον εκκλησιαστικού καί κανονικού δικαίου* 19 (1964): 3-17; "Βατικανοί κώδικες περιέχοντες τον βίον άγίου Ιωάννου του Καλυβίτου" in *Άρχεϊον Πόντου* 28 (1966): 3-71.

¹⁴⁶ PG 114, col. 568-582.

¹⁴⁷ Mantua C. IV. 13, n.104, 15th century, fol. 72r-74r.

¹⁴⁸ A. Poncelet, "Vitae s. Iohannis calibytae interpretatio latina auctore Anastasio Bibliothecario," *AB* 15 (1896):257-267.

¹⁴⁹ P. Chiesa, "Le Vitae latine di Giovanni Calibita" in *AB* 121 (2003): 45-102. Cf. also *TeTra* 2, 92-94.

The Greek original has been lost¹⁵⁰, while the Latin version can be read in Mansi¹⁵¹, the same text being also having been reproduced in the *PL*¹⁵². The *Actio V* was critically edited by Claudio Leonardi. His research demonstrates that our earliest testimony (Vat. Lat. 4965, 9th century) was the working manuscript of Anastasius Bibliothecarius. Besides this important discovery, this edition has the merit of containing all the notes of Anastasius Bibliothecarius to his own translation, an exceptional document for studying early medieval translation techniques. While awaiting Leonardi's critical edition - expected soon - one can consult the short presentation on the textual tradition in the *TeTra* 2.¹⁵³

Nr. 6. The *Acta concilii VII* (Nicea II, 787) were dedicated to John VIII in 873. Given the lack of a critical edition, the reader must consult Mansi¹⁵⁴ or the same text reproduced in the *PL*¹⁵⁵. Erich Lamberz is currently preparing the critical edition of the text,¹⁵⁶ Meanwhile he has published a set of studies dealing with the matters related to this text.¹⁵⁷

¹⁵⁰ C. Leonardi, "Anastasio Bibliotecario e l'ottavo concilio ecumenico," *Studi medievali* 8 (1967): 59-192.

¹⁵¹ Mansi 16, 1, col. 1-208.

¹⁵² *PL* 129, col. 9-196.

¹⁵³ Cf. *TeTra* 2, 95-100.

¹⁵⁴ Mansi 12, coll. 81-1154.

¹⁵⁵ *PL* 129, coll. 195-512.

¹⁵⁶ The oldest extant manuscripts of the Latin version are Vat. Reg. 1046 (10th century, Reims), Paris 17339 (10th century, Notre Dame), Vat. 1329 (10th century).

¹⁵⁷ E. Lamberz, "Die Überlieferung und Rezeption des VII. Ökumenischen Konzils (787) in Rom und im Lateinischen Westen," in *Roma fra oriente e occidente*, Settimane 49 (Spoleto: CISAM, 2001), 1053-1099; "Handschriften und Bibliotheken im Spiegel der Akten des VII. Ökumenischen Konzils (787)," in *I manoscritti greci tra riflessione e dibattito*, ed. by Giancarlo Prato (Firenze: Edizioni Gonnelli, 2000), 47-63; "Falsata Graecorum more? Die griechische Version der Briefe Papst Hadrians I. in den Akten des VII. Ökumenischen Konzils," in *Novum Millennium. Studies on Byzantine history and Culture dedicated to Paul Speck*, ed. by Claudia Sode and Sarolta Takács (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2001), 213-230.

Nr. 7. The *Chronographia tripertita*, which combined the respective histories of Nikephoros, George the Synkellos and Theophanes Confessor¹⁵⁸ (in Greek they were conceived as a tripartite chronicle, as they came down in one manuscript), dedicated to Anastasius' friend, John the Deacon, was probably finished around 871-874. A critical edition of both the Greek and the Latin version was prepared by Charles de Boor. An important detail in this edition is that de Boor, as part of his his critical apparatus also edited the translator's notes. Recently however, some new testimonies of the text surfaced, bearing witness to a more widespread use of this translation, than has hitherto been assumed.¹⁵⁹

Nr. 8. The so-called *Collectanea*, dedicated again to John the Deacon in 874, is a group of texts documenting the monothelete controversy. It survives in a single manuscript¹⁶⁰: and most of it was recently edited by Pauline Allen and Bronwen Neil, in both the Greek (where available) and the Latin versions.¹⁶¹ The same material was the subject of the doctoral thesis by Ilaria Bonaccorsi.¹⁶²

Nr. 9. This group contains one document, the *Acta Martini* (BHL 5592-94), which survived, as an independent hagiographic text in another manuscript¹⁶³

¹⁵⁸ C. G. de Boor, *Theophanis Chronographia*, 2 vols. (Leipzig: Teubner, 1885).

¹⁵⁹ Cf. *TeTra* 2, 100-103 and V. Brown, "The Chronographia Tripertita of Anastasius Bibliothecarius: New Fragments in Beneventan Script at Altamura and Matera," *Altamura*, 35 (1993): 131-140.

¹⁶⁰ Paris BNF 5095, 9th century.

¹⁶¹ P. Allen and B. Neil, ed., *Scripta saeculi 7. vitam Maximi Confessoris illustrantia: una cum latina interpretatione Anastasii Bibliothecarii iuxta posita*, Corpus Christianorum Series Graeca 39 (Turnhout: Brepols - Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1999); B. Neil, *Seventh Century Popes and Martyrs. The Political Hagiography of Anastasius Bibliothecarius* (Turnhout: Brepols, 2006).

¹⁶² I. Bonaccorsi, *La crisi monotelita e il culto di Martino I papa in Occidente: la traduzione dei Collectanea di Anastasio bibliotecario* (PhD thesis, University of Rome La Sapienza, 2004).

¹⁶³ Vallicelliana IX, ff. 166r-173r, 11th-12th centuries.

published by Bronwen Neil.¹⁶⁴ The whole group of this monothelite documentation can be found in *PL*.¹⁶⁵

Nr. 10. Then comes a text where dedicatee cannot be identified because of the lacunae in the badly damaged manuscript in which it survived.¹⁶⁶ The letter was issued on 30 January 875 and it was concerned with the Latin version of *Narratio miraculorum SS. Cyri et Johannis*, by Sophronios of Jerusalem (*BHL* 2077). In the catalogue of the hagiographic manuscripts of Chartres, there is also an appendix containing the edition of the prologue of the vita¹⁶⁷ and part of the dedication can also be found in the *PL*.¹⁶⁸ Both the Latin version of Anastasius and the Greek original (*BHG* 469) are extant in the *PG*.¹⁶⁹

Nr. 11. The *Sermo super Anna et Symeone* of Amphilochios of Ikonion, mentioned in the dedicatory letter of the *Translatio Stephani* has been amply discussed by Mathilde Cupiccia.¹⁷⁰ It may be found in a single manuscript, recently edited by A. P. Orbàn¹⁷¹. The Greek text was edited by F. Datema, who presented also the Latin version in parallel.¹⁷²

¹⁶⁴ B. Neil, *Seventh Century Popes and Martyrs*.

¹⁶⁵ *PL* 129, 585 sqq.

¹⁶⁶ Chartres 63, ff. 64r-72v, manuscript based on which Perels and Laehr edited the letter; in 1990 Walter Berschin published a better one, based on the manuscript Montpellier H 360, ff. 113r-113v, still truncated. See W. Berschin, "Bonifatius Consiliarius. Ein römischer Übersetzer in der byzantinischen Epoche des Papsttums," in A. Lehner and W. Berschin, ed., *Lateinische Kultur im VIII. Jahrhundert* (St. Ottilien: EOS Verlag, 1990), 25-40.

¹⁶⁷ "Catalogus Codicum Hagiographicorum Bibliothecae Civitatis Carnotensis", *AB* 8 (1889): 86-208, at pages 95-96: *Appendix ad cod. 63 - Initium prologi ad vitam S. Cyri*.

¹⁶⁸ *PL* 129, 703-706.

¹⁶⁹ *PG* 87,3 (3677-3689).

¹⁷⁰ M. Cupiccia, Anastasio Bibliotecario traduttore delle omelie di Reichenau (Aug LXXX)? *Filologia Mediolatina* 10 (2003): 41-102.

¹⁷¹ A. P. Orbàn, *Sermones in dormitionem Mariae. Sermones patrum graecorum praesertim in dormitionem assumptionemque beatae Mariae virginis in Latinum translati, ex codice Augiensi LXXX (saec. IX)*, *Corpus Christianorum Continuatio Medievalis* 154 (Turnhout: Brepols, 2000), 75-91.

¹⁷² F. Datema, *Amphilochius Iconensis Opera*, *Corpus Christianorum Series Graeca* 3 (Turnhout: Brepols, 1978), 11-73.

Nr. 12. The *Translatio Sancti Stephani* (BHL 7857-7858), describing the transfer of the saint's remains from Jerusalem to Constantinople, was dedicated to bishop Landulf of Capua around 874-875, together with the aforementioned Amphilochian sermons. It is again a text without critical edition, although it can be found in *PL*¹⁷³.

Nr. 13. The *Passio Sancti Petri Alexandrini* has a good critical edition by the Bollandist Paul Devos, including both the Greek (BHG3 1502a)¹⁷⁴ and the Latin (BHL 6698b) versions.¹⁷⁵ There may have been a letter of dedication to Peter, bishop of Gabii, which has now been lost.

Nr. 14. We know of the possible existence of this text from another letter dedicated to Peter of Gabii, the one accompanying the translation of the *Passio sanctorum martyrum in monte Ararat occisorum* (BHL 20 and 20a) and dated before July 876. This is still lacking a critical edition, but one can find a Latin version in the *AASS*¹⁷⁶ as well as in *PL*¹⁷⁷. According to the Bollandists *BHL* online, the Latin text survived in approximately thirty manuscripts, while unfortunately no trace of the Greek original has been found.

¹⁷³ *PL* 41, 817 sqq. It is extant in several manuscripts: the most important ones mentioned in the *MGH* are Bern 48 (10th century), f. 124, Paris lat. 12606 (12th century), f. 54 sqq., Casanat. Lat. 463 (13th century) ff. 79r-83v. The online BHL [<http://bhlms.fltr.ucl.ac.be/>] by now contains a much longer list, in which more than twenty manuscripts are compressed.

¹⁷⁴ P. Devos, "Un passion grecque inédite de s. Pierre d'Alexandrie et sa traduction par Anastase le Bibliothecaire," *AB* 83 (1965): 157-187.

¹⁷⁵ Based on Douai Abbey fol. 241-249v (11th century), Paris gr. 1537, fol. 139-143v (11th century) for the Greek, and Vat. Lat. 622, fol. 114-117 (10th century), Vallicelliana IX, fol. 206v-210 (11th century) for the Latin.

¹⁷⁶ *AASS*. 22 Iun., vol. 5, 157 sqq.

¹⁷⁷ *PL* 129, col. 743 sqq.

Nr. 15. One of his most famous achievements was the translation of the *Scholia* of Maximus Confessor and John of Scythopolis to the works of Pseudo-Dionysius the Areopagite. Notwithstanding its importance, the text lacks a critical edition in either language, although such edition is to be expected from Beate Regina Suchla (the entire Latin corpus) and from Matilde Cupiccia (*Ecclesiastical Hierarchy*). It is of crucial importance for our purposes also because the text again contains the notes from Anastasius. A fairly comprehensive list of manuscripts was recently prepared by E. S. Mainoldi for the *Te.Tra2*.¹⁷⁸ For the Greek text that lacks a proper edition, the reader has to go to the *PG*.¹⁷⁹ According to the dating of the dedication letter addressed to Charles the Bald, the translation was accomplished at the latest by 875 March 23.

The following group was also dedicated to Charles the Bald, in the same year of 875, and it is concerned with Byzantine liturgical treatises: the *Mystagogia* written by Maximus Confessor (**Nr. 16.**) and the *Historia mystica ecclesiae catholicae* by Saint Germanos I, patriarch of Constantinople (**Nr. 17.**). As far as the Latin texts are concerned, there exists a critical edition prepared by S. Pétridès.¹⁸⁰ According to Petrides, both are only extracts of the originals, most probably already produced in a Byzantine milieu. Again it is a valuable text for the purposes of this research in that it contains the marginal notes of the translator. The Cambrai manuscript has also an *Epistola Sancti Nili* to

¹⁷⁸ E. S. Mainoldi, "Versio operum Dionysii Areopagitae (ante 860-864; revisione: 864-866)," in *TeTra. 2.*, 244-251. The manuscripts in which these notes are the best conserved, are the Paris BNF 1618 (11th century), Florence Laurent. Plut. 89 sup. 15 (10-11th centuries) and Berlin Phill. 1668 (9th century).

¹⁷⁹ *PG* 4, col. 15-432, and 527-276.

¹⁸⁰ S. Pétridès, "Traité liturgiques de S. Maxime et de S. Germain traduits par Anastase le bibliothécaire," *Revue de l'Orient Chrétien* 10 (1905): 289-313, 350-364. The edition is based on two manuscripts: Cambrai Bibl. Municip. 711 and Paris BNF 18556, both from the late ninth century.

Nemertius (Nr. 18) – the Greek original is so far unknown. The two other Greek texts have been studied and edited by Frank Brightmann and Nilo Borgia,¹⁸¹ suspending the *PG* version¹⁸².

Nr. 19. Letter 15, addressed sometime after March 875 to Gauderic, bishop of Velletri, has as subject a text which has been lost in translation: the *De inventione reliquiarum S. Clementis* by Constantine the Philosopher (*BHL* 2184). Only the dedication letter has been conserved.¹⁸³ It was most probably used by Gauderic in completing his *Life of Saint Clement* (in its turn left incomplete and finished later by Leo of Ostia).¹⁸⁴

Nr. 20. On 25 March 876, Anastasius dedicated a hagiographic text, the *Passio et miracula Sancti Demetrii* (*BHL* 2122) to Charles the Bald. Of all the Greek writings concerned with the life of Saint Demetrius, this is probably the oldest surviving, serving both as a source for Anastasius' translation and for Photios' version in his *Bibliotheca*. The passion was critically edited in 1909 by Hippolyte Delehaye, based on two Greek manuscripts, while the miracles were edited by Paul Lemerle in 1979.¹⁸⁵ The Latin version is extant in several manuscripts and

¹⁸¹ Frank E. Brightman, "The *Historia Mystagogica* and other Greek Commentaries on the Byzantine Liturgy," in *Journal of Theological Studies* 9 (1908), 248-267, 387-397; Nilo Borgia, "La exegesis di S. Germano e la versione latina di Anastasio Bibliotecario," in *Roma e l'Oriente* 2 (1911), 144-156, 219-228, 286-296, 346-354.

¹⁸² *PG* 101, col. 701 sqq. and *PG* 108, col. 383 sqq

¹⁸³ In a manuscript from Lisbon: Bibl. Nacional 342 – a miscellanea about St. Clement.

¹⁸⁴ See G. Orlandi, G. (ed.), *Iohannis Hymmonidis et Gauderici Veliterni Leoni Ostiensis Excerpta ex Clementinis recognitionibus a Tyrannio Rufino translatis* (Milano: Istituto Editoriale Cisalpino, 1968).

¹⁸⁵ H. Delehaye, *Les Légendes grecques des Saints Militaires* (Paris: Librairie Alphonse Picard et Fils, 1909); P. Lemerle, *Les plus anciens recueils des miracles de Saint Démétrius et la pénétration des slaves dans les Balkans* (Paris: Éditions du Centre National de la recherche scientifique, 1979).

two redactions. There is not yet a critical edition of it, but one can find it in both AASS and Migne's PG.¹⁸⁶

Nr. 21. The *Passio S. Dionysii Areopagitae* (BHL 2184) was dedicated to Charles the Bald in June 876. The literary history of this text is rather complicated, but has been adeptly traced by P. G. Théry.¹⁸⁷ According to him, Anastasius' translation was based on the Greek text entitled μετὰ τὴν μακαρίαν (BHG 554), printed in PG¹⁸⁸, attributed to Methodios of Constantinople. This text was in turn a translation of the so-called *Post beatam et gloriosam* (BHL 2178), to be found in the AASS¹⁸⁹ and PL.¹⁹⁰ It is a text based on Hilduin's previous Latin versions, the *Libellus antiquissimus* - composed in 835, constituting Hilduin's first formulation of the areopagitic thesis (the identification of the three characters: the disciple of Saint Paul, the mystical writer and the patron saint of Saint Denis), extant now in PL¹⁹¹. The critical edition of both the Greek and Latin texts was prepared by J. C. Westerbrink.¹⁹²

Nr. 22. The *Sermo de sancto Bartholomeo* (BHL 1004) of Theodore of Stoudios, dedicated to Aio, bishop of Benevento sometime between 870-879 has a good critical edition with commentary prepared by Ulla Westerbergh containing both the Latin and the Greek texts,¹⁹³ To the latter, Ilaria Bonaccorsi later added

¹⁸⁶ Passio: AASS Oct. vol. 4, 87-89; PG 116, 1167-1171; Miracula: Greek: liber 1: AASS Oct. vol. 4, 1203-1324 liber 2: 1326-1384. Latin: PL 129, 717-726.

¹⁸⁷ P. G. Théry. "Contribution a l'histoire de l'aréopagitisme au IXe siècle" *Le Moyen Âge* 25 (1923): 111- 153.

¹⁸⁸ PG 4, 669-684

¹⁸⁹ AASS., Oct. IV, 792-794.

¹⁹⁰ PL 129, 737 sqq.

¹⁹¹ PL 106, col. 40 sqq.

¹⁹² J. C. Westerbrink, *Passio S. Dionysii Areopagitae Rusticii et Eleutherii* (Alphen A. D. Rijn: C. Haasbeek, 1937).

¹⁹³ Ulla Westerbergh, ed, *Anastasius Bibliothecarius, Sermo Theodori Studitae de Sancto Bartholomeo apostolo*, *Studia Latina Stockholmiensia* 9 (Stockholm: Almqvist&Wiksell, 1963). While tracing

more Latin manuscripts to her collation in her MA thesis.¹⁹⁴ The text is also extant in the *PL*¹⁹⁵ and the *AASS*¹⁹⁶.

Nr. 23. Another hagiographical translation of Anastasius, which was not independently circulated, are fragments from the **Pratum Spirituale** of John Moschos: two chapters on Gregory the Great (nr. 23 in the catalogue) were included in the *Life of Saint Gregory* written by Anastasius' friend John the Deacon (*BHL* 3641-3642). There is no critical edition yet, but there is a good survey of the extant manuscripts, as a preliminary study for a critical edition of the entire *Vita Gregorii*.¹⁹⁷ The Latin and the Greek versions are both available in the *PL* and the *PG* respectively.¹⁹⁸

EXCURSUS: HIS OWN WORKS

Anastasius was not only a translator: I have already mentioned his dedication letters. In addition to these letters, he also drafted papal and imperial letters: the letters related to the foreign affairs of Emperor Louis II and of the Popes Nicholas I, Hadrian II, John VIII. Moreover, although as author of the entire

back the different versions of the text, she identified three manuscripts as testimonies of the original version: Chartres 63, fol. 73v-80, from the 9th century (destroyed in the Second World War), Orléans, Bibl. Municip. 175 (152), p. 151-153, 162-164 (10th century) and Vat. Reg. 466, f. 23 (truncated), from the 11th century and Vat. Reg. 493, ff. 36v-41v (11th century). The most important Greek manuscripts are Messina, San Salvatore 29, fol. 233r-235v (from 1307), Vat. Graec. 1989, fol. 238r-241v (12th century) and Paris BNF 1470 (olim Colbertinus 340), ff. 209v-214r (from 890).

¹⁹⁴ I. Bonaccorsi, *Il sermo de S. Bartholomeo apostolo, interprete Anastasio Bibliothecario: tradizione manoscritta e culto cittadino nei secoli IX – XI* (BA thesis, University of Rome La Sapienza, 1998).

¹⁹⁵ *PL* 129, 729 sqq.

¹⁹⁶ *AASS*. 25 Aug. V, 39 sqq

¹⁹⁷ *Iohannes Hymmonides diaconus Romanus. Vita Gregorii I Papae. I. La tradizione manoscritta*, ed. by Lucia Castaldi (Firenze: SISMEL, 2004).

¹⁹⁸ *Vita Gregorii*, II, 45, IV. 63: *PL* 75, col. 106B-D 213C-D; John Moschos, *Pratum Spirituale*, ch. 192, *PG* 87,3, col. 3072, chapter 151, 3016-3017.

Liber Pontificalis he is by now discredited,¹⁹⁹ scholars argue that he might have been the second editor of the *Life of Nicholas I*, and thus the one responsible for chapters 19-20, 21-35, 38-42, part of 43, 44-50, 55-57, 58-63, 64, 68-76, perhaps 77-78, and part of 83, that is to say all in all 60 percent of the whole text.²⁰⁰

There is also a treatise called *De episcoporum transmigracione* in a manuscript of the Bibliotheca Vallicelliana (tomus XVIII), a collection of texts compiled to sustain the argument of the translation of bishops from one see to another. J. P. Pozzi, the editor of the text argues for the authorship of Anastasius Bibliothecarius, an identification that has been more or less accepted by the scholarly community.²⁰¹

¹⁹⁹ Arnaldi, G. "Come nacque la attribuzione ad Anastasio del *Liber pontificalis*." *Bullettino dell'Istituto storico italiano per il Medio evo e Archivio muratoriano*, 75 (1963): 321-344.

²⁰⁰ R. Davis, ed., *The Lives of the Ninth-Century Popes (Liber Pontificalis)* (Liverpool: Liverpool University Press, 1995), 189. He acknowledges the two editors, but as second editor he seems to prefer John the Deacon to Anastasius.

²⁰¹ J. P. Pozzi, "Le manuscrit tomus XVIIIus de la Vallicelliana et le libelle De episcoporum transmigracione et quod non temere judicentur regule quadraginta quattuor," *Apollinaris* 31 (1958): 313-350. Cf. also S. Lindemans, "Auxilius et le manuscrit Vallicellan Tome XVIII" *Revue d'Histoire Ecclésiastique* 57,2 (1962): 470-484 – he dates the work to the end of 871.

GENRES AND AUTHORS

Although the exact date cannot be assigned to many of Anastasius' translations, some approximate stages in the translation activity can be delineated. In the initial years of his service during the papacy of Nicholas I, Anastasius focused mainly on hagiography, in particular lives of church leaders. At this stage in his career he translated the life of John the Almsgiver (nr. 1 in the catalogue), Basil of Cesarea (nr. 2 in the catalogue), Amphilochios of Ikonion (nr. 3 in the catalogue), perhaps also Peter of Alexandria (nr. 13 in the catalogue).²⁰² The centre of his attention changes as his involvement in contemporary papal politics deepens: as a result of this he completed in 871, for Hadrian II the translation of the eighth ecumenical council, in which he himself had taken part (nr. 5 in the catalogue). This was followed by similarly serious enterprises, the translation of the 7th ecumenical council, finished in 873 (already during the pontificate of John VIII – nr. 6 in the catalogue). Between the years 871-874 he carried out two other huge projects, the translation of the *Collectanea*, a dossier about the monothelete conflict (that is to say, the subject of the sixth ecumenical council, nr. 8 in the catalogue) and of the *Chronographia tripertita* (nr. 7 in the catalogue). Then another series of hagiographical texts followed, all carried out before 876: the life of Saint Cyrus and John (nr. 10 in the catalogue), the passion of the martyrs of the Ararat (nr. 14 in the catalogue), sermons of Amphilochios on Anna and Simeon (nr. 11 in the catalogue), a sermon on Saint Bartholomew (nr. 22 in the catalogue), and the story of the discovery of the relics of Saint Clement (now lost, nr. 19 in the catalogue). Also from this period come the passions of Saint Demetrius (nr. 20 in the catalogue) and Dionysius (nr. 21 in

²⁰² An exception to this rule is the life of John the Calybite (nr. 4 in the catalogue), as it does not follow this model, although it dates to this period.

the catalogue), addressed to Charles the Bald. If the list thus far can be reasonably defined as governed by interest in historical texts (i.e. church history as represented by chronicles, hagiography and council acts) the remaining other two works have a of theological-liturgical character: the scholia to the *Corpus Dionysiacum* (nr. 15 in the catalogue) and the collection of liturgical commentaries of Maximus the Confessor and Germanos I, patriarch of Constantinople (nr. 16 and 17 in the catalogue).

From this sketch one can see that Anastasius' activity consisted of different periods with different foci and different weights. The peak of his work were the five years when he carried out the rendition of the councils (nr. 5 and 6 in the catalogue), the *Collectanea* (nr. 8 in the catalogue) and the *Chronographia tripartita* (nr. 7 in the catalogue), thus enriching the papal library with documents of great historical importance as far as doctrinal and church historical issues are concerned.

But the significance of hagiographical works should not be underestimated either. The models of sainthood he propagated are church leaders, bishops, popes, and, of course, martyrs. They may have served possible multiple functions: beyond being a perfect means to educate society, to transmit the ideals of a Christian elite, they also served as ideological foundations for created traditions: for example the passions of martyred pontiffs were aimed at strengthening the image of the pope as a champion of orthodoxy. It is with Anastasius and John the Deacon, that the stagnation of the Roman hagiography comes to an end, and interests turn from martyrs (still very well represented in his translations) to other models of sainthood, in particular figures which could strengthen the image of Rome and the papacy: this would explain his predilection for Roman saints (Acacius, the Roman soldier leader of the martyrs of the Ararat; Popes Clement and Martin) and to church leaders (besides the

aforementioned popes, the bishops Basil and Amphilochios, and the patriarchs John the Almsgiver of Alexandria and Peter of Alexandria).²⁰³

But besides these literary models, it is worth investigating the list of Greek authors he propagated. I suggest that such an approach can cast some light on the papal librarian's political orientation and perhaps also on the origins of some of his Greek materials.

The timeframe of his authors' life-span (apart from Amphilochios, Basil of Caesarea and John of Scythopolis), ranges from the seventh to the early ninth century, that is to say from the rise of the apologetic literature²⁰⁴ to Anastasius' near contemporaries. Also, many of his authors were connected with each other: they comprised groups of friends, or masters and students, similarly to the little faction of Leontios of Neapolis, Sophronios of Jerusalem, John Moschos and Maximus Confessor.

Since Anastasius was concerned mainly with Byzantine authors, only two of the Cappadocian fathers from late antique times captured Anastasius' interest and only in a very restricted way: he showed more interest in the lives of the Greek Church fathers, than in their writings.²⁰⁵ He translated a life of Basil (nr. 2 in the catalogue), then wrongly attributed to Amphilochios and the life of the same Amphilochios (nr. 3 in the catalogue), as well as some of his sermons (nr. 11 in

²⁰³ Cf. C. Leonardi, "L'agiografia romana nel secolo IX," In *Hagiographie, cultures et sociétés, IVe-XIIIe siècles* (Paris: Institut d'Études Augustiniennes, 1981); Idem, "Anastasio Bibliothecario e le traduzioni dal Greco nella Roma altomedievale," *The Sacred Nectar of the Greeks*, ed. by M. Herren (London: King's College, 1988).

²⁰⁴ A. Cameron, "New Themes and Styles in Greek Literature: Seventh-Eighth Centuries," in *The Byzantine and Early Islamic Near East. I. Problems in the Literary Source Material*, ed. by A. Cameron and L. I. Conrad (Princeton: The Darwin Press, 1992).

²⁰⁵ Whether this is a preference or a result of his limited linguistic capacities, it is hard to tell. The fact is that – no matter what was the result in terms of intelligibility – he did not get discouraged when he needed to translate various patristic quotes occurring in council acts.

the catalogue). He also seems to have known the epitaph of Basil written by Gregory of Nazianzen, since he devoted a paragraph of his dedication letter to the issue of the differences between Amphilochios' and Gregory's funerary discourse on Basil.²⁰⁶ This text²⁰⁷ had no Latin translation until the Renaissance (in Rufinus' translation of some of Gregory's speeches this one is not included), thus Anastasius presumably consulted the original somewhere.

The group of Constantinopolitan authors comprises in the first place the three historians of the *Chronographia tripartita*: Nikephoros, patriarch of Constantinople, up to 829, a fervent iconodule, looking to Rome for support in his fight against the iconoclasts; George the Synkellos, an erudite Greek monk from the end of the eighth, beginning of the ninth century; and Theophanes Confessor, a Constantinopolitan monk who lived at the turn of the century, known for his iconodule beliefs, something also reflected in his historical work. Another patriarch of Constantinople translated by Anastasius was Germanos I, patriarch of Constantinople from the beginning of the eighth century (715-730), deposed by Leo III (717-741) to be replaced by the iconoclast patriarch Anastasios (730-754). Also, the patriarch Methodios (843-847), allegedly the author of the Dionysian passion-story translated by Anastasius and an iconodule persecuted by the iconoclast government, spent some years in Rome at the beginning of the ninth century (between 815-821). The fact that he was the biographer of Theophanes Confessor is also relevant from our point of view. Theodore of Stoudios, reformer of the cenobitic community of the Stoudios monastery in Constantinople at the turn of the eighth-ninth centuries was another iconodule from Constantinople. He created an independent monastic organization to resist imperial coercion. In his conflicts with the Byzantine

²⁰⁶ Anastasius, *Epistolae* 400, 5-10.

imperial authority he often turned to Rome, whose primacy he fervently proclaimed in his writings.²⁰⁸ He corresponded with Popes Leo III²⁰⁹ and Paschal I.²¹⁰ It is reasonable to conjecture that Anastasius, head of the papal chancellery, had occasion to read Theodore's letters addressed to the popes, and was aware of his opinions. This is especially the case, because his philo-Roman attitude is seen by Anastasius as a virtue, when he profiled him in his dedicatory letter:

Qui cum semper in apostolicae sedis communione persisteret et hereticorum
nenias et imperatorum vesaniam etiam tormentis affectus mentis virtute
repressit.²¹¹

Then there was another group of writers from the former eastern provinces of Byzantium. The first of these in chronological order is John of Scythopolis, sixth century bishop in the Palestine city of Scythopolis, who was known for his fervent fight against another oriental heresy, the monophysitism. His doctrinal position is also identifiable in his glosses to the *Corpus Dionysiacum*.

To this group belong the eastern hagiographers Leontios of Neapolis, Sophronios of Jerusalem and John Moschos. Leontios was a seventh century hagiographer from Cyprus and bishop of Neapolis. He is known mainly for his lives of John the Almsgiver (nr. 1 in the catalogue) and Symeon of Emesa.²¹²

John Moschos, roughly his contemporary, was a hagiographer monk from Cilicia and the author of the *Pratum spirituale*, a successful collection of anecdotes about monks and hermits. Sophronios, seventh century patriarch of Jerusalem, was his student. According to the life of John (the prologue to the

²⁰⁷ *Oratio* 43 (BHG 3010 – PG 35-36, col. 12-664, Gregory's orationes).

²⁰⁸ Joseph Gill, "St. Theodore the Studite against the Papacy?" *Byzantinische Forschungen* 1 (1966): 115-123, at pages 116-117.

²⁰⁹ PG 99, 1017-1028, liber I, *Letter*. 33 and 34.

²¹⁰ PG 99, 1151-1156, liber II, *Letter* 12, 13.

²¹¹ Anastasius, *Epistolae* 442, 9-11.

²¹² Cf. *ODB* II, 1213-1214.

Pratum Spirituale), in 614, after the Persian invasion to Syria and the conquest of Jerusalem, he travelled to Rome, accompanied by Sophronios. There is no further information about this trip, but scholars tend to accept it as historically valid.²¹³ Presumably Rome was the city where John composed his hagiographical oeuvre, too.

In his turn, Sophronios was the teacher of another of Anastasius' favourite authors, Maximus Confessor, himself a monk from Palestine, arriving in Rome (in the monastery of St. Sabas) in 645-646, to become one of the chief actors during the Lateran synod of 649. Supporter of Pope Martin I, an energetic fighter against monothelism, he had been part of the entourage of Sophronios of Jerusalem in his youth. The church of Jerusalem left a long lasting cultural imprint on Rome during the monothelite controversy when numerous members of the Palestinian monastic community were seeking refuge in the West.²¹⁴

What is the immediate impression one has about these short profiles? That when Anastasius considered Greek literature worthy of translation, he selected authors who in one way or another had distinguished themselves in fighting Byzantine imperial heresies (monothelism, iconoclasm)– that is to say, the internal resistance from the Byzantine theological scene, whether from Constantinople itself or from the eastern provinces of the empire, overrun by the Arabs (Syria, Palestine, Egypt). Also, many of his characters are somehow connected to Rome – either by their actual physical presence in Rome, or through their connections. This might imply that the source of Anastasius'

²¹³ H. Chadwick, "John Moschus and His Friend Sophronios the Sophist" *The Journal of Theological Studies* 25 (1974): 41-74, at page 58. He also affirms that "Moschus' purpose in writing the Meadow is not merely to edify but to vindicate the bitterly controverted ecumenical council [Chalcedon, that is]. The ultimate objective of his work is the same as that of Sophronius' Miracles of Saint Cyrus and Saint John." *Ibidem*, 71.

Greek material was from Rome itself rather than Constantinople or any other Byzantine city. For example, Constantine/Cyril, the converter of the Slavs, during his years in Rome, was a good friend of Anastasius, and more than once provided him with texts. Anastasius translated his account of the discovery of Clement's relics (nr. 19 in the catalogue), but his name also occurs in connection with the passion of Dionysius (nr. 15 in the catalogue).²¹⁵

Thus, from this survey it seems that his translations were the result of a conscious filtering of contemporary Greek literature based on various geopolitical criteria. It can be further argued, that it is most probably, that what he left untranslated from the Greek literary production, was rather the result of a 'cultural forgetting'²¹⁶ as opposed to a lack of manuscripts or the impact of any other external factor. He attempted to initiate a canonization process which goes together with a decanonization, privileging texts over other texts. For such an argument, of course, it would be difficult to present evidence other than its convincing intrinsic plausibility. However, in this respect I would consider several instances in Anastasius' correspondence, where, upon recommending his own work, he attempted to obliterate other texts, be they either earlier translations (such as the previous rendering of the text of Nicea II) or only similar documents from the same genre he was dedicating. One might consider the slightly disapproving hint concerning the production of liturgical documents among the Carolingians,²¹⁷ or the criticism of the accuracy of the

²¹⁴ Cf. also C. Vircillo-Franklin, *The Latin Dossier of Anastasius the Persian*, 70-86.

²¹⁵ In addition to these examples, one might infer that he had some kind of role in acquiring for Anastasius the passion of Demetrius, patron saint of Thessaloniki, his native city.

²¹⁶ Goldhill defines 'cultural forgetting' as "the opposite of 'cultural memory', as it were – to sum up how a nexus of social, intellectual, personal and institutional interests work to refashion and to silence the authors and passions and comprehensions of the past." Goldhill, *Who Needs Greek?*, 299.

²¹⁷ *Quamvis autem hinc et Latine quaedam scripisse quosdam audierim, ego tamen, quia illa non vidi, haec interim Latino danda sermoni conspexi. Cui ergo utraque placent, utraque*

Historia tripartita, while presenting his *Chronographia tripartita* (nr. 7 in the catalogue)²¹⁸. All in all, what I see here is a strong filter, even censure, on Byzantine literature in harmony with the theological directions represented by pontifical doctrines.

relegat; cui vero minus utraque placuerint, legat potius, quod elegerit, dummodo ad indaganda tantorum mysteriorum medulla non torpeat. Anastasius, *Epistolae*, 435, 16-18.

²¹⁸ An opinion echoing that of Gregory the Great, who affirms in one of his letters: "In historia autem Sozomeni de quodam Eudoxio qui Constantinopolitanae ecclesiae episcopatum arripuisse dicitur, aliqua narrantur. Sed ipsam quoque historiam sedes apostolica suscipere recusat, quoniam multa mentitur et Theodorum Momsuestiae nimium laudat atque usque ad diem obitus sui magnum doctorem ecclesiae fuisse perhibet. Restat ergo, ut, si quis illam historiam recipit, et synodo quae piae memoriae Iustiniani temporibus de tribus capitula facta est, contradicat. Qui vero huic contradicere non valet, illam historiam necesse est ut repellat." *MGH Epistolarum Tomus I, Gregorii Papae registrum epistolarum I*, ed. P. Ewald and L. M. Hartmann (Berlin: Weidmann, 1891), 479. Cf. A. Momigliano, *The Classical Foundations of Modern Historiography* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1990), 147.

COMPOSITION AND LAYOUT

Anastasius' translations, as mentioned above, comprise a few genres of writing. Among these, several are in the form of collections. This might have applied to most of his hagiographical translations, too, but it would be difficult to argue about their original layout sine the majority of these texts survive in later legendaries. Thus it is not possible to say anything about the way they were initially organized whether in Greek or Latin.²¹⁹ The same holds true for his translation of different sermons. Council acts, even if they circulated as independent works, translated at different times and dedicated to different persons, can be considered a 'virtual collection', or a sort of a series, as it was Anastasius' concern to provide the papacy with a full collection of council acts preserved in Greek. It is stated in his dedicatory letters that he attempted a comprehensive survey of theological disputes and controversies, starting from the eighth ecumenical council (nr. 5 in the catalogue), in which he himself had taken part, moving backwards to the seventh ecumenical council (nr. 6 in the catalogue),²²⁰ At the end of the series comes the *Collectanea*, a dossier pertaining to the monothelete controversy, the focus of the sixth ecumenical council (nr. 8 in the catalogue). This latter, however, is a veritable collection in itself, a compilation of various documents pertaining to the monothelete controversy, the theological-political polemic about Christ's will which divided East and West and Byzantium internally in the seventh century. The translation was

²¹⁹ C. Viricillo-Franklin, *Hagiographic Translations in the Early Middle Ages (7th-10th centuries)* in J. Hamesse (ed.), *Les traducteurs au travail: leurs manuscrits et leurs methods* (Turnhout: Brepols, 2001), 1-18. Concerning possible Anastasian hagiographical collections see P. Chiesa, *Traduzioni e traduttori a Roma nell'alto Medioevo*, in *Roma fra Oriente e Occidente* (Spoleto: CISAM, 2002), 470-471.

²²⁰ *Nam nulla ratione octava dicitur vel teneri poterit, ubi septima non habetur.* Anastasius, *Epistolae*, 416.

intended to supply John the Deacon with sources for his planned, but never accomplished ecclesiastical history.

John the Deacon,²²¹ friend and collaborator of Anastasius, was a papal official during the papacy of Hadrian II and John VIII. Apart from rewriting the *Cena Cypriani*, he is known for two hagiographical works: the life of Gregory the Great,²²² and the life of Saint Clement (finished, after his death, by Gauderic of Velletri).²²³ Anastasius and John the Deacon were the two main pillars of the cultural life at the papal court of the ninth century. As G. Arnaldi affirms, whenever their team became involved in a literary project, it always had good reasons for it.²²⁴ They were both papal officials, and from their works a careful design of the grandiose past and future of the papacy is transparent: lives of popes, documents touching upon the history of the church and the papacy in particular were in the focus of their attention. The great church history of John, for which Anastasius translated the *Collectanea* (nr. 8 in the catalogue) and the *Chronographia Tripertita* (nr. 7 in the catalogue) is not their only common project. Anastasius probably translated Greek fragments from the *Pratum Spirituale* of John Moschos (nr. 23 in the catalogue) for him, to be incorporated into John's work on the life of Gregory the Great.²²⁵

²²¹ For John the Deacon and his role in the cultural developments of 9th century Rome see G. Arnaldi, "Giovanni Immonide e la cultura a Roma al tempo di Giovanni VIII," in *Bullettino dell'Istituto Storico Italiano per il Medio Evo e Archivio Muratoriano* 68 (1956): 33-89; Idem, "G. Immonide e la cultura a Roma al tempo di Giovanni VIII: una retractatio," in G. Cavallo and G. Arnaldi (ed.), *Europa medievale e mondo bizantino* (Roma: Istituto storico italiano per il Medio Evo, 1997). 163-177; F. Bertini, *Giovanni Immonide e la cultura a Roma nel secolo IX*, in *Roma nell'alto medioevo* (Spoleto: CISAM, 2001), 897-919 ; P. Chiesa, "Giovanni Diacono," in *DBI*. 56 (Roma: Istituto della Enciclopedia Italiana, 2001), 4-7.

²²² *PL* 75, 59-242.

²²³ G. Orlandi (ed.), *Excerpta ex Clementinis recognitionibus a Tyrannio Rufino translatis* (Milano: Istituto Editoriale Cisalpino, 1968).

²²⁴ See G. Arnaldi, "Giovanni Immonide," 37.

²²⁵ See *Vita Gregorii Magni*, II, 45 and IV, 63 (*PL* 75, col. 106, 213).

The *Collectanea* (nr. 8 in the catalogue) focuses on several of the main characters in the controversy, Greeks and Latins alike: popes Honorius and Martin I, and Maximus Confessor with his companions. In it are collected the writings of popes John IV (640-642), Theodore I (642-649), Martin I (649-655), Maximus Confessor (c. 580-662), Anastasius Apocrisiarius (d. 662), Anastasius the Disciple (d. 662) and Theodore Spoudeus (fl. 665). Only one manuscript from the ninth century (BNF lat. 5095), originating from Laon It has survived. A distinct part of the material, the *Acta Martini* (nr. 9 in the catalogue) - together with a dedicatory letter to Martin, bishop of Narni - also survived in an eleventh century passionary written in Beneventan script (Vallicelliana IX, ff. 166r-173r). The *Collectanea* (nr. 8 in the catalogue) contains several distinct pieces of writing: hagiographical texts, letters, and sermon fragments, all documenting the monothelete controversy. Since there are so many layers within this one collection, and since not all the dossier's Greek equivalent has survived, it is difficult to tell the extent to which Anastasius was responsible for setting it up as a whole. In the seventh century, during the time of the polemics, many monks fled Constantinople and took refuge in Rome.²²⁶ The circulation of some of these documents in Rome can most probably be connected with these monks. Whatever the case, at least three main sections can be distinguished within the body of Anastasius' work: documents concerning Popes Honorius and Theodore I, then a dossier of Martin I, and finally the texts focusing on Maximus Confessor. Each group constitutes a veritable collection on its own, probably with its own particular genesis.

The last group, concerning Maximus Confessor, has been critically edited and studied by Pauline Allen and Bronwen Neil. This is the group which was most probably put together in a Greek context by followers of Maximus (see Table 2,

²²⁶ Sansterre, J. M, *Les moines grecs et orientaux á Rome aux époques byzantine et carolingienne (milieu*

part III).²²⁷ The second group, the *Acta Martini* (nr. 9 in the catalogue), was studied by Paolo Chiesa, who concludes that this is a dossier that was probably composed in two steps, the *Commemoratio* proper, later supplemented with the letters of Martin (see Table 2, part II).²²⁸

The first group, which has attracted less scholarly attention, was all the more in the focus of Anastasius Bibliothecarius (see Table 2, part I). These texts are centred on the figure of Pope Honorius and the position of the papacy in the monothelite conflict. First, there is an apology for him by pope John IV, then four excerpts from letters of Maximus concerning the orthodoxy of Honorius - thus his orthodoxy was confirmed by prominent Greek and Latin ecclesiastical figures. Then come three letters from Pope Theodore I addressed to the new patriarch Paul and the bishops who had consecrated him, on the issue of monothelism, expressed the mainstream position of the papacy mostly in the form of critiques brought to Pyrrhus. In Anastasius' dedicatory letter to John the Deacon, the entire dedication is mainly concerned with this specific part of the whole *Collectanea*, dealing with the rehabilitation of pope Honorius,²²⁹ whereas the parts pertaining to Maximus and Martin are mentioned only in the very last sentence.

du VI^e s. – fin du IX^e s.) (Brussels: Académie Royale de Belgique, 1983).

²²⁷ Partially edited in P. Allen and B. Neil (ed.), *Scripta saeculi 7. vitam Maximi Confessoris illustrantia: una cum latina interpretatione Anastasii Bibliothecarii iuxta posita* (Turnhout: Brepols, 1999). See also B. Neil, "The Lives of Pope Martin I and Maximus the Confessor: Some Reconsiderations of Dating and Provenance," *Byzantion* 68 (1998): 91-109.

²²⁸ P. Chiesa, *Le biografie greche e latine di papa Martino*, in *Martino I papa (649-653) e il suo tempo* (Spoleto: CISAM, 1992). Most recently Bronwen Neil has published the Latin text together with an English translation of the *Narrationes*, *Hypomnesticum* and *Testimonia et Syllogismi* in her new monograph on Anastasius: B. Neil, *Seventh-Century Popes and Martyrs. The Political Hagiography of Anastasius Bibliothecarius* (Turnhout: Brepols, 2006). For a repertory of papal letters from the seventh century see P. Conte, *Chiesa e primato nelle lettere dei papi del secolo VII* (Roma: Vita e pensiero, 1971).

I.

Letter of Anastasius Bibliothecarius to John the Deacon (Ep. 9, *Anastasii Epistolae...*, p. 422-426)

1. Johannes IV papa: *Apologia pro Honorio papa* (Conte, 99; PL 129, 561-566)
2. Maximus Confessor: *Tomus dogmaticus ad Marinum presbyterum*, (CPG 7697 20; PL 129, 568-574-partim)
3. Maximus Confessor: *Diffloratio ex epistola Maximi ad Petrum illustrem* (CPG 7697, 12; PL 129, 573-576)
4. Maximus Confessor: *Ad Marinum Cypri presbiterum Epistola S. Maximi de processione Spiritu Sancti* (CPG 7697 10; PL 129, 577-578-partim)
5. Theodorus I papa: *Theodori papae synodica ad Paulum patriarcham Constantinopolitanum* (PL 129, 577-582; Conte 114)
6. Theodorus I papa: *Exemplar propositionis transmissae Constantinopolim*, (Conte d 115; PL 129, 581-582)
7. Theodorus I papa: *Theodori sanctissimi papae ad episcopos qui consecraverunt Paulum* (Conte d 116; PL 129, 581-584)
8. Maximus Confessor: *Epistola ad abbatem Thalassium (Commemoratio quod legati Romani Constantinopoli gesserint)* (CPG 7702; PL 129, 583-586)

II.

Letter of Anastasius Bibliothecarius to Martinus bishop of Narni (Ep. 8, *Anastasii Epistolae...*, p. 422)

Acta Martini (BHL 5593-5594)

1. Martinus I papa: Ep. *Quoniam agnovit* (Conte nr. 168; PL 129, 587-588)
2. Martinus I papa: Ep. *Noscere voluit* (Conte nr.169, PL 129, 588-590)
3. Theodorus Spudaeus: *Narrationes de exilio et morte S. Martini(Commemoratio)* (CPG 7969; PL 129, 585-604)
4. Martinus I papa: Ep. *Indicamus germanae* (Conte nr. 170, PL 129, 600-601)
5. Martinus I papa: Ep. *Omne desiderium* (Conte nr. 171; PL 129, 601-612)

III.

1. Anastasius Apocrisiarius: *Relatio motionis* (CPG 7736; PL 129, 604-622)
2. Maximus Confessor: *Epistola Maximi ad Anastasium monachum, discipulum suum* (CPG 7701; PL 622-623)
3. Anastasius the Disciple: *Epistola Anastasii ad monachos Calaritanos* (CPG 7725; PL 129, 623-625)
4. Anastasius Apocrisiarius: *Disputatio inter Maximum et Theodosium Caesareae Bithyniae* (CPG 7735, PL 129 626-659)
5. *Anastasius Apocrisiarius: Epistola ad Theodosium Gangrensem*(CPG 7733)- this is a letter which includes the testimony of Hyppolitus, bishop of Portus Romanus (*Sermo Hyppoliti contra Beronem et Heliconem haereticos* - CPG 1916), and syllogisms, probably both written by Anastasius (PL 129, 659-682)
6. Theodor Spudaeus: *Hypomnesticon* (CPG 7968; PL 129, 681-690)

Table 2: The Structure of the Collectanea

²²⁹ Pope Honorius, because of his hesitant answer to the letter of Patriarch Sergius raising the issue of monothelism, was accused of not being sufficiently orthodox and categorical. See E. Zocca, *Onorio e Martino: due papi di fronte al monotelismo*, in *Martino I papa...*, 103-147.

This could even lead to the conjecture that initially Anastasius' *Collectanea* proper was initially limited to the first part, being afterwards expanded with a single sentence added at the end of the dedicatory letter. In any case, if these were perhaps not chronologically distinct sequences of compilation, the arrangement does indicate a hierarchical classification of the material, in order of their importance. Thus, in addition to the role of the excerpter, here Anastasius can be credited here with the role of the compiler of the three main parts identified above.²³⁰

At several points, when listing the parts of the collection, the translator used the denomination *brevia opuscula*, from which he made excerpts (*excerpsi*).²³¹ As for the provenance of his sources, a laconic *ad manus nostras venire*²³² was considered sufficient information for the reader. On the other hand, at the beginning of the letter, there is even an allusion to the collation work in the form of a metaphor: *ab aliis rustica falce collegisse et ad aream Latinitatis fidei humero transvexisse sufficiat nil videlicet addendi vel minuendi*.²³³ The verb *colligere* occurs one more time in Anastasius' correspondence, denoting a similar type of editorial practice, this time in Latin, with reference to the composition of the life of Clement: *eius vitae actus et passionis historiam ex diversorum colligere Latinorum voluminibus*.²³⁴ Selection and collection go together in both of these processes.

Apart from the dedicatory letter to John the Deacon, there is another relevant letter, anterior in time, but also included in the *Collectanea*. It was addressed to Martin, bishop of Narni, to whom Anastasius dedicated the translation of the *Acta*. The insertion of another prologue as a dividing line revealing initial structures, also indicated that this was a compilation. Here he already

²³⁰ P. Conte argues for the same arrangement: *Il Sinodo Lateranense dell'ottobre 649*. (Vatican: Libreria Editrice Vaticana, 1989), 394-396.

²³¹ Letter 9, in Anastasius, *Epistolae* 423.

²³² Letter 9, in Anastasius, *Epistolae* 423.

²³³ Letter 9, in Anastasius, *Epistolae* 423.

mentioned *quaedam ex actis Maximi monachi ac discipulorum eius*, moreover, as *huic operi conexas et continuatas reperi*²³⁵. This information taken at face value, supposes that Anastasius had at his disposal an original Greek collection containing the documents concerning Martin and Maximus, which he then added to the documents collected by him regarding Honorius.

Reading further his exposition one gets a glimpse of the aims behind the translations of these texts, while witnessing a de-contextualisation, a transfer of the text into a new milieu. The introduction is there to show that with the changing linguistic and temporal environment, the text has taken on new functions: it lost its apologetic and propagandistic function the duothelite monks probably had in mind when putting together the dossier(s); instead, it becomes an historiographical evidence which was meant to be used in John's church history (then being planned, and perhaps already in preparation, but never completed). The aim of this translation was certainly no less propagandistic if placed in the context of contemporary papal policy. For instance, the letter of dedication seems more concerned with defending Pope Honorius, and in general with the position of the papacy in this controversy, than with the orthodoxy of Maximus Confessor. Thus, the conclusion Paolo Chiesa reached with regard to the *Acta Martini* holds true for the whole collection: namely, that when moving from one context to another, texts are subject to reinterpretations. Reading them with the documentary key implied by the new context can give us access to the religious politics of the ninth century papacy, eager to strengthen its own position as champion of orthodoxy in opposition to Constantinople.²³⁶

²³⁴ Letter 15, in Anastasius, *Epistolae* 436.

²³⁵ Letter 8, in Anastasius, *Epistolae* 422.

²³⁶ P. Chiesa, *Le biografie greche...*, 221-222.

The *Chronographia Tripertita* (nr. 7 in the catalogue)²³⁷- this is the name Anastasius himself gave to the collection of historical writings by three Byzantine authors: the *Chronographeion syntomon* - a compilation of lists of kings, emperors, caliphs, popes, patriarchs, apocrypha, etc. - by Nikephoros I, Patriarch of Constantinople; the chronicle of George the Synkellos, and its continuation by Theophanes Confessor (beginning of the 9th century). It is dedicated again to John the Deacon and was aimed at serving the same purpose as the *Collectanea* - providing raw material for John the Deacon's great ecclesiastic history. The fate of this translation was to be incorporated (*inseras et intexas*)²³⁸ in John's own work. This recycling did not take place, since John never carried out his project.²³⁹ Thus the work started to circulate on its own, and, as recent research has demonstrated, it was more widely known than has been previously thought.²⁴⁰ Thus, the misfortune of John's work might have constituted the fortune of Anastasius' endeavour: in case of another rendering by Anastasius, the independent witnesses of the so called *Translatio Clementis* (nr. 19 in the catalogue) were lost as soon as the text was incorporated in the work of John the Deacon about Clement (later continued by Gauderic of

²³⁷ Critical edition by C. G. de Boor (ed.), *Theophanis Chronographia* (Leipzig: Teubner, 1885) – this contains all the three texts. For the Latin textual tradition, the latest presentation is by M. Cupiccia, “Chronographia tripertita ex Nicephoro, Georgio e Theophane,” in *Te. Tra.* 2, 100-103. For an introduction and English translation of Theophanes see C. Mango and R. Scott (ed.), *The Chronicle of Theophanes Confessor. Byzantine and Near Eastern History AD 284-813* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1997). For George Synkellos, see William Adler, Paul Tuffin. *The Chronography of George Synkellos: A Byzantine Chronicle of Universal History from the Creation.* Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002.

²³⁸ Letter 7, in Anastasius, *Epistolae* 419.

²³⁹ Letter 15, in Anastasius, *Epistolae* 435-438.

²⁴⁰ “An exhaustive search of published and unpublished manuscript inventories would yield interesting conclusions for the popularity and circulation of the *Chronographia tripertita* in complete and partial form during the Middle Ages and Renaissance.” V. Brown, “The Chronographia Tripertita of Anastasius Bibliothecarius: New Fragments in Beneventan Script at Altamura and Matera,” in *Altamura*, 35 (1993): 131-140, at page 133. De Boor himself, while basing his edition of the Latin text on three manuscripts, lists several others (see de Boor, *Theophanis Chronographia*, 423), and, more recently, M. Cupiccia, “Chronographia tripertita,” 100-103.

Velletri), the only proof for its existence being a short reference to it in a dedicatory letter. Incorporating a text into another and thus annihilating its independent existence is characterizing not so much the cultural status of translations, but of texts in general. As Noble noted, to describe the phenomenon of early medieval Roman literacy it is helpful to evoke the concept of “textual communities” of Brian Stock.

What was essential to a textual community was not a written version of a text, although that was sometimes present, but an individual who, having mastered it, then utilized it for reforming a group’s thought and action.”²⁴¹

Thus, the main goal was not the conservation and consultation of a translated text, just as it was not the conservation and consultation of the to-be-written Latin version, rather the reshaping of Church history, the creation of an official version of an influential community (the papacy, in this case), to be then imposed on other communities as well.

The oldest surviving manuscript in the Latin version of this history is from the ninth/tenth century (Vat. Palat. lat. 826). Once more, the Greek manuscript Anastasius might have used did not survive, but it is known that there was a branch in the Greek tradition which contained the work all the three historiographers translated by Anastasius²⁴² - thus, it is more likely that Anastasius possessed such a manuscript than that he compiled it himself.

In his prolegomena, he remarks *quaedam ex Grecis voluminibus transferenda*²⁴³ - this would imply a selection, a choice, but is hard to say whether he was referring to a large number of available books, or simply to the process of excerpting from the volumes of the same book. He admitted that he had

²⁴¹ B. Stock, *The Implications of Literacy: Written Language and Models of Interpretation in the Eleventh and Twelfth Centuries* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1983), 90. Cf. T. F. X. Noble, “Literacy and the papal government,” 106.

²⁴² For example Paris, Coisl. gr. 133 (12th century).

²⁴³ Letter 7, in Anastasius, *Epistolae* 419.

considerably shortened the materials,²⁴⁴ from George the Synkellos *summatim quaedam* and from Theophanes *plura sed succinte carpenda*.²⁴⁵ Then, he inserted Nikephoros' *Cosmographia (huic sane operi ratum duxi beati Nicephori Constantinopolitani episcopi cosmographiam praeponere)*²⁴⁶ in the front for John to extract something out of it, if he wanted to: *ex ea possis aliquantula carpere*²⁴⁷ - here, the excerpting operation was to be entrusted to the reader. Later on in the preface Anastasius affirmed that the work was thus rather ill-organized, but that he had refrained from inserting anything: *Accipe itaque hoc, karissime, incompositum opus et nihil meum in hoc prorsus insertum praenosce*.²⁴⁸ Denying personal interference is a commonplace in medieval translation practice, and this assertion occurred in several places in Anastasius' letters. Nevertheless, for the moment there is no reason to believe that he did not proceed accordingly.

This admission does not mean that he did not have great plans for his project, or, rather with his common endeavour with John. From the dedicatory letter, it is obvious that Anastasius was mindful of the tradition the two of them were planning to perpetuate (and correct, where necessary):²⁴⁹ he mentioned Eusebius of course, and then Theodoret, Socrates and Sozomen, with their *Historia tripartita*.²⁵⁰ Moreover, such references imply the existence of a group of translators behind the scenes, predecessors to Anastasius: Rufinus in the case of Eusebius, and Cassiodorus and Epiphanius for the *Historia tripartita*. Upon

²⁴⁴It was only after the accession of Justin IInd that he produced full translation; until that point he had excerpted heavily. See C. Mango, xcvi.

²⁴⁵ Letter 7, in Anastasius, *Epistolae* 419.

²⁴⁶ Letter 7, in Anastasius, *Epistolae* 420. Note, however, that for example in the Florence manuscript Laurenziana, San Marco 359 (10th century), the order is reversed: the dedicatory letter together with Nikephoros' list constitute the closing part of the collection.

²⁴⁷ Letter 7, in Anastasius, *Epistolae* 420.

²⁴⁸ Letter 7, in Anastasius, *Epistolae* 421.

²⁴⁹ For historiography constructed as a chain of writings continuing one after the other see L. Canfora, *Il ciclo storico*, in *Belfagor* 26 (1971): 653-670. Cf. also Cf. A. Momigliano, *The Classical Foundations of Modern Historiography* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1990), 147.

²⁵⁰ Letter 7, in Anastasius, *Epistolae* 419, 421.

examination of the prefaces written by these translators, it can be seen that they had similar editorial preoccupations as Anastasius. Omission and insertion, for example, is something both Rufinus and Cassiodorus note as part of their methodology.²⁵¹ Furthermore, it is known that it was a general practice in ancient ecclesiastical historiography to compose works in two stages, the first being the collection of the material, the second its composition.²⁵² It is noteworthy, that in this peculiar case these two stages were to be carried out by two different scholars: the collection and the preparation of the material by Anastasius, and the composition work by John.²⁵³

The next editorial decision emphasized by the translator in the dedicatory letter was related to secular matters, whenever he thought it opportune, Anastasius also translated some relevant fragments. Indeed, the translation itself starts with such an excerpt, namely the capture of Jerusalem by Pompeius, most probably retained in the translation because of the obvious importance of the

²⁵¹ See his preface to the translation of Eusebius' *Historia ecclesiastica*: *omissis quae videbantur superflua, historiae si quid habuit, nono coniunximus libro et in ipso Eusebii narrationi dedimus finem. Decimum vero vel undecimum librum nos conscripsimus partim ex maiorum traditionibus, partim ex his, quae nostra iam memoria comprehenderat et eos velut duos pisciculos supra scriptis panibus addidimus.* (M. Simonetti (ed.), *Tyrannii Rufini Opera* (Turnhout: Brepols, 1961), 267, 35-44). Cf. Cassiodorus about his own work: *... quos nos per Epiphanium Scholasticum Latino condentes eloquio, necessarium duximus eorum dicta deflorata in unius styli tractum ... non aequaliter omnes de unaquaque re luculenter ac subtiliter explanasse; sed modo hunc, modo alterum aliam partem melius expediisse. Et ideo iudicavimus de singulis doctoribus deflorata colligere, et cum auctoris sui nomine in ordinem collocare.* (W. Jacob and R. Hanslik (ed.), *Cassiodorus–Epiphanius. Historia Ecclesiastica Tripartita* (Vienna: Hoelder-Pickler-Tempsky, 1952), 1-2).

²⁵² The same two stage-composition were both employed by the the medieval historian and hagiographer. Cf. F. Dolbeau, "Les hagiographes au travail: collection et traitement des documents écrits (IXe-XIIe siècles)," in M. Heinzelmänn, ed., *Manuscrits hagiographiques et travail des hagiographes* (Sigmaringen: Thorbecke, 1992), and B. Guenée, *Histoire et culture historique dans l'Occident médiévale* (Paris: Aubier, 1980).

²⁵³ M. Mazza, "Sulla teoria della storiografia cristiana: Osservazioni sui proemi degli storici ecclesiastici" in S. Calderone (ed.), *La storiografia ecclesiastica nella tarda antichità* (Messina: Centro di Studi Umanistici, 1980), 344-347. A similar kind of cooperation was also suggested for Cassiodorus and Epiphanius, see M. Mazza, *La Historia Tripartita di Flavio Magno Aurelio Cassiodoro Senatore: metodi e scopo*, in S. Leanza (ed.), *Flavio Magno Aurelio Cassiodoro*, Messina: Centro di Studi Umanistici, 1986), 214-216.

city for any ecclesiastical history. In order to justify this decision, he quoted the Theophanes' argument:

Ex civilibus autem gestis quaedam summatim excerpti... Non enim, ut praelatus beatissimus Theophanes se opinari testatur, modicae fructum utilitatis carpit, qui priscorum relegit actus.²⁵⁴

This last sentence was Anastasius' word for word translation of a sentence from Theophanes' own preface, which was otherwise entirely missing from the Latin translation.²⁵⁵ This represents an intriguing question: Why would Anastasius choose not to translate the introduction of the author, once he was in possession of it? Probably he intended his own prologue to be a replacement of the original one, thus removing the text from its original context, emphasizing the new functions of the work, ie. to be incorporated in a new, Latin ecclesiastical history. Perhaps he also had a secret ambition that this work would become the official, pontifical version of the history of Christianity.²⁵⁶

The liturgical commentaries²⁵⁷ also have a composite nature, namely two treatises were combined together: the *Mystagogia* (nr. 16 in the catalogue) of Maximus Confessor (c. 630) and the *Historia Mystica* (nr. 17 in the catalogue) of Germanos I, patriarch of Constantinople (first part of the eighth century), dedicated to Charles the Bald.

The Latin versions survive in two manuscripts from the ninth and early tenth centuries (Cambrai 711 and Paris, BNF 18556).²⁵⁸ It seems that for the time being it is impossible to identify any possible related manuscript(s) that might have

²⁵⁴ Letter 7, in Anastasius, *Epistolae* 421.

²⁵⁵ For the Greek text see de Boor, *Theophanis Chronographia*, I, 4.

²⁵⁶ This fact has also been noted in other medieval translators' work. Cf. Virgilio-Franklin, *The Latin Dossier of Anastasius the Persian*, 116.

²⁵⁷ B. Neil, "Anastasius Bibliothecarius' Latin Translation of two Byzantine Liturgical Commentaries," in *Ephemerides Liturgicae* 114, 4 (2000): 329-346.

been possessed by Anastasius. Thus, it is hard to tell, whether this work represents a genuine compilation by Anastasius or a collection that had first been produced in a Greek context. Two such attempts at reconstructing the translator's model were produced at the beginning of the twentieth century by Frank E. Brightmann²⁵⁹ and Nilo Borgia:²⁶⁰ as a result of their studies and text-editions it seems that the work that Anastasius knew as pertaining to Germanos I was already in the form of a compilation (Brightmann identified three stages in its composition)²⁶¹ combining the work of Germanos I with different interpolations from Maximus Confessor and others,²⁶² which was then circulated together with other different liturgical commentaries.

In his dedicatory letter Anastasius acknowledged that he translated Germanos I *in toto*, whereas he only excerpted some fragments from Maximus, which can also imply that the Greek source he possessed was already an extract. This excerpt consisted of the last chapter of the proper treatise (except for the last two paragraphs). Moreover, the older manuscript contained a short letter by Nilus of Ancyra to Nemertius (nr. 18 in the catalogue) on matters pertaining to liturgical symbolism, not extant in the original Greek collection of the letters of Nilus. Unfortunately, there is no reference to this letter in the preface of Anastasius.

²⁵⁸ Critical edition: S. Pétridès, "Traité liturgiques de Saint Maxime et de Saint Germain traduits par Anastase le Bibliothécaire," in *Revue de l'Orient Chrétien*, 10 (1905): 289-313.

²⁵⁹ Frank E. Brightman, "The *Historia Mystagogica* and other Greek Commentaries on the Byzantine Liturgy," in *Journal of Theological Studies* 9 (1908): 248-267, 387-397.

²⁶⁰ Nilo Borgia, "La exegesis di S. Germano e la versione latina di Anastasio Bibliotecario," in *Roma e l'Oriente* 2 (1911): 144-156, 219-228, 286-296, 346-354.

²⁶¹ Brightmann, "The *Historia Mystagogica*," 250-254.

²⁶² Chapters 55-57 and 61-62 are from Maximus Confessor, chapter 63 is in fact letter 228 of Isidore of Pelusium, chapters 21-27 is an exposition of parts of monastic garments, while chapters 31, 35, 37, 42 represent different short interpolations in the form of comments, or scholia. See Borgia, "La exegesis di S. Germano," 151.

On the other hand what the preface contains is a long quote referring to Pseudo-Dionysius, from the prologue of the *Mystagogy* of Maximus,²⁶³ a prologue which, again, just as with the *Chronographia*, is not part of the Latin translation proper. Perhaps the purpose of this omission had also similar reasons to the previous case – providing a new milieu for the commentaries by replacing the old prologue, and keeping from it only some bits of information he considered relevant. The inclusion of this fragment in his own preface obviously had to do with the well-known interest of Charles the Bald in Dionysius. The passage in question, a *topos* of humility on the part of Maximus, announces that the author will not treat subjects that had in a most elevated manner already been touched upon by Pseudo-Dionysius, since trying to exceed him would be a foolish enterprise. Thus, Maximus announced that he would discuss matters left out from the *Ecclesiastical Hierarchy*. Presenting this work as an appendix to the *Ecclesiastical Hierarchy* was the most efficient way for Anastasius to stir the interest of the emperor and at the same time to consolidate the authority of his translation.

The *Corpus Dionysiacum* (nr. 21 in the catalogue) differs from the other works in some important aspects. First, it is a genre less fitting for practical purposes that required huge interpretative efforts on the part of its readers - these circumstances clearly influenced the way this text was transmitted. Secondly, the process of translating the corpus from Greek into Latin involved the intervention of two editors. The *Corpus* was brought into the attention of Anastasius by Eriugena, a man with preoccupations and interests radically different from his own.

²⁶³ Letter 14, in Anastasius *Epistolae* 434-435, Greek text in R. Cantarella (ed.), *S. Massimo Confessore. La mystagogia ed altri scritti* (Florence: Libreria Editrice Fiorentina, 1928), 126.

John Scottus Eriugena translated the collected works of Pseudo-Dionysius the Areopagite from a manuscript that fortunately still exists today: Paris, BNF gr. 437, a diplomatic gift brought to the Frankish court by Byzantine envoys in 827. He added a dedicatory letter to the corpus, addressed to Charles the Bald, as well as two poems. This is probably the form in which the text then travelled to Rome around 860, sent there at the request of Pope Nicholas I, for censoring.²⁶⁴ Here, the *Corpus* encountered its second editor, Anastasius Bibliothecarius, who also appended his substantial contribution to it, supplying, so to say, a key to the text: the *scholia* of John of Scythopolis and Maximus the Confessor, corrections of his own on the translation, based on the better quality manuscript(s) he had, and to be sure, yet another introduction, in form of his own dedication to Charles the Bald. The result was thus a coherent pluritextual collection, surrounded by paratexts: a corpus with a double introduction, one by Anastasius and one by Eriugena, with two poetic intermezzos, and then the collection proper, organized on two levels: a main text consisting of Pseudo-Dionysius' *opera omnia* (the four treatises and ten letters) and the adjacent commentaries by John and Maximus (nr. 21 in the catalogue). This at least is how the corpus appears in some of the oldest and most important manuscripts, which I have been able to consult thus far (Berlin Phillips 1668, 9th century; Paris BNF lat. 1618, 10th century; and Florence Laurenziana Plut. 89 sup. 15, 11th-12th centuries).

²⁶⁴ About the much debated authenticity of this letter, see most recently the decisive article by R. Sommerville, "Pope Nicholas I and John Scottus Eriugena: JE 2833," in *Zeitschrift der Savigny-Stiftung für Rechtsgeschichte. Kanonistische Abteilung* 83 (1997): 67-85, see page 72 on the particular issue of early manifestations of papal censorship. Cf. also W. Berschin, *Greek Letters and the Latin Middle Ages. From Jerome to Nicolaus of Cusa*, trans. Jerold C. Frakes (Washington: The Catholic University of America Press, 1988), 325, n. 34. Remarkably, all examples mentioned by the aforementioned scholars are by Anastasius, John the Deacon and pope Nicholas I, revealing that the papal court indeed was zealously preoccupied with asserting a strong control over the literary production of Western Christianity.

In the Greek tradition of textual transmission, several lines can be distinguished: works of Pseudo-Dionysius circulating without any *scholia*, as in Eriugena's sample, or together with John of Scythopolis' *scholia*, and then the so called *corpus mixtus*, where the *scholia* of both John and Maximus are present²⁶⁵ – Anastasius' exemplar obviously was of this later type. The destiny of the two ninth century Latin versions would be somewhat similar: there were manuscripts containing only Eriugena's translation, probably deriving directly from his own exemplar and the other branch containing the *scholia*.²⁶⁶

The only missing piece from Anastasius' version as compared to the Greek one is the prologue of John to his *scholia*. Either Anastasius had a manuscript that was damaged at the beginning (such surviving Greek manuscripts do exist)²⁶⁷ or, since this is not the first case of missing prologues in the list of Anastasius' collection²⁶⁸, this can again be perceived as a case of deliberate replacement of an introduction.

His own prologue, unfortunately, is not particularly informative regarding content and organization of the originals he might have had access to. According to his own description, he first came across the *scholia* in Constantinople:

ecce repente parathesis sive scholia in eum (quae Constantinopoli positus videram) ad manus venire, quibus utcunque interpretatis, mihi

²⁶⁵ B. R. Suchla, "Die Sogennanten Maximus-Scholien des *Corpus Dionysiacum Areopagiticum*", in *Nachrichten der Akademie der Wissenschaften in Göttingen. I. Philologisch-Historische Klasse (NAWG, Phil.-Hist. Klasse)*, Göttingen, 1980, 33-66; Idem, "Die Überlieferung des Prologs des Johannes von Skythopolis zum griechischen *Corpus Dionysiacum Areopagiticum*," in *NAWG, Phil.-Hist. Klasse*, Göttingen, 1984, 177-188; Idem, "Eine Redaktion des griechischen *Corpus Dionysiacum Areopagiticum* im Umkreis des Johannes von Skythopolis, des Verfasser von Prolog und Scholi en. Ein dritter Beitrag zur Überlieferungsgeschichte des CD," in *NAWG, Phil.-Hist. Klasse*, Göttingen, 1985, 179-194.

²⁶⁶ For an extensive list of the manuscripts of Eriugena see E. S. Mainoldi, "Versio operum Dionysii Areopagitae (ante 860-864; revisione: 864-866)" in P. Chiesa and L. Castaldi (ed.) *Te.Tra. 2*, 244-250.

²⁶⁷ B. R. Suchla, "Die Überlieferung des Prologs des Johannes von Skythopolis...", 6-7.

²⁶⁸ Cf. above p. 81.

aliquantulum magis emicuit, quae videlicet in marginibus interpretati codicis ejus, ut in Graeco reperi, mox interpretata utcunque (donec a docto melius interpretarentur) respondentibus signis interpret ego satis imperitus apposui, vestraeque gloriosae sapientiae potissimum fore mittenda non immerito judicavi.²⁶⁹

Again, the indications of provenance are a loose *ad manus venere* with an intercalated note, *quae Constantinopoli positus videram*. What is not clear from the sentence is whether the *scholia*-collection he had seen in Constantinople and those which he had at hand when he was making the translation in Rome, are one and the same collection. Did he see them in Constantinople and bring them home, or, after having consulted the text in Constantinople did he discover another similar set in Rome too? The prologue to this translation was written in 875. Anastasius had visited Constantinople five years earlier, in 869-870, and it was approximately fifteen years previously, in 860, that Nicholas I requested the manuscript from Eriugena. It might be the case that these gaps in the chronological sequences of the story have some other explanation, but it may well be, that Anastasius had rediscovered these *scholia* in Rome only later.

As for his editorial decisions, he explained in his letter the way in which he distinguished the two scholiasts, putting a cross next to Maximus' name (most of these have disappeared in later copies). Then he mentioned that he marked all places where the translation of Eriugena differs from the interpretation of the scholiast. In addition, he noted that he occasionally took the liberties by completing all this with his own corrections. The result is a unique collection, which is exemplary in displaying a sophisticated assemblage of textual layers. The first part is constituted by the translation of the collection of Pseudo-Dionysius' works; at a second stage, its reader can be observed at work, who, in his turn, becomes an editor-compiler, adding new layers to this text,

²⁶⁹ Letter 13, in Anastasius *Epistolae* 432.

comprising three distinct elements: John's *scholia*, Maximus's *scholia*, and Anastasius' own notes.

The phenomenon of excerpting was observed in the case of these *scholia* too. This will be a long and difficult enterprise for future research, to try to discover, where possible, the principles according to which Anastasius abbreviated or omitted material from his collections. So far, it seems that he is innocent of the accusations of biased, distorted or theologically loaded redactions.²⁷⁰

Hidden behind the texts, there are several underlying threads conferring coherence and unity to a particular compilation. Some factors of consistency, such as the texts sharing the same author (Pseudo-Dionysius), or the same genre (liturgical commentaries), or the same theme (monothelitism), are easily detectable. Others, like arrangements of the texts and similar editorial intentions, or the dedications and the effect it was hoped they would have on their intended audiences are more difficult to interpret. In the majority of cases I have presented, the compilations turned out to have been constituted prior to the act of translation (*Chronographia tripertita*, *Corpus Dionysiacum*, parts of the *Collectanea*). Anastasius can perhaps be credited with the compilation of the liturgical commentaries and with putting together the major parts of the *Collectanea*. In all cases where it can be estimated, the Latin version is shorter than the originals, as witnessed also by the testimony of the letters, where expressions such as *excerpsi*, *difflozare*, *carpere* abound. Further research would be necessary to reveal the editorial mechanisms behind Anastasius' choices. For

²⁷⁰ It has recently been demonstrated, that in the case of the *scholia* to Dionysius, it is not possible to talk about omissions which would moderate radical interpretations as it was proposed by Dondaine - see M. Harrington, "Anastasius the Librarian's Reading of the Greek Scholia on the Pseudo-Dionysian Corpus," in *Studia Patristica* 36 (2001): 119-125. A similar tendency can be observed in the case of the *Chronographia tripertita*, where the critical tone used for describing Origen is already present in his source. Thus, Anastasius can not be credited with the Origen-denigrating machinations assumed by de Lubac (See H. de Lubac, *Medieval Exegesis*, vol. 1, translated by Marc Sebanc (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1998), 196-197).

the time being, our working hypothesis is that omissions and abbreviations were results of editorial decisions rather than tendentious selections. Besides, one has to take into consideration that editorial procedures are rooted in manifold traditions, each genre of writing having its own specific practices.

In the special case of translations, the changes in context adds to the research difficulties. Textual genesis is usually bound to its context, and when translators are replacing this context with a new one, they are also changing the text's linguistic, temporal and spatial environment adjusting the text to its new audience and purposes.

EXCURSUS: ANASTASIUS AND THE PAPAL LIBRARY – A RESEARCH QUESTION

“The Vatican Library was the chief intellectual arm of the first European state that rested its strength more on learning and art than on dynastic loyalties and military power[...]. The library stands as a record of science, learning and the arts as rich as any in the world. In history stands as an equally but more complex record of scholarship and propaganda, science and censorship – a tale of the disasters and triumphs that ensue when knowledge and power are directly linked.”²⁷¹

This tale sketched by Anthony Grafton is still a story without proper beginnings: the history of the papal library before its transfer to the Vatican has never been told; the major reason for this being the scarcity of evidence for periods such as the seventh to ninth centuries. While Frankish book-production has left a remarkable amount of traces,²⁷² scholars thus managing to reconstruct several libraries, whether royal, aristocratic or monastic,²⁷³ unfortunately this has never been the case for the papal collection.²⁷⁴

Bernard Bischoff, upon discussing possible methodologies for such a reconstruction, mentions two possible approaches: critical research, based entirely on palaeographical evidence, and imaginative solutions, relying on

²⁷¹ A. Grafton, “The Vatican and Its Library” in Idem, ed., *Rome Reborn. The Vatican Library and Renaissance Culture* (Washington: Library of Congress, New Haven/London: Yale University Press, Vatican City: Bibliotheca Apostolica Vaticana, 1993), 45.

²⁷² Cf. for example B. Bischoff, *Katalog der festländischen Handschriften des neunten Jahrhunderts (mit Ausnahme der wisigotischen) I: Aachen – Lambach* (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz 1998), *II: Laon – Paderborn* (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz 2004). The latest survey of Carolingian manuscripts is the splendid exhibition catalogue of the Bibliothèque Nationale: M.-P. Laffitte and C. Denoël, ed., *Trésors carolingiens. Livres manuscrits de Charlemagne à Charles le Chauve* (Paris: Bibliothèque Nationale de France, 2007).

²⁷³ See for example Bernhard Bischoff, *Manuscripts and Libraries in the Age of Charlemagne* (Cambridge: CUP, 1994), trans. and ed. by Michael Gorman; R. McKitterick “Charles the Bald (823-877) and his library: the patronage of learning” in *The Frankish Kings and Culture in the Early Middle Ages*. (Aldershot: Variorum, 1995); P. Riché, “Les bibliothèques de trois aristocrates carolingiens,” *Le Moyen Âge* 69 (1963): 87-104.

²⁷⁴ “... all efforts to reconstruct the early medieval holdings of the library have failed.” T. F. X. Noble, *The Republic of Saint-Peter. The birth of the papal state 680-825* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1984), 220. For the Greek holdings see A. Alexakis, *Codex Parisinus Graecus 1115 and Its Archetype* (Washington: Dumbarton Oaks Research Library, 1996), 257-260.

references from different other types of resources.²⁷⁵ The question then is, whether this later methodology can be applied to the Anastasian corpus. Is it possible to deduct anything from the literary luggage of the librarian about the Greek holdings of the pontifical library? Was he perhaps enriching the library?²⁷⁶ Or, vice versa, it was the holdings of the library that motivated some of his translations? This question - just like speculating about the connection of Borges's readings with the National Library of Argentina, or, to stay close to Anastasius, of Photios' *Bibliotheca* with the library(ies) behind²⁷⁷ -, I think it is worth asking: the list of Anastasius' translations is a resource which, even if does not allow a complete reconstruction, it at least is highly indicative about the profile of the Greek collection of a 'virtual' papal library. And combined perhaps with other data, it can get us close to the full picture. Recently, for example, Alexander Alexakis argued that the papal library's Greek holdings were more numerous than scholars presupposed: according to him, the archetype of *Parisinus Graecus 1115*, a florilegium of Greek ecclesiastical and theological texts, was produced by the papal *scriptorium*, moreover, that this compilation implied the presence of the complete volumes of its sources on the pontifical bookshelves.²⁷⁸

On 14 December 864 Anastasius was appointed papal librarian by Hadrian II.²⁷⁹ This nomination was the acknowledgment of the influential indispensability Anastasius acquired during his service at the papal court under Nicholas I: that is to say a skillful secretary responsible for the redaction of papal letters. But

²⁷⁵ Bischoff, *Manuscripts and Libraries*, 56.

²⁷⁶ In his letter to pope John VIII he says: *sacrae bibliothecae vestrae, cuius minister vestra dignatione consisto, ex hoc, quod desuper mihi datum est, debitor sum ministrare*. Anastasius, *Epistolae*, 416.

²⁷⁷ Cf. L. Canfora, "La Biblioteca di Fozio" in *Cristianità d'Occidente e Cristianità d'Oriente* (Spoleto: CISAM, 2004), 93-125.

²⁷⁸ A. Alexakis, *Codex Parisinus Graecus 1115 and Its Archetype* (Washington: Dumbarton Oaks, 1996), especially pages 257-260.

²⁷⁹ That is, on the very day of his election as pope. Cf. MGH *Concilia* IV, 317, 10-11.

bibliothecarius implied something more than a secretary, though, in lack of sources, it is not easy to present a precise “job description”.

At the time of Anastasius’ appointment, the papal *bibliothecarius*²⁸⁰ was a relatively new function: the first librarian recorded in the sources is a certain Zacharias, on 19 April 773.²⁸¹ It was a position occupied by the high clergy,²⁸² usually bishops (some of them even later future popes²⁸³). Besides being guardian of the pope’s bookshelves, he was also responsible for all sorts of chancellery duties, papal correspondence and the recording of council acts. Probably he was also head of the *scriptorium*.²⁸⁴ One of the most detailed descriptions of a librarian’s obligations for this period is offered by Anastasius himself in one of his glosses to the translation of the eighth ecumenical council (nr. 5 in the catalogue)²⁸⁵. Though he is in fact claiming to present the function of the Byzantine *chartophylax*, this passage can be interpreted as a self-portrait, all the more since he himself emphasises the similarities of the two positions:

Chartophylax means guardian of documents. And the *chartophylax* of the Constantinopolitan church has the same role as the *bibliothecarius* of the Romans [...] Without him, no cleric or high ecclesiastic from outside would be allowed in front of the patriarch, nobody would be introduced to ecclesiastical meetings, nobody’s letter addressed to the patriarch would be received, unless perhaps not sent by other patriarchs; nobody would be promoted to higher offices or other clerical orders or appointed as monastic

²⁸⁰ See R. Reynolds, “Clerics in the Early Middle Ages: Hierarchies and Functions,” in his *Clerics in the Early Middle Ages. Hierarchy and Image* (Aldershot: Variorum, 1999), 11.

²⁸¹ Leo Santifaller, “Saggio di un elenco dei funzionari, impiegati e scrittori della cancelleria pontificia dall’inizio all’anno 1099” in *Bullettino dell’Istituto Storico Italiano per il Medio Evo e Archivio Muratoriano* 56, 1-2 (1940): 1- 865.

²⁸² Cf. A. Vernet, “Du *chartophylax* au *librarian*,” in Olga Weijers, ed., *Vocabulaire du livre et de l’écriture au Moyen Age* (Turnhout: Brepols, 1989), at pages 155-167.

²⁸³ Such as for example pope Gregory II (716-731).

²⁸⁴ Cf. G. Arnaldi, “Anastasio Bibliotecario, antipapa,” in *EP I*, 738.

²⁸⁵ P. Chiesa, “Traduzioni e traduttori a Roma nell’alto medioevo,” in *Roma fra Oriente e Occidente*, Settimane 49 (Spoleto: CISAM, 2002), 487.

leaders without his approval and recommendation, and without his presentation and proposition [...].²⁸⁶

The text stresses the importance of his office by means of the rhetorics of prohibition – he is presenting his duties as rules imposed on others, in fact, implying thus a boundless authority for himself – and not only in matters cultural. This quote indicates that indeed the position of librarian was not only an intellectually prestigious, but also politically influential position (if this passage is more than Anastasius' wishful thinking). However, for the present chapter, the cultural aspect is of primary interest.

Before the thirteenth century, we possess no document listing the holdings of the pontifical library. As for its location, it is known that by the seventh century latest both the library and the archives were moved to the Lateran palace;²⁸⁷ but nothing is known about its organization, its function and above all, its possessions. However, one can get a rough estimate of the dimensions and the character of a library without tracing down the original volumes it contained, speaking about 'texts', rather than 'manuscripts' held by the library. For such an estimation, one good starting point would be the literary activity of the librarian himself.²⁸⁸

²⁸⁶ chartophilax interpretatur chartarum custos; fungitur autem officio chartophylax apud ecclesiam Constantinopolitanam quo bibliothecarius apud Romanos [...] Sine illo praeterea nullus praesulum vel clericorum a foris veniens in conspectum patriarchae intromittitur, nullus ecclesiastico conventui praesentatur, nullius epistola patriarchae missa recipitur, nisi forte a ceteris patriarchis mittatur; nullus ad praesulatum vel alterius ordinis clericatum sive ad praeposituram monasteriorum provehitur, nisi iste hunc approbet et commendet, atque de illo ipse patriarchae suggerat et ipse praesentet. C. Leonardi, "Anastasio Bibliotecario e l'ottavo concilio ecumenico", *Studi medievali* 8 (1967): 59-192, at pages 174-175.

²⁸⁷ About its previous locations see Marrou, H. I. "Autour de la bibliothèque du pape Agapit," *Mélanges d'archéologie et d'histoire* 48 (1931): 124-169 and T. F. X. Noble, *The Republic of Saint-Peter*, p 220.

²⁸⁸ To keep a record of all papal book donations for example would be another path to follow.

With the special case of Anastasius, one has to distinguish two different groups of text, that is the Greek texts he was working with, and the Latin texts which were produced based on the Greek originals.

Undoubtedly it would be too bold to speculate that the originals of all texts Anastasius translated, must have been acquired from the shelves of the papal library. However, in the light of my research on his authors, I would think that the city furnishing him with the majority of the Greek manuscripts was Rome, since most of these writers had connections with Rome, some even composing their writings there. Exception from this are the two texts where Anastasius himself gives us the provenance: the acts of the eighth ecumenical council was brought by himself from Constantinople, and the hagiographic dossier of Saint Stephen he found in Mantua.²⁸⁹ As for the others, once the premise of Roman provenance is accepted as plausible, there remain two major options for their location: in Rome, one could find Greek manuscripts either in the Greek monasteries²⁹⁰ or in the papal library. Anastasius states for example that he found the passion of Saint Dionysius (nr. 21 in the catalogue) in *maximo coenobiorum Romae sitorum*²⁹¹; then, for the *Acta Martini* (nr. 9 in the catalogue), he refers to an undefined location *apud Grecos*,²⁹² most probably a reference to a Greek monastery. A peculiar case are the *scholia* to the *Corpus Dionysiacum*, where Anastasius statement about his resources allows for a double provenience of the text: he says he had seen the text in Constantinople, but then later on it is not clear whether for translating he had used this text, or another he had later found in Rome: *ecce repente parathesis sive scolia in eum, quae*

²⁸⁹ Anastasius, *Epistolae...*, 410-411 and 428.

²⁹⁰ Cf. P. Batiffol, "Libraries byzantines à Rome," *Mélanges d'archéologie et d'histoire* 8 (1888): 297-308, and Sansterre, *Les moines grecs*, 174-186.

²⁹¹ Anastasius, *Epistolae*, 440. According to Sansterre, this must have been the Saint Saba monastery. Cf. Sansterre, *Les moines grecs*, 175.

²⁹² Anastasius, *Epistolae*, 422.

Constantinopoli positus videram, ad manus venire, he says.²⁹³ That there were Dionysian manuscripts in Rome, we know through the testimony of patriarch Methodios, who, when in Rome, had copied such a manuscript.²⁹⁴

Then, what can one state about the manuscripts containing the Latin translations of these Greek texts? Were they reserved to the papal library? The works he dedicated to the popes (the life of John the Almsgiver and the acts of the seventh and eighth ecumenical councils), probably ended up in the papal library. Can one sustain the same about dedication to clerics in the papal entourage like Ursus or John the Deacon? And what happened to the other texts? Paolo Chiesa called attention to the fact that the hagiographical translations of Anastasius are all to be found in non-Roman manuscripts,²⁹⁵ which would indicate that there is not much ground to suppose that he would keep copies of all his translations for the papal library.

Anastasius' list of books, if not about content, tells something about the orientation of the library: that it was not fashioned with the aim of becoming an exhaustive patrimony of Christian literature, in short, a store of documents supporting the papal position in ecclesiastical and theological controversies.

²⁹³ Anastasius, *Epistolae*, 432.

²⁹⁴ Cf. Sansterre, *Les moines grecs*, 175.

²⁹⁵ P. Chiesa, "Traduzioni e traduttori a Roma nell'alto medioevo" in *Roma fra Oriente e Occidente* (Spoleto: CISAM, 2002), 467-471.

TRANSLATION METHODS, THEORIES AND INCONSISTENCIES

TOOLS

Before scrutinising the methodological and theoretical stock-in-trade of a medieval translator, the equipment he employed should be reviewed. The scarcity of resources for learning Greek and understanding a Greek text stands in sharp contrast with the results of the translation activity and demands our respect keeping the researcher back from anachronistic value-judgements.

On the whole, in the early medieval West there were two possibilities for acquiring the necessary skills for translating: either from grammar books and dictionaries, or from native speakers. The most fortunate cases could perhaps combine the two methods. For scholars of the Carolingian kingdom such as Eriugena, the first way came more easily to hand, whereas Romans like Anastasius had better chances to meet Greek speaking clerics, monks, officials.

From one of his letters one can conjecture that Anastasius learned Greek as a child. The affirmation *passionem sancti ieromartyris Dionysii [...] Romae legi, cum puer essem*²⁹⁶ implies a chronological overlap: he was in Rome, and he already knew Greek, the language in which this passion was written. But as to when and where he had learned it exactly, remains an open question: probably in one of the Greek monasteries or churches of Rome - Sansterre argues that Anastasius may have studied Greek at the monastery of Saint Sabas.²⁹⁷ There is also a gloss to the *Ecclesiastical Hierarchy* of Pseudo-Dionysius, from where it can be deduced that he may have had a fairly good knowledge of the liturgy of the Greek churches in Rome.²⁹⁸

²⁹⁶ MGH, Anastasius, *Epistolae* 440, 8-9. English translation in Berschin, *Greek Letters*, 165-166.

²⁹⁷ Sansterre, *Les moines grecques*, 69.

²⁹⁸ Upon glossing the Greek term μελόδημα (*Ecclesiastical Hierarchy*, chapter 2) he says: *Id est alleluia. In quibusdam vero regionibus etiam vicesimum octavum psalmum versibus alternantibus concinunt, veluti Rome greci et quidam romanorum in ecclesiis illis quae antiquum grecorum morem*

The same letter gives an insight into one way one could enrich one's Greek vocabulary, namely, the use of bilingual copies of the Psalms and the New Testament. When discussing epithets of Pseudo-Dionysius - that is *πετεύγιον τοῦ οὐρανοῦ* and *πετεινὸν τοῦ οὐρανοῦ* - Anastasius called the attention to the two meanings of *πετεύγιον*, a word that can mean both 'pinnacle' and 'little bird'. He argues that in the Dionysian context one should opt for the meaning 'bird', since (pseudo)Chrysostom's use of the synonymous *πετεινὸν τοῦ οὐρανοῦ* made it explicit that this must have been the correct reading. As an explanation for the possible error in translating 'pinnacle of heaven' (he had found such a reading in one of the manuscripts of Hilduin's passion)²⁹⁹ he referred to the use of both meaning found in the Bible, which might confuse translators.³⁰⁰ This is a touching example of how inventive medieval translators had to be in using everything available to them as didactic material for learning Greek: in this case, perhaps a bilingual Psalter and Gospel.

This inventiveness was critically important, since real resources (proper grammars and dictionaries) for reading Greek were hard to find. Material was scarce³⁰¹ and connecting Anastasius with any of the surviving documents proved to be impossible. A comparison for example of the Pseudo-Cyril glossary (the only complete Greek-Latin dictionary to survive from our

sequuntur agunt. Que autem nunc a diaconibus geruntur, tunc presbiteri gerebant (F 27v, B 35v, P 25v). Thus he might have known Greek chanting either from the Greek monasteries, or from the non-Greek Roman churches where it was a widespread practice at that time to involve Greek monks in the liturgical psalmody. Cf. Sansterre, J. M. *Les moines grecs et orientaux à Rome aux époques byzantine et carolingienne (milieu du VIe s. – fin du IXe s.)* (Brussels: Académie Royale de Belgique, 1983), vol. 1, 87.

²⁹⁹ The text in the *PL* has, however, the reading 'ala coeli.' (*PL* 106, 31D)

³⁰⁰ E.g. *Matthew* 4:5 has 'pinnacle', while *Psalms* 8:9 and 103:12 have 'bird'.

³⁰¹ See the excellent survey by A.C. Dionisotti, "Greek Grammars and Dictionaries in Carolingian Europe", *The Sacred Nectar of the Greeks: The Study of Greek in the West in the Early Middle Ages*, eds. M.W. Herren and S.A. Brown (London: King's College, 1988).

period³⁰²) with a wordlist compiled from Anastasius' three translations (*Collectanea, Sermo de Sancto Bartholomeo apostolo, Chronographia tripertita*) showed with overwhelmingly negative results that the translator was not at all familiar with this particular tool. Although it is hard to imagine such a huge enterprise without a dictionary, it might have been that Anastasius rather turned to native assistants instead of books. For some of his translations, he himself testifies to such *viva voce* 'tools'. In the case of the eighth ecumenical council (nr. 5 in the catalogue) he speaks of the help of a more skilled man: *rara praeterea interpreti doctiori enucleanda servavi*³⁰³ – arguably then, Anastasius must have been referring to a learned Byzantine Greek. Marco Palma has suggested that this Greek may be identified with the fervent anti-Photian Constantinopolitan monk Theognostos, legate of patriarch Ignatius at the papal court.³⁰⁴ In other cases, Anastasius speaks of commissioning the translation from someone else, only reserving for himself the duties of a reviser: *Verum huius operis media in aliis implicitus ipse non transtuli, sed ab alio petitu meo interpretata postmodum in quibusdam correxi.*³⁰⁵ The identity of this person is unknown, just as was his status: it is not known whether he was an occasional collaborator of Anastasius, or perhaps somebody who assisted him permanently. Any other Greek speaking clerics or translators in ninth century Rome – if there were any - are unknown to us.³⁰⁶

³⁰² G. Goetz and G. Gundermann, *Corpus Glossarium Latinum* (CGL) vol. 2, 213-483. There is one more, which survives only in very fragmentary form, the so-called *Folium Wallraffianum*, ibidem 561-563. About the usage of the Pseudo-Cyril in Rome, see P. Chiesa, "Il dossier agiografico dei santi Gurias, Samonas e Abibos," *Aevum* 65 (1991): 221-258.

³⁰³ Anastasius, *Epistolae*, 411, 8.

³⁰⁴ M. Palma, "Antigrafo/apografo. La formazione del testo latino degli atti del concilio constantinopolitano dell'869-70," in C. Questa and R. Raffaelli, ed. *Il libro e il testo* (Urbino: Università degli Studi di Urbino, 1984), 309-335, at pages 332-334.

³⁰⁵ Anastasius, *Epistolae*, 422, 15-16.

³⁰⁶ There is a certain Gregorius, his contemporary in Rome, who displays similar preoccupations. We know of him as the editor of the second version of the life of Saint Anastasius the Persian (a revision which could have been carried out without much knowledge

In other instances, his task was alleviated by the existence of previous translations as in the lives of Saints Cyrus and John (nr. 10 in the catalogue); for the *Corpus Dionysiacum* he made use of the fragmentary presence of Pseudo-Dionysius in council-acts.³⁰⁷ Previous translations are both useful tools and sources of inspiration, especially for terminology.³⁰⁸

Greek acquaintances, bilingual books of the Scripture, and previous translations – this was a ninth century Roman translator’s share in the “sacred nectar of the Greeks.” To persevere in translating using such equipment required talent and commitment and almost inevitably led to faulty results. Thus, by now these texts should be not judged anymore by exterior, but rather by interior criteria and translators should be exculpated from linguistic faults and “incompetence,” and mistakes or mistranslations analysed not in value-judgements but as containers of information about the milieu the translator was working in.³⁰⁹

The conditions outlined about explain a great many translation errors and, at the same time, they necessarily lead to a re-evaluation of the infamous method of *verbum e verbo*, which long considered to be responsible for the eventual incomprehensibility of a text.

of Greek), but there is no indication that he knew him. See Vircillo-Franklin, *The Latin Dossier of Anastasius the Persian*, 124-125. Then, in the two-step editions, sometimes the second step is carried out without any knowledge of Greek, or at least without the consultation of the Greek original. Often, there are editors and revisors who claimed a translation *ad sensum* while the translators proper adhere *ad verbum*. Cf. Dolbeau, “Le rôle des interprètes”, 151-152, and Vircillo Franklin, *The Latin Dossier of Anastasius the Persian*, 94-96 and 111-113.

³⁰⁷ Cf. also Vircillo-Franklin, *The Latin Dossier of Anastasius the Persian*, 113.

³⁰⁸ See also my chapter on the notes to the *Corpus Dionysiacum*.

³⁰⁹ Recently, for this method applied to one of Anastasius’ texts, see A. C. Dionisotti, “Translator’s Latin,” In T. Reinhardt, M. Lapidge and J. N. Adams, ed. *Aspects of the Language of Latin Prose* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005).

METHODS

Before passing to more theoretical matters, I would like to present a short comparative analysis of two translations, focusing on a passage that illustrates the majority of the most urgent problems one is faced with when studying early medieval translations. It is a fragment from a hagiographical text, the *Life of Saint Mary the Egyptian* by Sophronius of Jerusalem. We are in the fortunate situation to possess two ninth century Latin variants of this text: the fragmented version by Anastasius, that is a passage quoted in the acts of the seventh ecumenical council (nr. 6 in the catalogue), and the complete translation by Paul the Deacon, dedicated to Charles the Bald. In what follows, I give the the complete text of Anastasius and the corresponding passages from the Greek and Paul's variant:

Sophronius of Jerusalem
PG 87, 3713-3716

Ταῦτα εἰποῦσα, καὶ ὡσπερ
τινὰ πληροφορίαν λαβοῦσα
τὸ τῆς πίστεως ἔμπυρον, τῇ
εὐσπλαγχνίᾳ τῆς θεοτόκου
καταθαροήσασα, κινῶ
ἑμαυτὴν ἐκ τοῦ τόπου
ἐκείνου, ἐν ᾧ ἐστῶσα
ἐποιοῦμην τὴν δέησιν·
καὶ ἔρχομαι πάλιν, καὶ τοῖς
εἰσιοῦσιν ἑμαυτὴν
ἐγκατέμιξα, καὶ οὐκέτι οὐδεὶς
ὠθῶν με καὶ ἀντωθούμενος,
οὐδεὶς ὁ κωλύων με τοῦ
πλησίον γενέσθαι με τῆς
θύρας, δι' ἧς εἰς τὸν ναὸν
εἰσήεσαν. ἔλαβέν με οὖν
φρίκη καὶ ἔκστασις, καὶ ὅλη
δι' ὅλου ἐκλονοῦμην καὶ
ἔτρεμον. εἶτα φθασάσης μου
τὴν θύραν τὴν ἕως τότε
ἠσφαλισμένην μοι, ὡσεὶ
πᾶσα ἡ δύναμις, ἡ πρότερόν
με κωλύουσα, νῦν ἐμοὶ

Anastasius Bibliothecarius
PL 129, 314-315

His dictis, ac si quadam
certitudine percepta, fidei
fervore, miserationis
Genitricis Dei confisa, et
movens meipsam de illo loco,
in quo stans deprecationem
faciebam; et venio rursus, et
ingredientibus memet
commiscui: et non erat jam
ullus qui me impelleret et
repelleret [*Gr.*, repelleretur],
nullusque prohiberet januae
appropinquare, per quam in
templum ingrediebantur.
Comprehendit ergo me
horror et ecstasis, et tota ex
toto torquebar atque
tremebam. Deinde cum
pervenissem ad januam, quae
usque tunc mihi fuerat
obserata, ac si omnino virtus,
quae prius me impederat,
nunc mihi praeparasset

Paul the Deacon
PL 73, 682-683

Haec dicens, et quasi aliquam
satisfactionem recipiens, fidei
succensa calore, et de pietatis
visceribus Dei genitricis
praesumens, movi me de
eodem loco, in quo stans feci
orationem; et veniens, iterum
ingredientibus me miscui, et
ultra non erat qui me
repelleret, neque qui me
prohiberet appropinquare
januis, quibus in templum
introibant. Accepit ergo me
tremor validus et extasis, et
tota ex omnibus tremebunda
turbabar. Itaque conjungens
me ad januam, cujus mihi
aditus primo claudebatur
(quasi omnis virtus quae
prius ingredi me prohibebat,
post autem viam ingrediendi
pararet), ita absque
impedimenti labore introivi,

προοδοποιεῖ τὴν εἴσοδον,
οὕτως εἰσηλθὼν ἄπονος,
οὕτως ἐντὸς τῶν ἁγίων
γεγέννημαι, τῆς τε ζωοποιῶ
θέας τοῦ σταυροῦ
κατηξίωμαι, καὶ εἶδον τοῦ
θεοῦ τὰ μυστήρια, καὶ οἶός
ἐστὶν ἕτοιμος τοῦ δέχεσθαι
τὴν μετάνοιαν. ῥίψασα
τοῖνυν ἐμαυτὴν ἐγὼ ἢ ἀθλία
ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς, καὶ τὸ ἅγιον
ἐκεῖνο προσκυνήσασα
ἔδαφος, ἔτρεχον ἐξιούσα,
πρὸς τὴν ἐγγυσησμένην με
σπουδάζουσα. γίγνομαι
τοῖνυν ἐν ἐκείνῳ τῷ τόπῳ, ἐν
ᾧ τὸ τῆς ἐγγύης ὑπεγράφη
χειρόγραφον· καὶ γόνυ
κλίνας ἔμπροσθεν τῆς
ἀειπαρθένου καὶ θεοτόκου,
τούτοις ἐχρησάμην τοῖς
ῥήμασι· σὺ μὲν, ᾧ φιλάγαθε
δέσποινα τὸ σὸν ἐνεδείξω
[ἐπ' ἐμέ] φιλόανθρωπον, σὺ
τῆς ἀναξίας οὐκ ἐβδελύξω
τὴν δέησιν· εἶδον δόξαν, ἣν
δικαίως οὐχ ὀρώμεν οἱ
ἄσωτοι· δόξα τῷ Θεῷ, τῷ διὰ
σοῦ δεχομένῳ τῶν
ἁμαρτωλῶν τὴν μετάνοιαν.
τί γὰρ εἶχον πλέον ἢ
ἁμαρτωλὸς ἐννοῆσαι ἢ
φθέγγασθαι; Καιρὸς ἐστὶ
λοιπὸν, δέσποινα,
πληρωθῆναι λοιπὸν τῆς
ἐγγύης, ἧς ἐγγύησω, τὰ
σύμφωνα. νῦν ὅπου κελεύεις
ὀδηγήσον· νῦν γενοῦ μοι
μᾶλλον τῆς σωτηρίας
διδάσκαλος, χειραγωγούσα
πρὸς τὴν ὁδὸν τὴν εἰς
μετάνοιαν ἄγουσαν. καὶ
ταῦτα λέγουσα, ἤκουσα
πόρρωθεν κράζοντος, Ἐὰν
τὸν Ἰορδάνην διέλθῃς, καλὴν
εὐρήσεις ἀνάπαυσιν. Ἐγὼ δὲ
τῆς φωνῆς ταύτης ἀκούσασα,
καὶ ταύτην δι' ἐμέ γενέσθαι
πιστεύσασα, δακρύνουσα

ingressum, ita sine labore
ingressa sum: ita intra Sancta
sanctorum ingredi digna
effecta sum. Nam et vivificam
crucis visionem promerui, et
Dei vidi mysteria, quin et
quam sit paratus ad
suscipiendam poenitentiam.
Projiciens itaque me ipsam
super terram, et sancto illo
adorato pavimento, currebam
postulatura [egressa], penes
eam quae mihi fidem dixerat,
accelerans. Fio itaque in illo
loco, in quo vadimonii
chirographum scriptum est:
et genu flexo coram
sanctissima Virgine Dei
genitrice, his usa sum verbis:
Tu quidem, bonitatis amatrix
domina, tuam in me
ostendisti misericordiam: tu
indignae non es abominata
deprecationem! vidi gloriam,
quam juste non videmus nos
luxuriosi. Gloria Deo, qui per
te peccatorum suscipit
poenitentiam. Quid enim
habeo, peccatrix, amplius
considerare, vel fari? Tempus
est, domina, ut compleantur
jam foedera vadimonii, cui
fidem dixisti. Nunc deduc
quo jusseris. Nunc esto mihi
magis salutis magistra, manu
ducens in viam quae ad
poenitentiam dirigit. Et cum
haec adhuc dicerem, audivi
quemdam a longe
clamantem: Si Jordanem
transieris, bonam invenies
requiem. Ego vero hanc
vocem audiens, et hanc
propter me factam fuisse
credens, lacrymata clamavi,
et Dei genitrici vociferata
sum: Dei genitrix, domina, ne
derelinquas me. Et his dictis,
exivi de atrio templi, et

et sic intra sancta sanctorum
reperta sum, et pretiosi ac
vivifici crucis ligni adorare
mysterium digna habita sum:
et tunc vidi Dei sacramenta,
et qualiter est paratus
suscipere poenitentes. Tunc
projiciens me coram in
terram, et sanctum illud
exosculans pavementum,
exibam. Currrens autem ad
illam quae me fidedixit, veni
restans. Conjunxi igitur me in
illum locum ubi fidedictionis
conscriptum erat
chirographum, et genu
curvans coram vultu sanctae
Virginis Dei genitricis, his
imprecata sum verbis: Tu
quidem semper, o
benignissima Domina, tuam
ostendisti pietatis
misericordiam: tu non
indignam supplicationem
projecisti; vidi gloriam quam
peccatores merito non
videmus, gloriam
omnipotentis Dei qui per te
suscipit peccatorum
poenitentiam. Quid amplius
peccatrix et misera valeo
recordari aut enarrare?
Tempus est jam implere quae
fidedixi, fide dilectionis tuae
placita. Nunc ubi tibi
complacet, dirige me. Esto
mihi salutis ducatrix, et
veritatis magistra, praecedens
me in viam quae ducit ad
poenitentiam. Et haec dicens,
audivi vocem alicujus a longe
clamantis: Jordanem si
transieris, bonam invenies
requiem. Ego autem hanc
vocem audiens, et pro me
factam credens, lacrymans
exclamavi, et ad Dei
genitricis imaginem
prospiciens vociferavi:

ἔκραξα, καὶ τῇ Θεοτόκῳ
ἐβόησα· δέσποινα, δέσποινα,
μὴ ἐγκαταλίπης με. καὶ
ταῦτα βοήσασα ἔξειμι ἐκ τῆς
αὐλῆς τοῦ ναοῦ, καὶ
συντόμως ἐβάδιζον.

constanter ambulabam.

Domina, Domina, Regina
totius orbis, per quam
humano generi salus advenit,
noli me derelinquere. Et haec
dicens, de atrio templi sum
egressa, et festinanter
ambulabam.

Both translations have a dedicatory letter: while unfortunately Paul the Deacon is not concerned with matters of translation theories in his preface, Anastasius Bibliothecarius refers to the earlier translation of the acts of the seventh ecumenical council by seriously condemning it for the literal method the translator applied:

... non quod ante nos minime fuerit interpretata, sed quod interpres pene per singula relicto utriusque linguae idiomate adeo fuerit verbum e verbo secutus, ut, quid in eadem editione intelligatur, aut vix aut numquam possit adverti in fastidiumque versa legentum pene ab omnibus hac pro causa contemnatur.³¹⁰

What one would expect after such a judgement, would be a free translation, a literary text – but what one finds instead, in both cases, is extreme literal faithfulness. Already from the juxtaposition of the three texts emerges the strikingly similar structure of the two Latin texts, and their faithfulness to the Greek original. Medieval translations usually are being contrasted with humanist or modern translations – however, I would argue that the differences one notices in such a parallel investigation are less telling than the similarities to be found in the two medieval translations of the same Greek text. It is through these two almost identical translations that one can grasp the poetics and mechanisms of the literal approach. In the following, I would only like to emphasize a couple of typical features, which are at the roots of this high degree

³¹⁰ Anastasius, *Epistolae*, 416.

of correspondence. The first striking feature is the respect of the word order: the two translators, while using different terms from the same Greek word, the order in which they display these words, is almost completely identical, and faithful to the original:

ἐν ᾧ ἐστῶσα ἐποιούμην τὴν δέησιν
Anastasius : *in quo stans deprecationem faciebam*
Paul : *in quo stans feci orationem*

Or

οὐδεὶς ὁ κωλύων με τοῦ πλησίον γενέσθαι με τῆς θύρας
Anastasius : *nullusque prohiberet januae appropinquare*
Paul : *neque qui me prohiberet appropinquare januis*

The careful reader, however, might notice, that in both cases, Anastasius took the tiny liberty of switching the order of the last two words, which allows him either to conclude the sequence with a verb, or to create better prose rhythm.

Another specific instance to observe translators is when they are rendering the grammatical forms of the original constructions. While for ταῦτα εἰποῦσα Paul has *haec dicens*, Anastasius offers *his dictis*; and the same for ταῦτα βοήσασα. Similarly, for ταῦτα λέγουσα Paul gives *haec dicens*, while Anastasius *haec dicerem*. For τινὰ πληροφορίαν λαβοῦσα, Anastasius has *quadam certitudine percepta*, while Paul *aliquam satisfactionem recipiens*. For most cases, the preservation of the cases of the original was considered as a necessary technique, whatever the Latin structure would have normally preferred - not respecting this could be done only in small quantities, within short syntagms and without major damage to word order.

One of the most peculiar features of medieval translations is the very consistent use of particles, adverbs, connectives: for example where one always uses *ac si* for ὥσπερ and ὡσεὶ, the other applies *quasi*; based on this constancy typical for medieval translators, several anonymous translations could be identified. The same, in general, could be affirmed about the overall vocabulary of the translators: for different forms of εἰσερχομαι Anastasius gives *ingredior*

(*ingrediebantur, ingressa*), while Paul has *introeo* (*introibant, introivi*). Not so much typical for hagiographical texts, this terminological consistency is increasingly accentuated in the case of philosophical and theological texts.

To sum up: rigid literality, which conceives the sentence as a chain, where only two elements have semantic value: the chain itself, and the chain link, that is the words, where chain links are defined by their respective positions in the chain, not, for example, by their relation with other chain links.

Just as these short texts are indicative of the major characteristics of a medieval translation, they are also warning about the problems one meets when trying to conclude such comparisons. The major problem is the lack of the critical editions; but even with the critical text, we might be unable to decide, which texts were the translators using – and the variants, especially in case of hagiographical writings, can differ significantly, jeopardising the conclusions one might draw from the textual analysis.

Nevertheless, I would argue that one major observation still holds in this case: namely, that whatever *ars poetica* translators choose in theory, their practice will unfold in the realm of literal translation: between the *sensum de sensu* and *verbum de verbo* there is no radical divergence, if not a difference in degree of literality.

THEORIES

Anastasius, like other medieval intellectuals, thought about translation as a dichotomy of *ad verbum* or *ad sensum*, that is to say the verbal expression and its meaning. If one tries to follow similar reflections by Anastasius in his prologues, one will often find seemingly contradictory statements.³¹¹ For a start, let me list some of his references to this knotty issue, as present in his letters. In his dedication of the text of the eighth ecumenical council (nr. 5 in the catalogue) to Hadrian II he opted for *verbum e verbo* as methodology:

Interpretans hanc sanctam synodum verbum e verbo, quantum idioma Latina permisit, excerpsti; nonnunquam vero manente sensu constructionem Grecam in Latinam necessario commutavi.

But then in his dedication to John VIII for the text of the seventh ecumenical council (nr. 6 in the catalogue), that is to say the same type of text, he criticised the existing version precisely for following this method:³¹²

nam nulla ratione octava dicitur vel teneri poterit, ubi septima non habetur, non quod ante nos minime fuerit interpretata, sed quod interpres pene per singula relicto utriusque linguae idiomate adeo fuerit verbum e verbo secutus, ut, quid in eadem editione intelligatur, aut vix aut numquam possit adverti in fastidiumque versa legentium pene ab omnibus hac pro causa contemnatur.

He criticised the earlier rendering in order to justify his own version, which is, on the other hand, no less literal. "Faithfulness is just one translational strategy that can be inspired by the collocation of a certain ideology with a certain poetics."³¹³ To complicate matters further, when looking at his translations,

³¹¹ Also noted by P. Chiesa, "Ad verbum o ad sensum? Modelli e coscienza metodologica della traduzione tra tarda antichità e alto medioevo," *Medioevo e Rinascimento* 1 (1987): 1-51 at pages 40-41 and Vircillo-Franklin, *The Latin Dossier of Anastasius the Persian*, 109-111.

³¹² Whenever he criticised a fellow translator, the reproach is always about the *verbum e verbo*, even though he used it himself for the same type of text. P. Chiesa, "Ad verbum o ad sensum?", 41.

³¹³ Lefevere, *Translation, Manipulation...*, 51

notwithstanding his inconsistent oscillation between *sensum* and *verbum* on a theoretical level, they all would qualify today as literal translations.³¹⁴

Why did medieval translators have such a notorious predilection for literal translation? How, if at all, can such a practice be explained? This is a problem which has troubled specialists of medieval translation theory and practice for a long time. Although this is a question that has not been completely answered, however, major misconceptions have already been removed: the eventual lack of a good knowledge of Greek or Latin is by now not considered a sufficient explanation for the phenomenon. The literal method was not chosen because of one's limited capacities (even if from certain viewpoints these capacities, or rather tools for developing it, proved to be quite restricted). Often, translators are good rhetoricians in their own prose.³¹⁵ And, often, since they also comment on the text, it surfaces that even if they did have problems with Greek they perfectly grasped the meaning of the text. Modern research has also demonstrated that medieval philosophical translations using this method are often more precise than twentieth century renderings. Word for word translation is not a primitive form of interpretation, but it is the result of a semantic theory for which meaning has nothing to do with rhetorics, but it is rather treated as a metalinguistic category. And even if theory usually comes after the practice, as a justification, it is also nevertheless true, that practice, more often than not, matches it. One should account for both the rising theory of the literal translation and the increasingly widely attested practice of it. The

³¹⁴ This was noted by most editors of his texts: Westerbergh, Boor, Devos, Chiesa, etc. and he is not alone in this. Also, one of his rough contemporaries, Guarimotus, a Neapolitan translator, while excessively praising the *ad sensum* method throughout his prologues, applies a thoroughly literal approach throughout his text, as emphasised by the editor of his prologues, P. Devos.

³¹⁵ A. C. Dionisotti, "Translator's Latin," In T. Reinhardt, M. Lapidge and J. N. Adams, ed. *Aspects of the Language of Latin Prose* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005).

theory has been beautifully elucidated by Paolo Chiesa and Rita Copeland³¹⁶, whereas for the practice my argumentation relies on two less well known names, Eric Jacobsen³¹⁷ and James Barr.³¹⁸ The following pages owe a heavy debt to their investigations.

Not choosing one's method of translation well implied more serious consequences than production of a poor quality text. Translation in an early medieval religious context and beyond could be a perilous craft. A letter of Nicholas I - composed by Anastasius - proclaimed *anathema* on those not utilising translation methods well.³¹⁹ Making heresy available by rendering it, or, (mis)translating orthodox texts into heretical ones was an accusation with serious consequences for a translator's career – the bitter conflict between Jerome and Rufinus after rendering Origen comes to one's mind. Since authorship and translatorship were not as sharply distinguished as in modern literary theories, it was dangerous to associate yourself with a heretic, even if as his translator - the suspicion of inserting or distorting is always hung above the head of anyone touching upon sensitive doctrinal issues. These considerations lead translators to distance themselves from their text, denying the faults as well as the merits of transposition.

³¹⁶ P. Chiesa, "Ad verbum o ad sensum? Modelli e coscienza metodologica della traduzione tra tarda antichità e alto medioevo." *Medioevo e Rinascimento* 1 (1987): 1-51. R. Copeland, *Rhetoric, Hermeneutics and Translation in the Middle Ages* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991). See also the reflections of Virgilio-Franklin in her *The Latin Dossier of Anastasius the Persian*, 120-123 and *passim*.

³¹⁷ E. Jacobsen, "The Art and Craft of Translation. Some historical and literary aspects," In *Essays presented to Knud Schibbye*, ed. Chesnutt, M. and others (Copenhagen: Akademisk Forlag, 1979) and E. Jacobsen, "Literary Translation in Context with Other Types of Textual Transformation" in Andersen, P. ed., *Pratiques De Traduction Au Moyen Âge / Medieval Translation Practices* (Copenhagen: Museum Tusulanum, 2004), 6-21.

³¹⁸ J. Barr, "The Typology of Literalism in Ancient Biblical Translations," *Nachrichten der Akademie der Wissenschaften in Göttingen. I. Philologisch-Historische Klasse* 11 (1979): 279-325.

³¹⁹ Quisquis etiam interpretatus eam fuerit (scil. epistolam) et ex ea quicquam mutaverit vel subtraxerit aut superaddiderit, praeter illud, quod idioma Graecae dictionis exigit vel interpretanti scientia intelligendi non tribuit, anathema sit. *MGH Epistolae* 6, *Karolini Aevi* 4, 487, nr. 88.

Of course, deducing from this that translators translated “slavishly” because they were frightened would be just as wrong as deducing from the method they used that they did not know Greek. However, there are several reasons to begin talking about theories of medieval translation within this premise. Firstly, because it is in apologetic religious contexts that one finds the most exciting methodological and theoretical statements about translation – to mention only the controversial issue of Bible-translation throughout history. Prologues such as those by Jerome and Rufinus abound in reflections on translation. However, since such prologues are in fact an indirect duel between two characters, due to the texts’ apologetic character theories tend to present themselves as ideologies, that is to say, serving different strategies of attack and defence, often with only a loose connection to the methodology of translation. The external pressure of “orthodoxy” – or, as we would perhaps say today “political correctness” – upon translators played a huge role in shaping translation techniques. Texts were supposed to be faithful not to the literary category of what could be called “the author’s intention”, but rather to the religious system they were part of. This is why I would suggest describing translation not within the realm of the dichotomy of theory and practice, but rather as being something of the triad theory, practice and ideology, where ideology is there to account for that mismatch between theory and practice that seems to be present in medieval translations. Behind a theory of translation, there exists an ideology of translation and at the same time, before a theory of translation, exists a practice of translation, and it is the configuration of this triangle which needs to be analysed.

Beryl Smalley in her introduction to her book on medieval biblical studies noted an analogy between Carolingian art and the biblical scholarship of the age: just as objects are there to make infinite space comprehensible, so texts also invited the readers to consider them as a mere surface, where it was worth reading

being behind the letters. “We are invited to look not at the text, but through it.”³²⁰

Now, what the art historian says about the techniques of fine arts, and what Smalley recognizes as applicable for describing biblical hermeneutics, can also be understood as the inherent presupposition of translators. And no wonder, since this is another field of hermeneutics where the opposition “letter” and “spirit” created a constant tension. The *verbum* and *sensum* gave as much trouble to translators, as did the *litterae* and *sensum* of the Bible for exegetes.³²¹ From Origen onwards, the many-level exegesis remained the dominant practice, implying a hierarchical combination of two basic elements: the *litterae* and the *sensum* of the scripture – a pair of terms that is almost identical to that of the *verbum-sensum* of the translation terminology. These two levels have a hierarchical relationship, plus, they are dependent on each other: there is no allegorical without the literal interpretation. Thus, the *littera*, or the *verbum* of the text becomes an emphasized place for the search for meaning. Perhaps one should think about translation in these terms, too: *verbum* and *sensum* being two levels in the same text. And just as the levels of biblical commentary were concerned with all these meanings, a huge body of the literal translations could have commentary appended to it. Here one could find together both the words and their proper expositions, but at the same time they were strictly divided. Also, what Smalley describes as the methods, attitude and limitations of Origen as adopted by the medievals, namely the obsession about variant readings and double commentaries or readings without the urge to choose between them³²² - clearly have an echo in translation practice. The users of translated texts operated with as many variants as they could get hold of: e.g. both from Arabic

³²⁰ Beryl Smalley, *The Study of the Bible in the Middle Ages* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1952), 2

³²¹ Smalley, *The Study of the Bible*, 41.

³²² Smalley, *The Study of the Bible*, 13.

and Greek sources, when available. The same phenomenon is also reflected in the practice of translators, in the continuous listing of synonyms, alternative readings for a term.

However, for medieval translators, even if words are polysemantic, texts are not: in the sense that there is one correct meaning for it. Especially with religious texts, it is not possible to posit a democratic realm of the many possible interpretations. There is only one correct interpretation: and the polysemanticism of words is conserved precisely to make it possible to grasp this one and only meaning, which lay beyond the language. Translators were conscious of the impossibility of creating perfectly corresponding translation. Anyway, their concern was not rhetoric: not the transposition of a Greek expression in a Latin expression, but rather the aim was to change the veil on an absolute meaning, a matter which is beyond particular languages: the Greek veil was to be changed into a Latin one. The major concern is that this veil should be transparent enough to allow readers to reconstruct the correct meaning. Multiplying the meaning of words does not multiply the meaning of the text. But if the meaning of words was reduced, it would have hindered the readers from grasping the text's ultimate meaning. Pope Nicholas I and implicitly his dictator, Anastasius, seem to have been absolutely keen on this issue: *Quamvis enim sit stilus diversus, sed sensus unus existit et nequaquam indifferens.*³²³ Anastasius broached the same idea to John VIII too, stating that - even if it would be too much simplified to reduce all theological conflicts to linguistic issues -, linguistic differences do count a lot in these discussions because, he says, while the meaning, the *sensum* is the same, *ob linguae varietatem* one can arrive at false distinctions.³²⁴

On the terminological level, this is reflected by the triangle of *verbum*, *sensum*

³²³ MGH *Epistolae 6 Karolini Aevi* 4, 453, n. 87.

and *veritas* – where perhaps *veritas* is much closer to our ‘meaning’ than ‘*sensum*.’

Siquidem praeter illa, quae hunc latuisse probantur ex his, quae sparsim a quibusdam de praedicti patris sermonibus et epistolis ante nos interpretata inveniuntur, plurimum utilitati subtraxit, quia tanto studio verbum e verbo elicere procuravit, quod genus interpretationis, licet et ipse plerumque sequar, quantum illustres interpretes vitent, tua profecto sollers experientia non ignorat. Quod eum non egisse aliam ob causam existimo, nisi quia, cum esset humilis spiritu, non praesumpsit verbi proprietatem deserere, ne aliquo modo a sensus veritate decideret.³²⁵

Here the *sensus* controls the *veritas* – I think this is what makes it so dangerous, this implication of *veritas* as opposed to *verborum circumstantia*. Nevertheless, the task of the translator was not to grasp and to express this truth, but only to present a version which would allow the reader to reach *veritas* by himself. This *veritas* should only be made accessible, rather than expressed, as it was not a basic assumption of translation activity to “interpret” in the sense of deciding on a meaning. On the level of terminology, perhaps this can be caught in the distinction between *interpretare* and *intellegere*,³²⁶ the first being the task of the translator, the second the task of the audience, that is to say, the reader or commentator.

The other practice, in addition to biblical exegesis, which comes to one’s mind regarding translation is the Hellenistic philosophical and literary exegesis, or rather its school-practice. Both account for the literal exposition followed by a paraphrase type of commentary. Thus literal translation is the interlingual application of an originally intralingual textual transformation, which in turn

³²⁴ Anastasius, *Epistolae* 417, 26-33.

³²⁵ Cf. also: Verum nos sic et haec et alia interpretandi propositum sumpsimus, u nec ab ipsa verborum usquequaque circumstantia discessisse noscamur nec pro posse a sensus veritate decidisse videamur. Anastasius, *Epistolae* 423, 26-28.

³²⁶ Quod enim Graece ‘hypostasis’ dicitur, hoc nonnulli ‘personam’, nonnulli vero ‘subsistentiam’ interpretati sunt. Porro ‘subsistentiam’ multi ‘personam’, multi vero ‘substantiam’ etiam intellexerunt. Anastasius, *Epistolae* 417, 27-29.

was a school-technique of textual exegesis.³²⁷ It represents the process of the interlinear gloss getting independent, and, in its own turn, receiving further glosses and comments.³²⁸ This is why one can even say about the paraphrase type of translation that it is literal, because originally, paraphrase was only a quantitative extension of the elements of the original text, like a parenthesis after each problematic term.³²⁹

The form and its extended version conceived as a unit might be the reason why in fact even the versions which claim to be *ad sensum*, are, in fact, manifestations of something that might be defined as literal. In this sense it is more useful to use the concept of 'degree of literality', rather than a dichotomy between *verbum* and *sensum*. The *sensum* method is not an equivalent of our current concept of "free". If we expect, whenever *sensum* is evoked, a free translation, we are likely to be deluded, and thus to think that the theoretical approach of medieval translators was confused. Both *ad sensum* and *ad verbum* implies literal translations in as much as the following phenomena are expected to occur: preservation of the word order; formal correspondence of grammatical constructions; regular lexical correspondence, including translation of every particle; use of etymological calques and of transcriptions, particularly of technical words.³³⁰ They differed on the level of amplification or diminution of the text.

³²⁷ For illustration, see the examples in E. Jacobsen, "Literary Translation in Context with Other Types of Textual Transformation" in Andersen, P. ed., *Pratiques de Traduction au Moyen Âge / Medieval Translation Practices* (Copenhagen: Museum Tusculanum, 2004), 6-21. The same view is held by Rita Copeland on the impact Latin exegetical practice had on vernacular translations. See Copeland, *Rhetorics*, 87.

³²⁸ One possible early medieval example of such interlinear translation as the first move in the so called two-step translation is discussed in C. Vircillo-Franklin, *The Latin Dossier of Anastasius the Persian* (Toronto: PIMS, 2004), 80.

³²⁹ In fact Jacobsen even uses the term "interlinear literal paraphrase", Jacobsen, *Literary Translation*, 7.

³³⁰ C. Vircillo-Franklin, *The Latin Dossier of Anastasius the Persian*, 81.

Barr's typology defines the categories by which one is able to judge degrees of literality. When translators mean *sensum*, they simply mean less detailed division into segments (compounds), and a lower reflection of the segments' etymology, less care to their sequence (word order), lower level of consistency (technical vocabulary), more semantic accuracy (idiom), fewer levels of analysis complementing the stages in the text (definitions, synonyms, etymological explanations) and a lower degree of quantitative correspondence. This concern for quantitative modifications is plainly manifest in Anastasius' prologues, too, in both directions: *nil videlicet addendi vel minuendi*, he affirms about his own translation of the *Collectanea*.³³¹ This preoccupation reflects a concern with the quantitative alterations of the text, as something which can affect meaning.

The concept of rewriting may be useful here: in its details discussed most recently by Monique Goulet, it accounts for textual modifications of many sorts. In the typology of Goulet translation is one sort of rewriting,³³² but already James Barr identified the basic techniques of rewriting – that is to say, abbreviation and expansion – as the two methods based on which one can differentiate *ad verbum* and *ad sensum* translation. These two editorial techniques, *abbreviatio* and *amplificatio* are also treated in medieval rhetorical texts.³³³

³³¹ Anastasius, *Epistolae* 423, 23. The same concern is echoed in the correspondence of pope Nicholas I: *Illum (scilicet imperatorem) adiura, ut ad talem interpretem illam interpretandam tribuat, qui non sit ausus ex ea quicquam aut minuere aut addere aut aliquid commutare, sed ita eam interpretetur, ut nichil de sensu, qui in ea scriptus est, aliquantisper occultet*. MGH *Epistolae* 6, *Karolini Aevi* 4, 488, n. 89.

³³² See M. Goulet, *Écriture et réécriture hagiographiques. Essai sur les réécritures de Vies de saints dans l'Occident médiéval (VIIIe-XIIIe s.)* (Turnhout: Brepols, 2005), 141-147. See also A. Lefevre, *Translation, Rewriting and the Manipulation of Literary Fame* (London and NY: Routledge, 1992).

³³³ M. Goulet, *Écriture et réécriture hagiographiques. Essai sur les réécritures de Vies de saints dans l'Occident médiéval (VIIIe-XIIIe s.)* (Turnhout: Brepols, 2005), 70-89.

On the other hand, Anastasius, presenting his translation of the eighth ecumenical council (nr. 5 in the catalogue) to Hadrian II, described his methods of working in the following terms:

Interpretans igitur hanc sanctam synodum verbum e verbo, quantum idioma Latinum permisit, *excerpsi*: nonquam vero manente sensu constructionem Grecam in Latinam necessario *commutavi*. Rara praeterae interpreti doctiori enucleanda servavi. Quaedam etiam, sicut mihi nota erant, nimirum qui tam Romae quam Byzantii positus in cunctis his sollicite laboravi, scholiis in marginibus codicis exaratis *annotavi*, vel etiam, sicut mihi visum est, *explanavi*. Sane et hoc notandum, quia quaedam scripturarum, quae super his a sede apostolica Constantinopolim missae sunt, deificentibus urbis eiusdem interpretibus non ex toto recte translata in Grecitatem inveni. Quorum ipse nonnulla, et quantum angustia illic morandi permisit temporis, *emendavi*, partim vero ut repperi hactenus incorrecta reliqui [emphasis mine].

All sorts of alterations are described here, but presented as a set of augmenting methods, not so much for translating but to complement the achieved translation: *annotavi*, *explanavi*, *emendavi*. Whatever critical auxiliary activity is welcome, and justified, as long as it remains outside the text, on a posterior-superior level to the translation.

CONCLUSIONS

The problem around which I organized my material is the notorious *verbum e verbo* versus *sensum e sensu* dichotomy, the central riddle of medieval translation theory and practice. I argued that many of the inconsistencies expressed by the ambivalent affirmations concerning the techniques of medieval translation theories can be explained once the larger historical and literary framework in which it developed is taken into account. Favouring *verbum e verbo* or *sensum e sensu* does not depend exclusively on genres of writing, literary qualities or semantic values of a text. In late antique and early medieval Christian literature the two extremes of the *verbum-sensum* dichotomy have been used and abused, I

would say, by the same people at the same time as praise or critique depending on the occasions.³³⁴ The fact that our main sources for translation theories are often debates concerning the entry of problematic Greek theologians like Origen and Pseudo-Dionysius to the West is itself a warning that these disputes are concerned with more than the prestige of a particular translating style. Introducing a new authority to Latin Christianity not only raised the question of the *interpretis libertas versus scriptoris auctoritas* (Jerome), but in both cases it contained some major subtexts: Jerome was looking for the safest way to implant foreign ideas into the still unstable dogmatic field of the Early Church; the fight against heresies and the proper definition of faith were his main concerns. Anastasius represented the growing papal power, very much concerned with controlling the Carolingian Church and, at the same time, seeking the Carolingian emperor's protection. For both of them, arguing about translation methods was also a way of expressing control, authority, censorship and power.

³³⁴ Recently something similar has been claimed by Peter Martens regarding Origen's critique of Jewish literalism: he argues that Origen's critique of literalism was not a general condemnation of the method – since he himself practiced it – rather, it was a way to deny certain Jewish interpretations of the Old Testament which were at odds with Christian beliefs. Peter Martens, "Why Does Origen Accuse the Jews of «Literalism»? A Case Study of Christian Identity and Biblical Exegesis in Antiquity," *Adamantius* 13 (2007): 218-230.

A CASE STUDY: THE NOTES OF ANASTASIUS ON ERIUGENA'S TRANSLATION OF THE CORPUS DIONYSIACUM

René Antoine Gauthier, evaluating Robert Grosseteste's completion of the Latin body of the *Nichomachean Ethics* (the translation of the Aristotelian text, Greek commentaries and the translator's own notes), affirms that this is

the only medieval commentary ever made directly on a Greek text, and also the only one which is really scientific, containing also discussions of problems of textual criticism, lexicographical and grammatical remarks justifying and explaining the translation, that is to say everything what we would expect today from a commentator.³³⁵

While these merits are incontestable, their novelty is not. There are at least two more Western translators who reflected upon the original Greek texts they translated, accompanying them with commentaries, both Greek and their own, even if perhaps quantitatively and qualitatively less impressive. I am referring to the creators of the Latin *Corpus Dionysiacum*, two major characters of the ninth century Carolingian renaissance: John Scottus Eriugena, the prominent scholar from the court of the Frankish emperor Charles the Bald and Anastasius Bibliothecarius, librarian of the papal court at Rome in the second part of the ninth century.

The contribution of Anastasius Bibliothecarius to this corpus was substantial: not only did he translate a valuable group of Greek *scholia* to the Dionysian text, but by supplementing Eriugena's rendering with his own hermeneutical reflections, he provided us with a unique means for documenting early medieval translation and commentary practices.

In medieval translation practice one often comes across texts coupled with commentaries. All translators, from ancient to modern times are familiar with the tension between the letter and the spirit of a text. Medieval practice tended

³³⁵ Aristote, *L'éthique à Nicomaque*, ed. R. A. Gauthier, vol. 1 (Paris, 1958), 78*.

to dissolve this tension not within the translation itself, but outside of it, with the help of a bridge, and this bridge was the commentary.³³⁶

Rehabilitation of such sets of paratexts³³⁷ is a rewarding territory for those interested in the learning and reading habits of medieval intellectuals. Moreover, the fortunes of a text can illuminate the cultural policies of a whole period. As Glenn Most suggests in his thought-provoking introductory essay from the volume on commentaries edited by him, commentaries can be described as “empowering” instruments, “bestowing new and greater power upon other institutions, upon the text commented upon, or upon the commentator himself.”³³⁸

A glimpse at the name of our author, and it is obvious that he was badly in need of such re-confirmation. Concerning the enigmatic figure of Pseudo-Dionysius the Areopagite much has been written and little is known: he was a fifth century Christian theologian of probably Syriac origins, writing in Greek, under heavy Neoplatonic influence; four of his treatises, and ten of his letters have survived. He presents himself as Dionysius from the *Acts of Apostles*, a disciple of Saint Paul, bishop of Athens. In the Middle Ages, the Franks fused the biblical person and the fifth century theologian with the third century holy bishop of Paris, converter of the Gauls, founder of the abbey of Saint Denis.

Pseudo-Dionysius’s writings were reinforced by commentaries soon after their launching: the commentaries of John of Scythopolis, Maximus Confessor and

³³⁶ P. Chiesa, “Interpres et expositor: le traduzioni non autosufficienti di Anastasio Bibliotecario,” in *Euphrosyne* 29 (2001), 173-184, at pages 183-4.

³³⁷ Recently: J. Zetzel, *Marginal Scholarship and Textual Deviance. The Commentum Cornuti and the Early Scholia on Persius*, Bulletin of the Institute of Classical Studies. Supplement 84 (London: Institute of Classical Studies, 2005); G.W. Most, *Commentaires-Kommentar* (Goettingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1999); J. Assmann and B. Gladigow, *Text und Kommentar* (Munich: Wilhelm Fink Verlag, 1995); earlier: E. Jeaneau, “Glosses et commentaires de textes philosophiques (IXe-XIIe s.)” in *Les genres littéraires dans les sources théologiques et philosophiques médiévales définition, critique et exploitation* (Louvain-la-Neuve: Institut d’Études Médiévales, 1982), 117-131.

others contributed substantially to the corpus's admission into the canon of established Greek Christian writers.

From here, the text's passage to the Latin West was secured by Eriugena. His achievement immediately stirred the interest of the papal court: pope Nicholas I requested a copy of the translation around 860³³⁹. One reason for the concern of the papacy was Eriugena's bad reputation for *non sane sapere*³⁴⁰ resulting from his views on predestination. But mistrust in Eriugena is in fact the expression of a more general papal concern, that is control of theological initiatives beyond Rome.

At this point our commentator entered the scene: Anastasius Bibliothecarius, who will embellish Eriugena's translation with the rendition of a set of Greek *scholia*. This realization brought him the fame of the infallible Grecist and the erudite scholar. But through Anastasius, this power was bestowed also upon the institution he represented: the papacy could thus confer upon itself the role of a moderator-mediator for the literary flow from Greek to Latin Christian culture, a power the papacy deeply desired.

On 23 March 875, Anastasius presented his *opus magnum* to the Frankish emperor. For Charles the Bald, dedicatee of both the letter of Eriugena and that of Anastasius, Dionysius was not so much the greatest mystical writer of the Greeks, but the first bishop of Paris, the patron saint of his dynasty.³⁴¹ The great beneficiary therefore of this blending of authorities was also Charles' dynasty, and, on a larger scale, the whole western Frankish empire.

³³⁸ Most, *Commentaries*, ix.

³³⁹ For the much debated authenticity of this letter, see the decisive article by R. Sommerville, "Pope Nicholas I and John Scottus Eriugena: JE 2833," in *Zeitschrift der Savigny-Stiftung für Rechtsgeschichte. Kanonistische Abteilung* 83 (1997): 67-85.

³⁴⁰ MGH, *Epistolae* 6, *Karolini Aevi* 4, 651.

³⁴¹ G. Arnaldi, "Anastasio Bibliothecario, Carlo il Calvo e la fortuna di Dionigi 'Areopagita nel secolo IX", in *Giovanni Scoto nel suo tempo* (Spoleto: CISAM, 1989), at pages 530-1.

There was an overlapping of theological and political, of local and universal interest in Dionysius: the papacy and the Franks were thus both being reaffirmed and strengthened in their secret desires and ambitions – a decisive factor that contributed significantly to the glorious career of the Dionysian writings in the Latin West.

I have studied the marginal interventions³⁴² of the Librarian in three of the oldest manuscripts of the “Anastasian corpus”: Berlin, Staatsbibliothek, Phillips 1668 (9th century)³⁴³ = **B**, Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale de France, MS. lat. 1618 (10th century)³⁴⁴ = **P**, and Florence, Laurenziana Plut. 89 sup. 15 (11-12th century)³⁴⁵ = **F**.

Hyacinthe Dondaine³⁴⁶ distinguishes two main branches in the early transmission of the Latin corpus, represented by two recensions of the main text, **A** and **T**, **T** being an amelioration of **A**.³⁴⁷ According to Dondaine, this is a recension made by Eriugena himself on the basis of his own translation, posterior to his *Expositiones in ierarchiam coelestem*.³⁴⁸ The “Anastasian corpus,” that is to say the text with the *scholia*, was probably built around the text of **T**,

³⁴² The issue of the interlinear notes will not be addressed here. See Dondaine, *Le corpus dionysien de l'université de Paris au XIIIe siècle* (Rome: Edizioni di Storia e Letteratura, 1953), 57-8.

³⁴³ V. Rose, *Verzeichniss der lateinischen Handschriften der königlichen Bibliothek zu Berlin* (Berlin: Asher, 1893), vol.1, 66-8.

³⁴⁴ Ph. Lauer, *Catalogue général des manuscrits latins*, vol. 2 (Paris: Bibliothèque Nationale de France, 1941), 93.

³⁴⁵ A. M. Bandini, *Catalogus Codicorum Latinorum Bibliothecae Mediceae Laurenzianae*, vol. 3 (Florence: n. p., 1776), 259-63.

³⁴⁶ H. Dondaine, *Le Corpus*, 35-66.

³⁴⁷ For **A**, Dondaine's representative sample is Paris BNF 1618, while for **T** stands for Troyes 802 (9th-10th centuries).

³⁴⁸ J. Barbet, on the other hand, considers that the first version of the translation is the one conserved in the text of Eriugena's *Expositiones*, all others being subsequent revisions. See *Iohannis Scoti Eriugena Expositiones in Ierarchiam coelestem*, ed. J. Barbet (Turnhout: Brepols, 1975), x-ix and “La tradition du texte latin de la ‘Hiérarchie céleste’ dans les manuscrits des *Expositiones in Hierarchiam Caelestem*” in *The Mind of Eriugena*, ed. J. J. O'Meara and L. Bieler (Dublin: The Irish University Press, 1973) 89-97.

but later, the comments were attached both to **T** and **A** - in the second case the readings of **T** were present in the form of interlinear glosses.³⁴⁹

The first two manuscripts derive from the **A** branch, while the Florentine manuscript contains a **T** revision. These three manuscripts are not sufficient to permit any substantial statement about textual transmission, but they do allow a comprehensive analysis of the nature of Anastasius' notes.

Their identification is a difficult task, since not even the authorship of the Greek glosses is a settled issue. Recently, through to the research of Beate Regina Suchla and Paul Rorem into the Syriac and Greek textual tradition, it has become possible to distinguish the notes of Maximus Confessor and others from those of John of Scythopolis, which is already of enormous help in the identification of the Anastasian notes. Anastasius himself was aware of the composite nature of the glosses: he distinguished the authors he believed to be Maximus and John by marking Maximus' interventions with a cross (unfortunately, these slowly disappeared from the Latin textual tradition). According to the research carried out by Michael Harrington, out of circa 600 *scholia* in the earlier Greek tradition, Anastasius omitted 32 completely, and also parts of 150 others.³⁵⁰ To this selection he then added his own interventions, too. So far, altogether 18 notes of Anastasius have been published by Dondaine and by Paolo Chiesa, all from the *Celestial Hierarchy*.³⁵¹ My presentation is based on a survey of the notes to the *Celestial Hierarchy*, the *Mystical Theology*, and the

³⁴⁹ **T**, on the other hand, does not contain a certain group of the interlinear corrections of **A**, based on better Greek manuscripts.

³⁵⁰ Harrington concludes from this that Anastasius probably had access to an even earlier recension, with fewer *scholia*, which he calls the "minority tradition". M. Harrington, *A Thirteenth-Century Textbook of Mystical Theology at the University of Paris* (Leuven: Peeters, 2004), 16-8. See also his "Anastasius the Librarian's Reading of the Greek Scholia on the Pseudo-Dionysian Corpus", in *Studia Patristica* 36 (2001): 119-125.

³⁵¹ Dondaine, *Le corpus*, 50-66; Chiesa, "Interpres et expositor," 176-177. For an analysis of them see P. Chiesa, "Traduzioni e traduttori dal greco nel IX secolo: sviluppi di una technica," in

Letters. I present mostly new, unpublished marginalia, referring to those already published only when they are directly relevant.

In order to optimize the results of identification of the Anastasian marginals, I proceeded according to the following criteria:

1. I consider what Anastasius himself says in his preface: "*Sane ubi a verbis interpretis scholia ipsa dissentire vidi, ut lector quid de apposita dictione interpretes senserit, quid scholion insinuet indifficulter agnoscat, et verba interpretis scholio inserui, et qualiter ea scholii compositor praetulerit, innui. Sed et, sicubi opportunum fore conspexi, ex me quoque (quoniam esse aliter non potuit) paucissima quaedam, et quae facilius ab intelligente agnosci poterant, interposui.*"³⁵²
2. Besides stressing that his own interventions may be easily recognizable by an intelligent reader – a remark both highly motivating and deeply frustrating for the investigator of his notes - he offers two identification clues: first, that he interfered when he observed discrepancies between the text and the Greek commentary; a second indication is the quantitative restriction implied in *ex me paucissima*.
3. I collated the notes from the manuscripts with the Greek notes printed in PG 4.³⁵³
4. I presumed that the Anastasian notes would be present in all three of the manuscripts that were examined.
5. The content of the notes proved highly indicative, especially when referring to issues of translation.

Giovanni Scoto nel suo tempo: l'organizzazione del sapere in età carolingia (Spoleto: CISAM, 1989), especially pages 189-196 for Eriugena's *Expositiones* and pages 197-199 for Anastasius' glosses.

³⁵² MGH, *Epistolae* 7, *Karolini Aevi* 5, 432.

Based on these criteria, cautiously applied on a case to case basis I have identified altogether around fifty comments in the *Celestial Hierarchy, Mystical Theology* and *Letters*, whether short or extensive, appended to his own and Eriugena's text. I divided them into the following categories: 1. rendering transliterated words; 2. proposing further semantic alternatives; 3. restoring the constitutive elements of Greek compounds; 4. correcting mistakes.

I have built my text on **B**, the oldest manuscript available, indicating textual variants from the other two manuscripts in brackets. Each note will be preceded by the semantic unit it illustrates. Sometimes the note is part of a Greek *scholion* – if that is the case, the relevant part of the *scholion* will also be quoted, while Anastasius's intervention will be marked in italicised letters.

TRANSLITERATION

A most simple type of intervention is the one in which a transliterated Greek word is given a Latin equivalent:

Cum sol ab ipsa(Letter 7)³⁵⁴

B (fol. 104r), **P** (fol. 83v), **F** (fol. 93r): ... disce quomodo deus solem et lunam secundum diametron, *id est lineam incidentem cyclum sive tetragonum* cum essent tunc adversus invicem cum iam sol occubisset...

There are other similar cases, all within the textual realm of the Greek notes: *gnosticos* is preserved, with the addition *id est scientes*;³⁵⁵ *monousion*, with the extension *id est singularis substantie*³⁵⁶, or *azoa* is referred to as *id est non viva*.³⁵⁷

³⁵³ PG 4, col. 15-432, 527-576.

³⁵⁴ G. Heil and A. M. Ritter, *Corpus Dionysiacum 2*, Patristische Texte und Studien 36 (Berlin: Walter De Gruyter, 1991) 169, 5-6; PL 122, 1180A; PG 4, 537D-540A.

³⁵⁵ **B** (fol. 26v), **P** (fol. 19v), **F** (fol. 20r) - PG 4, 104AB.

³⁵⁶ **B** (fol. 27v), **P** (fol. 20r), **F** (fol. 21r) - PG 4, 105C.

³⁵⁷ **B** (fol. 13v), **P** (fol. 9v), **F** (fol. 9v) - Heil-Ritter, *Corpus*, 20, 16; PL 122, 1046B. This gloss would have been of great help to Eriugena, who had a faulty manuscript, lacking the alpha privative. See P. Rorem, *Eriugena's Commentary on the Dionysian Celestial Hierarchy* (Toronto: PIMS, 2005), 28-31.

Already from the above cases it is obvious that the option of transliteration with an additional Latin explanation is mostly preferred for the case of technical terms or doctrinally loaded expressions. However, this motivation of precision in the technical vocabulary can lead sometimes to the opposite practice, namely, the recovery of the Greek term instead of its Latin equivalent:

Animorum (Celestial Hierarchy, 1)³⁵⁸

B (fol. 8r), **P** (fol. 5v), **F** (fol. 4v): “Animos sive noas quasi hic sermo grecus habet etiam gentiles philosophi intelligibiles id est spirituales virtutes haud dubium quin angelicas nuncupant (P F nuncupant).”

Anastasius seems to have been warned by the Greek scholiast, that the term ‘animus’ was not precise enough for the intellectual part of the soul (νοῦς).

SEMANTIC ALTERNATIVES

The text is full with such suggestions, such as *manifestatrices*³⁵⁹ expounded by *sive manifestatorie id est denunciatorie*³⁶⁰ *contemplationes*³⁶¹ by *sive conspectus*³⁶² or *coartantur*³⁶³ by *sive desinunt*.³⁶⁴

More complex interventions present themselves as follows:

Extergentes³⁶⁵ (Letter 9)

B (fol. 109r), **P** (fol. 87r), **F** (fol. 98r): *Quod interpres extergentes transtulit grecus magis imitari (F imitari) sive formare ac excipere seu recondere et immittere indicat quid in mentem suam ex metaphora pictorum qui attendentes veritati pingunt imagines (F imagines).*

³⁵⁸ PL 122, 1037D - PG 4, 32AB.

³⁵⁹ *Celestial Hierarchy* 4, PL 122, 1047A.

³⁶⁰ **B** (fol. 14r), **P** (fol. 10r), **F** (fol. 9v).

³⁶¹ *Mystical Theology* 3, PL 122, 1175A; PG 4, 425B.

³⁶² **B** (101v), **P** (fol. 81r), **F** (fol. 90r)

³⁶³ *Mystical Theology* 3, PL 122, 1175A; PG 4, 425B.

³⁶⁴ **B** (101v), **P** (fol. 81r), **F** (fol. 90r)

³⁶⁵ ἐναπομόγγυννται (Heil-Ritter, *Corpus*, 193); PL 122, 1188B; PG 4, 557D.

Here Anastasius fused his own comment with that of John: the Scythopolitan suggested ἀπομόραξαι and ἐμβάλειν for ἐναπομόργυννται, while Anastasius, faithfully translating them as *formare ac excipere*, added two more synonyms (*recondere et immittere*). In most of the cases thus far, Anastasius “corrected” himself, not Eriugena.

Conditionalem (*Mystical Theology* 3)³⁶⁶

B (fol. 101v), **P** (fol. 81r), **F** (90v): *quod grecus ypotethicam (F hypotheticam) habet et interpres conditionalem edidit quod magis exortativam (F exhortativam) seu inductivam et suppositivam signat. et hic pro dictatoria et indicatoria positum est.*

This time, a slightly corrective tendency can be observed, which introduced some sort of hierarchy within the universe of synonyms: when Anastasius put forward his suggestions, as opposed to that of the translator, he used the adverb *magis*, in both cases. However, this was not a tendentious judgement: when evaluating his own version as superior, he is relied on the authority of the Greek gloss. Similar qualifications are suggested by the terms *expressius* or *aptius*, for example when glossing the expression *ordo divinus*³⁶⁷: *velut expressius et aptius grece habetur ordo sacer*.³⁶⁸ This is a practice which can also often be found in Eriugena’s commentary on his own translation.³⁶⁹

Deiformis (*Celestial Hierarchy* 7)³⁷⁰

B (fol. 16v), **P** (fol. 11v), **F** (fol. 11r): *Notandum quod et divine virtutes secundum habitudinem sive consuetudinem habent deiformitatem et hic autem quam interpres in habitudinem transtulit queque in consuetudinem versa repperitur est qualitas perseverans.*

Next to *habitus* for ἔξις he proposes *consuetudo*, a term which in several instances he encountered rendered as such.³⁷¹ He sent the reader back to this

³⁶⁶ PL 122, 1175B – PG 4, 426D-428A.

³⁶⁷ *Celestial Hierarchy* 3, PL 122, 1044C.

³⁶⁸ **B** (fol. 12v), **P** (fol. 8v), **F** (fol. 7v); see also Chiesa, “Interpres et expositor” 176.

³⁶⁹ Rorem, *Eriugena’s Commentary*, 55.

³⁷⁰ PL 122, 1050A – PG 4, 65BC.

note once more in a cross-reference, with another occurrence of ἔξις, this time translated by Eriugena as *habitus*³⁷²: “Diximus quid sit ex his *quam interpres habitum transtulit lege in septimo capitulo.*”³⁷³

COMPOUNDS

Angelicarum imaginum descriptiones (*Celestial Hierarchy 2*)³⁷⁴

B (fol. 12r), **P** (fol. 8r), **F** (fol. 7v): Bene fictas immaginum (P F imaginum) descriptiones sive immaginales (P F imaginales) species quas et predixit *non angelicas tantum sicut interpres posuit sed angelicas species nominavit*. Non enim ipsorum angelorum ut sunt imagines (P F imagines) pingunt sed intelligentiam (P intelligentia) quandam speciei facte corpore subostendunt (F subostendiunt).

Here, Anastasius tried to restore all the semantic components of the Greek compound ἀγγελουειδεῖς,³⁷⁵ following the Greek scholiast. This receptiveness reflects an accurate and intelligent reading and confronting of the Greek texts. On the other hand, it lead to one of the most extreme manifestations of literal translation. His severe admonition of Eriugena for applying such a method may be contrasted with his own notes.

Perfectissimam (*Celestial Hierarchy 1*)³⁷⁶

B (fol. 7v), **P** (fol. 5v), **F** (fol. 4v): Perfectissima sacrorum dispositio *sive ut grece habetur summe immolationis sacra positio* est divine sacrorum mysteriorum nostrorum adordinationis positio seu traditio (*F traditio*).

Here the Greek phrase in question is τελετάρχης ἱεροθεσία³⁷⁷ which, as translated by Eriugena, did not, according to Anastasius, do justice to the text:

³⁷¹ Even Eriugena uses it in this way, eg. *Celestial Hierarchy 2* (PL 122, 1042 C; Heil-Ritter, *Corpus*, 14, 6).

³⁷² *Celestial Hierarchy 15*, PL 122, 1067C - PG 4, 109 CD.

³⁷³ **B** (fol. 29r), **P** (fol. 21r), **F** (fol. 22r).

³⁷⁴ PL 122, 1044A - PG 4, 48BC.

³⁷⁵ Heil-Ritter, *Corpus*, 16, 15.

³⁷⁶ PL 122, 1038D - PG 4, 32D-34A.

³⁷⁷ Heil-Ritter, *Corpus*, 8, 14.

he preferred to render the relationships implied by the Greek syntactic arrangement more precisely, while also preserving all possible semantic elements. However, this was a concern that, even if not reflected on the level of the translation, Eriugena shared with Anastasius. The term τελετάρχις was rendered by Anastasius as *summa immolatio*; Eriugena used a simple *perfectissima*³⁷⁸ but in his commentary he offered the alternative reading of *principium purgationum et finis*³⁷⁹ or, *perfectissima purgatio*³⁸⁰. Eriugena called his method *simplicia pro compositis*, that is to say, rendering a compound not by accounting for its elements, but by finding one expression, even if of lesser semantic force, for its overall meaning. Without adapting this method one cannot do justice to the text except through paraphrasing it. In support of his methodology he referred to the Greeks themselves, who, he observed, occasionally preferred plain terms to compounds.³⁸¹

³⁷⁸ Or, in variant readings, the transliterated Greek term.

³⁷⁹ “Cur autem summa Trinitas tali nomine quod est ΤΕΛΕΤΑΡΧΙΣ appellatur non incongrue queritur. Est igitur hoc nomen compositum ab eo quod est ΤΕΛΕΘΗ et ΑΡΧΙΣ; ΤΕΛΕΘΗ autem a Grecis dicitur hostia purgatiua omnium peccatorum, per quam de homine efficitur deus; ac per hoc sancta Trinitas unus Deus, quoniam causa et principium est totius nostre purgationis et deificationis, pulchre et rationabiliter ΤΕΛΕΤΑΡΧΙΣ vocatur, hoc est ΤΕΛΕΤΩΝ ΑΡΧΗ, principium scilicet purgationum et finis. Siquidem ΑΡΧΗ apud Grecos et principium significat et finem. Causa quippe substitutionis nostre secundum naturam eadem est causa et sanctificationis nostre et perfectionis secundum gratiam. Simili ratione eadem summa Trinitas ΙΕΡΟΘΕΙΑ, quasi ΙΕΡΩΝ ΘΕΙΑ, hoc est sacrorum positio, convenienter dicitur, quoniam ipsa est omnium sacrosanctorum mysteriorum...” *Eriugena Expositiones* 13-14.

³⁸⁰ *Eriugena Expositiones* 18, 19.

³⁸¹ *Eriugena Expositiones* 8-9.

CORRECTIONS

The most common corrections indicate mistakes originating in Eriugena's faulty manuscript³⁸²:

Effectum(Celestial Hierarchy 15)³⁸³

B (fol. 29r), **P** (fol. 21r), **F** (fol. 22v): Aestimo quos sputum vel etiam spiramus (P F spiramen) pro effectum hic habere debeat πτησιν enim et ποίησιν id est spiritum (F sputum) et effectum quod vicina sibi sunt scriptor pro primo posuit ut reor secundum.

Indeed, there are manuscripts³⁸⁴ that confuse these two terms, and obviously, the two translators had access to two variant readings. One might wonder, however, whether it was philological intuition which caused Anastasius to recognize that a scribal error had misled Eriugena, or whether he possessed manuscripts offering both versions.

Laudatores³⁸⁵

B (fol. 12v), **P** (fol. 8v), **F** (fol. 8v): Quos hic auctor libri grece 'thiasotas'³⁸⁶ dicit et interpres in 'laudatores' transtulit ego 'subditos' esse conitio (F conicio).

Here again, the conjecture of Anastasius represents the correct reading, stemming from a manuscript which probably read θιασώτας where Eriugena's text read θειασώτας.³⁸⁷

Rationem et intellectum(Celestial Hierarchy 2)³⁸⁸

B (fol. 10r), **F** (fol. 6v), **P** (om.): "secundum (F ins. *quid*) dicitur 'logos', *id est ratio sive ut hic aptius* (F *grecus*) *verbum interpretari congruit* et 'sensus' deus in eo scilicet loco (F ins. *quo*) dicitur 'quis cognovit sensum domini'(1 Cor. 2.16) et aliis et 'factum est verbum domini ad me dicens' (Jer. 1.4)."

³⁸² Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale de France, MS. gr. 437.

³⁸³ PL 122, 1068A.

³⁸⁴ Heil-Ritter, *Corpus* 55, 19.

³⁸⁵ *Celestial Hierarchy* 3, PL 122, 1044D.

³⁸⁶ θιασώτας (Heil-Ritter, *Corpus*, 18, 2).

³⁸⁷ "Hoc est divina cantantes", "eos videlicet qui in unitate ierarchie et participatione eum laudant": these quotes illustrate Eriugena's pains to harmonize the term with its context. *Eriugena Expositiones* 59.

³⁸⁸ PL 122, 1041B – PG 4, 40C.

Here, based on the scholiast's biblical quotations, Anastasius went for *sensus* or *verbum* over *ratio* for the present context of the Greek λόγος.

ardentibus³⁸⁹(Mystical Theology 1)

B (fol. 100v), **P** (fol. 80r), **F** (fol. 89r): “‘Ardentes’ quod (P dicit) interpres posuit grecus ‘non imbutos’ seu ‘non initiatos’ id est ‘non consecratos’ habet. et notandum quod alios ‘indoctos’ dicat et alios ‘non imbutos’”.

Anastasius relied again on the Greek *scholion*, which correlates the term ἀμύητος with ἄμυστος. It is difficult to guess, on the other hand, what misreading lead Eriugena to understand *ardentes*³⁹⁰.

Petiit deo igne³⁹¹ (Letter 8)

B(fol. 108v), **P** (fol. 87v), **F** (97v): ‘prester’ quod grecus habet interpres in ‘ignem’ transtulit nos pro ‘turbine’ positum invenimus. Est enim motus circularis forme qui sit desursum subtus aerem per ignem incendit autem huiuscemodi unde et a ‘pimran’ id est ‘comburare’ dicitur ‘prester’ id est ‘combustio’.

This was a rectification regarding a technical term, created by fusing together his own note with that of the Greek scholiast. The main difficulty is caused by an etymologizing explanation that Anastasius tried to mirror in his translation (*comburare-combustio*). Thus, for rendering the Greek term πρηστήρ, Eriugena chose *in ignem*, while Anastasius preferred *turbinem*, appended with what the Greek scholiast derived from πιμπρᾶν: *combustio*.

Quasi puer novus³⁹² (Letter 8³⁹³)

B (fol. 107v), **P** (fol. 86r), **F** (fol. 97r): “quod interpres hic posuit (F deest) quasi ‘puer novus’ interpretatus est grecus ‘cata tes corres’ id est in ‘corren’ habet. Est autem ‘corre’ ‘tempus’ vel sicut quidam scribunt ‘timpus’ nonnulli vero ‘buccam’ aiunt. Alii autem partem aliquam capitis. Porro melius ‘corre’ ‘tempus’ dicitur. Homerus tamen ‘corsen’ illud vocat ast ‘corre’ in penultimo

³⁸⁹ PL 122, 1173B - PG 4, 417C.

³⁹⁰ Perhaps a form of ἀμπυρόω? In other places where he translates *ardentes* (PL 122, 1065C, 1093 B) the Greek text has different forms of ἐμπρήθω: *Celestial Hierarchy* 15 (Heil-Ritter, *Corpus*, 52, 5); *Ecclesiastical Hierarchy*, 4 (Heil-Ritter, *Corpus*, 101, 11).

³⁹¹ PL 122, 1187B - PG 4, 556D-557A.

³⁹² PL 122, 1186B - PG 4, 553A.

³⁹³ Heil-Ritter, *Corpus*, 187, 3.

recipit accentum. Ergo in tempus percussit demophilus eum qui paenitentiam agebat.”

Anastasius, when correcting Eriugena’s misunderstanding of κατὰ κόρης (probably a confusion with κόρος) relied again on the Greek scholiast, who explained, that this term is in fact a synonym for κρόταφον or κόρη.

Omni repletur incredibili et ficti forme monstrositate (*Letter 9*)³⁹⁴

B (fol. 109v), **P** (fol. 88r), **F** (fol. 98v): *quod interpres hoc ‘omni’ posuit grecus ‘quanta’ habet (P ins. posuit) et (P F om.) hic autem ‘quanta’ pro ‘multa’ positum est.*

Since the Greek scholiast affirmed that ὀπόσης here meant in fact πολλῆς, Anastasius tried to render this distinction into Latin because otherwise the scholion would be unintelligible: he equated the *omni* of Eriugena with *quanta*, the meaning of ὀπόσης the scholiast will refer to.

incommutabili mansione et bonitate relictus (*Letter 9*)³⁹⁵

B (fol. 111r), **P** (fol. 89v), **F** (fol. 100v): *quod hic interpres ‘bonitatem’ ait et grecus ‘estian’ habet hic pater ut opinor explanat quid ‘estia’ sit innuens. ‘Estia’ enim quam interpres qua (F hucusque) ‘domum’ vel ‘convivium’ posuit ‘existentia’ est sicut enim latine ab ‘est’ ‘existentia’ dirivatur ita grece ab ‘estin’ ‘estia’ ab eo quod est et permanet producta.*

The Greek scholiast detected here a wordplay by Pseudo-Dionysius, ἐστία echoing ἐστηκώς, the participle from a few lines above. The text in the *PG* says ἐστία derives from ἐστί; this is in perfect accord with Anastasius, who translated it as *est*. It is difficult to guess what exactly the Greek scholiast has intended here: the verb from which the participle comes from is ἴστημι, and the noun can be derived from ἐστίαω. A missing spirit from the initial vowel (in accordance with the contemporary Byzantine pronunciation), must have misled both Eriugena and Anastasius, who, when trying to mirror the Greek etymological explication, offered us the correlatives *est* and *existentia*, which at

³⁹⁴ PL 122, 1188D - PG 4, 560A.

best is only an analogous situation. Further, he mentioned that for the Greek term ἐστία Eriugena usually uses *domus* or *convivium*. Here he revealed his faulty memory, since Eriugena, throughout the text, usually preferred to use *refectio* or *mansio* for it, operating with *domus* in the case of οἶκος, and with *convivium* in the case of συμποσία.³⁹⁶ Anastasius, one must admit it, was not always the perfect philologist who made such an impression on his readers in the dedicatory letter.³⁹⁷

ANASTASIUS'S INSTRUMENTS AND SOURCES

These notes, if read carefully, also indicate the possible sources and instruments a translator could use during his work. Many of the notes refer to extra-textual realia. These can be divided into two groups: hints at other manuscripts, or at other translators. In the case of references to manuscripts, I have found it impossible to reconstruct anything except the fact that he used more than one manuscript, from both the Latin and the Greek tradition.³⁹⁸

Then, he often spoke about his predecessors and colleagues, the other translators. Sometimes, he was simply referring to the general practice of rendering a word, such as for example ῥαστώνη.³⁹⁹ Nevertheless, a closer look

³⁹⁵ PL 122, 1191B– PG 4, 572A.

³⁹⁶ All other occurrences of ἐστία occur as follows: *Divine Names* 1 (B. R. Suchla, *Corpus Dionysiacum* 1, Patristische Texte und Studien 33 (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1990), 120, 2) has *custos* (PL 122, 1118B); *Divine Names* 7 (Suchla, *Corpus*, 199, 11) has *mansio* (PL 122, 1129B); *Divine Names* 4 (Suchla, *Corpus*, 142, 14) and *Divine Names* 10 (Suchla, *Corpus*, 215, 3) have *refectio* ((PL 122, 1129B; PL 1163C). *Convivium* (PL 122, 1192B) for συμποσία in *Letter* 9 (Heil-Ritter, *Corpus*, 205, 9); *domus* (PL 1187C) in *Letter* 8 (Heil-Ritter, *Corpus*, 190, 5) for οἶκος.

³⁹⁷ The other element in need of an explanation in this passage is Eriugena's choice for *bonitas*. I think a possible answer to this can be found in a passage in the *Divine Names*, where he used *refectio bonorum* (PL 122, 1129B.), for ἐστία τῶν ἀγαθῶν (Suchla, *Corpus*, 142, 14), maybe he did not want to repeat another term for edifice after *mansio*, so that he substituted an abstract term for the metaphor.

³⁹⁸ See for example P. Chiesa, "Interpres et expositor" 176, for sholia referring to both Latin and Greek manuscripts.

³⁹⁹ P. Chiesa, "Interpres et expositor" 177.

at certain other cases allows us to trace back concrete references, to get an idea about the presence of the Dionysian texts at the papal court prior to the translation of the entire corpus.

Monas est et unitas, tres substantialiter (Celestial Hierarchy 7)⁴⁰⁰

B (fol. 18v), **P** (fol. 13r), **F** (fol. 13r): 'Trisypostaton' vero quod hic interpret 'tres substantialiter' interpretatus est priores interpretes 'trium subsistentiarum' sparsim interpretati sunt. Nam dicens 'monada sive unitatem trisypostaton' aperte docet 'unitatem trium esse subsistentiarum id est personarum'.⁴⁰¹

This is not the only place where Anastasius discussed the problems of translating the term (τρισ)ὑπόστασις. In his dedicatory letter to John VIII, when presented his translation of the acts of the seventh ecumenical council (nr. 6 in the catalogue), he devoted an entire passage to this problem.

Sed et illud notandum, quoniam ubicumque in hujus synodi textu 'subsistentiam' posui, 'personam' intelligi volui. Quod enim Grece 'hypostasis' dicitur, hoc nonnulli 'personam', nonnulli vero 'subsistentiam' interpretati sunt. Porro 'subsistentiam' multi 'personam', multi vero 'substantiam' etiam intellexerunt. At illos ego secutus, qui 'subsistentiam' non 'substantiam', sed 'personam' intelligi voluerunt - magni quippe sunt - , ubicumque Grece in hoc codice 'hypostasin' repperi, in 'subsistentiam' transtuli, hanc 'personam', sicut et alii quam plurimi, volens intelligi.⁴⁰²

Many of the problems surrounding of early Christian trinitarian controversies arouse from the fact that terminology was equivocal. Thus, with the term ὑπόστασις, its semantic field in Greek made it possible to equate it with either οὐσία, or with πρόσωπον, just as in Latin it could stand for both *substantia* or *persona*. Anastasius, aiming at extreme terminological precision, emphasised that he used it in the sense of *persona*, but translated it as *subsistentia*, probably having in mind that *persona* should be reserved for πρόσωπον.

⁴⁰⁰PL 122, 1053B– PG 4, 76D-77A.

⁴⁰¹P. Chiesa, "Interpres et expositor" 177.

⁴⁰²MGH, *Epistolae* 7, *Karolini Aevi* 5, 417.

So, who were these *nonnulli*, these *priores interpretes*, on whose practice he builds his case? He himself pointed out four instances of previous Latin translations of Dionysian fragments in his dedicatory letter: the text of the Lateran council of 649 organized by Martin I, the letter of Pope Agatho to the third council of Constantinople, and his own renderings of the seventh and eighth ecumenical councils (nr. 5 and 6 in the catalogue).⁴⁰³ Another papal document containing Dionysian fragments is the so called *Hadrianum*, the reaction of Pope Hadrian I to the severe condemnation of Nicaea II by Charlemagne and his theologians⁴⁰⁴; these Dionysian fragments had already been quoted during the Lateran council of 769.⁴⁰⁵ Besides these documents, acts of the seventh and eight ecumenical synods, both translated by Anastasius (in 873 and 871 respectively, nr. 5 and 6 in the catalogue) contain some scarce references to Dionysius.⁴⁰⁶ Also, there is one letter from pope Nicholas I to Michael III (issued in 865 and composed most probably by Anastasius himself) which referred to Dionysius's *Letter 8*.⁴⁰⁷

Not only was Anastasius aware of the presence of Pseudo-Dionysius in previous dossiers prepared by the papacy, but he also made use of these fragments.

For example the letter of Pope Agatho indeed exhibited not only the expression mentioned before - *trium subsistentiarum* -, but also the equation

⁴⁰³ MGH, *Epistolae* 7, *Karolini Aevi* 5, 431-3.

⁴⁰⁴ This letter contains quotes from *Letter 10*, and *Celestial Hierarchy* 1, 3; MGH, *Epistolae* 5, *Karolini Aevi* 3, 32-33.

⁴⁰⁵ MGH, *Legum* 3, *Concilia* 2, 1, 91. For the Greek origins of these quotes see A. Alexakis, "The Source of the Greek Patristic Quotations in the *Hadrianum* (JE 2483) of Pope Hadrian I", *Annuario Historiae Conciliorum* 26 (1994), 14-30, at page 25.

⁴⁰⁶ In the acts of the council of Nicea, references are to be found in the letter of Tarasius from Actio 3 (Mansi 12, col. 1121), in the refutation from Actio 6 (Mansi 13, col. 211A, 254E) and in canon 2 (Mansi 13, col. 419). The eighth ecumenical council has only one reference, Actio 10, Regula 1 (Mansi 16, col. 160).

⁴⁰⁷ MGH, *Epistolae* 6, *Karolini Aevi* 4, 466.

subsistentia/persona in several instances.⁴⁰⁸ Echos of Agatho's letters can be found in another case, too:

Et ceterum non secundum deum divina operatus neque humana secundum hominem sed humanato ^{grecus virificato} deo novam quandam dei humanam ^{grecus dei virilem} operationem nobis conversatus est (*Letter 4*)⁴⁰⁹

B(fol. 103r), **P** (fol. 82v), **F** (fol. 92r): [...] Illud vero quod ait <virifica>to⁴¹⁰ seu viro facto significat humanato sive homine facto dei humana *sive ut ante expressius interpretatum est dei virilis* operatio significat divinam et humanam. Sic enim nobiscum id est <propter nos> super terram videlicet conversatus egit divina ut predictum est et humana.

He referred to an anterior, more expressive version, which offers instead of the *dei humana operatio* the formula *dei virilis operatio*. This phrase could be found in the letter of Pope Agatho to the participants in the Constantinopolitanum III: "*humana una deivirili operatione, secundum beatum Dionysium*".⁴¹¹ The same expression of Pseudo-Dionysius also appeared in the *Collectanea* (nr. 8 in the catalogue), translated by Anastasius: "*etiam vere deiphantor Dionysius, non unam vocaverit hanc, sed nova quadam deivirili nobis eum dixerit operatione conversatum*."⁴¹² The letter of Agatho might have also inspired this solution. This letter was composed in Latin, but translated immediately into Greek, to be read at the council.

⁴⁰⁸ "in duabus personis, vel subsistentiis" (PL 87, 1168B); "subsistentiam sive personam" (PL 87, 1181C); "trinitatem vero personarum sive subsistentiarum" (PL 87, 1220D), "trium subsistentiarum" (PL 87, 1220D).

⁴⁰⁹ PL 122, 1178B - PG 4, 533BC.

⁴¹⁰ <missing in B P.

⁴¹¹ PL 87, 1204A. This is not the only place Agatho quotes Dionysius. A long passage from the second chapter of the *Divine Names* is quoted as a testimony at the end of his letter. PL 87, 1192B- 1193A.

⁴¹² "Anastasio monachi epistola ad monachos Calaritanos", in *Scripta saeculi VII vitam Maximi Confessoris illustrantia una cum latine interpretatione Anastasio Bibliothecarii iuxta posita*, ed. P. Allen and B. Neil (Turnhout-Leuven, 1999), 168. In the *Collectanea* there is one more reference to the *Divine Names* ("Anastasio Apocrisiarii epistola ad Theodosium Gangrensem", in Allen-Neil, ed. *Scripta saeculi VII*, 184-5).

His other point of reference is the Lateran synod of 649, convoked by Pope Martin I.⁴¹³ This text also has four references to Pseudo-Dionysius, one of them containing precisely with the term in question:

Sancti Dionysii ex epistola ad Gaium directa ad locum: etiam non secundum Deum divina operatus, neque humana secundum hominem, sed Deo homine facto, novam quamdam dei virilem, id est, theandricin, operationem nobis ostendens.⁴¹⁴

It would have been very precious to have the name of at least one person with the ability to pick words *expressius* than Eriugena. But, unfortunately, the character of the council-translations does not offer such satisfactions: in many instances these translations represent the anonymous work of a group of translators - perhaps one of the reasons Anastasius used the plural *interpretes*.

SOME PROBLEMATIC NOTES

There are four notes I would hesitate to attribute to Anastasius. Two of them are simple lexical remarks on Greek terms,⁴¹⁵ while the others consist of short elucidations of the terms *καλός* and *ἀγαθός*,⁴¹⁶ and *ἀποφατική* and

⁴¹³ It is by now accepted that the language of the original acts was Greek, translated concurrently into Latin. See R. Riedinger, *Kleine Schriften zu den Konzilsakten des 7. Jahrhunderts* (Turnhout: Brepols, 1998); P. Conte, *Il sinodo Lateranense dell'ottobre 649* (Roma: Libreria Editrice Vaticana, 1989).

⁴¹⁴ R. Riedinger, *Concilium Lateranense 649, Acta Conciliorum Oecumenicorum 2/1* (Berlin: de Gruyter, 1984), 141-142.

⁴¹⁵ **B** (fol. 7v), **P** (fol. 5v): “ἀναγωγή sursum ‘reductio’ vel ‘contemplatio’ vel ‘ascensio’. γήρως ‘templum’. *iereus* ‘sacerdos’. ‘ierarchia’ ‘episcopatus’ vel ‘summu sacerdotem’.” **F**: om.

B (fol. 12v), **P** (fol. 8v): “ἀγάματα (P agalmata) ‘leticie’ (P leticie) ‘glorie’ sive ‘immago’ (P imago).” **F**: om. See also Dondaine, *Le corpus*, 59.

⁴¹⁶ **B** (fol. 7v), **P** (fol. 5v): “Duobus modis (P modis om.) nominibus vocatur deus apud grecos quibus maxime iste intellectus multiplicationis videlicet dei per omnia recollectionis iterum omnium in deum insinuat *καλός* et *ἀγαθός*. ‘kalos’ enim dicitur qui omnia ad se vocat ut unum in ipso sint (P sint). ‘Agathos’ vero quia valde currit per omnia dans ei (P eis) essentiam (P differentiam) proprietatem et universaliter et singulariter. ‘Agon’ enim apud grecos valde significat *θεός*, currens *καλῶ* vero voco. hinc verisimile dat quod et apud nos ‘bonus’ dicatur a verbo greco quod est (P est om.) *βοῶ* hoc est ‘clamo’. Bonus ergo dicitur deus qui omnia ad se clamat.” **F**: om.

καταφατική⁴¹⁷. Besides being missing from **F** (that is to say from the **T** branch), they echoed passages in other Eriugenian works. The derivation of θεός from θέω can be found in the first chapter of the *Expositiones*,⁴¹⁸ and the *Periphyseon*'s first book⁴¹⁹, while the connection of καλός with καλῶ and βοῶ appeared in the second book of the *Periphyseon*.⁴²⁰ Analogous reflections on ἀποφατική and καταφατική can be found in the second book of the *Expositiones*,⁴²¹ and the first book of the *Periphyseon*⁴²².

Furthermore, there are two notes on *Letter 10*, which are present in all three manuscripts, implying a knowledge of Greek, but not sharing the general character of the previous notes. Firstly, they are introduced by the word “grecus”, not to be found in the other notes, except for some interlinear ones described by Dondaine. Secondly, they simply offer a retranslation of the Latin text, while the notes presented thus far do not resemble the structure of Eriugena's translation and are heavily dependent on the glosses of the Greek commentators.

Iohanni theologo apostolo et evangelistae determinato et credito patmo insulae⁴²³

B (fol. 112r), **P** (fol. 90r), **F** (101v): *grecus exilio relegato apud patmum insulam habet*

⁴¹⁷ **B** (fol. 10v), **P** (fol. 7r): “Ac si dixisset sicut ἀποφατική id est negatio vel depulsio plus valet in divinis significandis quam καταφατική id est intentio vel affirmatio. Sic ille modus est figurationis que ex inconsequentibus figuris componitur (P componitur) maiorem vim in significandis divinis obtinet quam ille modus qui consequenter ex similibus formis componitur. Nam sicut deus et divina melius per negationes cognoscuntur quam per affirmationem sic minus falluntur homines dissimilibus formis quam similibus.” **F**: om.

⁴¹⁸ *Eriugena Expositiones...*, ed. Barbet, 5-6.

⁴¹⁹ *Iohannis Scotti seu Eriugena Periphyseon*, ed. E. Jeaneau, CCCM 161-165, vol. 1 (Turhout: Brepols, 1996-2003), 18.

⁴²⁰ *Eriugena Periphyseon*, vol. II, 74-5.

⁴²¹ *Eriugena Expositiones*, 33-4.

⁴²² *Eriugena Periphyseon*, ed. Jeaneau, vol. I, 30-1.

⁴²³ PL 122, 1193A.

appellans sacram animam dilectissime...⁴²⁴

B (fol. 112r), **P** (fol. 90r), **F** (fol. 101v): *Grecus saluto te sacram animam* (F ins. *tuam*)

These changes reflect variant manuscript readings, such as κατὰ Πάτμον τήν νήσον (*apud Patmum insulam*) instead of Πάτμω τῇ νήσῳ (*Patmo insulae*), or a simple, but more precisely rendered περιορισθέντι (*exilio relegato*) instead of περιορισθέντι καὶ πιστευθέντι (*determinato et credito*).⁴²⁵

CONCLUSIONS

By analysing a set of notes that Anastasius appended to Eriugena's translation of the *Corpus Dionysiacum*, it is possible to get an overview of the priorities, methods, practices, sources and instruments that could be used by a medieval translator.

Anastasius's concerns were mostly of a semantic character: he was sensitive to terminological precision and the conservation of the polysemantism of the original. Offering other possible alternatives rarely seemed a judgement on the choice of the previous translator. It aimed at a better understanding of the text, and as a method, sprang from the conviction that texts (or rather, words, since we are in the realm of literal translations) are polysemantic. Preferring one term would restrain the original polyphony and ambiguity of a text – and it was simply not considered to be the task of the translator, to indulge in such adventures.⁴²⁶ Thus, corrections were not replacements, but rather they constituted an infinite chain of meanings to which one could add more and more, without annihilating the others. Moreover, Eriugena's reflections in his

⁴²⁴ PL 122, 1193A.

⁴²⁵ Heil-Ritter, *Corpus*, 208.

⁴²⁶ See my chapter *Methods, Theories and Inconsistencies*, p. 109-110.

own commentary lead to the same conclusions. The methods, approaches and knowledge of Greek, semantic sensibility of the two translators were closer to each other than appears at first reading of the introductory letters which oppose them as champions of the *verbum e verbo* and respectively *sensum ad sensum* methods. Inside the text Anastasius shows more respect towards his colleague, than outside of it, in his preface: what he did was in fact an augmentation of the other's translation rather than disapproval of it.

In addition, this critique was never expressed on subjective grounds: replacement was suggested mainly in cases where there was a palaeographical explanation for the mistake. He was aware that issues of textual criticism could be decisive for a correct understanding of the text. Also, his interventions are often relied on the Greek *scholia*: he borrowed the authority of the Greek commentator, when interfering with the translator's authority. This does not represent an autonomous, direct approach to the text: he backed up his suggestions with the Greek *scholia* and a small arsenal of earlier papal-conciliar documentation. He compared Eriugena's solutions with those of earlier translators, digging out from the papal library a set of scattered occurrences of Dionysian passages in earlier documents prepared at the pontifical court. He not only considered what the Greek commentators said, but he was also sensitive to the problematic passages occurring in previous theological controversies.

Respect for the text(s), thoughtful and devoted reading, documentation - the qualities which made Gabriel Théry exclaim: "Qu'y a-t-il de plus ingénieux qu'un commentateur du moyen âge?"⁴²⁷ A translator-commentator, perhaps.⁴²⁸

⁴²⁷ G. Théry, *Études dionysiennes* (Paris: Vrin, 1932), vol. 1, 97. Admiration shared by Rorem, *Eriugena's Commentary*, 37.

⁴²⁸ I am referring here to both Anastasius and Eriugena.

EXCURSUS: THREE EUSEBIAN FRAGMENTS TRANSLATED BY ANASTASIUS?

While studying the Latin tradition of the *Corpus Dionysiacum*, I found three short fragments appended to the end of the works of Pseudo-Dionysius in some of the manuscripts. The three pieces include: a passage from a letter of Polycrates, bishop of Ephesus from the 2nd century, a fragment of Clement of Alexandria's *Quis dives salvetur*, and excerpts from Philo's *De vita contemplativa*. They are all second hand quotes that can be found in Eusebius' *Historia ecclesiastica*. At end of Pseudo-Dionysius' works in Florence Laur. Plut. 89 sup. 15, at folios 102-104, it can be noted that the note *finitus est cum deo liber dionisii aripagitae* comes only after these three short excerpts, indicating, that obviously someone had included them here because of their direct relevance to the Dionysian texts. And indeed, they are mentioned by John of Scythopolis in his *scholia* to the letters of Pseudo-Dionysius. The first reference can be found in his very first note on Pseudo-Dionysius' first letter. Here the term *therapeutes*, referring to the addressee, Gaius, is commented on as follows:

[...] In the sixth chapter of the *Ecclesiastical Hierarchy*⁴²⁹ he said that the monks are called *therapeutae*. He also discussed there how they are constituted – not clergy, but none the less above the laity. Philo the Jew seems to have admired them in his treatise *On the Contemplative Life* (i. e. *The Suppliants*), calling them *therapeutae* and discussing their way of life near the end of that book. Read Philo's comments.⁴³⁰

The other reference is included in the first note to *Letter 10*:

[...] Ireneus recounts the exile of Saint John by Domitian in the third and fifth book of his *Against Heresies*, where he also explained the chronology, as does Clement of Alexandria in his book *Can a Rich Man Be Saved?*⁴³¹

⁴²⁹ Heil-Ritter, *Corpus*, 116.

⁴³⁰ Rorem, *Eriugena's Commentary*, 250 – he also mentions, that the reason why John thinks that this passage is at the end of Philo's work (which is not the case) is that because he only knows his Philo from Eusebius'. Greek original in *PG* 4, 1065.

⁴³¹ Rorem, *Eriugena's Commentary*, 263, mentioning again, that the very same linkage between Ireneus and Clement appears in Eusebius, too, thus again it is likely, that John got his

Thus, our three fragments were obviously connected with the preoccupations of the scholiast - this I think is true also in the case of the first fragment, which, even if not mentioned as a reference can be associated with the end of *Letter 10*, to the prophesy concerning John the Evangelist's return from exile.⁴³² The foretelling of John's return from Patmos is mentioned already in some variants of the *Prologue* of John of Scythopolis; however, Suchla established that this is an interpolation from John Philoponos, which featured initially in some other manuscript as a marginal gloss.⁴³³ This first piece comes from a letter of Polycrates,⁴³⁴ bishop of Ephesus (end of the second century), to Victor, bishop of Rome. The passage in question referred to the burial places of the apostles, also stating, among other things that John the Evangelist was buried in Ephesus:

Adhuc autem Iohannes ipse super pectus domini recumbens qui factus est sacerdos petalum ferens et martyr et magister ipse in Epheso dormit.⁴³⁵

The fragment from Clement of Alexandria⁴³⁶ is actually the very last part of his homily *Quis dives salvetur*, a tale about Saint John converting a bandit. Of major importance for the Dionysian text is the first paragraph of the tale, asserting that John, after the death of Domitian, left Patmos, and returned again to Ephesus, the location of the narrative, thus again supporting the Greek scholiast:

Audi fabulam non fabulam sed verum verbum de Iohanne apostolo traditum et memoria custoditum, quam enim tyrrano defuncto a Pathmo insula reversus est Ephesum venit hortatus, et in proximas regiones gentium alibi

information from the *Historia Ecclesiastica* and not from the original works. Greek original in *PG* 4, 1117.

⁴³² Greek text in Heil-Ritter, *Corpus Dionysiacum*, 210.

⁴³³ B. R. Suchla, "Die Überlieferung des Prologs," 186. Cf. also Rorem, *John of Scythopolis*, 107, 148.

⁴³⁴ Only extant in Eusebius, *HE*, V, 25.

⁴³⁵ Florence, Laurenz. Plut. 89, sup. 15, fol. 102r.

⁴³⁶ Eusebius, *HE*, III, 23. Original text: *Clemens Alexandrinus*, ed. O. Stählin (Leipzig: Teubner, 1909), vol. 3, 187-90.

quidem episcopos constituens, alibi autem totas ecclesias adunans, alibi clerum et unumquenque sortitum existentibus ab eius spiritu signi.⁴³⁷

On the other hand, the last passage, that of Philo,⁴³⁸ refers back to the very first letter, to clarify a term used by Pseudo-Dionysius there, namely, the use of *therapeutes* for monks. At the conclusion of Philo's passages there is a further paragraph, that goes as follows:

Meminit horum et Iosebius Pamphili. Quidam autem dicunt haec Philonem de sociis iudeis dicere, alii de nazareis iudeis, alii ex circumcissione fidelibus et credentibus in Christum et custodientibus legem Moisi, alii de perfectis christianis. Talis autem erant aeresis monachicam viventes vitam therapeyte merito nominati sunt. Non solum autem Iosebius Pamphili sed et Philo Iudaeus sed et beatus Dionysius Ariopagita discipulus sancti Pauli Apostoli sanctus Athenarum episcopus in eo qui est de ecclesiastica ierarchia monachos ait antique et therapeytas nominat.⁴³⁹

It is not known who inserted this note here, but it supports the connection between John's note and Philo's fragments. The immediate question that arises now is when, where and how did these texts enter the *corpus*? If one checks the Latin Eusebius one instantly realises, that the fragments were not in Rufinus' translation,⁴⁴⁰ which as far as I know was the only translation that was in existence in the medieval West.

⁴³⁷ Florence, Laurenz. Plut. 89, sup. 15, fol. 102r.

⁴³⁸ Eusebius, HE, II, 17. Philo, *De vita contemplativa*, III, 21, 25, 28, 29; IV, 34, 35; VIII 68; X 78 in F. H. Colson, ed., *Philo*, vol. 9, Loeb Classical Library 363 (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1960).

⁴³⁹ Florence, Laurenz. Plut. 89, sup. 15, fol. 104r

⁴⁴⁰ Cf. Rufinus, *Eusebius, Kirchengeschichte*, ed. Eduard Schwartz, *Die Lateinische Übersetzung der Rufinus*, ed. Theodor Mommsen (Leipzig, 1903), for Polycrates page 265, 7-14, for Clement pages 239, 13 - 245, 5, for Philo page 145, 15 - 151, 21.

Whose translation then is this painstakingly literal version, much less elegant than that of Rufinus?⁴⁴¹ To formulate hypothetical answers to this question, first further questions first must be answered. From a quick survey of the available catalogues it turns out that ten such manuscripts at least partially display these elements (See Table 3).⁴⁴²

⁴⁴¹ Cf. the following sample:

Greek (Eusebius)

καὶ γὰρ κατὰ τὴν Ἀσίαν
μεγάλα στοιχεῖα κεκοίμηται
ἅτινα ἀναστήσεται τῇ
ἐσχάτῃ ἡμέρᾳ τῆς παρουσίας
τοῦ κυρίου, ἐν ἣ ἔρχεται μετὰ
δόξης ἐξ οὐρανοῦ καὶ
ἀναζητήσει πάντας τοὺς
ἁγίους, Φίλιππον τῶν
δώδεκα ἀποστόλων, ὃς
κεκοίμηται ἐν Ἱερραπόλει καὶ
δύο θυγατέρες αὐτοῦ
γενηρακυῖαι παρθένοι καὶ ἡ
ἐτέρα αὐτοῦ θυγάτηρ ἐν
ἁγίῳ πνεύματι
πολιτευσάμενη ἐν Ἐφέσῳ
ἀναπαύεται ἔτι δὲ καὶ
Ἰωάννης, ὁ ἐπὶ τὸ στήθος τοῦ
κυρίου ἀναπεσών, ὃς
ἐγενήθη ἱερεὺς τὸ πέταλον
πεφορεκῶς καὶ μάρτυς καὶ
διδάσκαλος, οὗτος ἐν Ἐφέσῳ
κεκοίμηται.

Anastasius

Etenim per asia magna elimenta
dormiunt quae resurgent
novissima die adventus domini in
qua inveniet cum gloria ex celo et
revivificabit omnes sanctos
philippum qui est duodecimus
apostolorum qui dormit in ierapoli
et due filie eius honorabiles
virgines et altera eius filia in sancto
spiritu conversata in epheso
quiescit. Adhuc autem iohannes
ipse super pectus domini
recumbens qui factus est sacerdos
petalum ferens et martyr et
magister ipse in epheso dormit.

Rufinus

Quod magna lumina in Asiae
partibus dormierunt, quae
resuscitabit dominus in
novissimo die adventus sui,
cum veniet in gloria et
requiret omnes sanctos suos,
dico autem de Filippo
<inquit>, qui fuit unus ex
apostolis, qui dormivit apud
Hierapolin. Sed et duae filiae
eius inibi virgines consenuere,
et alia eius filia spiritu sancto
repleta permansit apud
Ephesum. Et Iohannes ille, qui
supra pectus domini
recumbebat, qui fuit sacerdos
dei pontificale petalum
gestans et martyr et doctor
optimus apud Ephesum
dormit.

⁴⁴² Basel, Universitatbibliothek, O. III. 5, 12th c. refers to “Maximus Confessor, commentarius in Ps.-Di. Epistolam 10 exc.” fol. 1r – this may be my text. See Martin Steinmann, *Die Handschriften des Universitätsbibliothek Basel. Register zu dem Abteilungen A I – A XI und O* (Basel: Verlag der Universitätsbibliothek Basel, 1982), 405. To check perhaps G. Haenel, *Catalogi librorum manuscriptorum* (Leipzig: Teubner 1830) col. 514-659 deals with Basel.

1. Firenze, Biblioteca Medicea Laurenziana, Plut. 89 sup. 15, 11th c.⁴⁴³, fol. 102v-103v
2. Oxford, St. John's College, CXXVIII, 10th c.⁴⁴⁴, fol. 216 r-221v
3. Cambridge, Trinity College, B. 2. 31, 12th c.⁴⁴⁵, fol. 108b-111a
4. Darmstadt, Hessische Landes und Hochschulbibliothek 30, 12th c.⁴⁴⁶, texts start at fol. 101
5. Lilienfeld, Stiftsbibliothek, 128, 13th c.⁴⁴⁷, texts start at fol. 124v-
6. Oxford, Bodleian Library, Laud. Misc. 639, 12th c.⁴⁴⁸, fol. 110-111, without the letter of Policrates
7. Lyon, Bibliothèque municipale, 598, 12th c.⁴⁴⁹; Texts start at fol. 112
8. Montecassino, Biblioteca dell'Abbazia 221, 11th c.⁴⁵⁰, fol. 244, damaged codex, missing folios, ends abruptly
9. Troyes, Bibliothèque Municipale, 802, 9th/10th c.⁴⁵¹, 225rv, Philo missing
10. Koln, Dombibliothek 30, 11th c.⁴⁵², fol. 101r-103r

Table 3: Latin Manuscripts with the Eusebian Fragments

However, attaching these texts to the *corpus* was not an invention of the Latin tradition. One finds them in one of the oldest manuscripts of the Greek tradition, Florence, Laurenziana conv. soppr. 202 (f. 190-191b, 9th c.).⁴⁵³

⁴⁴³ A. Bandini, *Catalogus*, vol. 3, 259 sqq.

⁴⁴⁴ R. Hanna, *A Descriptive Catalogue of the Western Medieval Manuscripts of St. John's College Oxford* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002), 179-82.

⁴⁴⁵ Montague, Rhodes James, *The Western Manuscripts in the Library of Trinity College, Cambridge. A Descriptive Catalogue* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1900), 91-93.

⁴⁴⁶ *PL* 122, col. XIV.

⁴⁴⁷ P. G. Théry, "Catalogue des manuscrits dionysiens des bibliothèques d'Autriche," in *ADHLMA* 11 (1937-1938): 96-98.

⁴⁴⁸ H. O. Coxe, *Bodleian Library Quarto Catalogues. II. Laudian Manuscripts* (Oxford: Bodleian Library, 1973), 462-463.

⁴⁴⁹ Molinier and Desvernay, ed., *Catalogue général des manuscrits des bibliothèques publiques de France. Lyon* (Paris: Librairie Plon, 1900), vol. 30, 152-153.

⁴⁵⁰ P. Inguanez, *Codicum casinensium manuscriptorum catalogues* (Roma: Sansiani, 1928), vol. II. I, 24-25. Cf.: *Bibliotheca casinensis*, IV, 205-206

⁴⁵¹ According to Hanna – Dondaine seems not to be aware of this, see his description of the manuscript on page 40.

⁴⁵² [<http://www.ceec.uni-koeln.de/ceec-cgi/kleioc/0010/exec/katm/%22kn28-0030%22>]

⁴⁵³ Suchla dates it to before 886, *NAWG* 1984, 180.

According to the available catalogues, there were at least a further twelve such Greek manuscripts (See Table 4).⁴⁵⁴

Table 4: Greek Manuscripts with the Eusebian Fragments

1. Florence, Laurenziana conv. soppr. 202, 9 th century, ff. 190-191b
2. Florence, Laur. San Marco 686, 10 th century, fol. 214-217v,
3. Paris BNF grec 440 (ffol. 176v-178v, 12 th c.) ⁴⁵⁵
4. Paris BNF grec 934 ⁴⁵⁶ contains only the letter of Polycrates (fol. 116v, 11 th c.),
5. Paris BNF Coislin 86 ⁴⁵⁷ , 12 th from fol. 391
6. Venice, Marc. Gr. 144 (531), (13 th c.), fol. 87-89
7. Venice, Marc. Gr. 266 (517), (14 th c.), fol. 154r-154v. ⁴⁵⁸ the Philo and Polycrates fragments are to be found separately in a patristic florilegium
8. Vat. grec. 1787 (11 th century, with scholia- ff. 278v-280v) ⁴⁵⁹
9. Vat. grec. 1525 (ff. 210-214v) ⁴⁶⁰
10. Vat. grec. 374 (13 th century, with scholia, ff. 242-246) ⁴⁶¹
11. Vat. grec. 504 (a. 1105, miscellanea, inside Pseudo-Dionysius with scholia, f. 76). ⁴⁶²
12. Bibliotheca Nazionale di Napoli II. B. 5 (14 th century, ff. 137-139) ⁴⁶³
13. Roma Vallicelliana 69 (E. 29) from the 10 th century, with the scholia, ff. 163v-167v. ⁴⁶⁴

⁴⁵⁴ F. de Furia, *Supplementum ad Catalogum Codicum Graecorum, Latinorum, Italicorum, etc. Bibliothecae Mediceae Laurenzianae. Tomus I* (Florence: n. p.), 593-597. E. Rostagno and N. Festa, *Indice dei codici greci laurenziani non compresi nel catalogo del Bandini* (Firenze – Roma: Tipografia dei Fratelli Bencini, 1893), 171.

⁴⁵⁵ H. Omont, *Inventaire sommaire des manuscrits grecs de la Bibliothèque Nationale* (Paris: Ernest Leroux, 1898), vol. I, 48.

⁴⁵⁶ Omont, *Inventaire*, I, 179. Also R. Devreesse, *Bibliothèque Nationale. Catalogue des manuscrits Grecs. II. Le fonds Coislin* (Paris: Imprimerie Nationale, 1945), 75-76.

⁴⁵⁷ Omont, *Inventaire*, III, 129.

⁴⁵⁸ E. Mioni, *Codices graeci manuscripti bibliothecae divi Marci Venetiarum* (Roma: Istituto poligrafico e zecca dello stato, Libreria dello stato, 1981), vol. 1, 204-205 and 383-385. Both manuscripts belonged to Bessarion.

⁴⁵⁹ P. Canart, *Bibliothecae apostolicae vaticanae codices manu scripti recensiti. Codices Vaticani graeci. Codices 1745-1962* (Roma: Bibliotheca Vaticana, 1970), vol. I, 133-136 (Polycratis – f. 278v, Clemens – f. 278v-279v, Philo, 279v-280v).

⁴⁶⁰ C. Gianelli, *Bibliothecae apostolicae vaticanae codices manu scripti recensiti. Codices Vaticani graeci. Codices 1485-1683* (Roma: Bibliotheca Vaticana, 1950), 80-82. It also has the addition τοῦ δὲ μακαρίου Διονυσίου τοῦ Ἀρεοπαγίτου μέμνηται Λουκάς ὁ εὐαγγελιστῆς [...] καὶ Εὐσέβιος ὁ Παμφίλου ἐν τῇ ἐκκλησιαστικῇ ἰστορίᾳ. (Polycrates, f. 210-210v, Clemens, f. 210v-212v, Philo 212v-214v).

⁴⁶¹ R. Devreesse, *Bibliothecae apostolicae vaticanae codices manu scripti recensiti. Codices Vaticani graeci. Codices 330-603* (Roma: Bibliotheca Vaticana, 1937), 65-66. Devreesse says cum additione excerptoris, this might refer to the note on Dionysius' testimonies. (Polycratis, f. 242, Clemens, 242-244, Philo 244-246)

⁴⁶² Devreesse, *Codices Vaticani graeci*, 338-349.

⁴⁶³ Elpidius Mioni, *Catalogus codicum Graecorum Bibliothecae Nationalis Neapolitanae* (Roma: Istituto poligrafico e zecca dello stato, Libreria dello stato, 1992), vol. I/1, 102-105. (Philo, ff. 137-138v, Polycrates f. 138v, Clemens f. 139 r-v).

Ten Latin and thirteen Greek manuscripts – these numbers suggest that these texts were included within the tradition at a very early stage. Even if the Syriac manuscripts in the British Library⁴⁶⁵, according to the very detailed catalogue description, do not have them at all.⁴⁶⁶

To return now to the question of the translator. He had to be a person living earlier than the beginning of the tenth century, since the oldest manuscript including the texts, Troyes 802 dates from that period. Since the fragments were directly connected with the Greek *scholia*, my first hypothesis would be that the person in question must have been acquainted with the Greek version containing the *scholia* to the corpus – this would exclude Eriugena. Thus, the most obvious option for attribution remains the other contributor to the early Latin *Corpus Dionysiacum*, Anastasius Bibliothecarius.

Thus, the catalogue of his translations must be amended to include another three small items. However, before substantiating this claim, several problems should be addressed. One is the question of why did he retranslated the texts? We know that he was familiar with Rufinus' translation of the *Historia ecclesiastica* – although perhaps not enough to be able to recognize concrete fragments from it. It is also possible that he did not have the translation at hand but simply considered it more convenient to quickly translate these short passages anew.

The other problem stems from the fact that the earliest manuscript, the Troyes 802 mentioned above, is a version lacking the *scholia*. Moreover, it is the very

⁴⁶⁴ E. Martini, *Catalogo di manoscritti Greci esistenti nelle Biblioteche italiane. Vol. 2. Catalogus codicum graecorum qui in bibliothecae Vallicellanae Romae adservantur* (Milano: Ulrico Hoepli, 1902), 111-113.

⁴⁶⁵ Ms. 625, Add. 12,151; Ms. 625, Add. 12, 152; Ms. 627, Add. 14,539; Ms. 628, Add. 14,540; Ms. 629, Add. 22,370; and Ms. 630, Add. 14,541.

⁴⁶⁶ See W. Wright, *Catalogue of Syriac Manuscripts in the British Museum* (London: British Museum, 1871) vol. 2, 493-502.

text which, according to Dondaine, should bear witness to a revision by Eriugena. It has been dated to the late ninth/early tenth centuries. To complicate matters further, at the end of the fragments (in each case where there exists a complete version with all three quotes), there is the following note:

Beati autem Dionisii Ariopagite meminit Lucas evangelista in actibus apostolorum et Dionysius episcopus Chorinthi vir antiquus et beatus Policarpus in epistola ad ecclesiam Athenarum et Iosebius Pamphili in ecclesiastica historia.

This note is not present in the two Greek manuscripts from Florence I have consulted. But they exist in the two Venetian Greek manuscripts, as follows:

τοῦ δὲ μακαριοῦ Διονυσίου τοῦ Ἀρειοπαγίτου μέμνηται Λουκᾶς ὁ ἐναγγελιστὴς ἐν ταῖς πράξει τῶν ἀποστόλων καὶ Διονύσιος ἐπίσκοπος Κορίνθου ἀνὴρ ἀρχαῖος καὶ ὁ μακάριος Πολύκαρπος ἐν τῇ πρὸς τὴν ἐκκλησίαν Ἀθηνῶν ἐπιστολῇ καὶ Εὐσέβιος ὁ Παμφίλου ἐν τῇ ἐκκλησιαστικῇ ἱστορίᾳ.⁴⁶⁷

This closely resembles the prologue of John of Scythopolis:

... μνημονεύει δὲ τοῦ Ἀρειοπαγίτου καὶ Διονύσιος ἀρχαῖος Κορινθίων ἐπίσκοπος, καὶ Πολύκαρπος ἐν τῇ πρὸς Ἀθηναίους ἐπιστολῇ αὐτοῦ.

He also earlier mentioned Luke, and later, Eusebius, *passim*. Thus, the note from the end of the fragments looks like a summary of the testimonies as they appear in the prologue of John of Scythopolis, in places closely resembling even the latter's wording. Moreover, very strong echoes of it can be found in Eriugena's prologue as well:

Fertur namque praefatus Dionysius fuisse discipulus atque adjutor Pauli apostoli, a quo Atheniensium constitutus est episcopus, cujus Lucas commemorat in Actibus apostolorum, et Dionysius, episcopus Corinthi, vir antiquus, beatus quoque Polycarpus in epistola ad ecclesiam Athenarum, Eusebius item Pamphili in ecclesiastica historia.

If one compares all the versions mentioned before, as follows:

⁴⁶⁷ Venice, Bibliotheca Marciana Ms. Gr. 144 (531), f. 88r and Gr. 266 (517), f. 154v.

John of Scythopolis	Summary	Latin summary	Eriugena
... μνημονεύει δὲ τοῦ Ἀρειοπαγίτου	τοῦ δὲ μακαριοῦ Διονυσίου τοῦ Ἀρειοπαγίτου μέμνηται Λουκᾶς ὁ ἐυαγγελιστῆς ἐν ταῖς πράξει τῶν	Beati autem dionisii ariopagite meminit lucas evangelista in actibus apostolorum et	cujus Lucas commemorat in Actibus apostolorum, et
καὶ Διονύσιος ἀρχαῖος Κορινθίων ἐπίσκοπος	ἀποστόλων καὶ Διονύσιος ἐπίσκοπος Κορίνθου ἀνὴρ ἀρχαῖος καὶ ὁ μακάριος	dionisius episcopus chorinthi vir antiquus et beatus polycarpus	Dionysius, episcopus Corinthi, vir antiquus, beatus quoque
καὶ Πολύκαρπος ἐν τῇ πρὸς Ἀθηναίους ἐπιστολῇ αὐτοῦ	Πολύκαρπος ἐν τῇ πρὸς τὴν ἐκκλησίαν Ἀθηνῶν ἐπιστολῇ καὶ Εὐσέβιος ὁ Παμφίλου ἐν τῇ ἐκκλησιαστικῇ ἱστορίᾳ	in epistola ad ecclesiam athenarum et iosebius pamphili in eclesiastica historia.	Polycarpus in epistola ad ecclesiam Athenarum, Eusebius item Pamphili in ecclesiastica historia.

one gets the impression that just as the note depends on the Scythopolitan's letter, so the two Latin versions depend on the note from the end of the *corpus*, to which they correspond completely, as one would expect from a word for word translation. Not only does the expression *vir antiquus* indicate this, but so does the *beatus Polycarpus*, whereas in the prologue John has only a simple Polycarpus.

But, no matter how closely they correspond to the Greek text, the Latin versions do differ among themselves, which is perhaps sufficient ground to argue for the possibility that Anastasius and Eriugena had both access to the same information. While this is easy to accept in Anastasius' case, for Eriugena, it would be much more of a surprise. One other small element that favours this hypothesis is another similarity of Eriugena's letter with John's prologue: namely the etymological explanation for the name Areopagite, which both derive from Ares⁴⁶⁸ – though for a medieval mind such etymologies might of

⁴⁶⁸ John: "...thus, that hill was called Areius after Ares..." (P. Rorem and John C. Lamoreaux. *John of Scythopolis and the Dionysian corpus: annotating the Areopagite* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1998),

course also appear independently. However, so far it seems that Eriugena had only one resource at his disposal for Pseudo-Dionysius: the famous manuscript BNF Ms. grec. 437, containing the *Corpus Dionysiacum* without any *scholia*. At this point, it should be emphasised, that his manuscript lacked the last folios.⁴⁶⁹ It stops at *Letter 9*, and it is not possible to guess, whether the missing last folios could have contained this little summary. One reason why this seems improbable is that I have not yet found a manuscript in the Greek tradition which would have contained the above mentioned fragments and notes without John's *scholia*.

Another problem arises from a marginal note: the text of Polycrates contains a note, which I first conjectured to be by Anastasius, mentioning other manuscripts,

B (fol. 112v), **P** (fol. 90v), **F** (fol. 102r): Grecus magne Rome habet ut in emendationibus invenimus exemplaribus.

This note makes no sense in the place where it is placed in **B** and **P**, ie. attached to the last comment of the Scythopolitan scholiast. In **F**, however, it is attached to its proper referee, that is, the letter of Polycrates, justly correcting the see of Bishop Victor from *Megalae* to *Magnae Romae*. However, while emending somebody else's translation in such a way makes perfect sense, it would be strange to do it with one's own version: why did he not go instead for the better reading from the start in the main text? Thus, the note seems rather to correct somebody else's translation. This would mean that there was a revisor of the Anastasian *scholia* who knew Greek. This seems particularly likely, since already in the case of the interlinear notes, Dondaine called attention to a particular set, introduced by *grecus*, that seems to have been appended by

145); Eriugena: "...the Areopagite named from the place of Mars (for war is called Ares by the Greeks)..." (P. Rorem, *Eriugena's Commentary*, 176).

someone else. In addition I have found other suspicious instances like this, too.⁴⁷⁰

To substantiate these conjectures, however, only a thorough analysis of further manuscript material, both Latin and Greek would be necessary. They might tell us the story of these fragments, and the paratexts around them, and thus clarify the roles of all these contributors, from John of Scythopolis to Anastasius and Eriugena.

What I am tempted to see here, is an Anastasian translation of some Eusebius fragments which were appended to the Greek text at a very early stage, probably even by John of Scythopolis himself. In any case, I think the fragments' importance lies not only in constituting a further item in the list of Anastasius' translations, but it could be a precious element to assist those studying the intricate history of the Greek textual tradition. Last, but not least, it also supports the conjecture that Eriugena had to have more dionysian resources at his disposal, than the BNF Ms. grecus 437 (as it survived until today).

⁴⁶⁹ P. G. Théry, "Recherches pour une édition grecque historique du Pseudo-Denys" in *The New Scholasticism* 3 (1929): 366.

⁴⁷⁰ See my chapter on the Dionysian *scholia*.

TRANSLATION AS GIFT. LITERARY DEDICATIONS AND SOCIAL NETWORKS

“Unlike other chapters of the history of philosophy and the sciences, translation movements cannot be told in purely intellectual terms. The transport of ideas from one linguistic culture to another was dependent upon many social factors: which manuscripts were available, which linguistic collaborators could be found, which cities were conquered by which party, which patron was paying and which audience was willing to copy and read newly translated texts. To say this does not imply a reductionist attitude in the sense that the intellectual interest of the translators, patrons and readers would form a mere superstructure on the real structure of material factors. It is the specific character of translation movements that they are dependent both on the intellectual motives of individuals as well as on the structure of the society in which they take place.”⁴⁷¹

The dedicatory letter is an excellent source of data to get at the social setting of a translation as outlined above. It was a well-established literary genre throughout late antiquity and the Middle Ages and a wealth of information can be obtained from them regarding patterns of social networking. The picture emerging from an analysis of such letters tells us a great deal about friendship, patronage and its socio-political functions: how did individuals construct their networks, how was it sustained and used. Such letters not only reflect a learned clerical community’s tastes, interests and ambitions, but it can also be informative about the connections between politics and literacy, knowledge and power.

In the early Middle Ages, a solid network, whether of friends, family, patrons, etc, was crucial for maintaining or improving the social status of an individual.⁴⁷² One well established method of constructing and sustaining such

⁴⁷¹ Dag Nikolaus Hasse, “The Social Conditions of the Arabic-(Hebrew-)Latin Translation Movements in Medieval Spain and in the Renaissance”, in *Wissen über Grenzen. Arabisches Wissen und lateinisches Mittelalter*, ed. by Andreas Speer and Lydia Wegener (Berlin, NY: Walter de Gruyter, 2006), 68-86, at pages 68.

⁴⁷² G. Althoff, *Family, Friends and Followers. Political and Social Bonds in Medieval Europe* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004).

networks was gift-giving:⁴⁷³ the gift was generally speaking a performance meant to remind of the obligation of mutual support, usually staged at opportune moments. Gift-giving almost automatically demanded counter-gifts, thus establishing an endless round of favours and debts. Gifts could also communicate subtle diplomatic messages. The meaning of the gesture itself and the implication of the content were often dissonant: generosity veiling threat, or masking a cry for help (as the examples on the following pages demonstrate).

The literary gift is a special case, having the precious quality of being “inalienable” that is to say, preserving the imprint of the donor even after it was given away.⁴⁷⁴ It encompassed not only the *memoria* of persons or places commemorated in its contents, but also the *memoria* of the author, or the donor – and sometimes these two were identical. This quality made the book suitable for constituting a diplomatic gift exchanged by power zones in negotiations. Objects such as the fur coat donated by Hincmar to Anastasius⁴⁷⁵ communicate through their value: the more precious, expensive, rare, etc. they are, the better the donor’s intentions, or, the bigger support he needs. However, when donating texts, it was possible to communicate the donor’s position in many ways as well as the attitude expected from the other, by means of the content of the text and its relevance to the one who received it. Dedication letters often contained hints at the ways donors were expecting their gifts to be returned. While Hincmar’s fur coat is simply explicit (the material expression of his wealth, and his gratitude), the Dionysian translation is a nuanced gift of monopoly – a gift that was very important to Charles the Bald, and a gift only

⁴⁷³ Arnould-Jan A. Bijsterveld, “The Medieval Gift as an Agent of Social Bonding and Political Power: A Comparative Approach,” in Ester Cohen and Mayke B. de Jong, ed. *Medieval Transformations. Texts, Power, and Gifts in Context* (Leiden: Brill, 2001).

⁴⁷⁴ Annette B. Weiner, *Inalienable possessions: the Paradox of Keeping-While-Giving* (Berkeley/Los Angeles/Oxford, 1992).

⁴⁷⁵ Referred to by Hincmar in one of his letters (*Letter 200*): *MGH Epistolae 8, Karolini Aevi 6*, 223-225, at page 225, 10-11.

the papacy's polyhistor could offer. It is in this sense "inalienable": it emphasised the identity and the power of the donor, and compelled the recipient to acknowledge it.

Offering books as diplomatic gifts⁴⁷⁶ by the ninth century was a well established practice, betraying a close relationship between politics and culture. The most famous cases relevant to this milieu and period are the well-known BNF Ms. gr. 437, containing the *Corpus Dionysiacum*, a diplomatic gift brought to the Frankish court by Byzantine envoys in 827 and the so-called Bible of Saint Paul given by Charles the Bald to Pope John VIII, probably on the occasion of his coronation in 875.⁴⁷⁷

The institutional background making possible a boom in literary gift-giving was the court,⁴⁷⁸ whether Western Frankish, Byzantine or pontifical. Courtly culture, as a culture formed by a group of people around the figure of a leader, produced cultural artifacts that were never autonomous: it was a culture that was heavily embedded with politics, a culture whose products were often governed by and used for diplomatic purposes.

A major difficulty encountered in deciphering the dedicatory letters accompanying such gifts is that these were a widespread literary genre, quickly becoming very standardized, loaded with formulaic expressions and commonplaces. Nevertheless, the presence of *topoi* should not halt tentatives of interpretation, since they are forms, often filled with variable content, which can, if read attentively, prove to be highly informative. Much has been written

⁴⁷⁶ J. Lowden, "The luxury book as a diplomatic gift," In *Byzantine Diplomacy*, ed. by J. Shepard and Simon Franklin (Aldershot: Variorum, 1992); Rosamond McKitterick, *The Carolingians And The Written Word* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989), 155-157. On the symbolic value of books cf. also Éric Palazzo, "Le livre dans le trésors du Moyen âge. Contribution à l'histoire de la *memoria* médiévale," *Annales HSS* 52 (1997): 93-118.

⁴⁷⁷ Cf. G. Arnaldi, G. "Due doni regali?" in Idem, *Natale 875. Politica, ecclesiologia, cultura del papato medievale* (Roma: Istituto Storico Italiano per il Medio Evo, 1990), 115-128.

⁴⁷⁸ For a detailed discussion of the Carolingian courtly culture see Rosamond McKitterick, *The Frankish Kings and Culture in the Early Middle Ages* (Aldershot: Variorum, 1995).

about the hermetic language of philosophy and theology, but it is often neglected, that there was at least one other language which also worked by veiling the unutterable message: the language of diplomacy. For Anastasius was a papal official and a skilful diplomat: his dedications can offer us a clue about how papal diplomatic missions were carried out. Without reducing his personality to a simple function, emphasis on his social status seems crucial to me since it appears that this is what he himself did when executing his translations – he identified with the institution of the papacy, which then, of course, brought him the gratifications of a brilliant diplomatic career. Also, while I am aware of the danger of seeing meanings behind every tree, it seems to me altogether possible to account for all his dedications in the context of social networking.

Anastasius Bibliothecarius' social network, as reconstructed from his correspondence, is a complex one, extending over a wide scale both vertically and horizontally: it featured patrons, colleagues and friends - even enemies. His milieu was dominated by members of the clerical elite. Eighteen of his dedicatory letters survive,⁴⁷⁹ and also a few letters which were addressed to him, notably by Hincmar of Rheims and Photios. As a rare bird *utriusque linguae peritus*, he offered to his dedicatees Greek literature in Latin translation. This practice of dedication is also well attested also among the translators of late antiquity, such as for example Jerome, or Dionysius the Humble, who both used their literary activity for social networking. In this regard, Anastasius is a conscious imitator of his forerunners.

⁴⁷⁹ At present there are two studies devoted to the overall presentation of Anastasius' prologues: G. Laehr, "Die Briefe und Prologe des Bibliothekars Anastasius," *Neues Archiv der Gesellschaft für Altere Deutsche Geschichtskunde* 47 (1928): 457-463 and C. Leonardi, "Le lettere-prologo di Anastasio Bibliotecario," in P. Lardet, ed., *La tradition vive. Mélanges d'histoire des textes en l'honneur de Louis Holtz* (Turhout: Brepols, 2003).

Three main groups of Anastasius' dedicatory letters can be defined from the point of view of networking: 1. letters dedicated to his patrons: the three popes (Nicholas I, Hadrian II, John VIII) and Charles the Bald, 2. letters dedicated to his colleagues, or fellow bishops (a group of bishops around Rome and also a few southern bishops) 3., letters dedicated to his friend John the Deacon.

PATRONS

The first documented translation of Anastasius, from the years 858-862, is dedicated to **Pope Nicholas I**,⁴⁸⁰ who brought him to the papal court again, after years in exile, caused by his ambitions and the conflicts these ambitions provoked. The translation is a hagiographic text, the life of John the Almsgiver, patriarch of Alexandria (nr. 1 in the catalogue). At first sight, it seems to be a letter built up exclusively of prefabricated elements: it starts with the mandatory humility *topos*, followed by the presentation of the text, then the eulogy of the patron, the presentation of the methods of the translator, and his motivations, and closes with a tirade of humbleness. But if examined carefully, the letter reveals to be Anastasius' visiting card, a sort of letter of (self)recommendation.

The way the introductory humility *topos* is formulated suggests a sort of *mea culpa* for past events, emphasising that he is resigned to the place assigned to him in the hierarchy of Roman clergy, not longer carried away by his own ambitions (thus referencing his attempt to win the papacy a few years before): "...lest I presume something which has not been entrusted to me by my office," he affirms.⁴⁸¹

⁴⁸⁰ Laehr, G. "Die Briefe" 417-418.

⁴⁸¹ Cogitante ac diu tacite solliciteque mecum considerante, quid in domo Dei commodius ac dignius operari potuissem, ne ea videlicet praesumerem, quae mihi ex ministerio credito commissa non sunt, nec rursus illa arriperem, quae ingenioli mei vires excedunt. Anastasius, *Epistolae*, 396, 26-

In this moment of reflection, he reaches the following conclusion:

ecce subito quidam strenui ac studiosi viri me cohortari voluerunt, ut in Latinum sermonem verterem Leontium de residuis vitae Iohannis Alexandrini antistitis.⁴⁸²

And this was a crucial turning point in the career of Anastasius: when he discovered the difference between himself and the others, his secret weapon, his key to power. The fact that he dedicates his first translation to the pope already shows that not only did he suddenly discover his exceptional competence, but he also knew what use to make of it. In this letter he does more than just dedicate a translation to Nicholas; he is, so to speak, offering his services to the papacy. The other significant part of the *captatio benevolentiae*, the eulogy for the pope, concentrates on the role of the pontiff as a cultural *coryphée* of the Latin Christian world, the holder of the *clavis scientiae*. He suggests that no literary product should circulate without pontifical approbation. By offering the pope a translation from Greek to Latin he projects the possibility of the extension of papal control over non-Latin literary productions within the Latin speaking orbit. Anastasius' argument sketched here about appropriating the literary production of the Greeks, became a recurrent theme in many of his dedicatory letters.

So that Latinity should not grieve so much for lack of the salt with which the Greeks boast their language is most finely flavoured⁴⁸³

Anastasius with his knowledge of Greek is exploiting the Roman-Byzantine rivalry. Quantitatively these arguments make up the bigger part of the letter:

29. English translation in B. Neil, *Seventh Century Popes und Martyrs*, 15. A reproach to him by Leo IV, and later repeated by Hadrian II, that he was always seeking higher things for himself: that *quia pro eo, quod altiora se petens – quod sibi totiens interdictum fuerat*. English translation in J. Nelson, *The Annals of Saint Bertin*, 149.

⁴⁸² Anastasius, *Epistolae* 396-397.

the *utilitas operis* is mentioned in a brief sentence only, not going beyond the basic function of all hagiographical literature, that is to say, a model to be imitated: *tantus vir tamquam exemplar et speculum omnibus*.⁴⁸⁴ He closed his letter with excessive metaphors of humbleness - the imagery of the leaden vessel/pipe containing pure water, of the thorns surrounding the rose,⁴⁸⁵ and the ass who, by grace of God, can articulate like humans - and then concluded with a short poem in honour of the pope.⁴⁸⁶

To sum up, this first letter of Anastasius witnesses how he fashioned his seemingly becoming aware of his capacities and to what ends these could be used. Dedication does not illustrate a one-way cultural traffic: patrons were deeply interested in ideologies which kept alive the order they want to set up or maintain. Identifying the papacy as the relevant forum for the fruition of his capacities, Anastasius persuasively argues about the use of translations, not so much centred on the edifying character of the texts, but on the pillage of Greek wisdom, in service of the Roman rivalry with Byzantium.

This strategy proved to be useful, resulting in a long career in the service of Nicholas I and the two consecutive popes. Both of them, in their turn, received dedications by Anastasius.

The two following dedications present us Anastasius as a devoted papal official serving pontifical interests. Both texts are church councils of crucial importance for the history of Christianity, the seventh and the eighth ecumenical councils.

⁴⁸³ ...dummodo Latinitas se tanto non doleat esse sale privatam, quo Grecia se gaudet optime conditam. Anastasius, *Epistolae* 398, 3-4. English translation in B. Neil, *Seventh Century Popes und Martyrs*, 45.

⁴⁸⁴ Anastasius, *Epistolae* 398, 1-2.

⁴⁸⁵ One finds the same imagery in Eriugena's dedicatory poem addressed to Charles the Bald on the occasion of the translation of the *Corpus Dionysiacum: saepe solent spinis redolentes crescere flores*. M. W. Herren, ed., *Iohannis Scotti Eriugena Carmina* (Dublin: Institute for Advanced Studies, 1993), nr. 20, 108-109.

⁴⁸⁶ Anastasius, *Epistolae* 398, 12-13.

One of them was a contemporary event, about which the only surviving source is the translation of Anastasius; the other is a retranslation of Nicaea II, an attempt to ameliorate a notoriously poor earlier rendering. In these two dedications, the emerging self-portrait of Anastasius is very different than the one from the letter to Nicholas I. A more self-assured intellectual emerges, conscious of his own competences and the papacy's need of his services as interpreter.

The letter to **Pope Hadrian II**, written in 871,⁴⁸⁷ offered to the pope the translation of the acts of the eighth ecumenical council (nr. 5 in the catalogue), a major event, in which Anastasius took part personally; moreover, because of the adventures of the official version of the text (stolen by pirates), the version he made for himself was the only one accessible at that time in the West, and the only one to survive up to the present.

The beginning and the end of the letter lacks all those humble considerations that embellished the previous one. After brief praise of the pontificate of Hadrian II and the achievements of the council, he passes directly to the narration of the events, that is to say, the story of the council, his role in the transmission of the text, all the problems the council touched (e.g. Photios, the Bulgars), and, finally, a malicious caveat about the perfidy of the Greeks.

The man speaking here is no longer the Anastasius trying to obtain papal patronage, but the Anastasius who by now, had served this institution long and well. He is confident in his own capacities and the papacy's need for them. Throughout the text one sees an official deeply identifying with the establishment he is serving.

⁴⁸⁷ Cf. Laehr, "Die Briefe", 427-429.

In 873, he dedicates a retranslation of the acts of the seventh ecumenical council (nr. 6 in the catalogue) To **Pope John VIII**.⁴⁸⁸ Again, he used a rather humble tone, intensified by humility *topoi* and the eulogy for the pope. Anastasius was old by then, and the pope was new, just as his policy was new – all these factors rendered the position of Anastasius less solid than before.

The letter begins by evoking his translation of the eighth ecumenical council, as a sort of justification for the translation of Nicaea II. By recalling his main work, he is invoking the power he possessed before – this is perhaps the effect he expects from a similar action. His tone is nostalgic throughout: he refers with sadness to his old age and poor health, *infirmo corpori*. As a motivation for the translation, he speaks about the duties of a librarian, who is obliged to enrich the library and to supervise the quality of the works it possesses. Thus, the documentary values of the text are emphasised, no longer the direct political implications (although iconoclasm, even if suppressed, was still lingering on) as in the case of the eighth ecumenical council, but. Then he goes on presenting some technical problems regarding terminology and an excursus on the problem of the adoration of the images. This reveals his adherence to the policies of John VIII – reducing the conflicts of the churches to a linguistic problem is clearly a reconciliatory tendency, an attitude not at all characteristic of the younger Anastasius.⁴⁸⁹ The concluding papal eulogy emphasises the *censura apostolica*, just as in the case of Nicholas I, the right of the papacy to control literary production.

To sum up, three letters, three different tones, three different attitudes: whereas the first document was his first attempt to gain pontifical patronage with his

⁴⁸⁸ Cf. Laehr, “Die Briefe”, 429-432.

translations, the second illustrates the peak where this translating activity brought him, the third betrays an attempt to regain this power. While in the first case he chose a hagiographic text, later on he selected material of more immediate pontifical interest.

He was always careful to pick texts able to attract the dedicatee's attention –the translations offered to **Charles the Bald** also stand witness to this.

I am a bit hesitant to include the Frankish emperor among Anastasius' patrons. His place is there inasmuch as he was hierarchically superior to our librarian, but at the same time this hierarchical setting was disturbed by the fact that Anastasius seemed to represent pontifical positions in his letters. To disentangle his own interests from those of John VIII is hazardous, since in general they overlapped. In all cases, however, a 'private' concern can be conjectured behind seeking Charles' favour: he might have wanted to establish the close rapports with him that he had had previously enjoyed with Louis II: during his reign both he and his uncle Arsenius were 'double diplomats', serving both papal and imperial interests.

The first letter of Anastasius to Charles the Bald dates from 23 March 875, nine months before the king's elevation to emperor; three other letters followed in the subsequent year.⁴⁹⁰ This correspondence, interrupted by the death of the emperor in 877, seems, at a first glance, to be of a purely literary character. The librarian of the papacy dedicated translations from different Greek religious texts: the Greek *scholia* to Pseudo-Dionysius the Areopagite's *opera omnia* (nr. 15 in the catalogue), liturgical commentaries by Maximus Confessor and Germanos I, patriarch of Constantinople (nr. 16 and 17 in the catalogue) and a

⁴⁸⁹ G. Arnaldi. "Anastasio Bibliotecario, antipapa," *EP* 1, 743. The idea of the *varietas linguae* as a cause of doctrinal conflicts is also expressed in his *Letter 9*, to John the Deacon, Anastasius, *Epistolae* 425, 19-31.

passion of Saint Demetrius (nr. 20 in the catalogue) and of Dionysius (nr. 21 in the catalogue) to the Frankish ruler. Since Anastasius was perceived as one of the most intelligent clerics of his century and Charles the Bald was a prince aspiring to wisdom, under the rulership of whom the so-called second phase of the Carolingian Renaissance flourished,⁴⁹¹ this one-year communication could be viewed as a correspondence emerging from literary interests.

Nevertheless there is more in these messages than literary exchange. At the time he began his correspondence with Charles, Anastasius was already a trained, skilled and experienced translator. There is no obvious interior indication as to why he would turn from mostly hagiographical and conciliary material to mystical writers. If there are no satisfactory literary reasons,⁴⁹² the historical context should be considered. In the framework of the papal and Frankish courts, there was a strong political influence on cultural activities: literary products were meant to support different ideologies. Anastasius's translation project was not an isolated individual mission shaped by his literary taste: it was a purposeful collection to serve the interests of both the papacy and of Charles the Bald. Since the time of the first letter mentioned in this work, that of Nicholas I, requesting the translation of Eriugena, the political climate of the ninth century had changed, including the persons of popes and emperors. On 12 August 875 Emperor Louis II died leaving no male heir. After Pope Nicholas I's death in 867, Hadrian II ruled for five years (867-872); John VIII started his

⁴⁹⁰ Cf. Laehr, "Die Briefe", 448-453, 457-463.

⁴⁹¹ He is also the recipient of many dedicatory letters from Frankish intellectuals: for example Lupus of Ferrieres offers texts and jewelry to him (*MGH Epistolae 6 Karolini Aevi 4*, 96, 107, 108), Paschasius offered his treatise on the Eucharist (*MGH Epistolae 6 Karolini Aevi 4*, 135), Ratramnus of Corbie his books on predestination and the Eucharist (*MGH 149-150*) and John Scottus Eriugena presented his translations (*MGH Epistolae 6 Karolini Aevi 4*, 158-162).

⁴⁹² Arnaldi, based on a fragment from Anastasius' letter mentioned Constantine the Philosopher as the friend who had focused Anastasius' attention upon Dionysius, a hypothesis, which does not exclude our explanations. Cf. G. Arnaldi, "Anastasio Bibliotecario, Carlo il Calvo e la

pontificate in 872; he crowned Charles the Bald, king of the Western Franks since 840, emperor. Anastasius served as librarian to these three popes: his four letters to Charles the Bald reflect the decision of the papacy to support him out of all possible candidates to become the emperor of the Frankish kingdoms.

Moreover, Anastasius was not the only Italian cleric to approach Charles the Bald with literary gifts. Another case is the Neapolitan deacon, Paul, who dedicated the translation of the life of Saint Mary the Egyptian to the emperor.⁴⁹³ It has been argued, that he might have acted with the acknowledgement, if not the solicitation of the papacy.⁴⁹⁴

All these texts and dedications illustrate Anastasius' engagement in the manipulation of a complicated set of power relations. The letters and translations on Pseudo-Dionysius assisted Charles to build up the cult of his dynastic saint; the passion of Saint Demetrius was a reminder of Charles's duties, in particular the military assistance promised to the papacy in their fight against the Saracens. The commentaries on the liturgy probably tried to accentuate papal authority in this matter and to counterbalance the influence of the Frankish bishops; this offering reflects papal anxiety caused by the newly produced Frankish liturgical works. Of this possibility, I would suggest, an indication can be found in the letter: an uneasy allusion to rumours about new, Latin liturgical works, yet unseen by him.⁴⁹⁵

fortuna di Dionigi l'Areopagita nel secolo IX," In *Giovanni Scoto nel suo tempo. L'organizzazione del sapere in età carolingia* (Spoleto: CISAM, 1989), 526.

⁴⁹³ Letter of dedication in *MGH Epistolae 6 Karolini Aevi 4*, 193-194.

⁴⁹⁴ M. Fuiano, "I rapporti tra Oriente e Occidente nell'attività culturale di Paolo Diacono della Chiesa Napoletana nel sec. IX," in *Atti del 3° congresso internazionale di Studi sull' Alto Medioevo*. (Spoleto: CISAM, 1959) 397-411.

⁴⁹⁵ *Quamvis autem hinc et Latine quaedam scripsisse quosdam audierim, ego tamen, quia illa non vidi, haec interim Latino danda sermoni conspexi. Cui ergo utraque placent, utraque relegat: cui vero minus utraque placuerint, legat potius, quod elegerit, dummodo ab indaganda tantorum medulla non torpeat. Anastasius Epistolae 435. Cf. also the arguments of B. Neil, "Anastasius Bibliothecarius' Latin Translation of two Byzantine Liturgical Commentaries," *Ephemerides Liturgicae* 114 (2000): 329-346 at pages 329, 344.*

COLLEAGUES

With colleagues, fellow clergy men, letters were governed by different motivations, just as they were coloured in a different tone. The texts dedicated were exclusively hagiographic, but in most cases they were well chosen.

The first dedicatee in chronological order is **Ursus, court physician of Pope Nicholas I**, about whom no biographical data are extant. What he received, was the life of Basil of Caesarea (nr. 2 in the catalogue).⁴⁹⁶ Here the motivation for such a literary gift is described with the terms of debt and obedience, a recurrent dedicatory *topos*:

neque enim inoboediens esse tibi debeo, qui omnibus fratribus meis et proximis debitor sum.⁴⁹⁷

The rest of the letter, while evoking the imitation of the saint as supreme scope of a hagiographical reading, uses the space to express several interesting ideas about translation activity.⁴⁹⁸ Lacking concrete references in the letter itself and of biographical data about the dedicatee, it is impossible to make any conjectures about further motivations for such a gift. That the text is addressed to a member of the pontifical court, close to Nicholas I, remains an important element. Thus, it can be expected to have circulated among the members of the high Roman clergy.

Next was the letter to **Formosus, bishop of Porto**, accompanying the translation of the life of John the Calybite (nr. 4 in the catalogue).⁴⁹⁹ The future pope

⁴⁹⁶ Cf. Laehr, "Die Briefe", 418-421.

⁴⁹⁷ Anastasius, *Epistolae* 399, 11-12 and *passim*.

⁴⁹⁸ About this, see the chapter Theory and practice.

⁴⁹⁹ Cf. Laehr, "Die Briefe", 425-427 and P. Chiesa, "Le Vitae Romane di Giovanni Calibita" *AB* 121 (2003): 45-102.

Formosus was nominated bishop of Porto by Nicholas I in 864, and he remained so after a period of disgrace from 883 to 891, until his election as pope.⁵⁰⁰ This letter is a wonderful example of Anastasian wit, with word-plays such as *Formosi sortitus es nomen, cui nimirum cum formositate corporis concordat etiam formositas mentis*.⁵⁰¹

Behind the shameless buttering up of the eulogising formulae one can grasp the truly high esteem of Anastasius for the abilities of Formosus, a very ambitious and strong personality. Formosus was also *virtutum speculum* and as Anastasius was fully aware of the depths of his knowledge, his intentions were, of course not those of instructing him further. Let this text rather, he says, instruct the Christians of Rome. In a wider sense, as he himself made it clear, this referred to his general project of a *translatio studii* from the Greeks, all the more so, since this was a text referring to Romans;⁵⁰² that is to say, he attempted a “repatriation” of a literary tradition which would have strengthened the authority of the Roman church: *discat Roma tandem suos non spernere, sed colligere*. And, in a very concrete sense, this was about the people under the jurisdiction of the Bishop of Porto (Formosus), who precisely at that time changed his see, moving from the outskirts to the Isola Tibertina, an occasion on which a church was erected there, dedicated to this saint. Thus his gift is a reconfirmation of this move by a textually constructed tradition.⁵⁰³

In 874 **bishop Martin of Narni** receives a part of the *Collectanea* dedicated to John the Deacon, the texts about Pope Martin I⁵⁰⁴ (nr. 9 in the catalogue). The bishopric of Narni, an Umbrian town, was half way between Orte, the earlier

⁵⁰⁰ J. M. Sansterre “Formoso” in *DBI* 49, 55-61, and Idem in *EP* 2, 41-47.

⁵⁰¹ Anastasius, *Epistolae* 402, 17-18.

⁵⁰² See Chiesa, *Le Vitae Romanae*, 48.

⁵⁰³ Chiesa, *Le Vitae Romanae*, 46-49.

⁵⁰⁴ Cf. Laehr, “Die Briefe”, 436-437.

see of Arsenius, uncle of Anastasius, and Todi, birthplace of pope Martin I. It seems to have been a strategically important place, insofar as it was situated just at the border between the papal territories and the duchy of Spoleto.⁵⁰⁵ The first obvious connection between the text and the dedicatee is of course their name. The rhetorical setting of the offering is that of humble obedience to an irrefutable request on the part of the bishop.⁵⁰⁶ However, it seems that Martin of Narni was more interested in texts about Martin of Tours, patron of his church and monastery. Based on the text of this epistle it is impossible to decide, whether he was also interested in the martyr pope or whether it was Anastasius, who imposed the idea upon him, as an attempt to tie the bishoprics of Narni to a papal rather than to a monastic model and authority.

The next dedication, of the translation of the passion of Saint Cyrus and John (nr. 10 in the catalogue), completed in January 875, is problematic, since it is not known who the dedicatee was, the letter being heavily damaged.⁵⁰⁷ The *MGH* edition has been superseded by a better one by Berschin, based on another manuscript, but still, essential information is missing. It seems again that he was reacting to a request, and the motivation was the imminent feast day of the two saints as well what he calls the *memoria* of the saints from that church. It has been argued, that this church could be the Abbacyro or Santa Passera on via Portuense, a church which later housed the relics of the saints, or, perhaps, the S. Angelo in Pescheria, which had an altar dedicated to Cyrus.⁵⁰⁸ The recipient

⁵⁰⁵ B. Neil, *Seventh Century Popes and Martyrs*, 63, 163.

⁵⁰⁶ Completing a literary work as obeying a request is again a recurrent topos of dedicatory letters and it is often difficult to decide, whether there is a real request behind, or it is a simple way of discharging responsibilities. In any case, given the calculated nature of medieval gift the evocation of an order does not contradict the reading of these texts as offerings.

⁵⁰⁷ Cf. Laehr, "Die Briefe", 441-443.

⁵⁰⁸ P. Sinthern, "Der römische Abbacyrus in Geschichte, Legende und Kunst" *Römische Quartalschrift* 22 (1908): 196-239 at pages 223-224.

might have been a member of the clergy of these churches. It is also to be noted that the account contains a miracle with a Roman location, which might have been of (in)direct relevance to both churches.⁵⁰⁹

The letter accompanying the translation of Saint Stephen (nr. 12 in the catalogue) is dated approximately 874-875 and it is addressed to **bishop Landulf of Capua**.⁵¹⁰ Landolf was first bishop, then, after the death of his brother, duke of Capua, who, besides carefully preserving the independence of Capua for his whole reign, was also, after an initial resistance, an ally of John VIII in matters concerning the Saracen threat.⁵¹¹ Anastasius came into closer contact with the bishops of southern Italy during his embassy in 871, when he was trying to negotiate with the bishops supporting Duke Sergius II against the pope in the conflict over the exile of bishop Athanasius I.⁵¹² It is possible that his friendship with Landulf dated from this time. In all cases, the more dangerous the Saracen threat became the stronger grew the need to maintain good relations with Landulf. It is difficult to see what immediate the other texts mentioned by the letter served for the Capuan bishop: sermons of Amphilochios about Anna and Symeon (nr. 11 in the catalogue).⁵¹³ The other gift, narrating the translation of Saint Stephen is a clearer case: Capua did possess the relics of the saint (his right hand), thus, the text is connected to the church history, even if the Anastasian translation only narrated the transfer

⁵⁰⁹ Miraculum 69, *De Iohanne caeco Romano*, PL 87. 3, 3659-3664.

⁵¹⁰ Cf. Laehr, "Die Briefe", 443-445.

⁵¹¹ L. A. Berto, "Landolfo", *DBI* 63, 473-475.

⁵¹² Cf. G. Arnaldi, "Anastasio Bibliotecario a Napoli nell' 871? Nota sulla tradizione della vita Athanasii Episcopi Neapolitani di Guarimpoto" *La Cultura* (1980): 3-33.

⁵¹³ Most probably those found in the manuscript Augiensis LXXX. Edited by A. P. Orbán, *Sermones in dormitionem assumptionemque beatae Mariae virginis in Latinum translati, ex codicem Augiensi LXXX (saec. IX)* (Turhout: Brepols, 2000). Cf. also M. Cupiccia, "Anastasio Bibliotecario traduttore delle omelie di Reichenau (Aug LXXX)?" *Filologia Mediolatina* 10 (2003), 41-102.

from Jerusalem to Constantinople, and not that from Constantinople to Rome, the occasion when the Capuans allegedly acquired the saint's hand .

The next letter is addressed to **Peter, bishop of Gabii**: it accompanies the passion of the martyrs of Ararat (nr. 14 in the catalogue), but it also refers to an earlier gift, a life of Peter of Alexandria (nr. 13 in the catalogue)⁵¹⁴. This is a rather short note, from which it is impossible to excavate any meaningful information: a variation on the themes of debt, and of the duel of *inscientia* and *inoboedientia*, with his preference for being accused of the first, rather than the second. The fact that Acacius, the leader of the martyrs, was a Roman soldier would fit in the predilection of Anastasius to translate hagiographical documents of Latin saints that survived in Greek,⁵¹⁵ but it gives us no clue about the interests of the dedicatee.

The gift to **Gauderic of Velletri**⁵¹⁶ is now lost, to the great regret of scholars: it treated the discovery of the relics of Saint Clement (nr. 19 in the catalogue), written by one of the very protagonists, Constantine, converter of the Slavs. The letters of Anastasius often mention him, always with great respect and reverence.⁵¹⁷

This letter documents a literary collaboration between Roman intellectuals, Anastasius and John the Deacon included, but this time the idea comes from Gauderic of Velletri. He requested that John write a life of Saint Clement, and that Anastasius supply him with the Greek material to be appended to the Latin sources. This time the project was carried out, although not entirely by John;

⁵¹⁴ Cf. Laehr, "Die Briefe", 445-448.

⁵¹⁵ Cf. my chapter *Genres and authors*, p. 63-64.

⁵¹⁶ F. Marazzi, "Gauderico" in *DBI* 52, 680-683; Cf. Laehr, "Die Briefe", 453-456.

upon his death, the work was completed by Gauderic himself. The translation of Anastasius was probably incorporated in this text, which is also at the same time a possible reason for its disappearance as a document on its own.⁵¹⁸

The last dedication in chronological order is to another southern Italian bishop, **Aio of Benevento**, and is accompanied by the translation of a *sermo* of Theodore of Stoudios, about Saint Bartholomew (nr. 22 in the catalogue).⁵¹⁹ Aio of Benevento was the leader of the Beneventan Longobards (884-890), the last champion of the autonomy of Benevento, a fervent anti-Byzantine.⁵²⁰ As motivation for the translation, Anastasius evokes the well-known interest of Aio in Bartholomew, whose relics were transferred from the island of Lipari to Benevento in 838.⁵²¹ The letter also briefly presents the author of the text. Just as in several other cases, Anastasius' letter is a special kind of brief *accessus ad auctores*, providing us with valuable information about his authors or texts. One piece of information is a suggestion for the liturgical usage of the text: *eam legendam ecclesiae trade*⁵²² - that is an immediate, practical exploitation of the text which was often Anastasius' motivation for translations.

One more dedication letter, which was unknown to the editors of the *MGH*, was identified as Anastasian by Paolo Chiesa in 1987.⁵²³ It accompanies a life of Amphilochios of Ikonion (nr. 3 in the catalogue), a translation probably

⁵¹⁷ Anastasius, *Epistolae* 407, 11-25; 433, 17-26; 436, 21 and 437, 5. It seems that he learned a lot from him about Byzantine literary and theological matters, and perhaps even they were tied together by their interests in translation,

⁵¹⁸ Cf. my chapter *Composition and layout*, p. 77-78.

⁵¹⁹ Cf. Laehr, "Die Briefe", 463.

⁵²⁰ Cilento, N. "Aione" *DBI* 1, 534-535.

⁵²¹ See Ulla Westerbergh, *Anastasius Bibliothecarius Sermo Theodori Studitae de sancto Bartholomeo Apostolo* (Stockholm: Almqvist and Wiksell, 1963), ix and 65-70.

⁵²² Anastasius, *Epistolae*, 442, 22-23.

accomplished within the timeframe of the first translations, that is to say together with the life of Basil of Caesarea (nr. 2 in the catalogue) and Peter of Alexandria (nr. 13 in the catalogue), a period when Anastasius' interest had been mostly captured by charismatic leaders of the church. The prologue's elements are quite similar to the other dedications; they were used in identifying the author. Thus, for example, it seems that in the translation Anastasius answers a request; also, he evokes the problem of Latin ignorance about the Greek Church Fathers and insists on the necessity of knowing not only their writings, but their lives, too. Unfortunately, the dedicatee is not named, there is only a short eulogy at the end of the letter describing him as a very learned cleric of Rome: *O vir studio sanctitatis et scientie cunctos seculares in urbe nostra transcendens.*⁵²⁴

JOHN THE DEACON

John the Deacon occupied special position in this network. Witness to it bear not only the number of Anastasius' letters⁵²⁵ (two rather long ones; only Charles the Bald received more) but also the tone and content of these letters. The material dedicated is also of a different character, exclusively historical documents: the *Chronographia Tripertita* of Nikephoros, George the Synkellos and Theophanes (nr. 7 in the catalogue), and the *Collectanea*, a set of documents pertaining to the monothelete controversy (nr. 8 in the catalogue). They were both intended to serve a plan the two clerics cherished, and which probably also had papal support (if not commissioned by the pontifical court): the composition of a universal church history. Unfortunately John had never

⁵²³ P. Chiesa, "Una traduzione inedita di Anastasio Bibliotecario? Le vitae latine di Sant'Anfilochio," *Studi Medievali*, 28 (1987): 879-903.

⁵²⁴ Chiesa, "Una traduzione inedita," 894.

⁵²⁵ Cf. Laehr, "Die Briefe", 432-435, 437-441.

arrived to accomplish his plan, but Anastasius did complete his part, that is the translation of Greek material to be included in the work. The letters attest to intense intellectual cooperation, a friendship based on shared preoccupations. Both letters hold John's intellectual abilities in high esteem, which was reciprocal, if the laconic *docet Anastasius* from the third book of the *Cena Cypriani* can be interpreted in this sense.⁵²⁶ He is at the same time *tam carus, tam sapiens* for Anastasius, also called *carissime frater*. The term *amicitia* cannot be found in these letters, but there is *fraternitas*, which, in this context, is, so to speak, the ecclesiastical counterpart for the lay concept of friendship. The ever-present humility *topoi* evoke a request, which can not be refused, a promise which has to be kept.

In his turn, Anastasius received gifts too, from personages indebted to him like **Hincmar of Rheims**, who twice sent gifts to Anastasius. First, he sent a fur coat: *crusnam de pellibus variis cum panno coloribus vario*.⁵²⁷ A regestum of a lost letter of Hincmar also testifies a literary gift, this time the archbishop sending some of his own works to Rome.⁵²⁸ Hincmar was indebted to Anastasius since it was also due to his interference that Hadrian II proved to be more favourable to the archbishop of Rheims than his predecessor, Nicholas I.⁵²⁹

⁵²⁶ MGH, PL. IV, 2-3, where he is in the company of the others from the small circle of Roman intellectuals, Zacharias, Gauderic, Formosus: *Ridens cadit Gaudericus supinus in lectulum, / Zacharias admiratur, docet Anastasius, / Quando simplex Iob Formosum condempnabat subdolum.*

⁵²⁷ Letter 200, MGH Epistolae 8, Karolini Aevi 6, 223-225, at pages 225, 10-11.

⁵²⁸ Regesta in Flodoardus Remensis, "Historia Remensis Ecclesiae," MGH Scriptores 36, at pages 323 lines 21-24: *Anastasio venerabili abbati ac bibliothecario sancte Romane ecclesie graciaram referens actiones pro benedictionibus sanctissimis ab eo sibi per Actardum episcopum directis, suas eidem quoque abbati mittens munerum benedictiones, quedam etiam opuscula sua confecta ipsi delegans.*

⁵²⁹ G. Arnaldi. "Anastasio Bibliothecario, antipapa," , 738.

A curious aborted friendship turned out to be the one with **Photios**: being his bitter political enemy for years, it seems that at the end of his life he tried to remedy the situation, with a letter which no longer is extant, and to which only Photios' succinct refusal is known:

The competition starts for you from the holy line, as the proverb goes. Look, I do not complain about usefulness or intention. I see that the time is past, and it seems well-described by that riddle which depicts (opportunity) in the flesh as long-haired on the forehead and bald from behind. For when someone comes along after the opportunity has passed, even if he pursues it with great skill, he cannot grasp it. But I commend you for your belated sympathetic intention. For friends ought not to measure grace by its usefulness, but judge goodwill by disposition.⁵³⁰

CONCLUSIONS

Dedication letters, though operating with several of clichés, make their authors accessible to historical investigation; they expose his plans and ambitions, the ups and downs of his career; show the author's manoeuvres in power zones he recognizes as valid; portray his patrons, his allies and his enemies; and last but not least, they account for his translation project, elucidate its coherence. Leonardi says:

The prologue with Anastasius becomes a literary and ideological necessity. [...] He needs the prologue to explain, to clarify and to justify, both historically and culturally, the aim of the political-cultural operation he performs upon accomplishing a new translation.⁵³¹

⁵³⁰ Greek text in *Photii Patriarchae Constantinopolitani epistolae et amphilochia*, ed. B. Laourdas and L. G. Westerink (Leipzig: Teubner, 1984), vol. 2, 45-46. English translation in Neil, *Seventh Century Popes and Martyrs*, 28.

⁵³¹ ... il prologo con Anastasio diventa una necessità letteraria e ideologica. Questo è il carattere specifico che egli dà al prologo. Anastasio a bisogno del prologo, per spiegare, dare ragione, giustificare storicamente e culturalmente lo scopo stesso della sua operazione politico-culturale ogni volta che egli, con una traduzione, la mette in atto. C. Leonardi, "Le lettere-prologo di Anastasio Bibliotecario," In P. Lardet, ed., *La tradition vive. Mélanges d'histoire des textes en l'honneur de Louis Holtz* (Turhout: Brepols, 2003), 389.

Anastasius' knowledge of Greek, and, consequently, his translation activity supported by pontifical patronage, was of great service to both himself and the papacy. In his choice of texts and dedicatees one can follow a librarian identifying himself with the institution employing him. His network clearly reflected this professional identification: it was a clerical circle governed by church interests and centred on Rome.⁵³² His net extended from the suburbicarian churches of Rome to the southern bishoprics of the Italian peninsula and the Carolingian court – all strategically significant places from the point of view of the papacy. His translations serve to strengthen the position of Rome and the local traditions of those with whom the papacy wanted or needed to have trustworthy rapport. The renderings of the Librarian betray an immediate, practical function of the texts: they assist in the translations of relics (Benevento, perhaps Capua), the transfer of episcopal seats (Porto), and the establishment of a dynastic saint (Dionysius). Other cases are carefully veiled diplomatic messages – such as sending of the story of a military saint to the emperor who was requested to defend the papacy from the Arabs with armed forces.⁵³³ In all these cases the literary gift displays the vast resources of the papal literary patrimony for offering spiritual authentication to those in need of. The special case of his correspondence with John the Deacon also seems to have been governed by papal patronage: it was the universal church history from Rome's point of view, which the two of them strive to create.

⁵³² Cf. Chiesa, *Ad verbum*, 42.

⁵³³ Cf. my next chapter: *The Emperor and the Translator: the Dedication of the Passion of Saint Demetrius*.

**CASE STUDY: THE EMPEROR AND THE TRANSLATOR: THE DEDICATION OF THE
PASSION OF SAINT DEMETRIUS**

Et nunc reges intelligite: erudimini, qui judicatis terram.
(Psalms 2:10)⁵³⁴

Dedicated to Charles the Bald on 25 March 876, *Letter 16* of Anastasius introduces the translation of a hagiographic dossier,⁵³⁵ the passion and miracles of Saint Demetrius of Thessaloniki (a third-fourth century Christian martyr said to have lived in Thessaloniki - nr. 20 in the catalogue). The Latin material, according to the Bollandists' list, survives in 12 manuscripts (see Table 5), mostly in twelfth century legendaries; however only a few of them contain all three elements of the original dossier: dedication letter, passion and miracula.

- | | |
|-----|--|
| 1. | Paris, BNF lat. 15436, 024r-025r, 11 th c. – P1 |
| 2. | Paris, BNF, lat. 11749, 183v-184r, first half of 12 th c. – P2 |
| 3. | Paris, BNF, lat. 13377, 002r-003v, 12 th c. – P3 |
| 4. | Bourges, BM, 031, 106r-107v, 12 th c. – Bo |
| 5. | Bruxelles, KBR, 09289 (3223), 187v-188r, 12 th c. – Br1 |
| 6. | Bruxelles, KBR, 08690-08702 (3213), 065v-077v, 12 th c. – Br2 |
| 7. | Rouen, BP, O 055 (1047), 113-114, 12 th c. – R1 |
| 8. | Rouen, BP, U 032 (1388), 133v-135v, 12 th c. – R2 |
| 9. | Trier, SB, 1151, IV (965), 040r-040v, 13 th c. – T |
| 10. | Namur BV, 015, 039r-040r, first half of 13 th c. – N |

⁵³⁴ Quoted by Hincmar of Rheims in the preface to his *De diversa et multiplici animae ratione*, work dedicated to the king, which starts with an eulogy to the wise Christian ruler: "Priscorum sententia est virorum, utilia semper quaerentium, et posteritati inventa commendantium, felices fore respublicas, si eas aut sapientes regerent, aut eas regentes sapientiae studerent. [...] Et quia tam nostra quam et illorum sententia est, Sapientis animum in inquisitione summi boni semper debere versari, dicente Propheta: *Quaerite Dominum, et confirmamini, quaerite faciem ejus semper* (Psal. 104, 4), merito gratulamur te illas philosophiae partes et colere, quae noscuntur ad arcem verae soliusque sapientiae tendere. Meminisse enim semper oportet mentem principis, quid Spiritus sanctus eum admoneat per clarissimos eosdemque principes et vere sapientes: *Et nunc reges intelligite: erudimini, qui judicatis terram. Servite Domino in timore, et exsultate ei cum tremore. Apprehendite disciplinam, nequando irascatur Dominus, et pereatis de via justa* (Psal. 2, 10, 12). Itemque: *Diligite justitiam qui judicatis terram. Sentite de Domino in bonitate, et in simplicitate cordis quaerite illum* (Sap. I, 1)". PL 125, 930D – 931B.

⁵³⁵ On the hagiographical translations of Anastasius, see C. Leonardi, *Hagiografia romana nel secolo IX*, in *Hagiographie cultures et sociétés. IVe-XIIe siècles* (Paris: études Augustiniennes, 1981), 471-490.

- | | |
|-----|---|
| 11. | Alençon 10, ff. 103v-105r, 12 th c. – A |
| 12. | Roma ArchSGiovLater. A. 80 (Alias C) 202v-203v, 11 th . c. - Ro |

Table 5: Passion and Miracles of Saint Demetrius: the Latin Tradition

The dedication letter of the translation has two versions: the longer one is conserved only in **A**, ff. 103v-104r and **R1**, f. 113r. A shorter version of it does exist, however, in **Br2** and **P3**.⁵³⁶

The Latin version of the passion has no critical edition yet, but one can find the text both in *AASS*⁵³⁷ and Migne's *PG* and *PL*⁵³⁸. *AASS* and *PG* feature the same texts, by the Bollandist Cornelius de Bye, while *PL* offers the one edited by Mabillon. The Greek passion was critically edited in 1909 by Hippolyte Delehaye⁵³⁹, based on two Greek manuscripts.⁵⁴⁰ From any of the Greek writings concerned with the life of Saint Demetrius, this is probably the oldest surviving, serving as source both for Anastasius' translation and also for Photios' description in his *Bibliotheca*.⁵⁴¹

As for the miracles, Anastasius has translated altogether ten of them, from the two oldest such collections: from the first one, by John, seventh century bishop of Thessaloniki, Anastasius translated miracles 1-2, 6-9, 11, 14-15 (*BHG* 500-501, 505-508, 510, 513-514) and from the second, anonymous collection, only one, number 21 (*BHG* 522). The Greek version of the miracle-collections was edited by Paul Lemerle.⁵⁴² The Latin, on the other hand, is only extant in four

⁵³⁶ The *MGH* edition of Anastasius' letters is based on **A**, but in the apparatus they include the shorter version of **Br2**.

⁵³⁷ *AASS*, October 8-9, vol. 4, 87-89.

⁵³⁸ *PG* 116, 1167-1171, *PL* 129, 715-726.

⁵³⁹ H. Delehaye, *Les légendes grecques des saints militaires* (Paris: Librairie Alphonse Picard et Fils, 1909).

⁵⁴⁰ For other manuscripts see P. Lemerle, *Les plus anciens recueils des miracles de Saint Démétrius et la pénétration des slaves dans les Balkans* (Paris: CNRS, 1979), vol. 2, 197-199.

⁵⁴¹ Photios, *Bibliothèque*, ed. René Henri (Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 1974), vol. 7, 213-215. Cf. Paul Lemerle, *Les plus anciens recueils des miracles de Saint Démétrius*, 197-198.

⁵⁴² P. P. Lemerle, *Les plus anciens recueils des miracles de Saint Démétrius et la pénétration des slaves dans les Balkans* (Paris: Éditions du Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique, 1979).

manuscripts: **A**, **P3**, **Br2** and **R2**, but even here there are discrepancies. **Br2** and **P3** show a different version than **A**; however, they all contain ten miracles, while **R2** has only a few excerpts (miracles 2, 7, 14 and 8), heavily truncated probably for reasons of lectionary usage. The miracles from the first collection are heavily abbreviated, either because of Anastasius' intervention, or because he had found it already like this in Greek. To be sure, s a Greek manuscript exists, Vat. Gr. 1608,⁵⁴³ 11th c., ff. 125-153, where one finds excerpted precisely the miracles translated by Anastasius (this is *BHG* 516c).⁵⁴⁴ Even if it is posterior to our translation, it might have had an archetype Anastasius could have had in hand. From the dedicatory letter, it seems that he had a manuscript where all the miracles (from the first and the second collection) were together, and philological intuition told him that the last one was something different, that is to say a miracle from the second, anonymous collection.⁵⁴⁵ The editor of the Greek miracles argues even further that the last miracle of the second collection is not by the same author as the previous five and it was added to the collection later.⁵⁴⁶ Anastasius himself also distinguishes authors of the *passio* and the *miracula*, these last written by John, bishop of Thessaloniki. He expresses his doubts about the last miracle, which, he says, is not written by John, but by the African bishop mentioned in the miracle. The translator and philologist Anastasius is speaking here: he also observes, that the Greek text of the *passio* has something which reflects Latin style.⁵⁴⁷ It has yet to be seen, whether this is

⁵⁴³ Lemerle, *Les plus anciens recueils des miracles de Saint Démétrius*, vol. 1, 20-21.

⁵⁴⁴ *Catalogus codicum hagiographicorum graecorum bibliothecae Vaticanae*. Ed. Hagiographi Bollandiani and Pius Franchi de' Cavalieri (Brussels: apud editores, 1899), 139.

⁵⁴⁵ Notandum vero, quod Latino passio eius stilo reniteat. Miracula autem ipsius sanctus Iohannes eiusdem urbis antistes descripsit, cuius alia nichilominus extant necessaria opuscula, excepto dumtaxat ultimo miraculorum illius capitulo, quod videlicet non alium scripsisse coicio nisi episcopum, cui beneficium, quod in eo legitur, est collatum.

⁵⁴⁶ Lemerle, *Les plus anciens recueils des miracles de Saint Démétrius*, vol. II, 163-169.

⁵⁴⁷ Cf. Laehr, "Die Briefe," 457: "Wie in so vielen andern von ihm übersetzten Schriften will er auch in dieser Passio ein ursprünglich lateinisches Werk sehen."

the case; however, it would not be an exception: however in some of Anastasius' hagiographic translations, one finds a sort of repatriation, namely the tendency to translate from Greek texts which were once extant in Latin or which concern figures from the Western Latin world. These notes pertaining to a sort of textual criticism led Gerhard Laehr to conclude, that Anastasius is here driven by philological interests rather than curiosity about the content.⁵⁴⁸ I expect to disprove this affirmation in this research.

For my purposes, the core of the dossier, the passion proper is of major importance. It is to be found in all twelve manuscripts and it demonstrates, as do most hagiographic texts, a considerable instability. Since most of the witnesses are from later periods, other non-chronological criteria should be used for establishing a reliable text. The most obvious such criterium would be the completeness of the dossier. There are three such manuscripts: **P3**, **Br2** and **A**. But even among them only **A** has the longer dedicatory epistle (and also a different version of the miracles). **P3** and **Br2** have an abbreviated version. The version of **A** has been published by the editors of the *MGH*,⁵⁴⁹ with **Br2** appended. They have the same structure and content, except for the last philological remarks of the longer version. While it was not my ambition to prepare a critically acceptable text, I will give a diplomatic edition of the passion from **A** in the appendix.

I start the analysis focusing on the longer letter; however, it will always be compared with the short one. As far as the content is concerned, if the opening

⁵⁴⁸ "Diese Vermutung des Anastasius gründet sich offenbar auf die Art der Erzählung und bezeugt ein gewisses philologisches Interesse, da der Übersetzer seine Aufmerksamkeit nicht nur dem erbaulichen Inhalt der *Miracula* zugewandt hat." G. Laehr, "Briefe und Prologe des Bibliothekars Anastasius," *Neues Archiv* 47 (1928): 458.

and closing rhetorical formulas typical for the epistolary style are disregarded, three parts can be distinguished in the letter: the first seems to describe the author's motivation, the second is an allusion to the emperor's present conditions and the third goes back to the text again, mentioning the existence of a *vita* Anastasius was aware of.

Beati Demetrii martiris Thessalonicensis passionem atque miracula hortantibus fratribus descripsi et maxime viro peritissimo Iohanne diacono sapientiae vestrae fidei puritate ac scientiae claritate notissimo. Qui huius nobilis martiris in domo quidem sua mirae antiquitatis et pulcritudinis oratorium habebat, sed iste adletha (*sic*) Christi quis fuerit, penitus ignorabat.⁵⁵⁰

To sum up in English, Charles the Bald is told here, that Anastasius was persuaded to complete this translation by his fellows, more specifically by his friend John the Deacon; John's reason for learning more about this saint was that he had a beautiful old oratory dedicated to this martyr in his house. It is known from John's *Vita Gregorii* that his house in Rome was situated on the Suburra⁵⁵¹ or *vicus suburanus* (approximately the present via San Martino ai Monti). The oratory and the house are not identified to make it possible to ascertain if some remnants could have survived.⁵⁵² It would also be difficult to ascertain to which Demetrius this oratory was dedicated. In the *Martyrologium Romanum* there are several martyrs with this name: Demetrius, Honorius and Florus, martyrs of Ostia, are celebrated on 22 December; Demetrius and Blasius, saints and martyrs of Veroli, are celebrated on 29 November; and, finally, there

⁵⁴⁹ E. Perels and G. Laehr, ed., "Anastasii Bibliothecarii epistolae sive praefationes," in *Epistolae Karolini aevi* 5 (Berlin: Weidmann, 1928), 438-439.

⁵⁵⁰ Anastasius, *Epistolae*, 439.

⁵⁵¹ PL 75, 168 B: "...in oratorio domus meae in Suburra positae..." See also M. Manitius, *Geschichte der Lateinischen Literatur des Mittelalters* (Munich: Beck, 1911), vol. 1, 689, and G. Arnaldi, "Giovanni Immonide e la cultura a Roma a tempo di Giovanni VIII" *Bullettino dell'Istituto Storico Italiano per il Medio Evo e Archivio Muratoriano* 68 (1956): 33-89; at pages 48.

is also Demetrius of Thessaloniki, the saint with whom the present chapter is concerned, is celebrated on 9 October)⁵⁵³ - moreover, there was a also constant fusion of all these figures, which makes it difficult to identify historical figures behind their sainthood.⁵⁵⁴

This introductory paragraph comprises all the characteristic rhetorical elements of a dedication: the pretext of a request, as motivation of the author (here translator), by both the multitude and individuals (*fratres* and *Iohannes*), which usually served as a sort of detachment from any kind of responsibility in the creation of the work. Also, when he mentions his intention of illuminating John about this martyr, one can recognise the *topos* of ignorance, often evoked in dedications as a primary justification for writing.⁵⁵⁵ Thus the paragraph, using the *loci communes* of a literary tradition, moreover, alluding to material remnants of an edifice, traces of which no longer exist, does not seem solid enough as the only valid explanation. Gerhard Laehr in his article about the introductory letters, considers it plausible; according to him, since this letter dates just after Charles' visit to Rome on the occasion of his coronation as emperor, one might well assume that he visited this above mentioned chapel

⁵⁵² Excavations identified a row of Roman houses in that street running along the front of the atrium of Santa Prassede. See B. M. Apollonj Ghetti, *Santa Prassede, Le Chiese di Roma illustrate* 66 (Roma: Marietti, 1961), 12-32.

⁵⁵³ We also know of a Demetrius and Gregorius from Carthage, most probably ninth century saints martyred in Sicilia during the Saracen invasions. See Francesco Scorza Barcellona, "Note sui martiri dell'invasione saracena" in *La Sicilia nella tarda antichità e nell'alto medioevo. Religione e società*, ed. Roassna Barcellona e Salvatore Pricoco (Soveria Mannelli: Rubbettino Editore, 1999). This dating makes them irrelevant for our investigation, since if we are to believe Anastasius, this oratory was an old one, thus probably pre-dating the ninth century.

⁵⁵⁴ Cornelius de Bye, the bollandist who put together the dossier of Demetrius of Thessaloniki, also expressed his hesitations concerning this problem. See *AASS Oct.* vol. 4, 86/PG 116, col. 1165-66.

⁵⁵⁵ For an exhausting study of the rhetorics of dedication, see Tore Janson, *Latin Prose Prefaces* (Stockholm: Almqvist&Wiksell, 1964), for this aspect especially pages 116-124. Also E. R. Curtius, *Europäische Literatur und lateinisches Mittelalter* (Bern: A. Francke, 1948), 87-97.

and liked it.⁵⁵⁶ And our alert librarian, noticing this, immediately prepared the necessary background information for the emperor.

Besides the lack of evidence for this scenario, let me observe that the existence of the oratory of Demetrius in the house of John the Deacon justifies the translation only, but not the dedication: why was this text sent to Charles the Bald instead of the person who requested it, i.e. John?⁵⁵⁷ To find a possible answer, I suggest continuing read to the letter.

Quia vero imperium vestrum tanti fraudare agonistae notitia renui, vobis quoque id ipsum opportune mittere procuravi, quatinus vestra magnitudo cum ceterorum super arenam multiplicatorum intercessionibus amicorum Dei et istius quoque preces apud Deum obtinere satagat, ut perfrui mereatur eorum suffragio. Notus ergo iam a vobis petatur; exorabilis enim est et validus ad praestandum, sicut ipse apud Thessalonicam positus expertus sum, ubi pretiosum corpus ipsius conditum redolet et miraculorum splendore refulget.⁵⁵⁸

Since Anastasius knew that many enemies tried to cause troubles for the emperor's domain, he found it beneficial to send this text to the emperor too; thus, the emperor's majesty, with the mediation of the martyr friends of God, would fight for his prayers to reach God, so that he then would deserve to enjoy their support. The shorter version is less rhetorical, and more to the point: since he had heard about the enemies, he found it opportune to send this text so that the emperor, with the help of saints and friends of God could obtain the grace of God through prayers and would deserve to enjoy eternal glory.⁵⁵⁹ It seems

⁵⁵⁶ G. Laehr, "Briefe und Prologe des Bibliothekars Anastasius" *Neues Archiv* 47 (1928): 457-463.

⁵⁵⁷ He was already the subject of several dedications: the *Collectanea* and the *Chronographia tripertita* were translated to facilitate his own project of historiography. See *Letter 7* and *Letter 9* of Anastasius (MGH, *Epistolae* 7, *Karolini Aevi* 5, 418-426).

⁵⁵⁸ Anastasius, *Epistolae*, 439.

⁵⁵⁹ brevior versio – **Br2**, f. 65: "Sed quia imperium vestrum tanti agonistae fraudari notitia novi, vobis quoque id ipsum opportune mittere procuravi, quatinus vestra magnitudo cum intercessionibus sanctorum et amicorum Dei istius quoque prece apud Deum obtinere gratiam valeat et perfrui mereatur gloria sempiterna. Rex regum et dominus dominantium regnum vestrum dextera sua protegat et de temporali ad aeternum transferat regnum."

from these lines, the passion is sent to the emperor as spiritual support to assist him in his conflicts.

I think it is worth reflecting on this passage, especially connected to the *passio* proper and the historical circumstances. I argue, that in these lines, though carefully veiled, two major issues are touched upon: 1. the prerogatives of both the emperor and the pope in their alliance, renewed now with Charles' crowning as emperor (namely, that the warrior king's role is protecting Christendom, while the papacy offers spiritual guarantees of success through its payers and blessings) and 2. a hagiographic justification for war.

To make my argument clear, first the contents of the translated text will be addressed: it is a short story recounting the circumstances of the death of the martyr Saint Demetrius. During the great persecutions, emperor Maximianus visited Thessaloniki. His soldiers arrested many Christians, Demetrius among others. He was presented to the emperor while he was on his way to the stadium; Maximianus ordered the saint to be imprisoned in one of the rooms of the public baths. The emperor intended to see gladiator fights; his favourite gladiator, Lyaeus, was a very strong and successful fighter. Thus he invited the people to accept his provocation for the fight, promising valuable rewards. A young boy called Nestor volunteered. The emperor felt sorry for him because of his age, and, convinced that he wants to fight motivated by financial reasons, offered him an amount just to make him withdraw. But Nestor, responding that he is interested neither in money, nor in fame, insisted on fighting, finally killing Lyaeus. The emperor was enraged to the extent he even forgot about the prize, and sadly returned to his palace. But at this point he was reminded about Demetrius, and instantly ordered him to be killed. The soldiers murdered him on the street between the baths and the stadium; later in the middle of the night he was buried there by some pious men. It was on this very place that later a

certain Leontius erected an oratory for the martyr Demetrius, thus the story ends.

This narrative sketched above received sharp criticism from Paul Lemerle as a literary piece: according to him, the figure of Demetrius is almost non-existent, his relationship with Nestor is not clear, in the whole story only the emperor has a profile. He also affirms that the passion is to account for the placement of the church dedicated to him by Leontius, between the baths and the stadium.⁵⁶⁰ From all these elements I will focus now on the connection between Demetrius and Nestor, as it appears in the Greek original and the Latin rendering. First, it has to be noted that in later versions of the same theme this is a much elaborated fragment: both Demetrius and Nestor are Christians, and Nestor's victory is the result of the miraculous power of Demetrius' prayer – reason why, as soon as the emperor realises this, they both have to die.⁵⁶¹ No matter how unelaborated the early versions are, I think this is a focal point that one cannot miss in the legend. In fact, the Greek texts – the one on which the translation was made (1), and the version of Photios (2), are also rather explicit:

1. Ὑποβαλόντων δὲ αὐτῶ τινων περὶ Δημητρίου, ὡς ἐκεῖνος αἴτιος τῆς τοῦ Λυαίου σφαγῆς γένοιτο, εὐχαῖς κατ' αὐτοῦ ὀπλίσας τὸν Νέστορα, αὐτίκα παροξυνθεὶς καὶ ὡς ἔθος ἐστὶ τοῖς θεομαχοῦσιν οἰωνισάμενος, ὡς οὐκ ἀγαθῶ συμβούλῳ χρησάμενος αὐτῶ, ἠνίκα ἐπὶ τὸ στάδιον ἤρχετο, λόγχαις αὐτὸν ἐν τοῖς τόποις αὐτοῖς ἐν οἷς καθεῖρκετο διαφθαρεῖναι κελεύει.⁵⁶²

2. Ἐπεὶ δὲ αὐτῶ τινες λόγους ἔφερον περὶ τοῦ μάρτυρος Δημητρίου, ἅτε δὴ μεθύων καὶ τῶν θυμῶ καὶ τῇ ἀσεβείᾳ, καὶ ἅμα νομίσας ὡς οἰωνὸς αὐτῶ γέγονεν οὐκ ἀγαθὸς ἢ κατὰ τὸ στάδιον ἀπιόντι τοῦ ἁγίου συνάντησις λόγχαις ἐν οἷς καθεῖρκετο τόποις κελεύει τοῦτον ἀναιρεθῆναι.⁵⁶³

⁵⁶⁰ P. Lemerle, *Les plus anciens recueils des miracles de Saint Démétrius*, 197-198.

⁵⁶¹ There are two more extant passions extant: one by an anonymous author and the other by Symeon Metaphrastes. See AASS, 90-95 and 96-103.

⁵⁶² Delehaye, *Les Légendes grecques des Saints Militaires*, 262.

In the first version there is a clear reference to the fact that at least in the emperor's superstitious mind, the two events – himself meeting Demetrius and Nestor killing Lyaeus – are connected in a cause and effect relationship. Indeed, the Latin version is a bit more laconic and in content is closer to Photios' text.

Cum autem ei quidam de Demetrio suggessissent, statim in ira permotus in ipso loco in quo fuit retentus, jussit eum lanceis perforari.⁵⁶⁴

A possible reason for this abruptness might have been caused by the Greek manuscript tradition: of the two manuscripts used by Delehaye, the *Codex Parisinus* 1485 lacks the passage *ὡς ἐκεῖνος ... τὸν Νέστορα* containing the reference to Demetrius' prayer.⁵⁶⁵ The very hesitant *suggero* can indeed infer that Demetrius' name was simply mentioned at an inappropriate instant to the furious emperor and this unfortunate situation caused his execution. Nevertheless I think that one can opt for such an interpretation only by disregarding the inherent logic of the story.

The reason why I insist on this reading is that I assume that this was the meaning Anastasius gave to the text and this was what Charles the Bald was supposed to understand. The figure of a holy man and his protective prayers as correlated with a warrior who successfully faces pagan forces can be read as a transparent representation of the alliance of the papacy and of the Frankish emperor in the late ninth century. The protagonists Demetrius, Nestor, Maximianus and Lyaeus can be substituted with actors of the contemporary political scene as follows: Demetrius-pope, Nestor-Frankish emperor, Maximianus/Lyaeus-Saracens/internal enemies of the Frankish emperor.

⁵⁶³ Photios, *Bibliothèque*, ed. René Henri (Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 1974) vol. 7, 214.

⁵⁶⁴ *AASS*, October 8-9, vol. 4, 88.

⁵⁶⁵ It is very difficult to establish the relationship between the Greek original and the Latin version for hagiographic translations: there are sentences or expressions that are omitted quite often, even if the passages that are translated, are word for word renderings.

From Gregory III and Charles Martel onwards, the alliance between popes and Frankish rulers had a long history (and historiography). The constitutive elements of this *foedus* are perhaps most clearly formulated in one of Charlemagne's letters (composed by Alcuin in 796), where he congratulates the new pope Leo III on his election, and on this occasion repeats the duties and obligations of the two parties as set with the previous pope, Hadrian I.⁵⁶⁶ Charlemagne assumed it his duty to defend Christendom from the external danger of pagan invasions, meanwhile internally securing acknowledgement of the Catholic faith. In return, the pope has to act as a mediator between the people and God, so that through his prayers he can assure the victory of Christianity.

This is precisely what this letter does: it promises and offers some spiritual assistance for Charles the Bald to help him dealing with his military conflicts. And if looks at chronology, one discovers that he was in need of this assistance. The letter was written in March 876 – just after Charles the Bald's imperial coronation, which had taken place in Rome around Christmas of the previous year. His brother, Louis the German, who, as a possible candidate for the crown, was rather disturbed by the pope's choice, and attacked Charles almost immediately, devastating his dominions; these attempts halted only with the death of Louis the German, which occurred on 28 August 876. Given the fact that Charles was in full state of war with his brother when Anastasius sent the letter, I think that it is not an unfounded assumption to take Anastasius' allusion to the *imperium vestrum tanti fraudare agonistae* as a reference to Louis' forces.

⁵⁶⁶ Nostrum est: secundum auxilium divinae pietatis sanctam undique Christi ecclesiam ab incursu paganorum et ab infidelium devastatione armis defendere foris, et intus catholicae fidei agnitione munire. Vestrum est, sanctissime pater: elevatis ad Deum cum Moyse manibus nostram adjuvare militiam, quatenus vobis intercedentibus Deo ductore et datore populus

As one can expect from a clever papal official such as Anastasius Bibliothecarius, the text of the passion itself is a two-edged sword. It offers the due spiritual help, sending a text where the Christian warrior conquers the enemy, assisted by a saint— which, in the context here is an obvious promise of victory to Charles, since his army is being supported by the prayers of the pope. In contrast, the framing of the narrative reminds him of his obligations – as stated already in Charlemagne’s letter, it is the duty of a Christian prince *sanctam undique Christi ecclesiam ab incursu paganorum et ab infidelium devastatione armis defendere*.

In 870-880, the Arab conquest extended from Sicily to Calabria and even to Rome. Thus, the pagan danger was more acute than ever: the Saracens threatened the papacy’s realms, while the southern Italian dukes were deserting the pope and allying with the Arabs. John VIII had a hard time convincing the southern-Italian dukes to form a coalition against the Arabs, since at that time almost all southern the Italian regions (Benevento, Salerno, Capua, Naples, Amalfi) had a peace-treaty with the Saracens. The pope tried to persuade them to break the treaty, even threatening them with excommunication.⁵⁶⁷ Within this politically fragmented Italy, only the papacy could assume the defence of Christendom, and it could only achieve this with the assistance of the Carolingians.⁵⁶⁸

This imminent threat by the pagans forced John VIII to implore Charles’ assistance against the Saracens in several of his surviving letters - all post-dated

christianus super inimicos sui sancti nominis ubique semper habeat victoriam, et nomen domini nostri Iesu Christi toto clarificetur in orbe. Letter 93, *MGH Epistolae 4, Karolini Aevi 2*, 137.

⁵⁶⁷ See Arthur Lapôte, “L’Europe et le Saint-Siège à l’époque carolingienne. Première partie: le pape Jean VIII (872-882)” in Arthur Lapôte, *Études sur la papauté au IX. siècle* (Torino: Botteghe d’Erasmus, 1978), vol. 2, 61-423.

⁵⁶⁸ See P. Guichard “L’Islam e l’Europa” in *Storia d’Europa*, vol. 3, *Il Medioevo*, ed. Gherardo Ortalli (Torino: Einaudi, 1994).

this dedication. The first one dates from the autumn of the same year, 876.⁵⁶⁹ There are two from the winter of 877; moreover, he even addressed the empress and the Frankish clergy, asking for their support in convincing Charles about a military intervention.⁵⁷⁰ The last call is dated May 877⁵⁷¹. They were finally effective, making Charles embark on his unfortunate expedition in August, 877. This proved to be an inefficient attempt, since he had to turn back almost immediately to face the attacks of Carloman, son of Louis the German; the campaign ended with his death on 6 October, 877.

Examining these letters, one finds again many of the elements present in Anastasius' letter and in the narrative of his translation. This comparison is all the more relevant, since it is now an established fact that Anastasius Bibliothecarius is the author or at least the co-redactor of the letters of both Nicholas I and John VIII.⁵⁷²

In the first letter, issued on 15 November 876, after drawing a dramatic picture of the Saracen siege in very strong colours, and after complaining about the unfaithfulness of his Italian allies,⁵⁷³ John VIII finally turned to Charles.⁵⁷⁴ Here

⁵⁶⁹ Letter 22, dated 876 Nov. 15 – *MGH Epistolae 7, Karolini Aevi 5* (= *PL 126, 696, nr. 43*).

⁵⁷⁰ Letter 31, dated 877 Febr. 10- *MGH Epistolae 7, Karolini Aevi 5* (= *PL 126, 711, n. 58*); again: 877 Febr. 13 – Letter 32, *MGH Epistolae 7, Karolini Aevi 5* (= *PL 126, 714, n. 60*); Letter 33 to the empress: 877 Febr. 10 - *MGH Epistolae 7, Karolini Aevi 5* (= *PL 126, 713, n. 59*); Letter 36 to the bishops: 876 Nov. – *MGH Epistolae 7, Karolini Aevi 5* (= *PL 126, 716, n. 62*).

⁵⁷¹ Letter 56, 877 Mai – *MGH Epistolae 7, Karolini Aevi 5* (= *PL 126, 730, n. 79*).

⁵⁷² See E. Perels, *Papst Nikolaus I und Anastasius Bibliothecarius* (Berlin: Weidmann, 1920).

⁵⁷³ He mentions both the pagans and the wicked Christians together several times as enemies, since he had a truly hard time convincing the Southern-Italian realm to form an alliance against the Arabs. See F. E. Engreen, "Pope John the Eight and the Arabs" *Speculum* 20 (1945): 318-330. More recently Barbara M. Kreutz, *Before the Normans. Southern Italy in the Ninth and Tenth Centuries* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1991), especially pages 57-60.

⁵⁷⁴ "Sed cum undique angustiati clamamus, non est qui audiat, non est qui adjuvet, non est qui salvum faciat, nisi tu, fili charissime et imperator clementissime, qui post Deum nobis factus es in refugium, et solatium, et auxilium. Quocirca totis praecordiis, totisque commoti visceribus, cum episcopis et presbyteris ac proceribus, totisque plebis nobis olim commissae reliquii deprecamur, jube tandem aperire aures, audire gemitum et singultus omnium nostrum, porrigere manum, et praestare opem patriae periclitanti, civitati inter multas miserias et aerumnas jacenti, et huic Ecclesiae matri vestrae, a qua non solum regnandi, sed et in Dominum

the pope's request for help was at the same time a memento of the imperial coronation. Charles' power, the sacred kingship was given to him by the papacy. If his spiritual support were destroyed, to whom would he turn for solace? This argument is supported by the biblical parallel of King David: as the biblical figure, he was anointed by God, and thus, by his servant, the pope. Again, this symbolism was not new: already Charlemagne, whose other name was David, had exploited this correspondence.⁵⁷⁵ For me, the formula *alterus rex David* is even more interesting if the passion of Demetrius is reconsidered: the duel between the young and fragile Nestor and the experienced and successful fighter Lyaeus as well as the outcome of the confrontation have a clear resemblance to the biblical story of David and Goliath.⁵⁷⁶

The second letter has the same line of thought describing the Saracen raids, then complaining about the Italian allies, who were Christians in name only, and, finally, turning to Charles for help, at the same time reminding him of his obligations towards Rome. Now I will only stress the last lines⁵⁷⁷, which advice the emperor to treat the papal legates properly, to listen to what they have to say, and to try to reach a favourable decision quickly, in favour of his mediators

unum et verum credendi exordium percepistis, quaeque in ultimo, spreto bono et magno fratre, vos more Dei gratuita voluntate, tanquam alterum regem David elegit et praelegit atque ad imperialia scepra provexit. Cogitate itaque, Dei cultor semper Auguste, a propheta praemoniti, si haec humiliatur, ad cuius confugietis auxilium? vel ubi relinquetis gloriam vestram? Perpendite quia si haec humiliatur, non solum gloria imperii vestri periclitabitur, sed et ipsa profecto Christianae religionis cultura maxima ex parte peribit." Letter 22, *MGH Epistolae 7, Karolini Aevi 5*, 19-21.

⁵⁷⁵ For this analogy see for example Letter 41 of Alcuin, *MGH Epistolae 4, Karolini Aevi 2*, 84. Cf. P. Riché et G. Lubrichon, "La Bible et la vie politique dans le Haut Moyen Âge," in *Le Moyen Âge et la Bible* (Paris: Picard, 2003), 397-398.

⁵⁷⁶ It will even appear textually in the later version of Symeon Metaphrastes (*AASS*, 100).

⁵⁷⁷ "Postremo sublimitatem vestram deposcimus ut latores praesentium, Petrum scilicet atque Petrum venerabiles episcopos, missos apostolicae sedis, nostrosque dilectos, juxta morem benigne ac pacifice suscipere non dedignemini, et ea quae piis vestris auribus pro utilitate sanctae Romanae Ecclesiae in conspectu vestro retulerint, ad congruum ac opportunum effectum pervenire, pro sanctis apostolis vestris intercessoribus apud Deum, celeriter studeatis." *Epistolae 31, MGH Epistolae 7, Karolini Aevi*, 29-30.

to the heavens, *pro sanctis apostolis vestris intercessoribus apud Deum, celeriter studeatis*. The expression *intercessor* also occurs before in Anastasius' dedication, when he says that the emperor, confronting his enemies, will be assisted *intercessoribus amicorum Dei*. Both letters suggest that the way to eternal glory for the emperor leads only through the mediation, the intervention of the papacy, the only institution which can invoke for him the assistance of the saints or apostles. Also, in the last letter, one can observe spiritual power in action, when the pope, while insisting on his requests, also emphasizes that he is constantly praying for the emperor's health, at this time already very fragile.⁵⁷⁸ The mutual character of their alliance is highlighted here as everywhere: it is not a favour what he asks of Charles; while reminding him of his obligations, the pope does not forget to mention that he is also carrying out his duties.

The third letter starts with an impressive metaphor, based on a biblical quote,⁵⁷⁹ from the realm of ancient athletics⁵⁸⁰: it offers Charles the palm branch of victory, if he decides *in huius saeculi stadio pro Christi Ecclesia currere*. I think that this is not far from the setting of the gladiator fights as presented in the *passio* of Demetrius. Also, in a letter addressed to the bishop of Napoli in April 877, when reproaching him for the treaty with the Muslims, he describes him as not

⁵⁷⁸ "Nos enim, cum omnis sedis apostolicae ordine sacro, cum religiosis et Deum timentibus viris, pro vestrae gloriae prosperitate, continuaque mentis et corporis salute, omnipotentem Dominum, cuius est salus omnis et vita, totis deprecabimur nisibus, ut nec temporis fervor, nec loci natura insolita, nec molestia quaelibet vestro insigni corpori nocitura contingat." Letter 56, *MGH, Epistolae 7, Karolini Aevi 5*, 51-52.

⁵⁷⁹ 1 Cor. 9.

⁵⁸⁰ "Inter caetera quae, vera crescente religione, ab olim ecclesiastica facta vestrae pietati duximus intimanda, virentium vobis palmarum ecce bravium mittimus, quod Apostolus non omnes qui currunt, sed unum propter unitatem legitime certantium accipere protestatur (I Cor. IX). Quapropter, fili charissime, quasi praesentes, incurvatis genibus et submisso capite, deprecamur et obsecramus, ut ita legitime celsitudo vestra in huius saeculi stadio pro Christi Ecclesia currere, ita decertare contendat, ut non solum bravio victrix vestra dextera adornetur, verum etiam sacratissimum caput diademate gloriae decoretur imo pro visibilibus his et

behaving as a proper soldier of Christ should behave *sicut idoneum Christi athletam oportet*.⁵⁸¹ The expression *athleta Christi* was first used exclusively for martyrs, and only later, with the crusades, became popular as designating soldiers fighting against the Muslims.⁵⁸² The vocabulary of athleticism – that is, expressions such as *stadium*, *arena*, *agonista*, *athleta* - appears in early Christian sources in the stories of martyrdom: the *stadium* is the place where Demetrius' story takes place; a similar term, *arena*, even appears even in Anastasius' letter. Applying it to contemporary situations perhaps should be interpreted in the context of the new pagan dangers which made the ninth century situation similar to the times of the great persecution.

Scholars argue that it was precisely in the ninth century, when the later ideology of the justified war, i.e. the crusades originated.⁵⁸³ The popes of this

corruptibilibus, non tantum palmam, sed et coronam accipiat incorruptam." Letter 32, *MGH, Epistolae 7, Karolini Aevi 5*, 31-32.

⁵⁸¹ "Relictis litteris tuis, quas coepto jam paschalis festivitatis officio in die magno suscepimus, nihil quo laetificaremur, reperimus: unde ingens tristitia, et continuus dolor cordi nostro crevit, et multiplicatus nos vehementer affligit; quia populum civitatis vestrae, quae olim Dei, nunc autem principis tenebrarum effecta est, derelicto penitus creatoris sui amore, videmus jugum cum infidelibus ducere: teque ideo fore obnoxium, quoniam in medio populi polluta labia habentis, pollutum et complicem habitare, nec toto annixu te velle murum pro domo Domini, sicut idoneum Christi athletam oportet, contemplamur opponere." Letter 42, *MGH, Epistolae 7, Karolini Aevi*, 39-41.

⁵⁸² J. Flori, *La première Croisade. L'Occident chrétien contre l'Islam* (Brussels: Éditions Complexe, 1992), 119-131.

⁵⁸³ "Ainsi, du VIIIe au XIe siècle, la guerre fut un réalité constante en Occident et les papes lui accordèrent un intérêt d'autant plus grand que la chrétienté subit à cette époque les assauts multiples des Sarrasins, Hongrois, Bulgares et Normands, tous païens ou considérés comme tels en Occident. Ce caractère contribua dans un large mesure à la sacralisation des combats menés contre eux et à la qualité de martyr conférée à ceux qui viendraient à mourir dans cette entreprises menées pour le triomphe de la foi. La menace que faisaient peser ces peuples, et principalement les musulmans d'Afrique et de Sicile, sur les nouveaux Etats pontificaux joua également un grand rôle dans cette phase nouvelle de sacralisation de la guerre et des guerriers qui la mènent à l'initiative des pontifes romains." Flori, 131. See also Colin Morris, "Martyrs on the Field of Battle before and during the First Crusade" in Diana Wood, ed., *Martyrs and Martyrologies* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1993), 93-104, who affirms that "the writers of the court were familiar with the idea of wars fought in the name of Christ, for the defence of Christendom or even (more hesitantly) for its extension. Warfare, in their thought, was the function of the

period presented the defence of Christian lands as a holy war, often while claiming assistance and protection, not refraining from a language akin to moral blackmail.⁵⁸⁴ It was Leo IV who in 853 (after experiencing the pillage of Saint Peter by the Saracens in 846) first promised the heaven for those fighting the pagans.⁵⁸⁵ For Nicholas I, as attested by his letters,⁵⁸⁶ the issue proved to be a bit more problematic, since, while justifying war against pagans, he had to raise his voice against members of the Frankish clergy, who, as any other aristocrat of the period, were often present on the battlefield. John VIII, since his troubles with the Muslims continue after the death of Charles the Bald, in 878 offered indulgence to everyone who died in the battle with the pagans, an indulgence which he reissues again in 879.⁵⁸⁷

anointed ruler, sustained by the prayers of the Church". Morris, "Martyrs", 94. Janet Nelson has also pointed out that "the institutionalised warfare of the Church was not just permissible, but necessary: in practical terms because it sustained the Carolingian state, in ideological terms because it transcended the opposition between apostolicity and landed wealth. ... The liturgy of knighthood has ninth-century West Frankish roots (I am thinking of the benediction *super militantes* in the Leofric Missal) and the earliest dubbing rituals should be linked with the warrior-households of particular bishops, that is, with the familiae of particular saints." Janet L. Nelson, "The Church's Military Service in the Ninth Century: A Contemporary Comparative View?" in *The Church and War*, ed. W. J. Sheils (Oxford: Blackwell, 1983), 29. See also J. Imbert, "L'église et la guerre" in *Les temps carolingiens (741-891). L'église: les institutions. Histoire de droit et des institutions de l'Église en Occident* 5, 2 (Paris: Cujas, 1994), 242-248.

⁵⁸⁴ J. Herrin, *The Formation of Christendom* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1987), 296.

⁵⁸⁵ "Omnium vestrum nosse volumus karitatem, quoniam quisquis (quod non optantes dicimus) in hoc belli certamine fideliter mortuus fuerit, regna illi celestia minime negabuntur. Novit enim omnipotens, si quislibet vestrum morietur, quod pro veritate fidei et salvatione anime ac defensione patrie christianorum mortuus est, ideo ab eo pretitulatum premium consequetur." *MGH Epistolae 5, Karolini Aevi 3*, 601.

⁵⁸⁶ See, among other things, his letters to Charles the Bald and Louis the German (Letter 38, *MGH, Epistolae 6, Karolini Aevi 4*, 309-310), his advice to the Bulgars (Letter 99, *MGH, Epistolae 6, Karolini Aevi 4*, 585) and a fragmentary letter to one of his bishops (Letter 104, *MGH, Epistolae 6, Karolini Aevi 4*, 612-613).

⁵⁸⁷ "...illi qui cum pietate catholicae religionis in belli certamine cadunt, requies eos aeternae vitae suscipiet, contra paganos atque infideles strenue dimicantes, eo quod Dominus per prophetam dignatus est dicere: *Peccator quacunq[ue] hora conversus fuerit, omnium iniquitatum illius non recordabor amplius* (Ezech. 18), et venerabilis ille latro in una confessionis voce de cruce meruit paradisum (Luc. XXVII). Manasses quoque, impurissimus quondam rex, captus carcerique artissimo religatus, ibi poenitentiam agens, cum perfectione indulgentiae, etiam

It was not an easy task to combine the pacific messages of the New Testament with the increasing necessity of the Christendom to face the perils of different pagan invaders such as the Normans, Saracens and later the Magyars. Hagiography did a useful service to this with documents referring to the early Christian martyrs. In hagiology, Demetrius belongs to the category of military saints, together with Saint George, Saint Procopius, Saint Mercure, and others (Nestor, since martyred in the later passions, becomes a military saint too).⁵⁸⁸ According to Delehaye, what makes them military saints is not always clear: in iconography they are sometimes dressed as soldiers, but they have little to do with the disobedient soldiers of the Roman army during the first Tetrachy's reign.⁵⁸⁹ There can also be other explanations, such as the symbolism of the *militia Christi*, or the continuation of a pagan god's attributes: for example Demetrius can be seen as taking over the attributes of Thessaloniki's pagan fighter gods, the Cabiri.⁵⁹⁰ Paul Lemerle affirms that Demetrius initially was perhaps not a military saint, but he became one later as the dangers affecting his city grew, and Thessaloniki was in need of a protector.⁵⁹¹ Perhaps in a slightly different way, ninth century papal ideology was also in need of protective saints, or rather saints who could be offered as models to their earthly protectors.

regni pristini, propter Domini misericordiam, quia immensa est circa genus humanum, adeptus est solium (II Par. XXXIII)." Letter 150, *MGH, Epistolae 7, Karolini Aevi 5*, 126-127.

⁵⁸⁸ For more on this issue see C. Walter, *The Warrior Saints in Byzantine Art and Tradition* (London: Ashgate, 2003), 67-93 (Demetrius), 227-230 (Nestor).

⁵⁸⁹ H. Delehaye, "La persécution dans l'armée sous Dioclétien" in *Mélanges d'hagiographie grecque et latine* (Brussels: Société des Bollandistes, 1966), 256-268.

⁵⁹⁰ H. Delehaye, *Les Légendes grecques des Saints Militaires* (Paris: Librairie Alphonse Picard et Fils, 1909).

⁵⁹¹ "Pour la reste, tout se passe comme si Démétrius, dans nos deux Recueils, n'était pas encore un saint militaire, mais en voie de le devenir: évolution qui déculait tout naturellement de l'exceptionnelle gravité que les événements militaires ont revêtue pour Thessalonique à partir des attaques avaro-sklavènes, et du rôle décisif qu'on y fit alors jouer à saint Démétrius." P. Lemerle, 41.

Anastasius was an influential and intelligent politician, always bearing in mind the papacy's interests, as can be also seen in his other letters to Charles the Bald. During the papacy of Nicholas I and John VIII, the two main tenets of papal ideology were the issues of pontifical supremacy and holy war.⁵⁹² It was not by chance, that Anastasius was a collaborator of both of them; he played an active role in shaping this image; although only *probabiliter*, but on substantial grounds, one can assume that the dedication of the passion of Demetrius was a small contribution to this project.

Moreover, Anastasius' attempt was not a solitary phenomenon: saints, if not so often in text format, but in their material presence, were often translated to *Francia* with the same purpose. The heavy traffic in Roman relics, as described in the inspiring study of Julia Smith, was defined by the political interests of papacy, kings, nobles and bishops; as valuable items of the gift-economy they determined a complex net of relations.⁵⁹³ I think that even without being able to clearly identify a strong tie between all these elements, still, once placed in context, this dedication of Anastasius seems to emerge from anything but innocent literal or art-historical interest. As Ian Wood has already pointed out about Merovingian saints' lives:

⁵⁹² Cf. P. Riché, *Education et culture dans l'Occident médiéval* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 1993), 17.

⁵⁹³ "Whether local significance or historical oblivion was their fate, the relics translated from Rome to Francia in the ninth century were not translated primarily as objects of popular devotion. Rather, their removal north of the Alps demonstrates their role as tokens of high politics and of papal prestige. Their significance lies in the politics of early medieval gift exchange, in the webs of patronage and strategies of alliance building that bound prominent churchmen and lay aristocrats to their ruler in the charmed bond of *Königsnahe*, and in papal efforts to translate spiritual prestige into reliable political support and enduring authority. As mediators of friendship between emperors, kings, bishops, aristocrats and the papacy, Roman relics travelled along routes of obligation, loyalty and reward: their possession is an isotopic tracer of royal or imperial affiliation." Smith M. H. Julia, "Old Saints, New Cults: Roman Relics in Carolingian Francia" in Julia M. H. Smith, ed. *Early Medieval Rome and the Christian West* (Leiden: Brill, 2000), 332.

Hagiography, then, could be history as much as it could be liturgy, theology, edification and propaganda, whether spiritual, cultic or political.⁵⁹⁴

⁵⁹⁴ Ian Wood, "The Use and Abuse of Latin Hagiography in the Early Medieval West" in *East and West: Modes of Communication*, ed. Evangelos Chrysos and Ian Wood (Leiden: Brill, 1999), 108-109.

CONCLUSIONS: ANASTASIUS THE HISTORIAN

“... I felt that Averroes, wanting to imagine what a drama is without ever having suspected what a theatre is, was no more absurd than I, wanting to imagine Averroes with no other sources than a few fragments from Renan, Lane and Asín Palacios. I felt, on the last page, that my narration was a symbol of the man I was as I wrote it and that, in order to compose that narration, I had to be that man, and in order to be that man, I had to compose that narration, and so on to infinity. (The moment I cease to believe in him, “Averroes” disappears).”

Jorge Louis Borges, *Averroes’ Search*

“A new Cassiodorus” – even if not intended as a compliment, this characterisation of de Lubac⁵⁹⁵ is truly appropriate for condensing Anastasius’ approach to Greek culture. Walter Berschin talks about “Anastasius’ excellent historical sense.”⁵⁹⁶ In the eyes of Momigliano, the greatest achievement of Anastasius was that he “conceived the idea of reviving the Eusebian type of universal ecclesiastical history after 870.”⁵⁹⁷ None of these scholars considered the Latin *Chronographia tripartita* (nr. 7 in the catalogue) as just any translation, and they were right in doing so. The motivations of this work can be extended to the whole project: if seen together with his translations of other church documents and with an eye on contemporary papal preoccupations, it is part of

⁵⁹⁵ Lubac’s colorful portrait of Anastasius is nothing more than a curious long list of accusations: “a ruffian”, “not very commandable”, someone who “does not merit any confidence.” Henri de Lubac, S. J. *Medieval Exegesis. Vol. I. The Four Senses of Scripture*, translated by Mark Sebanc (Edinburgh: T and T Clark), 1998, *passim*.

⁵⁹⁶ Berschin, *Greek Letters*, 167. Cf. also page 168: Remarkably, the “historian” among the translators of the Latin Middle Ages is judged by modern historians according to standards which do not belong to his (or their) domain. For the translator Anastasius can scarcely be compared with the theologian Photios; ... the fact that John (Eriugena) exhibited other qualities as a theologico-philosophical writer cannot be played off against Anastasius’ achievement as a translator.

⁵⁹⁷ A. Momigliano, *The Classical Foundations of Modern Historiography* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1990), 147.

a large-scale historiographical project, deeply engaged politically, that is the authoritative pontifical version of the universal history of the Christian church. The project's significant outcome from this point of view can be grouped in the following sets: the assembly of Greek hagiographical texts, the rendering of two major council acts, and the groundwork for a universal church history; or, from a different perspective, the works dedicated to different social groups, like colleagues, to John the Deacon, to the popes, and to Charles the Bald. Studying at the same time the author, the text and the recipient discloses us a whole chain of communicative events, with a twofold function, serving both the dedicatee and the translator: sustaining the authority of the papacy, or the dynastic mythology of the emperor serves also as self-assertion for Anastasius. Anastasius' Greek erudition and the way he made use of it were exceptional – but by no means the result of a solitary mind with solitary preoccupations – on the contrary it was a project springing from contemporary preoccupations.⁵⁹⁸ Through his person, one can observe the link between society and culture, between power and literacy.

This is an approach not alien to the Carolingian mindset. According to Rosamond McKitterick, Frankish historiographers were “using the written word to organise, control and challenge the world,” being convinced that “books are not only symbols of power and authority but also the practical means of exercising power and authority.”⁵⁹⁹

It is for this reason that I chose to research one major translation project from a historical vantage point. I tried to focus on both the process of transmission and

⁵⁹⁸ “... the process resulting in the acceptance or rejection, canonisation or non-canonisation of literary works is dominated not by vague, but by very concrete factors that are relatively easy to discern as soon as one decides to look for them, that is as soon as one eschews interpretation as the core of literary studies and begins to address issues such as power, ideology, institution and manipulation.” A. Lefevre, *Translation, Rewriting and the Manipulation of Literary Fame* (London and NY: Routledge, 1992), 2.

⁵⁹⁹ McKitterick, *History and memory*, 242.

the artifacts produced, but given that the transmission of ideas is a human, rather than a textual process,⁶⁰⁰ Anastasius himself always remained at the center of my investigations. I tried, however, to integrate philological and historical research as much as possible. I was first trying to find out what is a Greek text doing in a non-Greek context? Why and how does it get transferred, and how does it behave in the new linguistic and cultural context. Or, to keep the translator- rather than translation-centered approach: why and how does a translator design a translation-project, and how does he integrate the text in its new environment?

I have started my investigations with the presentation of this new environment. Before passing to the texts, I have presented the milieu that hosted them: contemporary Western attitudes towards Greek language, Greek people and Greek culture were examined. This analysis has shown that translation of Greek texts was conditioned by the current ecclesiastical and political setting in a decisive manner. More importantly, Roman rivalry with Byzantium did not result in a refusal of Byzantine texts, but quite the opposite, it forced the papacy to create its own canon of Greek texts. Anastasius Bibliothecarius' translations have to be understood in this context.

Then I went on to analyse this corpus of translations. First I have provided an exhaustive catalogue of all his works, and then I tried to draw the overall profile of this project by analysing the preferred genres and authors, matters of composition and layout, and methods and theories of translation applied. This is followed by a case study in which all these focal points are observed as if under a magnifying glass. The notes of Anastasius to Eriugena's translation of the *Corpus Dionysiacum* illustrate how the papal librarian assists the Frankish emperor Charles the Bald in building the cult of his dynasty's protector saint;

⁶⁰⁰ A. Grafton, "Notes from Underground on Cultural Transmission," 7.

moreover, the text is a unique document where one can observe at the same time two early medieval translators at work. Moreover, an unexpected thread unfolded when I was reading the notes of Anastasius to the *Corpus Dionysiacum*: as I argue in this chapter, it seems that we can include three short fragments from Eusebius' church history to the list of anastasian translations.

The next part of the dissertation presented Anastasius' project in its social context. Through the reading of the dedicatory letters, one can draw the social network of an early medieval intellectual and the cultural milieu of a small clerical elite. This section is also followed by a case study, the dedication of Saint Demetrius' passion to Charles the Bald. Placing the hagiographic text in the contemporary military context redimensions the dedication, uncovering a possible political message in it. Next to the Eusebian fragments, I have also appended to the dissertation a diplomatic edition of the text Saint Demetrius' passion.

The pages of this dissertation are by no means the closing remarks on Anastasius' career. Of primary importance would be a research on Anastasius' afterlife in the Middle Ages, Renaissance and perhaps even further, studying not only the transmission of his texts, the survival of manuscripts, but the use people made of his translations and indexing all references to his achievements. I expect that the apparition of the critical texts of the two ecumenical councils will be a new landmark in the research of Greek and Latin interactions. The translation of the *scholia* to the *Corpus Dionysiacum* would also need further attention. And last but not least, perhaps the list of his translations is not yet complete and further texts could be discovered.

EPITAPH

“The course of history was [...] like the passage of clouds, like the way of a man sauntering through the streets – diverted here by a shadow, there by a little crowd of people... – finally arriving at a place he had neither known of nor meant to reach.”

(Robert Musil, *The Man without Qualities*)

What if Anastasius in 855 had successful in his attempt to gain the papal throne? Would have he been ruling throughout the whole second part of the ninth century? Would he crown Charles the Bald as emperor? These are all not inappropriate questions for an imaginative reflection on the diverse path Western Christianity might have taken through the centuries. However, for the present research, more relevant would be to raid into virtuality from a different angle: that is, would he translate at all, once becoming pope? Would the pontifical office keep him away from all sort of literary activities? While one is justified to think that perhaps humanity could do without an additional survived letter of Nilus of Ancyra, there are several achievements of Anastasius the lack of which would have directed branches of Christian culture onto different paths. While individually perhaps none of his hagiographic translations had a sizeable impact, the whole corpus in general was like a blood transfusion that pushed out early medieval Italian hagiography from its static state. Then, centuries of conciliar disputes and canon law development would perhaps be considerably poorer had he not translated the major conciliar materials, e.g. the eighth ecumenical council (without this, we would today have no documentation of this synod whatsoever). Last, but not least, Western mystical traditions owe him a great deal: had he not translated commentaries to the *corpus dionysiicum*, the Areopagite perhaps could not have had so glorious a career. Anastasius wanted to become a pope, not a translator: he wanted to make history, not texts. But his eventual path of life shows exactly how much these two things are interwoven.

APPENDICES

THE PASSION OF SAINT DEMETRIUS

Ms. Alençon 10 (12th century)

[103v]INCIPIIT PRAEFATIO ANASTASII PRESBYTERI IN PASSIONEM
SANCTI DEMETRII AD KAROLUM IMPERATOREM

Domino piissimo et tranquillissimo imperatori Karolo divinitus semper
protegendero augusto Anastasius exiguus.

Beati Demetrii martiris Thessalonicensis passionem atque miracula hortantibus
fratribus descripsi et maxime viro peritissimo Iohanni diacono, sapientie vestre
fidei puritate ac scientie claritate notissimo. Qui huius nobilis martiris in domo
quidem sua mire antiquitatis et pulcritudinis oratorium habebat, sed iste
adletha (*sic*) christi quis (*add.*) fuerit, penitus ignorabat. Quia vero imperium
vestrum tanti fraudare agoniste noticia renui, vobis quoque id ipsum opportune
mittere procuravi, quatinus vestra magnitudo cum ceterorum super arenam
multiplicatorum intercessionibus amicorum dei et istius quoque preces apud
deum obtinere satagat, ut perfrui mereatur eorum suffragia. Notus ergo iam a
vobis petatur, exorabilis enim est et validus ad prestandum, sicut ipse apud
Thessalonicam positus expertus sum, ubi preciosum corpus ipsius conditum
redolet et miraculorum splendore refulget. Notandum vero, quod latino
passionis eius stilo reniteat. Miracula autem ipsius sanctus Iohannes eiusdem
urbis antistes descripsit, cuius alia nichilominus extant necessaria opuscula,
excepto dumtaxat ultimo miraculorum illius capitulo, quod videlicet non alium
scripsisse conicio, nisi episcopum, cui beneficium, quod in eo legitur, est

collatum. Rex regum dominus gloriam vestram dextera sua protegat et quandoque a temporali ad eternum [104r] commutet imperium.

Data octavo kalendas aprilis indictione nona, anno pontificatus octavo Iohannis summi pontificis quarto vero anno imperii christianissimi imperatoris Karoli primi.⁶⁰¹

EXPLICIT PREFATIO, INCIPIT PASSIO SANCTI DEMETRII

Ia. Cum Maximianus imperator Thessalonicensium degeret civitate, homo supersticiosus et impugnator fidei et in profundum erroris dilapsus, pie ab eo religionis adiutores patiebantur passiones interficiebanturque vere fidei curatores. Inter quos erat et beatus Demetrius, manifestum faciens semetipsum nullum timorem vel discrimen reveritus. Vitam quidem mundam et immaculatam a iuventute demonstrans et salutare Christi verbum habens hec in semetipso distribuebat colloquentibus sibi. Docebat eos cum alacritate suadens ac disputans, secundum apostolicum preceptum beati apostoli Pauli ad Thimotheum scribentis *insta oportune importune* (2 Thim 4:2).

⁶⁰¹ Shorter version from **Br2** (MGH edition), confronted with **P3**: Domino piissimo et tranquillissimo (**P3** *tranquillissimo* deest) imperatori Karolo semper augusto Anastasius exiguus coronam et regnum cum Christo. Beati Demetrii Thessalonicensis martyris passionem atque miracula hortantibus fratribus et maxime viro peritissimo Iohanne diacono verae (**P3** *vestre*) fidei puritate ac scientiae claritate notissimo nuper de Greco in Latinum transtuli sermonem. Qui praefatus Iohannes huius martyris in domo quidem sua mirae antiquitatis et pulchritudinis oratorium habebat; tamen, quis iste martyr Christi esset, ignorabat. Ego vero, sicut expertus (**P3** *expertum*) sum apud Thessalonicam, ubi preciosum corpus eius conditum redolet et splendore miraculorum refulget, innotui ei per ordinem. Sed quia imperium vestrum tanti agonistae fraudari notitia novi, vobis quoque id ipsum opportune mittere procuravi, quatinus vestra magnitudo cum intercessionibus sanctorum et amicorum Dei istius quoque prece apud Deum (**P3** *dominum*) obtinere gratiam valeat et perfrui mereatur gloria sempiterna. Rex regum et dominus domnantium regnum vestrum dextera sua protegat et de temporali ad aeternum transferat regnum.

IIa. Hic enim deo amantissimus vir Demetrius omnem lucrari volens animam vivificos faciebat sermones, ostendens et interpretans, quia hominem perditum et suis iniquitatibus mortuum sapientissima dei verbi secundum carnem dispensatio ab errore quidem redimendo separavit. Ab omni vero ignorantia cunctisque tenebris seculum emundavit, lucem perduxit, et diem libertatis in animabus suscipientium ostendit. Operari enim iustitiam, clementiam, pacem, dilectionem, spem vite et abundantiam docuit: nam temporalia quidem percipientem eternorum vero et incorruptibilium pignus tenentem ex mortuis resurrectionem et ad paradisum reditum conciliantem ostendit.

IIIa. Ita et cum multa propter hec ab eo prolata fama de illo magnificata fuisset, quidam publici mortis ministri, qui talium facere requisitionem fuerant iussi, comprehendentes beatum dei impugnatori Maximiano quasi quandam obtulerunt venationem arbitantes se maxime imperatori commendandos, si nullum christianum latere permisissent. Et quidem contigit eum ad stadium civitatis ascendere, propter visionem eorum, qui ad singulare certamen erant congressuri. Illic enim parabatur per quasdam tabulatas circulus circumseptus, ubi suspecturus [104v] erat eos, qui se invicem teatrice impugnarent, quia delectatio erat ei humani sanguinis effusionem aspicere. Verumptamen non sine sollicitudine habebat et hoc esse sibi delectabile cernebatur. Flagrabat autem circa desiderio cuiusdam Liei nomine monomachi, qui iam multos virtute ac mole corporis abusus extinxerat occidendi experimentum per meditationem et consuetudinem possidens, hunc eo quod omnes formidarent, et nullus, qui ei resisteret videretur. Inter primos Maximianus habebat et diligebat et libenter in eum respiciebat. Laudabat autem et mirabatur et quasi super magna re in superbia viri gloriabatur. Porro cum prope stadium pervenisset obtulerunt ei, qui ceperant beatum Demetrium. Audiens autem imperator, quod Christianus esset, furore magno accensus est, et, quia se ad

presentiam spectaculi contulerat, beatum martirem iussit ibidem iuxta stadium vicino existente publico balneo penes caminorum cameras custodiri. Ipse vero residens Lio introducto invitabat, qui singulare cum eo vellet inire certamen dona proponens et repromittens.

Et quidam adolescens de plebe nomine Nestor a superioribus exiliens gradibus stabat adversus Lieum, singularem conflictum cum eo arripere gestiens, ita ut obstupescens Maximianus vocaret ad se eum, qui ad hoc exilierat, illique consilium daret dicens: “Novi quod te peccuniarum egestas ad tantam phantasia fecerit elevari, ut aut superans repentinas adquiras divitias, aut voto fraudatus cum vita molestante careas egestate. Ego enim tibi ob miseracionem quam adornaris etatis, dabo etiam pro solo ausu condigna et sufficientia dona et vade, habens cum vita etiam dona. Lyeo vero temet ipsum ne obicias, quoniam multos potentiores te debilitavit.” His Nestor auditis neque rapuit imperatoris libertatem, neque formidavit ad laudem Lyei. Imperatori autem respondit: “Nec pro pecuniis, ut asseruisti, veni, nec propter hoc ad agonem accessi, sed ut meliorem memet ipsum Lyeo isto constituam. Neque enim vivere vel ditare me vis qui prosternere precedentem Lyei gloriam veni.” Mox ergo tam imperator quam ii, qui circa illum erant, Lyeo faventes ira repleti sunt audaciam Nestoris non ferentes. Et imperator quidem exortatus clamabat et fidum reddebat Lyeum. At ille dignum imperatorio [105r] iudicio se festinabat ostendere. Cumque facta fuisset congressio mortalem Lyeus accepit ictum et protinus interemptus est, et extremam fecit imperatori confusionem. Unde nec ullis pactis et repromissis percuniis Nestorem recompensans, mox a solio illo resiliit et tristis ad aulas suas remeavit.

IIIa. Cum autem quidam ei de beato Demetrio suggessissent, statim iratus ut moris est iis, qui deum impugnant, auguriatus et quasi, qui non bono

consiliario usus fuerit, eo cum a stadio venisset lanceis eum in ipsis locis, in quibus retrusus erat, iussit consumi. Sicque beatus Demetrius bone confessionis martirium consummavit.

Sanctissimum vero corpus eius ab interfecto-ribus parvipensum, quidam viri ex fratribus, qui religiosiores erant, noctu latenter summentes in ipsis, in quos proi-ectum fuerat, pulveribus asportata terra quantum potuerunt abscondere curaverunt, ne lesionem ab aliquo de trucibus et cruentis animantibus sustineret. Nulli autem fuit cura post hec transferendi corpusculum beati martiris, sed manebat sub signo. Post modicum vero temporis non modica in eodem loco facta sunt virtutum ac sanita-tum gratiarumque insignia iis, qui cum fide invocabant illum cum facta fuisset operatio miraculorum martiris divulgata. Preterea Leontius quidam, vir deo amabilis, adornans prefecture thronum Illiricorum domum que sanctissimum continebat corpus, que humillima et undique ruderibus obruta et angustata publici porticibus balnei ac stadii fuerat. Hinc inde mundavit et expurgavit prediisque amplioribusque ditans, erexit oratorium Thessalonicensium civitati propii civis et martiris, clarioribus structuris templum adornans ad honorem scilicet ipsius gloriosissimi certatoris Demetrii, auxiliante domino nostro Ihesu Christo cum quo est deo patri cum spiritu sancto gloria, honor et imperium in secula seculorum. Amen.

EXPLICIT PASSIO SANCTI DEMETRII MARTYRIS

THE EUSEBIAN FRAGMENTS

F = Laurenziana Plut. 89 sup. 15

Fol. 102r

EXPLETAE SUNT DECEM EPISTOLAE DIONISII ARIOPAGITAE ARCHIEPISCOPI FACTI
ATHENARUM

POLICRATI SUCCESSORIS ARCHIEPISCOPI EPHESI EX EPISTOLA AD VICTOREM
SUCCESSOREM ARCHIEPISCOPUM MEGALAE⁶⁰²

Etenim per Asiam magna elimenta dormiunt, quae resurgent novissima die adventus Domini, in qua inveniet cum gloria ex celo et revivificabit omnes sanctos, Philippum qui est duodecimus apostolorum, qui dormit in Ierapoli et due filie eius honorabiles virgines et altera eius filia in sancto spiritu conversata in Epheso quiescit. Adhuc autem Iohannes ipse super pectus Domini recumbens, qui factus est sacerdos petalum ferens et martyr et magister ipse in Epheso dormit.

CLEMENTIS PRESBITERI ALEXANDRIAE DUCIS SCHOLAE EX SUPERScripto SUO SERMONE
QUIS SALVATUS DIVES.

Ut autem confidas sic paenitens vere, quia tibi manet salutis spes digne utiliter, audi non fabulam sed verum verbum de Iohanne apostolo traditum et memoria custoditum. Quando enim tyrrano defuncto a Pathmo insula reversus est, Ephesum venit hortatus et in proximas regiones gentium, alibi quidem episcopos constituens, alibi autem totas ecclesias adunans, alibi clerum et unumquenque sortitum existentibus ab eius spiritu signi. Veniens ergo quandam non longe civitatum, cuius et nomen dicunt quidam

⁶⁰² Grecus 'magne Rome' habet ut in emendationibus invenimus exemplaribus.

Taalla, requiescere faciens fratres in omnibus eo stante prospexit episcopum iuvenem idoneum corpore et vultum honestum et calidam animam videns. "Hunc," inquit "tecum depono cum omni sollicitudine in ecclesia et Christo teste." Eo vero recipiente et omnia promittente et iterum eadem disputavit et testatus est. [fol. 102r] Deinde ipse quidem repetiit Ephesum. Presbiter autem recipiens domum traditum iuvenem nutrit, frequentando fovit, extremo illuminavit et post hoc substituit plus diligentiae et custodie sic perfectum ei phylacterium imposuit signaculum Domini. Eo autem laudem ante horam accipiente, corrumpunt quidam adulti veloces et multum seductores usitatores malorum. Et primum quidem per comestiones multa sustinentium adducunt eum; deinde ibi et noctu ad vestimentorum furtum exeuntes consequebatur; deinde quid et maius cooperari dignum iudicabant. Ipse autem per parvum assuescit, et per magnum natura recessum, altus ore et preceps cursu equus a recta via et frenum mordens maximus per barathram ferebatur. Obliviscens autem perfecte in Deo salutis nihil iam vel parvum intellexit, sed magnum quid per agens quam quidem semel perit aequa aliis pati dignum iudicans. Ipsos autem eosdem recipiens et latrocinium conplaudens paratus latronum princeps erat, violentissimus, ferocissimus tempus in medio. Et quadam incumbente utilitate revocant Iohannes. Ipse vero in Taallorum gratiam venit stetit. "Age autem," inquit, "o episcope depositum redde nobis, quod ego et Christus tibi commendavimus in ecclesia cui presides testis." Ipse vero primum quidem serviles res aestimans, quas non accepit, calumniari et neque credere habebat pro his, quae non habebat, neque non credere Iohanni. Ut autem "Iuvenem" dixit "restituere et animam fratris" gemens deorsum presbiter et lacrimans. "Ille," ait, "mortuus est." "Quomodo et quando et qua mortem?" "Deo mortuus," dixit, "defunctus enim malus et perditus et nunc pro ecclesia montem preoccupavit cum simili exercitu." Scindens autem apostolus vestem et cum magno gemitu percutiens caput. "Bonum," inquit, "te custodem fratris animae relinquebam. Sed equus iam mihi assit et dux fiat mihi quisive." Agitavit sicut habebat se ipsum ab ecclesia. Veniens autem in regionem apre, custodia latronum capitur neque fugiens, [fol. 103r] neque

recusans, sed clamans "ad hoc veni ad principem vestrum ducite me" itaque sicut armatus expectavit. Ut autem advenientem cognovit Iohannem, in fugam erubescens est conversus. Ipse vero persecutus retentus accipiens suam aetatem clamans: "Quid me fugis fili, tuum patrem, nudum senem miserere, mei fili, noli timere, habes adhuc vite spem; ego Christo dabo rationem pro te; an autem tuam mortem volens sustineo, sicut Dominus se pro nobis, pro te animam reddam meam. Sta, crede, Christus me misit." Ipse autem audiens, primum quidem stetit deorsum aspiciens, deinde proiecit arma, deinde tremens flebat amare. Accidentem autem senem comprehendit excusans gemitibus, ut potuit et lacrimis baptizatus secundo tantum occultans dextram. Ipse autem appropinquans, iurans sic remissionem ei, quae a patre sunt, magnificavit deprecans genuflectens ipsam dextram ut a paenitentia purgatam osculans ad ecclesiam reduxit, et largis quidem orationibus expetens continuisque ieiuniis concertans. Variis autem ornamentis verborum consequens eius notitiam non prius recessit, ut aiunt, quam eum restitueret ecclesiae, dans magnum exemplum penitentibus, veram et magnam notitiam iterum generationis tropheum resurrectionis conspicue.

HUIUS HISTORIAE MEMINIT IOSEBIUS PAMPHILI ET IOHANNES EPISCOPOS CONSTANTINI CIVITATIS.

PHILONIS DE EX CIRCUNCISIONE CREDITIBUS IN AEGIPTO CHRISTIANI SIMUL ET MONACHIS EX SUPRASCRIPTO AB EO SERMONE DE VITA THEORICA AUT DE ORANTIBUS

Multiplex quidem orbis terrarum est genus. Oportebat enim optimum perfectum formare et grecum et barbarum; abundant autem in Egypto per singulos vocatis mansionibus et maxime circa Alexandriam. Ubique autem de gentes veluti in paternam monachorum habitationem arcentur ad regionem oportunissimam que quidem est super stagnum Mariae posita in geolopho humiliori nimis facilis propter firmitatem [fol. 103v] et aeris temperantiam.

EIUSDEM EX EODEM SERMONE

Unaqueque vero domus est habitatio sacra, quae vocatur semnium et monasterium, in quo solitarii pudice vitae mysteria, aliorum quaecumque ad corporis utilitates necessaria, sed leges et eloquia divina miranda ex prophetis et hymnis et alia quibus scientia et pietas coaugetur et perficitur.

EIUSDEM EX SERMONE

Quod autem exterius non usque vespertinum spatium simul omnis eis est operatio. Interpellantes enim sacras litteras philosophantur paternam philosophiam allegorizantes, quoniam symbola quae sunt aperte interpretationis nominant occulte naturae insuspicionibus declarate. Sunt autem et eius conscripta antiquis viris qui aeresis eorum primi duces facti multa monumenta in allegorizantibus specie reliquis, sicut quibusdam principalibus formis utentes imitantur prime aeresis modum.

EIUSDEM EX EODEM SERMONE

Itaque non contemplantur solummodo, sed et faciunt cantica et ymnos in deum per omnia metra et mela numeris insignioribus necessario gaudentes.

EIUSDEM EX EODEM SERMONE

Continentiam autem veluti quoddam fundamentum premittentes anime alias aedificant virtutes. Frumentum aut potum nemo eorum adducet ante solis occasum in quidem philosophari dignum lumine iudicant esse. Tenebris autem corporis necessaria, inde ei quidem diem eis autem noctis parvam quandam partem tribuere. Quidam autem et per tres dies recordantur esce quibus plus desiderium scientie collocatur. Quidam vero sic letantur et potiuntur a sapientia satiati ditissime et copiosissime dogmata donante sic et ad duplum tempus recipere et vix per sex dies gustare escam necessariam consueti.

EIUSDEM EX EODEM SERMONE

Sunt autem et mulieres monachicales quarum plures annose virgines impetrant castitatem, non neccessariam, sicut quaedam apud grecos templorum custodes, magis autem per voluntariam notitiam propter zelum et desiderium sapientie; quam nubere

festinantes circa corpus deliciis aut verbum desursum, aut ex parentibus sed immortalem concupiscentes, sol aparere ex se ipsa potens est deo amica anima.

EIUSDEM EX EODEM SERMONE

Narrationes autem sacrarum litterarum fiunt eis propter suspicationes in allegoriis. Omnis enim legislatio videtur talibus viris decorum esse animal et corpus quidem habere apertas ordinationes, animam autem recumbentem in dictionibus invisibilem intellectum. Quem inchoavere differentibus domus haec contemplandi tamquam per speculum nominum magna pulchra invisibilibus visibilia segregans.

Meminit horum et Iosebius Pamphili; quidam autem dicunt haec Philonem de sociis iudeis dicere, alii de nazareis iudeis, alii ex circuncisione fidelibus et credentibus in Christum et custodientibus legem Moisi, alii de perfectis christianis. Talis autem erant aeresis monachicam viventes vitam therapeyte merito nominati sunt. Non solum autem Iosebius Pamphili sed et Philo iudeus sed et beatus Dionisius Ariopagita, discipulus Sancti Pauli apostoli, sanctus Athenarum episcopus in eo qui est de ecclesiastica ierarchia monachos ait antique et therapeytas nominat.

Beati autem Dionisii Ariopagite meminit Lucas evangelista in actibus apostolorum et Dionisius episcopus Chorinthi, vir antiquus et beatus Policarpus in epistola ad ecclesiam Athenarum et Iosebius Pamphili in Ecclesiastica historia.

FINITUS EST CUM DEO LIBER DIONISII ARIPAGITAE

THE MAIN PROTAGONISTS

Aeneas of Paris (died on 27th December 870) – first active at the court of Charles the Bald, then from 853 until his death bishop of Paris.

Aio, bishop of Benevento - the leader of the Beneventan Longobards (884-890), the last champion of the autonomy of Benevento, a fervent anti-Byzantine.

Arsenius, bishop of Orte – uncle of Anastasius, one of the most influential Roman aristocrats of the first part of the ninth century. It was with his support that Anastasius tempted to take control of the papal throne in 855.

Basil I – co-emperor of Michael III from 866; Byzantine emperor from 867 to 886, founder of the Macedonian dynasty.

Benedict III – pope from 855 to 858, Anastasius' rival candidate for the papal throne.

Charles the Bald – (823-877), king of the Western Franks (840-877), Frankish emperor (875-877), recipient of four dedications from Anastasius.

Constantine the Philosopher (Cyril) – 826-869, missionary to the Slavs together with his brother Methodios; acquainted with Anastasius on the occasion of his trip to Rome in 867.

Formosus, bishop of Porto (815-896) – bishop of Porto from 864, later pope (891-896).

Gauderic, bishop of Velletri – not much is known of his life or origins; a significant cleric in Rome both on the political and on the cultural scene; author of the *Vita Clementis* (a continuation of the work of John the Deacon).

Hadrian II - pope for a short period (868-872) between Nicholas I and John VIII; he appointed Anastasius papal librarian.

Hincmar of Rheims – ca. 806-882, monk of Saint-Denis, archbishop of Rheims, influential adviser of Charles the Bald and a great expert on canon law.

John VIII – pope from 872 to 882. Anastasius remained as librarian and secretary under his rule too, but had considerably less influence.

John the Deacon – Roman aristocrat, a prominent court intellectual during the papacies of Hadrian II and John VIII; a friend of Anastasius; author of the *Cena Cypriani* and the *Vita Gregorii*.

John Scotus Eriugena (ca. 810-870) – active at the court of Charles the Bald from 847; the most prolific and original Carolingian thinker; also a translator from Greek.

Landulf, bishop of Capua – first bishop, then duke of Capua, an important ally of Pope John VIII against the Saracens.

Leo IV – pope from 847 to 855; Anastasius was excommunicated under his rule

Louis II – (825-875), Frankish emperor (855-875), Anastasius also served as his legate and secretary in matters concerning Byzantium.

Martin, bishop of Narni – abbot of the monastery of Martin of Tours and, from 874 onwards, bishop of Narni (Umbria).

Michael III – Byzantine emperor from 842 to 867.

Nicholas I, pope from 858 to 867; it is during his rule that Anastasius' ecclesiastical career started anew as abbot of Santa Maria in Trastevere.

Peter, bishop of Gabii – Bishop of Gabii (Castiglione, on via Praenestina) in the second part of the ninth century.

Photios – (ca. 810-893) arguably the most learned man in ninth century Byzantium; patriarch of Constantinople between 858 and 867 and again from 877 to 886; his position was much contested by the papacy.

Ratramnus of Corbie (ca. 800-870)– monk at Corbie circa 844 to 868, a Carolingian theologian, who actively participated in contemporary dogmatic debates.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

SOURCES

Anastasius' works

De episcoporum transmigracione

Pozzi, J. P. "Le manuscrit tomus XVIIIus de la Vallicelliana et le libelle *De episcoporum transmigracione et quod non temere judicentur regule quadraginta quattuor*." *Apollinaris* 31 (1958): 313-350.

Epistolae

Perels, E. and G Laehr, "Anastasio Bibliothecarii Epistolae sive Prefationes." *MGH Epistolae 7 Karolini Aevi* 5. Berlin: Weidmann, 1928.

Berschin, W. "Bonifatius Consiliarius. Ein römischer Übersetzer in der byzantinischen Epoche des Papsttums." In *Lateinische Kultur im VIII. Jahrhundert*, ed. Albert Lehner and Walter Berschin. St. Ottilien: EOS Verlag, 1990.

Chiesa, P. "Una traduzione inedita di Anastasio Bibliotecario? Le 'vitae' latine di sant' Anfilochio." *Studi medievali* 28 (1987): 879-903.

Vita Nicholai I (partim)

Duchesne, L. *Liber Pontificalis*. 2 vols. Paris: Beauchesne, 1886-1892.

Davis, R., ed. *The Lives of the Ninth-Century Popes (Liber Pontificalis)*. Liverpool: Liverpool University Press, 1995.

Epistolae Nicholai I, Hadriani II, Johannis VIII (dictator)

Dümmler, Ernst, Ernst Perels and others. "Iohannis VIII. Papae epistolae." *MGH Epistolae 7, Karolini Aevi* 5 Berlin: Weidmann, 1928.

Dümmler, Ernst, Ernst Perels and others. "Nicolai papae epistolae variae." *MGH, Epistolae 6, Karolini Aevi* 4. Berlin: Weidmann, 1902-1925.

ANASTASIUS' TRANSLATIONS

Vita Johanni Eleemosynarii

Gelzer, H. *Leontios von Neapolis. Leben des Heiligen Iohannes des Barmherzigen, Erzbischofs von Alexandrien*. Freiburg-Leipzig: Mohr-Siebeck, 1893.

J. Festugière and L. Rydèn. *Leontios de Neapolis. Vie de Syméon le Fou et Vie de Jean de Chypre*. Institut Française d'archéologie de Beyrouth. Bibliothèque Archéologique et Historique 95. Paris: Librairie orientaliste Paul Geuthner, 1974.

PG 93, 1617-1660

PL 73, coll. 337-384.

AASS. 23 January III, 111 sqq.

Vita Basilii

AASS 14 Iun. III, 416-436

PL 73, 293 sqq.

Vita Amphilochii

Chiesa, Paolo. "Una traduzione inedita di Anastasio Bibliotecario? Le 'vitae' latine di sant'Anfilochio." *Studi medievali* 28 (1987): 879-903.

Vita Johanni Calybitae

Chiesa, Paolo. "Le Vitae Romane di Giovanni Calibita." *Analecta Bollandiana* 121 (2003): 45-102.

Poncelet, A. "Vitae s. Iohannis calibytae interpretatio latina auctore Anastasio Bibliothecario." *Analecta Bollandiana* 15 (1896):257-267.

Lampsides, O. Άγιος Ιωάννης ο Καλυβίτης (Άνέκδοτα κείμενα έκ παρισίνων κώδικων), in Πλάτων 16 (1964): 259-303.

Acta concilii VIII

Leonardi, C. "Anastasio Bibliotecario e l'ottavo concilio ecumenico." *Studi medievali* 8 (1967): 59-192.

Mansi 16, 2-207.

PL 129, col. 9-196.

Acta concilii VII

Mansi 12, 959-1154.

PL 129, col. 195-512.

Chronographia tripartita

Adler, W. and Paul Tuffin. *The Chronography of George Synkellos: A Byzantine Chronicle of Universal History from the Creation*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002..

Boor, Charles de. *Theophanis Chronographia*. Leipzig: Teubner, 1885.

Boor, Charles de. *Nicephori Patriarchae Opuscula historica*. Leipzig: Teubner, 1880.

Mango, C., and Roger Scott. *The Chronicle of Theophanes Confessor. Byzantine and Near Eastern History AD 284-813*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1997.

Mosshammer, Alden A. *Georgii Syncelli Ecloga Chronographica*. Leipzig: Teubner, 1984.

Collectanea

Allen Pauline and Bronwen Neil, ed. *Scripta saeculi 7. vitam Maximi Confessoris illustrantia: una cum latina interpretatione Anastasii Bibliothecarii iuxta posita*. Corpus Christianorum 49. Turnhout: Brepols - Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1999.

Neil, Bronwen. *Seventh Century Popes and Martyrs. The Political Hagiography of Anastasius Bibliothecarius*. Turnhout: Brepols, 2006.

Maximus Confessor. Selected Writings. Tr. George C. Berthold. Mahwah, NJ: Paulist Press, 1985.

Acta Martini

Neil, Bronwen. *Seventh Century Popes and Martyrs. The Political Hagiography of Anastasius Bibliothecarius*. Turnhout: Brepols, 2006.

Narratio miraculorum SS. Cyri et Johannis

PG 87,3; 3677-3689.

Festugière, A., ed. *Saint Thècle, Saints Côme et Damien, Saints Cyr et Jean (Extraits), Saint Georges*. Paris: Éditions A. et J. Picard, 1971.

Sermo Amphilochii super Anna et Symeone

Datema, C., *Amphilochii Iconiensis opera. Orationes, pluraque alia quae supersunt, nonnulla etiam spuria*. CCSG 3. Turnhout: Brepols, 1978.

Orbán, A. P. *Sermones in dormitionem assumptionemque beatæ Mariae virginis in Latinum translati, ex codicem Augiensi LXXX (saec. IX)*. CCCM 154. Turnhout: Brepols, 2000.

Translatio Sancti Stephani

PL 41, 817 sqq.

Passio Petri Alexandrini

Devos, Paul. "Un passion grecque inédite de s. Pierre d'Alexandrie et sa traduction par Anastase le Bibliothécaire." *Analecta Bollandiana* 83 (1965): 157-187.

Passio Sanctorum martyrum in monte Ararat occisorum

AASS. 22 Iun., vol. 5, p. 157 sqq.,

PL 129, col. 743 sqq.

Scholia Johannis Scythopolitani et Maximi Confessoris

PG 4, 15-432, 527-576.

Maximus Confessor, Mystagogia

S. Pétridès. "Traité liturgiques de S. Maxime et de S. Germain traduits par Anastase le bibliothécaire." *Revue de l'Orient Chrétien* 10 (1905): 289-313, 350-364.

Soteropoulos, C. *He Mystagogia tou Agiou Maximou tou Omologetou*. Athens, 1978.

Cantarella, R., ed.. *S. Massimo Confessore. La mystagogia ed altri scritti*. Florence: Libreria Editrice Fiorentina, 1928.

Maximus Confessor. Selected Writings. Tr. George C. Berthold. Mahwah, NJ: Paulist Press, 1985.

Germanus Constantinopolitanus, Historia Mystica

Germanus of Constantinople. *On the Divine Liturgy*. Ed. Paul Meyendorff .
Crestwood, NY: St. Vladimir's Seminary Press, 1984.

Pétridès, S. "Traité liturgiques de Saint Maxime et de Saint Germain traduits
par Anastase le bibliothécaire." *Revue de l'Orient Chrétien* 10 (1905): 289-
313.

Passio et miracula Sancti Demetrii

Hippolyte Delehaye. *Les Légendes grecques des Saints Militaires*. Paris: Librairie
Alphonse Picard et Fils, 1909.

Lemerle, P. *Les plus anciens recueils des miracles de Saint Démétrius et la pénétration
des slaves dans les Balkans*. Paris: Éditions du Centre National de la
recherche scientifique, 1979.

AASS Oct. vol. 4, 87-89; , 1203-1324; 1326-1384.

PG 116, 1167-1171.

PL 129, 717-726.

Passio Dionysii

Westerbrink, J. C. *Passio S. Dionysii Areopagitae Rusticii et Eleutherii*. Alphen A.
D. Rijn: C. Haasbeek, 1937.

Sermo Theodori Studitae de s. Bartholomeo

Westerbergh, Ulla, ed. *Anastasius Bibliothecarius, Sermo Theodori Studitae de
Sancto Bartholomeo apostolo*. *Studia latina Stockholmiensia* 9. Stockholm:
Almqvist&Wiksell, 1963.

John Moschos' Pratum Spirituale (chapter 192, 151)

Vita Gregorii, II, 45, IV. 63: PL 75, col. 106B-D 213C-D.

Pratum Spirituale, ch. 192, 151: PG 87,3, col. 3072; 3016-3017.

OTHERS

Chevallier, Ph. *Dionysiaca. Recueil donnant l'ensemble des traductions latines des ouvrages attribués au Denys de l'Aréopage*. Bruges: De Brouwer, 1937-1951.

Crivellucci, A., ed. *Landolfi Sagaci Historia Romana*. Fonti per la storia d'Italia 49. Roma: Istituto Storico Italiano, 1912.

Duchesne, L. *Liber Pontificalis. Texte, introduction et commentaire*. Paris: Beauchesne, 1955-1957.

Dümmler, Ernst, ed. *MGH Epistolae 4 Karolini Aevi 2*. Berlin: Weidmann, 1895.

_____, Karl Hampe and others, ed. *MGH Epistolae 5 Karolini Aevi 3*. Berlin: Weidmann, 1898-1899.

_____, Ernst Perels and others, ed. *MGH Epistolae 6 Karolini Aevi 4*. Berlin: Weidmann, 1902-1925.

_____. *MGH Epistolae 7, Karolini Aevi 5*. Berlin: Weidmann, 1928.

Eriugena, Johannes Scotus. *Expositiones in ierarchiam coelestem*. Ed. J. Barbet. CCCM 31. Turnhout: Brepols, 1975.

Glorie, F., ed. *Dionysii Exigui Praefationes*. CCSL 85. Turnhout: Brepols, 1972.

Grat, F., J. Vieillard and S. Clemencet, ed. *Les Annales de Saint-Bertin*. Paris, 1964.

Heil, G. and A. M. Ritter. *Corpus Dionysiacum 2*. Patristische Texte und Studien 36. Berlin: Walter De Gruyter, 1991.

Jacob W. and R. Hanslik, ed. *Cassiodorus–Epiphanius. Historia Ecclesiastica Tripartita*. CSEL 71. Vienna, 1952.

Jeauneau, E., ed. *Maximi Confessoris Ambigua ad Johannem iuxta Johannis Eriugena latinam interpretationem*. CCSG 18. Turnhout: Brepols, (?).

- Laga, C. and C. Steel, ed. *Maximi Confessoris Questiones ad Thalassium* (Eriugena's translation included). Vol. 1. CCSG 7. Turnhout: Brepols, 1980.
- Nelson, Janet, ed. *The Annals of Saint-Bertin*. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1991.
- Orlandi, G., ed. *Iohannis Hymmonidis et Gauderici Veliterni Leoni Ostiensis Excerpta ex Clementinis recognitionibus a Tyrannio Rufino translatis*, Milano: Istituto Editoriale Cisalpino, 1968.
- Pseudo-Dionysius the Areopagite. *The Complete Works*. New York: Paulist Press, 1987
- Pseudo-Dionysius the Areopagite. *Thesaurus Pseudo-Dionysii Areopagitae. Textus Graecus cum Translationibus Latinis*. Leuven: CETEDOC, 1993.
- Riedinger, R. ed. *Acta conciliorum oecumenicorum, series secunda vol. I, Concilium Lateranense a 649 celebratum*. Berlin, 1984.
- Simonetti, M., ed. *Tyrannii Rufini Opera*. CCSL 20. Turnhout: Brepols, 1961.
- Suchla, B. R. *Corpus Dionysiacum 1*. Patristische Texte und Studien 33. Berlin: Walter De Gruyter, 1990.
- Photii Patriarchae Constantinopolitani epistolae et amphilochia*. Ed. B. Laourdas and L. G. Westerlink. Vol. 2. Leipzig: Teubner, 1984.

SECONDARY LITERATURE

Alexakis, A. "The Sources of Greek Patristic Quotations in the Hadrianum (JE 2483) of Pope Hadrian I." *Annuario Historiae Conciliorum* 26 (1994): 14-30.

_____. *Codex Parisinus Graecus 1115 and its Archetype*. Dumbarton Oaks Studies 34. Washington: Dumbarton Oaks, 1996.

Algazi, G., V. Groebner and B. Jussen. *Negotiating the Gift. Figurations of Exchange*. Goettingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2003.

Allard, G. H. *Jean Scot écrivain*. Paris: Vrin, 1986.

Althoff, Gerd. *Family, Friends and Followers. Political and Social Bonds in Medieval Europe*. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 2004.

Andersen, P. ed. *Pratiques de traduction au Moyen Âge / Medieval Translation Practices*. Copenhagen: Museum Tusulanum, 2004.

Andia, Ysabel de, ed. *Denys l'Aréopagite et sa postérité en Orient et en Occident*. Paris: Institut d'Études Augustiniennes, 1997.

Arnaldi, Girolamo. "Giovanni Immonide e la cultura a Roma al tempo di Giovanni VIII." *Bullettino dell'Istituto Storico Italiano per il Medio Evo e Archivio Muratoriano* 68 (1956): 33-89.

_____. "Impero d'Occidente e Impero d'Oriente in una lettera di Ludovico II." *La cultura* 1 (1963): 404-424.

_____. "Come nacque la attribuzione ad Anastasio del *Liber pontificalis*." *Bullettino dell'Istituto storico italiano per il Medio Evo e Archivio Muratoriano*, 75 (1963): 321-344.

_____. "Anastasio Bibliothecario." *Dizionario biografico degli Italiani* 3. Rome: Istituto della Enciclopedia Italiana, 1961.

_____. "Il Papato della seconda metà del secolo nell'opera di P. Lapôtre SJ." *La cultura* 16 (1978): 185-217.

- _____. "Anastasio Bibliotecario a Napoli nell' 871? Nota sulla tradizione della vita Athanasii Episcopi Neapolitani di Guarimpoto." *La Cultura* (1980): 3-33.
- _____. "Il Papato e l'ideologia del potere imperiale." In: *Nascita dell'Europa ed Europa Carolingia: Un'equazione da verificare*. Spoleto: CISAM, 1981.
- _____. "Anastasio Bibliotecario, Carlo il Calvo e la fortuna di Dionigi l'Areopagita nel secolo IX". In *Giovanni Scoto nel suo tempo. L'organizzazione del sapere in età carolingia*. Spoleto: CISAM, 1989.
- _____. *Natale 875. Politica, ecclesiologia, cultura del papato medievale*. Roma: Istituto Storico Italiano per il Medio Evo, 1990.
- _____, and G. Cavallo, ed. *Europa medievale e mondo bizantino: contatti effettivi e possibilità di studi comparati*. Rome: Istituto Storico Italiano per il Medio Evo, 1997.
- _____. "Giovanni Immonide e la cultura a Roma al tempo di Giovanni VIII: una retractatio." In *Europa medievale e mondo bizantino*, ed. G. Cavallo and G. Arnaldi. Rome: Istituto Storico Italiano per il Medio Evo, 1997.
- _____. "La Chiesa romana secondo Giovanni VIII: spogliature dalle lettere del suo registro." In *Storia, filosofia e letteratura. Studi in onore di G. Sasso*, ed. M. Herling and M. Reale, 131-154. Naples, 1999.
- _____. "Anastasio Bibliotecario, antipapa." *Enciclopedia dei Papi*. Rome: Istituto della Enciclopedia Italiana, 2000.
- _____. "Qualche novità sulla legenda della papessa Giovanni nella versione di Martino Polono." In *Ovidio Capitani: Quaranta anni per la Storia Medioevale*, ed. M. C. De Matteis. Bologna: Patron Editore, 2003.
- Arnold, Dorothee. *Johannes VIII. Papstliche Herrschaft in den karolingischen Teilreichen am Ende des 9. Jahrhunderts*. Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang, 2005.
- Assmann, J. and B. Gladigow. *Text und Kommentar*. Munich: Wilhelm Fink Verlag, 1995.

- Backus, Irena, ed. *The Reception of the Church Fathers in the West. From the Carolingians to the Maurists*. Leiden: Brill, 1997.
- Barbet, J. "La tradition du texte latin de la 'Hiérarchie céleste' dans les manuscrits des *Expositiones in Hierarchiam Caelestem*." In *The Mind of Eriugena*, ed. J. J. O'Meara and L. Bieler. Dublin: Irish University Press, 1973.
- Barr, James. "The Typology of Literalism in Ancient Biblical Translations." *Nachrichten der Akademie der Wissenschaften in Goettingen. I. Philologisch-Historische Klasse* 11 (1979): 279-325.
- Batiffol, Pierre. "Libraries byzantines à Rome." *Mélanges d'archéologie et d'histoire* 8 (1888): 297-308.
- Battelli, G. "Bibliotecario di Santa Romana Chiesa." In *Enciclopedia Cattolica* 2. Città del Vaticano: Ente per l'enciclopedia cattolica e per il libro cattolico, 1949.
- Berschin, W. "Elementi greci nella cultura letteraria medievale." *Aevum* 68 (1984): 131-143.
- _____. "Rom und Neapel am ende des IX. Jahrhunderts: die Übersetzungen aus dem Griechischen." In *Biographie und Epochenstil im Lateinischen Mittelalter*. Stuttgart: Anton Hierschemann, 1988.
- _____. *Greek Letters and the Latin Middle Ages. From Jerome to Nicolaus of Cusa*. Trans. Jerold C. Frakes. Washington, D.C.: The Catholic University of America Press: 1988.
- _____. "Bonifatius Consiliarius. Ein römischer Übersetzer in der byzantinischen Epoche des Papsttums." In Albert Lehner and Walter Berschin, ed. *Lateinische Kultur im VIII. Jahrhundert*. St. Ottilien: EOS Verlag, 1990.
- Bertini, F. "Giovanni Immonide e la cultura a Roma nel secolo IX". In *Roma nell'alto medioevo*. Settimane 48. Spoleto: CISAM, 2001.
- Bertolini, O. "Adriano II." *Dizionario Biografico degli Italiani* 1. Rome: Istituto della Enciclopedia Italiana (1960).

_____. "Benedetto III." *Dizionario Biografico degli Italiani* 8. Rome: Istituto della Enciclopedia Italiana, 1966.

_____. "Adriano II." *Enciclopedia dei Papi*, vol. 2. Rome: Istituto della Enciclopedia Italiana, 2000.

Beyers, Rita, and Jozef Brams, ed. *Tradition et traduction: les textes philosophiques et scientifiques grecs au Moyen Âge latin*. Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1999.

Bijsterveld, Arnould-Jan A. "The Medieval Gift as an Agent of Social Bonding and Political Power: A Comparative Approach." In *Medieval Transformations. Texts, Power, and Gifts in Context*, ed. Ester Cohen and Mayke B. de Jong. Leiden: Brill, 2001.

Bisanzio, Roma e l'Italia nell'alto Medioevo. Settimane 34. Spoleto: CISAM, 1988.

Bischoff, B. "Das griechische Element in der abendlandischen Bildung des Mittelalters." In *Mittelalterliche Studien*. Vol. 2, 246-275. Stuttgart: Anton Hiersemann, 1967.

_____. "The Study of Foreign Languages in the Middle Ages." In *Mittelalterliche Studien*, ed. B. Bischoff. Vol. 2, 227-245. Stuttgart: Anton Hiersemann, 1967.

_____. *Manuscripts and Libraries in the Age of Charlemagne*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994.

Blumenfeld-Kosinski, R., Louise von Flotow, and Daniel Russell. *The Politics of Translation in the Middle Ages and the Renaissance*. Ottawa: University of Ottawa Press, 2001.

Borgia, Nilo. "La exegesis di S. Germano e la versione latina di Anastasio Bibliotecario." *Roma e l'Oriente* 2 (1911): 144-156, 219-228, 286-296, 346-354.

Bornert, René. *Les commentaires byzantins de la divine liturgie du VIIe au XVe siècle*. Paris: Institut Français d'études byzantines, 1966.

Bougard, François. *Le royaume d'Italie de la fin du VIIIe siècle au début du XIe siècle: institutions, pouvoirs et société*. Paris: Université de Paris I, 1992.

- _____. "Niccolò I." *Enciclopedia dei Papi*, vol. 2. Rome: Istituto della Enciclopedia Italiana, 2000.
- le Bourdellès, R. "Connaissance du grec et methods de traduction dans le monde carolingien jusqu' à Scot Erigène." In *Jean Scot Erigène et l'histoire de la philosophie*, ed. R. Roques. Paris: CNRS, 1977.
- Brightman, Frank E. "The *Historia Mystagogica* and other Greek Commentaries on the Byzantine Liturgy." *Journal of Theological Studies* 9 (1908): 248-267, 387-397.
- Brock, Sebastian. "Aspects of translation technique in antiquity." *Greek Roman and Byzantine Studies* 20 (1979): 69-87; repr. in *Syriac Perspectives on Late Antiquity*. London: Variorum, 1984.
- _____. "From Antagonism to Assimilation: Syriac Attitudes to Greek Learning." In *East of Byzantium: Syria and Armenia in the Formative Period*, ed. Mathews, T., N. Garsoian, and R. Thompson, 17-34. Washington: Dumbarton Oaks, 1980.
- _____. "Towards a history of Syriac translation technique." In *III Symposium Syriacum = Orientalia Christiana Analecta* 221 (1983): 1-14; repr. in *Studies in Syriac Christianity*. London: Variorum, 1992.
- _____. "Changing fashions in Syriac translation technique: the background to Syriac translations under the Abbasids." *Journal of the Canadian Society for Syriac Studies* 4 (2004), 3-14.
- Brown, V. "The *Chronographia Tripertita* of Anastasius Bibliothecarius: New Fragments in Beneventan Script at Altamura and Matera." *Altamura*, 35 (1993): 131-140.
- Bullogh, D. A. "Roman Books and Carolingian Renovatio." In Derek Baker, ed. *Renaissance and Renewal in Christian History*. Studies in Church History 14. Oxford: Blackwell, 1977.
- Cameron, Averil. "New Themes and Styles in Greek Literature: Seventh-Eighth Centuries." In *The Byzantine and Early Islamic Near East. I. Problems in the Literary Source Material*, ed. Averil Cameron and Lawrence I. Conrad, 81-106. Princeton: The Darwin Press, 1992.

Cappuyns, M. "Le *De imagine* de Gregorie de Nysse traduit par Jean Scot Erigene." *Recherches de théologie ancienne et médiévale* 32 (1965): 205-262.

Cavallo, Guglielmo. "La circolazione dei testi greci nell'Europa dell'alto medioevo." In: *Rencontres de cultures dans la philosophie médiévale*, ed. J. Hamesse and M. Fattori, 47-64. Louvain-la-Neuve and Cassino: Publications de l'Institut d'Études Médiévales, 1990.

Chiesa, P. "Ad verbum o ad sensum? Modelli e coscienza metodologica della traduzione tra tarda antichità e alto medioevo." *Medioevo e Rinascimento* 1 (1987): 1-51.

_____. "Traduzioni e traduttori dal greco nel IX secolo: sviluppi di una tecnica." In *Giovanni Scoto nel suo tempo: l'organizzazione del sapere in età carolingia*. Spoleto: CISAM, 1989.

_____. "Il dossier agiografico dei santi Gurias, Samonas e Abibos." *Aevum* 65 (1991): 221-258.

_____. "Le biografie greche e latine di papa Martino I". In *Martino Papa I (649-653) e il suo tempo*, 211-241. Spoleto: CISAM, 1992.

_____. "Giovanni Diacono." In *Dizionario Biografico degli Italiani* 56, 4-7. Rome: Istituto della Enciclopedia Italiana, 2001.

_____. "Interpres and expositor: le traduzioni non autosufficienti di Anastasio Bibliothecario." *Euphrosyne* 29 (2001): 173-184.

_____. "Traduzioni e traduttori a Roma nell'alto medioevo." In *Roma fra Oriente e Occidente*, 455-488. Settimane 49. Spoleto: CISAM, 2002.

Chrysos, E. and J. Wood. *East and West: Modes of Communication*. Leiden: Brill, 1999.

Coens, M. "Utriusque linguae peritus. En marge d'un prologue de Thierry de Saint-Troud." *Analecta Bollandiana* 75 (1958): 118-150.

Conte, P. *Chiesa e primato nelle lettere dei papi del secolo VII*. Rome: Vita e pensiero, 1971.

- _____. *Il Sinodo Lateranense dell'ottobre 649*. Vatican: Libreria Editrice Vaticana, 1989.
- Contreni, John. J. *The Cathedral School of Laon from 850 to 930 – its Manuscripts and Masters*. Münchener Beiträge 29. Munich: Ardeo-Gesellschaft, 1978.
- _____. *Carolingian Learning, Masters and Manuscripts*. London: Variorum, 1992.
- Copeland, Rita. *Rhetoric, Hermeneutics and Translation in the Middle Ages*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991.
- _____. "Toward a Social Genealogy of Translation Theory: Classical Property Law and Lollard Property Reform." In *Translation Theory and Practice in the Middle Ages*, ed. by Janette Beer, 173-183. Kalamazoo: Medieval Institute Publications, 1997.
- Corradini, R., R. Meens, C. Pössel and P. Shaw, ed. *Texts and Identities in the Early Middle Ages*. Forschungen zur Geschichte des Mittelalters 12. Vienna: Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, 2006.
- Courcelle, P. *Les Lettres Greques en Occident. De Macrobe a Cassiodore*. Paris: E. de Boccard, 1948.
- Crimi, Carmelo. "Per un edizione del 'Discorso encomiastico' di Epifanio diacono di Catania. I. La versione latina di Anastasio Bibliotecario in due codici Vaticani." *Synaxis* 7 (1989): 373-383.
- Cristianità d'Occidente e Cristianità d'Oriente (secoli VI-XI)*. Settimane 51. Spoleto: CISAM, 2004.
- Crosby, Sumner McKnight. *The Royal Abbey of Saint-Denis*. New Haven, Yale University Press, 1987.
- Cupiccia, Matilde. "Anastasio Bibliotecario traduttore delle omelie di Reichenau (Aug LXXX)?" *Filologia Mediolatina* 10 (2003): 41-102.
- Cupiccia, M. *Chronographia tripertita ex Nicephoro, Georgio e Theophane*. In *La trasmissione dei testi latini del medioevo. Mediaeval Latin Texts and Their Transmission. TeTra. 2*, ed. P. Chiesa and L. Castaldi, 100-103. Florence: SISMEL, 2005.

- D'Alverny, M. T. "Les traductions à deux interprètes, d'arabe en langue vernaculaire et de langue vernaculaire en latin." In *Traduction et traducteurs au Moyen Âge*. ed. G. Contamine, 193-206. Paris: éditions du CNRS, 1989.
- Delehaye, Hippolyte. *Les Légendes grecques des Saints Militaires*. Paris: Librairie Alphonse Picard et Fils, 1909.
- _____. *Les origines du culte des martyrs*. Subsidia Hagiographica 20. Brussels: Société des Bollandistes, 1933.
- _____. *Les passions des martyrs et les genres littéraires*. Subsidia Hagiographica 13 B. Brussels: Société des Bollandistes, 1966.
- Déroche, V. *Études sur Léontius de Néapolis*. Studia Byzantina Upsalensia 3. Uppsala: Acta Universitatis Upsalensis, 1995.
- Devisse, J. *Hincmar, archevêque de Reims (845-882)*. Genève: Droz, 1976.
- Devos, Paul. "L'oeuvre de Guarimpotus hagiographe napolitain." *Analecta Bollandiana* 76 (1958): 151-187.
- _____. "Anastase le Bibliothécaire. Sa contribution à la correspondance pontificale. La date de sa mort." *Byzantion* 32 (1962): 97-115.
- _____ and P. Meywaert, "La date de la première rédaction de la 'Légende Italique'", in *Cyrillo-Methodiana. Zur Frühgeschichte des Christentums bei den Slaven: 863-196*, ed. M. Hellman, R. Olesch, B. Stasiewski, 57-71. Cologne: Böhlau, 1964.
- Devreesse, Robert. "Le texte grec de l'Hypomnesticum de Théodore Spoudée." *Analecta Bollandiana* 53 (1935): 49-80.
- Devreesse, Robert. "La lettre d'Anastase l'Apocrisiaire sur la mort de S. Maxime le Confesseur et de ses compagnons d'exil." *Analecta Bollandiana* 73 (1955): 5-16.
- Dierkens Alain and Jean-Marie Sansterre, ed. *Voyages et voyageurs à Byzance et en Occident du VIe au XIe siècle*. Liège: Bibliothèque de la Faculté de Philosophie et Lettres de l'Université de Liège, 1999.

Dionisotti, A. C. "On Bede, Grammars and Greek." *Revue Benedictine* 92 (1982): 111-141.

_____. "Greek Grammars and Dictionaries in Carolingian Europe", *The Sacred Nectar of the Greeks: The Study of Greek in the West in the Early Middle Ages*, ed. M.W. Herren & S.A. Brown, 1-56. London: King's College, 1988.

_____. "Translator's Latin." In *Aspects of the Language of Latin Prose*, ed. T. Reinhardt, M. Lapidge and J. N. Adams, 357-376. Proceedings of the British Academy 129. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005.

Dolbeau, François. "Le rôle des interprètes dans les traductions hagiographiques d'Italie du Sud." In *Traduction et Traducteurs au Moyen Âge*, ed. G. Contamine. Paris: Éditions du Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique, 1989.

_____. "Les hagiographes au travail: collection et traitement des documents écrits (IXe-XIIe siècles)." In *Manuscrits hagiographiques et travail des hagiographes*, ed. M. Heinzemann, 49-76. Beihefte des Francia 24. Sigmaringen: Thornbecke, 1992.

_____. *Sanctorum Societas. Récits latins de sainteté (IIIe-XIIe siècles)*. 2 vols. Subsidia Hagiographica 85-86. Brussels: Société des Bollandists, 2005.

Dondaine, H. *Les Corpus Dyonisien de l'Université de Paris au XIIIe siècle*. Rome: Edizioni di Storia e Letteratura, 1953.

Dubois, Jean-Daniel and Bernard Roussel, ed. *Entrer en matière. Les prologues*. Paris: Les Éditions du Cerf, 1998.

Dvornik, F. *Les légendes de Constantin et de Méthode vues de Byzance*. Prague: Imprimerie de l'état, 1933.

_____. *The Photian Schism. History and Legend*. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1948.

_____. "Constantinople and Rome". In *The Cambridge Medieval History. The Byzantine Empire*, ed. J. M. Hussey, 431-472. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1966.

- _____. *Byzantium and the Roman Primacy*. New York: Fordham University Press, 1966.
- Elm, K. ed. *Literarische Formen des Mittelalters. Florilegien, Kompilationen, Kollektionen*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz Verlag, 2000.
- Endress, Gerhard. "The Circle of al-Kindi." *The Ancient Tradition in Christian and Islamic Hellenism*, ed. G. Endress and Kruk Remke, 43-76. Leiden: Research School CNWS, 1997.
- Engreen, Fred, E. "Pope John the Eighth and the Arabs." *Speculum* 20 (1945): 318-330.
- Ertl, N. "Diktatoren frühmittelalterlichen Papstbriefe." *Archiv für Urkundenforschungen* 15 (1937-1938): 121-126.
- Faußner, Hans Constantin. "Anastasius Bibliothecarius und die Konstantinische und Pippinische Schenkung." In *Grundlagen des Rechts. Festschrift für Peter Landau zum 65. Geburtstag*, ed. Richard H. Helmholz, Paul Mikat, Jörg Müller und Michael Stolleis, 25-41. Rechts- und Staatswissenschaftliche Veröffentlichungen der Görres-Gesellschaft N. F. 91. Paderborn: Schöningh Verlag, 2000.
- Felici, Guglielmo. "Notaio." *Encyclopedia Cattolica* 8:1955-1959. Vatican City, 1952.
- Flori, Jean. *La première Croisade. L'Occident chrétien contre l'Islam*. Brussels: Éditions Complexe, 1992.
- Foz, Clara. *Le traducteur, l'Église et le Roi*. Ottawa: Ottawa University Press, 2000.
- Frend, W. H. C. *Martyrdom and Persecution in the Early Church. A Study of a Conflict from the Maccabees to Donatus*. Oxford: Blackwell, 1965.
- Fuhrmann Horst and Detlev Jasper. *Papal Letters in the Early Middle Ages*. Washington DC: Catholic University of America Press, 2001.
- Fuiano, M. "I rapporti tra Oriente e Occidente nell'attività culturale di Paolo Diacono della Chiesa Napoletana nel sec. IX". In *Atti del 3° congresso internazionale di Studi sull' Alto Medioevo*, 397-411. Spoleto: CISAM, 1959.

- Garrison, Mary. "Letters to a King and Biblical Exempla: the Examples of Cathulf and Clemens Peregrinus." *Early Medieval Europe* 7 (1998): 305-328.
- Gill, Joseph. "St. Theodore the Studite against the Papacy?" *Byzantinische Forschungen* 1 (1966): 115-123.
- Gillespie Henry, Patrick. "Emperor, Abbot, Patriarch, Pope: Determining Orthodoxy in the Aftermath of Iconoclasm." *Studia Patristica*. Leuven: Peeters, 1989.
- Goldhill, S. *Who Needs Greek? Contests in the Cultural History of Hellenism*. Cambridge: CUP, 2002.
- Goulet, M. and Heinzelmann, M. *La réécriture hagiographique*. Ostfildern: Jan Thorbecke Verlag, 2003.
- _____. *Écriture et réécriture hagiographiques. Essai sur les réécritures de Vies de saints dans l'Occident médiéval (VIIIe-XIIIe s.)*. Hagiologia 4. Turnhout: Brepols, 2005.
- Gribmont, J. "Saint Bede et ses dictionnaires grecs." *Revue Bénédictine* 89 (1972): 271-280.
- Gualdo Rosa, L. "Le lettere di dedica delle traduzioni dal greco nel '400. Appunti per un'analisi stilistica." *Vichiana* 2 (1973): 68-85.
- Gutas, Dimitri. *Greek Thought, Arabic Culture. The Graeco-Arabic Translation Movement in Baghdad and Early 'Abbāsid Society (2nd -4th /8th -10th centuries)*. London: Routledge, 1998.
- Hagiographie cultures et sociétés. IVe-XIIIe siècles*. Actes du Colloque organisé à Nanterre et à Paris (2-5 mai 1979). Paris: Institut d'Études Augustiniennes, 1981.
- Haldon, J. F. *Byzantium in the Seventh Century: the Transformation of a Culture*. Cambridge, 1990.
- Hamesse, Jacqueline, and M. Fattori, ed. *Rencontres de cultures dans la philosophie médiévale. Traductions et traducteurs de l'antiquité tardive au 14e siècle*. Louvain-la-Neuve: Institut d'études médiévales, 1990.

_____, ed. *Aux origines du lexique philosophique européen. L'influence de la Latinitas. Textes et Études du Moyen Âge 8.* Louvain-la-Neuve: Fédération Internationale des Instituts d'études médiévales, 1997.

_____, ed. *Les prologues médiévaux. Textes et études de Moyen Âge 15.* Turnhout: Brepols, 2000.

_____, and Carlos Steel, ed. *L'élaboration du vocabulaire philosophique au Moyen Âge.* Turnhout: Brepols, 2000.

Hammer, William. "The Concept of the New or Second Rome in the Middle Ages." *Speculum* 19 (1944): 50-62.

Harrington, M. "Anastasius the Librarian's Reading of the Greek Scholia on the Pseudo-Dionysian Corpus." *Studia Patristica* 36 (2001): 119-125.

_____. *A Thirteenth-Century Textbook of Mystical Theology at the University of Paris.* Leuven: Peeters, 2004.

Hen, Yitzhak. *The Royal Patronage of Liturgy in Frankish Gaul to the Death of Charles the Bald (877).* London: Boydell Press, 2001.

Henrichs, Albert. "Graecia Capta: Views of Greek Culture." *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology* 97 (1995): 243-261.

Herbers, Klaus. *Leo IV. und das Papstum in der mitte des 9. Jahrhunderts.* Stuttgart: Anton Hiersemann, 1996.

Herren, Michael W. *The Sacred Nectar of the Greeks. The Study of Greek in the West in the Early Middle Ages.* London: King's College, 1988.

Herrin, Judith. *The Formation of Christendom.* London: Fontana Press, 1989.

_____. "Constantinople, Rome and the Franks in the seventh and eight centuries." In *Byzantine Diplomacy*, ed. by Shepard, J. and Simon Franklin, 91-107. Aldershot: Variorum, 1992.

Hildebrandt, M. M. *The External School in Carolingian Society.* Leiden: Brill, 1992.

Holtz, Louis. "Les manuscrits latins à gloses et à commentaire de l'antiquité à l'époque carolingienne." In *Il libro e il testo*, ed. C. Questa, and R. Raffaelli, 140-167. Urbino: publisher, 1984.

_____. "Glosse e Commenti." In *Lo Spazio Letterario Del Medioevo. 1. Il Medioevo Latino*, ed. C. Leonardi and E. Menesto G. Cavallo, 3. La ricezione del testo, 59-105. Rome: Salerno Editrice, 1995.

I Deug-Su. "Agiografia e potere in età carolingia." In *Giovanni Scoto nel suo tempo. L'organizzazione del sapere in età carolingia*. Spoleto: CISAM, 1989.

Imbert, J. "L'église et la guerre." In *Les temps carolingiens (741-891). L'église: les institutions. Histoire de droit et des institutions de l'Église en Occident* 5, 2. Paris: Cujas, 1994.

Innes, Matthew. *Introduction to Early Medieval Western Europe 300-900. The Sword, the Plough and the Book*. London: Routledge, 2007.

Irigoin, Jean. "La culture grecque dans l'occident latin du VIIe au Xie siècle." In *La cultura antica nell'Occidente Latino dal VII all'XI secolo*, 425-456. Settimane 22. Spoleto: CISAM, 1975.

Jacobsen, Eric. "The Art and Craft of Translation. Some historical and literary aspects." In *Essays presented to Knud Schibbye*, ed. M. Chesnutt and others, 69-81. Copenhagen: Akademisk Forlag, 1979.

_____. "Literary Translation in Context with Other Types of Textual Transformation." In *Pratiques de Traduction au Moyen Âge / Medieval Translation Practices*, ed. P. Andersen, 6-21. Copenhagen: Museum Tusulanum, 2004.

Jacobsen, Peter Christian. "Il secolo nono." In *Letteratura latina medievale (secoli VI-XV)*, ed. Claudio Leonardi et alii, 75-158. Florence: SISMEL, Edizioni del Galluzzo, 2002.

Janson, Tore. *Prose Rythm in Medieval Latin from the 9th to the 13th Century*. Stockholm: Almqvist and Wiksell, 1975.

Jeaneau, E., *Jean Scot. Homélie sur le Prologue de Jean*. Paris, du Cerf, 1969.

_____. "Jean Scot l'Érigéne et le grec." *Archivum Latinitatis Medii Aevi* 41 (1979): 5-50.

_____. "Glosses et commentaires de textes philosophiques (IXe-XIIIe s.)." In *Les genres littéraires dans les sources théologiques et philosophiques médiévales. Définition, critique et exploitation*, 117-131. Louvain-la-Neuve: Institut d'Études Médiévales, 1982.

_____. *Études érigéniennes*. Paris: Institut d'Études Augustiniennes, 1987.

_____. "Jean Scot Érigéne: grandeur et misère du métier de traducteur." In G. Contamine, ed. *Traduction et Traducteurs au Moyen Âge*, 99-108. Paris: Éditions du Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique, 1989.

Kaczynski, B. *Greek in the Carolingian Age. The St. Gall Manuscripts*. Cambridge, Mass: The Medieval Academy of America, 1988.

Kennedy, Kevin. "The Permanence of an Idea: Three Ninth Century Frankish Ecclesiastics and the Authority of the Roman See." In *Aus Kirche und Reich. Studien zu Theologie, Politik und Recht im Mittelalter* ed. H. Mordek, 105-116. Sigmaringen: Jan Thorbecke Verlag, 1983.

Kéry Lotte. *Canonical Collections of the Early Middle Ages (ca. 400-1140). A Bibliographical Guide to the Manuscripts and Literature*. Washington DC: The Catholic University of America Press, 1999.

Kreutz, Barbara M. *Before the Normans. Southern Italy in the Ninth and Tenth Centuries*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1991.

Laehr, G. "Die Briefe und Prologe des Bibliothekars Anastasius." *Neues Archiv der Gesellschaft für Ältere Deutsche Geschichtskunde* 47 (1928): 457-463.

Laistner, M. L. W. *Thought and Letters in Western Europe A. D. 500-900*. Ithaca, New York: Cornell University Press, 1931.

Lamberz, Erich. "Die Überlieferung und Rezeption des VII. Ökumenischen Konzils (787) in Rom und im Lateinischen Westen." In *Roma fra Oriente e Occidente*, 1053-1099. Settimane 49. Spoleto: CISAM, 2002.

_____. "Stand und Perspektiven der Edition der Konzilsakten des Frühen Mittelalters (692-880) in den Acta Conciliorum Oecumenicorum."

Jahrbuch des italienisch deutschen historischen Instituts in Trient 29 (2003): 421-436.

_____. "Studien zur Überlieferung der Akten des VII. Ökumenischen Konzils: Der Brief Hadrians I. an Konstantin VI. und Irene (JE 2448)." *Deutsches Archiv für Erforschung des Mittelalters* 53 (1997): 1-43.

_____. "Von der Handschrift zum Druck: Die Akten des Nicaenum II in der Editio Romana von 1612." *Annuario Historiae Conciliorum* 30 (1998): 328-370.

_____. "Handschriften und Bibliotheken im Spiegel der Akten des VII. Ökumenischen Konzils (787)." In *I manoscritti greci tra riflessione e dibattito* ed. Giancarlo Prato, 47-63. Florence: Edizioni Gonnelli, 2000.

_____. "Falsata Graecorum more? Die griechische Version der Briefe Papst Hadrians I. in den Akten des VII. Ökumenischen Konzils." In *Novum Millennium. Studies on Byzantine History and Culture dedicated to Paul Speck*, ed. Claudia Sode and Sarolta Takács, 213-230. Aldershot: Ashgate, 2001.

_____. "Vermisst und Gefunden. Zwei Texte des Sophronios von Alexandria zur Bilderverehrung, die Akten des VII. Ökumenischen Konzils und eine Patriarchatsurkunde des 11. Jahrhunderts in einem griechischen Codex aus dem Besitz des Nikolaus von Kues (Harleianus 5665)." *Römische Historische Mitteilungen* 45 (2003): 159-180.

_____. *Die Bishofslisten des VII. Ökumenischen Konzils (Nicaenum II)*. Bayerische Akademie der Wissenschaften. Philosophisch-Historische Klasse 124. Munich: Verlag der Bayerischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, 2004.

Lamma, Paolo. *Oriente e Occidente nell'Alto Medioevo. Studi storici sulle due civiltà*. Padova: Editrice Antenore, 1968.

Lapidge, M. *Archbishop Theodore. Commemorative Studies on his Life and Influence*. Cambridge: CUP, 1995.

_____, G. C. Garfagnini and C. Leonardi, ed. *Compendium Auctorum Latinorum Medii Aevi, 1.2: Agobardus Lugdunensis archiep. - Anastasius Bibliothecarius*. Florence: SISMEL, 2000.

- Lapôte, Arthur, André Vauchez and Paul Droulers. *Études sur la papauté au IXe siècle*. Turin: Bottega d'Erasmus, 1978.
- Larchet, J. C. *Maxime le Confesseur, médiateur entre l'Orient et l'Occident*. Paris, 1998.
- Lefevere, A. and S. Bassnett, ed. *Translation, History and Culture*. London: Pinter Publishers, 1990.
- Lefevere, A. *Translation, Rewriting and the Manipulation of Literary Fame*. London: Routledge, 1992.
- Lemerle, Paul. *Le premier humanisme byzantin. Notes et remarques sur enseignement et culture à Byzance des origines au Xe siècle*. Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 1971.
- Leonardi, C. "Anastasio Bibliotecario e l'ottavo concilio ecumenico." *Studi medievali* 8 (1967): 59-192.
- _____. "L'agiografia romana nel secolo IX." In *Hagiographie, cultures et sociétés, IVe-XIIIe siècles*. Paris: Institut d'Études Augustiniennes, 1981.
- _____. "Anastasio Bibliotecario e le traduzioni dal Greco nella Roma altomedievale." *The Sacred Nectar of the Greeks*, ed. M. W. Herren, 277-297. London: King's College, 1988.
- _____. "Le lettere-prologo di Anastasio Bibliotecario." In P. Lardet, ed. *La tradition vive. Mélanges d'histoire des texts en l'honneur de Louis Holtz* ed. P. Lardet. *Bibliologia* 20, 387-390. Turhout: Brepols, 2003.
- Llewellyn, Peter. *Rome in the Dark Ages*. New York: Praeger Publishers, 1970.
- Loenertz, Raymond, "La légende parisienne de S. Denis l'Aréopagite: Sa genèse et son premier témoin." *Analecta Bollandiana* 69 (1951): 217-237.
- Lofts S. G. and P. W. Roseman, ed. *Éditer, traduire, interpréter: essais de méthodologie philosophique*. *Philosophes médiévaux* 36. Leuven: Éditions Peeters, 1997.
- Lohrmann, D. *Das Register Papst Johannes VIII*. Tübingen: M.Niemeyer, 1968.

- _____. "Eine Arbeitshandschrift des Anastasius Bibliothecarius und die Überlieferung der Akten des 8. Ökumenischen Konzils." *Quellen and Forschungen aus Italienischen Archiven und Bibliotheken* 50 (1971): 420-431.
- Lowden, John. "The luxury book as a diplomatic gift." In *Byzantine Diplomacy*, ed J. Shepard and Simon Franklin, 249-260. Aldershot: Variorum, 1992.
- Lubac, Henri de. *Medieval Exegesis: The Four Senses of Scripture*. Tr. Mark Sebanc. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1998.
- Luscombe, David. "Denis the Pseudo-Areopagite in the Middle Ages from Hilduin to Lorenzo Valla." *Fälschungen im Mittelalter*, vol. 1, 133-152. Hannover: Hahnsche Buchhandlung, 1988.
- Mainoldi, E. S. "Versio operum Dionysii Areopagitae (ante 860-864 ; revisione: 864-866)." In *Te.Tra. II. La trasmissione dei testi latini del Medioevo. Mediaeval latin texts and their transmission*, ed. P. Chiesa and L. Castaldi, 244-251. Florence: SISMEL, 2005.
- Mango, C. "La culture grecque et l'Occident au VIIIe siècle." In *Il problemi dell'occidente nel secolo VIII*. Settimane 20. Vol. 2, 683-721. Spoleto: CISAM, 1973.
- _____. "The Availability of Books in the Byzantine empire A.D. 750-850." In *Byzantine Books and Bookmen*. ed. C. Mango, 29-45. Washington: Dumbarton Oaks, 1975.
- Maniaci, M. "La serva padrona. Interazioni fra testo e glossa sulla pagina del manoscritto." In *Talking to the Text: Marginalia from Papyri to Print* ed. V. Fera, G. Ferrau, S. Rizzo, 3-35. Messina: Centro interdipartimentale di Studi Umanistici, 2002.
- Mansfeld, Jaap. *Prolegomena. Questions to be Settled before the Study of an Author, or a Text*. Leiden: Brill, 1994.
- Marazzi, F. "Gauderico." *Dizionario Biografico degli Italiani* 52, 680-683. Istituto della Enciclopedia Italiana, 1999.
- Marrou, H. I. "Autour de la bibliothèque du pape Agapit." *Mélanges d'archéologie et d'histoire* 48 (1931): 124-169.

Martini, Paola Supino and A. Petrucci. "Materiali ed ipotesi per una storia della cultura scritta nella Roma del IX secolo." *Scrittura e civiltà* 2 (1978): 45-101.

_____. *Roma e l'area grafica romanesca (secoli X-XII)*. Alexandria: Edizioni dell'Orso, 1987.

Mazza, M. *Sulla teoria della storiografia cristiana: Osservazioni sui proemi degli storici ecclesiastici*. In *La storiografia ecclesiastica nella tarda antichità*, ed., S. Calderone, 335-389. Messina: Centro di studi umanistici, 1980.

_____. *La Historia Tripartita di Flavio Magno Aurelio Cassiodoro Senatore: metodi e scopo*. In *Flavio Magno Aurelio Cassiodoro*, ed. S. Leanza, 210-244. Messina: Centro di studi umanistici, 1986.

McCormick, Michael. "Diplomacy and the Carolingian Encounter with Byzantium down to the Accession of Charles the Bald." In *Eriugena: East and West*, ed. McGinn, B. and W. Otten, 15-48. Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 1994.

McCormick, Michael. "The Liturgy of War in the Early Middle Ages: Crisis, Litanies and the Carolingian Monarchy." *Viator* 15 (1984): 1-23.

_____. *Origins of the European Economy. Communications and Commerce, A. D. 300-900*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001.

McGinn, B. and W. Otten, ed. *Eriugena: East and West*. Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 1994.

McKitterick, R. *The Frankish Church and the Carolingian Reform (789-895)*. London: Royal Historical Society, 1977.

_____. *The Carolingians and the Written Word*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989.

_____. "Royal Patronage of Culture in the Frankish Kingdom under the Carolingians: Motives and Consequences." In *Committenti e produzione artistico-letteraria nell' alto medioevo*. Settimane 39, 93-129. Spoleto: CISAM, 1992.

_____. *Carolingian Culture: Emulation and Innovation*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994.

_____. *The Frankish Kings and Culture in the Early Middle Ages*. Aldershot: Variorum, 1995.

_____, E. Powell and others. *The New Cambridge Medieval History*. Vol. 2. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995.

_____. *History and Memory in the Carolingian World*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004.

Momigliano, Arnaldo. "The Fault of the Greeks." In *Essays in Ancient and Modern Historiography*, 9-23. Middletown, Connecticut: Wesleyan University Press, 1977.

Momigliano, A. "Cassiodorus and Italian Culture of his Time." *Proceedings of the British Academy* 41 (1955): 207-245.

_____. *Alien Wisdom. The Limits of Hellenisation*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1975.

_____. *The Classical Foundations of Modern Historiography*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1990.

Morris, Colin. "Martyrs on the Field of Battle before and during the First Crusade." In *Martyrs and Martyrologies*, ed. Diana Wood, 93-104. *Studies in Church History* 30. Oxford: Blackwell, 1993.

Morrison Karl F. *The Two Kingdoms. Ecclesiology in Carolingian Political Thought*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1964.

_____. "The Church, Reform and Renaissance in the Early Middle Ages." In *Life and Thought in the Early Middle Ages*, ed. Robert S. Hoyt, 143-159. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1967.

Morse, Ruth. *Truth and Convention in the Middle Ages. Rhetoric, Representation, and Reality*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991.

Most, G.W. *Commentaires-Kommentar*. Goettingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1999.

Moulinier, J.-C. "Anastase le Bibliothecaire, hagiographe." In *Memoriam Sanctorum Venerantes. Miscellanea in onore di Monsignor Victor Saxer, 577-586*. Città del Vaticano: Pontificio Istituto di Archeologia Cristiana, 1992.

Nascita dell'Europa ed Europa Carolingia: un'equazione da verificare. Settimane 27. Spoleto: CISAM, 1981.

Neil, B. "The Lives of Pope Martin I and Maximus the Confessor: Some Reconsiderations of Dating and Provenance." *Byzantion* 68 (1998): 91-109.

_____. "Anastasius Bibliothecarius' Latin Translation of two Byzantine Liturgical Commentaries." *Ephemerides Liturgicae* 114 (2000): 329-346.

_____. "The Western Reaction to the Council of Nicaea II." *Journal of Theological Studies* 51 (2000): 533-552.

_____. "The Cult of Pope Clement in Ninth-Century Rome." *Ephemerides Liturgicae* 117 (2003) 103-113.

_____. *Seventh Century Popes and Martyrs. The Political Hagiography of Anastasius Bibliothecarius*. Turnhout: Brepols, 2006.

Nelson, Janet L. "The Church's Military Service in the Ninth Century: A Contemporary Comparative View?" In *The Church and War*, ed. W. J. Sheils, 15-30. *Studies in Church History* 20. Oxford: Blackwell, 1983.

_____. *Politics and Ritual in Early Medieval Europe*. London: Hambledon Press, 1986.

_____ and Margaret T. Gibson. *Charles the Bald: Court and Kingdom*. Aldershot: Variorum, 1990.

_____. "Charles le Chauve et les utilisations du savoir." In D. Iogna-Prat, C. Jeudy and G. Lobrinchon, ed. *L'école carolingienne d'Auxerre*. Paris: Beauchesne, 1991.

_____. *Charles the Bald*. London: Longmann, 1992.

Nichols, S. G. and S. Wenzel. *The Whole Book: Cultural Considerations on the Medieval Miscellany*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1996.

Noble F. X. Thomas. *The Republic of St. Peter. The Birth of the Papal State 680-825*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1984.

_____. "The Declining Knowledge of Greek in Eighth- and Ninth-Century Papal Rome." *Byzantinische Zeitschrift* 78 (1985): 56-62.

_____. "Literacy and the papal Government in Late Antiquity and the Early Middle Ages." In *The Uses of Literacy in Early Medieval Europe*, ed. R. McKitterick, 82-108. Cambridge: CUP, 1990.

_____. "The Intellectual Culture of the Early Medieval Papacy." In *Roma nell'alto Medioevo*. Vol.1. Settimane 48. Spoleto: CISAM, 2001.

_____. "Topography, Celebration, and Power: The Making of a Papal Rome in the Eight and Ninth Centuries." In *Topographies of Power in the Early Middle Ages*, ed. Mayke de Jong and Frans Theuws, 45-91. The Transformation of the Roman World 6. Leiden: Brill, 2001.

O'Meara, J. J. and L. Bieler, ed. *The Mind of Eriugena*. Dublin: Irish University Press, 1973.

Osborne, J. "Politics, Diplomacy and the Cult of Relics in the Northern Adriatic in the First Half of the Ninth Century." *Early Medieval Europe* 8 (1999): 369-386.

Otten, Willemien. "The Texture of Tradition: the Role of the Church Fathers in Carolingian Theology." In *The Reception of the Church Fathers in the West*, ed. Irena Backus, 3-50. Leiden: Brill, 1999.

Palma, M. "Antigrafo/apografo. La formazione del testo latino degli atti del concilio constantinopolitano dell'869-70." In *Il libro e il testo*, ed. C. Questa and R. Raffaelli. Urbino: Università degli Studi di Urbino, 1984.

Patlagean, E. "Les moines grecs d'Italie et l'apologie des thèses pontificales (VIIIe – IXe siècles)." *Studi medievali* 5 (1964): 579-602.

_____. "Le Stoudites, l'empereur et Rome: figure byzantine d'un monachisme réformateur." In *Bisanzio, Roma e l'Italia nell'Alto Medioevo*. 2 vols. Settimane 34. Spoleto: CISAM, 1988.

- Pecere, O. and E. Crisci. *Il codice miscellaneo. Tipologie e funzioni*. Segno e Testo, International Journal of Manuscripts and Text Transmission 2 (2004).
- Peeters, P. "Une vie grecque du pape S. Martin Ier." *Analecta Bollandiana* 51 (1933): 225-62.
- Perels, E., *Papst Nikolaus I. und Anastasius Bibliothecarius. Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte des Papsttums in neuen Jahrhundert*. Berlin: Weidmann, 1920.
- Petrucchi, A. "Arsenio." *Dizionario Biografico degli Italiani* 4, 339. Rome: Istituto della Enciclopedia Italiana, 1962.
- Poole, Reginald Lane. *Lectures on the History of Papal Chancery down to the Time of Innocent III*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1915.
- Punta, Francesco del. "The Genre of Commentaries in the Middle Ages and its Relation to the Nature and Originality of Medieval Thought." In *Was ist Philosophie im Mittelalter?* ed. J. A. Aersten and A. Speer, 138-151. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1998.
- Ragep, F. Jamil and Sally P. Ragep. *Tradition, Transmission, Transformation*. Leiden: Brill, 1996.
- Reynolds E. Roger. *Clerics in the Early Middle Ages*. Aldershot: Variorum, 1999.
- Riché, Pierre. *Éducation et culture dans l'Occident barbare VIe-VIIIe siècles*. Paris: Seuil, 1962.
- _____. "Les bibliothèques de trois aristocrates carolingiens." *Le Moyen Âge* 69 (1963): 87-104.
- _____. "Charles le Chauve et la culture de son temps." In *Jean Scot Erigène et l'histoire de la philosophie*, ed. R. Roques, 37-46. Paris : Editions du CNRS, 1977.
- _____. *Écoles et enseignements dans le Haut Moyen Âge*. Paris: Aubier-Montaigne, 1979.
- _____. "Les clerics carolingiens au service du pouvoir." In *Idéologie et propagande en France*, ed. Myriam Yardeni. Paris: 1987. Reprinted in P.

- Riché, ed. *Éducation et culture dans l'Occident médiéval*. Aldershot: Ashgate, 1993.
- _____, "La Bible et la vie politique dans le Haut Moyen Âge." In *Le Moyen Âge et la Bible*, ed. Riché P. and G. Lubrichon, 385-400. Paris: Picard, 2003.
- Riedinger, R. *Kleine Schriften zu den Konzilsakten des 7. Jahrhunderts. Instrumenta Patristica* 34. Turnhout: Brepols, 1998.
- Le riscritture agiografiche*. V Convegno Internazionale della SISMEL, 22-23 Marzo 2002. *Hagiographica* 10 (2003): 109-327.
- Roma fra Oriente e Occidente*. Settimane 49. Spoleto: CISAM, 2002.
- Roma nell'alto medioevo*. Settimane 48. Spoleto: CISAM, 2001.
- Roques René. *Libres sentiers vers l'érigénisme*. Rome: Edizioni dell'Ateneo, 1975.
- _____, ed. *Jean Scot Erigène et l'histoire de la philosophie*. Paris: CNRS, 1977.
- Roem, Paul. *Pseudo-Dionysius. A Commentary of the Texts and an Introduction to Their Influence*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1993.
- _____ and John C. Lamoreaux. *John of Scythopolis and the Dionysian corpus: annotating the Areopagite*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1998.
- _____. *Eriugena's Commentary on the Dionysian Celestial Hierarchy*. Studies and Texts 150. Toronto: Pontifical Institute of Medieval Studies, 2005.
- Rossi, Johannes Baptista de. *De origine historia indicibus scrinii et bibliothecae sedis apostolicae*. Roma: ex typographeo Vaticano, 1886.
- Rouse R. H. and Mary A. Rouse. "Ennodius in the Middle Ages: Adonics, Pseudo-Isidore, Cistercians, and the Schools." In *Popes, Teachers and canon Law in the Middle Ages*, ed. J. R. Sweeney and S. Chodorow, 91-113. Ithaca, NY : publisher, 1989.
- Sansterre, J. M. *Les moines grecs et orientaux à Rome aux époques byzantine et carolingienne (milieu du VIe s. – fin du IXe s.)*. Brussels: Académie Royale de Belgique, 1983.

- Santifaller, Leo. "Saggio di un elenco dei funzionari, impiegati e scrittori della Cancelleria Pontificia dall' inizio all' anno 1099." *Bulletino dell' Istituto storico italiano per il medio evo e archivio muratoriano* 56 (1940): 1-841.
- Schwartz, W. "The Meaning of *Fidus interpres* in Medieval Translation." *The Journal of Theological Studies* 45, No. 2 (1944): 73-38.
- Sennis, A. "Giovanni VIII." *Enciclopedia dei Papi*, vol. 1, 28-34. Rome: Istituto della Enciclopedia Italiana, 2000.
- Shepard, J. and S. Franklin, ed. *Byzantine Diplomacy AD. 800-1204*. London: Variorum Ashgate, 1992.
- Siegmund, A. *Die Überlieferung der Christlichen Literatur in der Lateinische Kirche zum XII. Jahrhundert*. Abhandlungen der Bayerische Benediktiner Akademie 5. Munich: Filser, 1949.
- Simonetti M. "Un falso Ippolito nella polemica monotelita." *Vetera Christianorum* 24 (1987): 113-146.
- Sinthern, P. "Der römische Abbcyrus in Geschichte, Legende und Kunst." *Römische Quartalschrift* 22 (1908): 196-239.
- Smith M. H. J. "Old Saints, New Cults: Roman Relics in Carolingian Francia." In *Early Medieval Rome and the Christian West*, ed. Julia M. H. Smith, 317-339. Leiden: Brill, 2000.
- Sommar, M. E. "Hincmar of Reims and the Canon Law of Episcopal Translation." *The Catholic Historical Review* 88 (2002): 429-445.
- Sommerville, R. "Pope Nicholas I and John Scottus Eriugena: JE 2833." *Zeitschrift der Savigny-Stiftung für Rechtsgeschichte. Kanonistische Abteilung* 83 (1997): 67-85.
- Speer, A. and Lydia Wegener, ed. *Wissen ueber Grenzen. Arabisches Wissen und lateinisches Mittelalter*. *Miscellanea Mediaevalia* 33. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2006.
- Suchla, Beate Regina. "Die Sogennanten Maximus-Scholien des *Corpus Dionysiacum Areopagiticum*." *Nachrichten der Akademie der Wissenschaften in Göttingen. I. Philologisch-Historische Klasse* 1980, p. 33-66.

_____. "Die Überlieferung des Prologs des Johannes von Skythopolis zum griechischen *Corpus Dionysiacum Areopagiticum*" *Nachrichten der Akademie der Wissenschaften in Göttingen, Phil.-Hist. Klasse*, Göttingen, 1984: 177-188.

_____. "Eine Redaktion des griechischen *Corpus Dionysiacum Areopagiticum* im Umkreis des Johannes von Skythopolis, des Verfasser von Prolog und Scholien. Ein dritter Beitrag zur Überlieferungsgeschichte des CD." *Nachrichten der Akademie der Wissenschaften in Göttingen, Phil.-Hist. Klasse*, Göttingen, 1985: 179-194.

_____. "Anastasius Bibliothecarius und der Dionysius Areopagita Latinus." *Archiv für mittelalterliche Philosophie und Kultur* 6 (2000): 23-31.

Sullivan, Richard, Eugene, ed. *The gentle voices of teachers: aspects of learning in the Carolingian age*. Columbus: Ohio State University Press, 1995.

Sumner, McKnight. *The Royal Abbey of Saint-Denis from Its Beginnings to the Death of Suger, 475-1151*. New Haven, Yale University Press, 1987.

Tabachovitz, D. "Sprachliches zur lateinischen Theophanesuebersetzung des Anastasius Bibliothecarius." *Byzantinische Zeitschrift* 38 (1938): 16-22.

Telfer, W. "St. Peter of Alexandria and Arius." *Analecta Bollandiana* 67 (1949): 117-130.

Théry. G. "Contribution à l'histoire de l'aréopagitisme au IXe siècle." *Le Moyen Âge* 25 (1923): 110-152.

_____. "Recherches pour une édition grecque historique du Pseudo-Denys." *The New Scholasticism* 4 (1929): 353-443.

_____. "Scot Erigene traducteur de Denys." *Archivum Latinitatis Medii Aevii* 6 (1931): 185-278.

Théry. G. *Études dionysiennes*. Paris: J. Vrin, 1932-1937.

Thomson, Francis J. "Sensus or Proprietas Verborum. Mediaeval Theories of Translation as Exemplified by Translations from Greek into Latin and

Slavonic." In *Symposium Methodianum*, ed. K. Trost, E. Völkl, E. Wedel, 675-691. Neuried: Hieronymus, 1988.

Ullmann, Walter. *The Carolingian Renaissance and the Idea of Kingship*. London, Methuen, 1969.

Ullmann, Walter. *The Growth of Papal Government in the Middle Ages: A Study in the Ideological Relation of Clerical to Lay Power*. London: Methuen, 1955.

Vaillant, André. "La préface de l'évangéliste vieux-slave." *Revue des études slaves* 24 (1948): 5-20.

Ven, P. van den. "La patristique et l'hagiographie au concile de Nicée de 787." *Byzantion*, 25-27 (1955-1957): 325-362.

Vernet, André. "Du 'chartophylax' au 'librarian.'" In *Vocabulaire du livre et de l'écriture au Moyen Âge*. Ed. by O. Weijers. Turnhout: Brepols, 1989.

Virchillo Franklin, Carmela. "Hagiographic translations in the Early Middle Ages (7th – 10th centuries)." In *Les traducteurs au travail. Leur manuscrits et leur méthodes*, ed. Jaqueline Hamesse, 1-18. Turnhout: Brepols, 2001.

_____. "Roman hagiography and Roman legendaries." In *Roma nell'alto medioevo*. Settimane 48. Spoleto: CISAM, 2001.

_____. *The Latin Dossier of Anastasius the Persian. Hagiographic Translations and Transformations*. Studies and Texts 147. Toronto: PIMS, 2004.

Wallace-Hadrill, J. M. "A Carolingian Renaissance Prince: the Emperor Charles the Bald." *Proceedings of the British Academy* 64 (1978): 155-184.

_____. *The Frankish Church*. Oxford: OUP, 1984.

Wallach, L. "The Libri Carolini and Patristics, Latin and Greek". In *The Classical Tradition. Literary and Historical Studies in honor of Harry Caplan*, ed. L. Wallach, 451-498. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1966.

_____. "The Greek and Latin version of II Nicea and the Synodica of Hadrian I." In Wallach, L. *Diplomatic Studies in Latin and Greek Documents from the Carolingian Age*, ed. L. Wallach, 3-26. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1977.

- Walter, Cristopher. *The Warrior Saints in Byzantine Art and Tradition*. London: Ashgate, 2003.
- Weiss, Roberto. *Medieval and Humanist Greek*. Padua: Editrice Antenore, 1977.
- Wickham, Chris. "Ninth-century Byzantium through western eyes". In *Byzantium in the Ninth Century: Dead or Alive?* ed. L. Brubaker, 245-256. Ashgate: Variorum, 1998.
- Wilson, Nigel. "The Libraries of the Byzantine World." *Greek, Roman, and Byzantine Studies* 8 (1967) 53-80.
- _____. "The Relation of Text and Commentary in Greek Books." In *Il libro e il testo*, ed. Cesare Questa, and Renato Raffaelli, 105-110. Urbino: Università degli studi di Urbino, 1984.
- Wood, Ian. "The Use and Abuse of Latin Hagiography in the Early Medieval West." In *East and West: Modes of Communication*, ed. Evangelos Chrysos and Ian Wood, 93-110. *The Transformation of the Roman World* 5. Leiden: Brill, 1999.
- Zetzel, J. *Marginal Scholarship and Textual Deviance. The Commentum Cornuti and the Early Scholia on Persius*. Bulletin of the Institute of Classical Studies. Supplement 84 (London, 2005).
- Zocca, Elena. "Onorio e Martino: due papi di fronte al monotelismo". In *Martino I Papa (649-653) e il suo tempo*. Spoleto, CISAM, 1992.