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... 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*
**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 ideological\(^1\) 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 medieval* (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

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

---


\(^5\)
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.  

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.  

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. 

---


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.”

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.”

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.”

Anastasius’ texts were there to populate the cultural landscape of the pontifical court, and there they signalled competences and jurisdictions.

---

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 *circumstantiæ* 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

---

notable advancements in this field.\textsuperscript{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.

\textsuperscript{14} See catalogue and bibliography.
**REVIEW OF LITERATURE**

In 1885 the doctoral thesis of the Jesuit scholar Arthur Lapôtre, 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, Lapôtre 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 Lapotre’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

---


\(^{16}\) “Hominem, non scriptorem considero.” Lapôtre, “De Anastasio”, 128.

extensive review of Anastasius correspondence, 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”. Similar research was conducted by Dietrich Lohrmann in 1968 focusing on the participation of Anastasius in the correspondence of Pope John VIII. 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. Devreesse and P. Peeters, but also W. Telfer and Raymond Loenertz.

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 tripertita* (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.\textsuperscript{22}

The Italian school is also represented by a new generation: Girolamo Arnaldi’s student Ilaria Bonaccorsi has specialised on the \textit{Collectanea}, while Paolo Chiesa’s student Matilde Cupiccia has dealt with the Amphilochian sermons and with the \textit{Corpus Dionysiacum}. Also, several minor critical editions have appeared in form of dissertations, the majority of them still unpublished.\textsuperscript{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 \textit{Collectanea}) and notable studies dealing with Anastasius’ translations.\textsuperscript{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.\textsuperscript{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

\textsuperscript{22} For a complete list of his works see the bibliography.


\textsuperscript{24} For a complete list of her works, see the bibliography.

\textsuperscript{25} For Erich Lamberz’s related publications see the bibliography.
carried out about the papal library, about the knowledge of Greek and about Roman literary production in general.

---


ANASTASIOS: LIFE AND PORTRAIT

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. The two of them constituted a true family of royal and papal diplomats (the fact that both have Greek names, does not weaken this thesis: it was a widespread practice of Roman aristocracy to use such names). In the only passage in which he referred to his childhood, he affirmed that he had been in Rome from already an early age.

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.


31 “Passionem sancti ieromartyris Dionysii [...] Romae legi, cum puer essem.” Anastasius, Epistolae, 440, 8-9.
members (mother, father, uncle)\textsuperscript{32}, at monasteries in Rome\textsuperscript{33} and at the Lateran school.\textsuperscript{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,\textsuperscript{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.\textsuperscript{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.\textsuperscript{37} Anastasius’ practice of epistolography employing the \textit{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

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{32} E. g. Paulus (LP I, 463), Hadrianus (LP I, 486), Sergius II (LP II, 86), Benedictus III (LP II, 140)
\item \textsuperscript{33} E. g. Stephanus III (LP I, 468), Leo IV (LP II, 106)
\item \textsuperscript{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).
\item \textsuperscript{35} For further discussion of his Greek education and knowledge see chapter \textit{Methods, Theories and Inconsistencies}.
\item \textsuperscript{36} Sansterre, \textit{Les moines grecques}, 69.
\item \textsuperscript{37} P. Riché, \textit{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”:

---

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.  

But then later in another of his letters, a slightly more flattering epithet appears: 

*ab Anastasio utriusque linguae perito et undecunque doctissimo, apostolicae sedis bibliothecario* 

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 instigations, or a dangerous man, governed by foolish presumptuousness always with ambitions above his position, retaining a mist of error around himself. 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. 

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*

---

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.\textsuperscript{45} Then, when he suspected Anastasius of taking part in the conspiracy against his family, he judged him with harsh words, condemning his overweaning ambitions,\textsuperscript{46} which caused him to fall back into a recurrent faithlessness,\textsuperscript{47} to sew discords\textsuperscript{48} and to plan secret machinations.\textsuperscript{49}

Further testimonies to the papal viewpoint can be found it 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 attempts\textsuperscript{50} – 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.\textsuperscript{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.\textsuperscript{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.\textsuperscript{53}

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

\textsuperscript{45} MGH Epistolae 6, Karolini Aevii 4, 711, 2-3.
\textsuperscript{46} Nelson, 149.
\textsuperscript{47} Nelson, 148.
\textsuperscript{48} Nelson, 149.
\textsuperscript{49} Nelson, 149.
\textsuperscript{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”.
\textsuperscript{51} Duchesne, 143, 27; English translation: Davis, LP, 175.
\textsuperscript{52} Duchesne, 181, 25 and 182, 8-9; English translation: Davis, LP, 282, 289.
\textsuperscript{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*. 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 arrip erem, quae ingenioli mei vires excedunt*. 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, and sometimes he can be found deplo ring his old age, poor health and the imminence of death. He is delighted in translating, on occasion even pretends to be “possessed” by the challenge: *arrepto interpretandi certamine*, 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

57 Anastasius, *Epistolae* 421, 9-10; 416, 23.
presenting the office of the Byzantine *chartophylax*, he was most probably describing in fact his own jurisdiction.\(^5^9\) 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.\(^6^0\) The other hint about great prestigousness of his position was the analogy he made with Jerome, calling him *caelestis bibliothecae cultor* or *divinae bibliothecae cultorem*.\(^6^1\) 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 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.\(^6^2\) 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.


\(^{61}\) Anastasius, *Epistolae* 442, 400.

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

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 pretentions: 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 conciliary 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 countinously 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”. 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.” 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, 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:

---

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 Constatine 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.\(^68\)


Medieval Rome was not at all as readily disposed to acknowledging Greek cultural supremacy as was Horace. 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

---

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.\textsuperscript{70}

This is a very inspired insight, an imagery which indeed occurred to the translators themselves as well: \textit{magn\'a sibi Graeciae spolia deferentem}, in Rufinus’ formulation.\textsuperscript{71}

Now this was exactly what Anastasius does as well. If his translation project is described in one sentence, despooiling 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 sources 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

\textsuperscript{70} T. F. X. Noble, “The Declining Knowledge of Greek in 8\textsuperscript{th} and 9\textsuperscript{th} c. Papal Rome,” \textit{Byzantinische Zeitschrift} 78 (1985): 56-62, at page 62.

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*.\(^2\) 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)\(^3\), 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.\(^4\) Besides the ecclesiastical, the political primacy of Byzantium

---


\(^4\) Sed quid mirum, si haec isti praetendunt, cum etiam glorientur atque perhibeant, quando de Roma urbe imperatos Constantinopolim sunt translati, tunc et primatum Romanae sedis ad Constantinopolitanam ecclesiam transmigrasse et cum dignitatibus regis etiam ecclesiae Romanae privilegia transdata 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
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.\textsuperscript{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 \textit{basileus}:

The Greeks for their ‘cacodoxia’, 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.\textsuperscript{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.\textsuperscript{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

\textsuperscript{75} For an analysis and an Italian translation see G. Arnaldi, “Impero d’Occidente e Impero

\textsuperscript{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. \textit{MGH, Epistolae} 7 Karolini Aevi 5, 390, 11-15. English translation in B. Neil,
\textit{Seventh Century Popes und Martyrs}, 64.

\textsuperscript{77} Iam vero, si ideo linguam Latinam barbarum dicitis, quoniam illam non intelligitis, vos
considerate, quia ridiculum est vos appellare Romanorum imperatores et tamen linguam non
\textit{Seventh Century Popes und Martyrs}, 17.
Sophronios’ text there is a miracle performed upon a Roman, the blind John,\textsuperscript{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: όυ πόλεως ύποφόρου Ρώμαιος όρμωμένος, ἀλλά Ρώμην αὐτὴν τὴν πρώτην αὐτῶν βασιλεύσασαν, πατρίδα καὶ πόλιν κτησάμενος\textsuperscript{79} 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.\textsuperscript{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

\begin{flushleft}
\textsuperscript{78} PG 87/3, 3659-3663.
\textsuperscript{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.
\end{flushleft}
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. Upon receiving the letter, Hincmar read it to the bishops present in the palace of the king at Corbeny. 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. 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 epistle. 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.
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 Scriptores 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 ad 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 Paris\textsuperscript{85} and the \textit{Contra Graecorum errores} by Ratramnus of Corbie.\textsuperscript{86} Apart from these treatises another document of the Frankish reaction are the synodal acts of the council of Worms from 868.\textsuperscript{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:

\begin{quote}
Haec deliramenta versuti arum Graecalis industria supercilioso ambitu per Romanum spargit imperium, et dominicis aciebus insistens, astu calliditatis scaturriens, contendit lace ssire quietos.\textsuperscript{88}
\end{quote}

But he was confident, that \textit{defensio Patrum, concordia canonum, auctoritas et victoria excellentissimorum antistitum}\textsuperscript{89} are on his side. In his case, an important biblical quote is I Cor. 1, 22, where Paul says \textit{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 \textit{matrem verborum et genitricem philosophorum, et omnium liberalium artium fautricem},\textsuperscript{90} and now believed herself to be able to judge everything rightly: \textit{putans se posse}

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

\textsuperscript{86} Text in PL 121, 225-346.


\textsuperscript{88} MGH Epistolae VI, Karolini Aevi 4, 175, 9-11; PL 121, 690A.

\textsuperscript{89} PL 121, 690B.

\textsuperscript{90} MGH, Epistolae VI, Karolini Aevi 4, 172, 25; PL 121, 686A.
However, he said, on the contrary, it was the birthplace of the most dangerous heresies:

\[ \text{genimina viperarum, id est, quamplurimi inventores perversorum dogmatum, veluti fuerunt, ut ex multis memoremus aliquos, Arrius, Eunomius, Fotinus, Marcion, Chaerintus, Manicheus, Hebion, Nestorius Constantinopolitanus episcopus...}\]

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:

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

\[ 91 \text{ MGH, Epistolae VI, Karolini Aevi 4, 172, 30-31; PL 121, 686A.} \]
\[ 92 \text{ MGH, Epistolae VI, Karolini Aevi 4, 172, 46-173,3; PL 121, 686C-D.} \]
\[ 93 \text{ MGH Epistolae 9, Karolini Aevi 7, 58-59.} \]
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 providence\(^96\) 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 fraudem communibus actionibus abuntur et ad suas lites cura, quae sibi visa fuerint, etiam violenter inflectunt. Itaque quicquid in Latino actionum octavae synodi codice repperitur, ab omni est fuco falsitatis extraneum. Quicquid vero amplius sive de dioecesi Vulgarica sive aliunde in Greco eiusdem synodi codice forsitan innoversit, totum est mendacii venenis infectum. Denique disceptatio, quam coram imperatore vicariis et Vulgaribus tantum super Vulgarum terra supra fuisse significavit activum, post synodum consummatam canonesque in viginti prolatis et septem tantum capitulis atque terminum fidei depromptum et omnia haec in quinque codicibus scripta sive compacta et omnium subscriptorum tradidos 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 insidiaria muscipula, quae a Grecis in infinis tendi poterunt, alto contemplationis saltu transcendent.* 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 inquiens 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 ennarantur* - 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 tripertita* (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 tripertita* 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

---

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.* 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,* or *apud Latinos quemadmodum apud Grecos non solum Grece sed et Latine accedentes* or *Indecorum et inconveniens arbitratus sum septimam universalem synodum... non habere Latinos* – 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* – 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

---

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.\textsuperscript{113}

Also, by dedicating the life of John the Calybite (a Byzantine saint “Romanised” by Anastasius, nr. 4 in the catalogue)\textsuperscript{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.”\textsuperscript{115} In the same letter he gave another example, that of Saint Clement:

Verum hoc Latinitas etiam in magno Clemente perpessa est, quem nisi a Graecis voluminibus postea redditum gauderet, nunc procul dubio perditum utpote tanto munere privata deflexer.\textsuperscript{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: \textit{notandum vero, quod Latino passio eius stilo retineat.}\textsuperscript{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

\textsuperscript{113} Anastasius, \textit{Epistolae} 426, 1-8: stilus epistolarium Latina redolet eloquentia, ex quo liquido constat non Grece illas, sed Latineuisse 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 sentientiam proferentem Antiochenum damnationis, quin immo sicut et ipsum quoque Clementem quem Rufinus nostrae linguae reddiditum restituitum et redeuntum ad Gaudentium scribens innuit, et quod Latine scriptus fuerit et amissus rursusque receptus, signanter ostendit.


\textsuperscript{117} Anastasius, \textit{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), 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. 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.

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. It is clear that Anastasius’ intention was to emphasize the key role that Rome supposedly played in the preservation and

---

120 Cf. *Anastasius Epistolae* 433.
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 *propría 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*, *pollentès 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. 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

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 \textit{ad sensum} methodology is to exercise property rights over the text translated.\(^{125}\)


\(^{124}\) “Sacro Graecorum nectare” is an expression from his preface to the Dionysian translations, a dedicatory poem to Charles the Bald. M. W. Herren, ed. \textit{Iohannis Scotti Eriugenae Carmina}, Scriptores 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, \textit{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 commonsplaces 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.” 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. 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.


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 tripertita) 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. 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

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. 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.
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), 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).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nr.</th>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Dedicatee</th>
<th>Oldest Latin ms.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Leontios of Neapolis</td>
<td>Vita Johanni Elemosynarii</td>
<td>858-862</td>
<td>Pope Nicholas I</td>
<td>Vendôme 213, 10th century</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>(Falsely attributed to) Amphilochios of Ikonion</td>
<td>Vita Basilii</td>
<td>858-867</td>
<td>Ursus</td>
<td>Rome, Bibl. Nazionale 1443, 11th century</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Vita Amphilochii</td>
<td>858-868</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td>Mantova 457, 13th century</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Vita Johanni Calybite</td>
<td>868</td>
<td>Formosus of Porto</td>
<td>Mantova 457, 13th century</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Acta concilii VIII</td>
<td>871</td>
<td>Pope Hadrian II</td>
<td>Vat. Lat. 4965, 9th century</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Nikephoros, George the Synkellos and Theophanes Confessor</td>
<td>Chronographia tripertita</td>
<td>871-874</td>
<td>John the Deacon</td>
<td>Vat. Palat. lat. 826</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Collectanea</td>
<td>874</td>
<td>John the Deacon</td>
<td>BNF lat. 5095</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Acta Martini</td>
<td>874</td>
<td>Martin of Narni</td>
<td>BNF lat. 5095</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>Sophronius of Jerusalem</td>
<td>Narratio miraculorum SS. Cyri et Johannis</td>
<td>875</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td>Chartres 63, 9th century</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>Amphilochios of Ikonion</td>
<td>Sermo super Anna et Symeone</td>
<td>874-875</td>
<td>Landulf of Capua</td>
<td>Karlsruhe, Augiensis LXXX, 10th century</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Translatio Sancti Stephani</td>
<td>874-875</td>
<td>Landulf of Capua</td>
<td>Bern 48, 10th century</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Author(s)</td>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>Peter of Gabii</td>
<td>Passio Sancti Petri Alexandrini</td>
<td>875</td>
<td>Vat. Lat. 622, 10th century</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>Peter of Gabii</td>
<td>Passio sanctorum martyrum in monte Ararat occisorum</td>
<td>876</td>
<td>Bourges BM 122, 11th century</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>Maximus Confessor and John of Scythopolis</td>
<td>Historia mystica ecclesiae catholicae</td>
<td>875</td>
<td>Charles the Bald, Berlin Phill. 1668, 9th century</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>Maximus Confessor</td>
<td>Mystagogia</td>
<td>875</td>
<td>Charles the Bald, Cambrai BM 711, 9th century</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td>Germanos I, patriarch of Constantinople</td>
<td>Scholia</td>
<td>875</td>
<td>Charles the Bald, Cambrai BM 711, 9th century</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td>Nilus</td>
<td>Epistola ad Nemertium</td>
<td>875</td>
<td>Charles the Bald, Cambrai BM 711, 9th century</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.</td>
<td>Constantine the Philosopher</td>
<td>De inventione reliquiarum S. Clementis</td>
<td>875</td>
<td>Gauderic of Velletri, Lost</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Passio et miracula Sancti Demetrii</td>
<td>876</td>
<td>Charles the Bald, BNF lat. 15436, 11th century</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Passio S. Dionysii Areopagiteae</td>
<td>876</td>
<td>Charles the Bald, BNF lat. 05569, 11th century</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22.</td>
<td>Theodore of Stoudios</td>
<td>Sermo de sancto Bartholomeo</td>
<td>870-879</td>
<td>Aio of Benevento, Chartres 63, 9th century</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.</td>
<td>John Moschos</td>
<td>Pratum Spirituale (II/45; IV/63)</td>
<td>870-879</td>
<td>John the Deacon</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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 came down to us. It is the *Vita Johanni Elemosynarii* by Leontios of Neapolis. The Greek original (BHG3 886) was critically edited by J. Festugière and L. Rydén, which superseded the *PG* version. 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. Also, the textual problems of the Latin translation were tackled in a study by Vincent Déroche. While waiting for the critical edition, it is possible to use the old editions of Migne and of the *AASS* and consult the short exposition on the textual tradition to be found in the in the *TeTra* 2.

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* and *PL*. The textual tradition of the Latin version is presented in the *TeTra* 2.

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

---

134 *PG* 93, 1617-1660.
140 *PL* 73, 293 sqq.
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 \textit{BHG} 73 a, not yet edited, and extant in three manuscripts.\textsuperscript{144}

\textbf{Nr. 4.} The \textit{Vita Johanni Calybite} (\textit{BHL} 4358) has an edition of the Greek original (\textit{BHG} 868) completed by O. Lampsides\textsuperscript{145}, replacing the \textit{PG} edition.\textsuperscript{146} The first edition of the Latin text, based on one manuscript\textsuperscript{147}, was completed by the Bollandist Poncelet.\textsuperscript{148} In 2003 Paolo Chiesa completed a critical edition of the Latin version of Anastasius, based on four surviving manuscripts.\textsuperscript{149} According to the letter of dedication, it was accomplished in 868 for Formosus, at that time bishop of Porto.

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

---

\textsuperscript{143} P. Chiesa, “Traduzioni e traduttori a Roma”, in \textit{Roma fra Oriente e Occidente} (Spoleto: CISAM, 2002), 479.

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


\textsuperscript{146} \textit{PG} 114, col. 568-582.

\textsuperscript{147} Mantua C. IV. 13, n.104, 15\textdegree century, fol. 72r-74r.


The Greek original has been lost\textsuperscript{150}, while the Latin version can be read in Mansi\textsuperscript{151}, the same text being also having been reproduced in the \textit{PL}\textsuperscript{152}. The \textit{Actio V} was critically edited by Claudio Leonardi. His research demonstrates that our earliest testimony (Vat. Lat. 4965, 9\textsuperscript{th} 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 \textit{TeTra} \textsuperscript{2}.

\textbf{Nr. 6.} The \textit{Acta concilii VII} (Nicea II, 787) were dedicated to John VIII in 873. Given the lack of a critical edition, the reader must consult Mansi\textsuperscript{154} or the same text reproduced in the \textit{PL}\textsuperscript{155}. Erich Lamberz is currently preparing the critical edition of the text\textsuperscript{156}. Meanwhile he has published a set of studies dealing with the matters related to this text\textsuperscript{157}:

\textsuperscript{151} Mansi 16, 1, col. 1-208.
\textsuperscript{152} \textit{PL} 129, col. 9-196.
\textsuperscript{153} Cf. \textit{TeTra} 2, 95-100.
\textsuperscript{154} Mansi 12, coll. 81-1154.
\textsuperscript{155} \textit{PL} 129, coll. 195-512.
\textsuperscript{156} The oldest extant manuscripts of the Latin version are Vat. Reg. 1046 (10\textsuperscript{th} century, Reims), Paris 17339 (10\textsuperscript{th} century, Notre Dame), Vat. 1329 (10\textsuperscript{th} century).
Nr. 7. The *Chronographia tripertita*, which combined the respective histories of Nikephoros, George the Synkellos and Theophanes Confessor\(^\text{158}\) (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.\(^\text{159}\)

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 manuscript\(^\text{160}\): and most of it was recently edited by Pauline Allen and Bronwen Neil, in both the Greek (where available) and the Latin versions.\(^\text{161}\) The same material was the subject of the doctoral thesis by Ilaria Bonaccorsi.\(^\text{162}\)

Nr. 9. This group contains one document, the *Acta Martini* (*BHL* 5592-94), which survived, as an independent hagiographic text in another manuscript\(^\text{163}\)


\(^{160}\) Paris BNF 5095, 9th century.


\(^{163}\) Vallicelliana IX, ff. 166r-173r, 11th-12th centuries.
published by Bronwen Neil. The whole group of this monothelite documentation can be found in PL.

Nr. 10. Then comes a text where dedicatee cannot be identified because of the lacunae in the badly damaged manuscript in which it survived. 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 vita and part of the dedication can also be found in the PL. Both the Latin version of Anastasius and the Greek original (BHG 469) are extant in the PG.

Nr. 11. The Sermo super Anna et Symeone of Amphilochios of Ikonion, mentioned in the dedicatory letter of the Translatio Stephani has been ampley discussed by Mathilde Cupiccia. It may be found in a single manuscript, recently edited by A. P. Orbàn. The Greek text was edited by F. Datema, who presented also the Latin version in parallel.
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 (*BHG* 3 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.


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.


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 *Te.Tra. 2.*, 244-251. The manuscripts in which these notes are the best conserved, are the Paris BNF 1618 (11\(^{th}\) century), Florence Laurent. Plut. 89 sup. 15 (10-11\(^{th}\) centuries) and Berlin Phill. 1668 (9\(^{th}\) century).

\(^{179}\) *PG 4*, col. 15-432, and 527-276.

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, suspending the PG version.

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. 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).

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. The Latin version is extant in several manuscripts and

---

183 In a manuscript from Lisbon: Bibl. Nacional 342 – a miscellanea about St. Clement.
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 Areopagita* (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 PL.191 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

---

188 PG 4, 669-684.
189 AASS., Oct. IV, 792-794.
190 PL 129, 737 sqq.
191 PL 106, col. 40 sqq.
more Latin manuscripts to her collation in her MA thesis. The text is also extant in the PL and the AASS.

**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*. The Latin and the Greek versions are both available in the PL and the PG respectively.

**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. 1889, fol. 238r-241v (12th century) and Paris BNF 1470 (olim Colbertinus 340), ff. 209v-214r (from 890).

195 PL 129, 729 sqq.
196 AASS. 25 Aug. V, 39 sqq
Liber Pontificalis he is by now discredited,\textsuperscript{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.\textsuperscript{200} There is also a treatise called De episcoporum transmigratione 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.\textsuperscript{201}

\textsuperscript{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.
\textsuperscript{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.
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).

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 tripertita* (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).  

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 literature 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. 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

---


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 group of Constantinopolitan authors comprises in the first place the three historians of the *Chronographia tripertita*: 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 iconclast 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.\textsuperscript{208} He corresponded with Popes Leo III\textsuperscript{209} and Paschal I.\textsuperscript{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:

\begin{quote}
Qui cum semper in apostolicae sedis communione persistet et hereticorum nenias et imperatorum vesaniam etiam tormentis affectus mentis virtute repressit.\textsuperscript{211}
\end{quote}

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 \textit{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.\textsuperscript{212} John Moschos, roughly his contemporary, was a hagiographer monk from Cilicia and the author of the \textit{Pratum sprituale}, 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

\begin{footnotes}
\item[207] \textit{Oratio} 43 (BHG 3010 – \textit{PG} 35-36, col. 12-664, Gregory’s orationes).
\item[209] \textit{PG} 99, 1017-1028, liber I, \textit{Letter}. 33 and 34.
\item[210] \textit{PG} 99, 1151-1156, liber II, \textit{Letter} 12, 13.
\item[211] Anastasius, \textit{Epistolae} 442, 9-11.
\item[212] Cf. \textit{ODB} II, 1213-1214.
\end{footnotes}
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. 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 montheletism, 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 monothelete controversy when numerous members of the Palestinian monastic community were seeking refuge in the West.

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 (monotheletism, 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 Sophronius 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).

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’ 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, 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)\textsuperscript{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.

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 since 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


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, 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, and the life of Saint Clement (finished, after his death, by Gauderic of Velletri). 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. 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.

---


222 PL 75, 59-242.


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. 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 Santerre, J. M, Les moines grecs et orientaux à Rome aux époques byzantine et carolingienne (milieu
part III). 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).

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 monothelete 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, whereas the parts pertaining to Maximus and Martin are mentioned only in the very last sentence.

---


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)
3. Theodorus Spudaeus: Narrationes de exilio et morte S. Martini(Commemoratio) (CPG 7969; PL 129, 585-604)
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.\textsuperscript{230}

At several points, when listing the parts of the collection, the translator used the denomination *brevia opuscula*, from which he made excerpts (excerpsi).\textsuperscript{231} As for the provenance of his sources, a laconic *ad manus nostras venire*\textsuperscript{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 fideli humero transvexisse sufficiat nil videlicet addendi vel minuenti*.\textsuperscript{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*.\textsuperscript{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

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

\textsuperscript{231} Letter 9, in Anastasius, *Epistolae* 423.

\textsuperscript{232} Letter 9, in Anastasius, *Epistolae* 423.

\textsuperscript{233} Letter 9, in Anastasius, *Epistolae* 423.
mentionned *quaedam ex actis Maximi monachi ac discipulorum eius*, moreover, as *huic operi conexa et continuata reperri*. 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 than added to the documents collected by him regarding Honorius.

Reading further his exposition one get 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

---

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

---


\(^{238}\) Letter 7, in Anastasius, *Epistolae* 419.


\(^{240}\) “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 anihilating 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.”

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 Anastasius - 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* - 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

---


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

considerably shortened the materials, from George the Synkellos *summatim quaedam* and from Theophanes *plura sed succinte carpenda*. Then, he inserted Nikephoros' *Cosmographia* (*huic sane operi ratum duxi beati Nicephori Constantinopolitani episcopi cosmographiam praeponere*) in the front for John to extract something out of it, if he wanted to: *ex ea possis aliquantula carpere* - 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*. 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): he mentioned Eusebius of course, and then Theodoret, Socrates and Sozomen, with their *Historia tripartita*. 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

---

244 It was only after the accession of Justin II that he produced full translation; until that point he had excerpted heavily. See C. Mango, xxvii.
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.
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.\footnote{See his preface to the translation of Eusebius’ History 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 judicavimus 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).} 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.\footnote{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. Heinzelmann, ed., Manuscrits hagiographiques et travail des hagiographes (Sigmaringen: Thornbecke, 1992), and B. Guenée, Histoire et culture historique dans l’Occident médiévale (Paris: Aubier, 1980).} 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.\footnote{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.}

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

Ex civilibus autem gestis quaedam summatim excerpsi… 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, i.e. 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 commentaries\(^{257}\) 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. Vircillo-Franklin, *The Latin Dossier of Anastasius the Persian*, 116.

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.

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, 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.

---

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 Eurigena, 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 Scytopolis’ *scholia*, and then the so-called *corpus mixtus*, where the *scholia* of both John and Maximus are present\textsuperscript{265} – 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*.\textsuperscript{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)\textsuperscript{267} or, since this is not the first case of missing prologues in the list of Anastasius’ collection\textsuperscript{268}, 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:

\begin{quote}
ecce repente parathesis sive scholia in eum (quae Constantinopoli positus videram) ad manus venere, quibus utcunque interpretatis, mihi
\end{quote}

\begin{footnotes}
\textsuperscript{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.
\textsuperscript{268} Cf. above p. 81.
\end{footnotes}
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aliquantulum magis emicuit, quae videlicet in marginibus interpretati codicis ejus, ut in Graeco reperi, mox interpretata utcumque (donec a docto melius interpretarentur) respondentibus signis interpres ego satis imperitus apposui, vestraeque gloriosae sapientiae potissimum fore mittenda non immerito judicavi.\(^{269}\)

Again, the indications of provenance are a loose \textit{ad manus venere} with an intercalated note, \textit{qua Constantiopolis 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 complementing 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,

\[^{269}\text{Letter 13, in Anastasius Epistolae 432.}\]
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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.  

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 (montheletism), 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 excerpti, difflorare, carpere abound. Further research would be necessary to reveal the editorial mechanisms behind Anastasius’ choices.

---

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 then 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.”

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, scholars thus managing to reconstruct several libraries, whether royal, aristocratic or monastic, unfortunately this has never been the case for the papal collection.

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

references from different other types of resources. 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? 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) behind, 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.

On 14 December 864 Anastasius was appointed papal librarian by Hadrian II. 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 bibliotecae vestrae, cuius minister vestra dignatione consisto, ex hoc, quod desuper mihi datum est, debitor sum ministrear. Anastasius, Epistolae, 416.
279 That is, on the very day of his election as pope. CF. MGH Concilia IV, 317, 10-11.
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*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* was a relatively new function: the first librarian recorded in the sources is a certain Zacharias, on 19 April 773. It was a position occupied by the high clergy, usually bishops (some of them even later future popes). Besides being guardian of the pope’s bookshelves, he was also responsible for all sorts of chancellary duties, papal correspondence and the recording of council acts. Probably he was also head of the *scriptorium*. 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). 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

---


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


leaders without his approval and recommendation, and without his presentation and proposition [...].\textsuperscript{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;\textsuperscript{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 then ‘manuscripts’ held by the library. For such an estimation, one good starting point would be the literary activity of the librarian himself.\textsuperscript{288}

\textsuperscript{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 prae-presentatur, nullius epistola patriarchae missa recipitur, nisi forte a ceteris patriarchis mittatur; nullus ad praesulatum vel alterius ordinis ordinis clericatue sive ad praesidiumurum monasteriorum provehitur, nisi iste hunc approbet et commendet, atque de illo ipse patriarchae suggerat et ipse prae-presentet. C. Leonardi, “Anastasio Bibliotecario e l’ottavo concilio ecumenico”, \textit{Studi medievali} 8 (1967): 59-192, at pages 174-175.

\textsuperscript{287} About it’s previous locations see Marrou, H. I. “Autour de la bibliothèque du pape Agapit,” \textit{Mélanges d’archéologie et d’histoire} 48 (1931): 124-169 and T. F. X. Noble, \textit{The Republic of Saint-Peter}, p 220.

\textsuperscript{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 sitorum291; 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.
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 venere, he says. That there were Dionysian manuscripts in Rome, we know through the testimony of patriarch Methodios, who, when in Rome, had copied such a manuscript.

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, 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 nel’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.\(^{298}\)

---


\(^{297}\) Sansterre, Les moines grecques, 69.

\(^{298}\) Upon glossing the Greek term μελῳδήμα (Ecclesiastical Hierarchy, chapter 2) he says: Id est alleluia. In quibusdam vero regionibus etiam vicesimum octavum psalmum versibus alternantibus concinunt, veluti Rome greci et guidam 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 πτερόγιον τοῦ οὐρανοῦ and πετεινὸν τοῦ οὐρανοῦ - Anastasius called the attention to the two meanings of πτερόγιον, 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) he referred to the use of both meaning found in the Bible, which might confuse translators. 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 scarce 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
period\textsuperscript{302} 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 Anatasius rather turned to native assistants instead of books. For some of his translations, he himself testifies to such \textit{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: \textit{rara praeterea interpreti doctiori enucleanda servavi}\textsuperscript{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.\textsuperscript{304} In other cases, Anastasius speaks of commissioning the translation from someone else, only reserving for himself the duties of a reviser: \textit{Verum huius operis media in aliis implicitus ipse non transtuli, sed ab alio petitu meo interpretata postmodum in quibusdam correxii.}\textsuperscript{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.\textsuperscript{306}

\textsuperscript{302} G. Goetz and G. Gundermann, \textit{Corpus Glossarium Latinum} (CGL) vol. 2, 213-483. There is one more, which survives only in very fragmentary form, the so-called \textit{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,” \textit{Aevum} 65 (1991): 221-258.

\textsuperscript{303} Anastasius, \textit{Epistolae}, 411, 8.


\textsuperscript{305} Anastasius, \textit{Epistolae}, 422, 15-16.

\textsuperscript{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.

\(^{307}\) Cf. also Vircillo-Franklin, *The Latin Dossier of Anastasius the Persian*, 113.

\(^{308}\) See also my chapter on the notes to the *Corpus Dionysiacum*.

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:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sophronios of Jerusalem</th>
<th>Anastasius Bibliothecarius</th>
<th>Paul the Deacon</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PG 87, 3713-3716</td>
<td><em>PL</em> 129, 314-315</td>
<td><em>PL</em> 73, 682-683</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

His dictis, ac si quadam certitudine percepta, fidei fervore, miserationis Genitricis Dei confisa, et movens me ipsam 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.*, repellertur], nullusque prohiberet januae appropinquare, per quam in templum ingrediabantur. Comprehendit ergo me horror et ecstasis, et tota ex omnibus tremebunda turbabar. Itaque conjungens me ad januam, cuius mihi aditus primo claussebat (quasi omnis virtus quae prior in ingressum prohibebat, post autem viam ingrediendi pararet), ita absque impedimenti labore introivi,
gressum, 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 susciendum 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 vadinmoni 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 vadinmonii, cui fidei dixisti. Nunc deduc quo jussieris. Nunc esto mihi magis salutis magistra, manu ducens in viam quae ad poenitentiam dirigat. Et cum haec adhuc dicerem, audivi quemandam 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 generici vociferata sum: Dei generix, 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 pavimentum, exibam. Currens 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 genericiis, his improcata sum verbis: Tu quidem semper, o benignissima Domina, tuam ostendisti pietatis misericordiam: tu non indignam suppolationem 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 ad poenitentiam. Et haec dicens, audivi vocem aliquius a longe clamantis: Jordanem si transieris, bonam invenies requiem. Ego vero hanc vocem audiens, et hanc propter me factam fuisse credens, lacrymata clamavi, et Dei generici vociferata sum: Dei generix, 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 pavimentum, exibam. Currens 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 genericiis, his improcata sum verbis: Tu quidem semper, o benignissima Domina, tuam ostendisti pietatis misericordiam: tu non indignam suppolationem 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 ad poenitentiam. Et haec dicens, audivi vocem aliquius a longe clamantis: Jordanem si transieris, bonam invenies requiem. Ego vero hanc vocem audiens, et hanc propter me factam fuisse credens, lacrymata clamavi, et Dei generici vociferata sum: Dei generix, domina, ne derelinquas me. Et his dictis, exivi de atrio templi, et
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 relictum 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.\(^\text{310}\)

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 emphasis a couple of typical features, which are at the roots of this high degree

\(^{310}\) Anastasius, \textit{Epistolae}, 416.
of correspondence. The first striking feature is the respect of the word order: the two translators, while using different terms for the same Greek word, the order in which they display these words, is almost completely identical, and faithful to the original:

Anastasius: in quo stans deprecationem faciebam
Paul: in quo stans feci orationem

Or

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 тαυτα ειπωσα Paul has haec dicens, Anastasius offers his dictis; and the same for таутα бοησασα. Similarly, for таутα λέγουσα Paul gives haec dicens, while Anastasius haec dicerem. For тινα πλησιόν λαβοσα, 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 ὅσπερ and ὅσει, 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 εισέρχομαι 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 permissit, excerspi; 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 interpretes pene per singula relictum 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,

---


\(^{312}\) 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, Guarimpotus, 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.

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.


³¹⁹ Quisquis etiam interpretatus eam fuerit (scil. epistolam) et ex ea quicquam mutaverit vel subtraxerit aut superaddiderit, praeter illud, quod idioma Grecae 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.”

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.

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 them 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

---

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 polysemantism 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 vetent, tua profecto sollers experiencia 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 then 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

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.
was a school-technique of textual exegesis.\textsuperscript{327} It represents the process of the interlinear gloss getting independent, and, in its own turn, receiving further glosses and comments.\textsuperscript{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.\textsuperscript{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 \textit{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 \textit{verbum} and \textit{sensum}. The \textit{sensum} method is not an equivalent of our current concept of “free”. If we expect, whenever \textit{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 \textit{ad sensum} and \textit{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.\textsuperscript{330} They differed on the level of amplification or diminution of the text.

\textsuperscript{327} For illustration, see the examples in E. Jacobsen, “Literary Translation in Context with Other Types of Textual Transformation” in Andersen, P. ed., \textit{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, \textit{Rhetorics}, 87.

\textsuperscript{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, \textit{The Latin Dossier of Anastasius the Persian} (Toronto: PIMS, 2004), 80.

\textsuperscript{329} In fact Jacobsen even uses the term “interlinear literal paraphrase”, Jacobsen, \textit{Literary Translation}, 7.

\textsuperscript{330} C. Vircillo-Franklin, \textit{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 minuenti, 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 Goullet, it accounts for textual modifications of many sorts. In the typology of Goullet 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 talen interpretum illum interpretandum tribuat, qui non sit ausus ex ea quicquum 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. Goullet, Écriture et réécriture hagiographiques. Essai sur les réécritures de Vies de saints dans l’Occident médiéval (VIIe-XIIIe s.) (Turhout: Brepols, 2005), 141-147. See also A. Lefevere, Translation, Rewriting and the Manipulation of Literary Fame (London and NY: Routledge, 1992).

\(^{333}\) M. Goullet, Écriture et réécriture hagiographiques. Essai sur les réécritures de Vies de saints dans l’Occident médiéval (VIIe-XIIIe s.) (Turhout: 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, excerspi: nonquam vero manente sensu constructionem Grecam in Latinam necessario commutavi. Rara praetereae interpreti doctori enucleanda servavi. Quaedam etiam, sicut mihi nota erant, nimirum qui tam Romae quam Byzantii positus in cunctis his sollicita 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, deicientibus 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.\textsuperscript{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.

\textsuperscript{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 ERIGENA’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.\textsuperscript{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 an 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

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.\textsuperscript{336}

Rehabilitation of such sets of paratexts\textsuperscript{337} 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.”\textsuperscript{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 \textit{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

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{itemize}
\end{itemize}
\end{footnotesize}
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 860. One reason for the concern of the papacy was Eriugena’s bad reputation for *non sane sapere* 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. 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.
340 *MGH, Epistolae* 6, Karolini Aevi 4, 651.
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 interventions of the Librarian in three of the oldest manuscripts of the “Anastasian corpus”: Berlin, Staatsbibliothek, Phillips 1668 (9th century) = B, Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale de France, MS. lat. 1618 (10th century) = P, and Florence, Laurenziana Plut. 89 sup. 15 (11-12th century) = F.

Hyacinthe Dondaine 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. 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.* The “Anastasian corpus,” that is to say the text with the *scholia*, was probably built around the text of T,

---

347 For A, Dondaine’s representative sample is Paris BNF 1618, while for T stands for Troyes 802 (9th-10th centuries).
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.\textsuperscript{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 \textit{scholia} in the earlier Greek tradition, Anastasius omitted 32 completely, and also parts of 150 others.\textsuperscript{350} To this selection he then added his own interventions, too. So far, altogether 18 notes of Anstasius have been published by Dondaine and by Paolo Chiesa, all from the \textit{Celestial Hierarchy}.\textsuperscript{351} My presentation is based on a survey of the notes to the \textit{Celestial Hierarchy}, the \textit{Mystical Theology}, and the

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

\textsuperscript{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, \textit{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 \textit{Studia Patristica} 36 (2001): 119-125.

\textsuperscript{351} Dondaine, \textit{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 interpres senserit, quid scholion insinuet indifferenter 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.”

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.

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.

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): ... disc quomodo deus solem et lunam secundum diametron, *id est lineam incidentem cyclem sive tetragonum* cum essent tunc adversus invicem cum iam sol occubuiisset...

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*.\(^{357}\)

---

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)\(^{358}\)

\[\text{B (fol. 8r), P (fol. 5v), F (fol. 4v): } \text{“Animos sive noas quasi hic sermo grecus habet etiam gentiles philosophi intelligibles id est spirituales virtutes haud dubium quin angelicas nunccupant (P F nunccupant).“}\]

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 (\(\nu\omega\zeta\)).

**Semantic Alternatives**

The text is full with such suggestions, such as *manifestatrices*\(^{359}\) expounded by *sive manifestatorie id est denunciatoric;*\(^{360}\) *contemplationes*\(^{361}\) by *sive conspectus;*\(^{362}\) or *coartantur*\(^{363}\) by *sive desinunt.*\(^{364}\)

More complex interventions present themselves as follows:

Extergentes\(^{365}\) (Letter 9)

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

\(^{358}\) *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)*  
\(^{365}\) \(\epsilon\nu\alpha\pi\omicron\mu\omicron\omicron\omicron\gamma\nu\nu\nu\tau\alpha\nu\nu\tau\iota\iota\iota\) (Heil-Ritter, Corpus, 193); *PL 122, 1188B; PG 4, 557D.*
Here Anastasius fused his own comment with that of John: the Scythopolitan suggested ἀπομόρφαξαι and ἐμβαλεῖν for ἐναπομόρφαγνυνται, 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)

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: velut expressius et aptius grece habetur ordo sacer.

This is a practice which can also often be found in Eriugena’s commentary on his own translation.

Deiformis (Celestial Hierarchy 7)

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 habitudo for ἔξις he proposes consuetudo, a term which in several instances he encountered rendered as such. 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 ἐξεις, this time translated by Eriugena as habitus\textsuperscript{372}: “Diximus quid sit ex his quam interpres habitum transtulit lege in septimo capitulo.”\textsuperscript{373}

**COMPONDS**

Angelicarum imaginum descriptiones (\textit{Celestial Hierarchy} 2)\textsuperscript{374}

\textbf{B} (fol. 12r), \textbf{P} (fol. 8r), \textbf{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 immagines (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 ἀγγελοεις\textsuperscript{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 (\textit{Celestial Hierarchy} 1)\textsuperscript{376}

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

Here the Greek phrase in question is τελετάρχις ἱεροθεσιά\textsuperscript{377} which, as translated by Eriugena, did not, according to Anastasius, do justice to the text:

\textsuperscript{371} Even Eurigena uses it in this way, eg. \textit{Celestial Hierarchy} 2 (\textit{PL} 122, 1042 C; Heil-Ritter, \textit{Corpus}, 14, 6).

\textsuperscript{372} \textit{Celestial Hierarchy} 15, \textit{PL} 122, 1067C - \textit{PG} 4, 109 CD.

\textsuperscript{373} \textbf{B} (fol. 29r), \textbf{P} (fol. 21r), \textbf{F} (fol. 22r).

\textsuperscript{374} \textit{PL} 122, 1044A – \textit{PG} 4, 48B C.

\textsuperscript{375} Heil-Ritter, \textit{Corpus}, 16, 15.

\textsuperscript{376} \textit{PL} 122, 1038D – \textit{PG} 4, 32D-34A.

\textsuperscript{377} Heil-Ritter, \textit{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 τελεταρχίς 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 ΤΕΑΕΤΑΡΧΙϹ appellatur non incongrue queritur. Est igitur hoc nomen compositum ab eo quod est ΤΕΑΕΘ et ΑΡΧΙϹ; ΤΕΑΕΘ autem a Grecis dicitur hostia purgatia 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 ΤΕΑΕΤΑΡΧΙϹ vocatur, hoc est ΤΕΑΕΤΩΝ ΑΡΧΗ, principium scilicet purgationum et finis. Siquidem APXH 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 IEPOΘΕϹΙΑ, quasi IEΠΩΝ ΘΕϹΙΑ, hoc est sacrorum postio, convenienter dicitur, quoniam ipsa est omnium sacrosanctorum mysteriorum...” *Eriugenae Expositiones* 13-14.

\(^{380}\) *Eriugenae Expositiones* 18, 19.

\(^{381}\) *Eriugenae Expositiones* 8-9.
CORRECTIONS

The most common corrections indicate mistakes originating in Eriugena’s faulty manuscript:\(^{382}\):

Effectum (Celestial Hierarchy 15)\(^{383}\)

\textbf{B} (fol. 29r), \textbf{P} (fol. 21r), \textbf{F} (fol. 22v):

\begin{quote}
Aestimo quos sputum vel etiam spiramus (P F spiramen) pro effectum hic habere debeat \textit{πτησιν enim et ποίησιν id est spiritum (F sputum) et effectum quod vicina sibi sunt scriptor pro primo posuit ut reor secundum.}
\end{quote}

Indeed, there are manuscripts\(^{384}\) 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.

\textbf{Laudatores}\(^{385}\)

\begin{quote}
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).
\end{quote}

Here again, the conjecture of Anastasius represents the correct reading, stemming from a manuscript which probably read \textit{θιασώτας} where Eriugena’s text read \textit{θειασώτας}\(^{387}\).

\textbf{Rationem et intellectum} (Celestial Hierarchy 2)\(^{388}\)

\begin{quote}
B (fol. 10r), F (fol. 6v), P (om.): “secundum (F ins. quid) dicitur ‘logos’, \textit{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).”
\end{quote}

\(^{382}\) Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale de France, MS. gr. 437.

\(^{383}\) PL 122, 1068A.


\(^{385}\) Celestial Hierarchy 3, PL 122, 1044D.

\(^{386}\) \textit{θιασώτας} (Heil-Ritter, \textit{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. \textit{Eriugenae Expositiones} 59.

\(^{388}\) PL 122, 1041B – PG 4, 40C.
Here, based on the scholiast’s biblical quotations, Anastasius went for *sensus* or *verb*um 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 ἀμύστος. It is difficult to guess, on the other hand, what misreading lead Eriugena to understand *ardentes*390.

Petit 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 subitus aerem per ignem incendit autem huiuscemodi unde et a ‘pimran’ id est ‘combure’ 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 (*comburere-combstio*). Thus, for rendering the Greek term ποιηστήρ, Eriugena chose in ignem, while Anastasius preferred *turbinem*, appended with what the Greek scholiast derived from πιμπανα: *combustio*.

Quasi puer novus392 (Letter 8393)


389 PL 122, 1173B - PG 4, 417C.

390 Perhaps a form of ἀμύητος? In other places where he translates *ardentes* (PL 122, 1065C, 1093 B) the Greek text has different forms of ἀμύστος: *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.

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

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

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

Since the Greek scholiast affirmed that ὑπόσης 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 ὑπόσης the scholiast will refer to.

incommutabili mansione et bonitate relictus (Letter 9) 395

The Greek scholiast detected here a wordplay by Pseudo-Dionysius, ἕστια echoing ἐστηκῶς, the participle from a few lines above. The text in the PG says ἕστια 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 ἐστημι, and the noun can be derived from ἐστιάω. 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.
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best is only an analogous situation. Further, he mentioned that for the Greek term ἐστίον 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.\textsuperscript{396} Anastasius, one must admit it, was not always the perfect philologist who made such an impression on his readers in the dedicatory letter.\textsuperscript{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.\textsuperscript{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 ὀρφειόν.\textsuperscript{399} Nevertheless, a closer look

\textsuperscript{395} PL 122, 1191B–PG 4, 572A.

\textsuperscript{396} All other occurrences of ἐστίον 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.

\textsuperscript{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 ἁγιάτων (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.

\textsuperscript{398} See for example P. Chiesa, “Interpres et expositor” 176, for sholia refering to both Latin and Greek manuscripts.

\textsuperscript{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)\textsuperscript{400}
\textbf{B} (fol. 18v), \textbf{P} (fol. 13r), \textbf{F} (fol. 13r): ‘Trysypostaton’ vero quod hic interpretes ‘tres substantialiter’ interpretatus est priores interpretes ‘trium subsistentiarum’ sparsim interpretati sunt. Nam dicens ‘monada sive unitatem trysypostaton’ aperte docet ‘unitatem trium esse subsistentiarum id est personarum’.\textsuperscript{401}

This is not the only place where Anastasius discussed the problems of translating the term (προσώπων). 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.


Many of the problems surrounding of early Christian trinitarian controversies arise from the fact that terminology was equivocal. Thus, with the term υπόστασις, 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.

\textsuperscript{400}\textit{PL} 122, 1053B–\textit{PG} 4, 76D-77A.
\textsuperscript{401} P. Chiesa, “Interpres et expositor” 177.
\textsuperscript{402} \textit{MGH}, \textit{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).

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 theologians; these Dionysian fragments had already been quoted during the Lateran council of 769. 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. 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*.

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”, *Annuarium 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.
The Interpreter of the Popes. The Translation Project of Anastasius Bibliothecarius

subsistentia/persona in several instances. 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)

B (fol. 103r), P (fol. 82v), F (fol. 92r): [...]

311 Illud vero quod ait <virifica>to 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 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”. 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.”

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.
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 ἀγάθος,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).


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 insinuatur καλός et ἀγάθος. ‘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, current καλω victorious. hic verisimile dat quod et apud nos ‘bonus’ dicatur a verbo greco quod est (P est om.) βοώ hoc est ‘clamo’. Bonus ergo dicitur deus qui omnia ad se clamat.” F: om.
καταφατική. Besides being missing from F (that is to say from the T branch), they echoed passages in other Eriugenan works. The derivation of θεός from θεό can be found in the first chapter of the Expositiones, and the Periphyseon’s first book, while the connection of καλός with καλῶ and βοῶ appeared in the second book of the Periphyseon. Analogous reflections on ἀποφασική and καταφατική can be found in the second book of the Expositiones, and the first book of the Periphyseon.

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 insulae

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 ἀποφασική 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 conponitur) 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 Eriugenae Expositiones..., ed. Barbet, 5-6.


421 Eriugenae Expositiones, 33-4.


423 PL 122, 1193A.
appellans sacram animam dilectissime...\textsuperscript{424}

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

These changes reflect variant manuscript readings, such as κατὰ Πάτμων τὴν νῆσον (\textit{apud Patnum insulam}) instead of Πάτμων τὴ νῆσῳ (\textit{Patmo insulae}), or a simple, but more precisely rendered \textit{περιορισθέντι} (\textit{exilio relegato}) instead of \textit{περιορισθέντι καὶ πιστευθέντι} (\textit{determinato et credito}).\textsuperscript{425}

\textit{CONCLUSIONS}

By analysing a set of notes that Anastasius appended to Eriugena’s translation of the \textit{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.\textsuperscript{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

\textsuperscript{424} PL 122, 1193A.

\textsuperscript{425} Heil-Ritter, \textit{Corpus}, 208.

\textsuperscript{426} See my chapter \textit{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?”

A translator-commentator, perhaps.

---


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* 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.

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?*

---

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. 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. This first piece comes from a letter of Polycrates, 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.

The fragment from Clement of Alexandria 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 tyranno 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.

434 Only extant in Eusebius, HE, V, 25.
435 Florence, Laurenz. Plut. 89, sup. 15, fol. 102r.
quidem episcopos constituens, alibi autem totas ecclesias adunans, alibi clerum et unumquenque sortitum existentibus ab eius spiritu signi.  

On the other hand, the last passage, that of Philo,\textsuperscript{438} refers back to the very first letter, to clarify a term used by Pseudo-Dionysius there, namely, the use of \textit{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 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 Iudaehler 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.  

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 \textit{corpus}? If one checks the Latin Eusebius one instantly realises, that the fragments were not in Rufinus’ translation,\textsuperscript{440} which as far as I know was the only translation that was in existence in the medieval West.

\textsuperscript{437} Florence, Laurenz. Plut. 89, sup. 15, fol. 102r.  
\textsuperscript{439} Florence, Laurenz. Plut. 89, sup. 15, fol. 104r  
Whose translation then is this painstakingly literal version, much less elegant than that of Rufinus? 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).
1. Firenze, Biblioteca Medicea Laurenziana, Plut. 89 sup. 15, 11th c.\textsuperscript{443}, fol. 102v-103v
2. Oxford, St. John’s College, CXXVIII, 10th c.\textsuperscript{444}, fol. 216r-221v
3. Cambridge, Trinity College, B. 2. 31, 12th c.\textsuperscript{445}, fol. 108b-111a
4. Darmstadt, Hessische Landes und Hochschulbibliothek 30, 12th c.\textsuperscript{446}, texts start at fol. 101
5. Lilienfeld, Stiftsbibliothek, 128, 13th c.\textsuperscript{447}, texts start at fol. 124v-
7. Lyon, Bibliothèque municipale, 598, 12th c.\textsuperscript{449}; Texts start at fol. 112
8. Montecassino, Biblioteca dell’Abbazia 221, 11th c.\textsuperscript{450}, fol. 244, damaged codex, missing folios, ends abruptly
9. Troyes, Bibliothèque Municipale, 802, 9th/10th c.\textsuperscript{451}, 225rv, Philo missing
10. Koln, Dombibliothek 30, 11th c.\textsuperscript{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.).\textsuperscript{453}

\textsuperscript{443} A. Bandini, \textit{Catalogus}, vol. 3, 259 sqq.
\textsuperscript{445} Montague, Rhodes James, \textit{The Western Manuscripts in the Library of Trinity College, Cambridge. A Descriptive Catalogue} (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1900), 91-93.
\textsuperscript{446} PL 122, col. XIV.
\textsuperscript{448} H. O. Coxe, \textit{Bodleian Library Quarto Catalogues. II. Laudian Manuscripts} (Oxford: Bodleian Library, 1973), 462-463.
\textsuperscript{451} According to Hanna – Dondaine seems not to be aware of this, see his description of the manuscript on page 40.
\textsuperscript{452} [http://www.ceec.uni-koeln.de/ceec-cgi/kleioc/0010/exec/katm/%22kn28-0030%22]
\textsuperscript{453} Suchla dates it to before 886, \textit{NAWG} 1984, 180.
According to the available catalogues, there were at least a further twelve such Greek manuscripts (See Table 4).

### Table 4: Greek Manuscripts with the Eusebian Fragments

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Florence, Laurenziana conv. soppr. 202, 9th century, ff. 190-191b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Florence, Laur. San Marco 686, 10th century, fol. 214-217v,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Paris BNF grec 440 (ffol. 176v-178v, 12th c.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Paris BNF grec 934 contains only the letter of Polycrates (fol. 116v, 11th c.),</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Paris BNF Coislin 86, 12th from fol. 391</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Venice, Marc. Gr. 144 (531), (13th c.), fol. 87-89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Venice, Marc. Gr. 266 (517), (14th c.), fol. 154r-154v, the Philo and Polycrates fragments are to be found separately in a patristic florilegium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Vat. grec. 1787 (11th century, with scholia- ff. 278v-280v),</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>Vat. grec. 1525 (ff. 210-214v)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>Vat. grec. 374 (13th century, with scholia, ff. 242-246),</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>Vat. grec. 504 (a. 1105, miscellanea, inside Pseudo-Dionysius with scholia, f. 76),</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>Roma Vallicelliana 69 (E. 29) from the 10th century, with the scholia, ff. 163v-167v).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---


462 Devreesse, *Codices Vaticani graeci, 338-349*.

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

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.
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 Dionisius episcopus Chorinthis vir antiquus et beatus Polycarpus in epistola ad ecclesiam Athenarum et Iosebius Pamphili in eclesiastica 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:

This closely resembles the prologue of John of Scythopolis:

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:

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.
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 Policarpus*, whereas in the prologue John has only a simple Policarpus.

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. 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
    emendatio ribus invenimus exemplaribus.

This note makes no sense in the place where it is placed in B and P, i.e. 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.\footnote{470}{P. G. Théry, “Recherches pour une édition grecque historique du Pseudo-Denys” in The New Scholasticism 3 (1929): 366.}

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).

\footnote{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.”

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. One well established method of constructing and sustaining such


networks was gift-giving: 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. 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 Anastasius 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 yo 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

---


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 gifts 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.

The institutional background making possible a boom in literary gift-giving was the court, 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


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, 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.
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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, 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 Cogitante ac diu tacite sollicitque 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:

\[ \text{ecce subito quidam strenui ac studiosi viri cohortari voluerunt, ut in Latinum sermonem verterem Leontium de residuis vitae Iohannis Alexandrini antistitis.}^{482} \]

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 flavoured\(^{483}\)

Anastasius with his knowledge of Greek is exploiting the Roman-Byzantine rivalry. Quantitatively these arguments make up the bigger part of the letter:


\(^{482}\) 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.


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, 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.

In 873, he dedicates a retranslation of the acts of the seventh ecumenical council (nr. 6 in the catalogue) to **Pope John VIII**. 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. 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

---

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 month before the king’s elevation to emperor; three other letters followed in the subsequent year. 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

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, 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, 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

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.\textsuperscript{493} It has been argued, that he might have acted with the acknowledgement, if not the solicitation of the papacy.\textsuperscript{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.\textsuperscript{495}

\textsuperscript{494} M. Fuiano, “I rapporti tra Oriente e Occidente nell’attività culturale di Paolo Diacono della Chiesa Napoletana nel sec. IX,” in \textit{Atti del 3\textsuperscript{o} congresso internazionale di Studi sull’ Alto Medioevo.} (Spoleto: CISAM, 1959) 397-411.
\textsuperscript{495} Qua mvis aute m hi nc et L atine quae da m s cri psis se q uosda m audie ri m, ego t a me n, quia illa non vidi, haec interim Latino danda sermoni conspexi. Cui ergo utraque placet, 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,” \textit{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).\textsuperscript{496} Here the motivation for such a literary gift is described with the terms of debt and obedience, a recurrent dedicatory topos:

\begin{quote}
neque enim inoboediens esse tibi deboe, qui omnibus fratribus meis et proximis debitor sum.\textsuperscript{497}
\end{quote}

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.\textsuperscript{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).\textsuperscript{499} The future pope

\textsuperscript{496} Cf. Laehr, “Die Briefe”, 418-421.
\textsuperscript{497} Anastasius, Epistolae 399, 11-12 and passim.
\textsuperscript{498} About this, see the chapter Theory and practice.
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 I\(^504\) (nr. 9 in the catalogue). The bishopric of Narni, an Umbrian town, was half way between Orte, the earlier


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. 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. 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. 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. 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.
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.\footnote{Miraculum 69, \textit{De Iohanne caeco Romano}, PL 87. 3, 3659-3664.}

The letter accompanying the translation of Saint Stephen (nr. 12 in the catalogue) is dated approximately 874-875 and it is addressed to \textbf{bishop Landulf of Capua}.\footnote{Cf. Laehr, \textit{“Die Briefe”}, 443-445.} 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.\footnote{L. A. Berto, \textit{“Landolfo”}, \textit{DBI} 63, 473-475.} 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.\footnote{Cf. G. Arnaldi, \textit{“Anastasio Bibliotecario a Napoli nell’ 871? Nota sulla tradizione della vita Athanasii Episcopi Neapolitani di Guarimpoto” \textit{La Cultura} (1980): 3-33.} 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 Amphilochos about Anna and Symeon (nr. 11 in the catalogue).\footnote{Most probably those found in the manuscript Augiensis LXXX. Edited by A. P. Orbán, \textit{Sermones in dormitionem assumptionemque beatae Mariae virginis in Latinum translati, ex codicem Augiensi LXXX (saec. IX) (Turhout: Brepols, 2000). Cf. also M. Cupiccia, \textit{“Anastasio Bibliotecario traduttore delle omelie di Reichenau (Aug LXXX)?” \textit{Filologia Mediolatina} 10 (2003), 41-102.}} The other gift, narrating the translation of Saint Stephen is a clearer case: Capua did posses 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
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)\textsuperscript{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,\textsuperscript{515} but it gives us no clue about the interests of the dedicatee.

The gift to Gauderic of Velletri\textsuperscript{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.\textsuperscript{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;

\textsuperscript{515} Cf. my chapter Genres and authors, p. 63-64.
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.\footnote{518}

The last dedication in chronological order is to another southern Italian bishop, \textbf{Aio of Benevento}, and is accompanied by the translation of a \textit{sermo} of Theodore of Stoudios, about Saint Bartholomew (nr. 22 in the catalogue).\footnote{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.\footnote{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.\footnote{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 \textit{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: \textit{eam legendam ecclesiae trade}\footnote{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 \textit{MGH}, was identified as Anastasian by Paolo Chiesa in 1987.\footnote{523} It accompanies a life of Amphilochios of Ikonion (nr. 3 in the catalogue), a translation probably

\footnotesize

\textsuperscript{517} Anastasius, \textit{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,
\textsuperscript{518} Cf. my chapter \textit{Composition and layout}, p. 77-78.
\textsuperscript{519} Cf. Laehr, "Die Briefe", 463.
\textsuperscript{520} Cilento, N. "Aione" \textit{DBI} 1, 534-535.
\textsuperscript{521} See Ulla Westerbergh, \textit{Anastasius Bibliothecarius Sermo Theodori Studitae de sancto Bartholomeo Apostolo} (Stockholm: Almquist and Wiksell, 1963), ix and 65-70.
\textsuperscript{522} Anastasius, \textit{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’ letters\(^ {525}\) (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


\(^{524}\) Chiesa, “Una traduzione inedita,” 894.

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: *Rident cadit Gaudericus supinus in lectulum,/ Zacharias admiratur, docet Anastasius,/ Quando simplex Iob Formosum condempnabat subdolum.*


\(^{528}\) Regesta in Flodoardus Remensis, “Historia Remensis Ecclesiae,” *MGH Scriptores 36*, at pages 323 lines 21-24: Anastasio venerabili abbati ac bibliothecario sancte Romane ecclesie graciarium 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.

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.\textsuperscript{530}

\textbf{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.\textsuperscript{531}


\textsuperscript{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., \textit{La tradition vive. Mélanges d’histoire des textes en l’honneur de Louis Holtz} (Turnhout: 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 suburbanian 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.

Et nunc reges intelligite: erudimini, qui judicatis terram.
(Psalms 2:10)\textsuperscript{534}

Dedicated to Charles the Bald on 25 March 876, Letter 16 of Anastasius introduces the translation of a hagiographic dossier\textsuperscript{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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Manuscript</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Codex</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Paris, BNF lat. 15436</td>
<td>024r-025r</td>
<td>11th c.</td>
<td>– P1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Paris, BNF, lat. 11749</td>
<td>106r-107v</td>
<td>12th c.</td>
<td>– P2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Paris, BNF, lat. 13377</td>
<td>002r-003v</td>
<td>12th c.</td>
<td>– P3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Bourges, BM, 031</td>
<td>183v-184r</td>
<td>12th c.</td>
<td>– Bo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Bruxelles, KBR, 09289 (3223)</td>
<td>187v-188r</td>
<td>12th c.</td>
<td>– Br1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Bruxelles, KBR, 08690-08702 (3213)</td>
<td>065v-077v</td>
<td>12th c.</td>
<td>– Br2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Rouen, BP, O 055 (1047)</td>
<td>113-114</td>
<td>12th c.</td>
<td>– R1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Rouen, BP, U 032 (1388)</td>
<td>133v-135v</td>
<td>12th c.</td>
<td>– R2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>Trier, SB, 1151, IV (965)</td>
<td>040r-040v</td>
<td>13th c.</td>
<td>– T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>Namur BV, 015</td>
<td>039r-040r</td>
<td>first half of 13th c.</td>
<td>– N</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\textsuperscript{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 republikas, 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. Mominisse enim semper oportet mentem principis, quid Spiritus sanctus eum admonet 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 iuscatur Dominus, et per terras 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.

\textsuperscript{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.
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11. Alençon 10, ff. 103v-105r, 12th c. - A
12. Roma ArchSGiovLater. A. 80 (Alias C) 202v-203v, 11th 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 if the passion has no critical edition yet, but one can find the text both in AASS537 and Migne’s PG and PL538. AASS and PG feature the same texts, by the Bollandist Cornelia 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.
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

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 descriptis, 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.

172
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.\textsuperscript{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,\textsuperscript{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

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 Suburra\(^{551}\) 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

---


is also Demetrius of Thessaloniki, the saint with whom the present chapter is concerned, is celebrated on 9 October\textsuperscript{553} - moreover, there was a also constant fusion of all these figures, which makes it difficult to identify historical figures behind their sainthood.\textsuperscript{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.\textsuperscript{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

\begin{footnotes}
\footnoteref{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, \textit{Santa Prassede, Le Chiese di Roma illustrate} 66 (Roma: Marietti, 1961), 12-32.

\footnoteref{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 \textit{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.

\footnoteref{554} Cornelius de Bye, the bollandist who put together the dossier of Demetrius of Thessaloniki, also expressed his hesitations concerning this problem. See \textit{AASS} Oct. vol. 4, 86/PG 116, col. 1165-66.

\end{footnotes}
and liked it. 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? 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.

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. It seems

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 reni, vebis 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 proteget 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.\textsuperscript{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’ 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.\textsuperscript{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. Υποβαλόντων δὲ αὐτῷ τινων περὶ Δημητριῶν, ὡς ἐκεῖνος αἰτίος τῆς τοῦ Λαυάου σφαγῆς γένοιτο, εὐχαίς κατ’ αὐτοῦ ὀπλίσας τὸν Νέστορα, αὐτίκα παροξυνθείς καὶ ὡς ἐθος ἐστὶ τοῖς θεομαχοῦσιν οἰωνισάμενος, ὡς αὐτῷ ἀγαθῶ συμβούλῳ χρησάμενος αὐτῷ, ἤνικαι ἔπι τὸ στάδιον ἣρχετο, λόγχαις αὐτὸν ἐν τοῖς τόποις αὐτοῖς ἐν οἷς καθείρκετο διαφθαρῆναι κελεύει.\textsuperscript{562}

2. Ἡπεί δὲ αὐτῷ τινες λόγους ἔφεσον περὶ τοῦ μάρτυρος Δημητριῶν, ὥστε μεθύον καὶ τῶν θυμῶ καὶ τῇ ἁστείᾳ, καὶ ἀμα νομίζας ὡς οἰωνὸς αὐτῷ γέγονεν τούτῳ ἀγαθῶς ἢ κατὰ τὸ στάδιον ἀπάντηται τοῦ ἀγίου συνάντησες λόγχαις ἐν οἷς καθείρκετο τόποις κελευεί τούτων ἀναιρεθήναι.\textsuperscript{563}

\textsuperscript{560} P. Lemerle, \textit{Les plus anciens recueils des miracles de Saint Démétrius}, 197-198.

\textsuperscript{561} There are two more extant passions extant: one by an anonymous author and the other by Symeon Metaphrastes. See \textit{AASS}, 90-95 and 96-103.

\textsuperscript{562} Delehaye, \textit{Les Légendes greques 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 suggessisset, statim in ira permotus in ipso loco in quo fuit retentus, jussit eum lanceis perforari.\textsuperscript{564}

A possible reason for this abruptness might have been caused by the Greek manuscript tradition: of the two manuscripts used by Delehaye, the \textit{Codex Parisinus} 1485 lacks the passage ως ἐκεῖνος ... τὸν Νέστορα containing the reference to Demetrius’ prayer.\textsuperscript{565} The very hesitant \textit{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-Saracen/internal enemies of the Frankish emperor.

\textsuperscript{564} AASS, October 8-9, vol. 4, 88.
\textsuperscript{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. 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 adiuvare militiam, quatenus vobis intercedentibus Deo ductore et datore populus
As one can expects 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 then 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.\footnote{See Arthur Lapôtre, “L’Europe et le Saint-Siège a l’époque carolingienne. Première partie: le pape Jean VIII (872-882)” in Arthur Lapôtre, Études sur la papauté au IX. siècle (Torino: Bottego d’Erasmo, 1978), vol. 2, 61-423.} 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.\footnote{See P. Guichard “L’Islam e l’Europa” in Storia d’Europa, vol. 3, Il Medioevo, ed. Gherardo Ortalli (Torino: Einaudi, 1994).}

This imminent threat by the pagans forced John VIII to implore Charles’ assistance against the Saracens in several of his surviving letters - all post-datig
this dedication. The first one dates from the autumn of the same year, 876.\footnote{Letter 22, dated 876 Nov. 15 – MGH Epistolae 7, Karolini Aevi 5 (= PL 126, 696, nr. 43).} 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.\footnote{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).} The last call is dated May 877.\footnote{Letter 56, 877 Mai – MGH Epistolae 7, Karolini Aevi 5 (= PL 126, 730, n. 79).} 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.\footnote{See E. Perels, Papst Nikolaus I und Anastasius Bibliothecarius (Berlin: Weidmann, 1920).}

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,\footnote{\textit{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 solatum, et auxilium. Quocirca totis praecordiis, totisque commoti visceribus, cum episcopis et presbyteris ac proceribus, totisque plebis nobis olim commissae religiosi 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}
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

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 dediternini, et ea quae piis vestris auribus pro utilitate
sanctae Romanae Ecclesiae in conspectu vestro retulerint, ad congruum ac opportunun
effectum perveniare, pro sanctis apostolis vestris intercessoribus apud Deum, celeriter
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, contiuauque mentis et corporis salute, omnipotentem Dominum, cujus est salus omnis et vita, totis deprecabimur nisiibus, 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 certantium accipere protestatur (1 Cor. IX). Quapropter, fili charissime, quasi praeasentes, incurvatis genibus et submisso capite, deprecamur et obsecramus, ut ita legitime celsitudo vestra in hujus 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 visibilius 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

---

\(^{581}\) “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 multiplicitas nos vehementer affigit; 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 5, 39-41.


\(^{583}\) “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 principalmente 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.\textsuperscript{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.\textsuperscript{585} For Nicholas I, as attested by his letters,\textsuperscript{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.\textsuperscript{587}


\textsuperscript{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 salvacione anime ac defensione patrie christianorum mortuus est, ideo ab eo pretitulatum premium consequetur.” \textit{MGH Epistolae 5, Karolini Aevi 3}, 601.

\textsuperscript{586} See, among other things, his letters to Charles the Bald and Louis the German (Letter 38, \textit{MGH, Epistolae 6, Karolini Aevi 4}, 309-310), his advice to the Bulgars (Letter 99, \textit{MGH, Epistolae 6, Karolini Aevi 4}, 585) and a fragmentary letter to one of his bishops (Letter 104, \textit{MGH, Epistolae 6, Karolini Aevi 4}, 612-613).

\textsuperscript{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: \textit{Peccator quacunque 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 arctissimo 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). 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. 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. 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. 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).


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 découlait 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.\textsuperscript{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 \textit{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 \textit{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.\textsuperscript{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:

\begin{quote}
\textsuperscript{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 \textit{Königsnah}, 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. \textit{Early Medieval Rome and the Christian West} (Leiden: Brill, 2000), 332.
\end{quote}
Hagiography, then, could be history as much as it could be liturgy, theology, edification and propaganda, whether spiritual, cultic or political. 594

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 Lubac\(^{595}\) 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


\(^{596}\) 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 of against Anastasius’ achievement as a translator.

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. Lefevere, 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,\textsuperscript{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 \textit{Corpus Dionysiacum} illustrate how the papal librarian assists the Frankish emperor Charles the Bald in building the cult of his dynasty’s protector saint;

\begin{footnote}{600}A. Grafton, “Notes from Underground on Cultural Transmission,” 7.\end{footnote}
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.
"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 trone? 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 dionysiacum, 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] INCIPIT PRAEFATIO ANASTASII PRESBYTERI IN PASSIONEM SANCTI DEMETRII AD KAROLUM IMPERATOREM

Domino piissimo et tranquillissimo imperatori Karolo divinitus semper protegendo 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) chrisquis (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 gloriām vestram dextera sua protegat et quandoque a temporali ad aeternum [104r] commutet imperium.

Data octavo kalendas aprīlis indictione nona, anno pontificatus octavo Iohannis summi pontificis quarto vero anno imperii christianissimi imperatoris Karoli primi.  

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 perittissimo Iohanne diacono verae (P3 vestre) fidei puritate ac scientiae claritate notissimo nuper de Greco in Latinum transtuli sermonem. Qui praefatus Iohannes huius martyris in do mo 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 redeolet et splendore miraculorum refugiet, innotui ei per ordinem. Sed quia imperium vestrum tanti agonistae fraudari novit, vobis quoque id ipsum opportune mittere procuravi, quatibus vestra magnitudo cum intercessionibus sanctorum et amicorum Dei istius quoque prece apud Deum (P3 dominantum) obtinere gratiam valeat et perfri mereatur gloria sempiterna. Rex regum et dominus dominantium regnum vestrum dextera sua protegat et de temporali ad aeternum transferat regnum.

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 arbitrantes 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 gloriamur. Porro cum prope stadium pervenisset obtulerunt ei, qui ceperant beatum Demetrium. Audiens autem imperator, quod Christianus esset, fure 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 Lieo introducto invitatbat, 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, singularum 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 phantasiam fecerit elevari, ut aut superans repentina 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 constitum. Neque enim vivere vel ditare me vis qui prosterne preceding 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 reddiebat Lyeum. At ille dignum imperario [105r] iudicio se festinabat ostendere. Cumque facta fuisset congressio mortalem Lyeus acceptum et protonus interemptus est, et extremam fecit imperatorii confusionem. Unde nec ullis pactis et repromissis percurris Nestorem recompensans, mox a solio illo resiliit et tristis ad aulas suas remeavit.

IIIla. 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 interfectoris parvipensum, quidam viri ex fratribus, qui religiosiores erant, noctu latenter summentes in ipsis, in quos proiectum 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 sanitatum 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 seculum. 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 Megalae

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 fabulum sed verum verbum de Iohanne apostolo traditum et memoria custoditum.
Quando enim tyranno defuncto a Pathmo insula reversus est, Ephesus venit hortatus
et in proximas regiones gentium, alibi quidem episcopos constituentes, alibi autem totas
ecclesias adunans, alibi clerum et unumqueque sortitum existentibus ab eius spiritu
signi. Veniens ergo quandam non longe civitatum, cuius et nomen dicunt quidam

402 Grecus ‘magne Rome’ habet ut in emendatoribus invenimus exemplaribus.
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 vitam speram; 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. Accedentem 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 ornamentiis verborum consequens eius notitiam non prius recessit, ut aiunt, quam eum restituerat ecclesiae, dans magnum exemplum penitentibus, veram et magnam notitiam iterum generationis trophæum resurrectionis conspicue.

HUIUS HISTORIAE MEMINIT IOSEBIUS PAMPHILI ET IOHANNES EPISCOPOS CONSTANTINI CIVITATIS.

PHILONIS DE EX CIRCUNCISIONE CREDENTIBUS IN AEGIPTO CHRISTIANI SIMUL ET MONACHIS EX SUPRASCRPTO 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 Mariea posita in geolopho humiliori nimis facilis propter firmitatem [fol. 103v] et aeris temperantiam.
EIUSDEM EX EODEM SERMONE

Unaque 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 voluntarium 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 suspicaciones in allegorii.
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 circunciscione 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 Eclesiastica historia.

FINITUS EST CUM DEO LIBER DIONISII ARIPAGITAE
**THE MAIN PROTAGONISTS**

**Aeneas of Paris** (died on 27\textsuperscript{th} 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 influencial Roman aristocrats of the first part of the ninth century. It was with his support that Anastasius tempted to take control of the papal trone 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 trone.

**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 carrier 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.
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