

Brief Notes on the Greek *Corpus Areopagiticum* in Rome during the Early Middle Ages

Salvatore Lilla

BIBLIOTECA APOSTOLICA VATICANA AND THE AUGUSTINIANUM

I. DID PAUL I REALLY SEND THE GREEK *CORPUS AREOPAGITICUM* TO PEPIN THE SHORT?

According to some scholars (Manitius, Godet, Grabmann, Théry, Chevallier, Loenertz, Mango, Brunhölzl, Cavallo) in 758 Paul I (757–767) sent the Greek text of the *Corpus Areopagiticum* together with other Greek books to the king of the Franks, Pepin the Short.¹ With the sole exception of Siegmund, this view seems now to be a common position.² The only evidence produced in support of it is represented by a passage of a letter of Paul I addressed to Pepin in 758. In the edition of the *MGH*, however, the relevant text runs as follows:

*Diraximus itaque excellentissime [sic] praecllentiae vestrae et libros, quantos reperire potuimus: id est antiphonale et responsale, insimul artem gramaticam [sic] Aristolis [sic], Dionisii Ariopagitis [sic] geometricam, orthografiam [sic], grammaticam, omnes Greco [sic] eloquio scriptas, nec non et horologium nocturnum.*³

¹ M. Manitius, *Geschichte der lateinischen Literatur des Mittelalters* (München, 1911) 325; P. Godet, *DThC* IV, 435; M. Grabmann, *Pseudo-Dionysius Areopagita in lateinischen Übersetzungen des Mittelalters*, in *Beiträge zur Geschichte des christlichen Altertums und der byzantinischen Literatur. Festgabe A. Ehrhard* (Bonn u. Leipzig, 1922) 181; P.G. Théry, *Recherches pour une édition grecque historique du pseudo-Denys*, "NSch" 3 (1929): 361; Ph. Chevallier, *Dionysiaque I* (Bruges, 1937) LXX, *DS* III 319; R.J. Loenertz, *La légende parisienne de S. Denys l'Aréopagite*, *AB* 69 (1951): 235–36; C. Mango, *La culture grecque et l'occident au VIII^e siècle in I problemi dell'occidente nel secolo VIII*, II, *SSCISAM* XX (Spoleto, 1973): 692–93; F. Brunhölzl, *Geschichte der lateinischen Literatur des Mittelalters I* (München, 1975) 411, 412; G. Cavallo, *La cultura italo-greca nella produzione libraria*, in *I Bizantini in Italia* (Milano, 1982) 508.

² A. Siegmund, *Die Überlieferung der griechischen christlichen Literatur in der lateinischen Kirche bis zum zwölften Jahrhundert* (München, 1949) 182–83. His strong suspicions about the veracity of the sending remained isolated and completely ignored.

³ *MGH* Ep.3 (529, 19–22).

It is evident that the words *Dionisii Ariopagitis geometricam, orthografiam, grammaticam* do not suit the famous theologian and mystic, Ps-Dionysius Areopagita, who had written nothing about geometry and grammar.⁴ Most probably Dionysius Areopagita is here confused with two homonymous authors: on the one hand, with the geometer Dionysius or Dionysodorus, who flourished between the third and second centuries BC. (both names seem to point to one and the same person);⁵ and on the other with Dionysius Thrax, the author of a famous *ars grammatica*, who flourished in the second century BC.⁶ In the titles of the works contained in the codex (or in the codices) which Paul I sent to Pepin and indicated by the words *Dionisii Ariopagitis geometricam, orthografiam, grammaticam* Dionysius was given twice as their author. Either Paul I himself, his librarian, or the scribe of the letter wrongly identified these homonymous authors with Dionysius Areopagita. It cannot even be excluded that the works on geometry, orthography and grammar were attributed to Dionysius Areopagita in the manuscript itself. In this case, the wrong attribution would revert either to the scribe of the Greek codex, to its direct model, or to one of its ancestors.⁷

The immediately preceding colon, *artem gramaticam* [sic] *Aristolis* [sic], points to another grammatical work. Here *Aristolis* is like to be a corruption of *Aristoclis*. In fact, a grammarian, Aristocles of Rhodos, a contemporary of Strabo, lived between the first century BC and the first century AD.⁸ Apart from the antiphonale and the horologium, the codices which were sent to Pepin as a gift consisted only in works of grammatical and geometrical content. The names Aristocles and Dionysius stood out clearly in their titles. Of Dionysius Areopagita's works there was not the slightest trace.

⁴ This was also one of Siegmund's main objections: "Was hat auch Aristoteles und Dionysius mit grammatica, geometria etc. zu tun" (*Die Überlieferung*) 183.

⁵ *PWV*, I, 992 (no. 145) on Dionysius the geometer; V, 1, 1005–06 (no. 20) on Dionysodorus the geometer and astronomer.

⁶ *PWV*, I, 977–83 (no. 124).

⁷ The confusion between Dionysius (or Dionysodorus) the geometer, Dionysius Thrax and Dionysius Areopagita is the most natural explanation of the attribution of works on geometry and grammar to the latter. Such wrong attributions are not rare in Greek manuscripts. It is therefore not necessary to suppose, as Siegmund does, that *Aristolis* and *Dionisii Ariopagitis* represent a later interpolation: "Ich vermute, daß wenigstens die beiden Namen Aristolis ... und Dionysius erst später in den Brief eingeschmuggelt wurden, als die Namen bekannter geworden waren" *Die Überlieferung* 182–83. In the Rome of the eighth century, in which Greek culture was still alive (cf. Mango, *La culture* 694, 700–14; Cavallo, *La cultura* 504–08), such names as Aristoteles (a corruption of Aristolis, which is however accepted by Siegmund only with reserve) and Dionysius Areopagita were certainly not unknown: as will be seen in the course of the present paper, this is especially true in the case of the latter.

⁸ *PWV*, I, 935–36 (no. 18).

In order to give stronger support to his view, Chevallier quotes the passage of the letter adopting another punctuation (sometimes his spelling, too, diverges from that of *MGH*): *antiphonale et responsale, insimul artem grammaticam, Aristotelis* [emendation], *Dionysii Ariopagitis, geometricam, orthographiam grammaticam, omnes graeco eloquio scriptas, nec non et horologium nocturnum.*⁹ But if a comma is set after *artem grammaticam* and *Ariopagitis*, the two genitives *Aristotelis* and *Dionysii Ariopagitis* remain completely ungoverned and are apparently inserted as autonomous elements between the two accusatives *artem grammaticam* and *geometricam*. After *direximus ... libros*, however, the accusative *libros* requires as an explanation a series of accusatives, in which the genitives of the authors' names can only be allowed on condition that they are governed by the accusatives of the titles of the works. Chevallier's punctuation breaks off the natural series of accusatives after *artem grammaticam* and takes up it again with *geometricam*, thus originating a logical and stylistic inconsistency. Moreover, it is hardly believable that such outstanding names as Aristotle and Dionysius Areopagita should have been left without any precise indication of their works: due to Aristotle's huge production, at least some titles should have been written; and in the case of Dionysius Areopagita it is surprising not to find any mention of at least some of his theological writings.

In adopting the reading *Aristotelis* as an emendation of *Aristolis*, Chevallier thinks that Aristotle's *Categories* are here hinted at. In this way, he is strongly inclined to regard the words *artem grammaticam, Aristotelis* as referring to the first two disciplines of the trivium, and *geometricam* as pointing to a discipline of the quadrivium. Rhetoric, represented by Dionysius Areopagita, would tower just in the middle, between the first two disciplines of the trivium and the geometry of the quadrivium.¹⁰ This is a fanciful and arbitrary interpretation.

⁹ Chevallier, *Dionysiaca* I, LXX. The same punctuation is adopted by Loenertz (*Loenertz, La légende* 285) and Mango (*La culture* 692).

¹⁰ Chevallier, *Dionysiaca* I, LXX–LXXI. It is hard to regard Dionysius' theological writings mainly as works of rhetoric, as Chevallier openly maintains: "Qui mieux que les ouvrages du pseudo-Aréopagite pouvait apprendre aux clercs à parler de Dieu sans broncher, à saisir la portée de ce qu'on dit de Lui dans l'Écriture et dans l'Église? Apprendre à s'exprimer, comprendre ce qui est exprimé, la rhétorique a tout ce but et n'a pas d'autre but. Il ne paraît pas téméraire de croire que les livres de Denys correspondaient dans la pensée du Pape au troisième des arts libéraux, à la rhétorique propre aux clercs" (*Dionysiaca* I, LXXII).

II. METHODIUS OF SYRACUSE AS A SCRIBE OF A CODEX OF DIONYSIUS' WORKS; THE GREEK *CORPUS AREOPAGITICUM* IN ROME FROM THE LATE SIXTH CENTURY UP TO THE TIME OF METHODIUS' ROMAN EXILE.

In a short but learned paper published in 1979 P. Canart has expounded the role played as a scribe by Methodius of Syracuse, the future patriarch of Constantinople, during his Roman exile of the years 815–821.¹¹ He drew attention especially to a Greek London codex, the Brit. Libr. Add. 36821, dating from the first half of the tenth century¹² and containing the whole *Corpus Areopagiticum*, its scholia and several other pieces which often accompany the text of the works in the Greek manuscript tradition of the *Corpus*¹³ (whereas the text of the *Corpus* and of the additional pieces is written in a minuscule sloping to the right, the script of the marginal scholia, titles and subscriptions is a small capital).¹⁴ The close inspection of the subscription of f. 196^v, in which the codex is reported to be the first manuscript written by Methodius near St. Peter's during his Roman exile,¹⁵ enables Canart to maintain that this subscription does not actually refer to the London codex itself, but simply reproduces faithfully that of an older manuscript, one which was written by Methodius in the second half of the second decade of the ninth century during his stay in Rome.¹⁶ Methodius wrote the manuscript entirely in capital, as can be seen from the technical expression *ἔργον λυτογραφήης* appearing in the subscription of the London codex.¹⁷ The London codex, mostly written in minuscule, is nothing but a later copy of this Methodian manuscript.¹⁸

¹¹ P. Canart, *Le patriarche Méthode de Constantinople copiste à Rome*, in *Palaeographica, diplomatica et archivistica, Studi in onore di Giulio Battelli I* (Roma, 1979) 343–53. Methodius, born in Syracuse, was patriarch of Constantinople from 843 to 847, the year of his death: cf. H.G. Beck, *Kirche und theologische Literatur im byzantinischen Reich* (München, 1959) 496–97. On the period of his stay in Rome cf. Beck, 496–97 and Canart, *Le patriarche* 344.

¹² Canart, *Le patriarche* 346 (with footnote 13), 348.

¹³ These pieces are surveyed by Canart, *Le patriarche* 345, n. 11.

¹⁴ Canart, *Le patriarche* 346, n. 13, 348.

¹⁵ Canart, *Le patriarche* 346–47. The subscription itself is edited by Canart, 346. A reproduction of f. 196^v of the codex, containing the subscription, can be found at the end of Canart's paper (cf. the table set immediately after page 353).

¹⁶ Canart, *Le patriarche* 347: "Le Méthode de ces vers [i.e., of the subscription]—si vers il y a—n'est pas le copiste du Londiniensis lui-même:" 348 "il est bien de plus simple de supposer que nous avons affaire à une subscription récopiée," "le Méthode en exil à Rome et insinué près de Saint-Pierre, ce ne peut être que le futur patriarche."

¹⁷ Canart, *Le patriarche* 348: "Les *γράμματα λιτά* désignent l'écriture onciale ... le modèle du Londiniensis était, lui, transcrit en onciale."

¹⁸ Canart, *Le patriarche* 348.

A conclusion can be easily drawn from the subscription of the London codex: towards the end of the second decade of the ninth century a Greek manuscript of the *Corpus Areopagiticum* written by Methodius himself in a capital script and furnished with scholia and several other additional pieces was found in Rome. This codex, in turn, was of course a copy of an even older manuscript of the *Corpus*. Methodius either found his model in Rome or brought it from Constantinople. The former possibility seems to be more probable. The presence of the Greek *Corpus Areopagiticum* in Rome during the seventh and eighth centuries is an ascertained fact; and it would not even be too hazardous to trace it back to the sixth century, i.e., to the time of John of Scythopolis and Gregory the Great. Although Stiglmayr and Chevallier have dealt with this question at some length,¹⁹ it may be worth while to sketch it again briefly, adding some new contributions and referring as exactly as possible to the editions of the safest pieces of evidence as well as to the most recent edition of the Greek *Corpus Areopagiticum*. This way of proceeding should make the task of eventual readers easier.²⁰

1) In a passage of his prologue to the *Corpus Areopagiticum* composed towards the end of the first half of the sixth century John of Scythopolis²¹ reports that a Roman deacon named Peter had assured him that all works of the divine Dionysius were indeed kept in Rome in the library τῶν ἱερῶν: διάκονός δέ τις Ῥωμαῖος. Πέτρος ὄνομα, διηγήσατό μοι πάντα τὰ τοῦ θεοῦ Διονυσίου σῶξέσθαι κατὰ τὴν ἐν Ῥώμῃ τῶν ἱερῶν βιβλιοθήκην ἀνατεθειμένα.²² If this witness really possesses some historical value and does not simply serve an apologetic purpose, the presence in Rome of a

¹⁹ J. Stiglmayr, *Das Aufkommen der pseudo-dionysischen Schriften und ihr Eindringen in die christliche Literatur bis zum Lateranconcil 649*, IV. Jahresbericht des öffentlichen Privatgymnasiums der *Stella Maturina* zu Feldkirch (Feldkirch, 1895) 70–71, 78–79, 84–86; Chevallier, *Dionysiaca* I, LXV–LXXIII, DS III 318–19.

²⁰ The references given by Stiglmayr and Chevallier (cf. the preceding note) are not quite clear: Stiglmayr does not refer to Mansi's edition of the councils and to PG 3; and Chevallier usually refers to his own edition in *Dionysiaca*, where Dionysius' Greek sentences are printed together with the corresponding Latin medieval translations.

²¹ That John of Scythopolis and not Maximus the Confessor is indeed the author of the prologue as well as of the majority of the scholia on the *Corpus Areopagiticum* has been definitively demonstrated by B.R. Suchla, *Die sogenannten Maximus-Scholien des Corpus Dionysiacum Areopagiticum*, NAWG philol. histor. Kl. 1980, 3, 33–66; *Die Überlieferung des Prologs des Johannes von Scythopolis zum griechischen Corpus Dionysiacum Areopagiticum*, NAWG philol. histor. Kl. 1984, 4, 177–88 (on the prologue cf. for instance 177 with footnote 1).

²² PG 4, 20 D 3–6. The exact meaning of τὴν ... τῶν ἱερῶν βιβλιοθήκην is uncertain: was it the papal library itself or simply the library of some Greek Roman monastery? Could it not perhaps be the library of the basilica (or monastery) of Sts John and Paul, which had originally been the basilica Pammachii or Bizantis and then received the new title SS. Iohannis et Pauli in the early sixth century? On both titles cf. for instance EC VI 633.

Greek *Corpus Areopagiticum* already before the middle of the sixth century might be regarded as possible.²³

2) Whether or not the Greek *Corpus Areopagiticum* was found in Rome towards the middle of the sixth century, a safer witness about its eventual presence in this city in the last decade of the same century is provided by Gregory the Great. In chapter 12 of his homily XXXIV on the gospels, dating from 592 or 593,²⁴ Gregory the Great points out that:

Dionysius Areopagita, the ancient and venerable Father, is reported to say that the "divine gifts" are sent to the outside, either visibly or invisibly, from the classes of the lower angels, so that the latter may perform their own task, since either the angels or the archangels come down to bring assistance to men. In fact the higher classes never leave the inmost recesses: the pre-eminent angels perform no task whatever in the outside (*feritur vero Dionysius Areopagita, antiquus videlicet et venerabilis pater, dicere quod ex minorum angelorum agminibus foris ad explendum ministerium vel visibiliter vel invisibiliter mittuntur, scilicet quia ad humana solatia aut angeli aut archangeli veniunt. Nam superiora illa agmina ab intimis numquam recedunt, quoniam ea quae praeeminent usum exterioris ministerii numquam habent*).²⁵

Gregory condenses here Dionysius' views as set forth in such passages as *Cael. Hier.* VII, 1 (27, 8–10 Heil)²⁶ ἡ πρώτη—ἰδρυῖσθαι, VII, 1 (28, 6–10) ἡ δὲ τῶν ὑψηλοτάτων—ἰδρυένον (cf. Gregory's *numquam recedunt*), VII, 2 (28, 25) πάσης ὑφέσεως—ὑψηλοτέρας, VII, 2 (29, 3–5) τὴν ἐπὶ τὰ χεῖρω—ἀμικεστάτην ἰδρυσιν (cf. Gregory's *usum exterioris ministerii numquam habent*), VII, 3 (30, 18–19) τῷ—ἀμέσως ἀνατείνεσθαι, VII, 4 (31, 7–8) περὶ θεὸν—ἐστηκυῖα, IX, 2 (36, 21–22) δι' ἀγγέλων—ἀναφαίνουσα (cf. Gregory's *visibiliter*), IX, 2 (37, 2–4) περὶ τὸ ἐμφανέστερον—τῷ κρυφίῳ ... πλησιάζουσιν (cf. Gregory's *visibiliter, intimis*), IX, 2 (37, 8–10) τὴν δὲ τῶν ἀρχῶν—ἐπιστατεῖν, IX, 3 (38, 14) οἱ—ἱεραρχοῦντες ἄγγελοι, IX, 4 (38, 22–39, 5) πρὸς τοῦ—ἀποκαλυφθείσης, IX, 4 (39, 12–13) πάντας ἀνθρώπους—διανειμάσης, IX, 4 (39, 22–24) πάντας δὲ—ἀνατείνοντας, X, 1 (40, 8–11) πρὸς τῆς τρίτης—ἀνάγεται, XIII, 2 (44, 5–6) τινὰ δὲ—

²³ Chevallier *DS* III 319 still attributes the prologue to Maximus; moreover, what he says about this passage ("... Maxime le Confesseur, qui lors de son voyage à Rome ... a vu un tel codex entre les mains du diacre Pierre") finds no direct support in its text, apart from the "diacre Pierre."

²⁴ On these dates cf. Chevallier. *DS* III 319 and R. Était, *Gregorius Magnus Homiliae in Evangelia* [Corpus Christianorum Series Latina 141] (Turnhout, 1999) V. According to the latter, Gregory did not preach after the year 592–593.

²⁵ *PL* 76. 1254B 2–10; Était, *Gregorius* 312, 336–43. This passage is quoted by Stiglmayr, *Das Aufkommen* 70, and Chevallier. *Dionysiaca* I, LXVI.

²⁶ PTS 36, Berlin-New-York, 1991.

ἀγγέλων, XIII, 2 (44, 10–11) τῶν ἡμῖν—δυνάμεων, XIII, 4 (46, 23–24) δι' ἐνός—ἀγγέλων, XIII, 4 (48, 26) ὁ τὴν καθάρσιν—ἄγγελος.²⁷

From Gregory's expression *fertur* (312, 1) one might infer that he did not learn Dionysius' doctrine of angels from a direct reading of *De Caelesti Hierarchia*, and that his knowledge of it was second-hand, being based only on some oral or written report. But what he says immediately afterwards betrays his intimate acquaintance with Dionysius' text: it does not derive simply from a report, but presupposes a Latin translation of a precise passage of *De Caelesti Hierarchia*. Thwarting a possible objection—based upon a literal interpretation of Is. 6:6–7—to the doctrine which he has just set forth, he makes it clear that the angel who was sent to Isaiah to purify him with fire was not a Seraph, but a lower angel who had been entrusted with the task of "burning" and had received the name "Seraph" just because "burning" is the main property of the Seraphs (*cui rei illud videtur esse contrarium quod Isaias dicit: Volavit ad me unus de Seraphin, et in manu eius calculus, quem forcipe tulerat de altari, et tetigit os meum* [Is. 6:6–7] ... *quia enim ut peccata locutionis incendat, de altari angelus carbonem portat, seraphim vocatur, quod incendium dicitur*).²⁸ It is exactly this trend of thought which underlies sections 1–2 of chapter XIII of *De Caelesti Hierarchia* (43, 20–44, 11): Gregory's words which immediately follow the quotation from Isaias have their exact counterpart in Dionysius' τῇ τῶν Σεραφίμ ὁμωνυμία κληθῆναι διὰ τὴν πρῆστιόν τῶν εἰρημένων ἀμαρτιῶν ἀναίρεσιν καὶ τὴν τοῦ καθαρθέντος ἐπὶ τὴν θεῖαν ὑπακοὴν ἀναζωπύρησιν, *Cael. Hier.* XIII, 2 (44, 7–9).²⁹

A Latin translation of *De Caelesti Hierarchia* XIII, 1–2 was therefore at Gregory's disposal when he wrote chapter 12 of homily XXXIV. Just before writing this homily, he may well have begged, as Stiglmayr and Chevallier think,³⁰ some skilled interpreter to translate and explain some passages of *De Caelesti Hierarchia* VII, IX, X, XIII which could eventually serve as a support for his point. If this were the case, the *fertur* in 312, 1 would refer to the interpreter's extensive translation or comment;³¹ in chapter 12 of homily

²⁷ It is far too easy to refer simply to chapters VII, IX, XIII of *De Caelesti Hierarchia*, as Stiglmayr and Chevallier do: cf. *Das Aufkommen* 70, *DS* III 319.

²⁸ *PL* 76, 1254 B 10–C 3; Était. *Gregorius* 312, 343–49.

²⁹ Unfortunately this further correspondence escaped both Stiglmayr, *Das Aufkommen* 70, and Chevallier, *Dionysiaca* I, LXVI, *DS* III 319. The words εἰρημένων ἀμαρτιῶν are badly rendered *peccata locutionis*.

³⁰ Stiglmayr, *Das Aufkommen* 71, Chevallier, *DS* III 319.

³¹ On this interpretation of *fertur* cf. Stiglmayr, *Das Aufkommen* 70–71: "... so möchten wir lieber das 'Ferrur' so erklären, daß Gregor damit nur seine Unkunde vom griechischen Text des Buches ausdrücken wollte. Er musste sich für die ganze Stelle, die er aus der himml. Hierarchie heranzieht, eben auf andere verlassen."

XXXIV Gregory first summarized it briefly, and then reproduced rather faithfully a passage of it.

The text of the passages of *De Caelesti Hierarchia* which Gregory had translated for himself was obviously contained in a Roman codex of the Greek *Corpus Areopagiticum* (Gregory composed and held his homily in Rome). This codex could be either the manuscript at which John of Scythopolis hints (if it was really found in Rome) or a manuscript which Gregory himself may have brought from Constantinople, where he had been ambassador from 575 to 581 (the latter possibility is suggested by Chevallier).³²

3) The Greek *Corpus Areopagiticum* did not vanish from Rome in the course of the sixth century. An evident proof is provided by the Greek acts of the Lateran council of October 649, which, as Riedinger's researches have unquestionably demonstrated, are not a translation from a Latin original draft, but are themselves the original draft, being almost entirely based on Greek materials formerly collected by the predecessor of Pope Martin I (649–655), the Greek Pope Theodor I (642–649), under whose pontificate the council could not take place.³³ As Riedinger points out, the Latin Pope Martin I and his Latin bishops certainly spoke Latin during the séances, even when they quoted long passages of Greek patristic writings;³⁴ but these passages were taken from Greek materials previously prepared, and purposely translated for the Pope and the conciliar Fathers either during the séances themselves or just before them.³⁵ This applied also to Dionysius' quotations which must have been taken from a Greek codex of the *Corpus*.

³² DS III 318–19.

³³ R. Riedinger, *Aus den Akten der Lateran-Synode von 649*, BZ 69 (1976) 37 "Dagegen ist es sehr wahrscheinlich, daß Martin die Akten dieser Synode aus dem Nachlaß seines Vorgängers Theodor übernommen und mit seiner eigenen lateinischen Autorität beglaubigt hat"; *Griechische Konzilsakten auf dem Wege ins lateinische Mittelalter*, AHC 9 (1977) 256: "Der griechische Akten-text dürfte aber bereits unter Papst Theodor ... 'vorgefertigt' worden sein, er ist keine Niederschrift von Verhandlungen, sondern ein vorgegebenes Textbuch für eine Synode, die vermutlich noch unter Papst Theodor geplant war, dann aber wegen des vorzeitigen Todes dieses Papstes verschoben werden mußte."

³⁴ Riedinger, BZ 69 (1976) 29 "... ihre Verhandlungssprache das Lateinische war," 37 "... es ist ebenso unvorstellbar ... daß Martin ... mit seinen Bischöfen und Beamten griechisch gesprochen habe"; AHC 9 (1977) 255 "... daß Papst Martin I auf dieser Synode mit seinen Bischöfen griechisch disputiert hätte, wir niemand annehmen wollen."

³⁵ Riedinger AHC 9 (1977) 256: "Deshalb wird man als äußerstes Zugeständnis an den 'Realitätsanspruch' der Akten annehmen dürfen, daß man ihm [i.e., the Pope] und seinen Bischöfen den lateinischen Text an eben den Tagen vorlas, welche die lateinische Überlieferung als Daten der fünf Sitzungen angibt." Riedinger points out also that the complete Latin text of the acts of the Council was mostly a later version of the original Greek draft: cf. BZ 69 (1976) 37, AHC 9 (1977) 254–55, *Grammatiker-Gelehrsamkeit in den Akten der Lateran-Synode 649*, JÖB 25 (1976) 57.

According to the Greek acts, in his dispute with the Monothelites, which characterizes the Lateran council, Pope Marrian I appeals to Dionysius' authority as well: he gets a codex of the *Corpus* taken from the papal library and produced to the assembly,³⁶ and orders some passages of it to be read aloud;³⁷ and does not refrain from quoting some excerpts or short sentences personally.³⁸ The bishop of Cagliari Deusdedit behaves in the same way.³⁹

4) In his long epistle sent to the ecumenical Constantinopolitan council of 680, Pope St. Agathon (678–681) quotes, among many other passages taken from works of patristic authors, a passage of chapter II of *De Divinis Nominibus* as well.⁴⁰ The same passage is quoted in the Greek acts of the Lateran council.⁴¹

5) Chevallier is inclined to bring a quotation from chapter I of *De Ecclesiastica Hierarchia* in canon II of the seventh ecumenical council of 787

³⁶ I.D. Mansi, *Sacrorum Conciliorum Nova et Amplissima Collectio* X (Florentiae 1764), 976E 977A τὴν βιβλὸν τοῦ ἁγίου Διονυσίου ἐπισκόπου Ἀθηνῶν οἱ καθυπουργοῦντες ταῖς πραττόμενοις ἀγαγέτωσαν ... κατὰ τὴν κέλευσιν τῆς ὑμετέρας μακαριότητος μετὰ χεῖρας ἔχον κομίσας τῆς ἱεράς ὑμῶν βιβλιοθήκης τὴν τοῦ ἁγίου Διονυσίου βιβλὸν πρὸς τὸ παριστάμενον ... ἡ βιβλὸς τοῦ ἁγίου Διονυσίου ληφθήτω. Latin translation in Chevallier, *Dionysiaca* I, LXVI–LXVII.

³⁷ Mansi, *Sacrorum* X 977 B καὶ τὸ λοιπὸν—πεπολιτευμένος *Ep.* IV (161, 7–10 Ritter, PTS 36)—Latin text in Chevallier, *Dionysiaca* I, LXVII: 1100D διακέκριται δὲ—θεοῦ λόγος *Div. Nom.* II, 5 (130, 5–11 Suchla PTS 33, Berlin-New-York, 1990); 1100E ἔστι δὲ—συνιστάμενον *Ep.* 4 (160, 2–161, 2). The last two passages (Mansi X 1100D, 1100E) belong to the long patristic florilgium which in the Greek acts is reported to have been read aloud by order of the Pope.

³⁸ Mansi, *Sacrorum* X 968 B ἀγνοοῦμεν—οὐσίαν *Div. Nom.* II, 9 (133, 8–11); 968 B–C καὶ ὑπὲρ ἄνθρωπον—συνιστάμενον *Ep.* 4 (160, 11–161, 2); 984 D οὐτε κατὰ θεόν—κατὰ ἄνθρωπον *Ep.* 4 (161, 8–9); 985 A τὸ πάντων καινῶν καινότατον *Div. Nom.* II, 10 (135, 7); 985 A–B ἐν ταῖς φυσικοῖς—ὑπερέχων *Div. Nom.* II, 10 (135, 7–9); 985 B καὶ πάντων καινῶν καινότατον *Div. Nom.* II, 10 (135, 7). Latin text of the last four passages (Mansi X 984 D, 985A, 985 A–B, 985 B) in Chevallier, *Dionysiaca* I, LXIX; cf. also Stiglmayr, *Das Aufkommen* 85.

³⁹ Mansi, *Sacrorum* X 988 B ἀλλ' ὅτι—καινότατον *Div. Nom.* II, 10 (135, 7); 988D ἀνδρῶθέντος—πεπολιτευμένος *Ep.* 4 (171, 9–10); cf. also Stiglmayr, *Das Aufkommen* 86.

⁴⁰ Mansi, *Sacrorum* XI (Florentiae, 1765), 264 C–D διακέκριται δὲ—θεοῦ λόγος *Div. Nom.* II, 6 (130, 5–11); cf. Chevallier, *Dionysiaca* I, LXX, DS III 319. The interest of Gregory the Great, Martin I and St. Agathon for Dionysius Areopagita is emphasized by Anastasius the librarian: priusquam Romani pontifices, Gregorius videlicet Martinus et Agatho, dictorum eius conscriptis suis mentionem fecerint ... Gregorius scilicet in homelia capituli evangelici de centum ovibus et decem dragmis, Martinus in synodo [sic] sua, quam Romae contra hereticos [sic] celebravit, et Agatho in epistola, quam ad sextam synodum [sic] destinavit MGH *Ep. Karol.* Aevi 5 (433, 4–8), *PL* 129 (740 D), *PL* 122 (1027–1028), Chevallier, *Dionysiaca* I, LXXVI.

⁴¹ Cf. above, n. 37.

(Nicaea II)⁴² into connection with Pope Hadrian I (772–795).⁴³ It is unlikely, however, that this quotation should have been taken from a Roman manuscript of the Greek *Corpus*. Such an assumption is unnecessary, since manuscripts of Dionysius' works were certainly available in Nicaea at that time. It could prove to be true only supposing that the Pope sent the definitive text of the canons of Nicaea II from Rome.

6) In a letter of 791 addressed to Charlemagne, Pope Hadrian I (772–795) quotes in Latin translation a passage of the tenth epistle of Dionysius as well as passages of *De Caelesti Hierarchia*.⁴⁴ These passages must have been translated into Latin from Greek just on that occasion—the same had happened with the passages of *De Caelesti Hierarchia* taken into account by Gregory the Great in chapter 12 of homily XXXIV and with the passages quoted or read in the course of the Lateran council.⁴⁵ There is no evidence of the existence of Latin translations of the whole *Corpus Areopagiticum* earlier than the versions prepared by Hilduin (835 ca) and Scotus Eriugena (858 ca).⁴⁶

From the end and perhaps also from the middle of the sixth century up to the end of the second decade of the ninth century, Greek manuscripts of the *Corpus Areopagiticum* were thus found in Rome, and were perhaps also copied. Towards 820 Methodius' codex, entirely written in a capital script, represented the last ring of this chain. It cannot even be excluded that this manuscript tradition went on throughout the ninth and perhaps also in the tenth century.⁴⁷ As will be shown presently, the work of Anastasius the librarian on Dionysius throws some new light on this tradition.

⁴² Mansi, *Sacrorum* XIII (Florentiae, 1767), 419 $\text{C} \ \alpha\upsilon\sigma\iota\alpha \ \gamma\alpha\rho \ \tau\eta\varsigma \ \kappa\alpha\theta'\eta\mu\acute{\alpha}\varsigma \ \iota\epsilon\rho\alpha\rho\chi\acute{\iota}\alpha\varsigma \ \epsilon\sigma\tau\iota \ \tau\acute{\alpha} \ \theta\epsilon\omega\lambda\alpha\rho\acute{\epsilon}\delta\omicron\tau\alpha \ \lambda\acute{o}\gamma\iota\alpha$, *Ecd. Hier.* I, 4 (67, 6–7 Heil, PTS 36).

⁴³ *Dionysiaca* I, LXII.

⁴⁴ *MGH* Ep. 5 (32, 26–33, 4), cf. Chevallier, *Dionysiaca* I, LXXI–LXXIII, *DS* III 319. The two passages are *Ep.* 10 (208, 3–11) $\tau\iota \ \theta\alpha\upsilon\mu\alpha\sigma\tau\acute{o}\nu\text{---}\theta\epsilon\acute{o}\varsigma$ and *Cael. Hier.* 13 (8, 15–9, 2) $\kappa\alpha\iota \ \tau\acute{\alpha}\varsigma \ \epsilon\iota\rho\eta\mu\acute{\epsilon}\nu\alpha\varsigma\text{---}\nu\omicron\eta\tau\eta\varsigma \ \delta\iota\alpha\delta\acute{o}\sigma\epsilon\omega\varsigma$. The Latin translation, however, is rather free and not exempt from misunderstandings.

⁴⁵ Cf. above, sections 2, 3 and notes 25, 28, 37, 38, 39.

⁴⁶ What Styglmayr says about the time of Gregory the Great ("Eine vollständige Übersetzung der Dionysiuschriften hat damals schwelich existiert," *Das Aufkommen* 71) may apply to the end of the eighth century as well.

⁴⁷ The latter assumption would be true if the London codex Brit. Libr. Add. 36821 of the first half of the 10th century could be proved to have been written in Rome. Canart, *Le patriarche* 353, n. 38 leaves this question unresolved: "Pour le Londiniensis, l'analyse codicologique reste à faire." I do not feel competent to pursue this enquiry myself. One argument in favour of the Roman origin of the Londiniensis might perhaps be represented by its rather close textual kinship with the Florence codex Laurent. Conv. Soppr. gr. 202 of the ninth century, which could perhaps be regarded as hailing from Rome, an hypothesis which is not entirely excluded by Canart, *Le patriarche* 353, n. 36 and is explicitly supported by Cavallo, *La cultura* 507. A

III. ANASTASIUS THE LIBRARIAN AND THE GREEK *CORPUS AREOPAGITICUM*.

In his dedicatory letter of 25 March 875 addressed to Charles the Bald and prefixed to his revised edition of Eriugena's version of the *Corpus Areopagiticum*, Anastasius the librarian confesses to have found this version very literal and obscure;⁴⁸ for this reason, he had eagerly been looking for a commentator or commentary of Dionysius' works. His laborious search did not prove to be fruitless, since he at last came across a collection of scholia, which he had already had occasion to see during his stay in Constantinople:⁴⁹

*quapropter ipse merito anxius coepi sedulus querere, si forte repperiri potuisset praeceptor quisquam vel aliquod scriptum, quo enucleante pater noster liquidius illucesceret, et, quia iam per interpretis industriam linguae nostrae fuerit traditus, nobis quoque patulus redderetur perfectius intellectibus. Tum ecce repente parathesis sive scholia in eum, quae Constantino poli positus videram, ad manus venire, quibus utcumque interpretatis mihi aliquantulum magis emicuit.*⁵⁰

After declaring to have written his Latin translation of these scholia on the margins of the leaves of the codex containing his improved edition of Eriugena's translation,⁵¹ he points out that they go back to two different authors: whereas those marked by a cross are reported to have been written by Maximus the Confessor, the remaining ones are attributed to John of Scythopolis,

*ipsorum autem scoliorum seu paratheseon quaecumque in calce sui vivificae crucis signum habent, a beato Maximo Confessore ac monacho inventa esse narrantur; cetera vero sancti Iohannis Scythopolitani antistitis esse feruntur.*⁵²

Grabar, *Les manuscrits grecs enluminés de provenance italienne* (Paris, 1972) 35 no 12 presents the Florence codex simply as "Italian" (on this question cf. however also below, n. 54). Evidence about the textual relationship between the Laurentianus Conv. Soppr. gr. 202 (I) and the Brit. Libr. Add. 36821 (B.) can be found in S. Lilla, *Ricerche sulla tradizione manoscritta del De divinis nominibus dello ps. Dionigi l'Areopagita*, ASNSP Classe di Lettere, Storia e Filosofia, Serie II 34 (1965) 316–19.

⁴⁸ MGH Ep. Karol. Aevi 5 (431, 29–432, 9), PL 129 (739 D–740 A), PL 122 (1027–28), Chevallier, *Dionysiaca* I LXXIV n. 3. This passage is partly reproduced by Manitius, *Geschichte* 679.

⁴⁹ Anastasius had been sent to Constantinople in 869, by order of emperor Ludwig II (850–875) and Pope Hadrian II (867–872): cf. Manitius, *Geschichte* 679.

⁵⁰ MGH Ep. Karol. Aevi 5 (432, 9–14), PL 129 (740 A–B), PL 122 (1027–28).

⁵¹ MGH Ep. Karol. Aevi 5 (432, 15–19), PL 129 (740 B), PL 122 (1027–28).

⁵² MGH Ep. Karol. Aevi 5 (432, 19–22), PL 129 (740 B–C), PL 122 (1027–28). This passage is also quoted by Suchla, NAWG philol. histor. Kl. 1980, 3, 37 n. 33.

A careful examination of these passages of Anastasius makes it possible to come to the following conclusions:

1) Anastasius discovered the Greek manuscript which he used as a basis for his translation of the scholia in Rome, and not in Constantinople, as Manitius and Suchla seem to be inclined to believe.⁵³ In fact, he writes his dedicatory epistle from Rome, and speaks of his looking over the scholia in Constantinople as of a remote and casual event (he uses purposely the simple perfects *coe pi, venere, emicuit* as a foil to the pluperfect *videram*). Had he brought a manuscript with the scholia from Constantinople, he could hardly have said *anxius coe pi sedulus quaerere, si forte repperiri potuisset ... ecce repente parathesis sive scholia in eum ... ad manus venere*: he pursued his search in Rome.

2) Most probably, the scholia were written on the margins of the leaves of this Roman codex, just as in Methodius' codex, of which the London codex Brit. Libr. Add. 36821 is a copy. Anastasius followed the same proceeding in the Latin manuscript containing his improved edition of Eriugena's version.

3) These scholia included both those written by Maximus the Confessor and those going back to John of Scythopolis.

From the first conclusion it is easy to infer that more than fifty years after Methodius' departure, i.e., towards 875, when Anastasius wrote his dedicatory epistle to Charles the Bald, at least a Greek codex of the *Corpus Areopagiticum* furnished with scholia was still found in Rome, and that therefore the Greek manuscript tradition of the *Corpus* did not die out completely in this city in the course of the ninth century. The best evidence in favour of such an assumption would be provided by a Florence codex of the *Corpus*, the Laurent. Conv. Soppr. gr. 202 of the ninth century, written in a capital script sloping to the right and furnished with scholia, if specialists in Byzantine book illumination, codicology and palaeography could definitively prove its Roman origin, proposed by Cavallo.⁵⁴

⁵³ Manitius, *Geschichte* 687: "Anastasius ... berührt seinen Scholientfund, den er in Konstantinopel gemacht habe"; Suchla, *NAWG philol. histor.* KI. 1980. 3. 37: "daß er in Konstantinopel Paratheses oder Scholia zum CD in die Hand bekommen habe; daß er diese Paratheses oder Scholia so, wie er sie im Griechischen vorgefunden habe, ins Lateinische übersetzt habe."

⁵⁴ Cf. above, n. 47. A thorough inquiry should proceed in the direction indicated by Weitzmann and Grabar, who drew attention to the kinship between the illumination of the Laur. Conv. Soppr. gr. 202 and that of a Milan codex of Gregory of Nazianzus, the Ambros. 1014 (E 49–50 inf.) of the ninth century, whose Roman origin is regarded as very probable by Cavallo: cf. K. Weitzmann, *Die byzantinische Buchmalerei des IX. und X. Jahrhunderts* (Berlin, 1935) 81, A. Grabar, *Les manuscrits grecs enluminés de provenance italienne* (Paris, 1972) 35 (no 12), G. Cavallo, *La cultura 507 and Funzione e strutture della maiuscola greca tra i secoli VIII–XI*, in *La paléographie grecque et byzantine* (Paris, 1977) 101–02. Codicological and graphic pecu-

The double authorship of the scholia witnessed by the Greek codex discovered by Anastasius brings us back to the seventh century, i.e., to Maximus the Confessor and to his intervention on the *Corpus*. It is highly probable that Maximus prepared a new manuscript of the *Corpus* by adding some scholia of his own to the pre-existent scholia of John of Scythopolis (but from earlier studies, and more recently from Suchla's thorough researches, it emerges that his own contributions must not have been very relevant).⁵⁵ He either brought this new manuscript to Rome towards 649⁵⁶ or got it prepared in Rome itself on occasion of the Lateran council, in which he must have played an active role.⁵⁷ In the latter case, he may have taken a Roman codex of the Greek *Corpus* as a basis.⁵⁸ This new codex of Maximus—either brought to Rome or prepared there—became in fact a new up-to-date edition of the *Corpus*, an edition which, in the intention of its author, was meant to enrich the pre-existing edition of the sixth century going back to the circle of John of Scythopolis.⁵⁹ If this is true, it is solely from Maximus' codex that the Roman manuscript tradition of the Greek *Corpus* furnished with scholia developed in the course of the seventh, eighth and ninth centuries. Methodius transcribed the text of the *Corpus* in his own manuscript

liarities of both manuscripts should also be taken into account. For a description of the Laurent. Conv. Soppr. gr. 202 and Ambros. 1014 (E 49–50 inf.) cf. respectively E. Rostagno - N. Festa, *Indice dei codici greci laurenziani non compresi nel catalogo del Bandini*, SIFC I (1893) 171 and Ae. Martini - D. Bassi, *Catalogus codicum Graecorum Bibliothecae Ambrosianae*, II (Mediolani, 1906) 1084–86; on the former cf. also G. Vitelli - C. Paoli, *Collezione fiorentina di faksimili paleografici greci e latini* (Firenze, 1884–1897) tab. XII (where, however, 102 should be corrected into 202).

⁵⁵ Cf. especially Suchla, NAWG philol. histor. Kl. 1980, 3, 56–60 (survey of former studies 56–59). Suchla herself does not exclude that some scholia were written by Maximus, 59–60: "Aus der Menge der restlichen Scholien können mit einiger Wahrscheinlichkeit die Scolien als Maximus zugehörig gelten, die in der lateinischen Handschrift Berlin Phill. 1668 mit einem Kreuz als solche gekennzeichnet sind" (Suchla adopts then Anastasius' distinction; for the reference to this text cf. above, n. 52).

⁵⁶ That Maximus brought Greek manuscripts to Rome is pointed out by Riedinger, AHC 9 (1977) 257: "Maximos der Bekenner ... und die Mönche ... führten darüber hinaus Bücher mit sich."

⁵⁷ Cf. on this point e. g. Stiglmayr, *Das Aufkommen* 79, Riedinger AHC 9 (1977) 258 n. 14, Cavallo, *La cultura* 505.

⁵⁸ Even admitting that Maximus' model was not his own codex, but a Roman codex—which is by no means sure—nothing can be said about the exact identity of the latter: to suppose that it was the codex of Gregory the Great or that kept in the papal library (cf. above, n. 36) is nothing but a simple guess, which is supported by no direct evidence.

⁵⁹ Cf. especially B.R. Suchla, *Eine Redaktion des griechischen Corpus Dionysiacum im Umkreis des Johannes von Skythopolis, des Verfassers vom Prolog und Scholien*, NAWG philol. histor. Kl. 1985, 4, and the preface of her edition of *De divinis nominibus*, PTS 33 (Berlin-New York, 1990) 55–57, 61–63, 66–69.

either from Maximus' original manuscript or from one of its copies. It is reasonable to suppose that the Greek codex with double scholia discovered by Anastasius towards 875 was either Maximus' original edition, Methodius' direct model, an ancestor of this model, Methodius' codex, or a copy of it, which was in any case earlier than the London codex Brit. Libr. Add. 36821—dating, it will be remembered,⁶⁰ from the first half of the ninth century. If the Laurent. Conv. Soppr. gr. 202 was really written in Rome, it would also become part of this survey.

CONCLUSION

We are thus faced with the existence in Rome of a Greek manuscript tradition of the *Corpus Areopagiticum*, stretching throughout the High Middle Ages at least up to the second half of the ninth century.⁶¹ This tradition is well attested in the middle of the seventh century, as the witnesses provided by the Greek acts of the Lateran council of 649 clearly show; and it probably goes back to the time of Gregory the Great, as chapter 12 of his homily XXXIV seems to suggest. The possibility of shifting its origin backwards up to the end of the first half of the sixth century rests completely, as has been seen, on the reliability of John of Scythopolis' witness.⁶²

⁶⁰Cf. above, the beginning of section II, with n. 12.

⁶¹ Siegmund's scepticism about the possible presence of a codex of the *Corpus* in the papal library of the eighth century, man könne auch fragen, ob der Papst selbst schon den ganzen Dionysius besaß" Siegmund, *Die Überlieferung* 183, seems therefore to be groundless.

⁶² I am grateful that Father R. Dodaro, Vice-President of the Institutum Patristicum Augustinianum in Rome, has kindly helped with the English text.