

ANALECTA
BOLLANDIANA

REVUE CRITIQUE D'HAGIOGRAPHIE

TOME 100

MÉLANGES

offerts à

Baudouin de GAIFFIER

et

François HALKIN

B 1040 BRUXELLES
SOCIÉTÉ DES BOLLANDISTES
24, BOULEVARD SAINT-MICHEL

1982



HAS BEDE'S VERSION OF THE
« PASSIO S. ANASTASII »
COME DOWN TO US IN « BHL » 408 ?

At the end of the *Ecclesiastical History of the English People* Bede inserted a short autobiography that included a list of his works. Under the general heading « de historiis sanctorum » occurs an item which reads : « librum vitae et passionis sancti Anastasii, male de greco translatum et peius a quodam inperito emendatum, prout potui ad sensum correxi »¹. Despite the doubt which Bertram Colgrave expressed about the identity of this Anastasius², there has never been any ground for believing that he was anyone other than the Persian monk, martyred in 628 under Chosroes II, whose feast occurs in many medieval calendars and martyrologies on 22 January. This was first and firmly established by John Bolland in the second volume of the January *Acta Sanctorum*, published in 1643. Bolland here stressed the long paragraph in the chronicle of Bede's *De Temporum Ratione*, which displayed a close familiarity with the *Life* of the Persian Anastasius³. Bede also included this

¹ *H. E. V.*, 24 : ed. C. PLUMMER, I (Oxford, 1896), 359 ; ed. B. COLGRAVE and R. A. B. MYNORS (Oxford, 1969), pp. 568-570.

² *Op. cit.*, p. 570, note 1 : « It is not certain which Anastasius it was, but it may well have been the friend of St. Gregory who translated the *Regula Pastoralis* into Greek, who became patriarch of Antioch in 599 and was killed in an insurrection of the Jews in 610. » This is a surprising statement, since one could have expected Colgrave to be aware of the contrary opinion of many recent scholars. Wilhelm Levison, for example, in « Bede the Historian » (*Bede : His Life, Times and Writings* [Oxford, 1935], p. 125), refers only to Anastasius, the Persian monk and martyr. Charles Plummer (*op. cit.*, I, cliv) made no comment about the identity of Anastasius, but noted : « This was a mere correction of a bad translation from the Greek. It is not known to exist. »

³ See *Acta SS.*, Ianuar. II, 422-440 (3rd ed. Ianuar. III, 35-54), for the material on Anastasius. The allusion to Bede's *Chronicle* is on 422-423, n. 5 (3rd ed., 36).

Anastasius, at the appropriate day, in his *Martyrology* ⁴. Has this work of Bede come down to us?

Up to the present we had reason to assume the existence of three Latin versions of the *Passio* of Anastasius ⁵. In the January volume of the *Acta Sanctorum* mentioned above, Bolland, using two manuscripts from monastic libraries (Gladbach and Trier), published a version which he thought might be the original unsatisfactory translation Bede had spoken of: « Suspicatur idem [Baronius] illam eandem vitam esse, quam male translata Beda emendavit... Certe impolitus sermo est » ⁶. From his introductory remarks it emerges that Bolland mainly followed the readings of the Gladbach manuscript, qualifying those of the Trier codex as « nonnihil variante ac fere fluente et laciniosa phrasi ». The *Bibliotheca Hagiographica Latina* (*BHL*) gave the number 408 to the text published by Bolland. This, however, was not the first edition of a Latin *Passio* of Anastasius. As Bolland in his introduction points out, Bonino Mombrizio had long before, in his *Sanctuarium* (issued before 1480), published a text that was almost identical with that of the Gladbach manuscript, except for the long Preface to the *Passio* that begins with the words « Unigenitus Filius et Verbum Dei ». The *BHL* assigned the number 409 to this truncated version of Mombrizio.

In his introduction Bolland mentions that Baronius, in his edition of the *Martyrology* (Rome, 1584), had said that he possessed a Latin version of the *Passio* of Anastasius that was the work of a certain medieval translator and cleric called Gregory ⁷. Bolland thought he recognized the opening words (« Unigenitus filius ») given by Baronius as those of his own text, and expressed some perplexity on the matter, since he (Bolland) had never encountered the name of Gregory in any of the manuscripts. It was to be many years before the version alluded to by Baronius came to be published in volume III of the *Bibliotheca Casinensis* ⁸. It was assigned the number 411 in the *BHL*.

⁴ See Dom H. QUENTIN, *Les martyrologes historiques du moyen âge* (Paris, 1908), p. 106; also Dom J. DUBOIS and G. RENAUD, *Édition pratique des martyrologes de Bède, de l'Anonyme lyonnais et de Florus* (Paris, 1976), p. 20.

⁵ We omit here the whole question of summaries (*epitomae*), and accounts of miracles.

⁶ *Acta SS.*, Ianuar. II, 426-431 (3rd ed., 39-45).

⁷ *Op. cit.*, 422, n. 3 (3rd ed., 35).

⁸ *Bibliotheca Casinensis*, III (Monte Cassino, 1877), *Florilegium*, pp. 102-109.

Many of the volumes of the *Analecta Bollandiana*, as well as of the series *Subsidia Hagiographica*, bear witness to the immense effort the Bollandists have put into analyzing and cataloguing the hagiographical manuscripts that are strewn among many libraries in Europe. In the course of this cataloguing, attempts were made to spot the texts that presented versions different in some significant way from those already published and known. It was thus that A. Poncelet, on analyzing the vast *Legendarium* of the Premonstratensian abbey of Windberg (Munich, cod. lat. 22240), noted that the *Passio* of Anastasius in this manuscript presented a « *re-censio aliquantum diversa a textu ed. Act. SS., Ian. t. II p. 426-31* »⁹. Although this text was never published, it was assigned the number 410 in the *BHL*.

On the basis of the indications provided above one could therefore assume, as we said earlier, the existence of three different Latin versions of the *Passio*, *BHL* 408, 411 and 410, but since no manuscripts of any of these versions, nor indeed of any other version, have ever emerged bearing the name of Bede in their titles or colophons, scholars have universally come to conclude that Bede's own revision of the text must be considered lost¹⁰.

The Cassinese editors indicate that more than one of their manuscripts contains the text, and that their edition (a very uncritical one!) is based on these witnesses (« *ex diversis cod. desumptis* »). They omit the preface, which names the cleric Gregory, since this had already been published by Angelo Mai in his *Spicilegium Romanum*, IV (Rome, 1840), 283-285.

⁹ *Anal. Boll.* 17 (1898), 103. In the same issue (p. 42), when dealing with the manuscripts of the Great Austrian *Legendarium*, Poncelet had indicated that the Anastasius *Passio* in this compilation also differed from that of the *Acta SS*: « *Non pauca hinc inde omissa sunt et nonnumquam mutatus est stilus* ». But when he came to analyze Munich, cod. lat. 22240, he failed to remember and note that the Anastasius text in this manuscript was also the one he had encountered in the Austrian *Legendarium*. The designation *BHL* 410 therefore also applies to this *Legendarium*. It should be noted that Poncelet warns his reader (*op. cit.*, p. 101) that the circumstances attending his study of these manuscripts may have resulted in some such oversights.

¹⁰ M. L. W. Laistner, *A Hand-List of Bede Manuscripts* (Ithaca, 1943), p. 87, states: « *The Life of St. Anastasius has disappeared, but, according to John Boston of Bury, there was a copy of it at the beginning of the fifteenth century in the monastic library of Bury St. Edmunds* », and adds a footnote reference to M. R. James, *The Abbey of St. Edmund at Bury* (Cambridge Archaeological Society, XXVIII [1895], 38). James, alas, was mistaken here. The medieval catalogue in question was the work of Henry of Kirkestede, as Richard Rouse has shown in « *Boston Buriensis and the Author of the Catalogus Scriptorum*

The fact remains, however, that no systematic study of the Life and Passion of Anastasius, as transmitted in Latin, has so far been undertaken ¹¹. No one has attempted to provide a full list of all the manuscripts, to sort out the real differences among the various versions they contain, and to seek to determine their interrelationship, or to examine fully all the elements that pertain to Bede's connection with the problem. Such an investigation is now underway, but it will require a study of monograph length to present all the texts and all the pertinent evidence. Our aim here is to indicate in a more summary form some of the new and exciting results that have already been reached, and to provide indications of how the investigation is proceeding, and what conclusions seem likely to emerge.

The most important discovery to date, a crucial one since it immediately sheds light on numerous elements in the puzzle, is that the faulty Latin translation mentioned by Bede has, in fact, come down to us. It survives in a single witness, MS F.III.16 (ff. 14-23) of the Biblioteca Nazionale of Turin, a former Bobbio manuscript of the tenth century. Poncelet in his catalogue of the hagiographical manuscripts at Turin, published in this journal in 1909, lists the *Passio* of Anastasius, but his reference « Cf. *BHL* 408 », while it gives a hint that the text was not quite identical with the one published by Bolland, hardly suffices to indicate the uniqueness and importance

Ecclesiae », *Speculum*, 41 (1966), 471-499. Kirkestede's procedure was to list patristic works whose titles he had obtained from one source or another and then, using a system of numbers for various English libraries, he would indicate, by placing one or more numbers opposite each title, where this or that particular work was to be found. Kirkestede's list of Bede's works is reproduced by Rouse (*op. cit.*, 495-496). It was obviously drawn from Bede's autobiography in the *H. E.* No numbers occur opposite the *Anastasius Life*, a clear indication that Kirkestede knew of no library where the work could be found. We have come across no medieval catalogue that mentions Bede's text. The medieval catalogue of the abbey of Murbach does list it, but under the rubric « *Sequentes libros adhuc non habemus* » (*cf. Anal. Boll.* 90 [1972], 216).

¹¹ The idea of undertaking a study of the Anastasius texts was prompted by my interest in Bede. As the material grew I solicited the help of Dr. Carmela Franklin, who began to explore the manuscript transmission, and to make a comparative study of the versions. It was she who discovered the Turin text and recognized its fundamental importance. This paper is therefore a collaborative study in which she has come to assume a primary role in the research (Paul Meyvaert).

of the version extant in this manuscript¹². It would seem that some verbal coincidences between the extracts which Poncelet copied in Turin and the text of the Windberg *Legendarium* (*BHL* 410) led the authors of the Supplementary volume to *BILL* (published in 1911) to classify the Turin version as *BHL* 410b. But a thorough examination shows, beyond the possibility of doubt, that the Turin text represents the first and original Latin translation, made directly from the Greek *Acta* (*BHG* 84), and that both 408 and 410 turn out to be mere revisions of this hitherto unknown and unpublished version. *BHL* 411, although it represents in part an independent translation from the Greek, made in southern Italy, was also to some extent influenced by the version contained in the Turin codex (*BHL* 410b)¹³. For the sake of convenience we will continue to use the

¹² Cf. A. PONCELET, « Catalogus codicum hagiographicorum latinorum Bibliothecae Nationalis Taurinensis », *Anal. Boll.*, 28 (1909), 431. On this manuscript see also C. CIPOLLA, *Codici bobbiesi della Biblioteca Nazionale Universitaria di Torino con Illustrazioni* (Milan, 1907), p. 154; G. OTTINO, *I Codici bobbiesi nella Biblioteca Nazionale di Torino* (Turin, 1890), pp. 20-22; A. SIEGMUND, *Die Überlieferung der griechischen christlichen Literatur in der lateinischen Kirche bis zum zwölften Jahrhundert* (Munich, 1949), *passim*; on p. 228 Siegmund writes: « Die Fassung *BHL* 410 ist noch nicht näher untersucht, sie steht im Legendar von Windberg, eine Nebenform *BHL* 410b schon in Turin F.III.16, s. x (aus Bobbio) ». This does not indicate any personal investigation by the author, but is based on the data of the *BHL Supplement*. See also G. PHILIPPART, *Les Légendiers latins et autres manuscrits hagiographiques* [= *Typologie des Sources du Moyen-Age occidental*, 24-25] (Turnhout, 1977), p. 33, n. 31. The Turin codex will deserve a careful study with a view to detecting the sources of the various texts it contains, in the hope that this may shed more light on the tradition from which *BHL* 410b derives.

¹³ The problem of *BHL* 411, which is a rather complex one, will not be discussed in this paper, since it has no direct bearing on Bede. Its author, a south Italian cleric named Gregory, explains in his prologue that he had at his disposal an old Latin translation of *BHG* 84, a new Latin translation which he had commissioned, and the Greek text of the *Acta*. His work is an attempt to produce a highly polished literary text based on all three. It is therefore unlike the other two Latin revisions (*BHL* 408 and 410) we are considering here, which are based solely on *BHL* 410b. A new critical edition of *BHL* 411 is needed, since it turns out that here too a crucial manuscript has been neglected. This is Bern, Bürgerbibliothek MS 24, ff. 86-92^v, containing numerous passages that were changed or omitted in the tradition from which the Cassinese manuscripts alluded to above (note 8) derive. We hope to treat the problem of *BHL* 411 in the monograph we are preparing.

designation *BHL* 410b for the Turin text, but it must be understood that the numerical designations of the *BHL*, in this case at least, in no way reveal the real historical priorities between the various texts which these numbers have now come to represent.

In order to bring out the main points which our investigation has already established, it will be useful if we now proceed to illustrate the nature of the text of *BHL* 410b, pass on to discuss its relationship with *BHL* 408 and 410, and finally take up the question of Bede's corrected version.

The original Greek *Acta* of Anastasius' life and martyrdom (*BHG* 84) were written in 630 A.D., not long after his death (628 A.D.), as we shall show at the conclusion of this paper. We possess two editions of the Greek text, one by H. Usener, based on Berlin, Deutsche Staatsbibliothek, Phillipps MS 1458¹⁴, the other by Papadopoulos-Kerameus based on Jerusalem, Patriarchate MS 18¹⁵. Since several other Greek manuscripts survive, there is need for a new critical edition of the Greek text¹⁶. For present purposes of comparison, however, it will suffice us to refer in the following pages to Usener's edition¹⁷.

¹⁴ H. USENER, *Acta martyris Anastasii Persae* (Bonn, 1894), pp. 1-12.

¹⁵ A. PAPADOPOULOS-KERAMEUS, 'Ανάλεκτα 'Ιεροσολυμιτικῆς σταχυολογίας, IV (St. Petersburg, 1897), 126-148.

¹⁶ M. Bernard Flusin of the 'Section grecque', Institut de Recherche et d'Histoire des Textes (Paris), has agreed to prepare a new critical edition of *BHG* 84 to be included in our forthcoming monograph on Anastasius.

It is worth pointing out that Berlin, Phillipps 1458, used by Usener for his editions of *BHG* 84 and 90, is the very same manuscript which John Bolland had also used for his own Latin translations of these Greek texts, printed in *Acta SS.*, Januar. II, 431-440 (3rd ed., 45-54). Bolland indicates what folios were missing in his Greek manuscripts, and the gaps correspond exactly with those in the Berlin manuscript, which at one time had belonged to the Jesuit College of Clermont in Paris.

¹⁷ The divergences between Berlin, Phillipps 1458 (edited by Usener), and Jerusalem, Patriarch. MS 18 (edited by Papadopoulos-Kerameus), seem rather minor. Here and there the Berlin manuscript omits a few words found in the other witness, and in such cases *BHL* 410b appears to side with the Phillipps manuscript. But it will need a full critical edition of the Greek manuscripts — which M. Bernard Flusin is preparing — to shed more light on their relationship with the early Latin translation (*BHL* 410b).

BHG 84¹⁸BHL 410b¹⁹

a) ἀλλ' ὁ τῆς ἀνθρωπίνης ζωῆς
ἀπ' ἀρχῆς ἐπιβουλος,
ὁ βράσκανός τε καὶ δόλιος
τῶν εὐσεβῶν ἐχθρός,
οὐκ ἔχων ὅπως ἐνέγκῃ
τὴν τοσαύτην τῶν ἀγαθῶν
τῆς διὰ Χριστοῦ χάριτος
εἰς ἀνθρώπους μεγαλοδωρεὰν
καὶ ὀρῶν ἑαυτὸν
ὡσπέρ τι ἀνδράποδον πονηρὸν
ἐκβεβλημένον τῆς ὑπ' οὐρανὸν
εὐρεν ἐπίνοιαν
τῆς μὲν ἑαυτοῦ πονηρίας ἀξίαν

b) καὶ ὡ παραδόξων πραγμάτων
αἰχμάλωτος μὲν ἦγετο
ὁ τοῦ κυρίου σταυρός
κατὰ τὴν τῶν ἀθέων
ὑπόνοιαν, ἡχμαλώτευσεν δὲ μᾶλ-
λον
κἀκεῖ τοὺς ἀξιολογῶντες ἑαυτοῦ
εἰς σωτηρίαν.

c) λέγει ὁ μαρζαβανᾶς ·
Τεθήτω καὶ τυπτέσθω,
ἕως ἂν ὁμολογήσῃ ποιεῖν
τὰ κελευόμενα αὐτῶ ·
μέλλων δὲ δεσμεῖσθαι
ὁ τοῦ θεοῦ δοῦλος λέγει ·
Ἐάσατέ με,
οὐ χρεῖαν ἔχω δεσμῶν.
καὶ καθίσας ἐσχημάτισεν
ἑαυτὸν
ὄν τρόπον
ἔμελλεν δεσμεῖσθαι παρ' αὐτῶν.

a) Sed qui humanae vitae
a principio insidiator
et fascinator atque dolosus
et piorum inimicus
non habens qualiter induceret
in tantam bonorum
quae per Christi gratia
in hominibus magnale donum
et videns semetipsum
ut quoddam mancipium malignum
eiectum a caelestibus
invenit concinnationem
eius quidem malignitatis dig-
nam (§ 3)

b) Et ob admirandarum rerum
captivus ille quidem ducebatur
Christi crux
secundum deo odibilium
suspceptionem, captivabat autem
magis
ibidem eos qui digni erant sibi
in salutem (§ 7)

c) Dicit marzabanas :
« Ponatur et caedatur,
usque dum confiteatur facere
quae iubentur ei. »
Incipiens autem alligari
famulus dei Anastasius dicit :
« Sinite me ;
non habeo necesse vincula. »
et sedens designavit
semetipsum
quemadmodum
incipiebat alligari ab eis (§ 22)

¹⁸ See H. USENER, *op. cit.* : (a) p. 1, col. b, l. 6-12 ; (b) p. 2, col. b, l. 18-21 ; (c) p. 6, col. b, l. 1-5 ; (d) p. 9, col. b, l. 1-10.

¹⁹ Turin, Biblioteca Nazionale, MS F.III.16 : (a) f. 14, l. 26-f. 14v, l. 3 ; (b) f. 15, l. 23-25 ; (c) f. 18, l. 24-27 ; (d) f. 20v, l. 21-26. The paragraph (§) numbers added at the end of each section correspond to those of BHL 408 in the *Acta Sanctorum*. We reproduce here the text as it stands in the manuscript leaving aside for the moment the question of textual slips and scribal mistakes that may have occurred. These can only be adequately dealt with once critical editions of BHL 410 and 408 have been established.

<p>d) καὶ ὁ ἅγιος ἀπεκρίνατο · "Ὅτι μὲν ἐστανρώθη ἐκούσιος ὑπὸ Ἰουδαίων ἀληθῶς λέγεις · αὐτὸς δὲ ἐστίν ὁ ποιήσας τὸν οὐρανὸν καὶ τὴν γῆν καὶ πάντα τὰ ἐν αὐτοῖς · καὶ εὐδόκησεν κατελθεῖν ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς καὶ ἐνανθρωπήσαι καὶ στανρω- θῆναι ἵνα ἐλευθερώσῃ τὸ τῶν ἀνθρώ- πων γένος τῆς πλάνης τοῦ σατανᾶ τοῦ παρ' ὑμῶν σεβομένου. ὑμεῖς δὲ σέβοντες τὸ πῦρ καὶ τὰ λοιπά, ἃ καὶ λέγειν αἰσχύνομαι, ματαίας ἔχετε τὰς ἐλπίδας τῇ κτίσει λατρεύοντες παρὰ τὸν κτίσαντα.</p>	<p>d) Et sanctus martyr respondit quam quidem crucifixus est sponte a iudeis verum dicis Ipse autem est qui fecit caelum et terram mare et omnia quae in eis sunt et voluit descendere super terram et humanari et crucifigi ut liberaret genus hominum de errore sathanae qui a vobis colitur. Vos vero colentes ignem et caetera quae dicere erubesco vanas habetis spes creaturae colentes praeter qui condidit (§ 29)</p>
---	---

The examples above, together with the ones given below, show the completely mechanical nature of the translation provided by *BHL* 410b. The Latin follows the Greek word order, line after line. The translation is replete with shortcomings; choice of the wrong word to render the Greek meaning²⁰, and an almost total neglect of Latin grammar, syntax, and idiom, resulting here and there in statements that remain unintelligible to anyone who is unable to refer back to the original Greek²¹. One can fully understand Bede's reaction to such an inadequate rendering. Nevertheless, because of the slavish nature of the translation, *BHL* 410b may prove to be of great value in sorting out the Greek transmission, and in providing clues about the kind of manuscript (even, perhaps, the kind of script) which the translator used.

The translation presented in *BHL* 410b also raises a host of fascinating questions about the cultural milieu in which it was

²⁰ For example, *μεγαλοδωρεάν* « magnale donum », *ἐπίνοιαν* « concinnationem », *ἐνανθρωπήσαι* « humanari ».

²¹ For example, *et sedens designavit semetipsum quemadmodum incipiebat alligari ab eis* in (c) hardly expresses the fact that Anastasius, rejecting the proffered fetters, sat down and assumed voluntarily the posture he would have been in, had he been bound.

produced²². Almost certainly the translator had some form of Greek-Latin glossary at his disposal²³. Are we dealing with a Latin monk or cleric of rather low intelligence and a very poor grasp of

²² There is still no comprehensive study of the translation of Greek hagiographical works into Latin in the early Middle Ages. H. Delehaye pointed out the need for such a study in « Les martyrs d'Égypte », *Analecta Bollandiana*, 40 (1922), 5-154; 299-354. In this long study he stressed, among other things, the many-sided values such an investigation would have: « Ces versions ont leur intérêt pour l'histoire des relations des églises, de la diffusion du culte des martyrs, comme aussi pour l'étude des textes dont elles dérivent, et dont elles permettent souvent de mieux suivre les transformations et de classer les recensions » (p. 121). Elsewhere (p. 126, n. 1), he specifically mentions our Turin manuscript (F.III.16) as needing further study. The general problem was again touched on by A. Siegmund, *op. cit.* (note 12), pp. 195-277. W. Berschin in a recent work, *Griechisch-lateinisches Mittelalter* (Bern, 1980), refers here and there to hagiographical texts, but makes no effort to treat the problem as a whole, or to point out its many ramifications. What we need in particular, in addition to good editions of the Greek and Latin texts involved, are detailed studies that will help determine whether groups of Greek *Lives* were translated together (as Delehaye suspected), or whether the translations were more of a piecemeal affair, representing individual efforts made here and there at different places and times. It should prove possible, for example, once the vocabulary of *BHL* 410b has been carefully analyzed, to reconstruct the kind of Greek/Latin glossary that was used. This may help to show whether other pieces from the same translator survive. We can be certain, however, that the Anastasius text reached Bede as an isolated piece, since he specifically alludes to it as a « liber » (« librum vitae et passionis sancti Anastasii... correxi »).

²³ The use and diffusion of Greek-Latin and Latin-Greek glossaries is a subject that has been little explored. Gregory the Great at one point complained to his friend Eulogius, patriarch of Alexandria: « Gravem hic interpretum difficultatem patimur. Dum enim non sunt, qui sensum de sensu expriment, sed transferre verborum semper proprietatem volunt, omnem dictorum sensum confundunt. Unde agitur, ut ea quae translata fuerint, nisi cum gravi labore intellegere nullo modo valeamus » (*Ep. X*, 21, *Monumenta Germaniae Historica*, *Ep. II*, 258). This surely must refer to translators who labored with glossaries in hand. Two such have come down to us, the so-called « Pseudo-Philoxenus » (Latin-Greek) and the « Pseudo-Cyril » (Greek-Latin), which occasionally shed light on this or that rendering of a Greek word in hagiographical texts. But there must have been other glossaries which have not survived. Bede may have had a bilingual glossary at his disposal, as Dom J. Gribomont has recently suggested: « Saint Bède et ses dictionnaires grecs », *Revue Bénédictine*, 89 (1979), 271-280, although the particular evidence adduced by Gribomont is susceptible of a different interpretation: see Carlotta DIONISOTTI, « On Bede, Grammars, and Greek », *Revue Bénédictine*, 92 (1982, p. 111-141).

the syntactical nature of his own language, or does the very roughness of the Latin product suggest rather that *BHL* 410b was the work of someone who was not a native Latin speaker²⁴? It seems reasonable to suppose that the translation was made in the West, and for a Latin audience. Southern Italy, and more particularly Rome, appear as likely places. The large Greek-speaking communities established there in the early Middle Ages created a natural environment for interpreters and translators, and for the transmission of Greek hagiography to the West. There are special reasons, however, for placing the translation of the Greek *Acta* of St. Anastasius in Rome.

According to *BHG* 84 the body of the Persian monk was buried immediately after his death (28 Jan. 628) at the monastery of St. Sergius near Bethsaloe (Beth-Slokh = Kirkuk in modern Iraq), the place of his martyrdom²⁵. When news of Anastasius' sufferings and death reached his own monastic community in Jerusalem, there arose a great desire to acquire the martyr's mortal remains. *BHG* 88 provides us with an account of how these remains were obtained

²⁴ We suggest below (p. 383) that *BHL* 410b could have been produced at the Greek monastery of « ad Aquas Salvias » in Rome, where the head of St. Anastasius was venerated.

²⁵ The historical value of *BHG* 84 has long been recognized. John Bolland wrote: « auctor vitae videtur in eodem monasterio cum ipso Anastasio vixisse » (*Acta SS.*, Ianuar. II, 422, n. 4 [3rd ed., 35]). The late Agostino Pertusi had the following comment: « Che il fondo degli *Acta* e dell'encomio [of George Pisidas] siano storici, non c'è alcun dubbio: le « coordinate aglografiche » di questo Santo, per usare una espressione cara al P. Delehaye, sono perfettamente a posto. I personaggi che si muovono nel racconto sono persone che esistettero realmente... » (« L'encomio di S. Anastasio martire persiano », *Analecta Bollandiana*, 76 [1958], 28). See also Paul Devos: « La présence de cette relique [= the Holy Cross in Jerusalem] fut à l'origine de la conversion de Mogundat-Anastase, cavalier des armées du Roi entré ensuite à Saint-Anastase près de Jérusalem; un ancien confrère bien informé a raconté [*BHG* 84] son retour en Perse et sa mort par strangulation, le 22 janvier d'une année lourde d'événements dramatiques pour la dynastie sassanide, l'an 628 » (« Les Martyrs persans à travers leurs Actes syriaques », in *La Persia e il mondo greco-romano = Problemi attuali di scienza e di cultura*, Quaderno 76, Roma, 1966, 213, 218). The *Acta* have a unquestionably genuine ring. Their quality is such as to permit a deeper penetration, perhaps, into the story they have to tell. On the psychological plane, for instance, there are a number of telling details: the predilection of Anastasius for stories about martyrdom, his « vision » warning him that he would have a similar end, the apparent inability of his monastic superiors to calm him down, his seemingly stealthy and unauthorized departure from the monastery on wanderings that culminated in his capture and death.

— by stealth, since the monks of St. Sergius were unwilling to relinquish possession of the relics — and brought back in triumph to Palestine, first to Caesarea and then to Jerusalem, where they arrived on 2 November 631²⁶. By the middle of the seventh century (probably already by 645), the head of Anastasius was being venerated in Rome, as we know from the *De locis sanctis martyrum quae sunt foris civitatis Romae*²⁷. No account of how this relic reached Rome has come down to us, but the historical sources suggest that groups of Greek-speaking monks from Asia Minor and Palestine came to the Eternal City at about this time, probably as a result of the Arab invasions. The capture of Jerusalem in 638 provides the most likely explanation for the fact that we find monks from the Jerusalem monasteries of both St. Saba and abbot Anastasius in Rome soon after this date. Monks from the latter monastery must have brought the head of their martyr with them, together with a copy of the Greek Acta (*BHG* 84) that, as we shall see further on, had once belonged to Modestus, the patriarch of Jerusalem who had played a part in the life of the Persian monk. The monastery « ad Aquas Salvias », near St. Paul's outside the Walls, where the relic of St. Anastasius was kept and venerated, soon became an honored place of pilgrimage, and with time the name of Anastasius supplanted all the other earlier appellations by which the monastery had been known²⁸. The veneration of this relic by pilgrims coming from all over the West must have prompted the desire to provide a Latin version (*BHL* 410b) that would tell

²⁶ *BHG* 88, 'Επάνοδος τοῦ λειψάνου τοῦ ἁγίου μάρτυρος Ἀναστασίου ἐκ Περσίας εἰς τὸ μοναστήριον αὐτοῦ, from Berlin, Phillipps 1458, was published by H. USENER (*op. cit.*, pp. 12-14). The arrival of the relics at their destination is described thus: Συστείλας δὲ ὁ προσετώς τὸ λείψανον μετὰ κηρῶν καὶ φαλμῶν ἤγαγεν εἰς τὸ μοναστήριον αὐτοῦ μηνὶ νοεμβρίῳ δευτέρᾳ τῆς ἐνεστώσης πέμπτῃς ἰνδικτιόνος... (p. 14) (2 November 631).

²⁷ See *Itineraria et alia geographica* (*Corpus Christianorum* Lat. 175 [Turnhout, 1965], 316, n. 6): « Inde haud procul in meridiem monasterium est aquae Salviae, ubi caput sancti Anastasii est et locus ubi decollatus est Paulus. » The editor (*ibid.*, 314) states about this work: « forma quae nunc in codicibus invenitur, ad pontificatum Honorii I vel Theodori I (circiter 635-645) pertinere videtur. »

²⁸ All the source material for the Greek Roman monasteries of St. Anastasius and St. Saba is presented, with excellent discussions, in Guy FERRARI, *Early Roman Monasteries* (Vatican, 1957), pp. 33-48 (St. Anastasius), pp. 281-290 (St. Saba).

the story of the Persian monk's conversion and death. A copy of *BHL* 410b reached England either through Theodore of Canterbury, the Greek monk from Cilicia who was consecrated archbishop of Canterbury in 668 by Pope Vitalian (and who may have resided for a time at the « ad Aquas Salvias » monastery)²⁹, or through Benedict Biscop or some other Northumbrian pilgrim returning home from a journey to Rome. A copy of *BHL* 410b must finally have found its way into Bede's hands.

We can understand that once *BHL* 410b was in circulation and being read aloud to monastic audiences, it must have provoked shudders in the hearts of many good Latinists³⁰. We have Bede's own reaction : « male de greco translatum et peius a quodam inperito emendatum » — indicating either that he possessed a single manuscript of the work which contained interlinear or marginal emendations, or that two different versions of the text had reached him, which he was thus able to compare. The surviving evidence shows that at least three serious efforts were made to remedy the situation, in the form of *BHL* 411, 410 and 408³¹. For reasons already ex-

²⁹ The Roman synod of 649, held under Martin I, uses the appellation « monasterium de Cilicia, qui ponitur in Aquas Salvias » (cf. G. FERRARI, *op. cit.*, p. 33). This has been interpreted to mean that this was a community of Greek monks who came from Asia Minor. Since Theodore was from Tarsus in Cilicia, some scholars have argued that he was a monk at this monastery before becoming archbishop of Canterbury. But Ferrari (*ibid.*, p. 41) points out that while this is a possibility, Theodore could also have belonged to one of the other two Greek Roman monasteries, St. Saba or the Monasterium Renati. Bede does not specify the place, but simply states : « erat ipso tempore Romae monachus... nomine Theodorus, natus Tarso Ciliciae » (*H. E.*, IV, 1).

³⁰ The question of the public reading of hagiographical texts at liturgical functions or other times, in the early Middle Ages, has been the subject of some discussion, since the evidence is not abundant or always clear. On this see especially B. DE GAFFIER, « La lecture des Passions des martyrs à Rome avant le ix^e siècle », *Anal. Boll.*, 87 (1969), 67-68, and also G. PHILIPPART, *Les Légendiers latins*, 106-107, 112-121. Not long after Bede's time, Alcuin says that he wrote the prose life of St. Willibrord so that « publice fratribus in ecclesia ... legi potuisset » (PHILIPPART, *op. cit.*, 112). Would that Bede had left us more details about public reading at Wearmouth and Jarrow! It could well be that it was public reading, and the desire to have a text that would be fully intelligible to its hearers, rather than mere scholarly « acribia », that prompted his work of correction on *BHL* 410b.

³¹ The recent publication of the dossier concerning Pelagia the Penitent, or as she is sometimes called, « the Harlot » (*Pélagie la Pénitente : métamorphoses d'une légende*, t. I, *Les textes et leur histoire* [Paris, 1981]), puts at our disposal

plained above ³², *BHL* 411 will not concern us here, and we can therefore concentrate on the other two revisions.

BHL 410 is a revision that predates the middle of the twelfth century, but it is difficult to determine by how long. It had a very limited circulation and we have found it so far only in the Windberg *Legendarium* and in the five manuscripts of the great Austrian *Legendarium* ³³.

BHL 408 is another independent and even earlier revision of *BHL* 410b. It is the one that obtained by far the greatest circulation throughout the Middle Ages. It must at least predate the earliest surviving witness, which is a leaf at Trier (Cod. 190 [1246]) deriving from a passionary of the end of the eighth or beginning of the ninth century, written at Freising by the scribe Cundpato ³⁴. Other early manuscripts like Vatic. Reg. 516 (s. ix^a), Stuttgart HB XIV 13

a fascinating series of texts that are in some ways similar to those concerning our Anastasius. Here again, in the course of sifting through the surviving evidence, the original Latin translation from the Greek came to light. It too survives in only one manuscript, of the twelfth century, which is edited together with the other revised Latin version by François Dolbeau and others in the volume mentioned above (pp. 161-249). The procedures adopted by the original translator — who, like the translator of Anastasius' *Acta*, produced a word-for-word rendering of the Greek — and by the revisors in the case of the Pelagia narrative will provide useful points of comparison for the Anastasius texts. It is worth noting that in the case of Pelagia the oldest manuscripts that transmit the revision (9th century) antedate by far the one (12th century) in which the original translation survives, and thus by their date help to establish the antiquity of this translation, which Dolbeau thinks was made in the pre-Carolingian period.

³² See n. 13.

³³ The evidence for the date depends on Poncetlet's study of the Great Austrian *Legendarium*, and of the related *Legendarium* of Windberg (*Anal. Boll.*, 17 [1898], 24-122). The presence of texts common to both collections led Poncetlet to assume the existence of a lost *Legendarium* that antedated them both and served as source. His date for the Austrian collection is 'shortly after 1181' (p. 25), and for that of Windberg 's. XII, post medium'. The lost source, which already had *BHL* 410, was therefore almost certainly in existence by the middle of the twelfth century. Whether further elements will turn up to allow us to determine even more precisely where and when this revision (*BHL* 410) was made still remains an open question.

³⁴ See M. COENS, 'Appendice au catalogue des manuscrits hagiographiques de Trèves', *Anal. Boll.*, 60 (1942), 213-215. As Coens explains, the fragments of this passionary were first identified by Prof. B. Bischoff of Munich, who recognized the hand of Cundpato.

(s. ix²), and Vatic. Palat. lat. 846 (s. x), also suggest that Germany was an important center for the diffusion of this revision, which goes back to the Carolingian period, if not earlier. *BHL* 408, although in origin an attempt to improve on the Latinity of *BHL* 410b, itself underwent further revisions in the course of its transmission. It would seem, however, that these later revisions were made entirely on the basis of the *BHL* 408 text itself, and without any further reference either to the Greek or to *BHL* 410 and 411³⁵. It was a case of various learned scribes trying here and there to introduce their own ameliorations and modifications into a text they were copying, and considered capable of improvement.

A direct comparison between a few passages of *BHL* 410b and *BHL* 408 and 410 is the best way to contrast the methods used in the two revisions, and to bring out some of the fundamental differences in their approach. We have chosen portions from paragraphs 25 and 35 for this purpose, and have added the text of *BHG* 84 opposite that of *BHL* 410b to underline once again the mechanical, word-for-word nature of the original Latin translation. The full edition of these texts at a later date will only further confirm the points we are here making. At this stage in our research we are inclined to conclude that the infrequent textual agreements that link *BHL* 408 and 410, against the Turin manuscript, suggest that the line of transmission of *BHL* 410b underlying these two revisions differed in some particulars from the one that has come down to us in the Turin exemplar. But this problem will evidently call for a full and careful examination in the monograph we are preparing.

BHG 84³⁶

ἐν μιᾷ ὄν νυκτὶ
ψάλλοντος αὐτοῦ

BHL 410b³⁷

In una igitur nocte
psallente eo

³⁵ Only detailed textual comparisons can help to determine what kind of interventions have taken place when a text is modified. Thus, for example, in the case of the Pelagia texts (see above, n. 31), F. Dolbeau was able to show that the Latin revision he terms A' was made with reference here and there to a Greek manuscript that differed from the one used by the original Latin translator. B. de Gaiffier has underlined the problem of discerning the differences that occur between hagiographical texts: « S'agit-il vraiment d'une recension différente ou du même texte où se sont glissées des variantes purement verbales? » (« Hagiographie et historiographie, » in *La storiografia altomedievale* [= *Settimane di studio del Centro italiano di studi sull' alto medioevo*, 10-16 April 1964, t. 17 (1970)], p. 149.

³⁶ USENER, *op. cit.*, p. 7.

³⁷ From Turin, F.III.16, f. 19^r-19^v.

ἐπηκροῶτο αὐτοῦ	auscultabatur ei
τις τῶν δεσμίων	quidam de vinctis
Ἑβραῖος μὲν τὴν θρησκείαν	5 hebreus quidem religione
καὶ τῶν ἐμφανῶν,	et de nobilioribus
ἐπιεικῆς δὲ τοῖς τρόποις,	clemens autem moribus
ὡς ἐμάθομεν,	sicut didicimus
καὶ εἰδὼς τὸν μακάριον	et videns beatum martyrem
τὴν μὲν ἡμέραν	10 die quidem
ἐν τῇ τῶν λίθων παρακομιδῇ	in lapidum asportatione mise-
ταλαιπωρούμενον,	rantem
νυκτὸς δὲ τῇ προσευχῇ τοῦ θεοῦ	nocte vero deprecatione dei sus-
προσκαρτεροῦντα,	tinente
ἐξίστατο τῇ διανοίᾳ λογιζόμενος	stupebat mente existimans
τίς ἂν εἴη οὗτος.	quis nam esset hic
ἐπὶ πολὺ οὖν	15 Tam diu ergo
ἀτενίζων εἰς αὐτὸν	intuens in eum
κείμενος ἐπὶ τοῦ ἐδάφους	iacens super pavimento
ἐν τῷ σκότει τῆς νυκτὸς,	in tenebras noctis
ἐστῶτος τοῦ ἁγίου	stante sancto
καὶ ψάλλοντος τοὺς ὁρθρινούς	20 et psallente matutinos hymnos
ᾠμους	
θεωρεῖ αἰφνίδιον	vidit subito
τινάς λευχειμονοῦντας	aliquos veste dealbatos
εἰσελθόντας διὰ τῆς θύρας τῆς	ingredientes per ostium carceris
φυλακῆς	
καὶ κυκλώσαντας τὸν μακάριον,	et circumdantem (1) beatum mar-
οἷς καὶ φῶς ἱκανὸν συνεξέλαμ-	25 quibus et lux copiosa refulsit
ψεν.	
ἔξέστη δὲ ὁ ἀνὴρ ἐπὶ τῷ θεάματι	Amens vero factus vir super con-
	templationem
καὶ εἶπεν ἐν ἑαυτῷ	dixit intra se
Ἅγιος ὁ θεός,	Sanctus deus
οὗτοι ἄγγελοι εἰσιν.	isti angeli sunt
τοῦτο δὲ λογισάμενος	30 Hoc autem existimans
ὄρα τούτους αὐτούς	vidit hos ipsos
ἡμιφόρια περικειμένους	pallia circumdatos
ἔχοντας σταυρούς,	habentes cruces
καὶ λέγει ἐν ἑαυτῷ	et dicit in semetipso
Οὗτοι ἐπίσκοποι εἰσιν.	35 isti episcopi sunt
θαυμάζων δὲ περὶ αὐτῶν,	Admirans autem de his
ἀτενίσας εἰς τὸν μάρτυρα Χρι-	intuens in martyrem Christi
στοῦ	
Ἀναστάσιον εἶδεν,	Anastasium vidit
καὶ ἰδοῦ καὶ αὐτὸς	et ecce hii qui
τοῖς περὶ αὐτὸν συνεξέλαμψεν	40 circa eum erant lux circumfulsit
ἑώρα γὰρ αὐτὸν	videbat enim eum
λαμπροφοροῦντα	splendide indutum

καθὼς καὶ τοὺς λοιποὺς	sicut et caeteros
.....
ἑωρακῶς δὲ ταῦτα πάντα	45 Aspiciens autem haec omnia
ὁ ἀνὴρ ἐβιάζετο τῇ χειρὶ	vir vim faciebat manu
νόξαι τὸν πλησίον αὐτοῦ κοιμώ-	pulsare proximum suum dor-
μενον,	mientem
ὃς ἦν χριστιανὸς ἄρχων Σκυθο-	qui erat christianus ut iudex
πόλεως,	Scythopoleos
πρὸς τὸ δεῖξαι αὐτῷ τὰ ὄρα-	qualiter ostenderet ei quae visa
θέντα.	sunt
καὶ οὐκ ἠδύνατο,	50 et non poterat
ἀλλ' ἔμενεν ἀχανής,	sed manebat amens
νήφοντι μὲν λογισμῶ	sobria quidem cogitatione
προσέχων τοῖς ὄραθεισιν,	adattendens quae videbantur
σώματι δὲ μένων ἀκίνητος.	corpori quidem manens immo-
	bilis (§ 25)

BHL 408 ³⁸BHL 410 ³⁹

Una igitur nocte,	Una igitur noctium
psallente eo	psallente beato Anastasio
auscultabat eum	
quidam de vinctis qui ibi erat,	quidam de vinctis
Hebraeus quidem religione,	5 hebreus professione
et nobili genere,	clemens
mitissimus autem moribus,	nobilior moribus quam vestibus
ut didicimus.	videns
Hic videns beatum martyrem	beatum Anastasium martyrem
per diem quidem	10 die quidem
in lapidum fatigatione,	in lapidum asportacione laboran-
	tem
nocte autem in laudibus perse-	nocte vero deprecationem deo fa-
verantem,	cientem
stupebat dicens :	stupebat admirans
Quidnam vult hoc esse ?	quidnam hoc esset
Tamdiu ergo	15 Et diu
intuens in eum,	intuens in eum
iacens super pavementum	iacens super pavementum
in noctis silentio,	
stante beato martyre	
et psallente matutinales hymnos,	20
vidit subito	subito vidit
aliquos in vestibus albis	aliquos veste dealbatos

³⁸ For the sake of convenience we quote BHL 408 from the edition in the *Acta SS.*, Januar. II, p. 429 (3rd ed. p. 42).

³⁹ Again, for practical purposes, we quote BHL 410 from one of the manuscripts of the Great Austrian *Legendarium*, Heiligenkreuz MS 11, f. 70^v.

ingredientes per ostium carceris,	per ostium carceris in matutinis horis cum esset in silencio noctis ingredientes
et circumdantes beatum marty- rem,	ac circumdantes beatum Anasta- sium martyrem
a quibus et lux copiosa infulsit 25 in carcere.	et lux copiosa refulsit
Amens vero factus praefatus vir super visione,	Amens vero factus super contem- placionem hanc
dixit intra se :	dixit intra se
Sanctus Deus, isti angeli sunt.	isti angeli sunt
Hoc autem aspiciens,	30 Hoc autem existimans
vidit hos ipsos	vidit eos
palliis circumdatos, habentes cruces in manibus,	palliis circumdatos habentes cruces in manibus
et ait in semetipso :	et dicit in semetipso
Isti episcopi sunt.	35 Isti episcopi sunt
Admirans autem de his, intuens in martyrem Christi Anastasium,	Intuens autem Christi martyrem Anastasium
et qui cum illo erant, immensum 40 lumen,	vidit eum
et candidis vestibus eum indutum	splendide indutum
cum eis qui ei apparuerant ;	sicut et ceteros
.....	
Aspiciens autem vir qui contem- 45 plabatur,	Aspiciens autem haec omnia
pulsabat manu proximum suum	cepit pulsare proximum suum
dormientem,	manu
qui erat Christianus, iudex Scytho- polis,	ut ostenderet ei quae videbat
quatenus ei ostenderet quae vide- bat ;	
et non poterat,	50 et non poterat
quia graviter dormiebat.	quia manebat amens
Ille autem attendebat his quae videbat,	
corpore quidem manens immo- billis... (§ 25)	

OBSERVATIONS : The dependence of *BHL* 408 and 410 on *BHL* 410b, and their ignorance of the Greek, is apparent throughout this chapter.

1. l. 27 and 34 : The Greek text has the same expression, ἐν ἑαυτῷ in both places ; *BHL* 410b, however, renders one by « intra se » (l. 27), the other by « in semetipso ». These same variations are repeated in both *BHL* 408 and *BHL* 410.

2. l. 3: *BHL* 410b invents the deponent *auscullabatur* to translate the middle *ἐπηκροῶτο*. *BHL* 408 corrects *auscullabatur* to *auscullabat*, while *BHL* 410 cuts it out, probably not understanding the meaning behind the grammatical mistake.
3. l. 22: *BHL* 410b's *veste dealbato*, which translates *λευχειμονούντας*, is changed into the more grammatical *in vestibus albis* by *BHL* 408. *BHL* 410 retains the awkward *veste dealbato*, whose meaning, however, is clear.
4. l. 46-47: The awkward *vim faciebat manu pulsare* of *BHL* 410b is improved by both 408 (*pulsabat manu*) and 410 (*cepit pulsare*).
5. l. 51: *BHL* 410b's *sed manebat amens* does not render the original accurately. In the Greek text we are told that the Jew is not able to awaken the Christian sleeping next to him because he is so astonished by what he sees that he cannot even open his mouth, but remains *ἀχανής*, mute with astonishment. In fact in the previous sentence we are told that he cannot move his hand to wake his neighbor; later, we see him throwing himself on his neighbor to wake him, his hand and mouth having failed to act. The author of 408 tries to make sense of *BHL* 410b's poor text by changing *manebat amens* to *quia graviter dormiebat*. It is an intelligent attempt which, however, does not correspond to the Greek original. The less careful author of 410 retains the unclear wording of the Turin translation.

BHG 84⁴⁰

Χριστιανὸς ὄν ὑπάρχων
 ὁ σελλάριος, ὡς εἴρηται,
 ὁ ἐπὶ τῆς φυλακῆς,
 ἠθέλησεν τὸ σῶμα τοῦ μάρτυρος
 παρὰ μέρος θεῖναι
 πρὸς τὸ εἰδγνωστον ὑπάρχειν,
 καὶ οὐ συνεχώρησαν αὐτῷ
 οἱ δῆμοι Ἑβραῖοι ὄντες.
 μαθόντες δὲ <οἱ> υἱοὶ τοῦ Ἰεσοῦ
 τὴν τελείωσιν τοῦ ἀγίου
 (καὶ γὰρ οἱ παῖδες αὐτῶν
 συμπαρήσαν τῷ μάρτυρι
 ἀπιόντι τοῦ τελειωθῆναι
 ὑπερειδόντες τὰς χεῖρας αὐτοῦ)
 ἔδωκαν λάθρα τοῖς δημίλοις
 ἀργύριον ἱκανὸν
 καὶ ἔπεισαν αὐτοὺς
 κενωρισμένον ἀποθέσθαι
 τὸ σῶμα αὐτοῦ.

BHL 410b⁴¹

Christianus igitur existens
 sellarius ut dictum est
 qui erat super carcere
 voluit corpus martyris
 5 seorsum ponere
 ut cognitum eo esset
 sed non sinebant ei
 questionarii cum essent hebraei
 Cognoscentes vero filii de Iesdim
 10 finitionem sancti martyris
 etenim pueri eorum
 simul aderant sancto martyri
 eunti ut finiretur
 superdespicientes manus eius
 15 dederunt clam quaestionariis
 argenteos multos
 et adqueverunt eos
 separatim ponere
 corpus eius (§ 35)

⁴⁰ USENER, *op. cit.*, p. 11.

⁴¹ Turin, F. III.16, f. 22.

*BHL 408*⁴²

Christianus igitur cum esset
 qui super carceres
 praeerat tribunus, sicut prius iam
 dictum est,
 voluit corpus martyris
 seorsum ponere.
 Et cognitum est
 a quaestionariis.

Et cognoscentes filii Ihesdin
 finem sancti martyris,
 quia et pueri eorum
 simul secuti erant Beatum Anas-
 stasium
 quando ducebatur ad mortem,
 ut viderent exitum rei,
 dederunt clam quaestionariis
 infinitam pecuniam,
 et permiserunt
 separatim reponi
 corpus eius sanctum (§ 35).

*BHL 410*⁴³

Igitur sellarius
 qui erat super carcerem
 existens ut dictum est Christia-
 nus
 voluit corpus martyris
 5 seorsum ponere
 et non sinebant eum questionarii
 cum essent hebraei
 Cognoscentes vero fideles gestum
 10 finem sancti martyris
 et pueri eorum
 15 dederunt clam quaestionariis
 argenteos multos
 et permiserunt eos
 separatim ponere
 corpus eius

OBSERVATIONS : Again we perceive the different approaches of the two revisers when dealing with a very unclear passage.

1. l. 6 ff. : *ut cognitum eo esset* of *BHL 410b* is not only a poor translation of the Greek, but is also misleading and obfuscates the real meaning. Since the head of Anastasius has been severed, his body cannot be identified, unless it is put in a different spot from the other seventy who have been executed with him. This is not allowed. But the children of Iesdin who knew how Anastasius had been executed are able, in any case, to identify the saint's body, and bribe the guards to put it aside. The author of 408, not understanding the meaning behind *BHL 410b*, makes some very reasonable changes : *ut cognitum eo esset* becomes *et cognitum est a questionariis*. The author of *BHL 410*, likewise failing to understand the meaning of the text, omits this line completely.
2. l. 13 : The author of *BHL 408* tries to grasp the meaning behind the poor text in front of him (*ut finiretur*, a literal but unidiomatic translation from the Greek), and makes a reasonable change (*ut viderent exitum rei*), while the author of 410, not understanding the parenthetical clause, omits it, thus changing the meaning of the sentence drastically.

⁴² *Acta SS.*, Ianuar. II, p. 431 (3rd ed. p. 44).

⁴³ *Helligenkreuz MS 11*, f. 71.

These passages and numerous others that could be quoted help to show that the two revisions (*BHL* 408 and 410) were both made directly but quite independently of each other on the old Latin translation (*BHL* 410b) of the Greek *Acta* (*BHG* 84). Comparison with the original Latin on which they depend illustrates the different approaches of the two revisers when faced with the same problems.

The author of *BHL* 410 is clearly an impatient man, who likes to wield an axe. Whenever he thinks the text is too long he chops off entire phrases or whole passages. He then tries to put what remains into somewhat more grammatical form, mainly by changing verb or noun endings. However, he seldom changes the word order, even when it is very awkward, nor does he often substitute terms of his own to help clarify the meaning. Consequently this shorter version still retains much of the awkwardness of the original translation, and by the same token presents itself also as a valuable witness from the textual point of view; *BHL* 410 can sometimes help unravel textual problems of *BHL* 410b, from which it departs less frequently than does *BHL* 408.

BHL 408, on the other hand, is the work of an author with a totally different cast of mind. We can watch him scrutinizing every word, every sequence of words, each sentence and each paragraph. He aims to make sense out of everything the original (*BHL* 410b) offers, but he seeks to do as little damage as possible to the integrity of the text that confronts him. When he finds it necessary to reframe in his own words an unintelligible phrase or passage in his poor, inadequate model, he returns to the text of this model at the earliest opportunity. In other words it is clear that, unlike the Italian cleric Gregory (author of *BHL* 411), who rewrote the text completely, and unlike the author who produced *BHL* 410, this author has a great respect for the text he is seeking to improve. Only on rare occasions does he omit a few words that seem superfluous to him, or which perhaps he cannot make out in the manuscript from which he is working.

The author of *BHL* 408 has an orderly mind. Since he does not possess the Greek version from which the Latin derives, he can only judge the Latin of *BHL* 410b on its own face value. For him certain words have specific connotations, and if these connotations are not present in the translation, he tries to make them explicit in his own rendering — often thus unwittingly departing yet further from the original Greek. For example, at a point where the narrative eulogizes Anastasius' conduct in the monastery, *BHG* 84 reads: *καὶ πρὸ τούτων ἐν τῷ κανόνι τῆς θείας λειτουργίας*⁴⁴, which *BHL* 410b rendered: *et prae omnibus in regulam divinae missarum aderat*⁴⁵. The author of *BHL* 408 interprets *regula* as referring to monastic

⁴⁴ USENER, *op. cit.*, p. 4, l. 9.

⁴⁵ Turin, F.III.16, f. 16.

rule, and he conjectures the omission of an *et* before *divinae missarum*, so his version reads: *et prae omnibus in regula monachica intentus et in missarum solemnibus frequens*.⁴⁶

Thus conjecture, and even textual conjecture, play a part in his procedures, as we can see even more strikingly in the following passage. Anastasius, after being baptized by the priest Elias and spending eight days in his house, is then taken by Elias to a monastery. *BHG* 84 at this point reads: *μετὰ οὖν τὴν ἀπόλυσιν εὐθέως παραλαβὼν αὐτὸν ἀπήγαγεν εἰς τὴν μονὴν τοῦ ἐν ἀγίοις ἀββᾶ Ἀναστασίου*⁴⁷, which *BHL* 410b renders as: *Post ergo Abbas continuo adsumens eum perduxit in mansionem sancte recordationis abbatis Anastasii*⁴⁸. The Greek-Latin glossaries give «*absolutio*» for ἀπόλυσις, but if the original Greek word was ἀπόλυσις it could have been rendered by «*ablutio*»^{48a}. What happened to explain the presence of the word *abbas* instead of *ablutio* or *absolutio* in *BHL* 410b has not yet become clear to us, but there seems little doubt that the author of *BHL* 408 was also faced with *abbas* in the manuscript he was using⁴⁹. Since up to that point there had been no question of an abbot in connection with Anastasius, the reviser decided that it must be a textual error for «*albas*» (*abbas/albas*). The newly baptized put on white garments at the time of baptism, and took them off eight days later — thus explaining why, in the ancient liturgical books, the Sunday after Easter was called «*Dominica in albis depositis*». The author of *BHL* 408 therefore emended to make his own version read: *Post depositas vero albas continuo perduxit eum...*, adding the word *depositas* to leave no doubt about the meaning. This, whatever else one may say about it, is a very learned emendation, the work of an *eruditus*.

Could either *BHL* 410 or *BHL* 408 be the work of Bede? At the present stage of our investigation we admit that the author of *BHL* 408 impresses us as having a cast of mind very like that of Bede, while the author of *BHL* 410 does not⁵⁰. Despite John

⁴⁶ *Acta SS.*, *ibid.*, p. 427, § 13 (3rd ed. p. 40).

⁴⁷ USENER, *op. cit.*, p. 3, l. 22-25.

⁴⁸ Turin, F.III.16, f. 16.

^{48a} Bolland in his own Latin translation of *BHG* 84 (*Acta SS.*, *ibid.*, p. 432; 3rd ed. p. 46), renders this: «*Peracta igitur ablutione...*».

⁴⁹ At this point *BHL* 410 likewise has the word «*abbas*»: *Abbas continuo assumens eum...*

⁵⁰ On Bede's attitude as a scholar and corrector of texts, see the comments of P. MEYVAERT in «*Bede the Scholar*», in *Famulus Christi, Essays in Commemoration of the Thirteenth Centenary of the Birth of the Venerable Bede* [ed. G. BONNER], (London, 1976), pp. 40-69, and «*Bede's Text of the Libellus Responsum of Gregory the Great to Augustine of Canterbury*», in *England before the Conquest: Studies in Primary Sources presented to Dorothy Whitelock* (Cambridge, 1971), pp. 31-33.

Bolland's rather negative assessment of *BHL* 408 (« certe impolitus sermo est »), one would have to conclude from a detailed comparison of *BHL* 408 with *BHL* 410b that the revision has been very skillfully accomplished, and is in every sense worthy of Bede. The obvious respect which the reviser shows towards the poor but original Latin translation, and his concern to clarify it with as little alteration as possible, corresponds with Bede's comment about his own work : « prout potui ad sensum correxi ».

The absence of Bede's name from the manuscript tradition that transmits *BHL* 408 is not in itself an obstacle against its attribution to him. Charles Plummer qualifies the work as « a mere correction of a bad translation from the Greek »⁵¹. We can understand that Bede might want to mention the revision among his works without formulating a new title or colophon, particularly if this *Passio* was intended to be incorporated in a collection for use at liturgical or other monastic occasions. The circulation of *BHL* 408 at an early period, and in Germany, could bear witness to a text brought to the Continent by Anglo-Saxon missionaries.

The only objection we can suggest against the attribution of *BHL* 408 to Bede derives from three small discrepancies between the wording of his *Chronicle*⁵² and that of *BHL* 408 :

⁵¹ *Venerabilis Baedae Historia Ecclesiastica*, I (Oxford, 1896), cliv.

⁵² For the *Chronicle* entry see the edition of T. MOMMSEN, *Chronica Minora*, III (*M.G.H.*, Auct. Antiquiss. XIII), 310-311. We repeat the text here, adding in square brackets references to the paragraph numbers of *BHL* 408 in the *Acta SS.* This will help to show that Bede used elements from the whole narrative to compose his summary :

Anastasius Persa monachus nobile pro Christo martyrium patitur. qui natus in Persidae magicas a patre puer artes discebat [6], sed ubi a captivis Christianis [7] Christi nomen acceperat, in eum mox animo toto conversus [8] relicta Perside Calcidoniam Hierapolimque Christum quaerens [9] ac deinde Hierosolymam petit [10], ubi accepta baptismatis gratia [11] quarto ab eadem urbe miliario monasterium abbatis Anastasii intravit [12]. Ibi septem annis regulariter vivens [13], dum Cesaream Palaestinae orationis gratia venisset [16], captus a Persis [18] et multa diu verbera inter carceres et vincula Marzabona iudice perpressus [21-23] tandem mittitur Persidem, ad regem eorum Chosronem [29], a quo tertio per intervalla temporis verberatus [30-32] ad extremum una suspensus manu per tres horas diei [32], sic decollatus cum aliis LXX martyrium complevit [33]. mox tunica eius indutus quidam daemonicus curatus est [38]. inter ea superveniens cum exercitu Heraclius princeps superatis Persis Christianos, qui erant captivati, reduxit gaudentes. reliquiae beati martyris Anastasii primo monasterium

1. Chosroes is called « rex » in the *Chronicle* and « imperator » in *BHL* 408. On the other hand *BHL* 410b uses both terms, and *BHL* 408 may simply demonstrate an attempt to unify the nomenclature by keeping to « imperator » throughout. If *BHL* 408 was an early work of Bede, we could suppose that at a later date he revised his opinion about who was an emperor (like Heraclius), and who a mere king (like Chosroes).

2. A form of torture inflicted on the martyr was suspension by one arm from a rope. *BHL* 410b together with *BHL* 408, 410 and 411 all agree in saying this lasted for two hours, while Bede in the *Chronicle* states that it was three hours. This could be a simple slip on the part of Bede's memory when he came to write the short resumé account for the *Chronicle*.

3. A miracle was worked through one of the martyr's garments after his death. *BHL* 410b (following the Greek) and the three revisions (*BHL* 408, 410 and 411) all call this garment a « colobium », while Bede in the *Chronicle* speaks of it as a « tunica ». Here again there could be a simple explanation : « colobium » is a word that must have been familiar to Bede and other monks through the *Sayings of the Fathers* (*Verba Seniorum*) and the *Etymologies* of Isidore. One can imagine Bede deciding to leave « colobium » in the revision intended for a monastic audience (*BHL* 408), but to use a better known word like « tunica » in the *Chronicle*, intended for a wider audience.

As can be seen, these are rather small discrepancies, capable of some explanation. They are to some extent counterbalanced by a series of verbal agreements between the wording of the *Chronicle* and that of *BHL* 408. Thus the *Chronicle* has *causa orationis* and *BHL* 408 *orationis gratia* at a point where there is no real equivalent in *BHL* 410b or the other revisions, and elsewhere the *Chronicle* and *BHL* 408 use *perpessus* where *BHL* 410b has *sustineret*, *BHL* 410 *sustinuisset*, and *BHL* 411 *affligeretur*. The *Chronicle's* *ibi septem annis regulariter vivens* seems to echo the *prae omnibus in regula monachi-ca intentus* which, as we saw above, is proper to *BHL* 408⁵³.

In summary, as matters now stand, we believe that the possibility of attributing *BHL* 408 to Bede deserves very serious consideration,

suum, deinde Romam advectae venerantur in monasterio beati Pauli apostoli, quod dicitur ad aquas Salvias.

It is not clear where Bede got his information about the relics being brought first to Jerusalem and then to Rome. The early Latin sources speak only of the head of Anastasius being venerated in Rome. It is striking that although Bede knew the *Acta* of several other martyrs (see H. QUENTIN, *Les martyrologes historiques* [note 4], pp. 57-97), he made use only of Anastasius' *Acta* for his *Chronicle*.

⁵³ See above, p. 393.

and we hope that by the time our investigation is complete we will be in a stronger position to come down on one side or the other of this question. In any case, whatever the final conclusion about Bede's part in the matter may be, it should be evident from the foregoing discussion that we are now, with all the new material in hand, in a position to throw much new light on the whole textual transmission of the Latin Acts of St. Anastasius.

In addition to providing us with the text of the early Latin translation of *BHG* 84, the Turin manuscript also contains a unique piece of historical information. It lets us know that the original instigator of *BHG* 84 was Modestus, Patriarch of Jerusalem. This is revealed in no other source, whether Greek or Latin.

To appreciate the new evidence we need to place side by side the texts of *BHG* 84, *BHL* 408 and 410, and Turin F. III.16. The section corresponds to the end of the long prologue which introduces the narrative.

BHG 84⁵⁴

Τούτων εἰς ὑπάρχει
καὶ ὁ ἡμέτερος στεφανίτης
Ἀναστάσιος, οὗ τὸν βίον
τὸν ἀπ' ἀρχῆς μέχρι
τοῦ μαρτυρίου γράφαι
κελευσθεὶς, αὐτὸν
προστήσω τοῦ λόγου
τὸν παρ' αὐτοῦ ὁμολογηθέντα
θεὸν καὶ κύριον ἡμῶν
Ἰησοῦν Χριστόν, καὶ οὕτως
ἄρξομαι τῆς διηγήσεως.

BHL 408⁵⁵

Horum unus extitit
et noster coronator

Anastasius, cuius vitam
ab initio usque

BHL 410⁵⁶

Quo in tempore inventus
est religiosissimus et bea-
tissimus
Anastasius cuius vitam
ab initio usque

TURIN F.III.16
(f. 15, l. 9-14)

Horum unus extitit
et noster coronator

Anastasius. Huius vitam
quam ab initio usque

⁵⁴ USENER, *op. cit.*, p. 2.

⁵⁵ *Acta SS.*, Ianuar. II, p. 426 (3rd ed. p. 39).

⁵⁶ Heillgenkreuz MS 11, f. 69v.

ad finem scribere	ad martyris finem des-	ad martyrii [finem?] scri-
		bere
iussus sum,	scribere iussus sum	iussus sum
		ego Modestus indignus
		archiepiscopus Hierusoli-
		mae sanctae dei civitatis
ipsum praeponens testem	propono sermoni	ipsum praeponens ser-
		moni
quem ipse confessus est	qui ab eo confessus est	eum quem ab eo confes-
		surus est
Deum et Dominum	dominum nostrum	deum et dominum nos-
		trum
Iesum Christum,	Ihesum christum	Ihesum christum
et sic incipiam	ac sic incipiam	et sic incipiam
enarrationis ser-	enarrare	gestis eius
monem (§ 5)		

All the manuscripts of *BHG* 84 that we have so far been able to consult lack the allusion to Modestus. The fact that it is also absent from *BHL* 408, 410 and 411 indicates that the copies of *BHL* 410b used by these revisers likewise lacked the passage in question. The agreement between the Greek and Latin versions thus requires that a solution involving only Turin F.III.16 must be found.

It would seem that we can exclude Modestus as the actual author of *BHG* 84⁵⁷. The manner in which he is directly referred to else-

⁵⁷ John Bolland, in his introduction to the Acts of Anastasius (*Acta SS.*, Januar. II, 422, n. 4 [3rd ed. p. 35]), states his belief, on the grounds of internal evidence, that the author of *BHG* 84 was an anonymous monk who was a contemporary of Anastasius and belonged to his own community. He adds that Baronius had put forward the names of Antiochus, a monk of St. Saba, and of Sophronius, patriarch of Jerusalem (634-638), as possible authors. G. Henskens, when he came to deal with Sophronius (*Acta SS.*, Mart. II, 68, n. 23), pointed out that the authentic works of this patriarch were written in a very different style from *BHG* 84, and thus cast some doubt on one of Baronius' conjectures. The other conjecture, making Antiochus the author of *BHG* 84, was recently resurrected by Agostino Pertusi («L'encomio di S. Anastasio martire persiano», *Anal. Boll.*, 76 [1958], 15, n. 1). Some comments on this hypothesis may be in order here. Antiochus, a monk of St. Saba, was a contemporary of the Persian Anastasius. We know from his letter to Eustathius (*P.G.* 89, 1421-1428) that at the time of the Persian invasion of 614 the monks of St. Saba took refuge at the monastery «of Abbot Anastasius», where the Persian Anastasius became a monk six years later (620). After some months, at the exhortation of Modestus, acting vicar of the see of Jerusalem (in the absence of its patriarch Zacharias, taken captive by the Persians), some of the St. Saba monks returned to their

where in the narrative points to someone else as author: *καὶ ἀναγαγὼν τὰ κατ' αὐτὸν Μοδέστῳ τῷ ὀσιωτάτῳ πρεσβυτέρῳ τῷ τηρικαῦτα τοποτηρητῇ τοῦ ἀποστολικοῦ θρόνου*. The reverential superlative *ὀσιώτατος*, which we find used throughout *BHG 84* for abbots and priests, fits in best with the hypothesis that it was a simple monk who composed the work. It is therefore all the more striking to encounter the statement *ego Modestus indignus archiepiscopus Hierusolimae sanctae dei civitatis* in the Turin manuscript. One must doubt that any Latin scribe would have had grounds for inserting such a statement into the text. It carries an authentic ring (*indignus archiepiscopus*), and must go back to Modestus himself⁵⁸. We should note that this statement occurs at the precise point where *BHG 84* reads *γράψαι κελευσθείς* (*iussus sum scribere*). Who issued the command that the account of the Persian monk's life and martyrdom should be written? *BHG 84* does not make this explicit⁵⁹, but it must surely have been Modestus, who chose to

own monastery, while some remained behind at the Anastasius monastery where Justinus was abbot. Pertusi reflects: « C'è da chiedersi anzi, dati i grandi elogi che Antioco rivolge a Giustino, se lo stesso Antioco non sia stato fra coloro che rimasero nel convento dell'abate Anastasio... Se così fosse, se si potesse provarlo, Antioco doveva trovarsi in tale convento quando l'abate Giustino diede ordine di stendere la relazione sul martirio di S. Anastasio persiano; e allora potrebbe essere lui stesso l'autore della passione, come già sospettava il Baronius. »

It does not seem to have occurred to Pertusi that since Antiochus was the author of several known works, the soundest method for establishing his authorship of *BHG 84* would have been through a comparison of vocabulary and style. Moreover a close reading of Antiochus' letter to Eustathius, mentioned above, suggests rather that he was one of the group of monks who returned to St. Saba and lived there under abbot Thomas.

⁵⁸ The expression *Hierusolimae sanctae dei civitatis* may also carry an authenticating note. Elsewhere in *BHG 84* (USENER, p. 2, l. 13) we read: *τῆς δὲ ἁγίας τοῦ θεοῦ πόλεως ἀλούσης* which *BHL 410b* renders *sanctae autem civitati excidioni factae*. It is also worth pointing out that in *BHG 90*, the account of the miracles worked while the relics of Anastasius were being carried from Persia to Jerusalem, on the three occasions when there is reference to Jerusalem, we find the expression *ἐπὶ τὴν ἁγίαν Χριστοῦ τοῦ θεοῦ ἡμῶν πόλιν* (USENER, p. 22, l. 27-28; p. 24, l. 36-37; p. 26, l. 22-23).

⁵⁹ USENER (*op. cit.*, p. iv) assumes that the command to write the *Acta* must have come from Justinus, abbot of the Anastasius monastery. This is also the view of Pertusi, as we saw in the passage quoted above in note 57.

note this fact in the margin of his own copy⁶⁰. Only if we accept the hypothesis that the comment was originally a marginal one — translated into Latin also as a marginal comment, but then at a later stage transcribed into the main text — can we provide an adequate explanation of the fact that both the Greek and the other Latin versions (deriving from *BHL* 410b) agree in *not* having it. The supposition that such a comment could come to be omitted, independently, from both the Greek and Latin transmissions does not appear a likely one. The presence of this addition in Turin F.III.16 implies, of course, that it was Modestus' own manuscript which was translated into Latin, either in Jerusalem or perhaps more likely after being taken to Rome. Recent scholarly opinion inclines to the view that Modestus was patriarch of Jerusalem for only a short period of seven months, from March 630 to 17 December of the same year⁶¹. The composition of *BHG* 84 can therefore be situated in this period.

⁶⁰ That Modestus was closely involved with the composition of *BHG* 84 should cause no surprise. The historical sources reveal how deeply interested he was in the monastic communities of the Jerusalem area, and how much he did to help with their restoration after the Persian invasion of 614. It was also to Modestus, then « vicarius » of the see of Jerusalem, that the priest Elias turned for advice when the moment seemed ripe to baptize the Persian convert Anastasius. Modestus must have been moved and gratified to learn that at least one Persian had ended his life as a martyr for the sake of Christ. He would therefore have had special reason to see that a full account was recorded of Anastasius' conversion and martyrdom.

In *BHG* 84 (ÜSENER, p. 3, l. 12-14) we read: *καὶ ἀναγαγὼν τὰ κατ' αὐτὸν Μοδέστῳ τῷ ὀσιωτάτῳ πρεσβυτέρῳ τῷ τηνικαῦτα τοποτηρητῇ τοῦ ἀποστολικοῦ θρόνου* (rendered in *BHL* 410b: *et suggerens quae erga eum Modesto sanctissimo presbytero qui tunc vicarius apostolicae sedis erat*). This implies that when *BHG* 84 was written, Modestus was no longer *τοποτηρητής* (or « vicarius »). Since he only relinquished this position to become patriarch himself, we have added confirmation that *BHG* 84 post-dates his elevation to the see of Jerusalem.

⁶¹ See G. GARITTE, « La sépulture de Modeste de Jérusalem », *Muséon*, 73 (1960), 127-133. Of particular interest is the statement from Cod. Sin. ar. 531 which Garitte (*ibid.*, p. 132, n. 2) reports and translates: « Et mansit Modestus septem menses patriarcha, et mortuus est ». The beginning of his patriarchate is held to coincide with the triumphant return of Heraclius to Jerusalem in March 630. On the dates of Modestus see also PERTUSI, *op. cit.*, p. 11.

It gives us much pleasure that the present essay, which spans both the Greek East and the Latin West — territories in which Fathers Baudouin de Gaiffier and François Halkin have labored so long — should appear in this centenary number of the *Analecta Bollandiana*, published in their honor. We offer it as a small token of our friendship, and of our profound esteem for the whole Bollandist enterprise.

St. John's University, Minnesota

Carmela VIRCILLO FRANKLIN

Cambridge, Massachusetts

Paul MEYVAERT