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Abstract

The research presented in this dissertation is an examination of the manuscript tradition of John Scottus Eriugena’s Latin translation (the *Versio Dionysii*) of the Greek works of Dionysius the pseudo-Areopagite. The goal of this project is fourfold: first, to establish the relationship between the extant families of the manuscripts; second, to re-examine the state of Greek studies in the 9th century based on the relationship between the manuscript families; third, to trace the continued use of these recensions through the 12th century; and, finally, to examine Eriugena’s interpretation of the writings of the pseudo-Areopagite based on the Irishman’s translations of certain philosophic ideas.

The First chapter establishes the existence of three distinct recensions, rather than two, as previously thought. Two of these recensions represent attempted corrections of the third. All three recensions (together with their corrections) are attributable to Eriugena (whether directly or indirectly). The second chapter examines the level of Eriugena’s understanding of Greek, especially within the context of the state of Greek studies in the 9th century. Special attention is given to the corrections of the later
recensions, which suggest an improvement in Eriugena’s Hellenism. The third chapter examines the continued use of the Versio’s during the Middle Ages through the 12th century, with special care to clarify which recensions were known to which readers. The fourth and final chapter presents the originality of Eriugena’s interpretation of the pseudo-Areopagite’s thought. This originality stems in part from his understanding of the Greek text, and in part from his attempts to harmonize his sources.
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Introduction:

The renewed interest in Eriugena which began, arguably, with Maïeul Cappyuns’ 1933 study of the man and his works has yielded its greatest fruit in the last 40 years. Within the last four decades we have seen the production of critical editions of virtually the whole of the Eriugenan corpus: The De imagine in 1965, the Homily on the Prologue to John in 1969, the Commentary on the Gospel of John in 1972, the Expositiones in Ierarchiam coelestem in 1975, the De divina praedestinatione and the Glossae Martiani in 1978, the translations of Maximus Confessor’s Ambigua ad Iohannem in 1988 and Quaestiones ad Thalassium in 1990, the Carmina in 1993, the Glossae

---

7 E. Jeanneau, Maximi Confessoris Ambigua ad Iohannem iuxta Iohannis Scotti Eriugenae latinam interpretationem, Corpus Christianorum Series Graeca 18 (Turnhout: Brepols, 1988).
9 M. Herren, Iohannis Scotti Eriugenae Carmina (Dublin: Dublin Institute for Advanced Studies, 1993).
Divinae Historiae\textsuperscript{10} in 1997, and the completion of the Periphyseon\textsuperscript{11} in 2003. Joseph Floss’ 1853 edition of the *opera Eriugenae* (*Patrologia Latina* 122) left much to be desired, and the re-edition of the works contained therein has resulted in significant findings which go well beyond a critical edition—one might think, for example, of the discovery of Eriugena’s hand in certain manuscripts of the Periphyseon.

Despite the fact that, of all the works of Eriugena, it exerted the greatest influence on the Middle Ages, the *Versio Dionysii* is conspicuously missing from this list of recent critical editions. The extreme complexity of the manuscript tradition of the Versio has long been known. The problem was first clearly laid out in 1896 by Ludwig Traube, who began from the position that Hincmar of Reims used Eriugena’s translation when he quoted the pseudo-Areopagite in his *Liber de praedestinatione*. While the manuscript studies of Gabriel Théry and Hyacinthe Dondaine proved Traube wrong\textsuperscript{12}, their work highlighted all the more the problems associated with editing the Versio, most especially the corrections to which the manuscripts of Eriugena’s translation were subjected throughout the whole of the Middle Ages.

However, the question that originally set in motion the research presented in the pages that follow did not concern Hincmar’s use of the Latin Dionysius, nor did it deal directly with the manuscripts of the Versio. Rather, the question arose from reading certain passages in Eriugena’s *Periphyseon*. Eriugena was deeply inspired by his reading

\textsuperscript{12} First, Hincmar used the translation of Hilduin, not that of Eriugena. Second, Traube’s division of the manuscripts into three families is artificial, based on external criteria rather than the actual collation of the texts.
of the Greek fathers (especially Dionysius, Maximus Confessor and Gregory of Nyssa), and his *Periphyseon*, completed not long after translating the pseudo-Areopagite, quotes the Latin Dionysius (as well as Maximus and Gregory) often. Some quotations are meager, and tell us little of Eriugena’s methods when referring to a text that he himself translated. However, on a number of occasions he quotes Dionysius at length, permitting a comparison of these passages from the *Periphyseon* with the same passages in the *Versio*. Such a comparison reveals significant discrepancies. For example, book five of the *Periphyseon* quotes the whole of the fifth letter of Dionysius to a certain Dorothy:

**Ep. V, PL 122, 1178C1-D4:**


**Periphyseon V, 2693-2707:**

Diuina caligo est inaccessibile lumen, in quo habitare deus dicitur, *dum inuisibilis existit* propter supereminentem claritatem, et *inaccessibilem*** ***superexcellentiam*** superessentialis luminum manationis. In hoc fit omnis deum scire et uidere dignus, *dum ipse* non *uidet nec cognoscit* uere *lumen*, in quo super visionem et cognitionem factus est, hoc *solum* cognoscens quia post omnia est sensibilia et intelligibilia, et prophetice uidens: ‘Mirabilis facta est scientia tua ex me, confortata est, ***non potero ad eam’*. Sic ergo diuinus Paulus cognouisse deum dicitur, cognoscens eum super omnem existentem intellectum ******. Propter quod et investigabiles esse uias eius ait et inscrutabilia judicia eius, et inenarrabiles donationes eius, et pacem ejus superantem omnem intellectum, sic inueniens super omnia et hoc super intelligentiam cognoscens, quia omnium est *summitas*, omnium causalis *existens*.

The differences between the two texts cannot be attributed to mere scribal error—the changes in the *Periphyseon* reveal a conscious effort to clarify, even improve
Eriugena’s translation. But what is the origin of these differences? Could Eriugena himself have been responsible for these changes? If so, what are the implications of such self-correction? A number of simple solutions suggest themselves immediately. These differences may not come from Eriugena at all, but could have been inserted by a later, intruding hand. Thomas Gale, the editor of the 1687 edition of the *Periphyseon* was known to have corrected Eriugena’s Greek translations in his own manuscript of the *Periphyseon*, Cambridge O.5.20\(^1\). The differences could be explained just as easily by manipulations of the manuscripts of the *Versio* rather than those of the *Periphyseon*. In this case, the quotations in the *Periphyseon* would provide a valuable witness of the *Versio*. Finally, Eriugena may have referred to the *Versio* freely, rather paraphrasing than quoting directly or literally.

The purpose of this question—how does one explain these discrepancies between the Dionysius of the *Periphyseon* and the Dionysius of the *Versio*?—was originally intended to open the way towards understanding how Eriugena used his Greek sources when composing original philosophic material, not as an introduction to the question of the manuscript tradition of the *Versio*. However, Eriugena’s use of the Greek sources that he himself translated is unapproachable—at least as regards the pseudo-Areopagite—until such a time as a reliable text of the *Versio Dionysii* is established. Indeed, the

\(^1\) *Cf. Periphyseon* I, LXIX: “Il ne s’est pas privé de corriger la latinité d’Érigène. Étant par ailleurs bon helléniste, il fut souvent tenté de comparer la traduction érigénienne des Pères grecs cités dans le *Periphyseon* avec le texte original. Il ne manquait pas de corriger la traduction d’Érigène, quand celle-ci ne lui paraissait pas conforme au grec. Le résultat de ces “embellissements” est qu’on ne peut s’appuyer sur l’édition de Gale pour répondre à la question suivante: À quelle famille appartiennent les manuscripts grecs utilisés par Érigène? On ne peut non plus porter un jugement rigoureux sur l’exactitude de la traduction érigénienne puisque, en plusieurs endroits, cette traduction a été manipulée par Gale lui-même.”
establishment of such a text itself will go a long way towards revealing the Irishman’s methods regarding the Latin Dionysius as a source.

To this end, the research that follows presents a careful examination of the manuscripts of Eriugena’s Versio Dionysii. This study has been divided into four chapters. Chapter one presents the results of the collation of the manuscripts themselves. Significant errors divide the manuscripts into three families or recensions—A, T and M—as Traube had originally proposed\(^\text{14}\). Nevertheless, Traube’s assumption that the original work of Eriugena was forever lost (witnessed now, on this theory, only by the references to Dionysius in Hincmar’s De prædestinatione) is incorrect. In fact, a close comparison of all three recensions with the references to Dionysius in the Periphyseon and with Eriugena’s commentary on the De caelesti hierarchia make it virtually certain that Eriugena was responsible (directly or indirectly) for some of the corrections found in the recensions T and M. Thus, Eriugena’s approach to Dionysius was not static—he did not consider his work finished after completing his Versio, but continued to revise his translation even while incorporating Dionysius into his Periphyseon and while commenting on the De caelesti hierarchia in his Expositiones in caelestem hierarchiam.

Chapter two follows up on the significance of the corrections witnessed by the recensions T and M of the Versio. Comparison of the Versio to the Greek manuscript, Paris, Bibliothèque nationale gr. 437, upon which Eriugena based his translation permits a close examination of Eriugena’s knowledge of the Greek language. One can find

\(^{14}\) Traube is correct to have proposed three recensions. The foundation of his distinction, which will be discussed in what follows, is incorrect, and, as a result, he attributes to the same family manuscripts which, in fact, belong to different recensions.
examinations of this sort by Edouard Jeaneau and René Roques most notably. However, the corrections of the later recensions, especially of M, provide entirely new evidence of Eriugena’s Hellenism, and, in particular, of his development as a graecist. The recension T, for example, shows an effort to purge the Versio of the graecisms Eriugena tended to preserve. The recension M, however, goes beyond mere vocabulary and concentrates on rendering the pseudo-Areopagite’s difficult Greek in a less literal Latin.

The existence of three separate recensions, all of which derive from the 9th (or early 10th) century, introduces the third chapter. Philippe Chevallier, in 1937, attempted to simplify the study of the Latin Dionysius in the Middle Ages by printing the translations of Hilduin, Eriugena (both from the 9th century), John Sarrazin (12th century), Robert Grosseteste, Thomas Gallus (13th century), Ambrose of Camaldule, Marsilio Ficino (15th century), Joachim Perion (16th century), Pierre Lanssel and Balthasar Cordier (17th century) in parallel rows. Chevallier’s intention was to provide a tool that would permit scholars interested in, say, John Sarrazin’s use of Dionysius to discover precisely which translation Sarrazin read. However, Chevallier prints the Versio Dionysii from only one family of manuscripts (namely, T). Sarrazin, however, wrote his commentary

---

17 Gallus, in fact, did not translation the whole of the Dionysius corpus, but rather made a Latin extract.
on the Dionysian corpus (which he composed well before his translation) based on the first recension, A. Thus, Chevallier’s work is of limited usefulness regarding the continued influence of the Versio Dionysii and Eriugena the translator after the 9th century. Chapter three, then, traces the use of the Versio from the 9th through the 12th century, distinguishing the influence of Eriugena’s translation from that of the Greek corpus as well as the influence of the other medieval translations. Moreover, where possible, this chapter establishes which recensions were used by Eriugena’s successors.

Chapter four discusses Eriugena’s incorporation of the Dionysian philosophy into his own system. Without a doubt, Eriugena was influenced by the pseudo-Areopagite more than any other thinker prior to the 13th century. Further, his Areopagitism is not mediated by a Latin translation, as is the case, for example, with Hugh of St. Victor. Eriugena’s Dionysius is the Greek Dionysius. Eriugena’s direct contact with the pseudo-Areopagite’s language affects both his understanding and his use of the Dionysian system. The fourth chapter traces the development of Eriugenan philosophy from the Irishman’s reading of the Corpus Areopagiticum.

The division of labor which this study follows is intended to sort out the stemmatics of the manuscripts of the Versio Dionysii—finally and definitively—and to demonstrate the significance of the relationship between the manuscript families for fields other than textual criticism—for example, the study and understanding of Greek during the Carolingian period, and the continued study of Dionysius during the Middle Ages.

A final word must be said regarding the historical and practical limits of this study. There exist over a hundred (complete and partial) manuscripts of Eriugena’s
translation of the *Corpus Areopagitum*. However, in the early 13th century, the Latin Dionysius and Eriugena’s translation underwent a radical—and, in many ways, a historically monumental—development. From the 13th century onwards, we find Eriugena’s *Versio* copied together with the translation of John Sarrazin and the *Extractio* of Thomas Gallus, surrounded by the commentaries of Eriugena himself, of John Sarrazin, of Hugh of St. Victor, and by the glosses of John of Scythopolis and Maximus Confessor (in the translation of Anastasius Bibliothecarius). The *Corpus Dionysiacum*\(^\text{19}\), as this manual has come to be called, must have been of enormous interest to the friars and students in Paris (where this corpus first appears) in the 13th and 14th centuries. However, the text of the *Versio* in the *Corpus Dionysiacum*, although it is derived from one of the three 9th century families, itself represents a fourth recension, \(P\). Although Albert the Great and Thomas Aquinas knew the *Versio* in the recension \(P\), this study ignores the 13th century recension. First, the inclusion of \(P\) would have rendered a detailed study impossible—the number of manuscripts and sources of contamination and corrections in each recension would require either a study of unmanageable length, or one of far less depth than this work presents. Second, the variants which separate \(P\) from its parent, \(T\), belong entirely to the 13th century, and, therefore, reveal nothing of Eriugena’s efforts as a hellenist or student of the pseudo-Areopagite. Thus, the research that follows is limited to manuscripts that were copied before the 13th century. There exist later manuscripts of the *Versio* that do not contain the *Corpus Dionysiacum*, nor present the recension \(P\). However, these manuscripts do not appear to add any new information to what may be gathered from the pre-13th-century manuscripts. For example, the Dublin

\(^{19}\) This medieval ‘handbook’ of Dionysius is the subject of Hyacinthe Dondaine, *Le corpus dionysien de l’Université de Paris au XIIIe siècle* (Rome, 1953).
manuscript, Trinity College 162, from the 16th century, is a faithful representative of a
sub-group of T manuscripts, also witnessed by Florence, Biblioteca Medicea
Laurenziana, Plut. 89, supp. 15 (11th-12th century), Heiligenkreuz, Stiftsbibliothek 111
(12th century) and Lilienfeld, Stiftsbibliothek 128 (12th century).

The bulk of the manuscript research presented below is based on a collation of
large sections of the De caelesti hierarchia. As the three recensions began to distinguish
themselves in my research, it became clear that the key to understanding the M recension
is to be found in Eriugena’s Expositiones. Because the corrections which distinguish M
from A and T come from Eriugena’s commentary on the De caelesti hierarchia, the
differences between the three recensions are far less evident in the other Dionysian
treatises. Collations of smaller sections of the De diuinis nominibus and the De mystica
theologia have confirmed that the three recensions are present in these treatises as well.
Nevertheless, it has seemed that the greatest results would come from concentrating on
the De caelesti hierarchia.
Chapter 1

Textual Criticism

1.1 Sigla

Manuscripts of the Versio Dionysii and the Corpus Areopagiticum used in this study:

A= Paris, Bibliothèque nationale 1618 (2nd half 11th century)
A= Avanches, Bibliothèque municipale 47 (end of 12th century)
B= Paris, Bibliothèque nationale 2612 (12th century)
Ba= Basel, Universität Bibliothek O.III.5 (12th century)
Ba'= Bamberg, Staatsbibliothek B.IV.8 (11th century)
Be= Bern, Burgerbibliothek 19 (9th-10th century)
Bo= Boulogne, Bibliothèque municipale 27 (12th century)
Bp= Berlin, Staatsbibliothek, Phillips 1668 (10th century)
Clm= Bayern Munich, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, Clm. 14137 (11th century)
Clm^2= Bayern Munich, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, Clm. 17072 (12th century)
Ct= Cambridge, Trinity College 74 (12th century)
E= Cologne, Erzbischöfliche Diözesan- und Dombibliothek 30 (11th century)
Fl= Florence, Biblioteca Medicea Laurenziana, Pluteo 89, supp. 15 (11th-12th century)
H= Heiligenkreuz, Stiftsbibliothek 111 (12th century)
Li= Lilienfeld, Stiftsbibliothek 128 (12th century)
Ly= Lyons, Bibliothèque municipale 598 (12th century)
Mc= Montecassino 221 (11th century)
Os= Oxford, St. John’s College 128 (11th century)
Ox= Oxford, Bodleian Laud misc. 639 (12th century)
Pa= Paris, Bibliothèque nationale, gr. 437 (c. 827)
T= Troyes, Bibliothèque municipale 802 (9th century)
To= Tours, Bibliothèque municipale 338 (12th century)
Va'= Vienna, Österreichische Staatsbibliothek 754 (12th century)
Va^2= Vienna, Österreichische Staatsbibliothek 971 (13th century)
Vr= Vatican, Biblioteca Apostolic Vaticana, Reginensi lat. 67 (2nd half 12th century)
Z= Zwettl, Stiftsbibliothek 236 (13th century)

Although I have been unable to secure copies of Ba and Mc, they are easily identifiable as manuscripts of the Versio Dionysii by their date and contents. Further, the Barcelonese manuscript Ripoll, 0 which appears in the list of Maëul Cappuyns (Jean Scot Érigène. Sa vie, son œuvre, sa pensée (Louvain: Abbaye du Mont César, 1933), 161), and is included in the list of Sheldon-Williams (“A Bibliography of the Works of Johannes Scottus Eriugena,” The Journal of Ecclesiastical History 10 (1959): 217) is a phantom. The archivist at the Arxiu de Corona d’Aragó has assured me that the archives have never used such a shelf mark, and my own search of the archival catalogue in situ produced no such manuscript, nor any manuscript witnessing the Versio Dionysii.
Recensions of the Versio Dionysii and the Corpus Areopagiticum:

A= 9th- or early 10th-century recension characterized by the presence of an extensive interlinear apparatus.
M= 9th-century recension closely associated with the Expositiones in caelestem hierarchiam.
P= 13th-century Parisian corpus studied by H. Dondaine, identified by the introductory piece Compellit me.
R= the so-called Roman or Anastasian recension of Greek manuscripts of the Corpus Areopagiticum, characterized primarily by the presence of the scholia of John of Scythopolis and Maximus Confessor.
T= 9th-century recension characterized by the latinization of Greek terms originally transcribed or transliterated by Eriugena.

Preliminary remarks:

This study preserves the sigla most recently assigned to the manuscripts of the Corpus Dionysiacum and of the Versio Dionysii. Thus, the Greek manuscript Paris, Bibliothèque nationale, gr. 437 is referred to as Pa rather than D with G. Théry or β with Ph. Chevallier. Likewise, where there is a conflict, the sigla that refer to Latin manuscripts follow those assigned by H. Dondaine rather than those assigned by J. Floss. Otherwise, Latin manuscripts have been assigned sigla signifying the libraries in which they are preserved.

This study also distinguishes between manuscripts and recensions by the use of italics to indicate recensions. Thus, T refers to the manuscript Troyes 802, T to the recension to which this manuscript happens to belong.

Finally, some terms require clarification:

Versio Dionysii. Eriugena’s translation of the works of Dionysius the pseudo-Areopagite has come to be known as the Versio Dionysii. This study preserves this method of distinguishing the translation of Eriugena from the Greek corpus as well as the translations of Hilduin, John Sarrazin and Robert Grosseteste.
Corpus Anastasii. The Corpus Anastasii refers to the Versio Dionysii together with the scholia of John of Scythopolis and Maximus Confessor, translated and appended (together with certain glosses written by Anastasius himself) to the Versio by Anastasius Bibliothecarius some time between 862 and 875.

Corpus Areopagiticum. The Corpus Areopagiticum refers to the Greek corpus composed by Dionysius the pseudo-Areopagite (De caelesti hierarchia, De ecclesiastica hierarchia, De diuinis nominibus, De mystica theologia, and the ten authentic letters) without consideration of manuscript, recension or edition.

Corpus Dionysiacum. Finally, the Corpus Dionysiacum refers to the 13th-century Latin ‘handbook’ characterized by the inclusion of the Versio, the translation of John Sarrazin, the commentaries of Eriugena, Hugh of St. Victor and John Sarrazin, the scholia of Maximus Confessor and John of Scythopolis, and the introductory piece known as the Compellit me.

1.2 The Date of the composition of the Versio Dionysii and the first Editions

1.2.1 The Dates

The date of the composition of the Versio Dionysii is complicated by the fact that the work was in continual progress throughout several years of Eriugena’s literary career. Thus, it does not fit squarely between specific dates indicating when the project was begun and when it was completed. Nevertheless, not only can the start of the project be suggested from the state of Dionysian studies at the time (both Eriugena’s and those of his near contemporaries—specifically of Hilduin and Hincmar), but certain transitional
points in the development of the text can be indicated with reference to Eriugena’s other works in which he quotes or comments on the Dionysian corpus.

As will be discussed in more detail in the following sections of this chapter, the Versio was corrected twice by the translator himself\textsuperscript{21}—thus there exist three versions of Eriugena’s translation.

The first attempt at translation cannot have been completed before 860, the date of Hincmar’s De praedestinatione. Hincmar quotes a Latin version of the Corpus Areopagiticum a total of five times in his text, and Théry\textsuperscript{22} has shown that these citations come from Hilduin’s translation rather than Eriugena’s. According to Théry, given the extremely poor quality of Hilduin’s translation, Hincmar would not have used the version made by the Abbot of St. Denis if Eriugena’s “royally commissioned”\textsuperscript{23} version had been available to him\textsuperscript{24}. However, Eriugena quotes the Corpus extensively in his own Periphyseon, the first recension of which must have been completed before 866. This leaves us with the period from 860-866. In addition, considering that Eriugena translated several other Greek works (the Ambigua and Quaestiones of Maximus Confessor and the De imagine of Gregory of Nyssa) before undertaking his opus magnum, the date by

\textsuperscript{21} Eriugena is certainly implicated in both sets of corrections, but the nature and extent of his involvement in each will be clarified in what follows.
\textsuperscript{23} Sheldon-Williams, “A Bibliography,” 203.
\textsuperscript{24} Théry’s suggestion is compelling given Hincmar’s close connection with both the court of Charles the Bald and Eriugena himself, who composed his own De praedestinatione at Hincmar’s request. Nevertheless, 860 must be taken merely as a reasonable suggestion.
which he must have completed the first version of the *Versio* should be placed around 862\(^25\).

While the *Periphyseon* provides a reliable *terminus ante quem*, the text quotes the second version of the *Versio*\(^26\), not the first version. Thus, on the one hand, the *Periphyseon* must be used with caution as a tool for dating the *Versio*, and on the other, the *Periphyseon* also provides a certain framework for determining the date of the second version.

The *Periphyseon* quotes not only the *Versio* but also the *Ambigua* and the *De imagine*. Thus, these translations must have been completed before the *Periphyseon* was begun. We can assume that Eriugena must have begun writing the *Periphyseon* sometime around 864, giving him four years to complete four Greek translations. However, the *Periphyseon* is dedicated to Wulfad, who was made archbishop of Bourges in 866. In his dedication at the end of book five, Eriugena refers to Wulfad as *frater*, a title that would have been rather inappropriate had Eriugena completed his work after Wulfad’s elevation\(^27\).

Version two, then, which seems to have been made in conjunction with his composition of the *Periphyseon*, must be placed some time between 864 and 866/7.

The third version of the *Versio Dionysii* was made in conjunction with the composition of the *Expositiones super caelestem hierarchiam*, which comments precisely on this third version. It is difficult to say whether the *Expositiones* represent an apology

---


\(^{26}\) Cf. §5 below.

\(^{27}\) Édouard Jeaneau has suggested that the second recension of the *Periphyseon* was completed after 866 since, in the last paragraphs of his work, Eriugena replaces the familiar *tuus* with *uester* when referring to Wulfad. *Cf. Periphyseon V*, XIXff.
for his corrected third version, or his corrected third version was meant to support his comments in the *Expositiones*. Nevertheless, the third version must have been begun by the time he began writing his commentary, and completed by the time he finished it. Our knowledge of the dates of the *Expositiones* is rather meager. All that is known for certain is that it was completed after the *Periphysion*, since Eriugena refers to his earlier work several times in his commentary. Beyond that, Cappuyns suggests that the work was completed by 870\textsuperscript{28}.

### 1.2.2 The Editions

#### 1.2.2.1 16\textsuperscript{th} Century

The *Versio Dionysii* was first printed in Strasbourg in 1503 (*Opera Dionysii ueteris et nouae translationis, etiam nouissimae ipsius Marsilii Ficini, cum commentariiis Hungonis, Alberti, Thomae, Ambrosii oratoris, Linconiensis et Vercellensis* (Strasbourg, 1503))\textsuperscript{29}, and again in 1556 in Cologne (*S. Dionysii Areopagitae martyris, episcopi Atheniensis et Gallorum apostoli opera, quae quidem extent, omnia, quintuplici translatione uersa, et commentariis D. Dionysii a Rikel Carthusiani nunc iterum diligentissime editis elucidata, ab innumeris, quibus antehac scatebant, mendis sedulo uindicata* (Cologne, 1556)). This edition was based on the Paris manuscripts, BN 1618, 1619, 2612, 15630, and 17341\textsuperscript{30}. I have been unable to consult either of these editions, but J. Floss, in his 1853 edition of the

\textsuperscript{28}Cappuyns, *Jean Scot Érigène*, 220.

\textsuperscript{29}The Strasbourg edition presents the *Hierarchies* only, and is based, according to Sheldon-Williams, “on a text resembling that of MS. Toulouse 151”; *cf.* Sheldon-Williams, “A Bibliography,” 218.

\textsuperscript{30}Cf. Sheldon-Williams, “A Bibliography,” 218
text (PL 122, 1023-1194), reports the readings of the Cologne edition (Floss’ A) together
with the variants reported by that edition (Floss’ A*).

1.2.2.2 Patrologia Latina 122

Apart from the 16th century Cologne edition, Floss based his edition on seven
manuscripts:

Ratisbon, St. Emmeran 137 (11th century)
Vienna, Österreichische Staatsbibliothek 971 (13th century)
Vienna, Österreichische Staatsbibliothek 754 (12th century)
Darmstadt, Hessische Landes- und Hochschulbibliothek Schloß 30 (11th
century)

Furstenfeld, Stiftsbibliothek 9 (15th century);
Vatican, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, lat. 176 (14th century)
Vatican, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, lat. 177 (14th century)

In addition to these seven manuscripts, Floss claims to have consulted Leipzig
188 (13th century); Florence, Biblioteca Medicea Laurenziana. Plut. 89, supp. 15 (11th-
12th century) and certain manuscripts form Paris and Ghent. Munich, Bayerische

---

31 Floss’ B, now Munich, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek 14137
32 Floss’ C; olim Salisbury 157; Floss dates this manuscript to the 11th century, but
Sheldon-Williams (“A Bibliography,” 217) and Gabriel Théry (“Catalogue des
manuscrits dionysiens de bibliothéques d’Autriche,” Archives d’histoire doctrinale et
littéraire du Moyen Âge 10 (1935-1936): 167) are agreed that the manuscript comes from
the 13th century.
33 Floss’ D.
34 Floss’ E. This manuscript is now held in the Erzbischöfliche Diözesan- und
Dombibliothek in Cologne, with the same shelfmark. Floss dates this manuscript to the
12th century, but the catalogues agree that it comes from the 11th century (cf. Diane
Warne Anderson and Jonathan Black, The Medieval Manuscripts of the Cologne
Cathedral Library, vol. I, MSS 1-100), as does Cappuyns, Jean Scot Érigène, 161.
35 Floss’ H; now, Munich, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek 23456.
36 Praeterea inspeximus istius versionis codicum Lipsiensem 188, membranaceum, fol.,
seculi XIII, quem supra § 6 laudavimus, codicum Florentinum Plut. LXXXIX, Sup. 15,
membran., fol. maj., seculi XI vel XII ineuntis, foliorum 253, ubi versio exstat fol. 1-104,
codices Gandavensem, Parisienses, necnon plurimos alios minoris pretii codices, quos
quidem hic enumerare et longum et a re alienum esse videtur, PL 122, XIV.
Staatsbibliothek 14137 (=Clm1) was copied *ipsa manu Othlonis perilustris S. Emmerammi monachi Retisponensis*⁵⁷, as Othlo himself indicates on fol. 112v⁵⁸.

Floss’ edition has suffered the severe criticism of both Dondaine⁵⁹ and Chevallier⁶⁰, primarily for its failure to appreciate the manipulations that the text underwent throughout the middle ages. Nevertheless, Floss’ edition, which presents the version witnessed by Othlo’s manuscript as well as his two Viennese manuscripts, contains a text, as will be shown, attributable to Eriugena himself—indeed, the last corrected version attributable to the Irishman.

### 1.3 The Greek Manuscript Tradition and Paris BN gr. 437

Although there is some evidence that there were Greek manuscripts of the *Corpus Areopagiticum* in Rome as early as the 6th or 7th century⁶¹, the corpus did not make its definitive entry into the West until the 9th century. It was during the reign of the first Carolingians that the divine Denys was first made accessible to Latin speaking scholars

---

⁵⁷ PL 122, XIII.
⁵⁸ *En ego tantillus Otloh vulgo vocitatus, Quamvis omnigenis corruptus sim malefactis Sat tamen istud opus scribendi tuum tibi promptus, Sancte Dionysi, martyr celeberrime Christi: Unde mei quaeus precibus sacris memor esto, Vos quoque qui legitis veniam mihi posco petatis Gratia regiminis nostri codicem Bonnam nobis missum diligenter excutere licuit.*
⁶¹ Gregory the Great quotes the *De caelesti hierarchia* in his 34th Homily on the Gospels; PL 76, 1254.
through the translations of Hilduin and then Eriugena. However, the corpus made its entrance in two phases.

In September of 827, Michael the Stammerer, the Byzantine Emperor, sent an envoy to Louis the Pious in hopes of fostering better relations between East and West. The Byzantine legates brought with them certain gifts and manuscripts42, which latter included the works of Dionysius the Areopagite, whom Hilduin would soon identify with the patron of Paris, the martyr Saint Denys43.

In 1904, H. Omont44, tracing the provenance of a certain Greek manuscript held at the BN in Paris, discovered that the manuscript that the Byzantine Emperor had sent as a gift to his French counterpart continues to exist45 under the shelf mark Paris BN, gr. 437 (Pa).

---

42 The *Vita Ludouici Pi* simply refers to *munera*; cf. *Recueil des historiens des Gaules et de la France*, VI, 108. The *Annales Laurissenses*, however, expands, naming both *munera* and *literas*, cf. *Recueil des historiens des Gaules*, VI, 185A, MGH, *Scriptores*, I, 212. Hilduin, in a letter to Louis, provides the clearest statement as to the inclusion of the *Corpus Areopagiticum* amongst these gifts: *Authenticos namque eosdem libros graecae lingua conscriptos, quando echonomus ecclesiae Constantinopolitanae et ceteri missi Michaelis legatione publica ad uestram gloriam Compendio functi sunt; in ipsa uigilia solemnitas sancti Dionysii pro munere magno suscipimus, quod donum deuotioni nostrae, ac si coelitus allatum, adeo diuina est gratia prosecuta ut in eadem nocte decem et nouem nominatissimae uirtutes in aegrotorum sanatione uariam infirmitatem, Rescriptum Hilduin abbatis ad serenissimum imperatorem Ludouicum, PL 6, 16BC, MGH, *S. Epist.*, V, 330. Although the letter does not mention the works of Dionysius by name, Théry interprets the passage as implying that it was the depositing of the works of the Areopagite on the eve of his feast that brought about the miraculous healings described in Hilduin’s letter; cf. Gabriel Théry, “L’entrée du pseudo-Denys en Occident,” in *Mélanges Mandonnet II* (Paris: Bibliothèque Thomiste 14, 1930), 27.

43 PL 106, 13ff.


45 Paris BN, gr. 437 was received into the famous collection of Henri de Mesmes in the 16th century, where Guillaume Morel used it in establishing his 1562 edition of the corpus. Morel gives a description of all the manuscripts which he used in his work. The
Pa is a peculiar manuscript, containing the works of the pseudo-Areopagite, written entirely in uncial with no word separation, lacking breathings and accents, and riddled with *lacunae* and faults. An examination of a series of variants in Pa against 18 other manuscripts of the *Corpus Areopagiticum* dating from the 9th to 13th centuries led G. Théry to conclude that Pa had never been copied during the Middle Ages, and that the Paris manuscript is the sole representative of its family. This consideration together with a close comparison between the *lacunae* and faults of Pa, on the one hand, and Eriugena’s *Versio*, on the other, shows that Pa is the very manuscript upon which Eriugena based his translation.

---

first described is clearly our Greek manuscript, 437: *Primus omnium antiquissimus literis maiusculis et propemodum uncialibus in membrana ita descripsit erat, ut uerba a uerbis nullo interstitio aut exiguuo admodum, distinguueretur, sine accentuum ulla aut rarissima nota, nisi sicubi uerbum alioqui ambiguum foret*. This manuscript, which Morel acquired from *uir clarissimus Erricus Memmius*, was deposited in the Royal library together with much of the Mesmes collection after the death of Henri’s son, Jean-Jacques de Mesmes, in the 17th century.


In the second phase of its entrance into the West, the Corpus Areopagiticum took on an entirely different shape, the shape by which it is known in the vast majority of extant Greek manuscripts. Some time before 875, Anastasius Bibliothecarius took it upon himself\textsuperscript{49} to ameliorate Eriugena’s Versio. For, according to Anastasius, Eriugena’s overly literal translation left the text still to be translated\textsuperscript{50}. As Anastasius tells the story, after grasping the state of Eriugena’s text, Anastasius began to search for a teacher or some writing which would help Dionysius to shine forth more brightly, when suddenly a manuscript of the Greek corpus fell into his hands which contained the scholia of John of Scythopolis and Maximus Confessor. Thus, Anastasius translated the scholia and appended them to a manuscript of the Versio, sending text and commentary back to Charles in 875\textsuperscript{51}.

\textsuperscript{49} The letter of Pope Nicholas I, which is printed in PL 122, 1025-6, reproving Charles the Bald for not having sent the Versio for Rome’s approval was proven inauthentic by Cappuyns, \textit{Jean Scot Érigène}, 155ff.

\textsuperscript{50} \textit{Verum etsi ad mensuram datus est ei Spiritus, ipse tamen, paternis doctrinis imbutus, quantum potuit, fecit, et prodesse proximis ultra vires tentavit. Siquidem praeter illa, quae hunc latuuisse probantur ex his, quae sparsim a quibusdam de praedicti Patris sermonibus et epistolis ante nos interpretata inveniuntur, plurimum utilitati subtraxit, quia tanto studio verbum e verbo elicere procuravit, quod genus interpretationis, licet et ipse plerumque sequar, quantum illustres interpretes vitent, tua profecto sollers experientia non ignorat. Quod eum non egisse ob aliam causam existimo, nisi quia, cum esset humilis spiritu, non praesumpsit verbi proprietatem deserere, ne aliquo modo a sensus veritate decideret. Unde factum est, ut tantum virum, qui per se, quoniam intima et ardua quaeque utriusque philosophiae penetralia rimari proposuit, perplexus nostris intellectibus videbatur, intra cujosdam labyrinthi difficilia irretiret, et in antris profundioribus invisibiliorem quodammodo collocaret, et quem interpretaturum susceperat, adhuc redderet interpretandum, PL 122, 1027-8.}

\textsuperscript{51} \textit{Quapropter ipse, merito anxius, coepi sedulo quaerere, si forte reperiri potuisset praeceptor quisquam vel aliquod scriptum, quo enucleante tantus Pater nobis liquidus illucesceret, et, quia jam per interpretis industriam linguae nostrae fuerat traditus, nostris quoque patulus redderetur perfectius intellectibus: cum ecce repente paraphrases sive scholia in eum, quae Constantinopoli positus videram, ad manus venere, quibus utcunque interpretatis mihi aliquantulum magis emicuit, quae videlicet in marginibus interpretati codicis ejus, ut in Graeco reperi, mox interpretata utcunque, donec a docto}
By 875, then, the *Corpus Areopagiticum* was known to the West through two separate families: 1) The French family represented by the manuscript Pa, and 2) the Roman or Anastasian family (=R), witnessed by the majority of extant Greek manuscripts.

The continued existence of Pa provides us with an invaluable tool for understanding Eriugena’s translation, and, as we shall see, for filiating the Latin manuscripts of the *Versio*. For, any research on Eriugena’s translation and the textual criticism of the *Versio* must begin by distinguishing the work of Anastasius from that of Eriugena—a feat which can only be accomplished by first comparing the *Versio* to Pa.

### 1.4 The Latin Manuscript Tradition of Eriugena’s Versio Dionysii

The majority of manuscripts of the *Versio* contain not only Eriugena’s translation, but also Anastasius’ translation of the *scholia* of John of Scythopolis and Maximus

---

*melius interpretarentur, respondentibus signis interpres ego satis imperitus apposni, vestraeque gloriosae sapientiae potissimum fore mittenda non immerito judicavi, ut scilicet, quae fuit alterius interpretationis hortatrix et auxiliatrix, sit etiam nostrae qualiscunque susceptrix et approbatrix. Ipsorum autem scholiorum sive paratheseon quaecunque in calce sni siguim vivificae crucis habent, a beato Maximo confessore et monacho inventa narruntur, cetera vero sancti Joannis, Scythopolitani episcopi, esse feruntur, PL 122, 1027-8. Although we will have cause to discuss Anastasius’ contribution further in later chapters, it is worth noting here that Anastasius does advise Charles that his work surpassed, in places, merely appending the *scholia*. He used the *scholia* to compare the many strange translations of Eriugena to the *lemmata* of the Greek commentaries in order to suggest better Latin equivalents, and even suggested his own in certain places where the commentaries did not provide one: *Sane ubi a verbis interpretis scholia ipsa dissentire vidi, ut lector, quid de apposita dictione interpres senserit, quid scholiion insinuet, indifficulter agnoscat, et verba interpretis scholio inserui, et, qualiter ea scholii compositor praetulerit, innui. Sed et, sicubi opportumum fore conspexi, ex me quoque, quoniam esse aliter non potuit, paucissima quaedam, et quae facilius ab intelligente agnoxi poterant, interposui*, PL 122, 1027-8.*
Confessor. Thus, while the two families of Greek manuscripts of the *Corpus Areopagiticum* enter the West separately, in the Latin tradition they overlap. Further, while the Greek tradition known to Anastasius Bibliothecarius is characterized primarily by the presence of the *scholia* of John and Maximus, its Latin counterpart includes glosses belonging to Anastasius himself. Anastasius claims to have added his own notes advising the interested reader of passages where the translation of Eriugena differs markedly from the *lemmata* of the *scholia*, and to have inserted certain brief notes\(^{52}\). Thus, if the glosses of Anastasius have insinuated themselves into the text of Eriugena’s translation, the *Versio Dionysii* cannot be separated from the *Corpus Anastasii* by simply removing the *scholia* from the text.

Virtually every attempt to stemmatize or categorize the manuscripts of the *Versio* has begun with the attempt to purge, as it were, the work of Eriugena of the contamination of Anastasius.

In 1886 L. Traube despaired of ever discovering the pure, authentic work of Eriugena. Traube believed that the citations of Dionysius in Hincmar’s *Liber de praedestinatione* came from Eriugena’s translation. Since Hincmar’s citations correspond to no extant manuscript of the *Versio*, Traube concluded that the discrepancies between the version known to Hincmar and the surviving manuscripts of the *Versio* can only be explained by Anastasius’ intervention.

Traube proposed\(^{53}\) that the manuscripts fall into three distinct families: a ‘Francogallic’, an Italian, and a German family. The first, the ‘Francogallic’, is characterized by the inclusion of the *scholia* of John and Maximus and the ‘corrections’

---

\(^{52}\) Cf. previous note.

of Anastasius Bibliothecarius. Thus, Traube considers Anastasius the author of the French family, and to this family belong Bp, Fl, Av and E. The second family, the Italian, has for its author John of Campagne, who had a copy made for himself from the first family in the 10th century. To this family, Traube assigns only Mc, and Ba. The author of the third family, the German, is Othlo of Ratisbon, a monk and abbot of St. Emmeran in the 11th century, whose autograph remains on folio 112v of Clm. Apart from Clm, Va and Va, belong to this family. Neither the Italian nor the German families contain the work of Anastasius according to Traube. However, these two families differ from the French by giving the corrupt Ierugena in place of Eriugena and the German differs from the first two by including the verse Nobilibus quondam, a text no longer considered to be the work of Eriugena.

Traube’s division suffers from several problems. First, his point of departure is faulty. Since Traube published his notes on the manuscripts of the Versio, Théry has proven that the citations in Hincmar’s Liber de praedestinatione come from Hilduin’s translation rather than that of Eriugena. Second, Traube does not explain precisely in what consists the contribution of Anastasius. For himself, Anastasius claims merely to have added some glosses to those of John and Maximus. Certainly it would take more than paucissima quaedam to make the version known to Hincmar so different from that witnessed by the manuscripts.

54 MGH, Poetae Latini III, 525: Auctor Italicae videtur esse Iohannes dux Campaniae, qui saeculo decimo cum Dionysium transscribi iussit, adhibitum est primae familiae exemplum; cf. nota ad loc.: “Cf. Leonis vita Alexandri M. edita a Landgraf pag. 28, 7.”
55 Cf. Cappuyns, Jean Scot Érigène, 78, n. 3.
57 Cf. Epistola ad Karolum, MGH, ep. VI, 432-3.
Following Traube, Théry believed he had identified Anastasius’ *paucissima quaedam* in several Viennese manuscripts. Théry found that Va¹ and Va² witnessed an interlinear commentary, the goal of which seems to have been the latinization of Greek terms that Erigena either preserved or transliterated⁵⁸. Thus, according to Théry, the manuscripts of the *Versio* fall into two categories: those which are free of the work of Anastasius, and those which contain the *scholia* of John and Maximus and Anastasius’ own interlinear glosses, or, more simply, those which reflect a simple reading of Pa and those which show the influence of R⁵⁹. For, according to Théry, the contamination from R, which pervades the manuscripts of the *Versio*, can only have come from Anastasius. The first can easily be distinguished from the second by reading the manuscripts against Pa.

---

⁵⁸ Cf. “Catalogue des manuscrits,” 172. Théry gives the following examples from the *De caelesti hierarchia*:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scot Erigène</th>
<th>Gloses d’Anastase</th>
<th>Ms. 14137 (autogr. d’Othlon)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ch. I. symbolice</td>
<td>id est significatviue</td>
<td>fol. 5r</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>analogice</td>
<td>id est contemplatviue</td>
<td>fol. 5r</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ierarchias</td>
<td>id est summa sacerdotia</td>
<td>fol. 5r</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>τελετάρχις</td>
<td>teletarchis, id est princeps hostiarum</td>
<td>fol. 5r</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>θέωσιν</td>
<td>theosin, id est deificationem</td>
<td>fol. 5r</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ch. II. archistrategos</td>
<td>id est dux, principium exercitus; stratos exercitus; strategos, princeps</td>
<td>fol. 6r</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>theologia</td>
<td>id est diuina disputatio</td>
<td>fol. 6r</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>θεαρχιασις</td>
<td>id est diuinitatis</td>
<td>fol. 7r</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>caracterizante</td>
<td>id est imaginante</td>
<td>fol. 7r</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>theosphi</td>
<td>id est diuini sapientes</td>
<td>fol. 8v</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

⁵⁹ “1° Les manuscrits sans les Scholies de Maxime et sans les gloses interlinéaires d’Anastase le Bibliothécaire; 2° Les manuscrits qui possèdent ces gloses et ces Scholies. D’une façon générale… on peut penser que les manuscrits sans gloses et Scholies sont issus directement de l’exemplaire de Scot Erigène; et les autres, de l’exemplaire envoyé par Anastase”, Théry “Catalogue des manuscrits,” 173.
Théry’s contribution, although a great deal more advanced than that of Traube, suffers from its own faults. Théry’s so-called glosses of Anastasius do not reflect the readings of R, and the interlinear commentary found in a considerable number of manuscripts of the Versio is far more complex than Théry supposed. H. Dondaine recognized that the interlinear commentary that Théry had identified as the work of Anastasius had several sources.

Dondaine, the last scholar to attempt a categorization of the manuscripts of the Versio, began his own research where Théry left off. Following Théry’s suggestion that the manuscripts of the Versio may be divided into those which lack the scholia and those which contain them, Dondaine set out to examine these two families against Pa in hopes of finding evidence of the intrusion of R. Comparing A, a manuscript which contains the scholia, and T, from the 9th-10th century, which lacks them, Dondaine discovered that in A many of the lacunae found in Pa, which one would expect to be reproduced in any manuscript of the Versio Dionysii, had been filled. T, on the other hand, simply reproduces the lacunae of Pa (as one would expect). Since the lacunae of Pa could only have been corrected using a manuscript from the R family, A must be contaminated by R. But Eriugena seems to have known but one manuscript, i.e. Pa: ad codicum graecum, unde ego interpretatus sum. If, then, A represents the work of Anastasius, and R enters the tradition of the Versio only through the work of Anastasius, we must conclude “la

---

60 Théry does not explain the fact that the Viennese manuscripts in which he claims to have found the glosses of Anastasius do not contain Anastasius’ translation of the scholia of John and Maximus.
61 The glosses archistategos and theosophi actually come from Eriugena’s Expositiones.
62 PL 122, 1032C.
pureté du texte de T”, according to Dondaine. T must represent the work of Eriugena prior to the work of Anastasius.

However, on further inspection, Dondaine noticed that where the readings of A and T differ, there appears a pattern of correction in T. Dondaine divides the corrections of T into two groups: “a) les latinisations et b) les progrès en traduction.” If, however, T is a correction of A, we must reverse the initial conclusion, according to Dondaine: the Paris manuscript A must represent an earlier version; the Troyes manuscript T represents a later, corrected version, which, according to Dondaine, is a correction of A based solely on Pa; the corrector shows no sign of having had access to R.

---

64 To Dondaine’s examples, I add the following from *De caelesti hierarchia* II:
1. PL122 1043A15,  
   Pa: ΑΠΙΗΧΗΜΑΤΑ  
   A: resonantias  
   T: imagines  
2. PL122 1043B8,  
   Pa: ΘΕΑΡΧΙΚΑΙΣ  
   A: thearchicus  
   T: diuinis  
3. PL 122, 1043C13,  
   Pa: ΑΓΑΛΜΑΤΩΝ  
   A: agalmatum  
   T: imaginum

65 To Dondaine’s, I add the following examples, again, taken form CH II:
1. PL122 1041C12-D1,  
   Pa: ΚΑΙ ΝΥΝ ΤΟΙΓΑΡΟΥΝ ΟΥΚ ΑΙΣΧΟΥΣ ΑΠΟΠΛΗΠΟΥΣΙΝ ΤΑΣ ΟΥΡΑΝΙΟΥΣ ΔΙΑΚΟΣΜΕΣΕΙΣ ΑΙ ΤΩΝ ΛΟΓΙΩΝ ΙΕΡΟΓΡΑΦΙΑΙ ΤΑΙΣ ΑΝΟΜΟΙΟΙΣ ΑΥΤΑΣ ΜΟΡΦΟΠΟΙΕΙΑΙΣ ΕΚΦΑΝΟΥΣΑΙ:  
   A: Et nunc itaque non turpes replent caelestes ornatus eloquiorum sacre descriptiones dissimilibus eas formarum facturis manifestantes;  
   T: Et nunc itaque non turpes replent caelestes ornatus eloquiorum sacre descriptiones dissimilibus eos formarum facturis manifestantes;  
2. PL122 1042 A9-10,  
   Pa: ΦΑΙΝΟΜΕΝΩΝ ΚΑΛΩΝ ΥΨΗΛΟΤΕΡΟΝ  
   A: usibilium bonorum altius  
   T: usibilibus bonis altius
Though A and T be separated by the corrections proper to T, A itself, Dondaine noticed, reports many of the corrections of T in a kind of interlinear commentary or apparatus. In almost every case where T presents what can only be called a correction over A, A gives the reading of T above the line\textsuperscript{66}.

Théry had identified the corrections of T above the lines in the two Viennese manuscripts, Va\textsuperscript{1} and Va\textsuperscript{2}, and concluded that they represented the work of Anastasius. However, Dondaine discovered that both types of corrections in T can be found in Eriugena’s \textit{Expositiones}\textsuperscript{67}. Indeed, the differences between A and T diminish noticeably in the \textit{De diuinis nominibus}, \textit{De mystica theologia} and \textit{De ecclesiastica hierarchia}, suggesting a close connection between the Scot’s commentary on the \textit{De caelesti hierarchia} and the corrections of T. Thus, Dondaine concludes that we are faced with two recensions, A and T\textsuperscript{68}, each subject to corrections on separate occasions with separate purposes. The corrector of the first (=A) intended to fill in the \textit{lacunae} of Pa, and to accomplish this must have had access to R. The second “latinise franchement le

\textsuperscript{66}“Sur 120 variantes par nous notées entre A et T dans une dizaine de chapitres des deux \textit{Hiérarchies} et des \textit{Noms divins}, 92 sont exactement signalées dans A B; les 28 autres sont presque toutes des variantes de copie, sans signification,” Dondaine, \textit{Le corpus dionysien}, 58.

\textsuperscript{67}Thus, for examples 1-3 of note 64, above, \textit{cf. Expositiones II}, 899-901: Resonantias autem dico uel resutlationes, quas Greci ΑΠΗΧΗΜΑΤΑ vocant, rerum intelligibilium imaginationes, \textit{Expositiones II}, 925: in ipsis diuinis... manifestationibus, and \textit{Expositiones II}, 1180-1: Agalma enim dicunt omnem expressam imaginem que intuentibus leitiiam efficit; for examples 1 and 2 of note 65, \textit{cf. Expositiones II}, 595 corrects the error: dum eos dissimilibus sibi formis manifestant, and \textit{Expositiones II}, 625-6 (lemma).

\textsuperscript{68}Significant agreement between A, B, Av, on the one hand, and T and Os, on the other, permits one to conclude that we are looking at two distinct recensions, A and T respectively.
vocabulary; il tente de dépasser le mot-à-mot élémentaire pour serrer de plus près les sens de l’original”69.

Dondaine, then, posed the question: which recension was known to Anastasius?70

The glosses which may be certainly attributed to Anastasius generally occur within the scholia themselves of John and Maximus. Thus, at De caelesti hierarchia II, 1043A, Eriugena translates the word ἀπίχημα resonantias according to A, and imagines according to T. PG 4, 46B reports the gloss: τὶ δὲ ἐστὶν ἀπίχημα ἔσχατον, ἐν τῷ Περὶ θείων ὀνομάτων λόγῳ σαφνύσω ἐν κεφαλ. δ’, which Anastasius translates: Quid autem sit apecchema [quod interpres in imaginem transtulit, ego uero absurditatem uel id quod absonum est esse inueni], in sermone qui est de diuinis nominibus explanatum est capito quarto (A, 8r). Again, at De caelesti hierarchia II, 1044A, Eriugena translates ἄγγελοειδεῖς angeliformes according to A, but angelicas according to T. And in his translation of the scholion on this passage (PG 4, 48BC), Anastasius inserts the following note: angelicas… [sicut interpres posuit] (B 12v). It is clear, then, that Anastasius knew the Versio according to the T recension.

However, both recensions witness the scholia. For, although T was chosen by Dondaine to represent the manuscript tradition, which does not know the scholia, Os—the only other T manuscript examined by Dondaine—has the scholia, as do a large proportion of the T manuscripts. Since, then, Anastasius used a T manuscript, the scholia as they exist in A must have come from a T manuscript, perhaps together with A’s interlinear apparatus. Thus, as far as the Corpus Anastasii is concerned, the chronology of the recensions must be: T → A. However, for the Versio Dionysii, Dondaine proposes

---

69 Dondaine, Le corpus dionysien, 44.
70 Ibid., 64ff.
the order: \( A \rightarrow \textit{Expositiones} \rightarrow T \)\textsuperscript{71}, claiming that, because the corrections of \( T \) are found in the \textit{Expositiones}, and because these corrections must have been made before 875 when Anastasius returned his expanded copy of the \textit{Versio} to Charles the Bald, Eriugena himself must have been responsible for correcting \( T \). In other words, the text of \( A \) represents Eriugena’s initial attempt at translating the \textit{Corpus Areopagiticum}, which Eriugena then corrected in conjunction with his reading of the \textit{De caelesti hierarchia} for his commentary thereon.

It seems, however, that Dondaine, as Théry and Traube before him, was too eager to see the interfering hand of Anastasius, too eager to point to a manuscript or recension which could be attributed to Eriugena alone. For, if the recension \( A \) is distinguished from \( T \) by \( A \)’s contamination against \( R \)—as Dondaine claims—, it cannot be considered the parent of \( T \), which according to Dondaine is not so contaminated. As it turns out, satisfied with his distinction between \( A \) and \( T \) based on the contamination \( R \), Dondaine failed to notice that several \( T \) manuscripts apart from \( T \) itself are contaminated by way of \( R \).

For example, in \textit{De diuinis nominibus} V, the chapter which considers the divine name ‘being’, Dionysius discusses the relationship between being itself and the source of being. \( R \) (in Suchla’s edition) reads thus:

\[
\text{Καὶ οὗτο δὲ τὸ εἶναι ἐκ τοῦ προώντος, καὶ οὗτοὺ ἐστὶ τὸ εἶναι καὶ οὐκ οὗτος τοῦ εἶναι, καὶ ἐν οὐτῷ ἐστὶ τὸ εἶναι καὶ οὐκ οὗτος ἐν τῷ εἶναι, καὶ οὗτον ἔχει τὸ εἶναι, καὶ οὐκ οὗτος ἔχει τὸ εἶναι. Καὶ οὗτος ἐστὶ τοῦ εἶναι καὶ αἰών καὶ ἀρχὴ καὶ ἔργα πρὸ οὐσίας ὡν καὶ ὄντος καὶ αἰώνος καὶ πάντων οὐσιοποιῶς ἀρχὴ καὶ μεσότης καὶ τελευτή.} \textsuperscript{72}
\]

According to \( T \), Eriugena translated the passage thus:

---

\textsuperscript{71} Dondaine, \textit{Le corpus dionysien}, 49.
\textsuperscript{72} 186.15-187.3, PG3 824A)
Et ipsum uero esse ex anteonte et ab ipso est esse et non ipse esse et eum habet esse et WN et principium et mensura ante essentias WN et saeculi et omnium substantificam principium et medietas et consuetudinio\textsuperscript{73}.

A comparison with Pa explains the lacunae in Eriugena’s rendering:

\[ \text{ΚΑΙ ΑΥΤΟ ΔΕ ΤΟ EIΝΑΙ ΕΚ ΤΟΥ ΠΡΟΟΝΤΟΣ ΚΑΙ ΑΥΤΟΥ ΕΣΤΙ ΤΟ EIΝΑΙ ΚΑΙ ΟΥΚ ΑΥΤΟΣ ΤΟ EIΝΑΙ. ΚΑΙ < ἐν αὐτῷ ἔστι τὸ ἔλιναι καὶ οὐκ αὐτός ἐν τῷ ἔλιναι, καὶ> ΑΥΤΟΝ ΕΧΕΙ ΤΟ EIΝΑΙ ΚΑΙ < καὶ οὐκ αὐτός ἔχει τὸ ἔλιναι. Καὶ αὐτός ἐστι τοῦ ἔλιναι καὶ αἰών> ΩΝ ΚΑΙ ΑΡΞΗ ΚΑΙ ΜΕΤΡΟΝ ΠΡΟ ΟΥΣΙΑΣ ΩΝ ΚΑΙ ΟΝΤΟΣ ΚΑΙ ΑΙΩΝΟΣ ΚΑΙ ΠΑΝΤΩΝ ΟΥΣΙΟΠΟΙΟΣ ΑΡΞΗ ΚΑΙ ΜΕΣΟΤΗΣ ΚΑΙ ΤΕΛΕΥΤΗ\textsuperscript{74}. ]

Pa has two lacunae, indicated in angled brackets above, which Eriugena’s translation reproduces in T. Further, the second lacuna contains a second error: \( \text{R}'s \) \( \alphaιων' \) at the end of the lacuna becomes ΩΝ in Pa. A, while it reproduces, with T, the first lacuna, fills in the second while preserving the reading ΩΝ with Pa as well as \( \alphaιων' \) with \( \text{R}: \) \textit{non ipse habet esse et ipse est existendi euum et WN…} \textsuperscript{75} However, several manuscripts, including Os\textsuperscript{76}, a \( T \) manuscript, have properly supplied what is wanting while leaving out ΩΝ. It seems, then, that the contamination by \( R \) is not peculiar to \( A \) and it did not enter the \textit{Versio} in one simple stage. \( T \), by virtue of having supplied what is wanting while correctly omitting ΩΝ, shows signs of having been contaminated quite separately from \( A \). Further, Théry’s list of lacunae\textsuperscript{77}, from which Dondaine takes his start, is incomplete. For example, the words \( \zetaωσιοιων' \) καὶ at PG 3, 816C\textsuperscript{78} are omitted from Pa\textsuperscript{79}.

\textsuperscript{73} Fol. 214r.
\textsuperscript{74} Fol. 157r.
\textsuperscript{75} Fol. 67v.
\textsuperscript{76} Apart from Os, Dt, H, Ox and Clm\textsuperscript{2} (the last an \( M \) manuscript) all correct this omission.
\textsuperscript{77} Cf. Théry, \textit{Études Dionysiennes} II, table 2.
\textsuperscript{78} DN V, 181.13.
\textsuperscript{79} Fol. 152r.
The collation of the manuscripts of the Versio shows that Dondaine’s division of A and T is correct; however, his initial premise, that they are separated by the contamination by R, is faulty, since both A and T show signs of such contamination.

Further, Dondaine has misconstrued the relationship between the interlinear apparatus of A and the corrections of T. For while A reproduces a large percentage of the variants of T, the latter is the source for less than half of the entries in A; A’s apparatus is far more extensive than the corrections of T. In several instances, A seems to have exchanged the reading of A and the variant of T. The recension A generally gives depulsio for the Dionysian ἀποφασις and intentio for καταφασις. However, A, 7r gives negationes in the text and id est depulsiones above the line (where the reading of T is negationes), and immediately following, affirmationes in the text and id est intentiones above the line (T=affirmationes)\(^{80}\). In some instances, neither the variant nor the lemma of A can be found in T: at 6v, A reports the variant uel inconsequentibus for inconsequentis; the same passage in T\(^{81}\) gives inconsequens.

The recension A, then, cannot be considered a proto-version, Eriugena’s initial attempt at translation prior to the corrections of T or the contamination from R. Even expunging the variants in A which come from T and the contamination which comes from R, there remains a foreign element in A which prevents it being considered the parent of T. At best, A merely points to an earlier version, α, preceding both A and T.

Dondaine’s gravest error, however, comes from his meager selection of manuscripts. For, had he included more manuscripts in his examination, he likely would

\(^{80}\) PL 122, 1041C.

\(^{81}\) E.g., Os 12v.
not have failed to recognize a third recension of the Versio represented by the manuscripts: Ba, Clm¹, Clm², E, Ly, Ox, Va¹, Va², and Z.

1.5 The Three Recensions of the Versio Dionysii

Although Dondaine’s point of departure (that the contamination against R separates A and T) is faulty, the division of A and T remains sound. They carry both conjunctive and separative errors, such that they must be considered two recensions of the same tradition. However, a third recension appears in Ba, Clm¹, Clm², E, Ly, Ox, Va¹, Va², and Z. This recension (=M) presents neither the contamination from R nor the scholia, and knows neither the apparatus of A, nor the corrections of T.

However, like T, M shows signs of having been thoroughly corrected. And the corrections of M go beyond the simple latinizations and changes of T. The corrector was looking to clarify the text, rendering it more readable, more comprehensible, not merely more accurate or faithful to Pa (as was the corrector of T).

For example, in the course of chapter two of De caelesti hierarchia⁸², Dionysius delineates the scope of the work: we must, he says, rise through forms to simplicity in

---

⁸² 9.16-10.9: Χρή τοιγαρούν ώς οίμαι πρώτον ἐκθέσαι τίνα μὲν εἶναι σκοπὸν ἀπάσης ἱεραρχίας οἰκουμέθα καὶ τί τούς ἀυτῆς ἐκαστή διασώτας ὀνήσιαν, ἕξης δὲ τὰς οὐρανίας ἱεραρχίας ὑμησια κατὰ τὴν αὐτῶν ἐν τῶν λογίων ἑκαττόριας, ἐπεμένως τις τούτοις εἰπεῖν ὅποιαις ἱεραῖς μορφώσεις τὰς οὐρανίας σχηματίζουσι διακοσμήσεις αἱ τῶν λογίων ἱερογραφίαι, καὶ πρὸς ποιῶν ἴαν εἶναι στὶς διὰ τῶν πλασμάτων ἀπλότητα, ὅπως ἡ καὶ ἡμεῖς ὀσσοῦται τοῖς πολλοῖς ἀνιέρως οἰκουμέθα τοὺς οὐρανίους καὶ θεοειδεῖς ψωτές πολύποδας εἰναί τινας καὶ πολυπροσώπους καὶ πρὸς βοῶν κτηνώδιαν ἢ πρὸς λεόντων θηριομορφίαν τετυπωμένους καὶ πρὸς ἀετῶν ἀγκυλόχειλον ἐιδὸς ἢ πρὸς πτηνῶν τριχώδη πτεροφύιαν διαπεπλασμένους καὶ τροχοῦς τίνας πυρώδεις ὑπὲρ τὸν οὐρανὸν φανταζώμεθα καὶ θρόους ὄλαιος τῇ θεαρχίᾳ πρὸς ἀνάκλισιν ἐπιτηδείους καὶ ἵππους τίνας πολυχρωμάτους καὶ δορυφόρους ἀρχιστρατήγους
order that we not imagine, as do the many, that the celestial minds are many-footed, or multi-faced... or that there are certain fiery chariots above the heavens; καὶ τροχοὺς τινὰς πυρῶδεις ὑπὲρ τὸν οὐρανὸν φανταζόμεθα.83 According to A and T, Eriugena translated this passage: et rotas quasdam igneas super caelum imaginamus. The sentence requires the subjunctive, and this is what R has (φανταζώμεθα). Eriugena simply reproduced the mistake of Pa in giving the indicative.84 However, M corrects this error: et rotas quasdam igneas super caelum imaginemus.

Again, in chapter two, Dionysius responds to an imaginary detractor who claims that it does dishonour to attribute despicable forms to the godlike and holy ranks.

Εἰ δὲ τὰς ἀπεμφανίωσας εἰκονογραφίας αἰτιάσοιτό τις αἰδεῖσθαι λέγων ἀναθέναι τὰ οὕτως αἰσχρὰ μορφώματα ταῖς θεοιδεῖ καὶ ἀγιοτάταις διακοσμήσαιν, ἀπόχρη πρὸς αὐτὸν εἰπεῖν ὡς δίπτος ἐστὶ τῆς ἱερᾶς ἐκφαντορίας ὁ τρόπος.85

Reading a text without diacriticals and virtually no word separation, Eriugena failed to understand the verb: ΑΙΤΙΑΣΟΙΤΟ and read one word as two: causas aestimauerit. Thus, we read the bizarre translation of T: Si autem deformes imaginum descriptiones causas estimauerit quis inhonestum dicens referre sic turpes formationes deformibus et sanctissimis dispositionibus...86 The double accusative descriptiones and causas is impossible to construe. Although M retains the faulty causas aestimauerit, the corrector has given the sentence some meaning: Si autem deformes imaginum descriptione causas estimauerit quis dehonestari dicens referri sic turpes formationes

---

83 10.5; φανταζόμεθα] Pa, φανταζώμεθα R
84 A, 6v; Os, 11v.
85 11.21-12.2.
86 T, 157r.
If, however, one were to consider deformed the causes of the descriptions of these images, saying that it does dishonor that such lowly forms be attributed to the godlike and holy orders... The version of M gives the meaning intended by Dionysius even if it mangles the Greek.

If Dondaine is correct and Eriugena was responsible for the corrections in T, what are we to make of the corrections in M? As with T, the corrections in M may be accounted for by the Expositiones. While T's corrections are suggested by the text of Eriugena’s commentary, M represents the very text commented. For, the lemmata of the commentary and the recension M are almost identical. In his comments on the first text examined above, the lemma of the commentary gives imaginemus in place of imaginamus. The text of the commentary seems to be a justification of the change:

In omnibus huius periodi colis, dum sit tetracolon, a superioribus aperitur intellectus sic: et ut non imaginemus rotas ignes super celum, hoc est in supercelestibus essentis, ubi nullus ignis sensibilis est, et ut non imaginemus ibidem thronos materiales, hoc est sedes ex corporali materia fabricatas, ad recubitum diuinitati necessarios uel, ut expressius transfertur, opportunos uel coaptatos, et ut non imaginemus in supercelestibus equos quosdam diuersorum colorum, et ut non imaginemus in spiritualibus naturis armiferos archistrategos, hoc est armiferos duces principum exercitus.

Almost all of the corrections of M can be accounted for in this way. Most of them are not only witnessed by the lemmata of the commentary, but are confirmed by the text as well.

The second example given above is also explained by the Expositiones. The lemma follows M exactly and the comment explains:

---

87 Clm1, 6v.
88 Exp. II, 104-14.
Si quis, inquit, estimarit causas deformes, qualescumque sint uerbi gratia irrationabiles rationabilis animi motus, descriptionis imaginum in sancta scriptura, et dehonestari dicit deiformes et sanctissimos angelorum ordines, si eis tales turpes formationes mysticarum uisionum referantur, sat est aduersus perniciosam ipsius opinionem respondere.  

Indeed, in almost every case where M differs from A and T, the text of the commentary shows that Eriugena was reading M. The following are examples taken from De caelesti hierarchia II where M seems to correct T, together with the references to the Expositiones which confirm that Eriugena knew the text of M.

10.9-10, Καὶ γὰρ ἀτεχνῶς ἢ θεολογία ταῖς ποιητικῶς ἱεροπλαστίαις ἐπὶ τῶν ἀσχηματιστῶν νοσῶν ἐκρήσατο
10.18-19, ἀναπλάττειν τε καὶ ἐκφάνειν σχηματισµὸν ἐκ τῶν παρ᾽ ἡµῖν τιµιωτάτων
10.19, καὶ ᾠλῶν ποσῶς καὶ ὑπερκειµένων οὐσιῶν

11.21-12.1, Εἰ δὲ τὰς ἀπεµφανύοισας εἰκονογραφίας αἰτίασιτό τις αἰδείοθαι λέγων ἀνατίθεναι τὰ οὕτως αἰσχρὰ μορφῶµατα

A/T, Et enim ulde artificialiter theologia poeticis sacris formationibus in non figuratis intellectibus usa est.
M/Exp. II, 124-6, Et enim ulde artificialiter theologia facticiis sacris formationibus in non figuratis intellectibus usa est.

A/T, immaterialibus quoquomodo et supereminentibus essentiis...
M/Exp. II, 202-3, reformare et manifestare formationibus ex apud nos preciosissimis...

A/T, Si autem deiformes imaginum descriptiones causas estimaerit quis inhonestum dicens referre sic turpes formationes deiformibus et sanctissimis dispositionibus...
M/Exp. II, 204, materialibus quomodo et supereminentibus essentiis...

M/Exp. II, 393-6, Si autem deiformes imaginum descriptione causas estimaerit quis dehonestari dicens referri sic turpes formationes deiformibus et sanctissimis...

---

89 Exp. II, 397-402.
92 Cf. Exp. II, 229: Quomodo et supereminentibus essentiis, hoc est eo modo quo supereminentibus angelicis conueniret essentiis, uel, ut expressius transferetur, quomodo et supereminentium essentiarum, eo scilicet modo quo supereminentium essentiarum imagines fieri oportet. Clearly, this passage is defending the change from quoquomodo to quomodo. M’s materialibus is simply a corruption and is not reported by the Expositiones.
93 A= descriptionis
ταῖς θεσειδεῖ καὶ ἀγιωτάταις
diaκοσμήσειν
12.9-10, τῶν τοιούτων
ἱερῶν ἀναπλασμάτων
σεμιντερῶν μὲν ὑπὸ τῶν
καὶ τῶν προσώπων
μορφῶσεων ὑπερκείθαι
12.15-16, καὶ ἄπειρον
καὶ ἀχώρητον
ἀποκαλούντων
12.16-17, καὶ τὰ
<λοιπὰ> ἐξ ὧν οὐ
tι ἐστιν, ἀλλὰ τί ὡς ἐστιν
σημαίνεται.
13.9, Εἰς μὲν γὰρ τὰς
τιμωτέρας
ἱεροπλαστίας εἰκὸς ἐστι
13.11-12, ἡμφιεσμένους
ἐσθῆτα φανῆν καὶ τὸ
πυρῶδες ἀβλαβῶς
ἀποστίλβοντας

dispositionibus…

A/T, tantis mirabilibus
formationibus,
manentibus et materiales
formationibus excellere

A/T, et infinitam et
incomprehensam
uocantibus

A/T, Et quae ex quibus non
quid est sed quid non est
significatur.

A/T, Per quidem enim
preciosiores sacras
formationes consequens est

A/T, indutos usamenti

M/Exp. II, 450-1, tantis
mirabilibus
reformationibus
gloriosioribus quidem
existentibus et materiales
formationibus excellere

M/Exp., II, 473-4, et
infinitam
incomprehensibilemque
uocantibus

M/Exp. II, 474-5, Et ea ex
quibus non quid est sed
quid non est significatur.

M/Exp. II, 607-8, In
quidem enim
preciosioribus sacrīs
formationibus consequens est

M/Exp. II, 610-1, indutos
usamenti candidae et
ignee innoque
resplendentes

94 Cf. Exp. II, 397-402: Si quis, inquit, estimarit causas deformes, qualescunque sint
urbi gratia irrationabiles rationabilis animi motus, descriptionis imaginum in sancta
scriptura, et dehonestari dicit deiformes et sanctissimos angelorum ordines, si eis tales
turpes formationes mysticarum uisionum referantur, sat est aduersus perniciosam ipsius
opinionem respondere…

95 A= reformationibus with M.

96 Cf. Exp. II, 453-455: Tales sunt, inquit, tante et tam magne, mirabiles forme que
gloriosiores existunt omnesque materiales formationes et imaginationes superant…
A/T’s manentibus is comprehensible only by reference to Pa. At fol. 6r, Pa reads
MENONTIN, which Eriugena failed to understand as μὲν ὑπὸ τῶν. The correction of M,
however, can only be explained if Eriugena continued to consult Pa as he wrote his
Expositiones.

97 Cf. Exp. II, 613-4: In pretiosis, inquit, hoc est pulchris natureque similibus sanctis
imaginationibus…

98 Eriugena recognized that τὸ πυρῶδες is the object of ἀποστίλβοντας, and felt
compelled to supply a transitive verb, but later realized that respergentes was grossly
inadequate. However, the more accurate resplendentes is an intransitive verb; thus, he
had to make candidum and igneum into adverbs. That he (mistakenly) took the two
adjectives, candidum and igneum, together rather than separately (candidum should
A/T, non concedens materiale nostrum in turpibus imaginibus remanens quiescere... M/Exp. II, 651, non concedens materiale nostrum in turpibus imaginibus manens requiescere...

A/T, et omnis irrationabilitatis est repletus furbundus eorum motus... M/Exp. II, 739, et omni irrationabilitate est repletus furbundus eorum motus...

A/T, ut lumen incircumulote et invisibiliter resplendens M/Exp. II, 934, ut lumen incircumulato et intellectualiter resplendens

A/T, diuina sapientes tradiderunt M/Exp. II, 1061, diuini sapientes tradiderunt

A/T, ut neque diuina immundis recte accepta sint... M/Exp. II, 1102, ut neque diuina immundis tractabilia sint...

A/T, mirabilium imaginum studiosi contemplationis M/Exp. II, 1102, mirabilium agalmatum studiosi contemplatores

A/T, ex inconuenientibus dissimilibus similitudinibus formant M/Exp. II, 1218-9, ex inconuenientibus dissimilibus similitudinibus reformant

A/T, extendere per usibilia M/Exp. II, 1242-3,

modify uestimenta and igneum should be the object of resplendentes) is evident from the text of Exp.II, 617-618: quique candido colore et igneo, innocueque tamen, resplendent. Part of the problem stems from the meaning of πυρώδες, which, with the article, is a substantive rather than an adjective.

99 Cf. Exp. II, 654-5: in turpibus imaginibus manendo requiescere...

100 Eriugena originally preserved the Greek genitive, not impossible with repletus, but, upon reconsideration, decided on the more Latin ablative. Eriugena generally uses the ablative with repletus; cf. Exp. I, 199; II, 274; II, 591; II, 1008; VII, 598.

101 The nonsensical incircumulote can only be a scribal error; incircumulate in M is not a correction.


103 Cf. Exp. II, 1064-5: Diuini siquidem sapientes, id est theologi...

104 Cf. Exp. II, 1147-53: Et notandum quod in loco quo transculmiss tractabilia in greco scriptum est EYXΕΙΡΩΤΑ, quod nos possimus dicere facilia, ut tals sensus sit: propertea diuina sapientes sacruma diuinaram rerum, dissimilia ipsis rebus, obscura, mixta et materialibus assumpta, conformant, ne diuina mysteria facilia fient ad intelligendum immundis animis dignisque cognitione ueritatis.

105 R= theiow.
in supermundanas altitudes.

A/T, inconuenientes M, Exp. II, 1258-9, inconuenientes diuinorum eloquiorum angeliformes imaginum eikonographias

A/T, Quidque ab ipsa ierarchia prosunt ierarchiam sortientes. M/Exp. II, 1262-3, Quidue ipsam ierarchiam prostat ierarchia sortientibus.

A/T, ausculta mirabiliter dictorum diuinus diuina in doctrina factus M/Exp. II, 1278-9, ausculata mirabiliter dictorum diuinus in deo et in doctrina factus

Not every variant separating M from A and T ameliorates the translation. Again, in chapter two of the De caelesti hierarchia, Dionysius explains what we mean when we speak of the irrationality of immaterial beings. When spoken of material and soulless beings irrationality refers to a lack or defect of reason, while in intellectual beings it refers to their excess with regard to our transitory reason: τὸ ὕπερέχον αὐτῶν ὡς ὕπερκοσμιῶν ὁμολογοῦμεν τοῦ καθ’ ἡμᾶς μεταβατικὸ καὶ σωματικὸ λόγου καὶ τῆς ὑλαίας καὶ ἀλλοτρίας τῶν ἀσωμάτων νοῶν αἰσθήσεως. According to A and T Eriugena understood τὸ ὕπερέχον to refer to an excess of intellect in immaterial beings and precisely over our reason and sense, but he could not force the passage to say what he understood without abandoning his word-for-word method and inserting a word (excellentes at the end of the passage): supereminentias earum ut supermundalium

107 T= angelicas.
109 Cf. Exp. II, 1286-7: diuin in Deo et in diuina doctrina perfecti.
confitemur nostram transitoriam et corporalem rationem et materialem et alienatum incorporealibus animi sensum excellentes. The M recension treats the Greek genitive as instrumental, making it an ablative in Latin: supereminens earum ut supermundalium confitemur nostra transitoria et corporali ratione et materiali alienato incorporealibus animis sensu. The reading of A and T, while abandoning Eriugena’s strict literalism, renders the passage intelligibly, and according to the intention of Dionysius. M, on the other hand, gives a reading which is difficult to construe, even if it has avoided supplying words not found in the Greek text.

In this case, too, the Expositiones follows M. The lemma of the Expositiones is identical to M, and the comment reads:

Dum autem irrationabilitas et insensualitas de immaterialibus et intellectualibus predicatur essentiis, insensualitas quidem de immaterialibus, de intellectualibus uero irrationabilitas, pulchre et religiose confitemur significari quod in ipsis supermundalibus supereminet, hoc est contemplationis earum uirtus, quo omnem sensum nostrum nostramque rationem supergregitur, dum nostra transitoria, et corporalis ratio, hoc est adhuc mortali corpore grauata, et materialis sensus longissime ab incorporalibus animis alienatur.

Finally, there are passages in which A agrees rather with M than with T.

13.3 ἡ δὲ τῶν T, per dissimiles formationes manifestatio. A/M/Exp. II, 516-7, per dissimiles reformationes manifestatio.
14.5-7, δηλοῦν ὡς οἷμαι τὴν ἀρετωπὸν αὐτῶν λογιστῆτα καὶ τὴν ἀμείλικτον ἐξιν ἐν ταῖς rationabilitatem et uirilem rationabilitatem et inmanem quietem in immitem quietem in

111 Cf. PL 122, 1043A8-11.
112 PL 122, 1043A8-11.
113 Exp. II, 857-66.
It is clear that Eriugena knew the recension \( M \), which he used in composing his commentary. Indeed, much of the commentary reads like a justification of the corrections which characterize \( M \). However, if Dondaine is correct in maintaining that Eriugena was responsible for the corrections of \( T \), then what are we to make of the relationship between these two recensions? For, while \( M \) shows signs of having been corrected, it does not follow the latinizations of \( T \); while, conversely, \( T \) does not know the corrections characteristic of \( M \).

Since the \textit{Expositiones} show that Eriugena knew and was responsible for the corrections of \( M \), one might assume that Dondaine was incorrect in attributing those of \( T \) to Eriugena. The corrections of \( T \) could certainly have been extracted from the \textit{Expositiones} by an attentive reader, perhaps a close colleague of Eriugena, and entered into a private copy of the \textit{Versio}\textsuperscript{115}. This copy could then have entered into public circulation where it was copied, becoming the recension \( T \). However, the \textit{Periphyseon} confirms Dondaine’s suspicion. For, where it is possible to compare, Eriugena quotes from the \textit{Corpus Areopagiticum} according to the recension \( T \textsuperscript{116} \) in his \textit{magnum opus}.

\textit{enim eos qui mites sunt in malo, hoc est totius malitie expertes, immutes fieri in bono, in bonarum uidelicet uirtutum seuera diligentique custodia, earumque zelo laudabili ira commotos, aduersus omnia uitia pugnare non desinentes, uigilique semper animo, ne in aliquo preualeant, in pace uirtutum quas custodiunt quiescentes}. Eriugena seems to have considered \textit{immanem} inadequate. Where Pa reads \( \lambda\hat{\eta}i\nu \), Heil-Ritter has \( \hat{\epsilon}\xi\iota \nu \). Heil-Ritter’s apparatus \textit{ad loc.} notes: \( \hat{\epsilon}\xi\iota \nu: \lambda\hat{\eta}i\nu \) Pa (corr in \( \lambda\hat{\eta}i\nu \) m rec). It seems clear that the correction in Pa itself was not made by a more recent hand since Eriugena translated \textit{quietem}.

\textsuperscript{115} An \( \alpha \) manuscript.

\textsuperscript{116} \textit{Cf.} for example, \textit{Periphyseon} III, 1048-1060 and 1066-1068= PL 122, 1046BC and II, 2244-2255= PL 122, 1052AB.
For example, at Periphyseon III, 1048-1060, Eriugena quotes De caelesti hierarchia IV according to the recension T:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Periphyseon</strong></th>
<th><strong>T</strong></th>
<th><strong>M</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>“Primum”, inquit, omnium illud dicere uerum est ut bonitate uniuersali superessentials diuinitas eorum quae sunt essentias substituens ad esse adduxit. Est enim hoc omni causae et super omnia bonitatis proprium ad communionem suam ea quae sunt uocare, ut unicuique eorum quae sunt ex propria diffinitur analogia. Omnia igitur participant prouidentiam ex superessentials et causalissima diuinitate manantem.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primum simul omnium illud dicere uerum ***, ut bonitate uniuersali superessentials diuinitas eorum quae sunt essentias substituens ad esse adduxit. Est enim hoc omni causae et super omnia bonitatis proprium ad communionem suam ea quae sunt uocare, ut unicuique eorum quae sunt ex propria diffinitur analogia. Omnia igitur quae sunt participant prouidentiam ex superessentials et causalissima diuinitate manantem.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primum simul omnium illud dicere uerum, ut bonitate uniuersali superessentials thearchia eorum quae sunt essentias substituens ad esse adduxit. Est enim hoc omni causa et super omnia bonitatis proprium ad communionem suam ea quae sunt uocare ut unicuique eorum quae sunt ex propria diffinitur analogia. Omnia igitur quae sunt participant prouidentiam ex superessentials et causalissima diuinitate manantem.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Non enim fortassis essent, nisi eorum quae sunt essentiae et principii assumptione. Existentia igitur omnia esse participant, esse enim omnium est super esse diuinitas. Vientia autem eadem super omnem uitam uiuificam uirtutem, rationabilia et intellectualia eadem super omnem et rationem et intellectum per se perfectam et...

Non enim fortassis essent nisi eorum quae sunt essentiam ex principio assumerent. Existentia igitur omnia esse eius participant. Esse enim omnium est, superesse diuinitas. Vientia autem eadem super omnem uitam uiuificam uirtutem rationalia et intellectualia eadem super omnem et rationem et intellectum per se perfectam et anteperfecta sapientia.

---

117 PL 122, 1046B4-C5.
118 There are some discrepancies between the Periphyseon and T. Generally, Eriugena’s references to the pseudo-Areopagite are somewhat free, in some places rather paraphrases with regard to his own translation (although never with regard to the Greek corpus). Nevertheless, the Periphyseon shows a tendency toward the latinizations of T. This tendency toward reworking Eriugena’s own translation in the Periphyseon will be discussed in more detail in a later section.
antepерfectam sapientiam”. antepерfectam sapientiam.

Although there are some variants between the Periphyseon and T here, there is no question but that Eriugena was referring to the T recension here\(^{119}\). The discrepancies between the Periphyseon and T here may be due to a manuscript from the T family which no longer exists, or to spontaneous corrections made by Eriugena while citing the text. In either case, the primary question is: would Eriugena have cited the Latin Dionysius in a translation which had been manipulated by someone else? The question is impossible to answer with any certainty, but one suspects that the man who strongly defended his translation in his dedicatory letter to Charles the Bald\(^{120}\) would not have relied on the translation of another.

Further, because the Expositiones were composed after the Periphyseon, we must admit that the recension M is more recent than the recension T. This chronology is confirmed by yet another passage in the Periphyseon, which quotes the passage above from De caelesti hierarchia IV.

Dionysius explains at De caelesti hierarchia IV, 20.15, that nothing exists except insofar as it participates in the substance and principle of beings: οὖ γὰρ ἄν ἣν, εἰ μὴ τῆς τῶν ὄντων σωτίας καὶ ἀρχῆς μετειλήφει. Periphyseon III, 1055-6 gives the translation: Non enim fortassit essent, nisi eorum quae sunt essentiae et principii

---

\(^{119}\) It is certain that Eriugena was not referring to an A manuscript, nor to α. A, and therefore α, have existentia in place of uiuentia at PL 122, 1046B14 following an error in Pa, which gives ΟΝΤΑ in place of ΖΝΟΝΤΑ at CH IV, 20.16.

\(^{120}\) PL 122, 1032B15-C9: Sin vero obscuram minusque apertam praeditae interpretationis seriem judicaverit, videat, me interpretem hujus operis esse, non exposiorem. Ubi valde pertimesco, ne forte culpam infidi interpretis incurram. At si aut superflua quaedam superadjecta esse, aut de integitate graecae constructionis quaedam deesse arbitratus fuerit, recurrat ad codicem graecum, unde ego interpretatus sum; ibi fortassis inveniet, itane est necne.
assumptione, the reading of T. It would seem that Eriugena did not know that \( \text{μεταλαμβάνω} \) governs the genitive. Forced to deal with the genitives \( \text{oūσίας} \) and \( \text{ἀρχής} \), he confused \( \text{μετειληφεῖ} \) with \( \text{μετάληψις} \) to form the Greek dative of an imaginary \( \text{μετειληφίς} \). \(^{121}\) \( M \) has recognized the verb and corrected the passage, although not entirely happily: *Non enim fortassis essent, nisi eorum quae sunt essentiam ex principio assumpserent* \(^{122}\). \( M \)'s reconsideration of this passage is already begun in *Periphyseon* V, 1991-2, where Eriugena gives: *Non enim fortassis essent eorum quae sunt essentiae, nisi a principio assummerent.* We can see, then, \( M \) developing together with the *Periphyseon*, and taking shape in its final form in the *Expositiones*.

Leaving aside A, which can only be situated with regard to \( T \) and \( M \) by a thorough examination of its extensive apparatus \(^{123}\), a timeline of the recensions would have to look something like this: Pa (827) \( \rightarrow \) \( α \) (c. 860-2) \( \rightarrow \) \( T/Periphyseon \) (c. 866-7) \( \rightarrow \) \( M/Expositiones \) (c. 870).

### 1.6 The recension A

While Dondaine believed that the text of \( A \) formed the primitive version which preceded \( T \) and upon which \( T \) made its corrections, unaware of the existence of \( M \) he failed to understand fully the elements which make up \( A \). The text of \( A \) cannot be at the origin of the *Versio*, for \( A \) is a bifurcated text, agreeing sometimes with \( T \), sometimes with \( M \), yet carrying separative variants of its own.

---

\(^{121}\) Surely thinking of \( \text{μετάληψις} \).

\(^{122}\) *Exp. IV*, 117-9; cf. 128-31: *Item ubi posuimus assumserent, \( \text{ΜΕΤΕΙΛΕΦΕΙ} \) est positum; quod uerbum simpliciter potest transferri assumerent uel participarent.*

\(^{123}\) Considered in the following section.
A generally agrees with T where M has corrected the translation, as we have
already seen. However, where T has corrected the graecisms which Eriugena’s first
attempt at translating must have preserved A tends to agree with M.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PL 122</th>
<th>A/M</th>
<th>T</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1043A</td>
<td>resonantias</td>
<td>imagines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1043B</td>
<td>thearchicis</td>
<td>diuinis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1043C</td>
<td>agalmatum</td>
<td>imaginum</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Yet, A remains a separate recension, a sibling, not a parent, of both T and M.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PL 122</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>M</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1040C</td>
<td>inconsequentis</td>
<td>inconsequens</td>
<td>inconsequens</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1043C</td>
<td>ypophete</td>
<td>prophete</td>
<td>prophete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1043D</td>
<td>resultationum</td>
<td>resonantiarum</td>
<td>imaginationum</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Therefore, although T and M represent corrected versions, they are not based on
A. A’s position as a sibling rather than parent of T and M hints at a version, α, which
preceded all three recensions; A is not to be identified with that text. Nevertheless, while
A has α for a parent, A’s relationship with T and M is more complex than that of a mere
sibling. The place of A in this family tree cannot be precisely determined by the text of A
alone—for this we must turn to its extensive glosses.

1.6.1 The glosses of A

The manuscripts of the Versio were subject to the indiscriminate intrusion of correctors
and glossators throughout the Middle Ages. Neither T nor M is entirely free of interlinear
and marginal comments, generally short, and mostly explanations of difficult words.
However, the glosses in A are present on virtually every folio (generally several per
folio), and must be considered a kind of apparatus or even a commentary.
Dondaine divided the glosses of A into four kinds: 1) explanations of words, introduced by id est, 2) textual variants introduced by aliter or uel, 3) corrections usually introduced by pro or graecus and which introduce a reading from R, and 4) certain longer, doctrinal glosses, of which type Dondaine signals several in A, fols. 62-63 (=De diuinis nominibus IV)\textsuperscript{124}. This section shall follow this division of the glosses.

1.6.1.1 The glosses id est, uel, and aliter

The first two types of glosses by far make up the bulk of the apparatus of A. As one might expect, these glosses generally report the variants of T and M\textsuperscript{125}. Of the 33 glosses found in chapter two of the De caelesti hierarchia, seven report the variants of T, eight report those of M, and three are found in both T and M. This leaves 16 glosses:

1. 1039C [ierarchias laudare] id est eas secundum ueritatem exponere
3. 1040A [anagogicas] id est contemplatiuas
4. 1040A [anagogicas] uel sursum ductiua
5. 1040B [ex apud nos] aliter supra
6. 1040B [supereminentibus essentiis] aliter eminientium essentiarum
7. 1040C [inconsequentis] uel inconsequentibus
8. 1041B [characterizante] id est imaginante

\textsuperscript{124} Cf. Dondaine, Le corpus dionysien, 57ff.
\textsuperscript{125} Dondaine notes that “sur 120 variantes par nous notées entre A et T dans une dizaine de chapitres des deux Hiérarchies et des Noms divins, 92 sont exactement signalées dans A B; les 28 autres sont presques toutes des variantes de copie, sans signification,” 58. Had he compared A to T, rather than T to A, he would have noticed that far fewer than half the glosses in A can be accounted for by T, and would certainly not have made the assertion which follows: “Combinées avec certaines gloses id est, les variantes vel et aliter permettent de reconstituer à peu près la recension T”; Dondaine, Le corpus dionysien, 58.
9. 1041C [ex quibus] uel his
10. 1042A [theologia] id est diuina disputatio
11. 1043A [per inconfusum] uel propter
12. 1043C [theosophi] id est diuini sapientes
13. 1043C [ypophetae] id est sacerdotes
14. 1043D [compactarum] propriorum uel domesticorum
15. 1044A [in anagogen] id est in contemplationem
16. 1044B [inconfusum] id est purum

Of these remaining 16, four (2, 4, 11 and 12) come from Eriugena’s *Expositiones*. The gloss on archistrategos is Eriugena’s own breakdown of the Greek term at *Expositiones*, II, 114-5: Archistrategos enim dicitur quasi ἄρχων τοῦ στρατοῦ ἡγεμόν, quod est principum exercitus dux. *Sursum ductuias* is Eriugena’s own gloss on anagogicas at *Expositiones*, II, 140-1: anagogicas, sursum scilicet animum ducentes… *Propter* in place of *per* at PL 122, 1043A can be found at *Expositiones*, II, 836, and diuini sapientes is explained by *Expositiones*, II, 1106-7: omnes theologi, quos nunc theosophos, hoc est diuina sapientes, appellat.

The glosses on anagoge and its derivatives are explained by a long note found on fol. 5r of the manuscript A:

**ΑΝΑΓΩΓΗ. Sursum reductio uel contemplatio uel ascensio. ΓΕΡΩΣ. Templum.**

---

126 For agan.
This explanation of Greek words seems to have been compiled from several sources. We have already seen *sursum dactio* for *anagoge* in the *Expositiones*. The etymology of θέος occurs at *Expositiones* I, 178-180: *Pater et Deus uocatur, hoc est ΘΕΟΣ, currens, nomen ex ΘΕΩ υερβο, id est curro, deriuatum. Currit enim per omnia, implens et substantificans omnia*. The etymologies of βόω and κάλω come from the *Periphyseon*, II, 1737-1745:

Nam et hoc nomen, quod est bonitas, non aliunde originem ducit nisi a ucerbo graeco quod est ΒΟΩ (hoc est clamo). ΒΟΩ autem et ΚΑΛΩ (id est clamo et uuco) unum sensum possident. Etenim qui uocat saepissime in clamorem erumpit. Deus ergo non inconuenieter bonus dicitur et bonitas, quia omnia de nihil in essentiam uenire intelligibili clamore clamat; ideoque graece dicitur deus ΚΑΛΟΣ (id est bonus), ΔΙΑ ΤΟ ΠΑΝΤΑ ΚΑΛΕΙ ΕΙΣ ΟΥΣΙΑΝ (hoc est: eo quod omnia uocat in essentiam).

The Greek words for temple and priest are not expressly given in either the *Expositiones* or the *Periphyseon*, but may be found in the famous 9th century Greek glossary compiled by Martin of Laon in the manuscript Laon 444128.

Thus, while the glosses cannot all be accounted for, the tools which the glossator of A had at his disposal can be narrowed down. He began with a copy of the *Versio* the text of which was close to α. From T he copied the *Corpus Anastasii* (the scholia of John and Maximus as well as the glosses attributable to Anastasius) as well as the variants of T. To these variants those of M were added. Since the glossator clearly had a copy of the *Expositiones*, the *lemmata* of which are identical to M, there is no way of knowing whether he had a copy of M or simply extracted the variants from his manuscript of the

---

Expositiones. Finally, he had a copy of the Periphyseon, or, at least, certain extracts that explain Greek terms. Would such an enterprise—creating a proto-edition with commentary—oblige one to acquire a Greek manuscript?

1.6.1.2 The glosses pro and graecus

The third type of glosses signaled by Dondaine are those which refer the reader to the Greek text which Eriugena was translating. There are far fewer glosses which take account of the Greek text than there are glosses taking the form id est, uel and aliter. I have identified 39 in the De diuinis nominibus. As a group, these glosses serve to correct Eriugena’s translation by referring to the Greek corpus. The corrections are of several sorts. Many improve Eriugena’s grammar, replacing adjectives with nouns, passive participles with active:


2.130 A, 75r: Participatione divinae pacis primores congregatarum [graeus congregantium] virtutum ipsae, et ad seipsas, et ad se invicem uniuntur… Τῇ μετοχῇ τῆς θείας εἰρήνης αἱ γοῦν πρεσβύτεραι τῶν συναγωγῶν δυνάμεων αὐταὶ τε πρὸς έαυτὰς καὶ πρὸς ἀλλήλας ἐνούνται...

Many of the glosses simply suggest equally legitimate alternatives to the translation given by Eriugena.

3.131 A, 74v: Nonne diuinitus [graeus diuine siue deo decenter] et hoc intelligendum?

---

130 PL 122, 1164D8-1165A1=217.10-11.
Où θεοπρεπῶς καὶ τούτο νοητέων;

4. 132 A, 75r: Proinde et in sacris mysticarum uisionum theophaniis et uetus [graecus canus] et nouus formatur...
Δίο καὶ ἐν ταῖς ἱεραῖς τῶν μυστικῶν ὑράσεων θεοφανείας καὶ πολιοῦ καὶ νέος πλάττεται...

These glosses seem gratuitous, offering little in the way of amelioration. However, many of the glosses graecus and pro present true advances over the translation of Eriugena. Many improve the faults resulting from the defects of Eriugena’s understanding of Greek.

5. 133 49r: de quibus in simbolica theologia secundum uirtutem diximus [graecus dicemus].
περὶ ων ἐν τῇ Συμβολικῇ θεολογίᾳ κατὰ δύναμιν ἐροῦμεν.

6. 134 52r: Neque enim est diligens similitudo causatiuis et causalibus, sed habent quidem causatiau causalium [pro causarum] receptas imagines;
Οὐδὲ γάρ ἐστιν ἀκριβῆς ἐμφέρεια τοῖς αἰτιατοῖς καὶ τοῖς αἰτίοις, ἀλλ’ ἔχει μὲν τὰ αἰτιατὰ τὰς τῶν αἰτίων ἐνδεχομένας εἰκόνας...

7. 135 67r: simplas [graecus normas directiones et semitas] uniformiter unitas
τὰς εὐθείας ἐνοείδως ἴμωμένας.

8. 136 62v: adunata [graecus lenia siue tractabilia]
Eriugena took προσηνή as some sort of participle of προσενώω.

Finally, and perhaps most significantly, there are several glosses which correct a fault or lacuna of Pa.

9. 137 69v: esse dei et membra eorum [graecus et non suos]
εἴναι θεοῦ καὶ μὴ (Pa=ΜΕΛΗ) ἐαυτῶν.

---

131 PL 122, 1162C12-13=213.8.
133 PL 122, 1119A5-6=121.2-3.
134 PL 122, 1124A4-7=132.14-15.
135 PL 122, 1149B3-4=185.5-6.
136 PL 122, 1141B9=169.10.
10. Ac per hoc et sol, quia omnia soluta [graecus collecta] facit, et congregat dispersa…

Διὸ καὶ ἡλιος, ὃτι πᾶντα ἀολλή (Pa=ΟΛΛΗ) ποιεῖ καὶ συνάγει τὰ διεσκεδασμένα.

The last two sorts of glosses graecus/pro would seem to expand the list of tools that the glossator of A had at his disposal. For could the corrections of Erigena’s errors or of Pa’s faults have been accomplished using anything but a Greek manuscript of the Corpus Areopagitcum from the R recension?

Dondaine suggested that the glosses pro, far less numerous and generally more intelligent than the glosses graecus, should be attributed to Anastasius himself. Dondaine’s intuition is well founded; Anastasius is, indeed, at the source of the glosses, both pro and graecus. For, many of the Greek glosses are simply the result of the glossator’s comparison of the text of the Versio with the scholia.

In the manuscript A, 49r (example 5, above), where the glossator has suggested dicemus in place of diximus, the scholion says: Aliud comentum se pollicetur fore scripturum simbolicam uidelicet theologiam. And on fol. 74v (example 3, above), where the glossator replaces diuinitus with diuine siue deo decenter, the scholion reads: Interdicens in deo ea quae de corporalibus motibus dicta sunt intelligi quodam modo decenter deo oporteat intelligi motum dei edisserit. The same is true of example 4:

---

138 PL 122, 1131B9-10=149.1-2.
139 149.1-2.
140 Cf. Dondaine, Le corpus dionysien, 61: [L]es gloses pro, c’est-à-dire le premier jeu de corrections sur R, d’abord marginales et mêlées aux scolies, puis passées dans les interlignes: ce lieu original, ainsi que leur qualité technique conviennent à Anastase.
141 Cf. PG 4, 209C: Συμβολικὴ θεολογία. Ἀλλο σύνταγμα ύποσχένειται γράφειν, ὅπερ καλεῖ Συμβολικὴν θεολογίαν.
142 Cf. PG 4, 384A: Ἀλλὰ καὶ κινήσεις θεοῦ. Ἀπαγορεύσας τὰ τῶν σωματικῶν κινήσεων ἐπὶ θεοῦ, ὅπως χρῆ θεοπρέπως νοεῖν κινήσειν ἐπὶ θεοῦ σαφεῖςει…
A, 75r (scholion): Vetus quidem siue canis apparuit deus danieli album habens caput ut lanam\textsuperscript{143}.

The glossator even follows Anastasius in a rare mistake. At A, 61v, the glossator suggests replacing consonantiam with in consonantiam: Etsi priuetur bono iuxta irrationabilem concupiscentiam, in hoc quidem neque est, neque existentia concupiscit, participat tamen bonum secundum ipsam unitatis et amicitiae obscuram consonantiam [immo in consonantium]. The Greek passage uses the word ἀπήχημα\textsuperscript{144}, which Anastasius, confusing the noun ἀπήχημα (echo, ringing) and adjective ἀπηχής, -ές (discordant), translates as absonitatem in the scholion pertaining to this passage. Anastasius criticizes Eriugena’s translation of the same word in the middle of a scholion which occurs in De caelesti hierarchia. A, 8r (scholion): Quid autem sit apecema [quod interpres imaginem transtulit, ego uero absuditatem uel id quod absonum est esse et inueni] in sermone qui est de diuinis nominibus explanatum est capitulo quarto\textsuperscript{145}.

It is clear that these glosses (graecus/pro) are not the work of Anastasius himself; for, had they come from the hand of the papal librarian, one would expect them to appear in the recension T, the version known to Anastasius. Nevertheless, they come from the hand of an astute reader of the scholia and marginal notes of Anastasius. Whether or not this glossator had before his eyes a Greek manuscript or found all his glosses in the scholia and marginalia must await an edition of the Latin scholia.

\textsuperscript{143} PG 4, 385A. Ἄς παντοκράτορα καὶ ός παλαιόν. Πολιος μὲν ὀφθη ὁ θεὸς τῷ Δανιηλ, λευκὴν ἔχων τὴν κεφαλήν, ός ἐριον...

\textsuperscript{144} DN 167.2-5: ...εἰ καὶ ἑστηρίται ταγοθοῦ κατὰ τὴν ἀλογον ἐπιθύμιαν, ἐν τούτῳ μὲν οὔτε ἔστιν οὔτε ὑπερτῶν ἐπιθύμησιν, μετέχει δὲ ὡμος τάγοθου κατ’ αὐτὸ τὸ τῆς ἐνώσεως καὶ φιλίας ἀμυδρὸν ἀπήχημα.

\textsuperscript{145} =PG 4, 48B.
1.6.1.3 The doctrinal glosses

Lastly, there are the so-called ‘doctrinal glosses’. Generally, they represent points of clarification, whether philosophical or grammatical, guiding the reader through especially difficult passages. As an example of these doctrinal glosses, Dondaine signals *De diuinis nominibus* IV in A, the famous chapter on evil. The glosses are merely the notes of an interested reader:

A, 63r: Et enim si natura mali neque ex bono neque in existentibus\(^{146}\) [id est in his quae sunt]…

A, 63r: neque ex bonis conuersum natura et semper mali existunt\(^{147}\) [sicilet ad ista inferiora et ea diligeret siquidem boni angeli ad bonum conuersi qui est forma illorum]…

A, 63r: Si autem aliis [sicilet mali] quomodo corrumpunt\(^{148}\)

A, 63r: Natura enim incorruptibilia [id est quae sunt ultra lunam] non corrumpunt [sicilet daemones] sed acceptiuas corruptionis [id est quae sunt in hoc mundo], sequitur neque hoc omnino et omnino malum\(^{149}\) [sicilet est].

As such, the doctrinal glosses offer little to help in identifying the author of A, but it is worth noting that this passage, so heavily glossed in A, is quoted at length and glossed in the *Periphyseon*\(^{150}\), which may help support the idea that the author of A was close to the circle of Eriugena.

The author of A had at his disposal several tools: an \(\alpha\) manuscript, a \(T\) manuscript, the *Expositiones*, perhaps a Greek manuscript from the \(R\) recension, and, very likely, the *Periphyseon*. Further, this author would have been working on \(A\) at the end of the 9\(^{th}\) or

\(^{146}\) PL 122, 1142A1-2.
\(^{147}\) PL 122, 1142A3-4.
\(^{148}\) PL 122, 1142A5-6.
\(^{149}\) PL 122, 1142A8-11.
\(^{150}\) Cf. especially V, 3192-3251.
beginning of the 10th century, as is shown by the very early A manuscript, Bp. In all
likelihood, A issued from a student (direct or otherwise) of Eriugena himself. Heiric of
Auxerre and Martin of Laon both knew and drew from the Versio\textsuperscript{151}. However, beyond
this mere suggestion, little more can be said of the author of A.

1.7 The corpus Anastasii

On 23 March, 875, Anastasius Bibliothecarius sent a letter to Charles the Bald together
with his translation of the scholia of John of Scythopolis and Maximus Confessor\textsuperscript{152}. Anastasius
was less than impressed with the work of Eriugena, \textit{uir ille barbarus}, and considered that the translator had left the text still to be translated\textsuperscript{153}. It is for this reason
that Anastasius took it upon himself to supply the Versio with a commentary. However,
it seems he did not limit himself to merely augmenting the text—his letter to Charles may
indicate that he changed it:

\begin{quote}
Sane ubi a verbis interpretis scholia ipsa dissentire vidi, ut lector, quid de apposita
dictione interprets senserit, quid scholion insinuet, indifferenter agnoscat, et verba
interprets scholio inserui, et, qualiter ea scholii compositor praetulerit, innui. Sed
et, sicubi opportunum fore conspexi, ex me quoque, quoniam esse aliter non potuit,
apaucissima quaedam, et quae facilius ab intelligente agnosci poterant, interposui\textsuperscript{154}.
\end{quote}

First, wherever he found a discrepancy between Eriugena’s translation and the
scholia, he noted, within the text of the scholia, the translation of Eriugena. These

\textsuperscript{152} PL 122, 1026-1029.
\textsuperscript{153} PL 122, 1028: \textit{et quem interpretaturum susceperat, adhuc redderet interpretandum}.
\textsuperscript{154} PL 122, 1028.
intrusions are common enough throughout his translation of the commentary of John and
Maximus, and are easily recognized by references to the *interpres* or to the Greek text.
Thus, for example, at PL 122, 1043A1, Eriugena has translated the word ἀντρίγῆς, *inconfusum*. The *scholion*, according to the translation of Anastasius, says: *Amigi [quod
interpres inconfusum transtulit.] mundum dicit, et eum qui ad nichil aliud uacat*. And,
again at 1043A2, where Eriugena has translated ἄποκλισίαν, *reuocationem*, the *scholion*
notes: *Reuocationem [uel quod grece hic epiglisin dicit] nutum appellat*.

However, what precisely Anastasius means by *paucissima quaedam* has
preoccupied every scholar who has attempted to sort through the manuscripts of the
*Versio*. Traube thought that they referred to whatever was found in the *Versio* as it exists
in the manuscripts which differed from the *Versio* as it was known to Hincmar. A
cursory comparison between the texts of Hincmar and the *Versio* shows that, had Traube
been correct, Anastasius' additions would be far from *paucissima*.

Hincmar, PL 125, 313AB:  
De sensuali enim igne est dicere, in omnes et per omnes immiste venit, et praecellit omnibus, et omnibus lucens cum sit, simul est et sicut occultus: ignotus ipse a se non in porro jacenti materie ostendens propriam operationem, innumerabilis et invisibilis seque tenibilis, et omnes in quibus fit ad suam operationem mutans, tradalis sui ipsius omnibus sibi approximantibus.

*Versio Dionysii*, 1065D4-1066A5:  
Ignis enim sensibilis est quidem, sic dicendum, in omnibus et per omnia clare venit, et removetur omnibus. Et lucidus est simul et quasi occultus, incognitis ipse per seipsum, non accumbente materia, in quam propriam manifestet actionem. Immensurabilisque et invisibilis per seipsum, potens simul omnium, et quaeunque in eis sunt, fiunt ad actionem propriam, mobilis, tradens seipsum omnibus quoqomodo proximantibus.

Théry\textsuperscript{155} believed he had found the work of Anastasius in the interlinear apparatus
of Va\textsuperscript{1} and Va\textsuperscript{2}. Dondaine\textsuperscript{156}, following Théry, restricted Anastasius’ contribution to

\textsuperscript{155} Théry, “Catalogue des manuscrits,” 172ff.
only a portion of the glosses of A, the Greek glosses *pro*. As we have seen, these glosses, like the glosses *graecus*, reflect a careful reading of the *scholia* and need not be considered the work of a separate scholiast (whoever, that may be). Further, these glosses do not occur in *T*, which they had ought had they issued from the hand of Anastasius; for, as we have noted already, Anastasius knew the *Versio* according to the recension *T*.

As Dondaine points out, Anastasius generally keeps from imposing himself upon the text. He signals his comments embedded in the *scholia* by referring to Eriugena (*interpres*) or to the Greek text. In several instances, we find in the margins of the *Versio*\(^\text{157}\) comments which follow this method but for which there is no corresponding *scholion*. For example, at A,7v, Eriugena has translated \(\dot{\alpha}κρατε\)\(^\text{158}\) *impotentiam*\(^\text{159}\). The gloss notes: *notandum quomodo id accipiatur potentia. Sane acrapes quod interpres impotentiam*\(^\text{160}\) *transtulit illud signicat quod teneri non potest.* And again, at A, 8v, Eriugena has translated το \(\theta\varepsilon\omicron\nu\rho\epsilon\sigma\varsigma\ \kappa\alpha\lambda\lambda\omicron\)\(^\text{161}\) as *diuina pulchritudo*\(^\text{162}\). The margin notes Eriugena’s simplification of the composite Greek adjective: *Notandum quod hic diuina dicatur pulcritudo uelut in greco composite profertur deo decibilis pulcritudo.* Again, the gloss corresponds to no separate *scholion*. These short marginal glosses

\(^{156}\text{Dondaine, *Le corpus dionysien*, 61; Dondaine seems to have assumed that Théry’s two Viennese manuscripts where A manuscripts. They belong, rather, to M.}\)

\(^{157}\text{In manuscripts which witness the *scholia*.}\)

\(^{158}\text{CH II, 14.17.}\)

\(^{159}\text{PL 122, 1042D2 (=potentiam in Floss’ edition).}\)

\(^{160}\text{Since Anastasius seems to have read *impotentiam*, Dondaine’s claim that *T* originally gave *ueluti potentiam* must be incorrect; cf. Dondaine, *Le corpus dionysien*, 54, n. 63. Indeed, most of the *T* manuscripts give *ueluti potentiam*, including the early manuscript, *T*. However, this should be considered an error where the i of *ueluti* originally had a macron above it—*uelut impotentiam* (A) became *ueluti potentiam* in *T*.}\)

\(^{161}\text{CH III, 17.5-6.}\)

\(^{162}\text{PL 122, 1044C4-5.}\)
appear throughout the Versio in both A and T, in other words, in the manuscripts that contain the scholia, the work of Anastasius. They follow the style of Anastasius’ glosses which are embedded in his translation of the scholia, and must be considered precisely what Anastasius meant by paucissima quaedam.

The glosses of Anastasius, then, may be reduced to the marginal (not interlinear) notes which refer the reader to the Greek text, and suggest an alternate translation. They are inevitably introduced by interpres or graecus (graece, in graeco, etc.). They are usually embedded in the scholia themselves, but are nevertheless found independent in certain instances. There is no positive evidence that A’s interlinear apparatus nor that the glosses graecus and pro represent the work of Anastasius.

1.8 The Manuscripts

In the manuscripts which witness the text, the Versio Dionysii consists of far more than the simple text of Dionysius. The work is furnished with several introductions, both to the opera as a whole and to each treatise, some in prose, some in verse, certain from the pen of Eriugena, certain from Anastasius, some coming from the Greek corpus. The Versio commences with the introduction or praefatio of Anastasius Bibliothecarius (Inter caetera, PL 122, 1025-30), the librarian’s letter to Charles the Bald, dated X kalends April, 875. Following the Inter caetera are three pieces of introduction by Eriugena himself, two in verse and one in prose. The first (Hanc libam, PL 122, 1029A-30A) is a short verse in praise of Charles the Bald and his efforts at renewing Greek studies. The second (Valde quidem, PL 122, 1031A-36A) is Eriugena’s letter of dedication to Charles the Bald, explaining why he undertook the project in the first place (the King’s bidding),
the limits of his project and the philosophic significance of the Dionysian corpus. After
the Valde quidem and before the third introductory piece, the manuscripts give this titulus
operis:

In hoc libro sancti Dionysii Ariopagitae contenentur libri quator quos Johannes
Eriugena transtulit de graeco in latinum, iubente ac postulante domino glorissimo
rege Karolo Ludouici imperatoris filio\textsuperscript{163}.

The third piece is another verse, \textit{Lumine sydero}\textsuperscript{164}, this time in praise of Dionysius
himself.

The introductory pieces are followed by the treatises of Dionysius, each of them
with their own pieces of introduction. The manuscripts invariably follow the order: \textit{De
caelesti hierarchia}, \textit{De ecclesiastica hierarchia}, \textit{De diuinis nominibus}, \textit{De mystica
theologia}, and \textit{Epistolae}. Thus, the \textit{Lumine sydero} is followed by a table of the
\textit{capitula}\textsuperscript{165} of the \textit{De caelesti hierarchia}, itself followed by an \textit{epigramma}\textsuperscript{166} to the \textit{De
caelesti hierarchia}. The \textit{De caelesti hierarchia} ends with a second \textit{epigramma}
(Angelicarum descriptionum), a peculiarity it shares only with the \textit{De diuinis nominibus}
(Tuam mentem). The concluding \textit{epigramma} of the \textit{De caelesti hierarchia} is followed by
the \textit{epigramma} of the \textit{De ecclesiastica hierarchia}, the \textit{capitula} and the \textit{De ecclesiastica
hierarchia} itself. The \textit{De diuinis nominibus} follows the same pattern: \textit{epigramma},
\textit{capitula} and text, ending with the closing \textit{epigramma} (Tuam mentem). The \textit{De mystica
theologia} follows the same order as the \textit{De caelesti hierarchia}, presenting the \textit{capitula}
before the \textit{epigramma} and text. Finally, the \textit{Epistolae} begin with their own \textit{epigramma

\textsuperscript{163} Cf. PL 122 1036A.
\textsuperscript{164} PL 122 1037A-38B.
\textsuperscript{165} PL 122 1035A-36B.
\textsuperscript{166} PL 122 1037A.
(not clearly designated as such in certain manuscripts) and a list of addressees in place of capitula. The scholia (Quia prisci) generally begin after the capitula of the De caelesti hierarchia.

A

The recension A consists of the introductory material, the text A, the scholia of John of Scythopolis and Maximus Confessor and the glosses of Anastasius, and the apparatus of variants, Greek glosses and doctrinal comments. Apart from the separative errors which set A apart from T and M, the manuscripts of A are easily recognized by their inclusion of the Eriugenian fragment discussed in § 7, above.

As a recension, A is a hybrid. The text of the Versio which it witnesses is more ancient than the other two recensions. However, its apparatus reports the readings of T and M, showing it to have been created after these two siblings. Thus, it is a valuable witness to Eriugena’s first attempts to render the Greek text of the Areopagite. Yet, the contamination as from T and M forces one to regard it with caution. For, in places the variants of its siblings have crept into the text itself.

Dondaine bases his examination of A on A, from the second half of the 11th century (together with its close sibling, B). However, A is witnessed by several more ancient manuscripts, most notably Bp from the 9th or 10th century and Be from the 10th or 11th century. Nevertheless, A is a stable recension, and the later manuscripts do not suffer systematic changes over time.
Stemma:

A. Paris, Bibliothèque nationale 1618 (Bibliothèque nationale, catalogue général des manuscrits latin II, Paris: Bibliothèque nationale, 1940, 93)

12th and 14th centuries, parchment, ii and 143fols. A comes from the Abbey of St. Émilion, and is the manuscript upon which Dondaine based his examination of A. It is A’s substantial agreement with B that permitted Dondaine to conclude that A represents a recension. However, his claim that the two Paris manuscripts were copied from the same exemplar is exaggerated167. A shares significant errors with B, but these are rather common to the recension A. A shares more errors with Be and Bp, and is a sibling of the manuscript from which these latter were copied.

167 Dondaine, Le corpus dionysien, 36, n. 8.
ff. 1r-2r: Inter caetera.
f. 2r: Hanc libam.
f. 2v: Valde quidem.
f. 4r: Lumine sidero.
ff. 4r-4v: Capitula De caelesti hierarchia libri.
f. 4v: Quia prisci.
f. 5r: Fragmenta Eriugenae.
f. 5r: Epigramma De caelesti hierarchia libri.
ff. 5r-22v: De caelesti hierarchia liber.
f. 22v: Angelicarum discriptionum.
f. 22v: Epigramma De ecclesiastica hierarchia libri.
ff. 22v-23r: Capitula de ecclesiastica hierarchia libri.
ff. 23r-46r: De ecclesiastica hierarchia liber.
f. 46r: Epigramma De diuinis nominibus libri.
f. 46r: Capitula De diuinis nominibus libri.
ff. 46v-79v: De diuinis nominibus liber.
f. 79v: Tuam mentem.
f. 79v: Capitula De mystica theologia libri.
f. 79v: Epigramma De mystica theologia libri.
ff. 79v-81v: De mystica theologia liber.
f. 81v: Epigramma epistolarum.
ff. 81v-82r: Destinati epistolarum.
ff. 81v-90v: Decem epistolae.

Part of A contains fragments of the Summa Theologiae of Thomas Aquinas (I\textsuperscript{a}, QQ. 115, 117, 119, all incomplete). This part of the manuscript comes from the 14\textsuperscript{th} century.


11\textsuperscript{th} or 12\textsuperscript{th} century, parchment, 117fols. B was not copied from the same archetype as A and thus it cannot be ‘more faithful’ to its parent, as Dondaine claimed\textsuperscript{168}. In fact, B is a rather defective manuscript and seems to have been corrected against a T manuscript in certain places.

ff. 1v-3v: Inter caetera.

\textsuperscript{168} Cf. Dondaine, Le corpus dionysien, 36-37, n. 8.
f. 3v: Hanc libam.
f. 4r-7r: Valde quidem.
f. 7r: Lumine sidero.
f. 8r: Capitula De caelesti hierarchia libri.
f. 8v: Quia prisci.
f. 8v: Fragmenta Eriugenae.
f. 8v: Epigramma De caelesti hierarchia libri.
ff. 8v-30v: De caelesti hierarchia liber.
f. 30v: Angelicarum descriptionum.
f. 31r: Epigramma De ecclesiastica hierarchia libri.
f. 31r: Capitula de ecclesiastica hierarchia libri.
ff. 31r-62r: De ecclesiastica hierarchia liber.
f. 62r: Epigramma De diuinis nominibus libri.
ff. 62r-62v: Capitula De diuinis nominibus libri.
ff. 62v-102r: De diuinis nominibus liber.
ff. 102r-102v: Tuam mentem.
f. 102v: Capitula De mystica theologia libri.
f. 102v: Epigramma De mystica theologia libri.
ff. 102v-105v: De mystica theologia liber.
f. 105v: Epigramma epistoluarum.
f. 105v: Destinati epistoluarum.
ff. 105v-117v: Decem epistolae.

Be. Bern 19 (Hermann Hagen, *Catalogus codicum Bernensium*, New York: Georg Olms, 1974, 12)

10\textsuperscript{th}-11\textsuperscript{th} century, parchment, 68fols. Be and Bp are siblings, copied from a manuscript closely related to A.

ff. 1r-2r: Inter caetera.
f. 2r: Hanc libam.
ff. 2r-3v: Valde quidem.
ff. 3v-4r: Lumine sidero.
f. 4r: Capitula De caelesti hierarchia libri.
f. 4v: Quia prisci.
f. 4v: Epigramma De caelesti hierarchia libri.
ff. 4v-18v: De caelesti hierarchia liber.
f. 18v: Angelicarum descriptionum.
f. 18v: Epigramma De ecclesiastica hierarchia libri.
ff. 18v: Capitula de ecclesiastica hierarchia libri.
ff. 18v-37v: De ecclesiastica hierarchia liber.
f. 37v: Epigramma De diuinis nominibus libri.
ff. 37v-38r: Capitula De diuinis nominibus libri.
ff. 38r-59v\textsuperscript{169} \textit{De diuinis nominibus liber}.
f. 59v: 
Capitula De mystica theologia libri.
f. 59v: 
Epigrama De mystica theologia libri.
ff. 60r-61v: 
De mystica theologia liber.
f. 61v: 
Epigrama epistolarum.
f. 61v: 
Destinati epistolarum.
ff. 61v-68v: 
Decem epistolae.

Colophon: \textit{Ex libris Petri Danielis Aurili, 1r}.


9th-10th Century, parchment, 112fols. Bp is one of the oldest extant manuscripts of the \textit{Versio}, and certainly the oldest surviving witness of A.

ff. 1v-3r: 
\textit{Inter caetera}.
f. 3v: 
\textit{Hanc libam}.
ff. 3v-5v: 
\textit{Valde quidem}.
f. 6r: 
\textit{Lumine sidero}.
f. 6v: 
\textit{Capitula De caelesti hierarchia libri}.
f. 7r: 
\textit{Quia prisci}.
f. 7r-7v: 
\textit{Fragmenta Eriugenae}.
f. 7r: 
\textit{Epigrama De caelesti hierarchia libri}.
ff. 7v-30v: 
\textit{De caelesti hierarchia liber}.
f. 31r: 
\textit{Angelicarum descriptionum}.
f. 31r: 
\textit{Epigrama De ecclesiastica hierarchia libri}.
f. 31r: 
\textit{Capitula de ecclesiastica hierarchia libri}.
ff. 31v-63r: 
\textit{De ecclesiastica hierarchia liber}.
f. 63r: 
\textit{Epigrama De diuinis nominibus libri}.
f. 63r: 
\textit{Capitula De diuinis nominibus libri}.
ff. 63v-100r: 
\textit{De diuinis nominibus liber}.
f. 100r: 
\textit{Tuam mentem}.
ff. 100r: 
\textit{Capitula De mystica theologia libri}.
f. 100r: 
\textit{Epigrama De mystica theologia libri}.
ff. 100r-102r: 
\textit{De mystica theologia liber}.
ff. 102r: 
\textit{Epigrama epistolarum}.
ff. 102v: 
\textit{Destinati epistolarum}.

\textsuperscript{169} Although the current foliation of Be does not indicate, several folios are missing between 52v and 53r. In effect, Be is missing part of chapter four, all of chapters five, six and seven, and part of chapter eight of \textit{De diuinis nominibus}. Folio 52v leaves off at 1144C4 (\textit{nondum malum…}), and 53r picks up at 1156C10 (\textit{…uitrum, non arbitror}).
ff. 102v-112v: *Decem epistolae.*

Colophon: *Colleg<ii> Biturc<ensis> Soc<ietatis> Iesu* (recentiore manu), 2r; *Iste liber est ex conuentu sancti saluatoris* (recentiore manu), 112v.

**T**

The manuscripts of the *T* recension contain the introductions of Anastasius and Eriugena (*Inter caetera, Hanc libam, Valde quidem* and *Lumine sidero*), the corrected text of the *Versio*, and the *scholia* of John and Maximus (*Quia prisci*) together with the glosses of Anastasius.

While this recension is characterized by the Latinizations which form the first set of corrections of the *Versio* and the *scholia* of John and Maximus, one manuscript, *T* from the 9th century, holds a privileged place in this family. It is the earliest *T* manuscript that does not contain the *scholia* and presents the text of *T* before it was sent to Anastasius. This manuscript is missing its first folios, and begins in the middle of *De caelesti hierarchia*\(^1\). Several of the folios have been rearranged such that sections of the text are out of order. Further, while the manuscript itself no longer names its author, a later hand has attributed the translation contained therein to Sarrazin. Despite these flaws, the importance of *T* must not be underestimated. For *T* has suffered no contamination as from *R*. While *T* is privileged by its antiquity, it is not the sole *T* manuscript which lacks the *scholia*. Bo, Ct and Vr belong to this sub-family of *T*.

This sub-family is of great value in editing *T*. Where the *T* manuscripts are in disagreement, Bo, Ct, *T* and Vr report the more ancient readings\(^2\). For example, at 1041C5, Dt, Os and Li give the reading *magis proprium potentius* for the Greek

---

\(^1\) *PL 122, 1038C10, se munite.*

\(^2\) That is, the more ancient readings of *T*—in certain instances these readings are not as ancient as those of *A*. 
comparative κυριώτερον. H and Li, after an attempted correction, give magis proprium \textit{et potentius}. Obviously there is no need for both comparatives, and the A manuscripts give \textit{potentius} in the text and \textit{magis proprium} above the line. Ct, T and Vr, however, give \textit{potentius}, with no alternate reading. It seems that \textit{magis proprium} was the original reading in \( \alpha \), which \( T \), following Eriugena’s commentary\textsuperscript{172}, corrected to \textit{potentius}. The author of \( A \) switched these readings in his manuscript—reporting \textit{potentius} in the text itself and \textit{magis proprium} above the line—, and a later scholiast of \( T \), finding \textit{magis proprium} above the line in his \( A \) manuscript inserted the reading as if it were filling a \textit{lacuna}.

There is a second major sub-family of \( T \), witnessed by Fl, H and Li. These manuscripts are characterized by a significant contamination against \( M \), probably from a manuscript closely related to Clm\textsuperscript{2}. The origin of this sub-family is difficult to determine. However, these manuscripts agree with \( T \) far more than with \( M \) and it seems clear that these are \( T \) manuscripts with corrections from \( M \) rather than \( M \) manuscripts with corrections from \( T \). Beyond this, these manuscripts present too many inconsistencies with one another to say more about their construction—for example, Fl contains the \textit{scholia} throughout, while the scribe of H stopped copying them at \textit{De diuinis nominibus} VIII, and Li does not witness the \textit{scholia} at all.

The \( T \) manuscripts do not contain the \textit{Fragmenta Eriugenae} which are proper to \( A \). However, most of the \( T \) manuscripts contain, immediately after the \textit{Versio}, several extracts from Eusebius’ \textit{Historia Ecclesiastica}. There are nine extracts in all: the first

\textsuperscript{172} \textit{Exp.} II, 495.
from Polycrates’ letter to Victor, the bishop of Megala\textsuperscript{173}, the second from Clement of Alexandria’s \textit{Quis diues saluetur}\textsuperscript{174}, and the third through ninth from Philo Judeaus’ \textit{De uita contemplatiua}\textsuperscript{175}. The first and second discuss the fate of John the Evangelist after his exile to Patmos and seem to be meant as an explanation of Dionysius’ tenth letter, addressed to the Evangelist, wherein he predicts the return of John from Patmos. The extracts from Philo discuss the use of the term \textit{therapeutes} as an appellation for monks, a term used by Dionysius in addressing his first letter to Gaius the monk.

The Philonian pieces are followed by an explanation of Philo’s discussion of the \textit{therapeutes} (a text evidently written neither by Philo nor by Eusebius—since both are mentioned in the passage\textsuperscript{176}—but by the excerpter himself):

Meminit horum et Iosebii Pamphili. Quidam autem dicunt haec Philonem de sociis iudeis dicere, alii de Nazareis iudeis, alii ex circumcisione fidelibus et credentibus in chrisum et custodientibus legem Moysi, alii de perfectis christianis.

Talis autem erat heresis monachicam uiuentes utam therapeyte merito nominati sunt. Non solum autem Iosebii Pamphili sed et Philo Iudeus sed et beatus Dionisius Ariopagita discipulus sancti Pauli apostoli factus athenarum episcopus in eo qui est De Ecclesiastica Ierarchia monachos ait, antique et therapeutas nominat. Beati autem Dionisii Ariopagite meminit Lucas evangelista in actibus apostolorum et Dionisius episcopus corinthi uit antiquus et beatus Policarpus in epistola ad ecclesiam athenarum et Iosebii Pamphili in Ecclesiastica Historia.\textsuperscript{177}

The presence of these extracts in these manuscripts of the \textit{Versio}, together with their relationship to the Dionysian corpus is explained by the \textit{scholia} of John of

\textsuperscript{173} Preserved only in Eusebius=\textit{HE} 3.31.3.
\textsuperscript{174} 42.1-42.15=\textit{HE}, 3.23.6-3.23.19.
\textsuperscript{175} 21-23, 26-27, 28-29, 29-30, 34-35, 68 (paraphrase) and 78=\textit{HE}, III, xvii, 7-8, 9, 10-11, 13, 16-17, 19, and 20.
\textsuperscript{176} \textit{Iosebii} is obviously a corruption of \textit{Eusebius}, since the \textit{Iosebii} in question is said to be from Pamphylius and is the author of one \textit{Ecclesiastica Historia}.
\textsuperscript{177} Os, f. 219r.
Scythopolis. In his *scholion* on the first letter to Gaius, John of Scythopolis considers the identity of this mysterious monk, and explains why Dionysius refers to Gaius as *therapeutes*:

Ἐν τῷ ἀρχιερατείῳ τῆς ᾿Ιουδαίας καλείται Ἰχτέων, ὁ δὲ Θαυμαζεῖν Φίλων ἐποίησεν *τὸ Περὶ θεωρητικοῦ* η ᾿Ικτέων συντάγματι, ἡ τεθραπευτάς αὐτοὺς καλών, καὶ τὴν δίαιταν αὐτῶν διηγούμενος πρὸ ὀλίγου τοῦ τέλους τοῦ βιβλίου τούτου. Ἀναγνώριζε τὰ τοῦ αὐτοῦ Φίλωνος.\(^{178}\)

The passages from Philo seem to be a continuation of John’s *scholion*, pursuing his directive to read what Philo has to say.

In his *scholion* on the tenth letter, John of Scythopolis, using the date of the reign of Tiberius, the solar eclipse which occurred that year—which Dionysius claims to have witnessed—, and assuming that the convert of Saint Paul would have been around 20 at the crucifixion of Christ, notes that Dionysius would have been around 90 when he wrote this letter. All these historical facts which allow him to suggest such an age are recounted by Clement of Alexandria in his treatise: *Quis diues saluetur? Μέμηται δὲ… καὶ Κλήμης ᾿Ολέξανδρευς, ἐν τῷ λόγῳ τῷ περὶ τής ῾Οσιόμενος πλουσίος*.\(^{179}\)

It seems, then, that the Eusebian extracts are simply glosses on the *scholia* of John of Scythopolis. And indeed these extracts are found in several of the more ancient Greek manuscripts of the *Corpus Areopagiticum*.\(^{180}\)

One could assume that the presence of these extracts in the *T* manuscripts is the result of the work of Anastasius; for these fragments are not present in Pa. However,

---

\(^{178}\) PG 4, 528A.

\(^{179}\) PG 4, 573CD.

Despite their absence from Pa, they are present in T, which precedes the contribution of Anastasius.

Could Eriugena himself have been responsible for translating these pieces? Several factors suggest that he was. First, Eriugena clearly knew the piece. His dedicatory letter to Charles the Bald betrays an acquaintance with the section which concludes the extracts from Philo:

Fertur namque praefatus Dionysius fuisse discipulus atque adjutor Pauli apostoli, a quo Atheniensium constitutus est episcopus, cujus Lucas commemorat in Actibus apostolorum, et Dionysius, episcopus Corinthi, vir antiquus, beatus quoque Polycarpus in epistolae ad ecclesiam Athenarum, Eusebius item Pamphili in ecclesiastica historia...181

However, this dedicatory letter is present in T, which witnesses the Versio prior to the contribution of Anastasius. Thus, Eriugena must have been acquainted with these extracts before Anastasius sent his translation to Charles the Bald.

Second, although Pa does not in its present state contain the extracts, its last folios are missing. Although it would have been strange, it is by no means impossible for Pa to have once contained these pieces so closely connected with the scholia without also containing the scholia themselves. For, the Greek manuscript that Robert Grosseteste had copied for the purposes of translating the Dionysian corpus, Bodleian Can. gr. 97, contains the Eusebian extracts, while its prototype, Paris, BN gr. 933, does not. Grosseteste collated his manuscript against Pa. Is it not possible that Pa is the source of these fragments in Can. gr. 97?182

---

181 PL 122, 1032A.
182 The presence of these extracts in Grosseteste’s manuscript led Barbour (“A manuscript of ps.-Dionysius”) to suggest that Bodl. Can. gr. 97 was collated against yet another manuscript. She corroborated her claim by certain variants recorded in Bodl.
Third, the translation of these pieces betrays Eriugena’s hand. Their word-for-word mimicry of the Greek text, and their extreme literalism parallel those of the Versio. Below are presented, side by side, the passage from Polycrates’ letter in Greek\textsuperscript{183} together with the Latin translation\textsuperscript{184}, which appears in the manuscripts of the Versio.

Policrati successoris archiepiscopi Ephesi ex epistola ad Victorem successorem archiepiscopum Megalae.

Etenim per Asiam magna elementa dormiunt quae resurgent nouissima die aduentus domini in qua uniet cum gloria ex caelo et reuiuificabit omnes sanctos Philippum qui est duodecimus apostolorum qui dormit in Hierapoli et duae filiae eius honorabiles uirgines. Et altera eius filia in sancto spiritu conuersata in Epheso quiescit adhuc autem Johannes ipse super pectus domini recumbens qui factus est sacerdos petalum feren et martyr et magister ipse in Epheso dormit.

\vspace{1em}

\begin{quote}
Поликрάτους διαδόχον ἀρχιεπισκόπου Ἐφέσου ἐκ τῆς ἐπιστολῆς τῆς πρὸς Βικτόρα τοῦ διαδόχου καὶ ἀρχιεπισκόπου τῆς Μεγάλης.

Καὶ γὰρ κατὰ τὴν Ἀσίαν μεγάλα στοιχεῖα κεκοίμηται ὁ τῶν δωδεκά ἁγίων, Φίλιππος τῶν δωδεκά ἁγίων, ὃς κεκοίμηται ἐν Ἰεραπόλει καὶ δύο θυγατέρες αὐτοῦ γεγορουθεῖ τις παρθενοὶ καὶ ἔτερα αὐτοῦ γεγορουθεῖ ἐν ἄγιο πνεύματι πολιτευμένῃ ἐν Ἐφέσῳ ἀναπαυόμεται ἐν δὲ καὶ Ἰωάννης, ὁ ἐπὶ τὸ στήθος τοῦ κυρίου ἀναπεσόν, ὃς ἑγευθή ἱερεὺς τὸ πετάλων πεφρεκὼς καὶ μάρτυς καὶ διδάσκαλος, οὗτος ἐν Ἐφέσῳ κεκοίμηται.
\end{quote}

Case is matched by case and no word is left untranslated with the exception of the Greek article. The final word on the question whether Eriugena was personally responsible for this translation must await an edition of the short text. Nevertheless, circumstantial

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{183} Eusebius, Historia Ecclesiastica V, 24. \\
\textsuperscript{184} Os, fols. 216r-216v.
\end{flushright}
though much of the evidence may be, it seems likely that the Irishman found the piece in Pa and translated it as a legitimate part of the Dionysian corpus.
**Stemma:**

![Stemma Diagram]


12th century, parchment, 197 fols. Dondaine puts Av in the A family with the two Parisian manuscripts, A and B:

Avranches 47, fin XIIᵉ, donne exactement le texte de A B, sauf pour les chh. 4 à 14 de HC, corrigés d’après la recension victorine... Ces chapitres 4-14 n’ont point d’apparat interlinéaire; mais l’apparat est au complet et conforme a celui de A B pour les autres chapitres des deux *Hiérarchies*.\(^{185}\)

Av is, in fact, a T manuscript which has copied some of the interlinear glosses from an A manuscript as well as some of the variant readings in the text of A. A simple comparison

\(^{185}\) Dondaine, *Le corpus dionysien*, 38, n. 10.
of Av with the interlinear apparatus as it is found in A, B, Be and Bp shows that the apparatus of Av is far from complete—explained in part by the fact that Av did not copy the glosses which simply report the readings of T.

ff 3r-6v: Inter caetera.
ff. 7r-7v: Hanc libam.
ff. 7v-13r: Valde quidem.
ff. 13v-14r: Lumine sidero.
ff. 14r-14v: Capitula De caelesti hierarchia libri.
f. 14v: Quia prisci
f. 14v: Epigramma De caelesti hierarchia libri.
ff. 14v-59r: De caelesti hierarchia liber.
f. 59r: Angelicarum descriptionum.
f. 59r: Epigramma De ecclesiastica hierarchia libri.
ff. 59r-59v: Capitula de ecclesiastica hierarchia libri.
ff. 59v-100v: De ecclesiastica hierarchia liber.
f. 100v: Epigramma De diuinis nominibus libri.
ff. 101r: Capitula De diuinis nominibus libri.
ff. 101r-170v: De diuinis nominibus liber.
ff. 170v=171r: Tuam mentem.
ff. 171r: Capitula De mystica theologia libri.
ff. 171r: Epigramma De mystica theologia libri.
ff. 171r-176r: De mystica theologia liber.
ff. 176r: Epigramma epistolorum
ff. 176r: Destinati epistolarum.
ff. 176r-187v: Decem epistolae.


12th century, parchment, 85fols. Bo falls into the sub-family of T which preserves the text of T prior to the additions and manipulations of Anastasius. This explains the absence of the Inter caetera in Bo.

f. 2v: Capitula De caelesti hierarchia libri.
ff. 1v-19v: De caelesti hierarchia liber.
f. 19v: Angelicarum descriptionum.
f. 19v: Epigramma De ecclesiastica hierarchia libri.
f. 19v: *Capitula de ecclesiastica hierarchia libri.*
ff. 19v-43v: *De ecclesiastica hierarchia liber.*
f. 43v: *Epigramma De diuinis nominibus libri.*
ff. 43v: *Capitula De diuinis nominibus libri.*
ff. 43v-74v: *De diuinis nominibus liber.*
f. 74v: *Capitula De mystica theologia libri.*
f. 74v: *Epigramma De mystica theologia libri.*
ff. 74v-76v: *De mystica theologia liber.*
ff. 76v: *Destinati epistolarum.*
ff. 76v-85r: *Decem epistolae.*

Colophon: *De libraria Sancti Bertini*, 69r.


12th century, parchment, 111fols. Ct is, like Bo, one of the T manuscripts which do not contain the *scholia*. It is also conspicuously lacking the *Inter caetera*. Ct is clearly a member of the sub-family of T which represents this recension prior to the work of Anastasius. Ct has been contaminated in a very few places as from the apparatus of A.

f. 2r: *Hanc libam.*
ff. 2r-4v: *Valde quidem.*
f. 5r: *Lumine sidero.*
ff. 5r-6r: *Capitula De caelesti hierarchia libri.*
f. 6r: *Epigramma De caelesti hierarchia libri.*
ff. 6r-27r: *De caelesti hierarchia liber.*
f. 27r: *Angelicarum descriptionum.*
ff. 27r: *Epigramma De ecclesiastica hierarchia libri.*
ff. 27r-27v: *Capitula de ecclesiastica hierarchia libri.*
ff. 27v-51v: *De ecclesiastica hierarchia liber.*
f. 51v: *Epigramma De diuinis nominibus libri.*
ff. 51v-52r: *Capitula De diuinis nominibus libri.*
ff. 52r-94v: *De diuinis nominibus liber.*
f. 94v: *Capitula De mystica theologia libri.*
f. 94v: *Epigramma De mystica theologia libri.*
ff. 95r-97r: *De mystica theologia liber.*
ff. 97r: *Destinati epistolarum.*
ff. 97v-108v: *Decem epistolae.*
ff. 108v-110v: Eusebian extracts.

The explicit of the *De ecclesiastica hierarchia* follows the Eusebian extracts: *finitus est cum deo liber Dionisii Ariopagite De ecclesiastica hierarchia*, 111r.


11th century, parchment, 253fols. Fl is a representative, together with H and Li, of an interesting sub-family of T which is characterized by a noticeable amount of contamination from M.

f. 2r: *Hanc libam.*
ff. 2r-3r: *Valde quidem.*
f. 3v: *Lumine sidero.*
f. 3v: *Capitula De caelesti hierarchia libri.*
f. 3v: *Quia prisci*
f. 3v: *Epigramma De caelesti hierarchia libri.*
ff. 3v-24r: *De caelesti hierarchia liber.*
f. 24r: *Angelicarum descriptionum.*
f. 24r: *Epigramma De ecclesiastica hierarchia libri.*
f. 24r: *Capitula de ecclesiastica hierarchia libri.*
ff. 24v-51r: *De ecclesiastica hierarchia liber.*
f. 51r: *Epigramma De diuinis nominibus libri.*
ff. 51r-51v: *Capitula De diuinis nominibus libri.*
ff. 51v-58v: *De diuinis nominibus liber.*
f. 88v (mg.): *Tuam mentem.*
f. 88v-89r: *Capitula De mystica theologia libri.*
f. 88v: *Epigramma De mystica theologia libri.*
ff. 89r-91r: *De mystica theologia liber.*
f. 91r: *Epigramma epistolorum* (not identified as *epigramma*).
ff. 91v: *Destinati epistolarum.*
ff. 91v-102r: *Decem epistolae.*
ff. 102r-104r: Eusebian extracts.

The *Versio* is followed (104r-147v) by several short treatises and letters, the bulk of them by or from Augustine.

12th and 14th centuries, parchment, 131fols. In H, the *Versio* is followed by a short treatise *De distinctione angelorum* (130v-131r). This portion of the manuscript comes from the 14th century according to the catalogue. The scribe of H stopped copying the *scholia* in the middle of *De diuinis nominibus* VIII.

ff. 1r-3v: *Inter caetera.*

f. 3v: *Hanc libam.*

ff. 3v-6v: *Valde quidem.*

ff. 6v-7r: *Lumine sidero.*

ff. 7r-7v: *Capitula De caelesti hierarchia libri.*

f. 7v: *Quia prisci*

f. 7v: *Epigramma De caelesti hierarchia libri.*

ff. 8r-33v: *De caelesti hierarchia liber.*

f. 33v: *Angelicarum descriptionum.*

f. 33v: *Epigramma De ecclesiastica hierarchia libri.*

ff. 33v-34r: *Capitula de ecclesiastica hierarchia libri.*

ff. 34r-67v: *De ecclesiastica hierarchia liber.*

f. 67v: *Epigramma De diuinis nominibus libri.*

ff. 67v-68r: *Capitula De diuinis nominibus libri.*

ff. 68r-112v: *De diuinis nominibus liber.*

f. 112v: *Tuam mentem.*

f. 112v: *Capitula De mystica theologia libri.*

f. 113r: *Epigramma De mystica theologia libri.*

ff. 113r-116r: *De mystica theologia liber.*

f. 116r: *Epigramma epistolorum* (not identified as *epigramma*).

f. 116r: *Destinati epistolarium.*

ff. 116r-128v: *Decem epistolae.*

ff. 128v-130r: Eusebian extracts.


13th century, parchment, 126fols. Li is closely related to Fl and H, sharing with them considerable contamination against *M*. However, Li contains none of the *scholia,*
while H witnesses the *scholia* up to *De diuinis nominibus* VIII and Fl witnesses them throughout.

ff. 1r-2v: *Inter caetera.*
ff. 2v-3r: *Hanc libam.*
ff. 3r-6v: *Valde quidem.*
f. 7r: *Lumine sidero.*
ff. 7r-7v: *Capitula De caelesti hierarchia libri.*
f. 7v: *Epigramma De caelesti hierarchia libri.*
ff. 8r-29v: *De caelesti hierarchia liber.*
f. 30r: *Angelicarum descriptionum.*
f. 30r: *Epigramma De ecclesiastica hierarchia libri.*
f. 30r: *Capitula de ecclesiastica hierarchia libri.*
ff. 30v-63r: *De ecclesiastica hierarchia liber.*
f. 63r: *Epigramma De diuinis nominibus libri.*
ff. 63r-63v: *Capitula De diuinis nominibus libri.*
ff. 63v-108v: *De diuinis nominibus liber.*
f. 108v: *Tuam mentem.*
f. 108v: *Capitula De mystica theologia libri.*
ff. 108v: *Epigramma De mystica theologia libri.*
ff. 109r-111v: *De mystica theologia liber.*
f. 111v: *Epigramma epistolorum* (not identified as *epigramma*).
f. 111v: *Destinati epistolarum.*
ff. 111v-124r: *Decem epistolae.*
ff. 124r-126v: Eusebian extracts.


12th century, parchment, 114fols.

ff. 1r-3r: *Inter caetera.*
f. 3r: *Hanc libam.*
ff. 3v-6r: *Valde quidem.*
ff. 6r-6v: *Capitula De caelesti hierarchia libri.*
f. 6v: *Quia prisci*
f. 6v: *Epigramma De caelesti hierarchia libri.*
ff. 7r-28r: *De caelesti hierarchia liber.*
f. 28r: *Angelicarum descriptionum.*
f. 28r: *Epigramma De ecclesiastica hierarchia libri.*
f. 28r: *Capitula de ecclesiastica hierarchia libri.*
ff. 28r-56r: *De ecclesiastica hierarchia liber.*
f. 56r: *Epigramma De diuinis nominibus libri.*
ff. 56r-56v: Capitula De diuinis nominibus libri.
ff. 56v-97v: De diuinis nominibus liber.
f. 97v: Capitula De mystica theologia libri.
f. 97v: Epigramma De mystica theologia libri.
ff. 97v-100r: De mystica theologia liber.
ff. 100v: Destinati epistolarum.
ff. 100v-114v: Decem epistolae.


Early 11th century according to Coxe and Cappuyns186, parchment, 237fols. Os was carefully prepared with decorated initials for most of the treatises. The initial of the De caelesti hierarchia (O) is a pantocrator, a feature which Os shares in common with H. This detailed preparation is incomplete, and, for certain treatises, there is a large blank area where the initial should be. Os has been carefully read and annotated by a later hand, perhaps 15th century. The 15th century glosses reflect a reading of the Expositiones.

ff. 1r-4r: Inter caetera.
f. 4r: Hanc libam.
ff. 4v-8r: Valde quidem.
ff. 8r-8v: Lumine sidero.
ff. 8v-9r: Capitula De caelesti hierarchia libri.
f. 9r: Quia prisci
f. 9r: Epigramma De caelesti hierarchia libri.
ff. 9r-52v: De caelesti hierarchia liber.
f. 52v: Angelicarum descriptionum.
f. 52v: Epigramma De ecclesiastica hierarchia libri.
ff. 52v-53r: Capitula de ecclesiastica hierarchia libri.
ff. 53r-110v: De ecclesiastica hierarchia liber.
f. 110v: Epigramma De diuinis nominibus libri.
ff. 110v-111r: Capitula De diuinis nominibus libri.
ff. 111v-186v: De diuinis nominibus liber.
ff. 187r: Capitula De mystica theologia libri.
f. 187r: Epigramma De mystica theologia libri.

---

186 Sheldon-Williams suggests it was only slightly later than T, but does not risk attributing an actual date to it; cf. Sheldon-Williams, “A Bibliography,” 217.
De mystica theologia liber.
Epigramma epistolorum (not identified as epigramma).
Destinati epistolarii.
Decem epistolae.
Eusebian extracts.


9th century and 13th century, parchment, 241 fols. This manuscript comes from the college of the Oratory of Troyes. T is one of the most ancient manuscripts of the Versio, and is the oldest witness of the T recension prior to the contribution of Anastasius. For this reason, T is a privileged manuscript, to be treated as the most faithful witness of T as it was intended by Eriugena.

T has been damaged over time. It is now made up of two volumes combined into one, the first, from the 13th century, contains the letters of Abelard and Heloise and the Regula sanctimonialium, and the second, from the 9th century, contains the Versio. It is missing several folios, including the beginning of the corpus (the De caelesti hierarchia begins in the middle of chapter I, PL 122, 1038C10). Likewise, the end of the manuscript is missing. Thus, the Eusebian extracts, characteristic of this family, present only the fragments from Polycrates and Clement—Philo is missing. Finally, several folios are out of place. The manuscript must be read in the following order: “après 217v, passer à 226r-241v; de là reprendre à 218r-225r où la version de Scot s’achève normalement avec la Lettre à Jean”.

ff. 156r-171r: De caelesti hierarchia liber (beginning at PL 122, 1038C10, in the middle of De caelesti hierarchia I).

---

187 Dondaine, Le corpus dionysien, 40, n. 18.
f. 171r: Angelicarum descriptionum.
f. 171r: Epigramma De ecclesiastica hierarchia libri.
ff. 171r-171v: Capitula de ecclesiastica hierarchia libri.
ff. 171v-194r: De ecclesiastica hierarchia liber.
f. 194r: Epigramma De diuinis nominibus libri.
f. 194v: Capitula De diuinis nominibus libri.
ff. 194v-221v, 226r-235v: De diuinis nominibus liber.
f. 235v: Capitula De mystica theologia libri.
ff. 235v-236r: Epigramma De mystica theologia libri.
ff. 236r-238v: De mystica theologia liber.
f. 238v: Destinati epistolarum.
ff. 238v-241v (epp. 1-8, incomplete), 221v-225r (epp. 8 (incomplete)-10): Decem epistolae.
f. 225v: Eusebian extracts (Polycrates and Clement only).

Colophon: hic est liber Sulpicii quae dedit Adebrannus, 194v-195r, repeated on 212v-213r.

The manuscript itself does not contain the usual titulus which names Eriugena as the translator. A later hand has attributed it to Sarrazin. However, the manuscript antedates Sarrazin by two or three centuries.

Nevertheless, the author of the catalogue, who points out this error, remains uncertain about the author of the version contained in T: “Ce n’est pas non plus celle de Jean Scot ou Erigène, qui a écrit dans la dernière moitié du IXᵉ siècle, à moins toutefois que celle que contient le manuscrit n° 841 et qui porte son nom ne lui soit faussement attribuée”188. However, while 841 does indeed contain the Versio of Eriugena, the text belongs to the recension P, that of the Corpus Dionysacum of the 13th century.


12ᵗʰ century, parchment, 216 fols.

ff. 33r-34r: Inter caetera.

188 Catalogue générale II, 334.
ff. 34r-34v: Hanc libam.
ff. 34v-35v: Valde quidem.
ff. 35v-36r: Lumine sidero.
f. 36r: Capitula De caelesti hierarchia libri.
f. 36r: Epigramma De caelesti hierarchia libri.
ff. 36r-48v: De caelesti hierarchia liber.
f. 48v: Angelicarum descriptionum.
f. 48v: Epigramma De ecclesiastica hierarchia libri.
f. 48v: Capitula de ecclesiastica hierarchia libri.
ff. 48v-65r: De ecclesiastica hierarchia liber.
f. 65r: Epigramma De diuinis nominibus libri.
ff. 65r-65v: Capitula De diuinis nominibus libri.
ff. 65v-90r: De diuinis nominibus liber.
ff. 90r-90v: Capitula De mystica theologia libri.
f. 90v: Epigramma De mystica theologia libri.
ff. 90v-92r: De mystica theologia liber.
f. 92r: Destinati epistolae.
ff. 92r-100r: Decem epistolae.


12th century, parchment, i + 76 (+ 63bis) fols. Vr is a T manuscript of the same family as T and Ct (without scholia or the glosses of Anastasius). There are two sets of corrections in this manuscript—the first in the hand of the scribe who copied the manuscript, the second in a much later hand. The latter was an astute reader who made doctrinal comments, suggested scriptural passages in support of Dionysius’ arguments and proposed new ways of translating Dionysius. This reader had a copy of the Greek corpus before him from the R recension as well as a copy of the Expositiones (whence some of his doctrinal comments and corrections).

f. 1v: Capitula De caelesti hierarchia libri.
ff. 2r-18r: De caelesti hierarchia liber.
f. 18r: Angelicarum descriptionum.
f. 18r-18v: Epigramma De ecclesiastica hierarchia libri.
f. 18v: Capitula de ecclesiastica hierarchia libri.
ff. 18v-24v: De ecclesiastica hierarchia liber.
The manuscripts of the third recension, \( M \), contain significantly less material than the manuscripts of \( A \) and \( T \). The text witnessed by this recension is chronologically the latest. Nevertheless, the corrections which characterize this recension were not made upon a \( T \) manuscript, nor upon an \( A \) manuscript\(^{189} \). \( M \) was corrected against the earliest version of Eriugena’s translation, a text which preceded both the corrections of \( T \) and the contribution of Anastasius, namely, \( \alpha \). Accordingly, the manuscripts of this family contain neither the \textit{Inter caetera} nor the \textit{scholia} of John and Maximus. Thus, although the manuscripts of this family are generally from the 12\(^{th} \) century or later, the text which they witness is very early, and the text of \( M \), together with that of \( A \), allows us to reconstruct the earliest version of the \textit{Versio}.

Several of the manuscripts of \( M \) contain a separate piece, the \textit{Nobilibus quondam}, a poem bemoaning the ruin of Rome. These verses—which Traube used to distinguish his Germanic family from the Franco-Gallic and Italian families—were once considered the work of Eriugena, but are no longer attributed to the Irishman\(^{190} \).

\(^{189} \) Because \( A \) has been contaminated against both \( T \) and \( M \) as well as \( R \), it is best not to consider the text as the earliest version of the translation.

\(^{190} \) Cf. Cappuyns, \textit{Jean Scot Érigène}, 78, n. 3.
Stemma:

Ba\textsuperscript{1}. Bamberg Misc. Patr. 66 (B.IV.8) (Leitschuh, Friedrich and Hans Fischer, Katalog der Handschriften der Königlichen Bibliothek zu Bamberg, Bamberg, 1887-1912, 437).

11\textsuperscript{th} century, parchment, 107 fols.

f. 1r: Hanc libam.
ff. 1r-3v: Valde quidem.
ff. 4r-4v: Capitula De caelesti hierarchia libri.
f. 4v: Epigraphma De caelesti hierarchia libri.
ff. 4v-5r: Lumine sidero.
ff. 5r-25r: De caelesti hierarchia liber.
f. 25v: Angelicarum descriptionum.
f. 25v: Epigraphma De ecclesiastica hierarchia libri.
ff. 25v-25r: Capitula de ecclesiastica hierarchia libri.
ff. 25v-54r: De ecclesiastica hierarchia liber.
f. 54r: Epigraphma De diuinis nominibus libri.
ff. 54r: Capitula De diuinis nominibus libri.
ff. 54r-93v: De diuinis nominibus liber.
ff. 93v-94r: Capitula De mystica theologia libri.
ff. 94r: Epigraphma De mystica theologia libri.
ff. 94r-96v: De mystica theologia liber.
ff. 96v: Destinati epistolarum.
ff. 96v-106v: *Decem epistolae*.

**Clm**¹. Munich, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, Clm. 14137 (S. Emmeran B 44) (*cf. Catalogus codicum latinorum bibliothecae regiae Monacensis* II, 2, Munich: Otto Harrassowitz, 1876, 134).

11th century, parchment, 113 fols. Clm¹ was copied by Othlo, dean of the monastic school of St. Emmeran between 1055 and 1062:

En ego tantillus Otloh uulgo uocitatus quamuis omnigenis corruptis sim malefactis sat tamen istud opus scribendo tuum tibi promptus sanctae Dionisi martyr celeberrime ΧΡΙΣΘ unde mei queso praecibas sacris memoresto uos quoque qui legitis ueniam mihi posco petatis.¹⁹¹

Although he gives no reason for doing so—other than the presence of the autograph of Othlo—Floss gives ‘first place’ to this manuscript in his edition of the *De caelesti hierarchia*:


However, Othlo’s signature is no guarantee of the fidelity of Clm¹—in fact, E (also used by Floss), together with Ox, present a version of *M* which appears to be closer to the origin of this recension.

f. 1r: *Hanc libam*.
ff. 1r-3v: *Valde quidem*.
ff. 4r: *Capitula De caelesti hierarchia libri*.
ff. 4v: *Epigrama De caelesti hierarchia libri*.
ff. 4v-5r: *Lumine sidero*.
ff. 5r-25v: *De caelesti hierarchia liber*.
f. 25v: *Angelicarum descriptionum*.
f. 25v: *Epigrama De ecclesiastica hierarchia libri*.

¹⁹¹ Fol. 112v.
¹⁹² PL 122, XIII.
f. 26r: *Capitula de ecclesiastica hierarchia libri.*
ff. 26r-55v: *De ecclesiastica hierarchia liber.*
f. 55v: *Epigrama De diuinis nominibus libri.*
ff. 55v-56r: *Capitula De diuinis nominibus libri.*
ff. 56r-98r: *De diuinis nominibus liber.*
f. 98r: *Capitula De mystica theologia libri.*
f. 98r: *Epigrama De mystica theologia libri.*
ff. 98r-100v: *De mystica theologia liber.*
ff. 100v: *Destinati epistolarum.*
ff. 100v-112v: *Decem epistolae.*
f. 112v: *Nobilibus quondam.*

Colophon: *En ego tantillus Otloh ulgo uocitatus quamuis omnigenis corruptis sim malefactis sat tamen istud opus scribendo tuum tibi promptus sanctae Dionisi martyr celeberrime XPΣΘI unde mei queso praecibus sacris memestro uos quoque qui legitis uentiam mihi posco petatis,* 112v.

**Clm**². Munich, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, Clm. 17072 (Scheftl. 72) (*Catalogus codicum latinorum bibliothecae regiae Monacensis* II, 3, Munich: Otto Harrassowitz, 1878, 80)

12ᵗʰ century, parchment, 105 fols.

f. 1v: *Hanc libam.*
ff. 1v-2v: *Valde quidem.*
f. 2v: *Capitula De caelestii hierarchia libri.*
f. 3r: *Epigrama De caelestii hierarchia libri.*
f. 3r: *Lumine sidero.*
ff. 3r-12r: *De caelestii hierarchia liber.*
f. 12r: *Angelarum descriptionum.*
f. 12r: *Epigrama De ecclesiastica hierarchia libri.*
f. 12r: *Capitula de ecclesiastica hierarchia libri.*
ff. 12r-24v: *De ecclesiastica hierarchia liber.*
f. 24v: *Epigrama De diuinis nominibus libri.*
ff. 24v-42v: *De diuinis nominibus liber.*
f. 42v: *Capitula De mystica theologia libri.*
f. 42v: *Epigrama De mystica theologia libri.*
ff. 42v-43v: *De mystica theologia liber.*
ff. 43v: *Destinati epistolarum.*
ff. 43v-48v: *Decem epistolae.*
In Clm², the Versio is followed by several pieces pointing to the continued interest in Dionysius in the Middle Ages, including the commentary of Hugh of St. Victor on the *De caelesti hierarchia*, 96v-99r, the letter of Louis the Pious to Hilduin, asking the abbot of St. Denis to put together a history of St. Denis, the patron and martyr of Paris, 99r-99v, Hilduin’s letter to Louis the Pious (PL 106, 22C1-24C5), 99v-105r, Hilduin’s *Passio sancti Dionysii* (PL 106, 23-50), a letter from Pope Stephen to Peppin the Little (dated 754, 5th kalends of August) concerning the consecration of the altar of St. Denis, 105r, and a hymn for the feast of Denis the martyr, 105v.


11th century, parchment, 103 fols. The manuscripts E, Ly and Ox (see below) stem from a similar branch of M. All three manuscripts follow M for the most part, but give the readings of T in certain instances. E, Ly and Ox contain the glosses of John and Maximus (a feature shared with no other M manuscript) as well as the Eusebian extracts. Nevertheless, the text presented by E, Ly and Ox corresponds even more closely to the lemmata of the *Expositiones* than do those of any other M manuscript. This is because the text of the *De caelesti hierarchia* in these manuscripts comes directly from Eriugena’s commentary. This fact is evident from the odd inclusion of terms such as inquit in Ox at *De caelesti hierarchia* II, 1040C13-14, which occurs in no other manuscript of the Versio, but is found in Eriugena’s commentary as an introduction to the lemma which follows (*Exp.*II, 327). Although E and Ly do not contain such conspicuous
errors, they follow the text of Ox rather closely, and must be considered close relatives of the English manuscript.

E, Ly and Ox are of great value precisely because of their differences with the rest of the M manuscripts and their close adherence to the text of the Expositiones. Where the variants of M (found in the Austrian and German manuscripts) do not correspond precisely with the Expositiones, one has the impression that the version found in E, Ly and Ox—which almost invariably agrees with the Expositiones—represents an early stage in the development of M. The Austrian and German manuscripts appear to have been manipulated even after the corrections associated with the Expositiones became an independent recension. The date of this later stage of the M recension is impossible to determine.

f. 2r: Hanc libam.
ff. 2v-4v: Valde quidem.
ff. 4v-5r: Capitula De caelesti hierarchia libri.
f. 5v: Quia prisci.
f. 5v: Epigramma De caelesti hierarchia libri.
ff. 5v-6r: Lumine sidero.
ff. 6r-25v: De caelesti hierarchia liber.
f. 25v: Angelicarum descriptionum.
f. 25v: Epigramma De ecclesiastica hierarchia libri.
f. 25v: Capitula de ecclesiastica hierarchia libri.
ff. 25v-52v: De ecclesiastica hierarchia liber.
f. 52v: Epigramma De diuinis nominibus libri.
f. 52v: Capitula De diuinis nominibus libri.
ff. 53r-89v: De diuinis nominibus liber.
f. 89v: Tuam mentem.

Colophon: 2r, *Liber maioris ecclesiae in Colonia concessus fratribus minoribus pro quo habent primum et secundum sententiarum fratrum* (in a 14\textsuperscript{th} century hand).

12th century, parchment, 114 fols. Ly belongs to the same sub-family of M as do E and Ox, presenting an ancient version of the third recension of the Versio. Ly shares a small number of variants with Ox against E, which, perhaps, can be said to increase the value of Ly as a witness of this early version of M. For, as has been mentioned above,

193 it can be shown that Ox was copied from the lemmata of the Expositiones, which work appears to be at the origin of this recension.

ff. 1r-3r: Inter caetera.
  f. 3r: Hanc libam.
  f. 3r: Valde quidem.
ff. 6r-6v: Capitula De caelesti hierarchia libri.
  f. 6v: Quia prisci
  f. 6v: Epigrama De caelesti hierarchia libri.
  f. 6v: Lumine sidero.
ff. 7r-38r: De caelesti hierarchia liber.
  f. 38r: Angelicarum descriptionum.
  f. 38r: Epigrama De ecclesiastica hierarchia libri.
  f. 38r: Capitula de ecclesiastica hierarchia libri.
ff. 38r-56r: De ecclesiastica hierarchia liber.
  f. 56r: Epigrama De diuinis nominibus libri.
  f. 56r: Capitula De diuinis nominibus libri.
ff. 56v-97r: De diuinis nominibus liber.
  f. 97r: Tuam mentem.
  f. 97v: Capitula De mystica theologia libri.
  f. 97v: Epigrama De mystica theologia libri.
ff. 97v-100r: De mystica theologia liber.
  f. 100r: Epigrama epistolorum.
  f. 100r: Destinati epistolorum.
ff. 100r-112r: Decem epistolae.
ff. 112r-114r: Eusebian extracts.

---

193 Cf. pp. 85-6 supra.

12th century, parchment, 6 + 139 fols. Ox is a special manuscript, closely related to E and Ly, representing the M recension at an earlier stage of its development. Ox is more faithful to the lemmata of the *Expositiones*—at least as we find the text in the *Corpus Christianorum*—than E, and thus is probably closer to their archetype.

ff. 1r: *Inter caetera.*
f. 3r: *Hanc libam.*
ff. 3r-5v: *Valde quidem.*
ff. 5v-6r: *Capitula De caelesti hierarchia libri.*
f. 6r: *Quia prisci*
f. 6v: *Epigramma De caelesti hierarchia libri.*
f. 6v: *Lumine sidero.*
ff. 6v-19v: *De caelesti hierarchia liber.*
f. 19v: *Angelicarum descriptionum.*
f. 19v: *Epigramma De ecclesiastica hierarchia libri.*
f. 20r: *Capitula de ecclesiastica hierarchia libri.*
ff. 20r-47r: *De ecclesiastica hierarchia liber.*
ff. 47r-47v: *Epigramma De diuinis nominibus libri.*
f. 47v: *Capitula De diuinis nominibus libri.*
ff. 47v-94r: *De diuinis nominibus liber.*
f. 94r: *Tuam mentem.*
f. 94r: *Capitula De mystica theologia libri.*
f. 94r: *Epigramma De mystica theologia libri.*
ff. 94r-97r: *De mystica theologia liber.*
f. 97r: *Epigramma epistolorum* (not identified as epigramma).
ff. 97r-97v: *Destinatione epistolorum.*
ff. 97v-108v: *Decem epistolae.*
ff.110r-111v: Eusebian extracts.

**Colophon:** *Liber Guilelmi Laud Archiepi. Cantuar. et Cancellarii Vinuersitatis Oxon. 1633, 1r; Iste liber pertinet michi Guilermo Reynaut, 139r.*

The Versio is followed by Augustine’s *Liber de uera innocentia*, fols. 112r-139r.

---

194 Folio 109 is missing, and with it Dionysius’ letter to John the Theologian; the ninth letter (to Titus) leaves off at 1193A (*declarantur et est, ut ar-*) As a result of the loss, Ox is also missing the first Eusebian extract and part of the second.
**Va**. Vienna, Österreichische Staatsbibliothek 754 (Tabulae Codicum Manu
Scriptorum Praeter Graecos et Orientales in Bibliotheca Palatina Vindomonensi

12th century, parchment, 100 fols.

ff. 1r-1v: Hanc libam.
ff. 1v-4r: Valde quidem.
f. 4r-4v: Capitula De caelesti hierarchia libri.
f. 4v: Epigrama De caelesti hierarchia libri.
ff. 4v-5r: Lumine sidero.
ff. 5r-23v: De caelesti hierarchia liber.
f. 23v: Angelicarum descriptionum.
f. 23v: Epigrama De ecclesiastica hierarchia libri.
f. 23v-24r: Capitula de ecclesiastica hierarchia libri.
ff. 24r-50v: De ecclesiastica hierarchia liber.
f. 50v: Epigrama De diuinis nominibus libri.
f. 50v: Capitula De diuinis nominibus libri.
ff. 50v-87v: De diuinis nominibus liber.
f. 87v: Capitula De mystica theologia libri.
f. 87v: Epigrama De mystica theologia libri.
ff. 88r-90r: De mystica theologia liber.
ff. 90r: Destinati epistolarum.
ff. 90r-100r: Decem epistolae.
f. 100r: Nobilibus quondam.


13th century, parchment, 152 fols.

f. 1r: Hanc libam.
ff. 1v-4v: Valde quidem.
f. 4v-5r: Capitula De caelesti hierarchia libri.
f. 5r: *Epigramma De caelesti hierarchia libri.*
f. 5r-5v: *Lumine sidero.*
ff. 5v-33v: *De caelesti hierarchia liber.*
f. 33v: *Angelarum descriptionum.*
f. 33v: *Epigramma De ecclesiastica hierarchia libri.*
f. 33v-34r: *Capitula de ecclesiastica hierarchia libri.*
ff. 34r-75v: *De ecclesiastica hierarchia liber.*
ff. 76r-132v: *De diuinis nominibus liber.*
ff. 132v: *Capitula De mystica theologia libri.*
ff. 132v-136r: *De mystica theologia liber.*
ff. 136r: *Desinat epistolaram.*
ff. 136r-152v: *Decem epistolae.*
ff. 152v: *Nobilibus quondam.*

**Z.** Zwettl, Stiftsbibliothek 236 (Die Handschriften-Verzeichnisse der Cistercienser-stifte I, Vienna: Alfred Hölder, 1891, 381).

13th century according to Théry, 12th according to the catalogue, parchment, 108 fols. In Z, the Versio is preceded by two short treatises on the virgin Mary (*Reuelatio monialis Elisabethae de Assumptione B.M.V. f. 2r; Modus uite dulcissime uirginis Marie*, f. 2v). Z is a hybrid text, generally following M, but contaminated by T195. At least two separate hands may be found above the lines in Z: the first is probably that of the main scribe, who simply copied the glosses common to M196; the second is that of a later glossator, who entered the ‘corrections’ from T, as well as some interpretive glosses of his own.

f. 3r: *Hanc libam.*
ff. 3r: *Valde quidem.*

---

195 The ‘contamination’ in Z is difficult to identify. The variants reported by the glossator of Z generally agree with both A and T against M. However, at 1042D2, the glossator of Z reports *ueluti potentiam* with T rather than *uelut impotentiam* with A at PL 122, 1042D2.

196 E.g. *diuinitas* for *thearchia*, etc.
f. 5v: Capitula De caelesti hierarchia libri.
f. 6r: Epigramma De caelesti hierarchia libri.
ff. 6r: Lumine sidero.
ff. 6v-27r: De caelesti hierarchia liber.
f. 27r: Angelicarum descriptionum.
f. 27r: Epigramma De ecclesiastica hierarchia libri.
f. 27v: Capitula de ecclesiastica hierarchia libri.
ff. 27v-57r: De ecclesiastica hierarchia liber.
f. 57r: Epigramma De diuinis nominibus libri.
ff. 57r: Capitula De diuinis nominibus libri.
ff. 57r-95v: De diuinis nominibus liber.
f. 96r: Capitula De mystica theologia libri.
f. 96r: Epigramma De mystica theologica libri.
ff. 96r-98r: De mystica theologica liber.
ff. 98r: Destinati epistolarum.
ff. 98v-108v: Decem epistolae.

1.9 Conclusion

The most significant conclusion which must be drawn from this examination of the manuscripts of the Versio Dionysii is that there exist three separate recensions of the Versio, all stemming from the late 9th or early 10th century. Dondaine’s suggestion that Eriugena was himself the author of the corrections of T must stand—both the Expositiones and the Periphyseon support this. However, it is also certain that Eriugena was the author of the corrections of M as well—this, too, is supported by the Expositiones. The questions remain, then: why two sets of corrections and why do the corrections of M not reflect those of T? No certain answer is possible, but a suggestion may be made based on the evidence available. Neither the citations of his Versio Dionysii in the Periphyseon nor the lemmata of his commentary on the De caelesti hierarchia imply that the versions cited (T and M respectively) existed as separate texts independent of α, Eriugena’s original translation, in the Irishman’s lifetime. It is entirely possible that the corrections in T were made by Eriugena in the very process of quoting
the Versio, and were never intended as a separate version. The same may be said of $M$—
that is, that the corrections found therein had been made as Eriugena was copying the
lemmata upon which he would then comment. In either case, the recension as we know it
would be the product of an eager student of Dionysius who did not merely copy the
Versio from an $\alpha$ manuscript, but compared that manuscript to the Periphyseon and/or
Expositiones.

It seems superfluous to assume that both $T$ and $M$ came about in this manner. Most likely, one of the two represents an attempt at correction on the part of Eriugena, which he intended as an independent—and authoritative—version. $T$ seems the mostly likely candidate for this. For $M$ would have been much easier to produce by simply copying the lemmata directly from the Expositiones (the lemmata reproduce the corpus in its entirety, whereas the Periphyseon and the text of the commentary reproduce only select passages). $T$ on the other hand is only witnessed here and there in the Periphyseon and the Expositiones. What is more, a manuscript of the $T$ recension must have existed before 875 since this was the version known to Anastasius. It seems most likely, then, that $M$ was never intended as a text separate from the lemmata of the Expositiones, and that its existence independent of the commentary was the work of another hand$^{197}$.

A second major conclusion may be drawn regarding the Versio in the 9th century. The corpus Anastasii should be reduced to the translation of the scholia of John of Scythopolis and Maximus Confessor and the marginal glosses which explicitly refer either to the Greek text or to Eriugena as interpres. Neither Traube, Théry nor Dondaine

$^{197}$ This conclusion is further supported by certain $M$ manuscripts (Ox, for example) which contain words such as inquit which come from Eriugena’s commentary and were clearly meant to introduce the lemmata, but do not make up part of the translation.
are correct to identify the intruding hand of Anastasius with the version of Hilduin (Traube), the superlinear glosses in M (Théry), or the interlinear glosses pro in A (Dondaine). Anastasius intruded very little on the Versio (in fact, since his comments are all marginal, one might argue that he did not ‘intrude’ at all), and the manipulations that the Versio Dionysii underwent in the course of the 9th and 10th centuries must be attributed to eager students of Dionysius—a rare witness to the popularity of the pseudo-Areopagite in the years that immediately followed the work of Eriugena.
Chapter Two
Evaluation of Eriugena’s Understanding of Greek

2.1 The State of the Question

2.1.1 The Hellenists of the 9th century and the ‘Irish Theory’
Since the end of the 19th century, scholars have been in general agreement that the knowledge of Greek in Western Europe was in serious decline from the 5th or 6th century until the end of the Middle Ages. In 1891, Traube suggested the knowledge of Greek amongst medieval scholars had been rather overestimated by his predecessors, that those who could actually understand Greek during the Carolingian period could be counted on one hand, and that all of these hellenists were Irish—which has come to be known as the ‘Irish Theory’\(^ {198} \).

Traube’s conclusions have been almost unanimously accepted by the scholarly community, although they have been subjected to several nuances. First, one must distinguish between a basic knowledge of the elements of Greek—a knowledge of the alphabet and the meanings of certain Greek words which could be found in Isidore or Jerome or in the Greek Liturgy—and an actual reading comprehension—the ability to read and understand an untranslated Greek text. The former was indeed common from the 5th to the 9th century, and it is certainly this which led Traube’s predecessors to assume a greater knowledge of Greek during this period than was in fact the case. It is the latter knowledge which was possessed by only a handful of medieval authors and scholars—almost all of them Irish. Secondly, one must be cautious in accepting the ‘Irish

Theory’. North of the Alps, the only graecists that can be identified with any certainty are Martin Hiberniensis, Sedulius Scottus, and Eriugena himself, all of them Irish. Nevertheless, this odd coincidence does not imply that Ireland had been teaching its sons the tongue of Athens when the continent had lost the taste for the language of the early church. Indeed, there is no evidence that any of the Irish scholars of the Carolingian empire had learned their Greek in their motherland before arriving on the continent.

To these conclusions yet another nuance must be added: although most scholars include Martin and Sedulius in the list of hellenists of the 9th century, the evidence in favor of these two Irishmen is of an entirely different sort than the evidence for Eriugena’s Greek. Neither Martin nor Sedulius left us anything comparable to a translation which would allow us to evaluate more closely their work in Greek. Martin left us the now famous manuscript, Laon 444, a collection of Greek \textit{lexica}, word lists and \textit{hermeneumata}, compiled by the Laon master from previous \textit{lexica} and wordlists, together with some original compiling—Laon 444 contains a list of words occurring in Eriugena’s Greek verses, a list most likely put together by Martin himself. Martin has also left us some Greek verses of the same variety as those left by Eriugena. However, the value and quality of these verses is far from agreed upon\textsuperscript{199}. The case for Sedulius is

even more difficult to assess. Sedulius left us only one piece of evidence—the Paris, Arsenal manuscript 8407 contains a Greek Psalter together with this colophon in Greek: I, Sedulius Scottus, wrote it. The act of copying a Greek text in no way implies an actual knowledge of the language, and the amount of Greek necessary to compose the colophon contained in the Arsenal manuscript is minimal at best. Nevertheless, both Martin and Sedulius stand out from their contemporaries in the scope of their projects.

2.1.2 The manuscript evidence of the study of Greek in the Carolingian Empire.

Although the number of Carolingian hellenists that can be identified by name is certainly meagre, the manuscript evidence for the study of Greek during the 9th century paints a rather different picture. The 9th century evidences a strong movement towards gathering the materials necessary for learning Greek—dictionaries and wordlists (idiomata), grammars and hermeneumata.

2.1.2.1 Dictionaries and wordlists:

There are two rather longer dictionaries that were known in the 9th century: The first is that of pseudo-Philoxenus, the second, that of pseudo-Cyril. Both were originally Latin-Greek dictionaries, destined for use by Greek-speakers, not Latins interested in learning Greek, as is made clear by the numerous Greek entries which begin with ΕΙΔΟΣ and the genitive, i.e., ‘a kind of x’. Pseudo-Philoxenus was composed some time in the 2nd or 3rd comprehension of the language; Contreni even suggests that Martin was teaching Greek in his monastery at Laon.
century\textsuperscript{200}, and it is impossible to determine when it entered the Latin West. Nevertheless, the original Latin-Greek version is preserved in the 9\textsuperscript{th} century manuscript, Paris, BN 7651. The Greek-Latin version is witnessed in its fullest form only in Laon 444 (item 21)\textsuperscript{201}. Nevertheless, the compiler of Laon 444, Martin of Laon, was most likely not responsible for the conversion from Latin-Greek to Greek-Latin. The presence of both versions in the 9\textsuperscript{th} century would seem to suggest that the process of turning the original Latin-Greek dictionary into a Greek-Latin dictionary began in the 9\textsuperscript{th} century itself\textsuperscript{202}. Pseudo-Philoxenus consists of about 12000 entries mostly consisting of “colloquial Greek of the late Empire”, lacking much of the vocabulary which would be necessary for translating the New Testament\textsuperscript{203}. Thus, despite its length, pseudo-Philoxenus would have been of limited use to Carolingian scholars, and there is little evidence of its employment in the 9\textsuperscript{th} century.

Although the date of pseudo-Cyril is uncertain, Dionisotti suggests that the original may have been written on papyrus\textsuperscript{204}. No manuscript of the original Latin-Greek lexicon exists today, while the Greek-Latin version exists in two Carolingian manuscripts: Bodleian, Harley 5792 (c. 800) and Laon 444 (item five). Although the contents of pseudo-Cyril would have been more useful than pseudo-Philoxenus to a


\textsuperscript{201} The Vatican manuscript Reg. lat. 1709 contains an intermediate version; according to Dionisotti, an annotator of the original glossary reversed the order of certain entries in the margin, which entries, rather few in number, were then copied into the Vatican manuscript; cf. Dionisotti, “Greek grammars”, 7.

\textsuperscript{202} For more on the history and process of the conversion of pseudo-Philoxenus into a Greek-Latin dictionary, cf. Dionisotti, “Greek grammars,” \textit{6ff.}

\textsuperscript{203} Dionisotti, “Greek grammars,” 8.

\textsuperscript{204} Dionisotti, “Greek grammars,” 12.
medieval scholar interested in reading the Bible or certain patristic texts\textsuperscript{205}, there is little evidence that pseudo-Cyril was much used during the 9\textsuperscript{th} century. Paris, BN 10307, late 9\textsuperscript{th} century, contains certain entries derived from Laon 444, and Paris, BN 3088 contains a fragment of Jerome’s letters together with glosses which show signs of the use of pseudo-Cyril\textsuperscript{206}.

Laon 444, compiled by Martin of Laon some time around 870, has many sources including the dictionaries of pseudo-Philoxenus and pseudo-Cyril. Nevertheless, Laon 444 witnesses several other kinds of word-lists which were known to the 9\textsuperscript{th} century. Item six\textsuperscript{207} is a word-list ordered grammatically rather than alphabetically. More specifically, item six is a collection of \textit{idiomata generum}, a list of Latin words of which the gender differs from that of their Greek equivalents. At least four different \textit{idiomata generum} existed in the 9\textsuperscript{th} century: The anonymous Bobiensis (Naples, lat. 2, 5\textsuperscript{th} century), pseudo-Charisius (Naples IV A 8, 8\textsuperscript{th} century, also from Bobbio, and Paris, BN 7530, 8\textsuperscript{th} century), the \textit{Glossae Servii} (excerpts in S. Paul Carinthis 86, 9\textsuperscript{th} century from Laon or Soissons) and the \textit{Idiomata Harleiana} (Laon 444 and Harley 5792). As with the dictionaries of pseudo-Philoxenus and pseudo-Cyril, all of these \textit{idiomata generum} were destined for Greek-speakers learning Latin, and therefore of limited use to Latin students of Greek.

Two other sorts of \textit{idiomata} existed in the 9\textsuperscript{th} century, although there are fewer surviving manuscripts today than there are of the \textit{idiomata generum}: the \textit{idiomata

\textsuperscript{207} Fols. 255v-275v.
casuum, lists of Latin verbs which take a particular case other than the case which their Greek equivalent governs; and the glossae nominum, lists of Latin words for each part of speech, organized by conjugation or declension\textsuperscript{208}. These, too, were lists compiled for those learning Latin, and were less useful than they would have been were their entries in Greek rather than Latin.

2.1.2.2 Grammars and hermeneumata:

As with the materials available to the medieval scholar for learning Greek vocabulary, the materials for learning grammar or morphology were not originally intended for learning Greek. Some of them were texts for teaching Latin, converted over time to facilitate the teaching of Greek. This is the case with the grammar of Dositheus (3\textsuperscript{rd} or 4\textsuperscript{th} century), a parallel Latin-Greek grammar probably intended to teach Latin to Greek-speaking immigrants\textsuperscript{209}. The text was not universally available during the 9\textsuperscript{th} century, and, in any case, it was severely limited in its discussion of the morphology of both verbs and nouns\textsuperscript{210}. A fragment of a grammar known as “TI ECTIN doctus” survives in one Carolingian manuscript originating at St. Denis (Paris, BN 528) from the beginning of the 9\textsuperscript{th} century\textsuperscript{211}. The TI ECTIN doctus, too, was originally a Latin grammar converted to a

\textsuperscript{208} Cf. Dionisotti, “Greek grammars,” 17-18.

\textsuperscript{209} The exact origin and purpose of the grammar is difficult to determine. Dionisotti calls it “a Latin grammar with an almost complete Greek crib”; “Greek grammars”, 19. However, the Greek ‘crib’ may simply have been intended to make the grammar accessible to Greeks rather than provide Latins with an introduction to Greek.


\textsuperscript{211} Cf. Bernhard Bischoff, “Das griechische Element,” 39-40, who suggests that the Greeks who worked for Hilduin were responsible for this ‘grammar’. Karl Neff, Die Gedichte des Paulus Diaconus. Kritische und erklärende Ausgabe. Quellen und Untersuchungen
tool for teaching Greek—first, in the extant fragment, *doctus* is parsed, and, second, the fragment has a parallel in the manuscript, St. Gall 876, from the beginning of the 9th century, which begins: *Quid est doctus? oratio est. quid est oratio*.

While there is no doubt that Macrobius’ *De differentiis et societatibus graeci latinique verbi*, extant in several manuscripts from the 8th, 9th and 10th centuries, was not composed for the teaching of Latin, as seems to be the case with Dositeus, neither was it intended as an introduction to Greek grammar. Paradigms are not given, and elements not common to Greek and Latin are excluded, for example, the dual and the aorist. However, despite its limitations as a grammar, and therefore its limited value to the novice, Macrobius’ text was copied and used during the 9th century. There exist three complete copies of the text from the 9th century, Paris, BN 7498, Milan, Ambrosiana B.71, supp. and, most significantly, Laon 444 (item three). However, more important than the manuscripts which contain the complete text is a certain defloratio of the work contained in the Paris manuscript, BN 7186, from northern France, second half of the 9th century. The explicit of the text suggests that Eriugena may have been responsible for the defloratio: explicuit defloratio de libro ambrosii macrobii theodosii quam Iohannes carpserat ad discendas grecorum uerborum regulas.

Further, there existed in the 9th century at least one grammar that seems to have been composed specifically for westerners interested in learning Greek, the so-called...
Declinationes graecorum. This grammar survives in at least seven manuscripts from the 9th and 10th centuries, and, according to Bischoff\textsuperscript{215}, treats of all the parts of speech with the exception of numerals. In fact, this characterization is somewhat misleading. For, while Laon 444 discusses 1) the noun, (giving paradigms for ГУНΗ, ΗΜΕΡΑ, ΑΓΑΛΛΙΑΣΙΣ, ΟΝΟΜΑ, ΕΡΓΟΝ, and ΑΝΗΡ), 2) the article and pronouns, 3) verbs, 4) adverbs, 5) participles, 6) conjunctions, 7) prepositions and 8) interjections, two manuscripts\textsuperscript{216} treat nouns alone, two\textsuperscript{217} treat only numbers 1 and 2, one\textsuperscript{218} treats items 1 through 4, and the last\textsuperscript{219} treats 1 through 4, 6 and 7. Laon 444 is certainly not the source for the rest, and therefore, the compiler of the collectanea contained in Laon 444 must have supplemented the material in his source. The text is clearly not based on a classical Greek grammar\textsuperscript{220}, for it gives ГУΝΗ as a paradigm for the first declension, and ΜΑΡΤΥΡΟΣ and ΜΕΓΑΛΟΣ as nominatives of the second declension. The verbs presented in the grammar have been extracted mainly from the Psalms, of which there were many Greek manuscripts at St. Gall in the 9th century, and Deuteronomy. The nominative form ΜΕΓΑΛΟΣ, the common form in the Middle Ages, together with the sources of the section on verbs suggests a medieval origin, although perhaps not an expert in the language.

\textsuperscript{215} Bischoff, “Das griechische Element,” 40.
\textsuperscript{216} Angers 477, 9th century, possibly from Brittany and Bodleian, Harley 2735, 9th century, from Auxerre.
\textsuperscript{217} St. Paul, Carinthia—Dionisotti does not seem to have included a shelf mark for this manuscript—, 9th century, from Laon or Soissons.
\textsuperscript{218} Bodleian, Harley 5642, 9th-10th century, from St. Gall.
\textsuperscript{219} St. Gall, 902, 9th-10th century, St. Gall.
\textsuperscript{220} Contrary to Bischoff, “Das griechische Element,” 40, n. 3.
Lastly, Dionisotti\textsuperscript{221} has identified nine different versions, witnessed to varying degrees in almost 30 manuscripts, of what are known as \textit{hermeneumata}, Latin-Greek schoolbooks of late antiquity used, most likely, for teaching Greek and Latin simultaneously. The \textit{hermeneumata} differ from grammars in that their purpose is not to present a systematic grammar, but rather a collection of exercises for reading and writing Greek and Latin, together with the tools necessary for completing these exercises. Thus, generally, the \textit{hermeneumata} contain all or much of the following elements: 1) an alphabetical glossary of verbs, 2) a list of nouns arranged by subject (parts of the body, kinds of birds, etc.), 3) conversational exercises, 4) reading exercises. The precise origin and nature of these bilingual workbooks is still debated. Regardless of whether their origin is eastern or western, the conversational Greek of the late empire which the \textit{hermeneumata} attempt to teach would be of extremely limited value to Carolingian scholars interested in reading the Psalms or the Gospels, and especially the Fathers. And the lack of any systematic presentation of Greek grammar rendered the \textit{hermeneumata} useless as reference tools. Medieval scholars recognized these limitations, and several of the \textit{hermeneumata} were either supplemented with extra vocabulary, generally taken from the scriptures, as is the case with the \textit{Hermeneumata Vaticana}\textsuperscript{222}, or converted in their entirety into a \textit{lexicon}, as we find in the \textit{Brussels Hermeneumata}\textsuperscript{223}.

\textsuperscript{221} Dionisotti, “Greek grammars,” 26-31.
\textsuperscript{222} Vatican, lat. 6925, 10\textsuperscript{th} century; cf. Dionisotti, “Greek Grammars,” 30.
\textsuperscript{223} E.g., Angers 477, 9\textsuperscript{th} century, Brussels 1828-30, 10\textsuperscript{th} century; cf. Dionisotti, “Greek grammars,” 30.
2.1.2.3 Greek manuscripts:

The last indispensable tool for learning Greek would have been (a) Greek manuscript(s) to read. The monastic library of St. Gall contained the largest collection of Greek manuscripts in the 9th century. Its collection included manuscripts of the dictionaries and *hermeneumata* just described. More importantly, St. Gall’s library included several bilingual Psalters as well as at least one bilingual manuscript containing the Gospels and the Acts of the Apostles\(^\text{224}\). Of course, the primary interest of Greek for Carolingian scholars would have been for reading the scriptures, and the presence of these manuscripts in the 9th century simply confirms the evidence of the dictionaries and grammars, themselves having been supplemented with vocabulary from the *Septuagint* and Greek New Testament. The availability of patristic texts during the 9th century was minimal: the case of Eriugena and the *Corpus Areopagitcum*, the *Ambigua* of Maximus and the *De opificio hominis* (or *De imagine*, as Eriugena called it) provide the only examples of complete Greek patristic texts during the period, and there is little evidence that any Carolingian scholar consulted the Greek manuscripts after Eriugena. Classical Greek texts were not at all available to Carolingian scholars.

Some word must be mentioned here about an otherwise unknown Greek text called the *Peplos Theophrasti*, from which extracts describing the invention of letters by the Egyptians are cited in Laon 444\(^\text{225}\), and to which Eriugena refers in his *Glossae*


\(^{225}\) E. Miller, “Glossaire grec-latin de la bibliothèque de Laon”, *Notices et extraits des manuscrits de la Bibliothèque nationale et autres bibliothèques* 29, 2 (1880): 181:

\[ \text{ΕΧ ΠΕΠΛΟ ΤΕΟΦΡΑΣΤΙ (ἐκ βιβλου, i. libro, Θεοφράστου), proprium et interpretatur deum intelligens.} \]
Martiani. The precise nature of this Peplos is unknown, and these fragments are all that is known of the text. Nevertheless, the discrepancy between Eriugena’s citation and that of Laon 444 indicates that a fuller version of it must have existed in the 9th century and Eriugena had read at least parts of it.

The presence of Greek manuscripts in Carolingian monasteries and libraries, whether they contained dictionaries, grammars or the Christian scriptures, gives the distinct impression not so much of a deep understanding of Greek amongst the 9th century masters as of a concerted effort to amass the tools for such learning. Eriugena seems to have been the first and perhaps only one really to have benefited from this effort, and one wonders to what degree the Irishman was behind this movement.

In any case, research on Greek studies during the Middle Ages has begun to take a new approach, one which concentrates rather on manuscripts than on masters. J. Contreni and B. Kaczynski have opened the way with their analyses of the libraries of Laon and St. Gall respectively. Yet, regardless of the outcome of this continuing


10,6: In Peplo Theofrasti legitur quendam serpentem prophetasse in Delo insula. Quem occidit Appollo, et inde cepit postea prophetare, ideoque Augur pithius uocatus est.


228 Bernice Kaczynski, Greek in the Carolingian Age: the St. Gall manuscripts (Cambridge, Mass.: Medieval Academy of America, 1988).
research, it is certain that Eriugena will remain one of the outstanding hellenists of the 9th century and, indeed, of the Middle Ages.

### 2.1.3 Eriugena’s intellectual career and his understanding of Greek

Traube’s ‘Irish Theory’ is limited in its significance. Although the idea that Ireland was a haven for Greek studies in the early Middle Ages has been largely dismissed, Bischoff has warned against underestimating the role of the Irish in the preservation of Greek in the pre-Carolingian period\(^{229}\). Nevertheless, it remains the case that there is no real evidence that the Irish hellenists of the Carolingian period had learned Greek in their motherland. Thus, we can say little of the state of Eriugena’s understanding of Greek in 845, when he arrived on the continent. Yet, not more than six years after his arrival at the court of Charles the Bald, Eriugena had clearly begun a more than superficial study of Greek.

Eriugena’s intellectual-literary career is often divided into two periods—the Latin and the Greek. The first period consists of that period, before he began his work as a translator, during which Eriugena was influenced primarily by Latin authors. The second follows his work on and exposure to Greek authors, primarily Dionysius, Maximus and Gregory of Nyssa. This division is rather artificial and misleading. The *De praedestinatione*, Eriugena’s earliest extant treatise written around 851, reveals a rather advanced\(^{230}\) understanding of Greek. Apart from the etymologies which pepper the treatise, a feature common to many Carolingian writings, the *De praedestinatione*

\(^{229}\) Bischoff, “Das greichische Element,” 28ff.

\(^{230}\) Advanced at least with regard to his contemporaries.
discusses certain rhetorical elements including: enthymeme\textsuperscript{231}, καταντήφρασις\textsuperscript{232}, and ύπολαλαγή\textsuperscript{233}. Further, the De praedestinatione divides philosophy into four parts: διαμετική, ὀριστική, ἀποδεικτική and ἀναλυτική\textsuperscript{234}. The Periphyseon makes an entirely different division: πρακτική, φυσική, θεολογία, and λογική\textsuperscript{235}. The latter division is a conflation of two different, tripartite divisions\textsuperscript{236}: that espoused by Cicero\textsuperscript{237} and Seneca\textsuperscript{238}—ethica, physica and logica—, which Augustine\textsuperscript{239} says Plato maintained; and that proposed by Origen\textsuperscript{240} and Evagrius\textsuperscript{241}—ethica, physica and theologia—, which Eriugena may have found in Maximus’ Ambigua ad Iohannem\textsuperscript{242}. The former division belongs to a certain tradition of commentaries on Porphyry’s Isagoge beginning with Ammonius of Alexandria\textsuperscript{243}, and reappears in a fragment (Paris, BN, gr. 1938, 15\textsuperscript{th} century) of David the Armenian’s commentary on Porphyry\textsuperscript{244}.

Théry suggests that at this early period in his intellectual career—around 10 years before Eriugena began his work as a translator—Eriugena had at his disposal a speculative grammar or treatise on rhetoric which discussed enthymeme, which discussed

\textsuperscript{231} PL 122, 391B.
\textsuperscript{232} PL 122, 393D.
\textsuperscript{233} PL 122, 415 B.
\textsuperscript{234} PL 122, 358A.
\textsuperscript{235} PL 122, 705A-B.
\textsuperscript{236} Cf. Periphyseon III, 3582-3593, nota ad loc.
\textsuperscript{237} Contra academicos I, 5, 19.
\textsuperscript{238} Ep. 89.
\textsuperscript{239} De ciuitate dei, VIII, X, 2 and XI, XXV.
\textsuperscript{240} Libri X in Canticum canticorum commentarium, PG 13, 73BC.
\textsuperscript{241} Practicus, I, PG 40, 1221D.
\textsuperscript{242} VI, 442-445; XXXIII, 55-65, 107-114, 128-130, LXIII, 48-56.
\textsuperscript{243} Cf. John Edwin Sandys, A History of Classical Scholarship: From the 6\textsuperscript{th} century B.C. to the 19\textsuperscript{th} century (Cambridge: University Press, 1903), 493, n. 2.
\textsuperscript{244} Cf. Théry, “Scot Érigène, traducteur de Denys,” 222: Ἀλλὰ καὶ εἰς πᾶσαν φιλοσοφίαν. εἰ γε πᾶσαν φιλοσόφου φωνήν. εὔταυθα διδασκόμεθα; ἀλλὰ καὶ εἰς τὰς διαλεκτικὰς μεθόδους; τέσσαρες γάρ σύμαι. διαφετικὴ, ὀριστικὴ, ἀποδεικτικὴ, ἀναλυτικὴ...
καταντίφρασις, and ὑπαλλογητή245, and was ‘inspired’, directly or indirectly, by the Greek commentary of David the Armenian246.

These suggestions imply nothing more than that by 851 Eriugena’s understanding of Greek was more profound than that of his contemporaries—a trivial comparison. However, Eriugena’s criticism of his adversaries in the De praedestinatione suggests something more. Above all, he says, their error stems from their ignorance of Greek247. This criticism gives no sense of the level of Eriugena’s comprehension of Greek in 851, any more than his consideration of Greek rhetorical terms or his four-fold division of philosophy. Nevertheless, one may ask if Eriugena would have made such a bold claim were he not certain that his understanding of Greek was far superior to that of his adversaries.

It is difficult to trace the development of Eriugena’s Greek between the De praedestinatione and the Versio Dionysii, that is, in the ten years between 850 and 860. The Glossae Diuinae Historiae and the Glossae Martiani Capellae, both generally assumed to have been written during this period, are pimpled with Greek etymologies and explanations of Greek terms. However, many of these explanations come from the standard sources: Isidore, Cassiodorus, Jerome. There is little evidence that Eriugena

246 Cf. Théry, “Scot Érigène, traducteur de Denys,” 224; cf., however, Cappuyns, Jean Scot Érigène, 134, n. 3: “Le P. Théry est tenté de croire que Jean Scot consulta ces commentaire dans la langue originale. Cela nous paraît tout à fait invraisemblable: Jean Scot ignore Ammonius comme il ignore Proclus. Bien qu’il nous soit impossible, pour l’instant, d’indiquer l’intermédiaire latin utilisé par Jean Scot—c’est le cas pour tant d’autres vestiges de la pensée grecque en Occident,—nous ne doutons pas que cet intermédiaire existe.”
247 Insuper etiam ex graecarum literarum insciitia, PL 122, 430C-D.
consulted the Septuagint while composing his glosses on the Bible\textsuperscript{248}. The glosses on Martianus show a more than superficial understanding of Greek. Eriugena explains, for example, the use of the alpha-privative as both a negation and an intensifier in the gloss on 8,1\textsuperscript{249}. Furthermore, the \textit{Glossae Martiani} betray an awareness of Gregory of Nyssa’s \textit{De imagine}\textsuperscript{250} and Maximus’ \textit{Ambigua}\textsuperscript{251}. This could indicate that Eriugena had taken up a serious study of Greek during the period between the \textit{De praedestinatione} and the \textit{Versio}. However, without a sure means of dating these glosses, it could also mean that Eriugena began (or revised) his work on Martianus after having translated the works of Gregory and Maximus\textsuperscript{252}.

\section*{2.2 The Versio Dionysii}

\subsection*{2.2.1 The circumstances under which Eriugena undertook the translation}

Eriugena’s letter to Charles the Bald (\textit{Valde quidem}) dedicating the \textit{Versio} to his Imperial patron provides all the information we possess regarding the circumstances under which Eriugena agreed to translate the works of Dionysius:

\begin{quote}
Iussionibus itaque uestris neque uolentes neque ualentes obsistere, rudes admodum tirones adhuc helladicorum studiorum, fatemur—quid enim pudeat nos
\end{quote}

\textsuperscript{250} Cf. Jeanneau, \textit{Quatre thèmes érigéniens}, 122.
\textsuperscript{251} Cf. Jeanneau, \textit{Quatre thèmes érigéniens}, 130.
\textsuperscript{252} It remains strange that, if Eriugena composed his glosses on Martianus after having translated Maximus and Gregory, there would be no sign of his knowledge of Dionysius in the \textit{Glossae Martiani}, given the ubiquitous presence of the pseudo-Areopagite in the \textit{Periphyseon}. 

fateri uestrae serenitudini?—ultra uires nostras, ipso tamen duce, qui est lux
mentium et illuminat abscondita tenebrarum, libros quattuor sancti patris Dionysii
Areopagite, episcopi Athenarum, quos scripsit ad Timotheum, episcopum
Ephesiorum, et decem epistolas ejusdem de graeco in latinum transtulimus...\textsuperscript{253}

First, the project was undertaken at the command of Charles. Charles the Bald
was known to have continued the ‘Renaissance’ begun by his grandfather, encouraging
the scholars of his kingdom to pursue the study of Greek, not only, as Eriugena points out
in the \textit{Valde quidem}, the Greek scriptures, but the Greek fathers as well:

\ldots totaque cordis deuotione sanctarum scripturarum secreta, ducente deo et
rationis lumine, investigatis, investigantesque diligitis, et non solum latialis
eloquii maximos sanctissimosque auctores perquiritis, uerum etiam in augmentum
aedificationis catholicae fidei nouis editionibus in laudem christiani dogmatis
\textit{\'Ελληνως} patres addidicistis consulere.\textsuperscript{254}

We are given no indication as to why Charles would have asked that the \textit{Corpus
Areopagiticum} be retranslated. It is highly unlikely that Charles himself had studied the
corpus in Hilduin’s translation and found it inadequate. Jeaneau\textsuperscript{255} suggests that it was
rather Eriugena who sought Royal sponsorship for the project. This would, however,
imply that Eriugena had some exposure to the Areopagite prior to agreeing to the
Emperor’s wish—not at all impossible, assuming his glosses on Martianus Capella were
composed before 860. For, as we have seen, the glosses betray some awareness of
Maximus Confessor.

It is a question, in the glosses, not of an explicit reference to Maximus. It is rather
a turn of phrase which mimics Eriugena’s own translation of Maximus: \textit{non ualentes nec

\textsuperscript{253} PL 122, 1031CD.
\textsuperscript{254} PL 122, 1031BC.
\textsuperscript{255} Édouard Jeaneau, “Jean Scot Érigène et le grec,” \textit{Archivum Latinitatis Medii Aevi
\textit{volentes}^{256}. Jeaneau’s note \textit{ad loc.} suggests the reader compare the passage with the Ambigua:

On peut comparer cette tournure avec les textes suivants: \textit{ἡ μὴ θέλουτες ἡ μὴ ἱσχύοντες}: (\textit{Maxime le Confesseur, Ambiguorum Liber}, Amb. 8; \textit{PG}, 91, 1104 D 1-2), ce que Jean Scot a traduit: \textit{«seu nolentes seu non ualentes»} (\textit{PL}, 122, 1215 C 15; \textit{PG}, 91, 1103 C 14) – \textit{«Iussionibus itaque Vestris neque uolentes neque ualentes obsistere...»} (\textit{Jean Scot, Lettre-préface à la traduction du pseudo-Denys}; \textit{MGH, Epist.}, VI, Berlin, 1925 p. 159, 263; \textit{PL}, 122, 1031 C 9-10).

The same ‘tournure’ occurs in Eriugena’s letter \textit{Valde quidem}. Did Eriugena know Maximus’ \textit{Ambigua}, which discuss difficult passages not only in Gregory Nazianzen, but also in Dionysius, before he began working on Dionysius? The question must remain open. But an affirmative answer seems likely.

Second, Eriugena began the project while still a novice in his understanding of Greek (\textit{rudes admodum tirones}^{257}). The rhetorical \textit{reкусatio} notwithstanding, Jeaneau takes Eriugena’s claim at face value^{258}, arguing that the errors in Eriugena’s translation justify this claim. Eriugena was aware of the difficulties involved in translating the \textit{Corpus Areopagiticum}, which come not only from the antiquity of the work, but also from the difficulty involved in discussing such lofty mysteries:

\dots opus ualde, ut opinamur, anfractusum, longeqae a modernis sensibus remotum, multis inuium, paucis apertum, non solum propter antiquitatem, uerum etiam caelestium altitudinem mysteriorum^{259}.

However, while Eriugena may have been a novice before taking on the difficult, philosophic Greek of the Areopagite, he had at least 10 years of Greek studies behind him.

---

256 Jeaneau, \textit{Quatre thèmes érigeniens}, 130, n. 63.
257 \textit{PL} 122, 1031C.
259 \textit{PL} 122, 1031D-1032A.
by the time he undertook the project, which studies may have included some initial forays into both Maximus Confessor and Gregory of Nyssa.

2.2.2 Philological analysis of the Versio Dionysii

2.2.2.1 The style of the Versio

Almost every student and scholar of the Versio, beginning with Anastasius in the 9th century\textsuperscript{260}, has commented on the extreme literalism of Eriugena’s translation. The word-for-word method of Eriugena led to what Théry referred to as the “general obscurity”\textsuperscript{261} of the Versio. According to both Théry and Anastasius, Eriugena’s choice of such a literal method was a conscious decision for translation \textit{ad litteram} and against translation \textit{ad sensum}. For Théry, this decision was founded on Eriugena’s desire “pour diminuer autant que possible les occasions d’erreur en matière si ténébreuse…”\textsuperscript{262}

Nevertheless, one may wonder whether this word-for-word method was a conscious decision for Eriugena.

Eriugena was certainly concerned with accuracy, faithfulness to his Greek exemplar. His dedicatory letter to Charles the Bald offers a defense of his method—the author of the Versio is, after all, acting as translator, not as commentator: \textit{Sin vero obscuram minusque apertam praedictae interpretationis seriem judicaverit, videat, me interpretem huius operis esse, non expositor.}\textsuperscript{263} The distinction between \textit{interpretes} and \textit{expositor} is telling. Roques has pointed out that Eriugena does not always keep the two

\textsuperscript{260}…\textit{plurimum utilitati subtraxit, quia tanto studio uerbum e uerbo elicere procuravit}, PL 122, 1027.
\textsuperscript{261}Théry, “Scot Érigène, traducteur de Denys,” 225ff.
\textsuperscript{262}“Scot Érigène, traducteur de Denys,” 226.
\textsuperscript{263}PL 122, 1032BC.
separate, and sometimes Eriugena the expositor influences the decisions of Eriugena the interpres. Nevertheless, Eriugena’s *Expositiones* is squarely built upon this division of labor. Barbet, the editor of the *Expositiones*, notes the following structure of the commentary: text (in the translation of Eriugena), paraphrase and, finally, commentary. The second part, the paraphrase, generally changes either the vocabulary or the word order, often both. Since Eriugena is remarkably consistent in this pattern, one example will suffice.

PROPTER QVOD ET SANCTISSIMAM NOSTRAM IERARCHIAM ΤΕΛΕΤΑΡΧΙΣ SACRORVM POSITIO CAELESTVM IERARCHIARVM SUPERMVNDANA IMITATIONE DIGNAM JVDICANS, ET DICTA IMMATERIALES IERARCHIAS MATERIALIBVS FIGVRIS ET FORMALIBVS COMPOSITIONIBVS VARIFCANS TRADIT.

Ordo uerorum: Propter quod traditit ΤΕΛΕΤΑΡΧΙΣ sacrorum positio, hoc est, teletarchicum sacerdotium, et sanctissimam nostram ierarchiam iudicans dignam supermundana imitatione caelestium ierarchiarum, et varificans dicta immaterialea ierarchias materialibus figuris et formalibus compositionibus. Et est sensus huiusmodi: quoniam paterna prouidentia simplicem suum radium per connaturalia nobis uelamina multiplicat, ut nos, merito peccati originalis dispersos, in pristinam naturae nostrae simplicitatem, in qua facti sumus ad imaginem diuiinae unitatis, revocaret, proptrera etiam sanctissimam nostram ierarchiam, hoc est sanctissimum ecclesiasticum episcopatum, ipsa ΤΕΛΕΤΑΡΧΙΣ sacrorum positio, quae graece dicitur ΤΕΛΕΤΑΡΧΙΣ ΙΕΡΟΘΕΣΙΑ, hoc est ΤΕΛΕΤΑΡΧΕ sacerdotium, traditit et constituit, quoniam indicait eam, nostram dico ierarchiam, dignam esse supermundana similitudine caelestium episcopatum, ut Ecclesia, quae adhuc in peregrinatione est huius utiae, sparsim per loca et tempora, uariatim per diuersa mysteria, multiplex in doctrinis, composita in symbolis caelestium uirtutum, in quibus nulla diuersitas est, unitatem et equalitatem possit ascendere, et praedictas ierarchias, id est caelestes essentias, dum sint naturaliter immateriales, super omnia loca et tempora, super omnes materiales figuras et formas et compositiones, per materiales figuras et formas et compositiones ad similitudinem nostrae ierarchiae quae adhuc in terris est, varificait, hoc est in diuersis uisionibus et symbolis et aliendiis multiplicavit, et

---


nostrae infirmitati conformauit, quoniam earum simplicitas et intelligibilis unitas per se ipsam lucere nobis impossibile erat.\textsuperscript{266}

The comment begins with the \textit{lemma} according to the recension \textit{M}, followed by the paraphrase, which preserves the vocabulary (while suggesting an alternative for \textit{sacrorum positio}, introduced by \textit{hoc est}) and suggests a simpler word order, introduced by \textit{ordo uerborum}. The third part, the commentary itself, expands on each clause by suggesting clearer terminology, and restructuring the sentence altogether, adding a great deal in the process. The commentary on this passage continues with a fuller explanation of the Greek term $\tau\varepsilon\lambda\varepsilon\tau\acute{o}\chi\varsigma$—yet further evidence that, for Eriugena, the role of the commentator is closely tied to the language of the text commented.

Thus, according to the division of labor followed by the \textit{Versio} and the \textit{Expositiones}, translation consists primarily of rendering the words of an author. The explanation of how those words work together belongs to the expositor.

Eriugena understood that such a division of labor could bring the harsh judgment of his critics. The passage from the \textit{Valde quidem} continues: \textit{Vbi ualde pertimesco, ne forte culpam fidi}\textsuperscript{267} \textit{interpretis incurram}\textsuperscript{268}. The “fault of the faithful translator” is a strange turn of phrase, and an early student of the \textit{Versio} seems to have corrected the text to \textit{infidi}. Nevertheless, Rorem\textsuperscript{269} has pointed out both that \textit{fidi} is the \textit{lectio difficilior}, and, more importantly, that the phrase may have been borrowed from Boethius’ commentary on Porphyry’s \textit{Isagoge}: \textit{Vereor ne subierim fidi interpretis culpam, cum uerbum uerbo

\textsuperscript{266} Exp. I, 426-459.
\textsuperscript{267} Fidei, Dth infidi, LiH sensor\textsuperscript{1}Va\textsuperscript{2}Z
\textsuperscript{268} PL 122, 1032C.
\textsuperscript{269} Paul Rorem, \textit{Eriugena’s commentary on the Dionysian Celestial Hierarchy}, \textit{Studies and Texts} 150 (Toronto: Pontifical Institute of Medieval Studies, 2005), 50.
expressum comparatumque reddiderim\textsuperscript{270}. Thus, not only did Eriugena consider this sort of faithfulness to the original of considerable importance to proper translation, but in this he was following an established tradition. Jerome, like Boethius and Eriugena, felt constrained by the dilemma that seemed to follow the translator: \textit{ad litteram} would bring the criticism of the confused reader, yet \textit{ad sensum} is outside the scope of the translator’s task. For, while Jerome states his preference for translating \textit{ad sensum} in the \textit{De optimo genere interpretandi}, the very attack against which Jerome is defending himself shows that, at the time, translation \textit{ad litteram} was considered the proper job of the translator: \textit{si ad uerbum interpretor, absurde resonant; si ob necessitatem aliquid in ordine, in sermone mutauero, ab interpretis uidebor officio recessisse}\textsuperscript{271}. Finally, not only had precedent been set by Jerome and Boethius, but Hilduin’s translation, which Eriugena clearly used as an important tool in his own translation, was a word-for-word translation.

Yet, Eriugena’s central fear seems to have been not the accusation of being too literal, but of not being faithful enough. Again, the passage from the \textit{Valde quidem} continues:

\begin{quote}
At si aut superflua quaedam superadjecta esse, aut de integritate graecae constructionis quaedam deesse arbitratus fuerit, recurrat ad codicem graecum, unde ego interpretatus sum; ibi fortassis inveniet, itane est necne.\textsuperscript{272}
\end{quote}

Eriugena seems to have oscillated between the two extremes: fear of being too literal, and fear of not being literal enough. The latter was clearly the greater fear as the style of the \textit{Versio} proves. Indeed, the former may have simply been an excuse to quote

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{270} 1.1; the Boethian passage itself refers to Horace, \textit{Ars poetica}, 133-134: \textit{nec uerbum uerbo curabis reddere fidus interpres.}
\textsuperscript{271} Praefatio interpretationis Chronicae Eusebii Pamphili, \textit{(De optimo genere interpretandi)}, PL 27, 35A.
\textsuperscript{272} PL 122, 1032C.
\end{flushright}
Boethius since Eriugena does not appear to have often acted on this fear of incurring the “fault of the faithful translator”.

Regardless of whether or not Eriugena’s was a conscious choice to translate word-for-word or simply the only method known to him, Théry claims,

“[c]ette traduction-décalque a le grand défaut, on le voit immédiatement, de ne tenir aucun compte du genre respectif du grec et du latin. Le grec a une syntaxe que le latin ne peut imiter sous peine de devinir obscur. Pour faire une traduction correcte et claire, il faut un sens de l’analogie des langues qui manquait à peu près totalement à Scot Érigène.”

Théry gives two parallel passages which demonstrate his point.

**CH I, 8.14-19=PL 122, 1038D3-1039A6.**

Διὸ καὶ τὴν ὀσιωτάτην ἡμῶν ἱεραρχίαν ἡ τελετάρχις ἱεροθεία τῆς τῶν οὐρανίων ἱεραρχίαν ὑπερκοσμίου μυστέριον ἅξιος ἡμῖν καὶ τὰς εἰρημένας ἁλλὰς ἱεραρχίας ὑλαιῶς σχήματι καὶ μορφωτικὰς συνθέσεις διαποικίλας παραδέδωκεν, ὅπως ἄναλόγως ἡμῖν αὐτοῖς ἀπὸ τῶν ἱερωτάτων πλάσεων ἐπὶ τὰς ἀπλὰς καὶ ἀτυπῶτους ἀναχθῶμεν ἀναγωγὰς καὶ ἀφομοιώσεις

Propter quod et sanctissimam nostram ierarchiam teletarchis sacrorum positio caelestium ierarchiarum supermundana imitatione dignam iudicamus, et dicta immaterialia ierarchias materialibus figuris et formalibus compositionibus uarium tradidit, ut proportionaliter nobis ipsis a sacratissimis formationibus in simplices et non figuratae ascendamus altitudines et similitudines

**CH I, 9.8-11=PL 122,1039B6-11.**

Τάτης οὖν ἔνεκα τῆς ἡμῶν ἄναλόγου θεώσεως ἡ φιλάνθρωπος τελεταρχία καὶ τὰς οὐρανίας ἱεραρχίας ἡμῖν ἀναφαίνομεν καὶ συλλειτουργοὺς αὐτῶν τελοῦσα τὴν καθ' ἡμᾶς ἱεραρχίαν ἐπὶ πρὸς δύναμιν ἡμῶν ἀφομιοίωσε τῆς θεοειδοῦς αὐτῶν ἱερώσεως...

Propter hanc ergo nostram conrationabilem theosin misericors perfectionis principium, et caelestes ierarchias nobis manifestans, et comminstram earum perficiens nostram ierachiam, ad uirtutem nostram similitudine deiformis suae sanctificationis

---

274 ὀσιωτάτην Pa, 2r.
275 συνθέσει Pa, 2r.
276 ἀτυπῶτους Pa, 2r.
277 ἱεραρχίαν Pa, 2v.
The parallelism between the Latin and Greek is indeed striking—in the first passage we read *propter quod* for the composite διό, the transliteration of ἱεραρχίαν and τελετάρχιας, *sacrorum positio* for ἱεροθεία, the perfect *tradidit* for the perfect παραδέδωκεν, participles for participles, adverbs for adverbs;—in the second the transliteration of θεώσεως and ἱεραρχίας, and the composite *deiformis* for θεοειδούς. Nevertheless, the passages do not, alone, justify Théry’s criticism. For example, Eriugena, in the first passage, has properly rendered the Greek, ὑπερκοσμίου μιμήσεως, by the ablative *supermundana imitatione* with *dignam*. In the second, he does not use a post-positive to render the phrase ταύτης οὖν ἐνεκα, *propter hanc ergo*. There remains a certain freedom in his translation, certainly more than merits the accusation of having created a “décalque”, and certainly enough to show that he understood the “analogy” of the two languages.

### 2.2.2.2 Grammar

#### 2.2.2.2.1 Particles and conjunctions

Eriugena recognizes the basic units that form the skeleton of almost every Greek sentence: the particles and conjunctions. As is Hilduin, Eriugena is generally consistent in his translation of particles and conjunctions:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Greek</th>
<th>English</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>γάρ</td>
<td>enim</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἐπειπέρ</td>
<td>quoniam quidem</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἐπεὶ</td>
<td>quoniam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἐπερ</td>
<td>siquidem</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἵνα μή</td>
<td>ne</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>καὶ γάρ</td>
<td>etenim</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ὅτι</td>
<td>quia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ὅπως</td>
<td>ut</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ὅταν</td>
<td>cum</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Nevertheless, he has particular difficulty with certain conjunctions. Eriugena generally renders ὁν by forsan, fortisan, fortassis. In certain cases, this translation does justice to Dionysius’ meaning.

In others it is intrusive and unnecessary. Théry gives the example: οὐ γὰρ ἂν ἦν, εἰ μὴ τῆς τῶν ὄντων οὐσίας καὶ ἀρχῆς μετειλήφει=Non enim fortassis essent, nisi eorum, quae sunt, essentiam ex principio assumerent. In yet other cases, Eriugena confuses the particle with the conjunction. Thus: Τί γὰρ ἂν φανέη διαμαρτάνουσα, καὶ τοῦ θειότέρου λόγο τῶν τελουμένων σειηγημένου=Quid enim, si apparat, peccat, et diuiniorem rationem perficiendorum silentem.

---

279 CH 20.15=PL 122, 1046B13-14; Eriugena’s translation remains an improvement over Hilduin’s. The latter seems to have understood ENHN rather than AN HN: non enim inessent, nisi essentiuram substantiae et principatus participarentur, 24, 2-3.
Eriugena also has particular trouble with the conjunction ό&kappa;υν281. Often he confuses this conjunction with the negative conjunction ό&kappa;ουν, rendering it non ergo282. The error is easily explained by the fact that in Pa the two words would have been indistinguishable: ΟΥΚΟΥΝ. However, Hilduin, working from the same manuscript as Eriugena, generally renders this conjunction simply ergo. Further, in most cases, the context of the Dionysian text renders the negation unintelligible:

CH I, 7.9-8.5: 
Ό&kappa;ουν ἐπικαλεσάμενοι, τὸ πατρικὸν φῶς, τὸ ὦν «τὸ ἀληθινὸν, ὃ φωτίζει πάντα ἀνθρώπον ἐρχόμενον εἰς τὸν κόμον», δι’ ὧν τὴν πρὸς τὸν ἀρχιφωτόν πατέρα προσογωγήν ἔσχηκαμεν, ἐπὶ τὰς τῶν ἑρωτήματις λογίας πατροπαραδότους ἔλλαμψεις ὡς ἐφικτὸν ἀνανεώσαμεν καὶ τὰς ὑπ’ αὐτῶν συμβολικὰς ἤμιν καὶ ἀναγωγικὰς ἐκφανείως τῶν οὐρανίων νοοῦ ἱεραρχίας ὡς ὁι ἑ τὲ ἐσμὲν ἐποπτεύσαμεν καὶ τὴν ἀρχικὴν καὶ ὑπεράρχιον τοῦ θεαρχικοῦ πατρος φωτοδοσίαν, ἢ τὰς τῶν ἀγγέλων ἤμιν ἐν τυπωτικοῖς συμβόλοις ἐκφανείη μακαριστάτας ἱεραρχίας, ἀλοίς καὶ ἀτρεμείς νοος ἀθλαμοὶς ἀιδεξάμενοι πάλιν ἐξ αὐτῆς ἐπὶ τὴν ἀπλὴν αὐτῆς ἀναπαθώμεν ἀκτίνα.

PL 122, 1037C12-1038C6: 
Non ergo Iesum inocantes paternum lumen, quod est quod uerum est, quod illuminat omnem hominem uenientem in mundum, per quem ad principale lumen, Patrem, accessum habuimus in sacratissimorum eloquiorum Patre traditas illuminationes, quantum possible, respiciemus, et ab ipsis symbolice nobis et anagogice manifestatas caelestium animorum ierarchias, quantum potentates sumus, considerabimus, et principalem et superprincipalem diuini patris claritatem, quae angelorum nobis in figuratis symbolis manifestat beatissimas ierarchias, immaterialibus et non trementibus mentis oculis recipientes, iterum ex ipsa in simpulum suum restituimus radium.

The negation changes Dionysius’ intention altogether, as one would expect.

Interestingly, Eriugena realizes, in the Expositiones, that there is a problem. He does not recognize the confusion of the conjunctions, but sees that a negation where


282 Cf. PL 122, 1037C12 (Floss prints ergo with Τ), 1045A10 (Floss prints nonne ergo with Μ*), 1046A1-2, 1049C7, 1052B11, 1062C2.
Dionysius did not intend one causes certain problems. His solution is to exchange *nonne* for *non* and to make each sentence in which he committed this error into a question. Thus, the comment on the passage above begins: *Nonne ergo respiciemus, quantum possibile est, in sacratissimorum eloquiorum a patre traditas illuminationes, inuocantes Iesum.*\(^{283}\)

Every first year student of Greek is made quickly aware of the importance of the particles μὲν and δὲ. Eriugena generally understands the coordination of these two particles and their function in the Dionysian corpus. Like Hilduin, Eriugena systematically translates μὲν as *quidem.* Δὲ, on the other hand, has several meanings for Eriugena\(^{284}\), especially when it stands alone, not coordinated with μὲν. With μὲν, Eriugena generally translates δὲ as *autem,* sometimes *uero,* which latter also serves as a translation of δὲ when it stands alone. However, in certain circumstances, Eriugena treats δὲ as a conjunction: *et, etiam, quoque.*

### 2.2.2.2.2 The article

The most noticeable difference between Latin and Greek is the lack of a definite article in the former. Eriugena systematically omits the Greek article when it serves its normal function. However, he deals with articles flexibly when the syntax of the Greek text requires.

CH I, 8.10-13: PL 122, 1038C14-D3:

Καὶ γὰρ οὐδὲ δυνατὸν ἐτέρως ἤμιν Etenim neque possibile est, aliter lucere

---

\(^{283}\) *Exp.* I, 226-228. Rorem (Eriugena’s Commentary on the Dionysian Celestial Hierarchy, 73, n.102) identifies six cases in which this change occurs in *Exp.*

\(^{284}\) Hilduin almost invariably renders δὲ as *autem.* In some rare circumstances he gives *tamen.*
Here, the article τῶν stands alone, as if a pronoun, and closely joined to the prepositional phrase καθ’ ἐμᾶς.

Again, at CH I, 9.5, Eriugena translates the phrase τὰς τῶν ἐνθάδε διακοσμήσεων τάξεις earum, quae hic sunt, dispositionum ordines. The articles are clearly not serving as pronouns in this passage. Nevertheless, the multiplication of articles in the attributive position separated from their nouns by hyperbaton makes the sentence difficult to render in Latin. Eriugena’s choice to make the article τῶν into a pronoun introducing the relative clause quae hic sunt preserves, as much as possible, Dionysius’ word order.

Eriugena also recognizes that, when immediately followed by certain particles, most commonly μὲν and δὲ, the article can have the force of a demonstrative pronoun.

---

286 illigitimte simul iniuste AT
A final example comes from section two of chapter two of the *De caelesti hierarchia*: Εἰ δὲ τῷ δοκεῖ… Eriugena recognizes the pronominal force τῷ and translates thus: *si cui autem uidetur*.

### 2.2.2.2.3 The articular infinitive

The articular infinitive occurs 275 times in the *Corpus Areopagiticum*. J. Nuchelmans has conducted a comparative study of Hilduin and Eriugena as translators of this syntactical structure peculiar to Greek. It is unnecessary to repeat Nuchelmans’ research in its entirety; it will suffice to summarize his conclusions.

Of the 275 articular infinitives found in the Greek *corpus*, around 80 are nominative subjects, and around 50 are accusative objects, unmodified by any preposition. Nuchelmans’ study omits these cases for the simple reason that both translators invariably, and intelligently render these substantives as simple infinitives. The remaining instances include articular infinitives which occur in the dative, in the genitive—modified by a preposition or standing alone—, and in a prepositional phrase with the accusative.

In regards to these instances, Nuchelmans proposes three conclusions:

---

287 CH II, 10.13.
288 PL 122, 1040A11-12.
290 Nuchelmans, “Hilduin et Jean Scot,” 219-220; I have reordered Nuchelmans’ conclusions—my nos. 1, 2 and 3 were originally presented in the order 2, 3, 1.
1. When translating the infinitive εἰναί, both Hilduin and Eriugena are content to give the infinitive esse. This may be explained, argues Nuchelmans, “par le fait que l’infinitif esse en tant que terme technique indiquant “l’être”, c’est-à-dire “le fait d’exister”, qui est très fréquent dans les traités du pseudo-Denys, est en voie de devenir un nom indéclinable.” Nevertheless, this shared practice is slightly modified by Eriugena, which leads to the next conclusion.

2. When translating the infinitive, whether εἰναί, or any other substantive, Eriugena is careful to avoid the ambiguities of merely reproducing the Greek syntax of the articular infinitive while omitting the article itself—which is generally Hilduin’s procedure. Eriugena uses several different techniques to manifest the substantive function of the infinitive: sometimes he provides a pronoun, which performs the function of the article, sometimes he adds a preposition before the infinitive, sometimes he changes the infinitive to a substantive, such as a gerund or a participle, which leads to Nuchelmann’s final conclusion.

3. Concerning infinitives other than εἰναί, Hilduin is generally content to give the Latin infinitive of the equivalent verb, without any modifier. Eriugena, on the other hand, regularly replaces the Greek infinitive with the Latin gerund, which better signifies the function of Dionysius’ articular infinitives.

The general impression one forms from these conclusions is that Eriugena was not only aware of the Greek articular infinitive, but was careful to render it meaningfully in Latin. Whereas Hilduin was most often content to render the Greek construction as an

---

infinitive in Latin, Eriugena preserves the case that the article provides to the otherwise indeclinable verbal noun.

Nevertheless, one should be cautious when evaluating Nuchelmans’ conclusions. The author, himself, advises the reader that, in referring to the Versio, he used Chevallier’s ‘edition’, itself based on the 1556 Cologne edition. The Cologne edition, and, de facto, Chevallier’s, generally follow T. Thus, in certain circumstances, where Nuchelmans’ example demonstrates Eriugena’s superiority over Hilduin in choosing to render a Greek substantive verb by a gerund or a finite verb, the reading of M gives an infinitive. Nuchelmans’ example 12, under the heading “l‘infinitif au datif”\(^{292}\), presents the translations of Hilduin and Eriugena of the articular infinitive, τὸ ἐποχετεύεσθαι.\(^{293}\)

Where Hilduin gives the infinitive inuehi, Eriugena, according to Nuchelmans, gives transuehendo. However, the gerund is the reading of T; M gives the infinitive transuehere. The same occurs in Nuchelmans’ example 18-19: for the articular infinitives τὸ ἰδρύσθαι… διαπορθεύεσθαι,\(^{294}\) Hilduin gives the infinitives locari and peruehi. Eriugena, according to Nuchelmans,\(^{295}\) renders the Greek hoc est… collocatur…deferuntur. Once again, the reading of Cologne and Chevallier is that of T; M gives the infinitives collocari and deferri.

These exceptions do not nullify Nuchelmans’ conclusions, but they do indicate some need for nuance. Eriugena certainly understood this Greek construction better than his predecessor. Nevertheless, he seems to have struggled with it in certain circumstances.

\(^{292}\) Nuchelmans, “Hilduin and Jean Scot,” 206-207.

\(^{293}\) CH XIII, 46.4-5.

\(^{294}\) CH VII, 27.10-12.

\(^{295}\) Nuchelmns, “Hilduin and Jean Scot,” 207.
2.2.2.2.4 Prepositions

As with conjunctions, Eriugena is rather consistent in his translation of prepositions.

7.4 ἀπὸ  
7.5 εἰς  
7.6 πρὸς  
7.7 ἐξ  
7.10 διὰ  
7.11 ἐπὶ  
7.13 ὑπὸ  
8.10 κατὰ  
9.8 ἐκενα+gen.  

a+abl., ex+abl.  
in+acc., per+acc.  
ad+acc., iuxta+acc.  
ex+abl.  
per+acc.  
in+acc.  
ab+abl.  
secundum+acc., per+acc., contra+acc.  
propter+acc.

For the most part, Eriugena’s flexibility in his translation of certain prepositions (κατὰ, for example) is not random. Théry gives the example of Eriugena’s translation of κατὰ as contra at PL 122, 1120C7-9²⁹⁶: Εἰ δὲ τις φαίη σύγχυσιν ἡμᾶς ἐν τούτῳ κατὰ τὴν θεοπρεποῦσας διαίρέσεως εἰσάγειν...=si uero quis dixerit, confusionem nos in hoc contra diuinam discretionem introducere. Secundum or per here would have completely misconstrued Dionysius’ meaning.

2.2.2.2.5 Cases

Eriugena would not have made much progress in his translation of the Corpus Areopagiticum had he not recognized the morphology and use of the Greek cases. Eriugena usually recognizes case endings, and the grammatical errors concerning nouns and adjectives which are found in the Versio generally do not come from a failure to recognize case endings. Nevertheless, there are certain cases which proved more difficult

²⁹⁶ =DN II, 124.16-17.
than others for the Irishman. At least once\textsuperscript{297} in the \textit{De caelesti hierarchia} Eriugena translates the dative singular of the first declension as a nominative singular. In chapter four of the \textit{De caelesti hierarchia}, Dionysius says that ‘the holy orders of heavenly beings… come into being in the participation of the heavenly gifts’: \textit{Αἰ γοῦν ἄγια ὑμῶν οὐρανίων οὐσίων διακοσμήσεις ὑπὲρ τὰ μόνον ὄντα καὶ ἀλόγως ζῶντα καὶ τὰ καθ’ ἡμᾶς λογικὰ τῆς θεαρχίκης μεταδόσεως ἐν μετουσίᾳ γεγόνασίν\textsuperscript{298}. Eriugena’s rather problematic translation, \textit{Sanctae ergo caelestium essentiarum dispositiones super ea quae tantum sunt, et irrationabiliter utuentia, secundum quae nos rationalia, ierarchica traditione participatio factae sunt}\textsuperscript{299}, is only comprehensible when compared to Pa. For, the scribe of Pa omitted all iota-subscripts, and in place of \textit{μετουσίᾳ}, Eriugena read ΜΕΤΟΥΣΙΑ\textsuperscript{300}.

This fault is largely a confusion resulting from the peculiar orthography\textsuperscript{301} of Eriugena’s manuscript, and, in general, Eriugena recognizes this case; \textit{εἰ μὴ τῇ κατ’ αὐτὸν ὑλαίᾳ χειραγωγίᾳ χρήσατο\textsuperscript{302}=nisi ea, quae secundum ipsum est, materiali manuductione utatur\textsuperscript{303}; ἐν ποικιλίᾳ\textsuperscript{304} = \textit{in uarietate}\textsuperscript{305}; etc.

Eriugena’s confusion between the dative singular of the third declension and the

\textsuperscript{297}Théry points out another example at DN VII, 869Cff.; Théry, “Scot Érigène, traducteur de Denys,” 236.
\textsuperscript{298}CH II, 21.1-3.
\textsuperscript{299}PL 122, 1046C7-10; Floss prints \textit{secundum nos rationalia ierarchicae traditionis participatio} with \textit{M}.
\textsuperscript{300}The problem is compounded by the fact that Pa omits the preposition ἐν. It is worth noting that \textit{T} has attempted to correct Eriugena’s translation: \textit{in ierarchiae traditionis participazione}.
\textsuperscript{301}The same occurs at CH I, 8.13, \textit{προνοίᾳ πατρικῆ} = PL 122, 1038D: \textit{providentia paterna}.
\textsuperscript{302}CH I, 8.21.
\textsuperscript{303}PL 122, 1039A9-10.
\textsuperscript{304}CH II, 10.8.
\textsuperscript{305}PL 122, 1040A5.
third person singular verb ending comes from no fault in Pa. Generally, when this confusion occurs, it is a matter of a verb which Eriugena takes for a dative:

CH III, 19.2-3⁰⁰⁶:
ēkāstō tō theōmīmētov ārmōsei kathā tōν tōn trōpōn

PL 122, 1045B9-10:
unicuique deiforme aduationi qualiquaque modo.

CH IV, 20.15:
oū γὰρ ἄν ἦν, εἰ μὴ τῆς τῶν ὄντων οὐσίας καὶ ἀρχῆς μετειλήφει.

PL 122, 1046B13-14:
Non enim fortassis essent, nisi eorum, quae sunt, essentiae et principii assumptione⁰⁰⁷.

Of course, this problem does not arise every time Eriugena finds a third person singular verb, and these examples perhaps witness a problem of vocabulary rather than one of grammar.

Théry⁰⁰⁸ has noted that Eriugena has difficulty rendering the Greek genitive in certain instances. This occurs often in connection with the Greek genitive absolute. For example, chapter four of De caelesti hierarchia begins with this sentence:

Τῆς τοῖνυν ἱεραρχίας αὐτῆς ὁ τί ποτέ ἔστιν, ὡς οἶμαι, καλῶς ἢμιν ὀρισθεῖσας, τὴν ἀγγελικὴν ἱεραρχίαν ἔξις ὑμητέου καὶ τὰς ἱερὰς αὐτῆς ἐν τοῖς λογίοις μορφοποιίας ὑπερκοσμίως ὀφθαλμοῖς ἐποπτεύετο, ὅτας ἀναχώμεν ἐπὶ τὴν θεοειδεστάτην αὐτῶν ἀπλότητα διὰ τῶν μυστικῶν ἀναπλάσεως, καὶ τὴν ἀπάσης ἱεραρχικῆς ἐπιστήμης ἀρχὴν ὑμητῶς ἐν θεοπρεπεὶ σεβασμότητι καὶ τελεταρχικαὶς εὐχαριστίαις.⁰⁰⁹

‘Since this hierarchy, I think, has been well defined by us as far as what it is, let us next praise the angelic hierarchy and let us look with supercosmic eyes at the holy formations in the scriptures…’ Eriugena does not recognize the genitive absolute which begins the

---

⁰⁰⁶ For this example, cf. Théry, “Scot Ériugène, traducteur de Denys,” 236.
⁰⁰⁷ Both T and M have attempted to correct this passage (as we have seen in chapter one, 40-43, above).
⁰⁰⁹ 20.3-8.
chapter, preserving the genitives ἱεραρχίας σύμφων, forcing them to modify ὁ τί ποτέ ἐστιν rather than allowing the latter to modify the former:

Igitur iberarchiae huius qualiscunque est, ut estimo bene a nobis difficinita angelica iberarchia, deinde laudanda, et mirabiles eius in eloquios formarum facturae supermundanis oculis intuendae, ut ascendamus in deiformosissimam eorum simplicitatem per mysticas reformationes, et simul omnis iberarchiae scientiae principium laudabimus in dei praedicta religiositate, et teletarchicis gratiarum actionibus.\textsuperscript{310}

Eriugena realized his mistake in M, and corrected the genitive absolute, making the rest of the sentence generally more comprehensible.

Igitur iberarchia hac quid sit, ut aestimo, bene a nobis difficinita, angelicam iberarchiam consequenter laudandum, et mirabiles eius in eloquios formarum facturae supermundanis oculis intuendum, ut ascendamus in deiformosissimam eorum simplicitatem per mysticas reformationes et simul omnis iberarchiae scientiae principium laudabimus in diuinitus praefata uenerabilitate et teletarchicis gratiarum actionibus.\textsuperscript{311}

In some instances, Eriugena sees a genitive absolute where there is none. At De caelesti hierachia II, 14.21-24, Dionysius discusses the meaning of the name ‘incontinent’ or ‘intemperate’ (ἀκρατές) when applied to celestial beings. In this case, Dionysius explains, the negation does not indicate a defect, but an excess, ‘surpassing… our changing and corporeal reason…’:

ἐπὶ δὲ τῶν ἄυλων καὶ νοερῶν οὐσιῶν ἀγιοπρεπῶς τὸ ὑπερέχον αὐτῶν ὡς ὑπερκομίων ὀμολογούμεν τοῦ καθ’ ἡμᾶς μεταβατικοῦ καὶ σωματικοῦ λόγου καὶ τῆς υλαίας καὶ ἀλλοτρίας τῶν ἀσωμάτων νοῶν αἰσθήσεως.

Eriugena takes the series of genitives from τοῦ καθ’ ἡμᾶς το αἰσθήσεως as a genitive absolute.

\textsuperscript{310} A, 9v=PL 122, 1046A11-B4.
\textsuperscript{311} Clm1, 10r.
in autem immaterialibus et intellectualibus essentiis, sancte et decenter supereminens earum, ut supermundalium, confitemur nostra transitoria et corporali ratione et materiali alienato incorporealibus animis sensu\textsuperscript{312}.

‘We confess the supereminence of them… while our changing and corporeal reason and material sense remain alienated from immaterial minds’. Eriugena failed to understand that the series of genitives, which he mistook for a genitive absolute, are, in fact, the objects of τὸ ὑπερέχων, which governs the genitive. In addition, he was forced to render the adjectival ἀλλοτρίος as the participle alienato. Again, a corrector of A has attempted to fix the problem, but not without straying from the grammar and syntax of the Greek original:

\begin{quote}
In autem inmaterialibus et intellectualibus essentiis sancte et decenter supereminentias earum ut supermundalium confitemur nostram transitoriam et corporalem rationem et materialem et alienatum incorporealibus animis sensum excellentes.\textsuperscript{313}
\end{quote}

This last example introduces another situation in which the Greek genitive proves difficult for Eriugena—where certain verbs govern the genitive. In the \textit{Expositiones}, Eriugena notes that the Greek verb μετέχω governs the genitive:

\begin{quote}
Non te moueat constructio greca, in qua uerbum ΜΕΤΕΧΩ, quod est participo, et genitium trahit et ablatium; ΜΕΤΕΧΩ ΣΟΥ participo tui et a te, latini autem dicunt participo te et a te.\textsuperscript{314}
\end{quote}

The passage is a justification of his translation of CH XII, 42.19-43.1:

\begin{quote}
τῆς γὰρ μερικῆς καὶ ἀναλόγου μετέχουσι κατὰ τὴν μίαν ἀπάντων ἐναρμονίαν καὶ συνδετικὴν κοινωνίαν. Όιον ἦ τῶν ἁγίων Χριστοῦ ταξίς μετεχει σοφίας καὶ γνώσεως ὑψηλοτέρας, αἱ δὲ τῶν ὑπ’ αὐτοὺς οὐσίων διακοσμήσεις μετέχουσι μὲν καὶ αὐταὶ σοφίας καὶ γνώσεως…
\end{quote}

\textsuperscript{312} Clm1, 8r=PL 122, 1043A7-11.
\textsuperscript{313} A, 7v-8r.
\textsuperscript{314} Exp. XII, 30-33.
In his translation, Eriugena renders the genitive objects of μετέχω, μερικὴς and ἀναλόγου, σοφίας and γνώσεως, in the ablative:

Media enim et proportionali participant iuxta unam simul cunctorum etconiuntiam societatem; quale est, sactorum cherubim ordo participat sapientia et scientia altiori; sub ipsos autem essentiarum dispositiones participant quidem et ipsae sapientia et scientia…

Eriugena never leaves the Greek genitive complement of μετέχω in the genitive, but he opts for the ablative more often than the simpler accusative in most cases. Compared to the Periphyseon, where Eriugena never uses the ablative (nor, for that matter, the genitive) as the object of participare, one gets the sense that his use of the ablative is meant to mimic the Greek rather than make the text clear.

Eriugena also shows some difficulty with the Greek verb ὁκουῦω, which takes the genitive:

CH II, 16.19-22:  
Σὺ δὲ, ὥσ παῖ, κατὰ τὴν ὁσίαν τῆς καθ' ἡμᾶς ιεραρχικῆς παραδόσεως θεσμοθεσίαν αὐτὸς τῇ ἱεροπρεπῶς ἁκούω τῶν ἱερῶς λεγομένων ἐνθέων ἐν μήπει γινόμενος καὶ τῇ κατὰ νοῦν κρυφότητι τὰ ἁγία περιστέλλας ἐκ τῆς ἀνιέρου πλήθους ὡς ἐνοειδὴ διαφύλαξον.

PL 122, 1044B4-9:  
Tu uero, o puer, secundum sanctam nostrae sacerdotalis traditionis legislationem, ipse sancte et decenter ausculta mirabiliter dictorum, diuinus in Deo et in doctrina factus, et secreto animi, quae sancta sunt, circumtegens ex immunda multitudine, tanquam uniformia custodi.

Théry points to problems with the cases governed by μιμηῆςκω and μεταδίδωμι, as well. Nevertheless, often Eriugena recognizes verbs which require cases other than the accusative and translates them according to the exigencies of Latin.

CH I, 8.5-6: τῆς οἰκείας ἐνικῆς ἐνότητος ἀπολεῖται  
CH I, 8.15: ὑπερκοσμίου μιμήσεως ἀξιώσασα

PL 122, 1038C7: propria singulari unitate deseritur
PL 122, 1039A1-2: supermundana imitatione dignam iudicam

315 PL 122, 1060B6-11.
2.2.2.2.6 Verbs

As with the morphology of the Greek cases, Eriugena knows the basic structure of the Greek verb system—he always recognizes person, number and voice, and usually identifies tense and mood. Nevertheless, there are some interesting patterns in his translation of the latter two. Eriugena systematically renders Greek futures in the future tense, and perfects in the perfect. His treatment of the aorist, on the other hand, varies depending on the mood of the verb. In the indicative mood, Eriugena almost always translates the aorist as a perfect: ἀνεγράψατο=descripsit, ἐσχημάτισε=figuravit, ἔχρησατο=usa est, ὑφηγύσατο=subintroduxit. However, when Dionysius uses the aorist with a mood other than the indicative, whether subjunctive, optative or infinitive, Eriugena usually renders the aorist tense as a present: subjunctive—περιπλάσσωμεν=circumformemus; optative—χρησαῖτο=utatur; infinitive—ἀπορρίψαι=proicere, ἐννοῆσαι=intelligere. In these cases, Eriugena seems to suggest

317 T has poieticus.
318 Cf. Exp. VII, 51-55: … apud graecos media uerba sunt que ab eis ΜΕΣΑ uocantur, passiuorum uerborum formam saepissime optinent, ideoque media dicuntur quia pro actuis et pro pastuis ponuntur, sicut apud nos communia…
an awareness of the fact that outside the indicative mood, the aorist has no definite temporal signification.

Eriugena usually identifies the subjunctive and optative moods, and, in accordance with his general practice of staying as close as possible to Dionysius’ Greek, he translates both as subjunctives whether or not the Latin requires it. For example, in chapter one of *De caelesti hierarchia*, Dionysius justifies scriptural imagery noting that ‘...it is impossible for our minds to attain the immaterial imitation of the heavenly hierarchies unless [scripture] uses a material progression which is in accordance with [the human intellect]’.

\[
\text{ἐπεὶ μὴ δὲ δυνατὸν ἔστι τῷ καθ' ἡμᾶς νοὶ πρὸς τὴν ἁυλὸν ἐκείνην ἀναταθηκῇ τῶν ὑμαρτίων ἱεραρχίων μίμησιν τε καὶ θεωρίαν, εἰ μὴ τῇ κατ' αὐτὸν ἁλαίᾳ χειραγωγίᾳ χρήσατο...}^{319}
\]

Dionysius uses the optative χρήσατο with ei μη, and Eriugena follows him in this:

Quoniam impossible\(^{320}\) est nostro animo ad immaterialem illam ascendere caelestium ierarchiarum et imitationem et contemplationem nisi ea quae secundum ipsum est materiali manuductione *utatur*...\(^{321}\)

In chapter two\(^{322}\), Dionysius interprets some of the material images used by scripture, explaining their immaterial meaning. Thus, affection, according to the pseudo-Areopagite, refers to divine love:

\[
\text{ὅταν δὲ τὰς ἁμοίους ὁμοίωτας τοῖς νοεροῖς περιτιθέντες ἐπιθυμίαιν αὐτοῖς περιπλάσομεν, ἔρωτα θείον αὐτὴν ἐννοησαι χρή τῆς ὑπέρ λόγου καὶ νοῦν ἁυλίας καὶ τὴν ἁκλίνη καὶ ἀνενδότον ἐφεσιν τῆς ὑπερούσιας ἁγνῆς καὶ ἀπαθοῦς θεωρίας καὶ τῆς πρὸς ἐκείνην τὴν καθάραν καὶ ἀκροτάτην διαγεγείναι καὶ τὴν ἁφάνη καὶ καλλοποιοῦ ἐυπρεπεῖαν αἰώνιας ὄντως καὶ νοητῆς κοινωνίας.}
\]

---

319 CH I, 8.19-21.
320 Floss prints *impossibile* with *M*, but both *A* and *T* give *neque possibile*.
321 PL 122, 1039A6-10.
322 CH II, 14.11-16.
The subjunctive περιπλάσωμεν is unnecessary in Latin, yet Eriugena gives the subjunctive circumformemus nonetheless:

Cum uero dissimiles similitudines intellectualibus circumponentes, concupiscientiam eis circumformemus amorem diuinum ipsam intellegere oportet super rationem et intellectum inmaterialitatis et inflexibile et non indigens desiderium superessentialiter castae et impassibilis contemplationis et ad illum puram et sublimissimam claritatem et inuisibilem et formificam pulchritudinem aeternae uere et inuisibilis societatis.\(^3\)

Nevertheless, Eriugena shows, in the *Expositiones*\(^4\), his awareness that the subjunctive is unnecessary here:

Dum uero, inquit, dissimiles similitudines ex materialium rerum rationeque carentium naturalibus motibus circa intellectuales, ueluti quaedam uestimenta, ponimus uirtutes, et concupiscientiam eis circumformamus, non irrationabilem motum sed amorem diuinum per ipsam concupiscentiam intelligere debemus.

The corrector of *T*\(^5\) took the suggestion from the text of the *Expositiones*, changing the subjunctive to the indicative.

The difficulties which Eriugena seems to have had with the grammar and syntax of the pseudo-Areopagite are rather the exceptions. He knows well the basic structure and rules of the Greek language, and is, without a doubt, a better hellenist than his predecessor, Hilduin. What is more, his understanding of the language surpasses anything we find in the extant textbooks and *lexica* from his generation. If his translation remains difficult to read, this is a result of two factors quite apart from his overall understanding of Greek. The first, his decision to translate the *Corpus Areopagiticum* in

---

\(^3\) PL 122, 1042C8-D2.
\(^4\) Exp. II, 812-818.
\(^5\) E.g., Os, 15r.
direct word order, has already been discussed. The second is the obscure vocabulary of Dionysius—a vocabulary which would have been unfamiliar to a student of New Testament Greek, and which comes rather from the philosophers of the Late Academy. Indeed, even within his own milieu, Dionysius was an innovator. For, his Greek corpus is filled with neologisms which distinguish his vocabulary from those of Plotinus, Iamblichus and Proclus.

2.2.2.3 Vocabulary

The vocabulary of the Greek Corpus Areopagiticum consists of around 4,175 words by Daele’s reckoning—a relatively meager count compared to the dictionary of pseudo-Cyril with around 15,000 words or that of pseudo-Philoxenus with around 12,000, but rather average compared to the New Testament with almost 7,700 words, or Plato’s Timaeus with about 3,000 words. However, what distinguishes the Dionysian corpus from the lexica available in the 9th century as well as from the New Testament and the Timaeus is not the quantity of the Dionysian vocabulary, but its quality. The lexica of pseudo-Cyril and pseudo-Philoxenus are conspicuously lacking much of the Dionysian terminology. The language of the pseudo-Areopagite is neither that of Plato, nor precisely that of the

---

326 Regarding the glossary of Laon 444, cf. Théry, “Scot Érigène, traducteur de Denys,” 195; for pseudo-Cyril, cf. 196-197; for pseudo-Philoxenus, cf. 197-200; cf. also, the table comparing the vocabulary of the three dictionaries with the vocabulary of Eriugena on page 201.  
327 There is no evidence that Eriugena knew the Greek text of the Timaeus; cf. Sheldon-Williams, “Eriugena’s Greek Sources,” Iff.
Christian scriptures\textsuperscript{328}—it is rather the philosophic terminology of the Platonic Academy of the 5\textsuperscript{th} century, clothed in the language of the Bible.

\subsection{2.2.2.3.1 Basic philosophic vocabulary}

Both Hilduin and Eriugena know the basic Greek philosophic vocabulary of Dionysius. However, Hilduin’s translation betrays his severe limitations regarding the philosophic significance of certain key terms in the \textit{Corpus Areopagiticum}.

\begin{quote}
\textsc{'\textgreek{a}g\textgreek{a}th\textgreek{os}—\textgreek{a}g\textgreek{a}th\textgreek{ot}\textgreek{is}}. The good is, for the Athenian neoplatonists, one of the two highest names of the divine\textsuperscript{329}. For Dionysius, the divine name good is higher even than being inasmuch as it extends to both that which is and that which is not: καὶ γὰρ ἡ τᾶγαθοῦ θεωνυμία τὰς ὀλὰς τοῦ πάντων αἰτίου προοδοὺς ἐκφάνουσα καὶ εἰς τὰ ὄντα καὶ εἰς τὰ οὐκ ὄντα ἐκτείνεται καὶ ὑπὲρ τὰ ὄντα καὶ ὑπὲρ τὰ οὐκ ὄντα ἠστιν\textsuperscript{330}. Hilduin generally translates this key term as \textit{benignum}\textsuperscript{331} and the abstract, \textsc{αγαθότης}, as \textit{benignitas}. Eriugena, on the other hand, invariably translates the adjective \textit{optimum}\textsuperscript{332} and the abstract \textit{bonitas}. The superlative \textit{optimum} may seem rather strange, and certainly inconsistent with Eriugena’s usual practice of extreme literalness.
\end{quote}

\textsuperscript{328} Eriugena certainly knew the fourth gospel in Greek as well as the Greek Psalter, and was perhaps familiar with the Pauline epistles; cf. Jeaneau, “Jean Scot Érigène et le grec,” 27-30.

\textsuperscript{329} Cf., \textit{e.g.}, Proclus, \textit{Theologie Platonicienne}, II, 6.

\textsuperscript{330} DN V, 181.1-3

\textsuperscript{331} One must use caution when using the appendix “Esquisse d’un lexique comparé: la terminologie d’Hilduin et de Jean Scot” at the end of Théry’s edition of Hilduin’s translation. The entries are, in some instances, incomplete. Although Hilduin commonly uses \textit{benignum} to translate \textsc{αγαθόν}, he also uses the simpler \textit{bonum}; cf., \textit{e.g.}, CH XV, 58,20.

\textsuperscript{332} Eriugena’s translation of the \textsc{αγαθόν} remains consistent even when the Greek adjective is contracted with its article in the platonic fashion, τᾶγαθόν; cf. PL 122, 1129A1=DN IV, 143.12.
Nevertheless, it is the translation provided by the vulgate for the beginning of the letter of James\textsuperscript{333}, which is also the first sentence of the \textit{De caelesti hierarchia}: \textit{Πάσα δόσις ἀγαθὴ καὶ πάν δόσιμα τέλειον ἀνωθὲν ἐστί καταβαίνον ἀπὸ τοῦ πατρὸς τῶν φῶτων=omne datum optimum et omne donum perfectum desursum est, descendens a patre luminum.}\textsuperscript{334} Hilduin, as Eriugena after him, follows the vulgate here in translating the adjective ἁγαθή as \textit{optimum}\textsuperscript{335}. However, the abbot of St. Denis ignores this translation throughout the rest of his work.

\textit{Ἀναγωγή–ἀναγωγικός, –ῶς}. Dionysian theology is anything but static. A casual examination of the \textit{Corpus Areopagiticum} as a whole suggests a movement as much as a doctrine—the \textit{De diuinis nominibus} and the two Hierarchies describe the names or symbols for God, the angels and the ecclesiastical ranks in a sort of descending order—for example, the \textit{De diuinis nominibus} begins with the highest name, the good, and proceeds downwards through the names being, wisdom, life, etc. This descent culminates in the \textit{De mystica theologia}, which proceeds upwards, negating in opposite order all the names which were affirmed of God in the \textit{De diuinis nominibus}. Thus, for Dionysius the names or veils under which we know the divine are ‘upward-leading’ or anagogic, and his theology as a whole is an anagogy. Anagogy is primarily associated by Dionysius with the relation between ranks of hierarchies (whether ecclesiastic or heavenly), and the term ἁναγωγή together with its adjectival form, ἁναγωγικός, occur only once each in the \textit{De diuinis nominibus}, and almost fifty times (combined) in the two Hierarchies. Invariably, Hilduin transliterates the term \textit{anagoge} for the noun and

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{333} 1:17.
\item \textsuperscript{334} CH I, 7.3-4=PL 122, 1037C5-6.
\item \textsuperscript{335} Théry, \textit{Études dionysiennes} II, 5, 9.
\end{itemize}
anagogicus, -e for the adjective and adverb. In certain instances, Eriugena follows Hilduin in transliterating this Greek term. However, he prefers the translation reductio, and occasionally gives altitudo for the nominal form. Indeed, Eriugena’s transliterations of this term seem to occur only when it occurs more than once with in the same sentence. The adjectival form, on the other hand, is generally rendered anagogicus by Eriugena. Nevertheless, Eriugena’s understanding of this term is made clear by several statements in his Expositiones. For example, at Expositiones I, 262, he explains: per anagogen, hoc est per ascensionem mentis in diuina mysteria.

Ἀπόφασις. Although this term occurs only five times in the whole of the Dionysian corpus, its importance cannot be overstated. Of the four treatises which make up the Corpus Areopagiticum, only one is, properly speaking, a work of apophatic theology—the De mystica theologia. Nevertheless, the idea of apophasis appears in the De caelesti hierarchia in support of Dionysius’ argument that dissimilar symbols are more powerful than merely similar symbols: Εἰ τοίνυν αἳ μὲν ἀποφάσεις ἐπὶ τῶν θείων ἀληθείς, αἳ δὲ καταφάσεις ἀνάρμοστοι τῇ κρυφίτητι τῶν ἀπορρήτων, οἰκειότερα μᾶλλον ἐστιν ἐπὶ τῶν ἀοράτων ἢ διὰ τῶν ἀνομοίων ἀναπλάσεων ἐκφαντορία. Hilduin confused the noun derived from ἀπόφημι with that derived from ἀπόφαινω. As a result, his translation fails to render the true meaning of the pseudo-Areopagite: Si igitur sententiae quidem in diuinis uerae sunt, professiones autem inconuenientes, occultae archanorum proprio more est quae est per dissimilium reformationum ostentio. Eriugena, on the other hand, understood well the opposition

336 Cf. CH II, PL 122, 1044A4 and 10-11.
337 CH II, 12.20-13.3.
338 Théry, Études dionysiennes II, 14, 4-6.
between ἀπόφασις and κατάφασις: Si igitur depulsiones in diuinis uerae, intentiones uero incompactae, obscuritati arcanorum magis apta est per dissimiles reformationes manifestatio. He explains the Greek terms in his comment on this passage at

Expositiones II, 517-521:

Si, inquit, depulsiones, hoc est negationes, quas graeci ΑΠΟΦΑΣΕΙΣ uocant, in diuinis significationibus uerae fiunt, non autem intentiones, affirmationes uidelicet, quas ΚΑΤΑΦΑΣΕΙΣ dicunt, eisdem diuinis significationibus compactae et conuenientes sunt.

Eriugena’s translation of ἀπόφασις and κατάφασις as depulsio and intentio betrays at least one of his sources for learning Greek, as he indicates in his Peripheyeon:

Duas nanque, ni fallor, sublimissimas theologiae partes esse diximus, et hoc non ex nobis sed auctoritate sancti Dionysii Ariopagitae accipientes, qui apertissime, ut dictum est, bipertitam theologiam asserit esse, id est in ΚΑΤΑΦΑΤΙΚΗΝ et ΑΠΟΦΑΤΙΚΗΝ, quas Cicero in intentionem et repulsionem transfert, nos autem ut apertius uis nominum clarescat in affirmationem et negationem manuimus transferre.

Εκφαντορία. Because the Dionysian philosophy begins and ends with the complete unknowability of God, all understanding of the divine is mediated, manifest through created reality, either heavenly or earthly. Thus, manifestation becomes a central concept in the Corpus Areopagiticum. Hilduin shows little consistency in his translation of Εκφαντορία and its derivatives, which appear almost thirty times in the De cælesti hierarchia alone. He begins by rendering the term dilucidatio, which he immediately abandons for the simpler ostensio. By the time he reaches chapter four of the De cælesti hierarchia, he has decided on the completely accurate manifestatio, which he,

---

340 Peripheyeon I, 811-817; for the reference to Cicero, cf. De inventione, I, X, 13; despite his stated preference, Eriugena preserved the translation of Cicero in his Versio; the corrector of T, however, took Eriugena’s suggestion and changed the translation to affirmatio and negatio.
nevertheless, alternates with *demonstratio*. The term does not have multiple meanings in the Dionysian *corpus*, and one word will suffice for every occurrence—Eriugena opts for *manifestatio*, from which he never wavers.

"Ελλαμψίς. The passage from the letter of James with which Dionysius begins the *De caelesti hierarchia* establishes light as a central theme of the Dionysian philosophy. God the father is the father of lights, and Christ the fatherly light shining forth. Thus, the divine manifestations may rightly be called illuminations. Hilduin is seldom able to convey the meaning behind the imagery, and generally renders "Ελλαμψίς as *splendor*—in some cases he uses the slightly more suitable *illustratio*. Eriugena’s *illuminatio* both preserves the imagery and conveys its philosophic meaning—an intellectual connection or communication between the divine and created minds.

"Επέκεινα. This contraction for "Επ’ ἐκείνα became, amongst the Neoplatonists of the later Academy, a standard preposition indicating superiority or transcendence. The word is entirely absent from the *De caelesti hierarchia*, but it occurs frequently enough in the *De diuinis nominibus*. Hilduin shows little grasp of the actual meaning of the term, changing his mind each time he encounters it, sometimes translating it in *illa*, sometimes, *super ipsa*, sometimes *in ista* or *post haec*, *sub qua*, *sub ipso*. In his translation, Eriugena veers somewhat from his customary literalness. However, his translation, usually *summitas* or *sumnum*, captures the meaning of the pseudo-Areopagite\(^{341}\).

Μετουσία. Participation is a central doctrine throughout the Dionysian *corpus*. The most common term used by the pseudo-Areopagite to indicate the noun, participation, is *μετουσία*. Hilduin shows no comprehension of this word, transliterating

in almost every circumstance. The sole instance in which Hilduin offers an actual translation results in the nonsensical *dei humanati* for Ἰησοῦ μετουσίας. Eriugena simply renders the term *participatio* in every instance.

όος. The hierarchy established by Dionysius, whether we are speaking of the heavenly or ecclesiastical or the two together as continuous, is first of all a hierarchy of intellects. The word νοος occurs almost 180 times in the whole of the *corpus*, yet it does not always refer to the same member of the hierarchy of minds. In certain instances it refers to divine or angelic intellects, sometimes to human, sometimes it is ambiguous. Hilduin generally renders this Greek word as *mens*, sometimes as *spiritus* without any distinction between those instances which refer to human intellects and those which refer to angelic. Eriugena, on the other hand, pays careful attention to the context in which Dionysius uses this word—he seems to have adopted the general rule: where νοος is modified by an adjective or phrase which clarifies the context (e.g., οὐρανίος, καθ’ ἡμῶν), Eriugena translates νοος as *animus*; where there is no modifier, he simply translates *intellectus*.

While Eriugena’s understanding of the basic Greek, philosophic vocabulary upon which Dionysius bases his system is clearly more profound than Hilduin’s, there remain certain difficulties and oddities in Eriugena’s treatment of certain words.

όητός—νοερός. This couple is common in the Dionysian *corpus*. In general, they refer to two of the highest levels of reality, the intelligible and the intellectual, even above the neoplatonic triad of being, power and act: Διὰ ταύτας

---

Nevertheless, Dionysius also uses νοητός in contrast to αἰσθητός in several instances, which seems to have led Eriugena to misunderstand the meaning of the former. For example, at De duuinis nominibus I, 109.7, Eriugena translates the phrase: "Ὤσπερ γὰρ ἀληπτα καὶ ἄθεωρῆτα τοῖς αἰσθητοῖς ἐστι τὰ νοητὰ...Sicut enim incomprehensibilita et incontemplabilia sunt sensibilibus insensibilis." Eriugena seems to have taken the dative τοῖς αἰσθητοῖς as modifying τὰ νοητὰ, rather than ἀληπτα καὶ ἄθεωρῆτα, and this led him to understand νοητὰ not simply as intelligible, but as invisible, which is how he translates this word throughout the Versio.

Οὐσία—ὑπόστασις—ὑπαρξία. Despite the traditional translation of οὐσία as substantia ever since Boethius translated the logical works of Aristotle, and despite his predecessor, Hilduin, who follows Boethius’ lead, Eriugena consistently translates οὐσία as essentia. In doing so, he is following rather Augustine than Boethius, who prefers essentia to substantia when speaking of the doctrine of the trinity. Nevertheless, Eriugena gives no indication that he is making a conscious choice in favor of Augustine over Boethius. His choice of essentia over substantia may have been influenced by his own desire to stay close to the Greek manner of speaking of the trinity.

Sanctus siquidem Dionysius Areopagita et Gregorius Theologus eorumque elegantissimus expositor Maximus differentiam esse dicunt inter oysian (id est essentiam) et ὕποστασις (id est substantiam), ΟΥΣΙΑN quidem intelligentes unicam illam ac simplicem duuinæ bonitatis naturam, ὕποστασις uero singularum personarum propriam et individuam substantiam. Dicunt enim ΜIΑN ΟΥΣΙΑΝ ΕΝ ΤΡΙΣΙΝ ὕποστασιν (hoc est unam essentiam in tribus substantiis). Sanctus quoque Augustinus ceterique sancti patres latialiter scribentes fidem sanctae trinitatis exprimunt dicentes unam substantiam in tribus

---

343 DN IV, 144.6-7.
344 PL 122, 1113B13-14.
345 De trinitate, V, viii, 10.
personis, significantes unitatem divinae naturae eo nomine quod est substantia, trinam uero substantiarum proptietatem trium personarum uocabulis.\textsuperscript{346}

In any case, Eriugena had already reserved \textit{substantia} for \(\Upsilon\mathrm{p}\Upsilon\mathrm{o}\Upsilon\mathrm{t}\alpha\sigma\iota\varsigma\), and both translations (\textit{essentia} for \(\omicron\upsilon\omicron\varsigma\iota\alpha\) and \textit{substantia} for \(\Upsilon\mathrm{p}\Upsilon\mathrm{o}\Upsilon\mathrm{t}\alpha\sigma\iota\varsigma\)) have the added advantage of appealing to Eriugena’s literalness—\textit{essentia} preserves the idea of a participle derived from esse, and \textit{substantia} mimics the composite Greek equivalent. With these two Latin terms already assigned, \textit{subsistentia} was all that remained for \(\Upsilon\pi\rho\varepsilon\iota\varsigma\).

Eriugena’s translation of these important philosophic terms may seem strange. However, they are not precisely inaccurate, and they were certainly better chosen than those of both Hilduin before Eriugena and Sarrazin, after him, who, while they translate \(\omicron\upsilon\omicron\varsigma\iota\alpha\) as \textit{substantia} and \(\Upsilon\pi\rho\varepsilon\iota\varsigma\) as \textit{essentia}, preferred the rather nonsensical\textsuperscript{347} \textit{persona} for \(\Upsilon\pi\Upsilon\rho\iota\sigma\alpha\sigma\iota\varsigma\).

\textbf{2.2.2.3.2 Transliterations}

Eriugena, as Hilduin before him, felt it necessary to leave a good number of Greek terms untranslated, merely transliterating them, or, as many manuscripts seem to indicate, transcribing them directly in Greek. The difference between the two 9\textsuperscript{th} century translators is that, where he resorts to transliteration, Hilduin shows no awareness of the meaning of the word he is copying. We have seen in the case of \(\mu\varepsilon\tau\omicron\omicron\omicron\iota\alpha\), that, in the one instance where he attempted to translate the word, he misunderstood it entirely. However, in almost every circumstance where Eriugena preserves a Greek word in his

\textsuperscript{346} \textit{Periphyseon} II, 3025-3037.

\textsuperscript{347} In a non-trinitarian context, at any rate.
translation, he explains the meaning of that word in his commentary. For example, at De caelesti hierarchia I, 8.14, Eriugena has left the word τελετόρχις untranslated. Yet he explains the term at Expositiones I, 464-471:

Est igitur hoc nomen compositum ab eo quod est ΤΕΛΕΤΗ et ΑΡΧΙΣ; ΤΕΛΕΤΗ autem a graecis dicitur hostia purgatvia omnium peccatorum, per quam de homine effectur deus; ac per hoc sancta trinitas unus deus, quoniam causa et principium est totius nostrae purgationis et deificationis, pulchre et rationabiliter ΤΕΛΕΤΑΡΧΙΣ uocatur, hoc est ΤΕΛΕΤΩΝ ΑΡΧΗ, principium scilicet purgationum et finis.

At Expositiones I, 623-624 and 639-640, Eriugena glosses the word θεωσεως, which he has changed to the accusative and nominative: ΘΕΩΣΙΝ, hoc est deificationem, and ΘΕΟΣΙΣ, hoc est deificatio. At Expositiones II, 435-436, he glosses the word θεορχίας, which he has transcribed at PL 122, 1041B1: ΘΕΑΡΧΙΑΣ, hoc est summae deitatis. And again, at Expositiones II, 1178-1184, Eriugena glosses the word agalmatum, which he has transliterated at PL 122, 1043C14:


Despite his fanciful etymology, it is clear that Eriugena did not preserve the Greek term for lack of understanding. He never explicitly explains the principle behind his transliterations. Théry attributes this practice to Eriugena’s vanity, pointing out that certain terms, which are transcribed in one instance are translated in others:

---

348 CH I, 8.9=PL 122, 1039B7.
349 =CHII, 12.5.
350 =CH II, 16.13.
... il rendra μετάληψις tantôt par metalepsin, tantôt par assumptio; σύναξις, tantôt par synaxis, d’autres fois par communio; θεουργία par theurgia et par diuina operatio; θεογενεσία par theogenesis et par diuini generatio.

In any case, Théry is correct to point out that this was “le goût du temps, de Sedulius Scottus, d’Heiric, de Martin l’Irlandais”\(^\text{352}\).

### 2.2.2.3.3 Composite terms

Much of the philosophic vocabulary encountered in the Corpus Areopagiticum may be found in other authors of late antiquity, both pagans and Christians—indeed, much of the basic philosophic terminology used by Dionysius is rooted in antiquity. However, there are certain terms which set his corpus quite apart from any other writings of its time. The most conspicuous amongst these are the composite terms. There are two sorts of composites which occur frequently in the Dionysian corpus: terms which are composed of a root (noun, adjective, adverb, verb) and a prepositional prefix, and those which are composed of two root words. Of the former, the most predominant is the negation in alpha-privative.

Of the more than 4,000 words in the dionysian vocabulary, over 1,000 begin with alpha. Of these, over 300 are negations beginning with an alpha-privative. Eriugena regularly recognizes the alpha-privative, rendering it with the prefix in- or with non, sometimes with carens or sine. In several instances where Hilduin preserves the negation, Eriugena attempts to find a positive expression for a negative term:

DN VII, 199.11 Hilduin, 254, 8 Eriugena, PL122, 1156A13

Eriugena’s glosses on Martianus Capella show that he was aware that the alpha-prefix could serve as an intensifier as well as a negation: ‘A’ *apud graecos multa significat. Per uices enim negat, per uices implet, sicut in hoc nomine ANIA: *ibi enim auget sensum*353. In several instances he renders a negation in Dionysius as a superlative.

Likewise, Eriugena understands the role of the alpha-prefix of ἀπόστας, which he explains in his commentary on chapter three of the *De caelesti hierarchia*:

Simul omni transtulimus pro eo quod est ἈΠΑΣΗΣ, pro quo simpliciter possumus dicere omni sine simul. Siue ergo simul sit, siue non sit, nihil interest, quoniam apud greacos saepe A pro AMA, id est simul, ponitur saepe amplificandi gratia355.

While Eriugena’s translations of ἀτεχνῶς and ἀκράτητον are simply erroneous, the fact that he is aware that the alpha-prefix can play multiple roles betrays a rather

---

advanced understanding of Greek. Furthermore, his explanation of the composite ἀπας illustrates the general principle which Eriugena follows throughout the Versio: as far as possible, no word, indeed, no part of a word is to be left untranslated.

This principle is all the more evident in his translation of other composites formed by the addition of a prefix. Eriugena is aware that the numerous prefixes used by Dionysius do not always alter the meaning of the root to which they are appended:

Notandum quod ex abundantia graece locutionis saepe prepositiones ponuntur et nullum augent intellectum. Et maxime he tres: re, et, ad; ΑΝΑ, ΚΑΙ, ΠΡΟΣ; ΚΑΤΑ similiter quae in diuersas uertitur translationes.

Nevertheless, for the sake of accuracy and faithfulness, he systematically translates the prefixes together with their roots.

Quas prepositiones uidelicet propter diligentiam interpretationis noluimus preterire, presertim cum curious lector perspeciet ubi necessarie sunt et ubi superabundant.

Théry provides several examples of Eriugena’s translation of words beginning with the prefix ἀνα-:

| ἀνατατικῶς | re-stituens |
| ἀνανευσάμεν | re-spiciemus |
| ἀνασθαμᾶμεν | re-stitumur |
| ἀνανεύοντας | re-spicientes |
| ἀναπτύσσιν | re-serationem |
| ἀνακλήσις | re-uocatio |
| ἀναστάσις | re-surrectio |
| ἀναμορφώσις | re-formatio |

---

356 Exp. II, 885-889.
357 Exp. II, 889-892.
358 Théry, “Scot Érigène,” 234; the corrector of T has systematically supressed the prefix re- where it renders ἀνα-.
Prefixes denoting upward motion or transcendence (as ἀνα-) are frequent in the *Corpus Areopagiticum*, most notably the prefix ὑπερ-, which occurs 131 times in the *De caelesti hierarchia*. Eriugena systematically translates these words by the prefix super-.

Nevertheless, in this, Eriugena is careful to distinguish the dionysian superlatives such as ὑπερκοσμίως = *supermundane*359, and ὑπερουσίως = *superessentialis*360 from words in ὑπερ- which have their own significance: ὑπερφρονοῦσα = *despiciens*361, which Hilduin translates *supersapiens*.

Indeed, despite the extreme literalism exhibited in the translation of the prefix ἀνα—, Eriugena does not slavishly translate all prepositional prefixes regardless of their meaning. Ἀποκλήρωσις is *partem*362, as opposed to Hilduin’s *delegatam*, ἀποπλανήσεως is *errore*363, διάκοσμος is *dispositio* or *ornatus*364, διατάξεις is *ordinationes*365.

More significant than the composite terms which begin with a preposition, and certainly more conspicuous, are the composites which are constructed from root words. Among the most common are those in ἀρχη-, αὐτο-, -αρχια, -αρχικος, -ειδης, -ειδως, -εργος, -ουργος, -πρεπης, -πρεπως, -ποιεω, and -ποιος.

Eriugena preferred to render these composites by simple terms:

Sed notandum quod in hac periodo, sicut et in ceteris ac paene omnibus, simplicia uerba pro in graeco compositis propter faciilorem introitum difficillimorum intellectuum transtulimus: pro ΦΩΤΟΦΑΝΙΑΣ, hoc est luminum—apparitionis,
illuminationis solummodo ponentes, et pro $\Lambda \Gamma \Theta \Omega \Delta \Omega \Upsilon \Sigma$, quod est aduerbialiter optime—datiue, affatim, uel bene ac large.$^{366}$

Nevertheless, where Eriugena found a suitable composite term in Latin, or where he simply transliterated the Greek elements, he maintains the complexity of the Dionysian terms. Words which begin with αὐτο- are systematically rendered per se or per seipsum. Those ending in –ποιον or –ποιεω are usually given a –fictum or -fictio ending. Those ending in –ειδης or –ειδως are rendered with some form of –formis; this last case a vast improvement over Hilduin, who regularly renders these composites with some form of –uisum. Eriugena has particular trouble with –πρεπης. The adverbs which are composed of this term are usually translated pulchre or decenter.$^{367}$ However, in several circumstances, Eriugena provides some form of praedictio or praedicatio$^{368}$ (see θεοπρεπεῖς below), confusing πρέπω with προεῖπον.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>αρχη-</th>
<th></th>
<th>αυτο-</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>αρχέτυπον</td>
<td>primam exemplarem</td>
<td>αυτενέργητον</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>αρχίφωτον</td>
<td>principale lumen</td>
<td>αυτεξουσιότης</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>αρχιστρατέγος</td>
<td>archistrategos</td>
<td>αυτοκινητική</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$^{366}$ Exp. I, 193-199.
$^{367}$ CH II, 16.20 (τεροπρεπεῖως)=PL 122, 1044B6 (sancte et decenter).
$^{368}$ CH IV, 20.8 (ἐν θεοπρεπεί) = PL 122, 1046B2-3 (in diuinitus praefata).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Greek Words</th>
<th>Latin Translation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ἀρχια, ἀρχικος</td>
<td>bonitatem</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἀγαθαρχιαν</td>
<td>pacem pristinam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>εἰρημαρχιαν</td>
<td>taxarchiae</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ταξιαρχιας</td>
<td>perfectionum principis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>τελεταρχου</td>
<td>teletarchias</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>τελεταρχιας</td>
<td>amore principatus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>фиλαρχια</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| ειδησ, ειδως | deiformes |
| εγαθειδης | uniformis |
| ενοειδης | uniformiter |
| ενοειδως | deiformem |
| θεοειδη | deiformiter |

| εργοι, ουρογς | benefactoribus |
| εγαθειργων | benignam, benefica |
| εγαθουργου | theurgia |
| θεουργιας | deificum |
| θεουργικων | ierurgia |
| ιερουργιας | sacrificatores |
| ιερουργοι | perfectores |
| τελειουργους | perfectiendae |
| τελετουργουμενης | perfecta operatio |
| τελετουργιας |

| πρεπης, πρεπως | optime et pulchre |
| ογαθπρεπως | hominem decentibus |
| ονθρωπρετεσιν | Dei praedicta, Dei praedicationes |
| θεοπρεπεις | diuinitus |
| θεοπρεπως |

| ποιεω, ποιου | specificatum |
| ειδοποιουμενου | unificat |
| ενοποιει | unifica |
| ενοποιω | formarum facturas |
| μορφοποιειων | substantificam |
| ουσιοποιου | |

This analysis of Eriugena’s understanding of the grammar and vocabulary of the Dionysian corpus remains incomplete until such time as a complete lexicon of the Versio
can be established, which takes into account all three recensions and the corrections of \( T \) and \( M \). Nevertheless, even a summary exposé gives the distinct impression that, if anyone in the 9\(^{th} \) century was up to the task of translating the *Corpus Areopagiticum*, it was Eriugena. One is struck by his knowledge of certain terms and grammatical phenomena which were not only conspicuously absent from the 9\(^{th} \) century grammars and *lexica*, but many of which were peculiar to late-antique neoplatonism.

Despite his abilities as a hellenist, Eriugena himself, was aware of some of the defects of his translation, and he made efforts to ameliorate his *Versio*, which efforts resulted in the recension \( M^{369} \). For this reason, our evaluation of Eriugena’s understanding of Greek must consider this recension, which reveals both Eriugena’s development as a translator as well as his continued limitations.

### 2.3 The corrections of the recension \( M \)

The corrections present in \( M \), which represent the work of the Eriugena himself, must have been made some time after Eriugena finished his *Periphyseon*, in 866, and, perhaps, around the same time as he composed his commentary on the *De caelesti hierarchia*, around 870. Given that he began his career as a translator some time around 860, Eriugena had almost ten years in which to continue his education in the Greek language before he returned to his first attempt at a complete translation. Much of that time was spent translating other works of the Greek fathers—after the *Corpus Areopagiticum*, he translated the *Ambigua* of Maximus Confessor, and the *De imagine* (as he called the *De*  

\(^{369} \) The corrections of \( T \) are of rather less interest than those of \( M \) regarding Eriugena’s development as a hellenist; if \( T \)’s ‘latinizations’ can be said to improve the text, it is generally, and merely on the level of vocabulary.
opificio hominis) of Gregory of Nyssa. His Periphyseon is, in part, the result of his reflection on these Greek fathers. Thus, one would expect that Eriugena’s understanding of Greek had improved considerably by the time he returned to the Dionysian corpus towards the end of his life.

Although his understanding of Greek may have improved, his principal goal as translator remained the same: faithfulness. It is clear that Eriugena had a Greek manuscript of the corpus (there is no evidence that it was any other than Pa370) before his eyes as he corrected his translation, and many of the corrections in M can be categorized as a correction of his reading of Pa as much as a correction of his Latin translation. An example of Eriugena’s re-reading of Pa may be found in chapter two of De caelesti hierarchia, wherein Dionysius discusses the two modes of revealing the divine371.

ο μὲν ώς εἶκος διὰ τῶν ὀνομάτων προϊόντων ἱεροτύπων ἐικόνων, ὁ δὲ διὰ τῶν ἀνωμοίων μορφοποιίων εἰς τὸ παντελῶς ἀπεικός καὶ ἀπεμφάνιον πλαττόμενος. Ἀμέλει καὶ τὴν σεβασμίαν τῆς ὑπερουσίου θεορίας μακαριώτητα τῶν ἐκφαντορικῶν λογιῶν αἱ μυστικαὶ παραδοσεῖς ποτὲ μὲν ώς λόγον καὶ νοῦν καὶ οὐσίαν ἴμυνούσι, τὴν θεοτρητὴ λογίστη καὶ σοφίαν αὐτῆς διηλύσαι καὶ ὑποτεῖς ὅσου ὑπάρχει καὶ τῆς τῶν ὄντων ὑπάρχεις αὐτίαν ἀληθινήν, καὶ ώς φῶς αὐτήν ἀναπλάττουσι καὶ ἵζων ἀποκαλούσι, τοὺς τοιούτου ἱερῶν ἀναπλασματῶν σεισμοτέρους μὲν ὄντων καὶ τῶν προσώπων μορφοσειων ὑπερεξέπαι πῶς δοκοῦσιν, ἀποδεόντων δὲ καὶ οὕτω τῆς θεορίας πρὸς ἀληθείαν ἐμφερείας372.

The first mode uses similar images to express the divine, while the second uses dissimilar formations. Dionysius continues by giving examples of the former: the mystical teachings of the scriptures sometimes praise the divinity as reason, intellect and being (ὡς λόγον καὶ νοῦν καὶ οὐσίαν ἴμυνούσι). Such divine figures, he continues, are

370 So many of Eriugena’s errors resulting from the peculiarities of Pa remain that one must conclude he possessed no other manuscript of the Corpus Areopagiticum.

371 CH II, 12.1-2: διττός ἐστι τῆς ἱερᾶς ἐκφαντορίας ὁ τρόπος.

372 CH II, 12.2-12.
rather more pure, and are shown to surpass material formations (τῶν τοιούτων ἱερῶν ἀναπλασμάτων σεμνότερων μὲν ὄντων καὶ τῶν προσύλων μορφῶσεων ὑπερκείσθαι πώς δοκοῦντων).

The whole of this passage proved rather difficult for Eriugena, as one can see by a comparison of \(A^{373}\) and \(M^{374}\) in this place\(^{375}\).

\(A\), Itaque et colendam superessentials diuinitatis\(^{376}\) beatitudinem manifestatuorum eloquiorum mysticae traditiones aliquando quidem ut rationem et intellectum et essentiam laudant diuinam rationalitatem et sapientiam eius declarantes et uere existentem subistentiam et eorum quae sunt subistentiae causam uram et quasi lumen eam reformant et uitam uocant; tantis mirabilibus reformationibus castioribus manentibus et materiales formationes excellere quoquomodo probatis deficientibus et sic diuina\(^{377}\) ad ueritatem similitudine.

\(M\), Itaque *** colendam superessentials \(\Theta E A P X I A E\) beatitudinem manifestatuorum eloquiorum mysticae traditiones aliquando quidem ut rationem et intellectum et essentiam laudant diuinam rationabilem et sapientiam eius declarantes et uere existentem subsistentiam et eorum quae sunt subistentiae causam uram et quasi lumen eam reformant et uitam uocant; tantis mirabilibus reformationibus gloriosioribus quidem existentibus et materiales formationes excellere quomodo probatis deficientibus et sic thearchica ad ueritatem similitudine.

The correction which is of interest here is the change from \textit{manentibus} to \textit{quidem existentibus}. In this place, the Greek corpus has μὲν ὄντων, which in Pa appeared to Eriugena as \textit{MENONTΩN}. The translation, \textit{manentibus}, gives virtually the same meaning to the genitive absolute, as does the correction, \textit{quidem existentibus}. However, in \(A\), the \(δὲ\) of the following clause is meaningless without the preceding μὲν: \textit{while} (μὲν) these divine formations remain rather more pure…,\textit{nevertheless} (δὲ), they fall short of

\(^{373}\) \(A\), 7r.

\(^{374}\) Clm\(^1\), 7r.

\(^{375}\) \textit{Cf. PL 122, 1041B1-12.}

\(^{376}\) \(A\) has taken this correction from \(T\); the apparatus preserves the original reading, thearchiae.

\(^{377}\) \(Diuina\) also comes from \(T\); the apparatus of \(A\) gives thearchica.
the truth of the divine manifestation. The contrast is essential, since it is precisely the continued deficiency of even the noblest names that justifies the use of negations:

ποτὲ δὲ ταῖς ἀποφατικαῖς ἐκφαντορίαις ὑπὸ τῶν αὐτῶν λογίων ὑπερκοσμίως ὑμείται, ἀδρατον αὐτὴν καὶ ἀπειρον καὶ ἀχώρητον ἀποκαλύπτων καὶ τὰ <λοιπὰ> ἐξ ὧν ὦ τί ἐστιν, ἀλλὰ τί ὦκ ἔστιν σημαίνεται. Τούτῳ γὰρ ὡς ὀίμαι καὶ κυριώτερον ἔστιν ἐπ’ αὐτῆς, ἐπεὶ περὶ, ὡς ἡ κρυφία καὶ ἱερατικὴ παράδοσις ψηφηγήσατο, τὸ μὲν ὦκ εἶναι κατὰ τὶ τῶν ὄντων αὐτὴν ἀληθεύομεν, ἀγνοοῦμεν δὲ τὴν ὑπερούσιον αὐτῆς καὶ ἀνοητον καὶ ἀρρητον ἀφοιστιαν.

A rather careful correction, it seems highly unlikely that Eriugena could have accomplished it without working with his Greek manuscript before him. Several other corrections in M give this same impression—that Eriugena’s corrections in M are the result of his return to the Greek manuscript Pa. For example, at PL 122, 1041C7 (=CH II, 12.18-19), Eriugena originally translated the articular infinitive τὸ μὲν ὦκ ἔιναι hoc quidem non esse, taking what appeared to him to be a hanging article as a pronoun (as he sometimes does). In M379, he has excised the otherwise useless hoc, together with the quidem. Again, at PL 122, 1046B14 (=CH IV, 20.15), A380 takes the verb μεταλήφηι as a substantive of μετάληψις in the dative381. M382 corrects the error, changing assumptione to assumerent.

While these corrections seem to indicate that Eriugena retuned to Pa in correcting his translation, others represent the application of certain principles of translation throughout (even if there is no error stemming from a misreading of Pa). For example, in

---

378 The reading ἀποφατικαῖς was conjectured by Langerbeck here; Pa gives ἀνομοίοις ἐκφαντορίαις, which Eriugena translated dissimilibus manifestationibus.
379 Clm1, 7r.
380 A, 9v.
381 This is an error we have already discussed in chapter one.
382 Clm1, 10r.
almost every occurrence of an indirect question in the *De caelesti hierarchia*, M has replaced the indicative with the subjunctive.

PL 122, 1039C6-7=CH II, 9.17
οἴόμεθα

*A*383, aestimamus

*M*384, aestimemus

PL 122, 1039C12=CH II, 9.21
χρῆ

*A*385, oportet

*M*386, oporteat

PL 122, 1040A1=CH II, 10.1
οἴόμεθα Pa, οἴόμεθα R

*A*387, imaginamus

*M*388, imaginemus

PL 122, 1044B1=CH II, 16.16
οἴόμεθα

*A*389, aestimamus

*M*390, aestimemus

PL 122, 1046A10=CH IV, 20.3 app. crit.
σημαίνει

*A*391, significt

*M*392, significet

This correction is not in every instance witnessed by the *Expositiones*, and, therefore, it is impossible to attribute each of these corrections to Eriugena himself. Nevertheless, those that do belong to Eriugena show a concern to render the text more properly in Latin. The rest may belong to another hand, but they remain an expression of the intention of Eriugena himself.

Eriugena is also concerned with his rendering of the Greek genitive. In many cases in *A* he preserves a genitive construction where Latin requires the ablative. This occurs often with *repleo/repletus* for πέμπτημι and its derivatives.

---

383 A, 6r.
384 Clm1, 6r.
385 A, 6r.
386 Clm1, 6r.
387 A, 6v.
388 Clm1, 6r.
389 A, 8v.
390 Clm1, 8v.
391 B, 14r; Be, 8r; Bp, 13v. A, 9v; Ba 9v. give significet.
392 Clm1, 10r. Clm2, 5r gives *sit*.
PL 122, 1042B12=CH II, 14.4
πάσης αλογίας ἐστὶν Ἄ, omnis irrationabilatis M, omni irrationabilitate est
ἀνάπλεως... est repletus... repletus...

PL 122, 1045A1=CH III, 18.4
ἐνδιδομένης αἴγινς Ἄ393, inditae quidem M394, indita quidem claritate
ἱερῶς ἀποσπηρούμενα claritatis sacre repleta sacre repleta

Eriugena is also aware of other contexts in which the Greek genitive must be
rendered by another case in Latin—for example, the genitive of comparison:

PL 122, 1042A9=CH II, 13.14
οἱ μηδὲν τῶν φαινομένων Ἄ395, qui nihil uisibilium A*TM396, qui nihil
καλῶν ὑψηλότερου bonorum altius intelligunt...
ἐννένεκιντες...

—or the genitive governed by μετέχω and its derivatives:

PL 122, 1052C1-3=CH VII, 30.21-22
πάσης μὲν ύφεσιν Ἄ397, ... omni quidem M398, ... omni quidem
ἀμιγῆς πρῶτον δὲ minoratione pura primi uero
φωτός πλήρης καὶ luminis plena et primo data
πρωτοδότου γνώσεως καὶ cognitio et scientia
καὶ ἐπιστήμης μέτοχος participans perfecta.
ἀποτελουμένη.

Datam cognitionem et scientiam participans perfecta.

Despite the fact that Eriugena corrected his Versio with Pa in hand, not all of his
corrections represent a return to the Greek. Many corrections show a decided tendency
away from the literalness which characterizes the recension A. For example, prophetae399

393 A, 8v.
394 Clm1, 9r.
395 A, 7r.
396 Os, 14r; Clm1, 7v.
397 Ba1, 13v; A gives in oratione in place of minoratione at 12v.
398 Clm1, 13v.
399 Clm1, 8v.
at PL 122, 1043C10 for ὑποφήται at CH II, 15.22, in place of ypophetae in A⁴⁰⁰, tractabilia⁴⁰¹ at PL 122, 1043C12 for εὐχείρωτα at CH II, 16.2, instead of recte accepta in A⁴⁰², and angelicarum imaginum descriptiones⁴⁰³ at PL 122, 1044A13-14 for ἀγγελοειδεῖς εἰκονογραφίας at CH II, 16.15, rather than angeliformes imaginum descriptiones in A⁴⁰⁴.

In certain other instances where Eriugena could find no solution in his Greek manuscript to a misunderstanding, he simply provided one of his own. For example, in the course of De caelesti hierarchia II, Dionysius warns against taking biblical imagery too literally: one could easily be lead astray, he says, by the more honorable of the divine formations, believing that certain heavenly beings are golden or that certain men are literally brilliant and shimmering, beautiful, clothed in bright garments, and give off a fiery substance that does not burn...

Εἰς μὲν γὰρ τὰς τιμωτέρας ἱεροπλαστίας εἰκός ἔστι καὶ πλανηθημαί, χρυσειδεῖς τινὰς οἰκύμενους εἶναι τὰς οὐρανίας ουσίας καὶ φωτεινὰς τινὰς ἄνδρας καὶ ἑξαστράπτουτας, εὐπρεπεῖς, ἡμφιεσμένους ἔσθητα φανήν καὶ τὸ πυρῶδες ἀβλαβῶς ἀποστίλβουτας...

Eriugena mistook the accusative singular feminine ἔσθητα for an accusative plural neuter, and translated indutos uestimenta candidum et igneum innocue respergentes, in A⁴⁰⁶. This left the adjective φανή without a noun; nor did Eriugena recognize the substantive τὸ πυρῶδες. As a result, Eriugena’s translation left two hanging adjectives, candidum and igneum. Unable to rectify the problem—by, for example, realizing his

---

⁴⁰⁰ A, 8r.
⁴⁰¹ Clm¹, 8v.
⁴⁰² A, 8r.
⁴⁰³ Clm¹, 8v.
⁴⁰⁴ A, 8v.
⁴⁰⁵ CH II, 13.9-12=PL 122, 1042A2-7.
⁴⁰⁶ A, 6v-7r.
mistake with the noun ἱσθητα—Eriugena simply eliminated the hanging adjectives by making them adverbs in M:\(^407\) *indutos uestimenta candide et ignee innocueque resplendentes.* The text of the *Expositiones* suggests a solution perhaps more elegant: *induti sunt uestimenta, quiue candido colore et igneo, innocuo tamen, resplendent*\(^408\).* The intrusion of *colore* is certainly acceptable in a commentary, but perhaps is to be avoided in a translation.

A similar correction—one which does not come from a re-reading of Pa—occurs at the end of chapter two of the *De caelesti hierarchia.* Chapter two proposes both to define ‘hierarchy’ and to describe of what advantage it is to its members: ἔξης δὲ ἀφορίσασθαι χρὴ τί μὲν αὐτὴν εἶναι τὴν ἱεραρχίαν οἴόμεθα, τί δὲ πρὸς αὐτῆς τῆς ἱεραρχίας ὀνύνασθαι τοὺς ἱεραρχίας κεκληρωμένους.\(^409\) Eriugena’s first attempt at translating this passage, witnessed by A\(^410\), remained close to the Greek: *deinde autem segregare oportet quod ipsam quidem est hierarchiam aestimamus quidque ab ipsa hierarchia prosunt hierarchiam sortientes.* However, the Latin, as the Greek, seems unnecessarily complicated by the repetition of *hierarchia* (πρὸς αὐτῆς τῆς ἱεραρχίας and ἱεραρχίας)\(^411\), and, in M\(^412\), Eriugena decided to remove the preposition *ab*, making *ipsa hierarchia* the nominative subject of *prosit* (for *prosunt*): *deinde autem segregare oportet quod ipsam quidem esse herarchiam aestimemus quidue ipsa hierarchia prosit hierarchiam sortientibus.* The passage has precisely the same meaning. Nevertheless,

\(^407\) Clm\(^1\), 7v.
\(^408\) Exp. II, 616-618.
\(^409\) CH II, 16.15-17=PL 122, 1044A14-B2.
\(^410\) A, 8v.
\(^411\) Exp. II, 1266-1267 explains the repetition by distinguishing between the general hierarchy and the specific: *quidue ipsam, generalem uidelicet hierarchiam, sortientibus prodest unaqueque specialis hierarchia.*
\(^412\) Clm\(^1\), 8v.
Eriugena’s solution takes him outside the limits of his usual literalness.

Still other corrections are guided by Eriugena’s own philosophic sensibilities, which led him to change not only the text—as he had already translated it—but, unknowingly, to change the meaning. Chapter two of the De caelesti hierarchia concerns, as its title (ὅτι πρεπόντας τὰ θεία καὶ οὐράνια καὶ διὰ τῶν ἀνομοίων συμβόλων ἐκφαίνεται=Quoniam pulchre diuina et caelestia etiam per dissimilia symbola manifestantur) indicates, the propriety of using dissimilar or base symbols to describe the divine. A hypothetical objector claims, in the course of this chapter, that the nobler images have a double advantage: they are more uplifting to us, and more honorable to the divine beings they describe, inasmuch as they prevent us from filling heaven with the foulest of images:

τὸ μὲν γὰρ ἡμῶν τε ἀναγωγικῶτερον ἐμελλεν εἰναι καὶ τὰς ύπερκοσμίους ἐκφαντορίας οὐ κατὴγεν εἰς τὰς ἀπεμφαίνουσας ἀνομοίότητας, τὸ δὲ καὶ εἰς τὰς θείας ἀθέασας ἐξουθειεσ δυνάμεις καὶ τὸν ἡμέτερον ἱδας ἀποπλανᾶν νοῦν εἰς τὰς ἀνιέρους αὐτῶν ενιζύλων συνθέσεις, καὶ τάχα καὶ οἰνηστὰ πάντων ζωτικῶν λεοντείων τινῶν καὶ ἕπειτῶν ἐσμῶν ἀποπεπληρῶθαι καὶ μυκητικῆς ὑμνολογίας καὶ ὀρνιθείας ἀγελαρχίας καὶ ζώων ἄλλων καὶ ὑλᾶς ἀτμοτέρων, οἵς πρὸς τὸ ἄτοπον καὶ νόθον καὶ ἐμπαθεῖς ἀποκλιθέσθαι διαγράφουσιν αἱ κατὰ πᾶν ἄνομοι τῶν δὴ ἐκφαντορικῶν λογίων ὀμοιότητες.⁴¹³

Dionysius counters this objection by claiming that, in fact, the baser the image, the less likely we are to be so wrapped up in it that we understand it literally:

Τιμῶσι τοιγαροῦν, οὔτε αἰσχρών ἀποπληροῦσι τὰς οὐράνιας διακοσμήσεις αἰ τῶν λογίων ἱερογραφίαι ταῖς ἀνομοίως αὐτῶς μορφοποιηθεῖς ἐκφαίνουσι καὶ διὰ τούτων ἀποδεικνύσαι τῶν υλικῶν ἀπάντων ύπερκοσμίως ἐκβεβηκυῖσας.⁴¹⁴

Thus, the pseudo-Areopagite continues by interpreting certain words which would

---

⁴¹³ CH II, 10.21-11.7.
⁴¹⁴ CH II, 13.4-7.
otherwise seem inappropriate to describe the divinity. Anger, for example, in irrational animals, simply refers to the motion of the passions, whereas in divine intellects it refers to their unwavering rationality:

"Καὶ γὰρ ὁ θυμὸς τοῖς μὲν ἀλόγοις ἥξε ἐμπαθοῦς ὀρμῆς ἐγγίνεται καὶ πᾶσις ἀλογίας ἐστὶν ἀνάπλεως ἡ θυμοειδής αὐτῶν κίνησις, ἀλλὰ ἐπὶ τῶν νοερῶν ἐτέρω τρόπῳ χρή τὸ θυμικόν ἐννοῆσαι, δῆλου ὡς οἶμαι τὴν ἀρένωπον αὐτῶν λογιστικὴ καὶ τὴν ἀμείλικτον ἐξίν ἐν ταῖς θεοειδεῖ καὶ ἀμεταβόλοις ἱδρύσεσιν."415

Likewise, desire in animals represents unchecked, changing and irrational passion, while in the angelic minds it signifies unwavering desire for divine contemplation:

"Ὡσάμεν ἐπιθυμία ἐν μὲν εἶναι φαμὲν ἐπὶ τῶν ἀλόγων ἀπερίσκεπτῶν τινα καὶ πρόσολον ἥξε ἐμφύτου κινήσεως ἡ συνηθεία ἐν τοῖς ἀλλοιωτοῖς ἀκρατῶς ἐγγυνομενή προσπαθεῖαν καὶ τὴν ἀλογοῦ τῆς σωματικῆς ὁρέζεως ἐπικράτειαν ἀπὸ τὸ ζῶον ὀθούνῃ ἐπὶ τὸ κατ’ αἰσθησιν ἐπίθυμη ἡ πλοῦσι τῶν ἀμοιβάς ὁμοιότητας τῶν νοερῶς περιπλάκας ἐπιθυμίαν αὐτῶν περιπλάκας ἐρωτοθέον αὐτὴν ἐννοῆσαι χρὴ τῆς ὑπὲρ λόγου καὶ νοοῦ αὐλίας καὶ τὴν ἀκλινή καὶ ἀνέκδοτον ἐφεσιν τῆς ὑπεροῦσας ἀγνῆς καὶ ἀπαθοῦς θεωρίας καὶ τῆς πρὸς ἐκείνῃ τὴν καθαρὰν καὶ ἀκροτάτην διαρκείαν καὶ τὴν ἀφανὴ καὶ καλλοποιοῦν εὔπρεπειαν αἰσθήματος ὑπωτος καὶ νοητῆς κοινωνίας."416

Finally, Dionysius adds intemperance or lack of control to the list of crass images which may be used of the divine. Ἀκρατεῖς, used to describe the divine intellects, indicates their pure and undivided love of divine beauty and their inclination towards the object of their desires:

"Καὶ τὸ ἀκρατεῖς ἐκλάβῳνεμ ἐπὶ τοῦ συνιτῶνο καὶ ἀνεπιστρόφου καὶ πρὸς μηδενῶς ἐγκόπτεσθαι δυναμένου διὰ τὸν ἀμιγῆ καὶ ἀναλλοίωτον τῆς θείας καλλοποιή ἐρωτά καὶ τῆς ὀλική ἀπόκλισιν ἐπὶ τὸ ὑπωτος ἐφεσιν."417

Until this point, Eriugena has been a willing student of Dionysius’ rather extreme views

---

415 CH II, 14.3-7.
416 CH II, 14.7-16.
417 CH II, 14.16-19.
on the baser symbols—he translates ὀ θυμῶς as furor\textsuperscript{418}, and ἐπιθυμίαν as concupiscentiam\textsuperscript{419}. However, using the name impotentia\textsuperscript{420} to describe the divine seems less acceptable to Eriugena. He begins by apologizing in A\textsuperscript{421}—uelut impotentiam—, but finally decides to omit the negation altogether, giving potentiam in M\textsuperscript{422}. He justifies the change at Expositiones II, 826-828, where he seems to confuse ὀκρατής with ὀκρατος: potentiam uel, ut significantius ex ambiguo graeco, quod est ΑΚΡΑΤΕΣ, potest transferri, puritatem… He then proceeds to interpret the passage as if ὀκρατής is an explanation of ἐπιθυμία from the previous sentence:

Et ipsa spiritualis concupiscentia potentiæ uel, ut significantius ex ambiguo graeco, quod est ΑΚΡΑΤΕΣ, potest transferri, puritatem, suscipit in sufficienti, hoc est forti, strenuo, robusto, et inconuersibili, in eo uidelicet quod sufficiens est strenuumque atque robustum, inconuersibile quoque, et in eo quod a nullo affligi potest.\textsuperscript{423}

Eriugena’s sensitivities regarding the use of such inappropriate terms to describe the angelic ranks led him to change a perfectly accurate translation. What is more, Dionysius’ point, arguably one of the most important in the De caelesti hierarchia, is obscured by Eriugena’s attempted correction.

Clearly, not all of Eriugena’s corrections lead to a happy result. In several instances the corrected reading of M is just as unintelligible as that of A. For example, as has been noted above, Eriugena had difficulty recognizing the word πρέπω and its derivatives, often confusing it with προεὶπον. Several times Eriugena attempts to fix his

\textsuperscript{418} PL 122, 1042B11.
\textsuperscript{419} PL 122, 1042C2.
\textsuperscript{420} cf. PL 122, 1042D2.
\textsuperscript{421} A, 7r.
\textsuperscript{422} Clm\textsuperscript{1}, 8r.
\textsuperscript{423} Exp. II, 826-831.
translation on this point, yet never realizes the cause of the error.

PL 122, 1047B7-8=CH IV, 22.4
πρέπουσας θεω A⁴²⁴, praedictas deo M⁴²⁵, praedicationes a deo

Other vocabulary problems prove insolvable in De caelesti hierarchia IV.

PL 122, 1048B4-5=CH IV, 23.12-13
οὐκ ἀποστειλα της ὑπ' A⁴²⁶, non resilit sub se et M⁴²⁷, non resilit sub se et αὑτοῦ ταχθείσης τε καὶ bellicali et libenti humana militari et electi humana αἰρεθείσης bona ordinatione… bona ordinatione…

anthropoprepous εὐταξίας…

While they continue to reveal the limitations of Eriugena’s understanding of Greek, the corrections of M also betray a certain improvement. Eriugena shows himself to have been aware of many of the problems which were discussed earlier in this chapter—the defects of Pa, difficulties with the Greek genitive, confusion between conjugated verbs and substantives. However, what the corrections of M show most clearly is a movement away from the literalism of his first attempt at translating the pseudo-Areopagite, a greater freedom of expression, albeit still limited in the extreme. This tendency in the corrections of M leads one to suspect that Eriugena followed a twofold procedure in translating: first, he rendered the Greek text rather literally, without considering too acutely the meaning of what he was translating; second, he revised this text, looking as much toward meaning and, to a certain degree, style, as to accuracy. This conclusion is rather tempting, yet remains difficult to maintain, inasmuch as the first and second versions seem to have been separated from one another by as much as 10 years, and we

⁴²⁴ A, 10r.
⁴²⁵ Clm¹, 10v.
⁴²⁶ A, 10v.
⁴²⁷ Clm¹, 11r.
have every reason to believe that Eriugena considered the version represented by A as complete—for, almost all of the manuscripts of this family witness the dedicatory letter to Charles the Bald, wherein Eriugena declares his task complete.

2.4 Conclusion

From this examination of Eriugena’s Versio Dionysii, three points stand out. The first is the striking contrast between the Irishman’s understanding of the language of the East and that of his contemporaries, on the one hand, and the available resources on the other. The contrast with his colleagues suggests that he learned his Greek in a school outside the heart of the Carolingian Empire. Nevertheless, while many of his contemporaries were themselves Irish, Traube’s ‘Irish theory’ cannot answer this question. The discrepancy between Eriugena’s Greek and the medieval lexica and grammars suggests, rather, that we simply have not discovered all the Greek materials available during the 9th century.

Second, although he claims to have been a novice to the language when he began his translation of Dionysius, Eriugena clearly had a firm foundation in Greek studies some time prior to 860. As well, he may have already had some education in later Neoplatonism. Although he translated Maximus Confessor and Gregory of Nyssa after completing the Versio Dionysii, Eriugena’s glosses on Martianus Capella seem to indicate that he knew the Ambigua and the De imagine prior to 860. These texts, and Maximus in particular, could certainly have piqued Eriugena’s interest in the pseudo-Areopagite, compelling him to seek royal sanction for the ambitious project of translating the Corpus Areopagiticum. For, could the idea really have been the emperor’s?

Third, the Versio was a work in continual progress. Eriugena began with a rather
literal translation, which served well enough for his own research and the meagre quotes in his *Periphyseon*. However, this translation would not suffice for a full scale commentary on the Dionysian *corpus*, and so he undertook the project—whether before, after or in conjunction with the composition of the *Expositiones* it is difficult to say—of re-reading his Greek manuscript, and correcting the *Versio* against it.

Each of these three points raises as many questions as it answers: If the *lexica* and grammars of the early-Middle Ages were so defective, where did Eriugena learn the middle voice\(^\text{428}\), or the dual\(^\text{429}\)? If the translation of the *Corpus Areopagiticum* implies some introduction to Greek Neoplatonism, was the Dionysian *corpus* truly Eriugena’s first foray into this genre of philosophy? Were the corrections of *M* a necessary step to composing his *Expositiones*, or the natural result?

\(^{428}\) Cf. Exp. VII, 51-55: … *apud graecos media uerba sunt que ab eis \(ΜΕΣΑ\) uocantur, passiumorum uerborum formam sepissime optinent, ideoque media dicuntur quia et pro actuis et pro passuis ponuntur, sicut *apud nos communia*…; cf. 129 above.

\(^{429}\) Cf. PL 122, 1075C4: ambobus uiris=\(ονδρον\), EH II 71.2.
Chapter Three
The Versio Dionysii through the 12th Century

3.1 A Preliminary distinction

A preliminary distinction must be made at the outset of this chapter, which will discuss the continued use and influence of the Versio Dionysii from the 9th through the 12th century. Eriugena’s translation of the Corpus Areopagiticum is not the only path through which the pseudo-Areopagite reached the medieval West.

3.1.1 Rome

First, the Greek corpus made its way to Rome as early as the late 6th century. In Rome, in 593, Gregory the Great pronounced his 34th Homily on the Gospels, wherein he refers to the ‘venerable and ancient father’, Dionysius, by name,

\[
\text{Fertur uero Dionysius Areopagita, antiquus uidelicet et uenerabilis pater, dicere quod ex minoribus angelorum agminibus foris ad explendum ministerium uel uisibiliter uel inuisibiliter mittuntur, scilicet quia ad humana solatia aut angeli aut archangeli ueniunt. Nam superiora illa agmina ab intimis numquam recedunt, quoniam ea quae praeeminent usum exterioris ministerii nequaquam habent}^{430}. 
\]

and indicates some awareness of the Dionysian corpus by listing the nine ranks of angels:

\[
\text{Nouem uero angelorum ordines diximus, quia uidelicet esse, testante sacro eloquio, scimus angelos, archangelos, uirtutes, potestates, principatus, dominationes, thronos, cherubim, atque seraphim}^{431}. 
\]

---

430 PL 76, 1254B.
431 PL 76, 1249D; Whether or not Gregory could read Greek remains a disputed issue, and the use of fertur at the beginning of the first passage would seem to indicate that his familiarity with the Greek corpus was indirect (cf. Joan M. Petersen, “Did Gregory the Great know Greek?”, Studies in Church History 13 (1976): 121-134 and “Homo omnino Latinus?” The Theological and Cultural Background of Pope Gregory the Great” Speculum 62.3 (1987): 529-551). The Dictionnaire de spiritualité (III, 319) argues that
Although it is unclear whether or not Gregory found the corpus in Rome, the Lateran Council of 649 and Pope Martin I assure us of the presence of the Corpus Areopagiticum in Rome by the middle of the 7th century. The Council, which was called to combat the monothelite heresy, translates four passages from the De diuinis nominibus and three from the fourth letter (to Gaius). Further, the council reports that Pope Martin I ordered a manuscript of the Dionysian corpus, which was evidently kept in Rome, be compared to the translation of the letter to Gaius provided by the monophysite bishops.

Finally, Maximus Confessor is a third witness of the Dionysian corpus in Rome in the 7th century. Maximus, who traveled to Rome in defense of Chalcedonian dyothelitism, claims to have found a manuscript of the works of Dionysius in the hands of Peter the Deacon.

Although the presence of the Dionysian corpus in Rome had little effect on the Middle Ages until Anastasius translated the scholia of John of Scythopolis and Maximus Confessor from a Roman manuscript, the influence it did have must be carefully distinguished from that of the Versio Dionysii.

---

Gregory is a witness of the presence of the whole of the Corpus Areopagiticum in Rome in the 6th century, suggesting that Gregory may have learned to read Greek while he was apocrisarius in Constantinople from 579 to 585, or that, in any case, there would have been many notaries in Rome at the time who could have translated the corpus (or passages) for the Pope. However, Gregory could easily have discovered Dionysius in Constantinople and had passages translated for him there. Gregory’s knowledge of Dionysius does not prove that the corpus was present in Rome in its entirety in the 6th century. Rather, Gregory is an early source for the knowledge of Dionysius in the West in the 12th century—regardless of whether he represents the beginning of this tradition in Rome.

Cf. Petersen, “Homo omnino Latinus?”, 532; the codex was certainly a Greek manuscript, since Paschalis and Exuperius were called upon to translate the texts in question for the council.

Cf. Dictionnaire de spiritualité, III, 319.
For example, Peter Lombard refers to Dionysius twice in his *Sententiae*. In book two, distinction eleven, the *Magister Sententiae* gives two lists of angelic beings:

Post praedicta superest cognoscere, de «ordinibus angelorum quid scriptura tradat, quae in pluribus locis nouem esse ordines angelorum promulgat, scilicet angelos, archangelos, principatus, potestates, uirtutes, dominationes, thronos, cherubim, seraphim ».

« Et inueniuntur in istis ordinibus tria terna esse, et in singulis tres ordines, ut trinitatis similitudo in eis insinuetur impressa. Vnde Dionysius tres ordines Angelorum esse tradit, ternos in singulis ponens; sunt enim tres superiores, tres inferiores, tres medi; superiores: seraphim, cherubim, throni; medi: dominationes, principatus, potestates; inferiores: uirtutes, archangeli, angeli ».

Although he attributes the second to the pseudo-Areopagite, it is rather the first which is Dionysian—the second order is that of Gregory the Great.

That Gregory was Lombard’s source for his Dionysian borrowings is made clear from a second passage, from book two, distinction ten:

*Sententiae* II, d. X, c. I

Item, Dionysius in Hierarchia, quae sacer Furtur uero Dionysius Areopagita, antiquus principatus dicitur, de praelatone spirituum uidelicet et uenerabilis pater, dicere quod ex ait: Superiora illa agmina ab intimis minoribus angelorum agminibus foris ad nunquam recedunt, quoniam ea quae explendum ministerium uel uisibiliter uel praeeminent usum exterioris officii inuisibiliter mittuntur, scilicet quia ad humana solatia aut angeli aut archangeli ueniunt. Nam superiora illa agmina ab intimis numquam recedunt, quoniam ea quae praeeminent usum exterioris ministerii nequaquam habent.

---


435 Paul Rorem, *Pseudo-Dionysius, a Commentary on the Texts and an Introduction to Their Influence* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1993), 77, claims that Lombard shows “a clear preference for the Dionysian authority”, pointing to book two, distinction nine. However, there, as here, Lombard attributes the Gregorian hierarchy to Dionysius.

436 Petri Lombardi *Sententiae in IV Libris distinctae*, 351.
The passage, which is a direct quote of no Dionysian writing, is likely from Gregory. The only significant difference is that Lombard is aware that the teaching comes from the *De caelesti hierarchia*, while Gregory merely claims that this is something the pseudo-Areopagite is said to have taught. A simple familiarity with the traditional chapter titles of the *De caelesti hierarchia* would have made the source evident to Lombard. For, the *Magister Sententiarum*, as Gregory before him, notes that this strict hierarchical ordering is in contradiction with *Isaiah*, 6:2, who claimed to have been visited by a seraphin\textsuperscript{437}. This passage in Gregory’s *Homilia*, and therefore in the *Sententiae*, is certainly referring to the thirteenth chapter of the *De caelesti hierarchia*, which concerns: *Quare a seraphim dicatur purgatus fuisse propheta Isaias?*

Our examination of the continued influence of the *Versio Dionysii* in the Middle Ages must not be confused with the continued influence of Dionysius in the Middle Ages, the presence of which can be detected not only in Lombard. For, the Gregorian hierarchy is repeated several times in the 12\textsuperscript{th} century, for example, in Abelard’s *Sic et non*\textsuperscript{438}, and in the pseudo-Hugonian *Summa sententiarum*\textsuperscript{439}.

### 3.1.2 Hilduin:
Not only was the Greek *Corpus Areopagiticum* present in the West prior to Eriugena’s work on the pseudo-Areopagite, a Latin Dionysius was also available before the 860s. Although it was never the basis of much intense study, Hilduin’s translation was known during the Middle Ages. Besides Hilduin himself, who refers to his own translation of

\textsuperscript{437} *Sententiae* II, d. X, c. I: *Quibus obiititur quod Isaias ait: Voluit ad me unus de seraphim, qui ordo super est et excellentior; cf. PL 76, 1254B.

\textsuperscript{438} PL 178, 1420.

\textsuperscript{439} PL 176, 85.
the Dionysian *corpus* in his *Vita Dionysii*, Hincmar of Reims also quoted the pseudo-Areopagite according to the translation of the Parisian abbot\(^{440}\). Failure to recognize the influence (albeit meager) of Hilduin on the Areopagitism of the Middle Ages led Traube to conclude, falsely, that Hincmar was using the lost proto-version of the *Versio*.

Thus, neither should we confuse the medieval influence of the *Versio Dionysii* with the influence of the Latin Dionysius, which traveled by more than one route into the Middle Ages.

### 3.2 Introduction

The collation of the manuscripts of the *Versio Dionysii* has provided evidence of an active study of the Latin *corpus* during the later 9\(^{th}\) and, perhaps, early 10\(^{th}\) centuries. Eriugena himself was engaged not only in assimilating the Dionysian system, which assimilation resulted in his own *Periphyseon*, but also in revising his translation, which led to the corrections of *T* and *M* on the one hand, and the *Expositiones* on the other. But the appearance of the apparatus of *A* some time in the late 9\(^{th}\) or early 10\(^{th}\) century shows that Eriugena was not alone in the activity of digesting the language and philosophy of the pseudo-Areopagite. The author of the apparatus of *A* was probably not far behind. Since the apparatus of *A* reports the readings of *T*, *A* must have been completed some time between the early 870s—that is, after the completion of *T*—and no later than the date of the earliest manuscripts of this family, *Be* and *Bp*—that is, some time between the end of the 9\(^{th}\) century and the beginning of the 10\(^{th}\) century. Then there is Anastasius

\(^{440}\) *Cf. supra*, 54.
himself, who was reading not only the Versio but also the Corpus Areopagiticum in a manuscript from the R family.

The evidence for active study of the Versio diminishes significantly in the 10th and 11th centuries. Indeed, there is a marked decline in interest in the works of Eriugena altogether beginning in the 10th century, followed eventually by a ‘renouveau érigènien’ during the 12th century⁴⁴¹. Nevertheless, the coincidence of the Eriugenian renewal and intensification of the study of Dionysius during the 12th century⁴⁴² does not, de facto, imply that the Versio Dionysii suffered a fate similar to that of the Periphyseon during the 10th and 11th centuries, and diminishing evidence ought not be confused with desuetudo simpliciter.

3.3 The 9th and 10th centuries

3.3.1 Laon

As has already been explained, the Versio underwent significant revisions during the 9th century at the hands of Eriugena and others. The evidence of these manipulations comes directly from the collation of the manuscripts: The recension A contains both the earliest (surviving) version of Eriugena’s translation together with a great deal of contamination against T; T contains a text which has been purged of almost all Greek terms, transliterations and literalisms; and M presents the text of A together with the corrections

⁴⁴² One might think of the commentaries of Hugh of St. Victor and John Sarrazin on the De caelesti hierarchia and William of Lucca’s commentary on the De diuinis nominibus.
made by the translator himself. However, the Versio had some readership outside the
circle of those who simply wished to improve the text. The famous Laon manuscript 444
has already been discussed in chapter one in connection with some of the glosses found
in A. The manuscript attributed to Martin of Laon contains a reference to Dionysius,
which shows clearly that the Versio was its source. Folio 298ρ reads: *Vit Dyonisius
Ariopagita dicit Deus γπερθεοc est, id est, superdeus, et γπεραγθοc id est superbonus,
et γπεραλθθεc id est supererus*.

Contreni points out that Hilduin translates ὑπεραγθος as *superoptimus*, while
Eriugena fluctuates between *superbenignus* and *superbonus*. Thus, the source of these
dionysian terms is certainly Eriugena. However, whence the author of this Greek word
list from Laon learned the Greek terms of which Eriugena has provided the equivalents
remains perplexing. One might consider the apparatus of A a reasonable source for such
translations, inasmuch as many of the glosses of A come from T, which had as its purpose
the latinization of precisely such Greek terms. However, none of these three terms occurs
in the *De cælesti hierarchia*, where the corrections of T are most evident. In any case,
not only did Martin have some access to the Versio, the fact that Martin knows the Greek
terms as well as their Latin equivalents may put him rather close to Eriugena’s work.

We know that Laon possessed a copy of the *Expositiones*. By the time of
Anselm, in the 11th century, Laon also possessed Eriugena’s *Vox Spiritualis*. As
evidence for the presence of the Versio at Laon in the 9th century this is merely

---

443 *Cf. supra*, 47.
446 *Cf. Contreni, The Cathedral School of Laon*, 86; the commentary is #244 in Contreni’s
catalogue of manuscripts at Laon.
suggestive, but one might wonder whether a library to which Eriugena had close ties, and which certainly possessed two of his major works, would not have tried to include the *Periphyseon* and the *Versio* in their collection.

### 3.3.2 St. Gall

In her study of the manuscripts of the St. Gall library, Bernice Kaczynski suggests that the liturgical poets of the Swiss monastery had some familiarity with the *Versio* as well as with the *Expositiones*.

In the liturgical pieces of the Medieval West, Greek served as a sacral or hieratic language. It was used in order to give an impression of solemnity, of formality, and of mystery. The authors of Latin tropes and sequences sought the same effect when they brought Greek words into their verse. From the ninth century onward, religious poets delighted in Greek vocabulary. Words like “melodema,” “ierurgia,” “hymnologia,” and “euprepia,” came from John Scottus Eriugena’s translations of pseudo-Dionysius and his commentary on the *Celestial Hierarchy*, while “deo ipsistis,” “agius,” and “kyrie” came from the liturgy itself. Notker Balbulus and Hartmann in the ninth century, Ekkehard I and Ekkehard IV in the tenth and eleventh were among the St. Gall poets who contributed to the monastery’s reputation as a center of the new liturgical verse.\(^{448}\)

The first three of these dionysian terms indeed occur in the *Versio*\(^{449}\), and the fourth, *euprepia* is common enough in the *Corpus Areopagiticum*. However, the presence of such terms in the poems of the masters of St. Gall neither implies the presence of the *Versio* in the library collection of the Swiss monastery, nor proves, supposing they were present, that they were read and studied.

---

\(^{448}\) Kaczynski, *Greek in the Carolingian Age*, 113.

\(^{449}\) For *melodema*, cf. EH II, 1076B7, for *ierurgia*, cf. EH IV, 1049C, for *hymnologia*, EH IV, 1049C; *euprepia* is generally translated *pulchritudo* by Eriugena in the *Versio* (e.g., CH I, 1039A11 and CH II, 1041D1) and I have yet to find a reference to this Greek term in the *Expositiones*. 
3.4 The 11th century: Chartres

In 1895, Clerval claimed, perhaps optimistically, that the Chartrian masters of the late 10th and early 11th centuries were heavily influenced by Dionysius and Eriugena. If we follow Clerval in his assertion, the Versio ought to have been present at the cathedral school from its very beginnings under Fulbert. The evidence of such an influence on Fulbert is very thin, consisting of one passage from his first letter to Abbo of Fleury, in 1004. The passage does indeed sound Dionysian: *ut participando superessentiam deitatis deus fias*. The theme of deification may be Dionysian, even Eriugenian. However, as Jeanneau has pointed out, the mere presence of such Dionysian terms as ‘superessential’, does not prove the direct influence of either Dionysius or Eriugena.

According to Clerval, Berengar of Chartres was equally influenced by the pseudo-Areopagite. Indeed, Berengar names Eriugena as one source of his (heretical) theology

---


452 The term *deificatio* occurs often enough in the Eriugenian corpus; but deification is never a matter of participation directly in the divine superessence for Eriugena. In fact, the *Expositiones* (1, 639-642) rather argues that *deificatio* is the result of symbolic anagogy.


454 Clerval, *Les écoles de Chartres*, 131: “…il s’attachait à saint Denys l’Areopagite et à Scot Erigène…”
of the Eucharist. Nevertheless, as Cappuyns has shown\textsuperscript{455}, Berengar has attributed the work of Ratramnus (\textit{De corpore et sanguine domini}\textsuperscript{456}) to Eriugena.

Although Fulbert and Berengar make rather poor witnesses for the presence of the \textit{Versio} during the early days of the cathedral school, the library holdings of Chartres provide some evidence that the \textit{Versio} was available at Chartres during the 10\textsuperscript{th} and 11\textsuperscript{th} centuries. According to the \textit{Catalogue général}, the Chartres manuscript 110 (which was destroyed in the fire of 1944), written in the 10\textsuperscript{th} or 11\textsuperscript{th} century, contained Eriugena’s translation of the \textit{Corpus Areopagiticum}. Fulbert and his disciples, then, may have had access to the Latin Dionysius. Whether or not the first generation of Chartrian masters availed themselves of the translation is difficult to say.

\section*{3.5 The 12\textsuperscript{th} century}

\subsection*{3.5.1 The Porretani}

The generation of Chartrians which followed, those now referred to as the \textit{Porretani}, provide a clearer picture of the use of the \textit{Versio} at Chartres during the end of the 11\textsuperscript{th} and beginning of the 12\textsuperscript{th} centuries. Gilbert of Poitiers, the father of the \textit{Porretani}, was educated in Laon under Anselm, who made extensive use of Eriugena’s \textit{Vox Spiritualis}\textsuperscript{457}. Indeed, Laon seems to have had a connection with Eriugena and the \textit{Versio} since the late 9\textsuperscript{th} century. One might expect, then, that Gilbert would have been introduced to Dionysius while under the tutelage of Anselm. Indeed, in the 1190s,

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{455} Cappuyns, \textit{Jean Scot Érigène}, p. 89.
\item \textsuperscript{456} \textit{Cf.} PL 150, 407-442.
\end{itemize}
Evrard d’Ypres claimed that Gilbert knew perfectly the teachings of the Greek fathers, that is, of Basil, Eusebius and Dionysius. Nevertheless, the actual evidence of a Dionysian influence on Gilbert, as in the case of Fulbert, may be reduced to one passage.

Deus enim est essentia: non est aliquid. Nec esse aliquid fingitur creatasubstinentia. Ac per hoc nihil eorum, que subsistentias comitantur, in illo esse potest. Itaque etsi magnus est, non tamen hoc est quantitate: etsi qualis est, non tamen qualitatem: etsi durat, non tamen tempore.

Vnde humani animi motus agens in ipsum concipiendum, nihil huiusmodi inuenire potest quod eius conceptum amminiculetur. Ideoque ipsum comprehendere per ea, quibus sit aliquid et aliquid esse fingatur, nullatenus uaele. De inter cetera tamen per horum omnium ab illo remotionem ipsum selegens et eum uere esse cum assensione perciens, qualitercumque intelligit.

The use of remotio to refer to negation in this passage is significant. As we have seen, Eriugena prefers negatio or depulsio to translate the Dionysian apophesis. Hilduin, confusing ἀπόφημι for ἀποφαίνω, generally gives sententia for apophesis. Although the theme of negation may appear Dionysian or Eriugenan, the language of this passage has nothing in common with the Versio (nor with the Periphyseon, for that matter).

Although the evidence for a Dionysian influence on Gilbert is slight, the work of his followers reveals a clearer, although not much deeper, interest in Areopagitism. The commentaries on Boethius attributed to Thierry of Chartres and his school contain several references to Dionysius, which references, by their consistency, reveal the nature of

---

459 Nicholas Haring, The Commentaries on Boethius by Gilbert of Poitiers (Toronto: Pontifical Institute of Mediaeval Studies, 1966), 247, ll. 24-34.
460 Luscombe has conveniently compiled them into one list in his article, “L’Areopagisme et Chartres” in Monde médiéval et société chartraine, actes du colloque international organisé par la Ville et le Diocèse de Chartres à l’occasion du 8e centenaire de la Cathédrale de Chartres, 8-10 septembre 1994 (Paris: Picard, 1997), 118-120.
Thierry’s interest in Dionysius. The few citations of the Dionysian corpus found in Häring’s edition of the commentaries refer, invariably, to the same two or three ideas.

First, God is not a being since he approaches more closely to nothing than to something:

Quod autem deus non sit ens aperte Dionysius in lerarchia dicens quod deus potius accedit ad nihil quam ad aliquid. Ad nihil i.e. ad nullum ens accedit quia non est ens sed est entitas uel essentia omnium rerum a quo entia fluunt et habent esse.\(^{461}\)

Second, there are two types of theology, affirmative and negative:

Quod ostendit et exequitur Dionisius summus theologus in Girathia ubi theologiam per affirmationem exequitur dicens quod deus est sapientia uirtus prudentia iustitia fortitudo. Quae omnia de deo affirmat et ei conueniunt per translationem non proprie. Ipse enim ut diximus nullo intellectu comprehendi nullo uocabulo significari potest. Deinde aggregatur theologiam per negationem dicens quod deus nec uirtus est nec sapientia nec prudentia nec iustitia et ita de alii: quippe nihil horum proprie deo conuenit. Et idcirco negat ea a deo exequendo theologiam per negationem pertissime de deo sciret loqui. Vnde errant in loquendo de deo qui theologiam ignorant.\(^{462}\)

These passages show that Thierry and his colleagues were primarily interested in Dionysian apophasis. However, they also reveal the mediation of Eriugena. For, Dionysius never refers to God by the name ‘nothing’—this ‘divine name’ is original to Eriugena.\(^{463}\) Likewise, the clarification of affirmation as per translationem non proprie is found rather in Eriugena’s Expositiones than in the Versio itself.\(^{464}\) Indeed, none of the

\(^{461}\) _Lectiones in Boethii de Trinitate_, IV, 28; the same idea is referred to Dionysius again at _Glosa super Boethii librum de Trinitate_, IV, 13; _Abbreviatio Monacensis, De hebdomadibus_, 34; and _Abbreviatio Monacensis, contra Eutychen_, I, 27.

\(^{462}\) _Fragmentum Londinense, contra Eutychen_, 63; repeated at _Tractatus de Trinitate_, 26, _Abbreviatio Monacensis, contra Eutychen_, III, 63, and _Commentarius Victorinus, de Trinitate_ 99 and 102-103.

\(^{463}\) This feature of Eriugena’s Areopagitism will be discussed in more detail in the following chapter.

\(^{464}\) _Exp. II_, 526-531: _Ac si diceret: si uera est negatio in diuinis rebus, non autem uera sed metaphorica (=per translationem in Thierry) affirmatio; uere enim dicitur Deus inuisibilis, non autem uisibilis uere ac proprie dicitur, similiter infinitus,
references in Thierry’s commentaries is quoted directly from the *Versio*, and one suspects that Thierry knew Dionysius only through Eriugena’s commentary, or, perhaps, through the *Periphyseon*. However, the substitution of *per translationem* in Thierry for Eriugena’s *metaphorica affirmatio* as well as the fact that Clarambold of Arras\(^{465}\) refers to the exact same Dionysian theme of *nihil* as a ‘divine name’ suggests that Thierry’s knowledge even of Eriugena was indirect, perhaps through a *florilegium* of some sort.

### 3.5.2 John of Salisbury

Of the Chartrians, John of Salisbury represents the most intriguing case, even if his direct knowledge of the *Versio* is no more certain than that of Gilbert or Thierry. In his own works, John refers to the pseudo-Areopagite by name only twice. The first instance occurs at *Metalogicon* II, 20, 354-359:

> Clamat mecum et Dionysius Ariopagita, et numerum quo discernuntur, pondus quo statuuntur, mensuram qua difiniuntur omnia, dei dicit imaginem. Siquidem Deus sine numero numerus est, pondus sine pondere, sine quantitate mensura. In quo solo creata sunt omnia quae facta sunt in numero, pondere, et mensura\(^{466}\).

The second occurs at *Policraticus* II, 11, 19-21: *Dionysius Ariopagita in epistola ad Policarpum scribit se et plures alios philosophantes tunc uidisse lunam soli incidentem*\(^{467}\). Neither reference is a direct quote, and, despite the confidence of the editor of the *Metalogicon*, who gives *De diuinis nominibus* IV.4, PG 3, 697, which

\(^{465}\) *De hebdomabus*, 4, 28-30: magis...ad nihil accedere quam ad aliquid.

\(^{466}\) CCCM 98.

\(^{467}\) CCCM 117.
Jeauneau makes more precise by adding the line numbers 10-11\textsuperscript{468}, John’s source is far from clear. PG 3, 697, 10-11 makes no mention at all of measure, number or weight: \’Αλλ’ ὅπερ ἡμᾶς ἐν μέσῳ παραδραμόν διαπέφυγε, καὶ τῶν οὐρανίων ἄρχων καὶ ἀπεπερατώσεων αἰτία τάγαθον… Hall’s suggestion that we search for the passage in PL 122, 1130C9-12 offers little help. The \textit{Versio}, at 1130C9-12, does refer to God as the \textit{mensura} and \textit{numerus} of all existences: \ldots \textit{facit, et uiuificat, et continet, et perficit, et mensura est existentium, et aeternitas, et numerus, et ordo, et ambitus, et causa, et finis.} But Eriugena’s translation does not bring the text any closer to John’s source. Indeed, John may have taken the passage rather from the \textit{Periphyseon}. The phrase \textit{mensura sine mensura, numerus sine numero, pondus side pondere} is found twice in the \textit{Periphyseon}, in books two\textsuperscript{469} and three\textsuperscript{470}.

The second passage, from the \textit{Policraticus}— \textit{Dionisius Ariopagita in epistola ad Polycarpum scribit se et plures alios philosophantes tunc uidisse lunam soli incidentem}—refers to Dionysius’ seventh letter to Polycarp.

\begin{quote}
Τί λέγεις περὶ τῆς ἐν τῷ σωτηρίῳ σταυρῷ γεγονοῦσας ἐκλείψεως; Ἀμφοτέρω γὰρ τότε, κατά Ἡλιούπολιν ἀμά παρόντε τε καὶ συνεστώτε, παραδόξως τῷ ἡλίῳ τὴν σελήνην ἐμπιπτοῦσαν ἐωρῶμεν, οὐ γὰρ ἦν συνὸδος καιρὸς αὐθίς τε αὐτήν ἀπὸ τῆς ἐνατίς ὥρας ἀχρὶ τῆς ἐσπέρας εἰς τὸ τοῦ ἡλίου διάμετρον ὑπερφυῶς ἀντικαταστάσαν\textsuperscript{471}.
\end{quote}

However, Hall’s citation of Eriugena’s \textit{Versio}, which Jeaneau repeats\textsuperscript{472}, is gratuitous.

Quid dicis de ipsa in salutari cruce facta eclipsi? Nam utrique tunc iuxta solis ciuitatem simul aduenientes et consequentes, mirabiliter soli lunam incidentem


\textsuperscript{469} II, glossa 161, 661-662.

\textsuperscript{470} III, 2063-4.


\textsuperscript{472} Jeanuean, “Jean de Salisbury,” 98, n. 150; PL 122, 1180C3-8.
uidimus—non enim erat coitus tempus—iterum autem ipsam a nona hora usque
uesperas, in solis diametrum supernatraliter e contrario consistentem.

Nothing in John’s reference to Dionysius indicates that Eriugena’s translation was his
source.

It is certain that John possessed some of the works of Dionysius. Upon his death
in 1180, he donated his personal library to the Cathedral school at Chartres. The
cartulary of Chartres indicates that his collection included a *librum de ecclesiastica siue
celesti Yerarchia* and another *Gerarchiam*. According to Luscombe, “[i]l ne fait
aucun doute que ces volumes comportent des copies des traités de Denis de *Hiérarchie
céleste* et de *Hiérarchie ecclésiastique*.” In reality, the cartulary leaves nothing but
doubt. The first entry is uncertain regarding which *hierarchia* is in question, and the
second *hierarchia* has no qualifier whatsoever. William of Lucca refers to the *De diuinis
nominibus* as the *tertia hierarchia*, and Alan of Lille and others knew of a text entitled
simply *Hierarchia* or *De hierarchia*, which they falsely attributed to Eriugena. Could
John’s *Gerarchiam* refer to one of these?

And which translation did John’s library include? Prior to 1944, Chartres
possessed at least two manuscripts containing the Latin Dionysius. Chartres 131
included the translation made by Sarrazin; however, the catalogue dates this manuscript
to the 13th century, too late to have been donated by John. The other manuscript,
Chartres 110, contained the *Versio*, and was copied in the 10th or 11th century, according

---

473 PL 122, 1180C1-8.
474 *Cartulaire de Notre-Dame de Chartres*, edd. E. de Lépinois and Lucien Merlet
(Garnier: Chartres, 1865), 201-202.
476 Cf. C.C.J. Webb, “Note on Books bequeathed by John of Salisbury to the Cathedral
to the catalogue. Although there is no evidence that this manuscript was ever in John’s possession, one might wonder how many copies of Dionysius the Cathedral school could have possessed.

The suggestion that John possessed a personal copy of the Versio is repeated in John’s personal communication with the elusive figure John Sarrazin. Sometime in, or just before 1166, Sarrazin wrote to John, indicating that he had finished translating the De caelesti hierarchia, a project Sarrazin had undertaken at John’s request: *Quoniam prudentiae uestræe sinceritatem in libris beati Dionysii perpendi delectari, librum eius de angelica Ierarchia uestræe transtuli charitati*. Sarrazin concludes his communication by asking John to compare his own translation to that of Eriugena. If John finds the results satisfactory, then Sarrazin will continue with the De ecclesiastica hierarchia:

> Erit autem uestræ discretionis hanc meam translationem cum translatione Joannis Scoti comparare. Quod si forte commodius illo uisus fuero transtulisse, ut librum quoque de ecclesiastica Ierarchia transferem poteris impetrare.

John does appear to have been pleased with the results of Sarrazin’s efforts. For, he writes not only to the translator himself—*Expecto a gratia uestra residuum Gerarchiae transferri, ut uestro beneficio uobis ad aeternam gloriam Francis suis beatus Dionisius plenius innotescat*—but also to Raymond, the *magister scholarum* at Poitiers—

---


478 PL 199, 143C12-14.

479 PL 199, 144B8-12.

Si uero per misericordiam Dei res circa uos laetius agitur, precor attentius quatinus interpretem nostrum modis omnibus ad hoc inducere studeatis, ut quod de Ierarchia, cuius unum librum transtulit, residuum est, ad formam suam transferat et emendet; quia id quod praemisit his, qui illud uiderunt in Francia, satis placet.  

And Sarrazin wrote back once he had finished translating the De ecclesiastica hierarchia:

Post translationem angelicae Ierarchiae translationem ecclesiasticae distuli, quia super ea transferenda uestram uoluntatem ignorai. Verebar autem ne uiderer et meorum nimius approbatorum, et contra Salomonem liminum amici mei odiosus frequentator. Verum tam ad transferendum magister scholarum me commouit, qui eiu ierarchiae factam a me translationem uos approbare et huius postulare confirmauit. Eundem autem modum transferendi in hac ierarchia quem in coelesti obserui, hoc excepto quod latinæ dictiones multas pro una graeca positas non ubique coniunxi, at alicubi sensum potius quam uerba sum secutus. Poterit autem aliquis remonstrare quare placuerit latinorum ecclesiae quadem mutare quae constat uirum sanctissimum et ab apostolis eruditum tradidisse, imo tradita ab antecessoribus suis narrauasse, et quare tradita fuerint rationes ostendisse.

However, it is impossible to say whether or not John upheld his end of the bargain—comparing Sarrazin’s version with Eriugena’s. If he did, it goes without saying that John possessed and read the Versio. As it stands, it is merely probable that John knew the Versio, was frustrated with its unintelligibility, and asked Sarrazin for help.

3.5.3 John Sarrazin
With this elusive figure, John Sarrazin, we have the first, indubitable evidence that the Versio was read and carefully studied after the late 9th or early 10th century. Indeed, his work on the Versio and on the Corpus Areopagitcum is virtually all that is known of

---

481 The Letters of John of Salisbury, letter 166, 92.
482 PL 199, 259D8-260A12.
Sarrazin. His date of birth, death, place of origin and education are all matters of speculation. Jeuneau suggests that he was an Italian, perhaps from Santa Severina or Calabria, where he and John of Salisbury would have met. Théry, however, proposes an English origin for the hellenist, and suggests the two Johns met while John of Salisbury was studying in France, sometime in the 1130s or 1140s. Whether he was Italian or English by origin, it is certain from John’s letters to Raymond, that Sarrazin worked for a time in Poitiers.

3.5.3.1 The commentary of John Sarrazin on the De caelesti hierarchia

3.5.3.1.1 Date

If Théry is correct in supposing that Sarrazin composed his commentary before 1137, then Sarrazin is the first Dionysian commentator of the 12th century, indeed, the first Dionysian lector after the 9th or 10th century. There is no doubt that Sarrazin commented on the De caelesti hierarchia before he made his translation of this work of the pseudo-Areopagite, for his lemmata reconstruct the Versio invariably. But how long before the 1160’s Sarrazin finished his commentary is more difficult to determine. In the preface to his commentary, Sarrazin tells us his primary impetus for commenting on the Dionysian hierarchy was the inadequacy of Eriugena’s translation, together with the lack of a suitable teacher to clarify the pseudo-Areopagite’s meaning:

Quibus et interpres minus quam oportuisset, ut arbitror, eruditus, non parum obscuritatis superaddidit. In quorum explanatione librorum doctiores audire tacendo potius uellem si fieri posset. Sed quia nec expositor nec didascalus apud nos reperitur qui hos edisserat et fructuosissima eorum scientia uelut thesaurus

484 Gabriel Théry, “Documents,” 54.
Théry takes Sarrazin’s remark to the effect that he (Sarrazin) could find no master capable of explaining the teachings of the pseudo-Areopagite as evidence that Sarrazin was unaware of Hugh’s commentary, which must have been composed between 1137 and 1141. Thus, according to this interpretation, Sarrazin’s commentary should be dated before 1137. Sarrazin’s statement is far from conclusive—the best that can be suggested is that Sarrazin’s commentary was completed sometime between the late 1130s and 1167, when he completed his translation of the first Dionysian treatise.

3.5.3.1.2 The version of the Versio known to Sarrazin

The lemmata of his commentary leave no doubt that Sarrazin used the Versio in commenting on the De caelesti hierarchia. But which recension did he know? Certain statements in his commentary make it possible to answer to this question. For example, Sarrazin comments on the following lemma from chapter four of the De caelesti hierarchia,

---

485 Paris, Bibliothèque nationale, 1619, col. 22; 18061, fol. 21v; printed in Théry’s “Documents,” 46.

486 The terminus post quem is provided by the ascendency of Louis VII, to whom Hugh’s commentary is dedicated, while the terminus ante quem is provided by the death of Hugh; cf. Théry, G. “Existe-t-il un commentaire de J. Sarrazin sur la Hiérarchie céleste du Pseudo-Denys?,” Revue des sciences philosophiques et théologiques, XI (1922): 80 and Théry, “Documents,” 51.

487 Cf. Théry, “Existe-t-il,” 79 and Théry, “Documents,” 47; note that in the first of these articles, Théry has mistranscribed the first lemma of Sarrazin’s commentary (Omne datum obtimam et omne datum perfectum …), which he corrects in the second (Omne datum obtimam et omne donum perfectum…).
Video enim, quoniam et ipse Iesus supercaelestium essentiarum superessentialis essentia, ad id, quod secundum nos est, immutabiliter veniens non resilit sub se et bellicali et libenti humana bona ordinatione, sed obediens subditur patris et dei per angelos dispositionibus.\textsuperscript{488}

noting that there is another translation for the words in italics above: \emph{alia translatio habet: non resilit [a se]}\textsuperscript{489} \emph{ordinata humana ordinatione}.\textsuperscript{490} The original reading is that of the recension \textit{A}\textsuperscript{491}, while Sarrazin’s \emph{alia translatio} is the reading of \textit{T}\textsuperscript{492}. While it is possible that Sarrazin possessed two manuscripts of the \emph{Versio}, it seems more likely that he simply had an \textit{A} manuscript complete with its interlinear apparatus\textsuperscript{493}. Further, the reading of \textit{M}\textsuperscript{494} here differs from both that of \textit{A} and that of \textit{T}: \emph{sub se militari et electa humana bona}.

Théry believes that Sarrazin’s commentary already shows signs of the revision of the \emph{Versio}. The Paris manuscript, BN 18061 gives explanations for certain Greek terms on fol. 26v: \emph{ierarchia...sacer principatus uel summum sacerdotium, ieros quidem templum uel sacrum, iereus uero sacerdos}. However, as we have already seen, these explanations are found at the beginning of our \textit{A} manuscripts, confirming that Sarrazin was in possession of a manuscript from this family.

\textsuperscript{488} PL 122, 1048B1-6.
\textsuperscript{489} Théry’s manuscripts, Paris BN 18061 and 1619, give \textit{esse} in place of \textit{a se}. In both, a scribe has corrected this error; however, Théry has misinterpreted this correction: “\textit{a se, c’est-à-dire par lui-même}, Jean Sarrazin, considéré ici comme auteur de cette nouvelle versio. Il est évident que le lecteur du ms. ne s’est pas référé au texte de Scot Érigène”. Obviously, it is Théry who has failed properly to refer to Eriugena’s translation here.
\textsuperscript{491} A, 10v.
\textsuperscript{492} Os, 21v.
\textsuperscript{493} Cf. Dondaine, \textit{Le corpus dionysien}, 80, n.34.
\textsuperscript{494} Clm\textsuperscript{1}, 11r.
Other explanations in Sarrazin’s commentary may point to his awareness of the *Expositiones*. For example, Sarrazin comments on Eriugena’s *armiferos archistrategos* in chapter two:

> Si bene reminiscor quod audii uel legi, archos dicitur princeps, stratos exercitus, strategos dux exercitus, archistrategos igitur princeps ducum exercitus, uel summos duces exercitus dicere possimus\(^{495}\).

Sarrazin’s *si bene reminiscor* is rather odd since, as we have seen, this gloss is present in the apparatus of A. In any case, there is no need to assume that Sarrazin had read or used the *Expositiones*, since we know he could have found this explanation in his manuscript of the *Versio* itself.

Although Théry believes that such comments in Sarrazin’s commentary represent the beginnings of his own translation of Dionysius—essentially a revision of the *Versio* according to Théry—many of Sarrazin’s ‘corrections’ in his own commentary come, in fact, from the apparatus of A or other manuscript sources closely connected with the *Versio*. Apart from the apparatus of A, the glosses of Anastasius provide Sarrazin with other corrections. For example, the gloss of Anastasius on Eriugena’s translation of σκοπός as *interpretatio*, in *De caelesti hierarchia* III, 1044C10\(^{496}\): *Nomen scopos quod hic translator interpretationem dicere placuit latine intentio uel intuitus uel huiusmodi, sed et speculator interpretatur*\(^{497}\). And again, Sarrazin knows Anastasius’ correction of

\(^{495}\) Bayerische München Clm. 34567, fol. 21v.

\(^{496}\) This example of Sarrazin’s knowledge and use of the glosses of Anastasius as well as the following are discussed by Dondaine, *Le corpus dionysien*, 55.

\(^{497}\) For Anastasius’ gloss, *cf.* Paris BN 1618, fol. 8v. Sarrazin’s comment may be found in Paris BN 18061, fol. 52r.
Eriugena’s reference to the angels as *immundae* at PL 122, 1049A14, a mistake which comes rather from a fault in Pa, which gives *ANIEPOI* in place of *παυιεροι*\(^{498}\):

Heu quam periculose latuit interpretem ut pro *sacratissimis* poneret *immundas, παυιερον*, quod *ualde sacrum* siue *omnino sacrum* interpretatur, putans *immundum* dici debere, quo *αυιερον* græce secundum sensum dicitur: nam ad uerbum *non sacrum* siue *insacrum*, si dici potest, interpretatur\(^{499}\).

Beyond these revisions, which represent rather the work of Anastasius than that of Sarrazin, I can find no evidence that Sarrazin had access to a Greek manuscript of the *Corpus Areopagiticum* at this time. Théry’s characterization of Sarrazin’s commentary as an explanation of the translation of Eriugena is correct, inasmuch as Sarrazin tells us as much in his preface. Nevertheless, Théry’s suggestion that Sarrazin “recourra assez fréquemment à un manuscrir grec\(^{500}\)” must be rejected.

### \textbf{3.5.3.2 John of Sarrazin’s translation of the Corpus Areopagiticum}

#### \textbf{3.5.3.2.1 Date and circumstances}

The date and circumstances of Sarrazin’s translation of the *Corpus Areopagiticum* are provided, as we have seen, by the correspondence between Sarrazin and John of Salisbury. Sarrazin’s letter to John, submitting for approval his translation of the *De caelesti hierarchia*, assures us that Sarrazin’s translation of the first hierarchy was completed before 1167\(^{501}\). John of Salisbury had not long to wait before the second and third hierarchies—the *De ecclesiastica hierarchia* and *De diuinis nominibus*—were

---

\(^{498}\) CH III, 19.20.  
\(^{499}\) Paris, BN 1618, fol. 11r; Sarrazin gives *sacratissimae* with Anastasius at Paris BN 18061, fol. 69v.  
\(^{500}\) Théry, “Existe-t-il,” 81.  
\(^{501}\) The letter is printed in PL 199, 259-260 and reprinted in Théry’s “Documents,” 51-52.
completed. For, in this same year, John wrote to Raymond, the chancellor of Poitiers, asking him to communicate his desire to Sarrazin that he send copies of his translations of these two works, which John had recently learned were now complete.

De caetero quotiens oportunum fuerit, sollicita magistrum Iohannem Sarracenum ut petitioni meae satisfaciat et transmittat mihi librum beati Dionysii de Ecclesiastica Ierarchia et de Diuinis Nominibus quos, sicut apud beatum Dionysium didici, nuper transtulit.\(^{502}\)

We have no such evidence for the completion of Sarrazin’s versions of the De mystica theologia and the ten letters. However, given the speed with which he accomplished his translations of the first three works in the Dionysian corpus, we may reasonably assume it was not long after 1167 that the whole Corpus Areopagiticum was rendered into Latin for the third time during the Middle Ages.

The extent of the communication between John and Sarrazin (sometimes through Raymond) reveals that John was the main promoter of this project to retranslate the pseudo-Areopagite. And it seems clear from Sarrazin’s 1167 letter to John, asking John to compare Sarrazin’s new translation to the Versio of Eriugena, that the project was conceived as a remedy to the obscure translation of the Irishman. Indeed, his translation shows at every turn that Sarrazin’s was as much a revision of the Versio as it was a new translation of the Dionysian corpus.\(^{503}\)

\(^{502}\) Letters of John of Salisbury, letter 232, 424.

\(^{503}\) Théry has gone so far as to call Sarrazin the “traducteur de Scot Erigène” in an article by this very name in Studia Mediaevalia in honorem R. J. Martin (Bruges, 1948), 359-381.
diuinis profuit laudatoribus; deinde caelestes Ierarchias laudare secundum ipsarum in eloquii manifestationem, consequentibusque his dicere, qualibus diuinis formationibus caelestes figurant ordines eloquiorum sacrae descriptiones, et ad qualem oportet ascendere per formas ueritatem, ut non et nos eodem modo multis immunde aestimemus, caelestes et deiformes animos multipedes esse quosdam, et multorum uultuum, et ad boum pecudalitatem, aut ad leonum bestialem imaginationem formatos, et ad aequilarum curio rostro speciem, aut ad uolatilium tripartitam alarum commotionem effiguratos, et rotas quasdam ignes super caelum imaginemus, et thrones materiales diuinitati ad recubitum necessarios, et equo quosdam multicolores, et armosferos archistrategos, et quaececumque alia ex eloquii nobis sacre et formabiler in uarietate manifestatiuorum symbolorum tradita sunt. Etenim ualde artificialiter theologia factitii sacris formationibus in non figuratis intellectibus usa est, nostrum, ut dictum est, animum revelans, et ipsi propria et connaturali reductione providens, et ad ipsum reformans analogicas sacras scripturas.

deinde autem caelestes hierarchias laudare secundum ipsarum in eloquii manifestationem; consequenter uero post haec dicere qualibus sanctis formationibus caelestes figurant ornatus eloquiorum sanctae scripturae, et ad qualem reduci oportet per formationes simplicitatem, quatenus non et nos similiter ut multi immunde arbitremer caelestes et deiformes mentes et multipedes esse quosdam et multorum uultuum, et ad boum animalitatem aut ad leonum feri nam formationem formatas, et ad aequilarum curio rostri speciem aut ad uolatilium tripartitam alarum naturalem positionem formatas, et rotas quasdam ignes super caelum imaginemur, et thrones materiales deitatis principatui ad reclamationem opportunos, et equo quosdam multorum colorum, et lanceas ferentes principum militiae principes, et quaececumque alia ab eloquii nobis sancta formatione in uarietate manifestatiuorum signorum tradita sunt. Etenim non sine arte theologica poeticae sanctis formationibus in non figuralibus mentibus usa est, nostram, ut dictum est, mentem respiciens, et familiarem ipsi et connaturalem sursumactionem prouident, et ad ipsum reformans sursumactiuas sanctas scripturas.

The differences between the two versions are minimal, consisting, in this passage, largely of lexical changes: conuenit for oportet, intentionem for specificationem, ornatus for ordines, etc.

3.5.3.2.2 The Versio and Sarrazin’s translation
If Théry is correct in dating Sarrazin’s commentary on the De caelesti hierarchia to sometime around or before 1137, then Sarrazin’s commentary and translation are
separated by almost 30 years. As we have seen, Sarrazin bases his commentary on a manuscript from the A family. Is it possible that he obtained a new manuscript of the Versio, one from a different family, between 1137 and 1167? A close comparison of chapter two of the De caelesti hierarchia in the Versio with the same text in Sarrazin’s translation shows that Sarrazin’s text generally follows the readings of A. He preserves the re- prefix for the Greek ἄνα-, which T has systematically removed. His translation often preserves the graecism thearchia in place of T’s diuinitas. True, Sarrazin gives affirmationes and negationes in place of the more ancient readings of A, intentiones and depulsiones. However, Sarrazin would have found these indicated in the apparatus of any A manuscript.

There are, however, instances in which Sarrazin follows the reading of M where this recension is in disagreement with A and T. For example, at 1041B9-10, M504 corrects the misreading of MENONTΩN as manentibus, replacing the reading of A505 and T506 with quidem existentibus. Sarrazin’s translation gives the corrected reading of M507. And again, at 1141C7, M508 omits the phrase hoc quidem, which A509 and T510 give as the translation of τὸ μὲν. Sarrazin follows M here511. One may be tempted to conclude that Sarrazin either had a manuscript from the M recension, or that he had a copy of the Expositiones. Both of these conclusions are possible. However, in both of the cases mentioned above, the reading of M is a correction of the Versio as from a Greek

504 Clm1, 7r.
505 A, 7r.
506 Os, 13v.
507 Chevallier, Dionysiaca II, 755.
508 Clm1, 7r.
509 A, 7r.
510 Os, 13v.
511 Chevallier, Dionysiaca II, 758.
manuscript. Eriugena’s Pa had virtually no word separation or diacriticals, so MENONTΩN originally appeared as one word to the Irishman. Upon reflection, Eriugena realized that the correct reading is μὲν ὄντων, and changed his translation accordingly. The same phenomenon may be observed with the omission of hoc quidem. The Greek phrase which hoc quidem is meant to translate is τὸ μὲν, followed by οὐκ εἶναι. That is, we are dealing with an articular infinitive. Eriugena originally translated the article, not understanding its relationship with the infinitive, but must have later realized that hoc quidem was entirely unnecessary, and omitted it from M. In each of these cases, Sarrazin could have come to the same conclusion on his own since he possessed a Greek manuscript of the Corpus Areopagiticum.

3.5.3.2.3 Sarrazin’s Greek manuscript of the Corpus Areopagiticum

One assumes that in order to translate the Dionysian corpus Sarrazin must have had a Greek manuscript of the works of the pseudo-Areopagite. However, as we have seen with the corrections of the T recension, one could easily revise the Versio without ever looking at a word of Greek. And to argue that Sarrazin must have had a Greek manuscript in order to translate the Corpus Areopagiticum seems to beg the question—indeed, we are justified in claiming that Sarrazin actually translated the corpus (rather than that he merely revised the text of Eriugena) only if he had a copy of the Greek corpus. Fortunately, the differences between Pa and the manuscripts of the Roman family make this an easy question to answer. Several of the errors of Pa, which Eriugena
naturally follows, Sarrazin has corrected. For example, where Pa reads ηδίος, Eriugena translates laetitia. Sarrazin, however, gives sol in place of Eriugena’s laetitia, a change which is explained by the correct reading of the R manuscripts, ἔλατος. And again, where Pa gives καὶ υψος, Eriugena translates et nunc. R gives the correct reading, τιμώσι, which Sarrazin follows: hono-rant. Thus, Sarrazin must have had a Greek manuscript of the Dionysian corpus, a manuscript from the R recension.

3.5.3.2.4 Sarrazin and Anastasius

Finally, it is worth pointing out that Sarrazin continues to use the glosses of Anastasius as an aid in his work as translator. As we have already seen, in chapter two of the De caelesti hierarchia, Eriugena has some difficulty translating the term ἀκρατείς. The vocabulary is not in itself problematic. It is rather Dionysius’ application of the term, which simply means ‘powerless’, to the angelic minds (an example of one of his ‘dissimilar symbols’) which causes Eriugena serious problems. The recension A gives the somewhat apologetic uelut impotenti-um. T, considering it scandalous to call the divine ‘impotent’, gives the reading ueluti potentiam. M has removed the uelut/i

---

512 DN VII, 193.11.
513 PL 122, 1153A3
515 PG 3, 141A
516 PL 122, 1041C3
517 CH II, 14.17.
518 A, 7v.
519 Os, 15r.
520 It is quite possible that the variant of T is due partially to scribal error—failure to recognize the macron above the i in impotenti-um would yield ueluti potentiam rather than uelut impotenti-um.
521 Clm', 8r.
altogether and simply reads potentiam. Sarrazin gives non ualens teneri\textsuperscript{522}—as a correction, Sarrazin’s text is rather less intelligible than Eriugena’s uelut impotentiam, but it is explained by Anastasius’ gloss on this passage: Notandum quomodo id accipiatur potentiam. Sane acrates quod interpres impotentiam transtulit illud significat quod teneri non potest\textsuperscript{523}.

\section*{3.5.4 Hugh of St. Victor}

\subsection*{3.5.4.1 Date and circumstances}

The date and circumstances of Hugh’s commentary on the De caelesti hierarchia are difficult to determine with much precision. As we have seen, Théry places the commentary between 1137 and 1141. However, the dedication of Hugh’s commentary to Louis VII, which provides the first of these dates, is dubious. The Patrologia Latina prints this dedication: Ad Ludovicum Regem Francorum, Filium Ludovici Grossi, Qui aedem D. Victoris Parisiensis aedificandum curavit\textsuperscript{524}. However, PL 175 simply reprints the 1648 Rouen edition\textsuperscript{525}, and there exists no manuscript of Hugh’s commentary which preserves this dedication\textsuperscript{526}. Hauréau points to a Viennese manuscript which contains the explicit: Explicit expositio magistri Hugonis et praepositi S. Victoris\textsuperscript{527}. Hugh, notes

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{522} Chevallier, Dionysiaca II, 769
\item \textsuperscript{523} E.g., Be, 6v.
\item \textsuperscript{524} PL 175, 923-924.
\item \textsuperscript{525} I have yet to find a discussion of the manuscript(s) upon which the Rouen edition was based.
\item \textsuperscript{527} Cf. Hauréau, Les oeuvres de Hugues, 60; Hauréau gives no shelf-mark, simply referring the reader to the catalogue of Denis, Cod. man. theol. Vindob., t. I, col. 2722.
\end{itemize}
Hauréau, would have been obliged to abandon the title provost when he became prior sometime around 1137.

Van den Eynde has suggested an even earlier date for the commentary, 1120-1124, arguing that certain doctrines introduced in Hugh’s commentary are developed in later works, particularly in the *De sacramentis*. Van den Eynde’s argument is inconclusive. There is no reason to assume, on the basis of shared doctrines, that the commentary preceded these ‘later works’. That is, this solution is no more reasonable than its opposite: that the *De sacramentis* proposes certain doctrines that are later developed by the commentary.

In fact, the prologue to Hugh’s commentary proves that his work on the pseudo-Areopagite was completed after the *Epitome in philosophiam* or the *Didascalicon*, both completed before or around 1125. For the prologue proposes that there are four parts of philosophy. Hugh mentions here only three of these parts—logic, ethics and the theoretic part—noting that the fourth has been discussed in its own, proper place.

Nunc dicendum est quid sit theologia, altius quidem incipienti ad evidentiam rerum dicendarum. Philosophia omnis in tres principales partes secatur: Logicam, ethicam, theoreticam. Quartam enim, quam in suo loco adiecimus, hic ex superabundanti enumerare est.

---

The fourth part is the mechanical, as was mentioned in both the *Epitome* and the *Didascalicon*\(^{531}\). Thus, although it is unlikely that Hugh’s commentary on the *De caelesti hierarchia* was completed as late as 1137, it must certainly be dated somewhat later than 1120-1124.

The date of Hugh’s commentary is further complicated by the internal structure of the text itself. Regardless of the precise date on which Hugh began his commentary, once begun, his work of explaining the pseudo-Areopagite seems to have occupied him for some time. For, mid-way through his comments on chapter seven of the *De caelesti hierarchia*, Hugh tells the reader that he is returning to his work after some delay:

*Otia longa nouum exordium poscunt*. Paulo superius ingressi fuimus sermonem de cognominatione angelorum, ubi auctor demonstrat quare singulis ordinibus angelorum tales sunt cognominationes, siue appellationes attributae. Et de primo quidem, atque supremo ordine, qui seraphim cognominatur, eiusdem appellationis rationem, quae a theologia data est, secundum capacitatem nostram prosecuti sumus. Nunc superest ut eam quoque, quam de sequentis ordinis cognominatione rationem reddit, consideremus\(^{532}\).

However, not only does Hugh seem to have commented on the *De caelesti hierarchia* on two separate occasions—first, on chapter one through the first half of chapter seven, and then on the rest of chapter seven through the last, fifteenth chapter—but, according to Weisweiler, Hugh commented on the whole of the first Dionysian hierarchy twice over—that is, from beginning to end. The evidence for Weisweiler’s *Doppelkommentar* comes from the repetition of certain *lemmata*, followed by new interpretations of these same *lemmata*.

For example, in the course of chapter seven, on the first order of angels—the

---


\(^{532}\) PL 175, 1045A1-11.
Cherubim, Seraphim and Thrones, Dionysius claims that these highest ranks of angelic intellects circle around God himself, receiving illuminations directly and purely.

Ipsa ergo est, quantum ad nostram scientiam, prima caelestium essentiarum dispositio, in circuitu dei et circa deum immediate stans, et simplicher et incessanter circumiens aeternam eius scientiam, secundum excellentissimam, quantum in angelis, semper mobilem collocationem, multas quidem et beatas uidens pure contemplationes, simplo uero et immediato fulgore illuminata, et diuino alimento repleta; multa quidem primo data fusione, sola uero domestic et unifica diuinæ refectionis unitate: multaque communione dei et cooperatione digna effecta, ad eam, ut possible, similitudine bonarum habitudinum et actionum: multaque diuinorum superpositae cognoscens, et diuinæ scientiae et cognitionis in participatione, secundum quod fas est, facta.533

Hugh cites the clause which begins with multas quidem at 1062B8 and then comments on the passage.


nec interueniat positione, nec praueuoiarion etimee, nec transcendet
dominatione. Ita est dispositio ista prima in circuitu dei, et circa deum immediate
stans ita proprie. Et quis est fructus huius tantae familiaritatis?

The very same lemma is repeated immediately after, at 1063A, and again commented on
at length.

Audi quod sequitur: «Multas quidem et beatas uidens pure contemplationes
simplosque et immediate fulgores illuminata, et diuinon alimento repleta.» Ne ergo
mireris si sic ambiunt et elongari non patiuntur. Aliquid ibi est quod trahit; et quid
hoc est? Exspectas, ut dicatur quid sit illud quod in tantum desiderantium
affectum incitat et prouocat dilectionem? Sed quomodo putas a nobis dicetur,
quod ab illis non penetratur? Illi adhuc non intrauerunt, sed in circuitu stant; et
magnum illis est accedere ad illud, ut uideant, et contrectent, et gustent, et
experiantur qualis sit dulcedo boni sine obstaculo dilectoribus expositi; nec intrant
tamen nec penetrant ut comprehendant, et usque ad totum capiant, quanta sit
immensitas occulti. Quomodo ergo tu foris exponere putas, cui et illi qui intus
sunt foris manent? Non ergo dici potest a nobis bonum illud, quod illos beatos
animos per gaudium aeternae contemplationis iuxta se immobiles tenet, ut ad
cadua non effluant et rursum per desiderium mouens ad se trahit, ut ipsum
incessabili dilectione appetant. Sed ne omnino taceatur, quod prorsus dici non
potest, audi quid sit, quod illos et tenet iuxta se, et trahit ad se...

…«Multas quidem, et beatas uidens pure contemplationes simplosque, et
immediate fulgores illuminata.» Hoc de illuminatione et cognitione dictum est.

Hugh’s commentary then goes on to repeat the second half of the original lemma:
Sequitur: «Diuno alimento repleta. Multa quidem primo data fusione, solaque
domestica, et unifica diuinae reflectionis unitate.» Weisweiler suggests that the
references to lemmata already commented—for example, hoc de illuminatione et
cognitione dictum est, repeated after the lemma quoted immediately above, hoc dictum
est de dilectione et reflectione—indicate that we are dealing with later additions.

534 PL 175, 1062B8-1063A5.
535 PL 175, 1063A7-1065C2.
536 PL 175, 1065C3-5.
537 Cf. Heinrich Weisweiler, “Die Ps-Dionysiuskommentare In Coelestem hierarchiam
des Skotus Eriugena und Hugos von St. Viktor,” Revue de théologie ancienne et
However, without any indication that Hugh has changed his interpretation of any of these passages, it is difficult to prove that these repetitions point to a *Doppelkommentar*. For, the repetitions seem to be limited to the *lemmata*—Hugh neither repeats nor contradicts his own comments. These repetitions may be later scribal additions. The solution of this problem must await a critical edition of Hugh’s commentary, or, at least, a thorough examination of the manuscripts.

### 3.5.4.2 The so-called *Translatio Hugonis*

Although a comparison of Hugh’s commentary with the *Versio* shows that Eriugena’s translation formed the basis of the work of this Victorine master, there exist certain medieval sources which suggest that Hugh, himself, made a translation of the Dionysian *corpus*. According to Sanderus\(^5\)\(^3\)\(^8\), a certain manuscript from Saint-Martin de Tournaï contains not only Hugh’s commentary on the *De caelesti hierarchia*, but his own translation of the *De ecclesiastica hierarchia: Hugo de Santo-Victore in Dionysii Hierarchiam. Item libri 8 Dionysii ab eodem Hugone de graeco in latinum translati*. To this Théry adds the Polish manuscript Krakow 1383, from the 15\(^{th}\) century, which contains a *translacio Hugonis De diuinis nominibus*\(^5\)\(^3\)\(^9\). The *Histoire littéraire* admits the existence of a translation made by Hugh, noting that Hugh’s translation is much more useful than his glosses\(^5\)\(^4\)\(^0\). However, the *Histoire littéraire* bases its critique on the

---

\(^{538}\) Antonius Sanderus, *Bibliotheca Belgica Manuscritta* I (Lille, 1641-1643), 122.


\(^{540}\) *Histoire littéraire de la France*, t. XII, 61.
French manuscript, Paris BN 1619, which contains the *Corpus Dionysiacum*, that is, the translations of Eriugena and Sarrazin. And the Kracow manuscript 1383 contains rather the revisions of Thomas Gallus⁵⁴¹.

William de la Mare also refers to a “Version dont Hugues est l’auteur” in his commentary on the *Sententiae*⁵⁴². However, the references of William are, according to Dondaine, “late and ambiguous”, and the current consensus since Hauréau is that Hugh did not have enough Greek to accomplish such a work⁵⁴³. In any case, without a manuscript containing a Latin version of the *Corpus Areopagiticum* that is not attributable to any of the four known medieval translators (Hilduin, Eriugena, Sarrazin and Grosseteste), there remains no reliable evidence for such a *translatio Hugonis*.

3.5.4.3 Hugh’s commentary and the Versio Dionysii

The 13th century witnesses the presence of a fourth recension of the *Versio Dionysii*, the so-called *P* (Parisian) recension. *P* forms the basis of the 13th century *Corpus Dionysiacum*, the manual of Dionysius which contains the *Versio* as well as the translation of Sarrazin, together with the glosses of Maximus Confessor and John of Scythopolis and the commentaries of Eriugena, Sarrazin and Hugh. As a recension, *P*

---

arose directly from the comparison of T and R, and thus T and P differ only in the 51 additions from R which appear in P and are missing from T\textsuperscript{544}.

In the course of his research on the 13\textsuperscript{th}-century Corpus Dionysiacum, Dondaine considers the possibility that Hugh knew, and perhaps was responsible for the corrected recension P\textsuperscript{545}. For, this 13\textsuperscript{th}-century recension (which may have existed as early as the mid-12\textsuperscript{th} century), based on the earlier T recension, is characterized by its contamination against R\textsuperscript{546}, and Hugh knows the readings of R which intrude upon P in the De caelesti hierarchia (the only work of the Dionysian corpus upon which Hugh wrote a commentary).

However, of the corrections from R which appear in P only one occurs in the text of the De caelesti hierarchia. At CH XIII, 47.1-2 (chapter thirteen) of the De caelesti hierarchia, the R recension reads: ὑπὸ θεὸν καὶ μετὰ θεοῦ καὶ περὶ θεοῦ ἱδρυμένας καὶ τὴν ἀπάντων καὶ αὐτῶν ὑπεραρρήτως ἐξηρημένην ὑπεράρχων ἀκρότητα… The manuscript Pa omitted the phrases ὑπὸ θεὸν καὶ and καὶ τὴν ἀπάντων καὶ αὐτῶν ὑπεραρρήτως ἐξηρημένην; thus, Eriugena translated: post deum, et circa deum collocates, superprincipalm summitatem\textsuperscript{547}. Hugh, however, read: collocatas post Deum, et circa Deum, et cum Deo…\textsuperscript{548} In other words, Hugh’s manuscript had supplied

\textsuperscript{544} Cf. Théry, Etudes dionysiennes II, 381-391; Théry lists 100 omissions in Pa, of which the following have been supplied in P: 7,18, 19, 22, 28, 29, 31-35, 42, 45, 50, 51, 53, 54, 56, 57, 59, 60, 62-67, 69-72, 74-78, 81-84, 86-88, 91-94, 96, 97, 100; cf. Dondaine, Le corpus dionysien, 78, n. 28.

\textsuperscript{545} Dondaine, Le corpus dionysien, 80: “Est-il impossible que Hugues ait trouvé à Saint-Victor quelqu’un pour l’aider à cette révision sur R dont profite la recension P?”

\textsuperscript{546} Dondaine (Le corpus dionysien, 40) has identified over 30 intrusions in P from R.

\textsuperscript{547} PL 122, 1062D.

\textsuperscript{548} PL 175, 1142A.
what was missing from Pa (and, as a result, from the Versio) in the first instance (ἀπὸ
θεὸν καὶ).

This one correction known to Hugh is enough to prove neither that Hugh knew the
recension P, nor that he was responsible for the additions from R which characterize it.
Indeed, as Dondaine admits, the corrections of P seem to have appeared in stages, “un
processus graduel, par étapes”\textsuperscript{549}. And, in fact, this correction—number seven on
Théry’s list\textsuperscript{550}—may be found in the margins of several T manuscripts, including Fl and
Vr.

Since I have found no manuscripts of the P recension dating from the 12\textsuperscript{th} century,
and there seem to exist no manuscripts of this recension apart from those which contain
the 13\textsuperscript{th} century Corpus Dionysiacum, it seems reasonable to assume that Hugh must
have known one of our three recensions, A, T or M. A close comparison of the lemmata
of Hugh’s commentary reveals that the Victorine must have possessed a manuscript from
the T family\textsuperscript{551}.

Of the 11 variants which separate A and M from T in De caelesti hierarchia II,
Hugh’s text agrees with T in every instance.

AM v T

\textsuperscript{549} Dondaine, Le corpus dionysien, 81.
\textsuperscript{550} Cf. supra note 544.
\textsuperscript{551} PL 175 prints each chapter of the De caelesti hierarchia before each chapter of
Hugh’s commentary; this text has been taken directly from PL 122, and does not
represent the format of the manuscripts of Hugh’s commentary: Sequuntur tituli XV
capitulorum coelestis sive angelicae hierarchiae divi Dionysii Areopagitaee ad
Timotheum; post quos singulorum capitulorum apponetur secundum Joannem
Scotum littera; et post litteram, Hugonis nostri expositio; PL 175, 932. However,
Hugh’s commentary reproduces almost the whole of the text of Eriugena’s Versio.
Whether or not the lemmata of the edition found in PL 175—itself simply a reprint
of the 1684 Rouen edition—are reliable will have to await a new edition of Hugh’s
commentary.
PL 122 1040B5 reformare AM, formare THugh
1041B8 reformant AM, formant THugh
1041B9 reformationibus AM, formationibus THugh
1041C13 reformationes AM, formationes THugh
1042A3 et AM, om. THugh
1042A11 et AM, om. THugh
1042C1 immitem AM, immanem THugh
1043A15 resonantias AM, imagines THugh
1043B8 thearchicus AM, diuinis THugh
1043C13 agalmatum AM, imaginum THugh
1044A2 reformant AM, formant THugh

Of the seven instances where M and T agree against A, Hugh’s text always agrees with M and T as against A.

MT v A

PL 122 1041C15 eos TMHugh, eas A
1042A5 decora TMHugh, decore A
1042A9 uisibilus bonis TMHugh, uisibilium bonorum A
1042B14 irascibile TMHugh, irascibilem A
1043B15 in TMHugh, om. A
1043C10 prophetae TMHugh, ypophetae A
1043C15 negationibus TMHugh, depulsionibus A

Interestingly, of the 51 variants which separate M from both A and T (where A and T are in agreement), Hugh agrees with M four times.

AT v M

PL 122 1039C7-7 aestimamus AT, aestimemus M, existimamus Hugh
1039C12 oportet ATHugh, oporteat M
1040A1 imaginamus AT, imaginemus M, imaginemur Hugh
1040A7 poeticis ATHugh, facticiis M
1040B6-7 immaterialibus quoquomodo ATHugh, materialibus quomodo M
1040B12 dissimilitudines ATHugh, dissimulationes M
1040B13 simul iniuste ATHugh, illegitime M
1040B15 immundas ATHugh, immundanas M
1040C6 dum describuntur ATHugh, describendo M
1040C11 sic ATHugh, si M
1040D2 in ATHugh, om. M
1040D4 possibiles AT, passibiles MHugh
diuina *ATHugh*, et diuina *M*

descriptionis causas aetimauerit quis inhonestum *ATHugh*,
descriptione causas aetimauerit quis dehonestari *M*

et colendam *AT*, colendam *MHugh*

diuninitatis *ATHugh*, ΘΕΑΡΧΙΑΕ *M*

rationalitatem *ATHugh*, rationabilem *M*

castioribus manentibus *ATHugh*, gloriosioribus quidem
existentibus *M*

quodquomodo *ATHugh*, quomodo *M*

diunia *ATHugh*, thearchica *M*

et incomprensam *ATHugh*, incomprehensibilemque *M*

quaes ex quibus *ATHugh*, ea ex quibus *M*

hoc quidem (non esse) *ATHugh*, om. *M*

negationes *ATHugh*, depulsiones *M*

affirmationes *ATHugh*, intentiones *M*

per quidem enim praeiosiores sacras formationes *ATHugh*, in
quidem enim praeiosioribus sacris formationibus *M*

candidum et igneum innocue respergentes *ATHugh*, candide et
igneo innocueque resplendentes *M*

remanens quiescere *ATHugh*, manens requiescere *M*

sursum ferens animae *ATHugh*, sursum ursus animam *M*

materialibusque formare *ATHugh*, materiis reformare *M*

in irrationabilibus *ATHugh*, irrationabilibus *M*

omnis irrationabilitis *ATHugh*, omni irrationabilitate *M*

in intellectualibus *AT*, intellectualibus *MHugh*

circumformamus *ATHugh*, circumformemus *M*

sufficientia et inconuersabilitate et a nulla affligitur uirtute
*ATHugh*, sufficienti inconuersibili et a nullo afligli ualente *M*

immutabille *ATHugh*, commutabille *M*

supereminentias *ATHugh*, supereminens *M*

nostram transitoriam et corporalem rationem et materialem et
alienatum incorporalibus animis sensum excellentes *ATHugh*,
nostra transitoria et corporali ratione et materiali alienato
incorporalibus animis sensu *M*

dissonas *ATHugh*, et dissonas *M*

formare *ATHugh*, reformare *M*

incircumuolate *ATHugh*, incircumuelate *M*

invisibiliter *ATHugh*, intellectualiter *M*

diuina *ATHugh*, diuin *M*

recte accepta *ATHugh*, tractabilia *M*

contemplationis *ATHugh*, contemplatores *M*

utique *ATHugh*, aequae *M*

extendere *ATHugh*, extendi *M*

aestimamus, quidque ab ipsa hierarchia prosunt hierarchiam
sortientes *ATHugh*, aestimamus, quidue ipsa hierarchia prosit
The four readings which come from $M$ are interesting, but inconclusive. Most could easily be explained as trivial scribal errors. Further, the variants in $M$ with which Hugh agrees are not always stable—passibles (1040D4) occurs above the line in Be (an A manuscript); in (1042B13) was originally missing from Os and Bp, supplied above the line in each (T and A respectively); and hierarchiae (1044B3) is found in H, Be and above the line in Bp (T, A and A). Finally, Hugh certainly knew the Expositiones of Eriugena, and could have taken these readings from the commentary of his predecessor. This last suggestion may be bolstered by the fact that Hugh consistently substitutes existimare for aessimare\textsuperscript{552}, a feature peculiar to the manuscripts of the Expositiones.

\textbf{3.5.4.4 Richard of St. Victor}

Although Hugh’s commentary makes it certain that the Dionysian corpus was actively studied at the Parisian abbey, it is difficult to determine whether or not Hugh’s near contemporary\textsuperscript{553} Richard of Saint Victor knew the corpus directly or only through the commentary of Hugh. In fact, the evidence for Richard’s interest in and study of Dionysius is rather conflicting. On the one hand, of the four treatises and ten letters which make up the Corpus Areopagiticum, Richard cites only the De caelesti hierarchia,

\textsuperscript{552} Twice at 962A, twice again at 962B.

\textsuperscript{553} Whether or not Richard arrived at St. Victor before Hugh’s death is a question of some contention amongst modern scholars. For a summary of the various positions on this question cf. Steven Chase, \textit{Angelic Wisdom: The Cherubim and the Grace of Contemplation in Richard of Saint Victor} (Notre Dame: University Press, 1995), 143-146.
the text commented by Hugh. Some\textsuperscript{554} have suggested that this points to Hugh as Richard’s source—that is, Richard did not know the Versio Dionysii directly, but only through the writing of his master. Further, Richard reproduces a rather long passage from Hugh’s commentary in his own In apocalypsim Iohannis\textsuperscript{555}:

PL 175, 941C-D
Notat autem hic duplicem modum reprehensionis diuinae, quae theologorum et prophetarum mentibus infusa est per visiones et demonstrationes, quas graeci theophanias appellant, id est diuinam apparitionem. Quoniam aliquando per signa sensibilibus similia inuisabilia demonstrata sunt, aliquando per solam anagogen, id est mentis ascensum, in suprema purae contemplata. Ex his uero duobus generibus visionum, duo quoque descriptionum genera in sacro eloquio sunt formata. Vnum, quo formis, et figuris, et similitudinibus rerum occultarum ueritas adumbratur. Alterum, quo nude et pure sicut est absque integumento exprimitur. Cum itaque formis, et signis, et similitudinibus manifestatur, quod occultum est, uel quod manifestum est, describitur, symbolica demonstratio est. Cum uero puro pura et nuda reprehelatione ostenditur, uel plana et aperta narratione docetur, anagogica.

PL 194, 687A14-C2
Notat autem hic duplicem modum reprehensionis diuinae, quae theologorum et prophetarum mentibus infusa est per visiones et demonstrationes, quas graeci uocant theophanias, id est diuinam apparitionem, quae aliquando per signa sensibilibus similia inuisabilia demonstrata sunt. Aliquando per solam anagogen, id est mentis ascensum in suprema purae contemplata. Ex his uero duobus generibus visionum duo quoque descriptionum genera in sacro eloquio sunt formata. Vnum quo formis, et figuris, et similitudinibus rerum occultarum ueritas adumbratur. Aliud quo nude et pure sicut est absque integumento exprimitur. Cum itaque formis, et signis, et similitudinibus manifestatur quod occultum est, uel quod manifestum est describitur, symbolica demonstratio est: cum uero puro et nuda reprehelatione ostenditur, uel plana et aperta ratione docetur, anagogica.

The passage occurs immediately after the first of four citations of Dionysius in the In apocalypsim, the only text in which Richard refers to the pseudo-Areopagite. The context of Richard’s use of Hugh merely suggests that the former knew the Dionysian corpus through the latter.

\textsuperscript{554} Cf. e.g., Chase, Angelic Wisdom, 30.

\textsuperscript{555} Cf. Jean Châtillon, “Richard de Saint-Victor” in Dictionnaire de Spiritualité, 13, 602-603.
On the other hand, Richard’s citations of the Latin Dionysius—which certainly come from the version of Eriugena, and not that of Hilduina nor that of Sarrazin—represent a text which was either poorly read by Richard himself, or poorly transcribed\textsuperscript{556}. In some instances, Richard’s citations are mangled beyond sense:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PL 196, 687A6-11</th>
<th>PL 122 1037D1-1038C1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In sacratissimorum eloquiorum praeter radiatas illuminationes quando possibile est respiciemus symbolice nobis et analogice manifestas coelestium animorum, id est spirituum hierarchias, id est, quantum ad sensum caelestes pontificatus, quantum possimus considerabimus.</td>
<td>...in sacratissimorum eloquiorum patre traditas illuminationes, quantum possibile, respiciemus, et ab ipsi symbolice nobis et analogice manifestatas caelestium animorum hierarchias, quantum potentates sumus, considerabimus…</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Richard may have known and used Hugh’s commentary; however, Hugh did not have the same troubles with this passage as did Richard\textsuperscript{557}—thus Richard cannot have been using Hugh alone.

The other three citations of Dionysius in the \textit{In apocalypsim} show similar problems.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PL 194, 688A5-9</th>
<th>PL 122, 1039A7-10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Neque possibile est animum nostrum ad non materiale illam ascendere coelestium hierarchiarum et imitationem et contemplationem, nisi ea quae secundum ipsum est materiali manuductione utatur.</td>
<td>...neque possibile est nostro animo, ad immateriale illam ascendere caelestium hierarchiarum et imitationem et contemplationem, nisi ea, quae secundum ipsum est, materiali manuductione utatur…</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PL 194, 688C15-689A4</th>
<th>PL 122, 1043B8-C9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aliquando, inquit, theologi illi (id est, qui de scripturis diuinis loquentur) ipsam inuisibilem uidelicet sapientiam ex luminibus pretiosis laudant, ut solem justitiae, ut stellam matutinam, ut animum sancte orientem, ut lumen incircumuolute et inuisibiler resplendens. Aliquando uero et aliquando quidem ipsum ex luminibus pretiosis laudant, ut solem justitiae, ut stellam matutinam, in animum sancte orientem, et ut lumen incircumuolute et intellectualiter resplendens: aliquando uero ex mediis, ut ignem innocue splendentem, ut aquam uitalis plenitudinis datricem, et</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


\textsuperscript{557} Cf. PL 175, 938Dff.
ex mediis, ut ignem innocue splendentem, ut aquam uitalis plenitudinis datricem, et symbolice dicendum, id est, ut figuratiue dicantur in uentrem subuentem, fluminaque redundantem immensurabiliter refluentia: aliquando autem ex novissimis, ut unguentum suaeue, ut lapidem angularem. Sed et bestialem ipsi formam circumponunt, et leonis ei et pantherae specialitatem coaptant, et pardalem eam esse dicunt ut ursam saeviuentem. Addam, inquit, et quod omnium uilii est, esse et magis significare uisum est, quia est uermiss speciem ipsam seipsam circumformantem diuina sapientes (id est uipi theologi) tradiderunt.

PL 194, 759A1-8
Dignum, inquit, aestimo intellectuali cogitatione quia elquiorum (subauditur diuinorum) de angelis traditio milies milia ait. Et decem milia decies milies, secundum nos sublimissimos numerorum in seipsam seuoluens, et multiplicans, et per nos aperte significans innumerabiles caelestium essentiarum ordinationes.

PL 122, 1064C6-12
...dignum, ut aestimo, intellectuali cognitione, quia eloquiorum de angelis traditio milies milia esse ait, et decem milia decies milies, secundum nos sublimissimos numerorum in seipsam seuoluens et multiplicans, et per nos aperte significans innumerabiles caelestium essentiarum ordinationes.

The variants in Richard’s version generally do not match the version known to Hugh, nor do they allow one to determine which recension he knew with much certainty. Certain readings, however, are of interest. Speciem in place of specie at the end of the third citation is found in Clm², Dt, H, Li and Z. Clm² and Z are M manuscripts, while Dt, H and Li are T manuscripts which have corrections from an M manuscript closely related to Clm². Divina rather than diuini in the same citation is found in A, Av, Be, Bo, Bp, Fl, Li and Z. The first five are all A manuscripts, while Fl and Li are from the same group (T manuscripts corrected against M). Thus, Richard may have known a manuscript from the sub-family of T which is contaminated by M. However, none of the extant manuscripts
from this family follow Richard’s citations in all its variants and errors. Whether this is because Richard was unable to read his exemplar or this exemplar simply no longer exists is impossible to say.

A final point on Richard’s use of Dionysius is worth noting. Alongside the Versio Dionysii and Hugh’s commentary, Richard seems to have consulted Eriugena’s Expositiones. In his In apocalypsim, Richard explains the phrase ego sum uermis in Psalm 21:

Notate quod dicitur, quod omnium uiilius est, hoc magis uisum est significare, uermis uidelicet qui Christum significat, ubi ipse Christus per prophetam de se secundum carmem assumptam ait: Ego sum uermis. Sicut enim uermis sine coitu nascitur de terra, sic Christus sine uirili semine natus est de Maria.  

The comparison of the conception of Christ with the birth of a worm is absent from Hugh’s commentary, but is made at Expositiones, II, 1064-1071:

Diuni siquidem sapientes, id est theologi, tradiderunt, ipsum sapientiam in specie uermis seipsam formasse, eo loco fortassis ubi per prophetam loquitur: “Ego sum uermis et non homo”. Hoc enim intelligitur de Christo, qui de uirili semine non est natus sed, sicut uermis de simplici natura terre, ita ipse ex uiseribus perpetue uirginis et incontaminate carmem assumpsit.

3.5.5 William of Lucca, Alan of Lille, and the ‘Petite école porrétaine’  

558 PL 196, 689A5-9.  
559 Cf. Giulio D’Onofrio, The History of Theology II: Middle Ages, tr. Matthew J. O’Connell (Collegeville, Minnesota: Liturgical Press, 2008): 200: “The historians have overgeneralized in gathering all these men together as Porretans’ (theologians following the man from Poitiers) or the “School of Gilbert.” In fact, there is reason to perceive different attitudes among his most fervent admirers and defenders. At one end of the spectrum were those who maintained their own doctrinal autonomy and combined his remembered teaching with that of other masters of theology and logic (this group included John of Salisbury and Otto of Freising, but also Alan of Lille and Rudolph Glaber = “Rudolph the fervent”). Then there were disciples who were more open to his influence, but not in a consistent way (such as Simon of Tournai or Stephen Langton). Finally, there were the closest and most faithful disciples, men solidly dedicated to his
3.5.5.1 William of Lucca

Of William very little is known. His epitaph at the Cathedral in Bologna indicates that he died on the first of August, 1178, that he was a famous master of theology, and that he was from Lucca\textsuperscript{560}.

Augusti sibi prima dies fuit ultima uita
   Huius et ad uita iamprua prima fuit
Anno milleno centeno septuageno
   Octauo Domini mors sibi uita fuit…
Sacrae doctrinae titulis et honore magistri
   Lucens Italiciis Lucifer alter erat.

The obituary of Santa Maria di Reno indicates that William was a canon in Lucca, although the obituary does not indicate to which chapter he belonged\textsuperscript{561}.

---


\textsuperscript{561} Cf. Jeanneau, “Le commentaire,” 178, n. 4; Ferruccio Gastaldelli, \textit{Comentum in tertiam ierarchiam Dionisii que est de divinis nominibus. Introduzione e testo critico di teachi...
William’s *Comentum in tertiam Hierarchiam* is the only surviving work which is certainly authentic. William himself claims to have written a commentary on the *De ecclesiastica hierarchia: ...post secunde* (sic), *quam Ecclesiasticam dicunt, uigiles commentationes molto peruigilio desudatas, anxios nouosque labores aggredior*⁵⁶², and the obituary of Santa Maria di Reno attributes four books of sermons to this master⁵⁶³. However, none of these works has come down to us. The manuscript 614 of the Capitular Library of Lucca contains two treatises attributed to a certain William from Lucca: one on dialectic—*Summa dialectice artis*—and one on arithmetic—*De arithmetica compendiose tractata*⁵⁶⁴. These treatises may represent the work of the same William who wrote the *Comentum*, but this is not certain⁵⁶⁵.

Although so little is known of this master of Bologna, Gastaldelli has attempted to reconstruct his intellectual formation based largely on his preferred sources. Of course, the intellectual forces of the 12th century were Abelard and Lombard. Indeed, William seems to have been influenced by Abelard’s dialectic as well as Lombard’s sacred theology⁵⁶⁶. However, according to Gastaldelli, William’s preferred source was Boethius:

> In questo lavoro il vero maestro e ispiratore di Guglielmo è Boezio, «magnus ille

---

⁵⁶² Gastaldelli, *Comentum*, 3.
⁵⁶⁶ Cfr. Gastaldelli, *Comentum*, LXIII: “Con Abelardo Guglielmo ha in comune l’uso accentuato della dialettica... Quanto a Pietro Lombardo, le sue *Sententiae* offrono a Guglielmo alcune «quaestiones» cristologiche, negli ultimi paragrafi del secondo libro, sulle quali tuttavia il nostro autore innesta argomentazioni e conclusioni diverse.”
philosophus» «soporum maximus», al quale riserva insieme con Dionigi titoli di venerazione: «sanctus Boetius», «beatus Boetius», la cui autorità è messa quasi sullo stesso livello della sacra Scrittura\textsuperscript{567}.

His reliance upon Boethius—especially the \textit{Consolatio Philosophiae}, but also the commentaries on Aristotle and Porphyry and the theological \textit{opuscula}, the \textit{De trinitate} and the \textit{De hebdomadibus}, together with his interest in Plato’s \textit{Timaeus}, Cicero’s \textit{Somnium Scipionis} and Macrobius’ commentary, in Priscian’s \textit{Institutiones}, in Augustine and Eriugena place William squarely within the school of the \textit{Porretani}.

Da questa rapida analisi de fonti appare chiaro che Guglielmo si muove nell’ambito della scuola di Gilberto de la Porrée, non tanto della cosiddetta «piccola scuola porretana» che si proponeva di difendere il maestro dalle accuse di eresia formulate nel concilio di Reims del 1148, quanto piuttosto di quella scuola intesa in senso più largo, sviluppatisi tra il 1165 e il 1190, che pur senza citare esplicitamente Gilberto, si ispira ai suoi orientamenti epistemologici e metodologici\textsuperscript{568}.

His relationship with this ‘petite école porretani’ could explain William’s interest in the pseudo-Areopagite. As we have already seen, the earlier \textit{Porretani} held Dionysius in high regard, even if their knowledge of the pseudo-Areopagitic writings was indirect. However, Jeanneta\textsuperscript{569} has pointed out that William may not have been the most orthodox of \textit{Porretani}. For, William contradicts the master of Poitiers when he claims \textit{nihil est in Deo nisi Deus}\textsuperscript{570} and \textit{quicquid enim de Deo dicitur Deus est}\textsuperscript{571}. Gilbert explicitly denied this expression against his detractors\textsuperscript{572}. Both Jeanneta and Gastaldelli have defended William’s place in the ‘petite école’ by suggesting that William was attempting to correct

\textsuperscript{567} Gastaldelli, \textit{Comentum}, LXIV.
\textsuperscript{568} Gastaldelli, \textit{Comentum}, LXV.
\textsuperscript{570} Gastaldelli, \textit{Comentum}, 103.
\textsuperscript{571} Gastaldelli, \textit{Comentum}, 174.
\textsuperscript{572} Jeanneta, “Le commentaire,” 180.
his master\textsuperscript{573}. In any case, while one may accuse William “d’une sérieuse infidélité aux dogmes de l’École porrétaine\textsuperscript{574}”, his formation permits us to consider him a follower of the followers of Gilbert.

\subsection*{3.5.5.2 Date and circumstances of the Comentum in tertiam Ierarchiam}

William’s \textit{Comentum} is the last of the 12\textsuperscript{th}-century commentaries on the Corpus Areopagiticum. William’s reference to an episode in the life of Hildegard of Bingen provides a \textit{terminus a quo} for his \textit{Comentum}. In book two of his commentary, William mentions Hildegard’s exorcism of a Colognese woman, which event must have occurred between 1169 and 1170\textsuperscript{575}. The \textit{terminus ad quem} may be provided by William’s death in 1178. However, Gastaldelli gives this \textit{terminus} more precision by pointing out that Alexander III intervened in the question of Christological nihilism in 1177:

Per il «terminus ad quem» ho già indicato il 1177, come anno dell’intervento di Alessandro III nella questione del nihilismo cristologico, che chiuse ogni discussione sull’argomento. Dato che Guglielmo vi interviene e dice persino che la questione «era agitata» tra i teologi, bisogna supporre che il suo commento sia anteriore a questa data. Altrimenti non resta che quella della sua morte, avvenuta l’anno dopo\textsuperscript{576}.

William dedicates his commentary to a certain David, a monk at the Benedictine abbey at Lorsch, near Mayence. Apart from William’s commentary, this David is virtually unknown to history. The \textit{Chronicon Laureshamense} mentions a monk with this

\textsuperscript{574} Jeuneau, “Le commentaire,” 181.
\textsuperscript{575} Gastaldelli, \textit{Comentum}, 221, \textit{cf.} Introduction, XCII.
\textsuperscript{576} Gastaldelli, \textit{Comentum}, XCIII.
name at Lorsch in 1166. Nothing more of this David is known—that it was to this David that William dedicated his commentary is a mere possibility. Regardless of the identification of the David mentioned in William’s prologue, it was David’s _exhortatio_ which provided the impetus for the _Comentum_. It seems David was expected to read and criticize William’s commentary: _suffragator precor ut assis, itaque arbiter rigidus et trutine castigator dependentis examinis_.

The precise relationship between William and David—how did they come to know each other, why would William write a commentary for David?—is impossible to reconstruct with any certainty. William does seem to have travelled to Germany and visited the monastery at Lorsch, for, in his commentary, he describes the marsh and mosquitoes which surround the area. Whether William knew David before he visited Lorsch we cannot say.

### 3.5.5.3 The _Comentum in tertiam Ierarchiam_ and the _Versio Dionysii_

#### 3.5.5.3.1 The state of the text

William’s _Comentum_ survives in only one manuscript, currently preserved at the Bibliothèque Municipale in Troyes under the shelfmark 1003 ( _olum_ Clairvaux, F 16), and

---

577 MGH, S.S. 21, 449.
578 Gastaldelli, _Comentum_, 3.
579 Gastaldelli, _Comentum_, 4.
dated to the end of the 12th century. The Comentum in this manuscript is incomplete, terminating in the middle of book two of the De diuinis nominibus. It is difficult to tell whether William left the work incomplete or if the rest of the commentary has been lost. Gastaldelli points out that, given the length of William’s comments on books one and two (about 215 pages), the full commentary would have consisted of about 2000 pages.

### 3.5.5.3.2 The text of Dionysius

The length of such a task was not the only hindrance to its completion. William had difficulty with Eriugena’s Latin translation of the Corpus Areopagiticum. The foreign, Greek syntax made the Dionysian thought difficult to construe, and William suggested that the Corpus Areopagiticum ought to have been translated more in conformity with the rules of Latin: *Expeditius igitur illi latinitati deseruient conferuntque magis, qui sensum ex sensu uerbis romane professionis accommodis interpretantur*. The obscurity of the Versio Dionisii led William to manipulate his version of the corpus.

---


582 Gastaldelli (“Il manoscritto Troyes 1003,” 38) argues that the text found in Troyes 1003 was not left incomplete by its scribe: “Ciò lascia supporre che il commento di Guglielmo non è stato lasciato incompleto dal trascrittore, che si è fermato là dove si arrestava l’esemplare da cui copiava. Il commento di Guglielmo è dunque frammentario in questo codice, perché lo era già nell’antografo.”


584 Gastaldelli, *Comentum*, 221.

The most obvious and ubiquitous changes are those which rearrange the *ordo uerborum*.

De diu. nom. 109.10-11

υπέρκειται τῶν οὐσίων ἢ
ὑπερουσίωσ ἀπειρία καὶ
τῶν νοσῶν ἢ ὑπὲρ νοσῶν
ἐνότης.

PL 122, 1113C3-4
Comentum, 15

superat essentias superessentialis magnitudo
superessentialis magnitudo, superat essentias et anime
et animos super animum super animum unitas.

unitas.

Eriugena’s literalism in the *Versio* makes this passage difficult to understand. William has simply rearranged the first half of the phrase, putting it in direct order—subject, verb, object. But, unaware of the article before *super animum*, William is unsure how to construe the second half of the phrase. His *Comentum* offers two different interpretations:


While his second interpretation is rather successful, William’s hesitation prevents his changing the second half of the phrase as he did the first. These same rearrangements occur rather often in William’s text.

248, 13-14⁵⁸⁷

animorum uniuscuiusque diuina uniuscuiusque animorum respiciuntur
thearchicae bonitatis respiciuntur et diuina et inspiciuntur thearchicae bonitatis inspiciuntur

---

⁵⁸⁶ Comentum, 15.

⁵⁸⁷ The numbers used to cite William’s text in the tables which follow refer to the reconstruction of William’s version of the *Corpus Areopagiticum* in Gastaldelli’s “La traduzione,” 247-254.
William’s corrections are not always improvements over Eriugena’s translation. The Bolognese master clearly did not have a Greek manuscript with which to compare Eriugena’s Versio, nor did he have enough Greek to make use of such a manuscript had he possessed one.588

Perhaps the most interesting feature of William’s commentary is the fact that he changes texts mid-way through chapter two—beginning with the words idoneam sicut est verax589, William begins to use Hilduin’s translation. He gives no explanation for such a radical shift—as we have already seen, apart from Hilduin himself, Hincmar is the only

588 Cf. Gastaldelli, “La traduzione,” 191: “Guglielmo d’altra parte non ha la possibilità di confrontare la traduzione con un testo greco e non è molto più in là di una superficiale conoscenza della lingua greca”; and 194: “Malgrado i ragionamenti sulla lingua greca e sulla povertà dell latina, malgrado la civetteria tutta eriugeniana di usare spesso tecnicismi filosofici e retorici greci... e di trascrivere qualche parola greca, Guglielmo non dimostra di possedere la lingua greca al punto di valutare l’esattezza della traduzione, di sospettare una corruzione o una lacuna, di istituire un confronto con l’originale.”
589 Théry, Études dionysiennes II, 180, 11=PL 122, 1120 (quomodo est uerax).
medieval scholar to use the translation of Eriugena’s predecessor. One can imagine that William’s move from Eriugena to Hilduin was an attempt to avoid the difficulties of Eriugena’s Versio. However, if his changes to his base text are any indication, William found no more success with Hilduin than he did with Eriugena. His rearrangements of Hilduin’s translation are just as common as those of the Versio:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>William’s Translation</th>
<th>Eriugena’s Versio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>253, 234 intendere sursum in diuinus splendores, secundum uirtutem</td>
<td>Dionysiaca I, 70 2-3 secundum uirtutem in diuinus splendores sursum intendere</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>253, 235-237 festinamus que ibi iacent custodire in ipsis, tanquam quandam regulam optimam ueritatis, inmultiplicata et inminorata et inmutata</td>
<td>Dionysiaca I, 70 4-7 tanquam quandam regulam opvim am ueritatis, quae ibi iacent custodire in ipsis immultiplicata, et imminorata et immutata, festinamus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>253, 239-240 per multa de sermonibus ostendimuis in Theologicis Deformitationibus</td>
<td>Dionysiaca I, 71 3-4 in theologicis deformationibus per multa de sermonibus ostendimus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>254, 254-255 occultas et ineffabiles superstabilitates unitatis superarchane et superignote</td>
<td>Dionysiaca I, 74 4-5 superarchaneae et superignotae unitatis occultas et ineffabiles superstabilitates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>255, 256 sequentes sacros serones fantur</td>
<td>Dionysiaca I, 758-761 fantur sacros serones sequentes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The main characteristics of William’s commentary—the fact that he manipulated his text of Dionysius, and changed translations in the middle of chapter two—combined with the fact that the only surviving manuscript of the Comentum has been corrected by

---

590 Recalling, of course, that Eriugena’s Versio probably did not appear until after Hincmar had completed his Liber de praedestinatione.
no less than six hands\footnote{Cf. Gastaldelli, “Il manoscritto,” 41: “Questo complesso di interventi deve suddividersi tra il copista, che ha trascritto tutto il testo e poi l’ha corretto, e altre cinque mani di lettori che l’hanno variamente ritoccato e glossato.”} (including the copyist), make it extremely difficult to identify the version of the \textit{Versio} known to William.

In several studies, Gastaldelli compares the version of the \textit{Versio} known to William to the manuscripts \textit{Vr}\footnote{\textit{V} in Gastaldelli’s studies.}, \textit{Fl}\footnote{\textit{L} in Gastaldelli.}, Floss’ edition, Chevallier’s \textit{Dionysiaca}, and the 1556 Cologne edition. His conclusion in both his article on the translation of Dionysius which William used and in the introduction to his edition of William’s \textit{Comentum} suggests that William used a manuscript of Eriugena’s \textit{Versio} from the ‘second redaction’:

Il testo di Guglielmo si presenta collegato specialmente con VL. Ora L rappresenta il testo anastasiano, che è testimone sicuro della seconda redazione del DDN, basata, come ha già dimostrato il Dondaine, sul testo tramesso dal codice \textit{Troyes} 802, sul quale si basa a sua volta il ms. V. Appare pertanto abbastanza verosimile che Guglielmo ha usato un testo della redazione definitiva di Scoto. Tuttavia nel testo di Guglielmo compaiono diverse e notevoli varianti in comune con C, che rappresenta una redazione diversa da VL, che non può essere altro che la prima\footnote{Gastaldelli, “La traduzione,” 223-224.}.

The problem with Gastaldelli’s conclusion, as with his predecessors, is that he was unaware of the true relationship between the three (rather than two) redactions. Indeed, William does not seem to have used an \textit{M} manuscript—Gastaldelli’s study seems to support this. Nevertheless, of Gastaldelli’s five manuscripts, there is no representative from the \textit{A} recension—Floss generally reproduces \textit{M}, while Chevallier prints the text of the Cologne edition (with some corrections of his own), which latter generally follows \textit{T}. Further, while Gastaldelli’s two manuscripts, \textit{Fl} and \textit{Vr}, do, indeed, represent the \textit{T} recension, they are both peculiar representatives—\textit{Fl} belongs to the group of \textit{T}
manuscripts (together with H and Li) which are contaminated from M, and Vr belongs to the group of T manuscripts (together with T and Ct) which lack Anastasius’ translation of the scholia. Combined with the corrections found in the manuscript Troyes 1003, the unaccounted-for variants in William’s copy of the Versio⁵⁹⁵, and William’s own corrections of the Versio, make the identification of William’s version of the Latin Dionysius very difficult to identify.

3.5.5.4 Alan of Lille and the ‘petite école porrétaine’

William is the last 12th century master (and the only Porretanus) to have written a commentary on the Corpus Areopagitcum. For this reason, it becomes more difficult to determine the extent of the influence of the Versio Dionisii after 1178. Certainly, the later Porretani were as interested in Dionysius as were the earlier. However, the later school had access to the Periphyleon and the Expositiones, works from which they could have derived their Dionysian dogmata without ever reading the Dionysian corpus.

After William, Alan of Lille is perhaps the greatest witness to the Areopagitism of the 12th-century followers of Gilbert. Citations from the pseudo-Areopagite are peppered throughout Alan’s writings, but are most evident in his Summa quoniam homines. Many of Alan’s references to the pseudo-Areopagite leave no room for doubt—Alan took his citations from Eriugena’s translation (rather than from the translation of Hilduin or Sarrazin)⁵⁹⁶. However, Alan also knew Eriugena’s Expositiones:

⁵⁹⁶ Cf. Summa quoniam homines, 120, 1 (in P. Glorieux’s “La somme ‘Quoniam homines’ d’Alain de Lille” Archives d’histoire doctrinale et littéraire du Moyen Âge 28 (1953)) (=PL 122, 1044B10-12): ut Dionisii testatur eloquia, in porcos projicere
Theologia in duas distinguitur species: supercaelestem et subcaelestem, siue apotheticam et ypotheticam, ut testatur Johannes Scotus super Hierarchiam. Istae autem duae species originem habent ex duabus potentiss animae. Animae enim uarie sunt potentiae: una quae dicitur thesia, scilicet ratio, secundum quam potentiam homo in suo statu consideratur, nec suum statum egreditur quia ea humana et terrena considerat; alia est quae extasis nuncupatur, cuius speculacione homo extra se constituitur\textsuperscript{597}.

Alan also seems to have known the \textit{Periphyseon}\textsuperscript{598}. Thus, he would have had many sources from which he could have derived certain Dionysian teachings without having known the \textit{Versio}. Nevertheless, there are certain citations in Alan’s \textit{Summa} which can be found neither in the \textit{Periphyseon} nor in the \textit{Expositiones}\textsuperscript{599}.

Such citations do not make it certain that Alan knew the \textit{Versio} directly. Indeed, there was at least one apocryphal writing of Dionysian inspiration which was current among the later school of \textit{Porretani}, referred to simply as the \textit{Iohannes Scotus super Hierarchiam}\textsuperscript{600}. This treatise, essentially a series of five definitions (\textit{hierarchia}, \textit{theophania}, \textit{epiphania}, \textit{hyperphania} and \textit{hypophania}), was known to virtually all of the later \textit{Porretani}\textsuperscript{601}, and Alan wrote a commentary on the short treatise, the so-called "

\textit{invisibillum margaritarum inconfusum et luciforme beneficumque ortanum}; and 140, 9 (=PL 122, 1041C8-10): \textit{Idem ignoramus superessentialem Dei et invisibilem et ineffabilem infinitatem.}

\textsuperscript{597} \textit{Summa quoniam homines}, 121, 2; cf. Jeaneau, “Le renouveau,” 42.

\textsuperscript{598} Cf. \textit{Summa quoniam homines}, 127, 5a, 140, 9 and 154, 15; and Jeaneau, “Le renouveau,” 42 and note 82; strangely, Alan attributes the \textit{Periphyseon} to a certain Paul at 127, 5a—whether this error belongs to Alan or to a scribe is difficult to say.

\textsuperscript{599} For example, \textit{Summa quoniam homines}, 120, 1=PL 122, 1044B10-12; 125,4a=PL 122, 1125D4-6; 131, 6b=PL 122, 1139D7-10.


Hierarchia Alani. The super Hierarchiam has survived in no manuscript. Nor is the definition of theophania reported by Alan and his contemporaries to be found in any surviving work of Eriugena:

Est autem theophania ex consequentibus signis, non ex substantificis geniis, mentibus ab imaginibus defecatis superessentialiis et diffinitiue originis simpla et reciproca manifestatio\textsuperscript{602}.

Eriugena tends to prefer a simpler definition in his Periphyseon: \textit{hoc est comprehensibles intellectuali naturae quasdam diuinas apparitiones}\textsuperscript{603}, and \textit{Qui modus a graecis theophania (hoc est dei apparitio) solet appellari}\textsuperscript{604}. Alan’s commentary on the ‘Eriugenian’ super Hierarchiam also recognizes a few new orders to the angelic ranks, including an \textit{antiuirtutes}\textsuperscript{605} and an \textit{antiangeli}\textsuperscript{606}, neither of which occurs anywhere in the accepted Eriugenian canon.

\textbf{3.6 Conclusion}

\textsuperscript{602} d’Alverny, Alain de Lille, 228.
\textsuperscript{603} Periphyseon, I, 180-181.
\textsuperscript{604} Periphyseon I, 190-191.
\textsuperscript{605} d’Alverny, Alain de Lille, 234: \textit{De antiuirtutis. Huic ordini oppositum est quoddam collegium demonum ministerio quorum fiunt prestigia ad homines illudendum. De eorum conuentu erunt illi qui prestigiis et diuinationibus intendunt. Ordinem autem predictum insinuat primus articulus descriptionis, cum dicitur: «nature legibus occurrrens». Predicti enim angeli in hoc nature legibus occurrunt quod praeter legem nature multa miracula faciunt.}
\textsuperscript{606} d’Alverny, Alain de Lille, 235: \textit{De antiangeli. Huic ordini oppositus est conuentus demonum qui minus abhominabilia, tamen falsa de Deo hominibus suggerunt. De hoc ordine erunt minores haeretici qui per maiores decipiuntur; istos duas ordines insinuant duo sequentes articuli predictae descriptionis, cum dicitur: archana caelestia pro discreta capacitate reuelans. Hoc enim ad angelos et ad archangelos pertinet. Et de istis ista sufficeant.}
It is difficult to explain the Dionysian renewal of the 12th century after almost two centuries of silence. One suspects that the Dionysian renewal was simply a function of the Eriugenan renewal. The Areopagitism of the Porretani—both early and late—may provide evidence of this link between the Eriugenan and Dionysian renewals. For in both periods the followers show signs of having read Dionysius only through the eyes of Eriugena. Hugh and Sarrazin are certainly aware of Eriugena and use both his translation and his Expositiones in their interpretation of the pseudo-Areopagite. Nevertheless, neither places Eriugena next to Saint Denys as an authority as do the Porretani.

It is perhaps better to suggest that the Eriugenanism of the Porretani was an accident of their Dionysianism. For, given the connections between these several schools (St. Victor, Chartres, St. Denis, Laon), one suspects that the Dionysian renewal was an organic growth. Clerval’s suggestion that interest in Dionysius began with Fulbert may be inaccurate, but the followers of Gilbert (the first Porretanus) clearly had a taste for the teachings of the pseudo-Areopagite. John of Salisbury could have developed his own taste for Dionysius during his studies at Chartres in the 1130s or 1140s. John of Salisbury and John Sarrazin would most likely have met at this point.607 Perhaps John of Salisbury brought Sarrazin to the Corpus Areopagiticum; perhaps Sarrazin brought John of Salisbury to it. In any case, by the time John of Salisbury returned to England, he had already caught the bug, and certainly could have passed it on to Alan of Lille while the latter was in the circle of Thomas Becket. Such personal connections between all of these masters makes it tempting to suggest that their Areopagitism was passed from one

---

607 Théry’s suggestion—that the two Johns met in France—seems more economical than Jeaneau’s—that they met in Italy—since we know for certain that both Johns were in France in the early- or mid-1100s, whereas, it cannot be shown with any certainty that Sarrazin was from Italy.
school to the other and did not represent independent developments. However, this can only be confirmed by further study of these schools and their masters.
Chapter Four
Eriugena’s Areopagitism

4.1 State of the Question

The question of Eriugena’s relationship to the pseudo-Areopagite is a delicate matter, which is easily misunderstood or misrepresented. For over a century, scholars have approached the question from one of two perspectives. The first attempts to answer the question, “how dependent upon the Dionysian writings was the Irishman?” The second addresses the question, “how faithful was Eriugena to the Dionysian system?”

It is generally recognized by the scholars who take the first approach that “[n]o philosopher was ever less original, in the narrower sense, than Eriugena. It would be easy to find in the pseudo-Areopagite, Maximus, Origen, Gregory of Nyssa, and Augustine, a source for almost every single thought in the Scot’s system.”\(^{608}\) Thus, the question of Eriugena’s dependence has become a question of his relative dependence: is he more dependent on Dionysius than he is on Maximus or Gregory or Augustine? Bett, himself, weighed in on the question in favor of Augustine:

The plain fact is that Eriugena got all the Neoplatonist substance of his philosophy out of Augustine, and when he met with the pseudo-Dionysius he found (and was doubtless delighted to find) the philosophic doctrine which he had already made his own wrought out in more detail, with more system, and with the supreme authority of one who was an associate of the Apostles.\(^ {609}\)

“Next to Augustine”, Bett continues,

\(^{608}\) Henry Bett, Johannes Scotus Eriigena, a Study in Medieval Philosophy(Cambridge: University Press, 1925), 164-165; Hauréau goes so far as to call Eriugena “un autre Proclus à peine Chrétien,” Histoire de la philosophie scholastique I, 13-114.

\(^{609}\) Bett, Johannes Scotus, 160; the italics are Bett’s.
Eriugena unquestionably owes most to Gregory of Nyssa, and the whole of his indebtedness is to the one work entitled, *On the Creation of Man*, περί κατασκευῆς ἄνθρωπος, which he consistently quotes as *De imagine*.\(^{610}\)

Although Bett presents his position that “Eriugena’s dependence upon the Fathers is mainly upon Gregory in the East, and upon Augustine in the West” as a sort of corrective to an over-emphasis on the role of Dionysius, Bett’s position in 1925 is simply that of Staudenmaier in 1834:

> Der größte unter allen Kirchenvätern, wenn wie auf Liebe und Kraft des Geistes, auf Innigkeit und Stärke des Gefühls, auf Feuer und Macht des Willens, so wie auf das Vermögen zur Speculation und Dialektik hinsehen, ist Augustinus.\(^{611}\)

This emphasis on the role of Augustine and Gregory of Nyssa in the system of Eriugena was shared by many scholars of the late 19\(^{th}\) and early 20\(^{th}\) centuries, including Christlieb\(^{612}\), Huber\(^{613}\) and Dräseke\(^{614}\).

---

\(^{610}\) Bett, *Johannes Scotus*, 162.

\(^{611}\) Franz Anton Staudenmaier, *Johannes Scotus Eriigena und die Wissenschaft seiner Zeit* (Frankfurt, 1834), 274; Staudenmaier adds, in a footnote, “Was ihm Gregor von Nazianz für das Morgenland ist, das ist ihm Augustinus für das Abendland,” 274, n. 3. However, Staudenmaier has followed Eriugena in his intermittent error of referring the Gregory of Nyssa as Gregory the Theologian, a name usually referring to Gregory of Nazianzen. Staudenmaier refers to *Periphyseon IV*, 2642-2645 (804C), where Eriugena remarks: Scientes praeter sanctos Apostolos nullum apud Graecos fuisse in expositionibus divinæ scripturæ majoris auctoritatis Gregorio theologo, nullum apud Romanos Aurelio Augustino. The *theologus* to whom this passage refers is clearly Gregory of Nyssa, whose doctrine on the corporeal existence of the first man is considered by Eriugena in the previous lines.

\(^{612}\) Theodor Christlieb (*Leben und Lehre des Johannes Scotus Eriigena* (Gotha, 1860), 385) claims that Eriugena found his doctrine on evil in Augustine (as opposed to the famous book four of the *De diuinis nominibus*, which discusses evil at length in the context of the divine name Good).

\(^{613}\) Cf. *Johannes Scotus Eriigena* (Munich, 1861), 428: “Ein Blick auf das System überzeugt uns sogleich, daß darin ein neuplatonischer Grundton durchklinge, daß seine allgemeine Basis nicht von Eriugena selbst gelegt, sondern ererbte sei. Zwar knüpft er nicht unmittelbar an die Neuplatoniker an, gewiß hat er keine von ihren Schriften gelesen und wenn er auch die vorzüglichsten Namen dieser Schule kennen würde, obwohl er sie
In more recent years, Robert Crouse, Stephen Gersh, Goulven Madec, John J. O’Meara and Brian Stock (amongst others) have amply addressed Bett’s complaint that “Eriugena’s indebtedness to Augustine has never been sufficiently emphasized.”

The problem with Bett’s critique of Eriugena’s dependence on his sources (and, par conséquence, the critiques of Bett’s predecessors) is that Bett has not clearly stated


his criteria for claiming the superiority of one source over another. Within the last half-century, Jeuneau and Sheldon-Williams have provided some systematization to the question—both scholars, incidentally, arguing in favor of a stronger influence of Dionysius over Gregory of Nyssa (as well as Augustine, in the case of Sheldon-Williams).

According to Jeuneau, there are two possible approaches to the comparative value of Eriugena’s sources: the quantitative and the qualitative. The former, according to Jeuneau, is less significant than the latter. Nevertheless, a glance at the numbers may help to explain how Gregory of Nyssa had taken the lead position among Eriugena’s Greek sources:

In the Floss edition, the *Periphyseon* itself occupies 589 columns. Of this total, quotations from Maximus the Confessor (*Ambigua ad Iohannem* only) fill 9 columns, those from Dionysius 10, and those from Gregory of Nyssa 15. In other words, the quotations from Maximus represent 1.55% of Eriugena’s text, those from Dionysius 1.69%, and those from Gregory of Nyssa 2.66%. The comparison is unquestionably in favor of Gregory of Nyssa. Now, if we compare the percentages of each of these Greek texts quoted in the *Periphyseon*, the predominance of Gregory of Nyssa is still more remarkable: while only 5% of Maximus’s *Ambigua ad Iohannem* was used in Eriugena’s major work and only 6.5% of Dionysius’s *Opera*, as much as 25% of Gregory of Nyssa’s *De imagine* was quoted.

These numbers may signify a greater dependence on Gregory of Nyssa. Nevertheless, they may equally indicate that Eriugena “did not assimilate [Gregory’s] thought as completely as he did that of Dionysius or that of Maximus.”

---

622 Jeuneau, “Pseudo-Dionysius, Gregory of Nyssa, and Maximus the Confessor…” 144.
623 Jeuneau, “Pseudo-Dionysius, Gregory of Nyssa, and Maximus the Confessor…” 144.
dismissed the quantitative method, Jeauneau falls into the same problems as Bett and his predecessors. For, according to Jeauneau,

...among the three Greek Fathers with whom we are dealing, the one who exerted the strongest influence on John Scottus was probably Maximus the Confessor. Yet, the influence of Dionysius was of the first importance: he it was who awakened John Scottus and kept him from dropping off over his Latin texts. But it is Maximus who, eventually, finished the work begun by Dionysius. The Dionysius whom John Scottus read was a Dionysius revised and corrected by Maximus.624

The problem remains: what technical difference is there between “the strongest influence” and the influence “of the first importance”? If the Dionysius known to Eriugena was Maximus’ Dionysius, which of these two sources is more important? Furthermore, as Sheldon-Williams has pointed out,

[those elements in Dionysius’s teaching in which Maximus, who is more of an Aristotelian than a Platonist, was least interested were precisely those which fascinated Eriugena, namely those which express the Neoplatonism of the school of Proclus.625

Indeed, the quantitative approach will only work if it is recognized that Eriugena read his authorities as confirming the teachings of one another, even in instances where they are in contradiction. The most obvious cases are those where Augustine and Dionysius are in disagreement, such as regarding divine omnipresence, which is direct according to Augustine, and mediated or hierarchical according to the pseudo-Areopagite.626 According to Jeauneau, Eriugena saw no contradiction between these two fathers, and, in fact, used the De mystica theologia of Dionysius to support the position of

624 Jeauneau, “Pseudo-Dionysius, Gregory of Nyssa, and Maximus the Confessor…” 147.
625 “Eriugena’s Greek Sources”, 6.

Augustine. Nevertheless, Sheldon-Williams is correct to point out that, where his sources contradict one another, one or the other is bound to be misrepresented in the attempt to make them agree. Thus, in response to Bett and his “lavish use of italics”, Sheldon-Williams retorts,

‘the plain fact is’ that Eriugena constantly misrepresents St Augustine, for whereas St Augustine’s thought was always moving away from Neoplatonism, Eriugena’s is moving into it, and St Augustine is made to approximate to the Pseudo-Dionysius rather than the opposite.

Weighing Eriugena’s sources against one another in hopes that one will reveal itself heavier than the others has had little success. On the other hand, the direction which Sheldon-Williams has given the question—an examination of how Eriugena resolves the inherent differences in his sources—has been developed in recent years in articles by Guilio d’Onofrio and J.C. Marler, amongst others. Until Eriugena’s ‘Hermeneutic of Disagreement’ in his sources is fully understood, the attempt to determine which of his sources was the most influential, significant or important will yield no fruit.

While it remains impossible to determine which of Eriugena’s sources influenced the Irishman most, certain scholars in the recent past have approached the question of

---

627 Jeuneau, “Pseudo-Dionysius, Gregory of Nyssa, and Maximus the Confessor…” 145.
628 “Eriugena’s Greek Sources,” 5.
Eriugena’s Areopagism through the question of his faithfulness to Dionysius. René Roques has been at the forefront of this movement, concentrating on Eriugena’s *Versio Dionysii* and *Expositiones*. Following Théry’s work on Eriugena’s translation of the Dionysian corpus, Roques published in the 1970s a series of lectures on Eriugena’s peculiar translations of certain key Dionysian terms in the *De caelesti hierarchia*. We have seen already, in chapter three, that Eriugena mistranslates the pseudo-Areopagite’s description of scripture as ἀπεξεραγμένος, giving the Latin, *valde artificialiter*. Roques argues that Eriugena intentionally mistranslated this Greek adverb, which, as a description of scripture, contradicted Eriugena’s own teaching regarding the Liberal Arts.

Selon cette interprétation, la doctrine érigénienne des *artes liberales*, indissociables du φῶς et de l’Écriture, se trouvait contredite, menacée et, puisqu’il s’agissait de l’autorité de Denys, condamnée. En conséquence, Erigène n’a ni pu ni voulu, comme Hilduin, lire et traduire littéralement ἀπεξεραγμένος; d’où la traduction *valde artificialiter* qu’il ne justifie nulle part, mais qu’il commentera directement, comme allant de soi, dans le sens de sa propre doctrine des arts libéraux. Le philosophe et, déjà, l’*expositor* en puissance s’est impost à l’*interpres*.

Roques also points out Eriugena’s conflation of the Dionysian divisions between affirmative and negative theology, on the one hand, and similar and dissimilar symbols, on the other hand, within the context of Eriugena’s fidelity to the pseudo-Areopagite.

Il a même souligné avec plus d’insistance et de vigueur que Denys que les deux oppositions, bien que situées en apparence à deux niveaux différents, n’étaient en réalité que l’expression et la solution ébauchée d’un seul et unique problème.

---

632 *Cf. supra* 143.
634 Roques, “Traduction ou interprétation?,” 127; *cf.* also “Tératologie et théologie,” 13ff.
The unfortunate result of situating such a study within the context of the question of Eriugena’s faithfulness to Dionysius is the inevitable misrepresentation of the Eriugenian system itself. Roques acknowledges Eriugena’s deliberate mistranslation of Dionysius in the first case. Nevertheless, he concludes that, while “le commentaire érigénien déborde ou prolonge la pensée de Denys, mais dans un sens qui, pour être très typiquement érigénien, n’eût certainement pas été désavoué par Denys.”

Roques’ conclusion is not inaccurate. It is, rather, shortsighted. The result of Eriugena’s adjustments of the Dionysian system (whether they are intended to make the pseudo-Areopagite accommodate Eriugena’s own thought or that of Augustine, Maximus or Gregory) must not be considered Dionysian (nor Augustian, Maximian, Cappadocian, etc.). They are precisely Eriugenian. In this sense, Eriugena’s philosophy, which is indeed dependent on Dionysius, must be examined for what it is—an original combination of sources, which are sometimes in disagreement (even in contradiction) with one another.

When Eriugena is dependent on the Pseudo-Dionysius, which he is most of the time whether explicitly or implicitly, his interpretation always carries overtones derived from one or other of these subsidiaries. It is the subtle harmonization of these overtones with the central melody that constitutes the virtue of Eriugena’s philosophy, which is neither Augustinian nor Dionysian, nor that of Maximus nor of Gregory, but a new thing.

Thus, the state of the question is the following: until recently, Eriugenan scholars have attempted to define the Irishman’s philosophy by weighing the balance of his sources against one another, and determining the degree to which he has faithfully incorporated those sources into his system. However, this approach, in each case, is

---

635 Roques, “Traduction ou interpretation?,” 100.
backwards. We must first establish the nature of Eriugena’s philosophy before dissecting it into its various elements.

This is the approach taken by the philosophic chapters (V, Creation; VI, Anthropology; and VII, Christ and Salvation) of Paul Rorem’s 2005 study of Eriugena’s Expositiones. Rorem keeps Eriugena’s sources and translation practices within sight, while recognizing that the goal is Eriugena, not Dionysius nor any other father. The result is a picture of Eriugena’s philosophy, in which the various elements of which it is composed are evident. And it is this approach which we will take in the rest of this chapter.

4.2 Apophasis

4.2.1 Dionysius

In chapter seven of the De diuinis nominibus, Dionysius poses the question: how can we know what is subject neither to intellect nor to sense, and which may not even be called a being? We do not know God’s nature, he answers, for it is unknowable and above reason and intellect. Nevertheless, we move upwards, from the order of all things which proceeds from the divine, which procession possesses a kind of image or similarity of the divine paradigms, into that which is above all, who is the negation of all, the transcendence above all and the cause of all.

---

637 Eriugena’s Commentary on the Dionysian Celestial Hierarchy, Studies and Texts 150 (Toronto: Pontifical Institute of Medieval Studies, 2005).
638 If knowledge is of being, then what is above being is above all knowledge, Cf. DN 115.16-18; Εἴ γὰρ αἱ γνώσεις πᾶσαι τῶν ὄντων εἶσι καὶ εἰς τὰ ὄντα τὸ πέρας ἔχουσιν, ἥ πάσης οὐσίας ἐπέκεινα καὶ πάσης γνώσεως ἐστιν ἐχθρημένη.
God is known by us, according to Dionysius, through his causal activity and his created effects. As the cause of all, then, God is known through and named by all the names of his created effects. Επειδή δὲ ὡς ἀγαθότητος ὑπαρξὶς αὐτῶ τῷ εἶναι πάντων ἐστὶ τῶν ὄντων αἰτία, τὴν ἀγαθαρχίκην τῆς θεορχίας πρόνοιαν ἐκ πάντων τῶν αἰτιατῶν ὑμνητέον. It is in this sense that Dionysius asserts that God is the essence of all beings. τὸ γὰρ εἶναι πάντων ἐστὶν ἡ ὑπὲρ τὸ εἶναι θεότης.

Nevertheless, as cause of all beings, God is not, himself, a being. αἰτίον μὲν τοῦ εἶναι πάσιν, αὐτὸ δὲ μὴ ὃν ως πάσης ύποσίας ἐπέκεινα. Thus, with regard to created beings, God is nothing. πάντων μὲν ἐστὶ τῶν ὄντων αἰτίου, αὐτὸ δὲ οὐδὲν ως πάντων ὑπερουσίως ἐξηρημένου.

The causality and transcendence of God lead Dionysius to two different ways of theology. Because God is the cause of all, he receives every name; and cataphatic or affirmative theology names God by every name taken from created reality. Because God transcends all of his effects, no name taken from reality can comprehend him; and

---

639 DN VII, 197.17-198.3.
640 DN I, 117.11-13; Cf. also MT I, 143.3-4: Δέον ἐπ’ αὐτῇ καὶ πάσας τὰς τῶν ὄντων τιθέναι καὶ καταφάσκειν θέσεις, ως πάντων αἰτία...
641 CH III, 20.16-17.
642 DN I, 109.15-16.
643 DN I, 117.3-4.
apophatic or negative theology denies every name of God. Thus, for Dionysius, God is both nameless and receives every name. Οὔτως οὖν τῇ πάντων αἰτία καὶ ὑπὲρ πάντα οὕς καὶ τὸ ἀνώυμων ἐφαρμόσει καὶ πάντα τὰ τῶν ὄντων ὄνόματα...

The Corpus Areopagitcum is based on a dialectic between these two theologies. The treatises which use cataphasis rather than apophasis follow a downward motion. Κάκει μὲν ἀπὸ τοῦ ἄνω πρὸς τὰ ἔσχατα κατιῶν ὁ λόγος κατὰ τὸ ποσὸν τῆς καθόδου πρὸς ἀνάλογον πλῆθος ηὔρυνετο. The De diuinis nominibus, for example, begins with the highest, most universal and dignified names of the divine—Good, Being, Life, Wisdom—and ends with the names which are conceptually narrower—Holy of Holies, King of Kings, Lord of Lords, God of Gods. And the De caelesti hierarchia begins with the names of the highest triad of the hierarchy—Seraphim, Cherubim and Thrones—moving downward through the middle ranks—Dominions, Powers and Authorities—ending with the lowest triad—Virtues, Archangels and Angels.

The descent of cataphasis is paralleled by the ascent of apophasis. νῦν δὲ ἀπὸ τῶν κάτω πρὸς τὸ ὑπερείμενον ἀνιῶν κατὰ τὸ μέτρον τῆς ἀνόδου συστέλλεται καὶ μετὰ πάσαν ἀνόδον ὅλως ἄφωνος ἐσται καὶ ὅλως ἐνωθήσεται τῶν ἀφθέγκτω. The De mystica theologia, the only strictly apophatic treatise in the Dionysian corpus, moves upwards, negating the names affirmed by the cataphatic treatises, beginning with the negations of the negations, non-existent, non-living,
irrational and unintellectual, and ending with the denial of the dialectic itself: οὐτε ἔστιν αὐτῆς καθόλου θέσις οὔτε αφαίρεσις.\textsuperscript{647}

The Dionysian dialectic follows the ontological motions of procession and return. For, the affirmations of cataphatic theology do not name the divine himself, who is above all names, but refer to his processions.

Τοσοῦτον δὲ ὑπομνήσαμεν, ὅτι τῶν λόγων σκοπὸς ὑπὲρτοῦν ὑποίποι, ἐκφαίνειν, ἀρρητοῖν γὰρ τὸ τοῦτο καὶ ἀγνωστὸν ἐστὶ καὶ παντελῶς ἀνέκφαντον καὶ σύντον ὑπεραίρου τὴν ἐνωσίν, ἀλλὰ τὴν ὑψιστοῦν εἰς τὰ οὕτα πάντα τῆς θεαρχῆς ὑσιαρχίας πρόοδον ὑμνήσαι.\textsuperscript{648}

The path of apophatic theology, on the other hand, leads to a return to the cause of all in a kind of unification or henosis: τὰς αἰσθήσεις ἀπόλειπε καὶ τὰς νοερὰς ἐνεργείας καὶ πάντα αἰσθήτα καὶ νοητὰ καὶ πάντα οὐκ ὄντα καὶ ὄντα καὶ πρὸς τὴν ἐνωσίν, ὡς ἐφικτόν, ἀγνώστους ἀνατάθητε τοῦ ὑπὲρ πᾶσαν οὕσιαν καὶ γνῶσιν.\textsuperscript{649}

\textbf{4.2.2 Eriugena}

Eriugena's incorporation of the Dionysian teaching on the two theologies in his \textit{Periphyseon} shows that he understood well the doctrine of apophasis. For Eriugena, as for Dionysius, theology has two parts.

Aut si quis de ea disputare coeperit, necessario multis modis multisque argumentationibus uerisimile suadebit, duabus principalibus theologiae partibus.

\textsuperscript{647} MT V, 150.5.
\textsuperscript{648} DN V, 180.9-13; cf. also, DN I, 112.7-10: Τάυτα πρὸς τῶν θείων λογίων μεμυμηθε. Καὶ πᾶσαν, ὡς εἰπέν, τὴν ἱεράν τῶν θεολόγων ὑμνολογίαν εὐρήσεις πρὸς τὰς ἀγαθοργοὺς τῆς θεαρχῆς πρόοδους ἐκφαντορικῶς καὶ ὑμνητικῶς τὰς θεωνυμίας διασκευάζουσαν.
\textsuperscript{649} MT I, 142.6-9.
utens, affirmatiua quidem, quae a graecis ΚΑΤΑΦΑΤΙΚΗ dicitur, et abnegatiua, quae ΑΠΟΦΑΤΙΚΗ uocatur. Vna quidem, id est ΑΠΟΦΑΤΙΚΗ, diuinam essentiam seu substantiam esse aliquid eorum quae sunt, id est quae dici aut intelligi possunt, negat; altera uero, ΚΑΤΑΦΑΤΙΚΗ, omnis quae sunt de ea prae dicat, et ideo affirmatiua dicitur, non ut confirmaret aliquid esse eorum quae sunt, sed omnia quae ab ea sunt de ea posse prae dicari suadeat.

Eriugena acknowledges that affirmative theology is founded on God’s causality,

Rationabiliter enim per causatiua causalis potest significari. Dicit enim esse ueritatem, bonitatem, essentiam, lucem, iustitiam, solem, stellam, spiritum, aquam, leonem, ursum, uermem, et caetera innumerabilia.

and that negative theology is based on God’s transcendence.

Eo igitur vocabulo deum uocari necesse est, qui solus negatione omnium quae sunt pro pie innuitur, quia super omne quod dicitur et intelligitur exaltatur, qui nullum eorum quae sunt et quae non sunt est, qui melius nesciendo scitur.

Eriugena recognizes that the two theologies are intimately connected. Through *apophasis* we deny precisely those names we once affirmed through *cataphasis*.

Omnibus enim significatibus quas ΚΑΤΑΦΑΤΙΚΗ diuinatatem induit ΑΠΟΦΑΤΙΚΗ eam spoliare non nescit. Vna enim dicit ‘sapientia est’, uerbi gratia, eam induens; altera dicit ‘sapientia non est’, eandem exuens.

Nevertheless, Eriugena notes that the two methods are not contradictory. *Vna igitur dicit hoc uocari potest*, sed non dicit ‘hoc pro pie est’; altera dicit ‘hoc non est’, quamuis et hoc appellari potest.

---

650 Periphyseon I, 678-688.
651 Periphyseon I, 688-689.
652 Periphyseon III, 2797-2801.
653 Periphyseon I, 838-841.
654 Periphyseon I, 841-843.
While Eriugena understands the Dionysian teaching, his incorporation of *apophasis* into his own philosophy expands the significance of this teaching quite beyond what Dionysius claimed for the method.

Eriugena begins his transformation of the Dionysian teaching by expanding the significance of the pair of opposites: being and non-being. Whereas for Dionysius these two terms simply refer to two aspects of the divine, the manifest and the hidden, for Eriugena the whole of nature may be divided into being and non-being.

Saepe mihi cogitanti diligentiusque quantum uires suppetunt inquirenti rerum omnium quae ul animo percipi possunt uel intentionem eius superant primam summamque divisionem esse in ea quae sunt et in ea quae non sunt horum omnium generale vocabulum occurrit quod graece ΦΥΣΙΣ, latine uero natura uocitatur.655

Eriugena follows the Dionysian parallel between being and manifestation, on the one hand, and non-being and hiddenness, on the other. For, according to Eriugena there are five ways to understand this distinction. In the first way, all that is graspable by either sense or intellect may be said to be, while what is ungraspable is non-being.

Quorum primus uidetur esse ipse per quem ratio suadet omnia quae corporeo sensui uel intelligentiae perceptioni succumbunt uere ac rationabiliter dici esse, ea uero quae per excellantiam suae naturae non solum sensum sed etiam omnem intellectum rationemque fugiunt iure uideri non esse... 656

Eriugena explains this first interpretation of the division of nature by introducing the Aristotelian/pseudo-Augustinian categories. For, there is nothing in created reality which does not fit into one or another of the ten categories657. However, the categories are

655 *Periphyseon* I, 1-6.
656 *Periphyseon* I, 53-57.
657 *Periphyseon* I, 887-893: *Aristoteles, acutissimus apud graecos, ut aiunt, naturalium rerum discretionis repertor, omnium rerum quae post deum sunt et ab eo creata innumerabiles varietates in decem uniuersalibus generibus conclusit, quae decem
limited to what is subject to the senses or to intellect. Thus, as Augustine says, the power of the categories leaves off where theology begins.

Sed, ut ait sanctus pater Augustinus in libris de triniteate, dum ad theologiam (hoc est ad diuinæ essentiae investigationem) peruenitur, kategoriarum uirtus omnino extinguitur. Nam in ipsis naturis a deo conditis motibusque eorùm kategoriae qualiscunque sit potentia præualet, in ea uero natura quæ nec dici nec intelligi potest per omnia in omnibus deficit. 658

Thus the division of nature into being and non-being, where the former signifies the intelligible and the latter signifies the superintelligible, parallels the division between the categorical and the supercategorical. In this sense the division between categorical and non-categorical parallels the two theologies, cataphatic and apophatic, respectively.

For, categorical names may be used to describe the divine metaphorically.

Attamen, ut praediximus, quemadmodum fere omnia quæ de natura conditarum rerum proprie praedicantur de conditore rerum per metaphoram significandi gratia dici possunt, ita etiam kategoriarum significations, quæ proprie in rebus conditis dinoscuntur, de causa omnium non absurde possunt proferri, non ut proprie significant quid ipsa sit, sed ut translatiue quid de ea nobis quodam modo eam inquirentibus probabiliter cogitandum est suadeant. 659

Eriugena’s introduction of the ten categories is an original application of Dionysian apophasis and demonstrates Eriugena’s general principle—his authorities (in this case, Dionysius and Augustine) may contradict neither one another nor uera ratio, Eriugena’s perferred authority. Nor does this use of the categories to explain the division between being and non-being and the incomprehensibility of God significantly change the Dionysian doctrine of apophasis.

---

kategorias (id est praedicamenta) uocavit. Nihil enim in multitudine creatorum rerum uariisque animorum motibus inueniri posset quod in aliquo praedictorum generum includi non possit.
659 Periphyseon I, 908-915.
However, the parallel between categorical/cataphatic and non-categorical/apophatic breaks down when Eriugena introduces the teaching of Gregory Nazianzen (through Maximus Confessor\(^{660}\)) on the intelligibility of ΟΥΣΙΑ as a category. For, like the divine thearchy, the first category cannot be defined *quid sit*, but only *quia est*.

ΟΥΣΙΑΝ per se ipsam diffinire et dicere quid sit nemo potest... ΟΥΣΙΑ itaque nullo modo diffinitur quid est, sed diffinitur quia est. Ex loco nanque, ut diximus, et tempore accidentibusque alis, quae siue in ipsa seu extra intelliguntur esse, tantummodo datur non quid sit sed quia est. Et hoc generaliter de omni ΟΥΣΙΑ, siue generalissima, siue specialissima, siue media non incongrue quis dixerit. Nam et causa omnium, quae deus est, ex his quae ab ea condita sunt solummodo cognoscitur esse, nullo uero creaturarum argumento possimus intelligere quid sit\(^{661}\).

Thus, the categorical is not the same as the intelligible, and on this interpretation ΟΥΣΙΑ falls rather on the side of non-being than of being.

...ea uero quae per excellentiam suae naturae non solum sensum sed etiam omnem intellectum rationemque fugiunt iure uideri non esse, quae non nisi in solo deo et in omnium rerum quae ab eo condita sunt rationibus atque essentiiis recte intelliguntur. Nec immerito. Ipse nanque omnium essentia est, qui solus uere est, ut ait Dionysius Ariopagita: “Esse enim”, inquit, “omnium est super esse diuinitas”. Gregorius etiam theologus multis rationibus nullam substantiam seu essentiam siue visibilis siue invisibilis creaturae intellectu uel ratione comprehendi posse confirmat.\(^{662}\)

Thus, Eriugena adds a new element, which changes the original Dionysian doctrine significantly. Like the divine thearchy, όυσια, the first of the ten categories, cannot be defined *quid est* but only *quia est*\(^{663}\).

---


\(^{661}\) *Periphyseon* I, 1911-1924.

\(^{662}\) *Periphyseon* I, 55-64.

\(^{663}\) *Periphyseon* I, 1912-1924.
Gregory Nazianzen’s suggestion that no *essentia* whatsoever is comprehensible, together with Dionysius’ claim that God is the *essentia* of all things, leads Eriugena to attribute the same incomprehensibility to created essences as characterizes the creator of all essence. Dionysius’ negative theology has become, in the *Periphyseon*, “a most radical and complex *meontology*”, where *apophasis* is not so much a function of the transcendence of the One (as it is for Dionysius) but of the transcendence of each hierarchic *taxis* over its immediate predecessor:

Inferioris enim affirmatio superioris est negatio. Itemque inferioris negatio superioris est affirmatio. Eodemque modo superioris affirmatio inferioris est negatio, negatio uero superioris erit affirmatio inferioris.\(^{665}\)

This interpretation of negation as relative to the hierarchic rank of each member of a hierarchic order comes rather from Maximus Confessor than from Dionysius.

\[\text{Δεῦ γὰρ, εἴπερ ὡς ἀληθῶς τὸ γνώσα διαφοράν θεοῦ καὶ κτισμάτων εστὶν ἀναγκαῖον ἡμῖν, τὸν δὲ τοῦ ὑπέροντος τὴν τῶν ὄντων ἀφαίρεσιν καὶ τὴν τῶν ὄντων θείαν, εἶναι τοῦ ὑπέροντος ἀφαίρεσιν.}\(^{666}\)

Eriugena’s *meontology* incorporates one final characteristic of Dionysius’ negative theology. Just as God is not known directly but is made manifest only through his theophanies, so created essences are unknown (as to their *quid est*) and made manifest only through their accidents.

Nam sicut ipse deus in se ipso ultra omnem creaturam nullo intellectu comprehenditur, ita etiam in secretissimis siniibus creaturae ab eo factae et in eo existentis consideratus incomprehensibilis est. Quicquid autem in omni creaturae uel sensu corporeo pericpitur seu intellectu consideratur nihil aliud est nisi quoddam accidens incomprehensibili, ut dictum est, unicuique essentiae. Nam aut


\(^{665}\) *Periphyseon* I, 94-97

\(^{666}\) *Mystagogia*, preface, PG 91, 664B4-7.
per qualitatem aut quantitatem aut formam aut materiem aut differentiam quandam aut locum aut tempus cognoscitur non quid est, sed quia est\textsuperscript{667}.

For Dionysius, negative theology is the final moment of a dialectic which begins with the images of scripture and the assertions of philosophy, and which at one and the same time guards man from resting in the images which enfold the divine, and God from being confined to the images we use to speak of Him. The veils, or theophanies, which reveal the divine are mere coverings which must be drawn aside, allowing only silence\textsuperscript{668}. For Eriugena, on the other hand, apophasis is not the final moment in the dialectic of the two theologies, but something encountered at each level of nature, inasmuch as all essences, the created as well as the divine, are equally ungraspable with regard to their inferiors. As the divine is revealed through his theophanies, so the natural are revealed through their accidents, “ousiophanies\textsuperscript{669}”, as it were.

4.3 Creation

The Dionysian corpus was as instrumental in the development of Eriugena’s doctrine of creation as it was in his teaching on apophasis. And, as with his teaching on apophasis, so Eriugena’s doctrine of creation, although inspired by the pseudo-Areopagite, is not the

\textsuperscript{667} Periphyseon I, 65-73.

\textsuperscript{668} MT III, 147.12-14: ὑπὲρ ἀπὸ τῶν κάτω πρὸς τὸ ὑπερκοίμενον ἁνίων κατὰ τὸ μέτρον τῆς ἀνύσχου συστέλλεται καὶ μετὰ πάσαν ἀνύσχον ὅλως ἄφωνος ἔσται καὶ ὅλως ἐνωθησται τῷ ἐνωθέγκτῳ.

doctrine of Dionysius. Indeed, scholars continue to question whether or not Dionysius actually maintained a Christian position on creation\textsuperscript{670}.

The Dionysian corpus is surprisingly silent on the creation of the world. Although the elements of what would later become the orthodox teaching of creation can be found as early as Basil of Caesarea\textsuperscript{671}, Dionysius does not occupy himself with these specific elements (the question of the temporal beginning of the world, for example).

\textsuperscript{670} Eugenio Corsini. Il trattato De divinis nominibus dello pseudo-Dionigi e i commento al Parminide (Turin: Facoltà di lettere e filosofia, Pubblicazioni, v. 13, fasc. 4, 1962), 43-44, argues that the ‘biblico-Christian concept of creation’ is at the center of the pseudo-Areopagite’s re-interpretation of the Platonic Parmenides: “Dionigi cioè, inserendosi a questo punto nella lunga schiera degli interpreti del dialogo platonico, opera bruscamente la riunificazione in un unico soggetto delle due prime ipotesi, dell’Uno che è sopra l’essere e dell’Uno che è partecipato dall’essere. Questo atteggiamento gli permette di ricondurre e ricollegare allo stesso e identico Uno, all’unico Dio, tanto la teologia negativa quanto quella positiva, a differenza di Proclo che è sostretto a riservare all’Uno soltanto la prima ipotesi (cioè la teologia apofatica) e ad applicare la seconda ipotesi (=teologia positiva) alle divinità inferiori all’Uno. L’unificazione delle due vie, negativa e positiva, nell’unico soggetto è stata forse l’intuizione più feconda dell’Areopagita e la correzione più originale apportata al sistema neoplatonico. E la possibilità de questa correzione gli è derivata indiscutibilmente dal concetto biblico-cristiano di creazione, che gli ha permesso non soltanto di eliminare alla radice ogni emanatismo panteistico ma anche di risolvere in maniera definitiva il problema del trapasso dall’unità alla molteplicità, attorno a cui si era affaticata invano la speculazione neoplatonica.” Ronald Hathaway, on the other hand, finds no reason to assume that the author of the Corpus Areopagiticum was a Christian at all, in particular, because he finds no evidence of a doctrine of creation in his writings; Hierarchy and the definition of order in the letters of Pseudo-Dionysius. A study in the form and meaning of the Pseudo-Dionysian writings (The Hague: Nijhoff, 1969) XV ff.

\textsuperscript{671} Cf. Harry A. Wolfson, “The Identification of Ex Nihilo with Emanation in Gregory of Nyssa,” Harvard Theological Review 63 (1970), 53 ff. Wolfson suggests that all the elements of the doctrine of creation as defined by the 4\textsuperscript{th} Lateran Council in 1215—creation is temporal, a free act of the divine will, and \textit{ex nihilo}—may be found in Basil’s \textit{Homiliae in Hexaemeron}. 
Regarding the necessity of creation, Dionysius seems to side rather with the Platonists, comparing created reality to the creator as rays of light to the sun, and claiming that its rays emanate from the sun without forethought (ὁ λογιζόμενος):

Καὶ γὰρ ὥσπερ ὁ καθ’ ἡμᾶς ἠλιος οὐ λογιζόμενος ἢ προαιρούμενος, ἀλλ’ αὐτῷ τὸ εἶναι φωτίζει πάντα τὰ μετέχειν τοῦ φωτὸς αὐτοῦ κατὰ τὸν οἰκεῖον δυνάμενα λόγον, οὕτω δὴ καὶ ταγαθὸν υπὲρ ἥλιον ὡς υπέρ ἀμυδράν εἰκόνα τὸ ἐξηρήμενος ἀρχέτυπον αὐτῇ τῇ υπάρξει πάσι τοῖς οὕσιν ἀναλόγως ἐφίησε τὰς τῆς ἄλης ἀγαθότητος ἀκτίνας.

Nor does the pseudo-Areopagite occupy himself with the question of creation ex nihilo. Instead, Dionysius prefers the positive expression πρὸς τὸ εἶναι.

In his choice of verbs for making or creating, Dionysius shows a tendency towards pagan rather than Christian terminology. Basil’s In Hexaemeron supports the biblical verb ποιέω, in opposition to the less orthodox ύφιστημι:

οὐκ ἄλλῃ τινι φωτὴ ἐχρήσατο ὁ σοφὸς Μωϋσῆς περὶ αὐτοῦ, ἀλλ’ εἶπεν, Ἐν ἀρχῇ ἐποίησεν οὐχὶ ἐνηργησεν, οὐδὲ ύφιστησεν, ἀλλὰ Ἐποίησεν.

Gregory of Nyssa includes the equally biblical κτίζω in the list of acceptable terminology for describing creation, noting that its meaning is the same as that of ποιέω: τὸ γὰρ ποιῆσαι τῷ κτίσαι ταύτὸν ἔστιν.

Against Basil’s judgement, Dionysius never uses the words of Genesis to describe creation, and his use of the verb κτίζω is limited to scriptural quotations. The pseudo-Areopagite often uses the Greek ύφιστημι to indicate God’s causal activity towards the

---

673 DN V, 144.1-5; cf. Plato, Rep. 507d ff.
674 Cf. e.g., CH IV, 20.10.
675 Homeliae in Hexaemeron, 1.7.15-17.
676 Contra Eunomium IV; PG 45, 656D
677 E.g., DN II, 124.1 (=Col. 1,16), 124.2 (=Ps.-104,30), DN IX, 209.5-6 (=Heb. 4,13).
world. His preferred terminology, however, is παράγω. Πρῶτον δ’ ἀπάντων ἐκεῖνο εἰπεῖν ἁληθές, ὡς ἀγαθότητι πάσας ἡ υπερούσιος θεορχία τὰς τῶν ὄντων υόσίας ύποστήσασα πρὸς τὸ εἶναι παρήγαγεν.

The whole of this passage, from chapter four of the *De caelesti hierarchia*,

Πρῶτον δ’ ἀπάντων ἐκεῖνο εἰπεῖν ἁληθές, ὡς ἀγαθότητι πάσας ἡ υπερούσιος θεορχία τὰς τῶν ὄντων υόσίας ύποστήσασα πρὸς τὸ εἶναι παρήγαγεν. Ἐστὶ γὰρ τούτῳ τῆς πάντων αἰτίας καὶ ὑπὲρ πάντα ἀγαθότητος ἱδίον τὸ πρὸς κοινωνίαν ἔαυτῆς τὰ ὄντα καλεῖν, ὡς ἐκάστῳ τῶν ὄντων ἑρίσται πρὸς τῆς ὀικείας ἀναλογίας. Πάντα μὲν οὖν τὰ ὄντα μετέχει προνοίας ἐκ τῆς υπερούσιαν καὶ παναιτίου θεότητος ἐκβληθεμένης: οὐ γὰρ ἂν ἦν, εἰ μὴ τῆς τῶν ὄντων υόσίας καὶ ἀρχῆς μετειλθησεί. Τὰ μὲν οὖν ἄδωα πάντα τῷ εἶναι αὐτῆς μετέχει (τὸ γὰρ εἶναι πάντων ἑστίν ἡ ὑπὲρ τὸ εἶναι θεότης), τὰ δὲ ξώντα τῆς αὐτῆς ὑπὲρ πάσαν ζωὴν ζωοποιοῦ δυνάμεως, τὰ δὲ λογικά καὶ νοερὰ τῆς αὐτῆς ὑπὲρ πάντα καὶ λόγου καὶ νοῦν αὐτοτελεύς καὶ πρωτελεύος σοφίας. Δῆλον δὲ ὅτι περὶ αὐτῆν ἐκεῖναι τῶν υόσίων εἰσίν ὁσα πολλαχῶς αὐτῆς μετειλθασιν.

was of particular interest to Eriugena, and he quotes it in full twice in the *Periphyseon*.

However, it is Eriugena’s *Expositiones* which contains his most direct and explicit interpretation of this passage.

Immediately after his translation and paraphrase of the *lemma*, Eriugena discusses the meaning of the dative ἀγαθότητι.

Et hoc est illud mirabile et ineffabile quod superat omnem sensum et intellectum, quo modo diuina bonitas uniuersalis omnium bonorum fons substituit essentias existentium et ex seipsa ut essent adduxit, dum ipsa plus quam essentialis sit.

As the font of all goods, the superessential goodness brings into being the essences of all existents from itself (ex seipsa). The Greek dative ἀγαθότητι, made an ablative

---

678 Cf. e.g., DN IV, 148.12-13 and 171.2-3.
679 This verb occurs over 20 times in the *De diuinis nominibus* alone; cf. Albert van den Daele, *Indices pseudo-Dionysiani* (Louvain: Bibliothèque de l'Université, 1941), 111.
680 CH IV, 20.9-11.
682 *Exp. IV*, 63-67.
(bonitate universali) by Eriugena, is interpreted, not as an agent or instrument of creation, but as the matter of creation.

Non enim aliunde deus accepit materiem operationis sue, qui nullius indigens est et cum quo nihil ei coaeterum uel sibi coessentialia creditur esse, nisi a seipso, ab universali itaque sua bonitate et ab ineffabilibus sapientiae suae thesauris essentias omnium quae sunt produxit.\(^6\)

God is entirely self-sufficient for his creative activity, having no need for any matter from which to form his creation; and, in any case, there is nothing co-eternal with God from which he might shape the created world. Thus, God finds the matter of creation within himself, from his universal goodness *(a seipso, ab universali itaque sua bonitate).*

Eriugena’s pantheistic assertion goes well beyond the text of Dionysius. However, he justifies his identification of God with the matter of creation by introducing the idea of creation *ex nihilo* and the dionysian apophasis.

*Quid est ergo quod de eo predicatur? Credimus enim ipsum de nihilo omnia fecisse; nisi forte illud nihil ipse est qui quoniam super omnia superessentialis extollitur et super omne quod dicitur et intelligitur glorificatur, non rationabiliter per excellentiam nihil esse dicitur, quoniam in numero omnium quae sunt nullo modo collocatur. Si enim ipse est simul omnia quae sunt et quae non sunt, quis dixerit aliquid eum esse uel non esse, dum omnium sit esse et plus quam esse?*\(^7\)

Dionysius never explicitly treats ‘nothing’ as a name for the divine in the same manner as he does ‘good’, or ‘being’\(^8\). Nevertheless, Eriugena’s assertion that God is nothing does

---

\(^6\) *Exp. IV*, 67-72.

\(^7\) *Exp. IV*, 72-80.

\(^8\) On this point, *cf.* Rorem, *Eriugena’s Commentary*, 110: “As he did back in Book III [of the *Periphyseon*], Eriugena has here gone slightly beyond the Areopagite, in treating “Nihil” as a name for God.” It should be noted, Eriugena is careful not to include *nihil* in any list of the divine names. The shift from the pseudo-Areopagite’s intention to Eriugena’s interpretation is rather subtle, based on the Irishman’s translation of the passages in which Dionysius uses the word *οὐδὲν* to refer to god. In general, Dionysius avoids using the word *οὐδὲν* without any qualification to refer to god *(DN I, 117.3-4*
reflect his reading of the *De diuinis nominibus*, where Dionysius explicitly calls God nothing (οὐδὲν) because of his transcendence above being: ὁτι πάντων μὲν ἐστὶ τῶν ὄντων αἰτίον, αὐτὸ δὲ οὐδὲν ως πάντων ὑπερουσίως ἐξηγημένον. For, this name, ‘nothing’, is always applied to God through his superessential character.

Thus, when it is said that God made all things from nothing (de nihilo omnia fecisse), what is meant is that God created all things from himself. For God is called nothing on account of his excellence, since he is superessential and above all things which are spoken or understood (quoniam super omnia superessentialis extollitur et super omne quod dicitur et intelligitur glorificatur), and since he is not numbered amongst those things which are (quoniam in numero omnium quae sunt nullo modo collocatur).

seems to be the only exception). Instead, οὐδέν is used in combination with a partitive genitive, as at DN I, 119. 9: οὐδέν τῶν ὄντων, and DN IV, 148.1: οὐδέν ἐστὶ τῶν ὅρατων, and DN V, 187.13: οὐδέν ἐστὶ τῶν πάντων. When Dionysius uses οὐδέν in a case other than nominative or accusative, Eriugena regularly gives the appropriate case of nullus: DN I, 110.11: οὐδένι τῶν ὄντων = PL 122, 1114A7: uli eorum quae sunt; DN VII, 1988-9: ἐν οὐδένι οὐδὲν ... ἐκ οὐδενος οὐδένι = PL 122, 1155C1-2: in nullo nullum ... ex nullo in nullo. However, when in the nominative or accusative, οὐδέν is always rendered nihil by Eriugena. It seems that, given the partitive genitive construction, nullus better captures the meaning of the pseudo-Areopagite, who is not calling god nothing, but claiming that god is no being, no visible thing, etc. Eriugena’s nihil seems a conscious choice to push Dionysius further than his text intended.

686 DN I, 117.3-4; cf. Rorem, *Eriugena’s Commentary*, 110-11: “While Dionysius never included any such flat negation among the names formally treated in The Divine Names, preferring to state the biblical names cataphatically and then to add the apophatic interpretation or negation, John’s fundamental insight here is justifiably credited to the Areopagitic writings regarding the general principle.”


N. Ineffabiliem et incomprehensibilem diuinae bonitatis inaccessibilemque claritatem omnibus intellectibus siue humanis siue angelicis incognitam—superessentialis est enim et supernaturalis—eo nomine significatum crediderim, quae, dum per se ipsam cogitatur, neque est, neque erat, neque erit; and *Periphyseon III*, 2569-2571: Diuita igitur bonitas, quae propterea nihilum dicitur quoniam ultra omnia quae sunt et quae non sunt in nulla essentia inuenitur...
Finally, Eriugena defends his interpretation by noting that the nothing from which all things are created is precisely nothing *per excellentiam*, not nothing *per priuationem*; a point which he reaffirms in his comments on the *lemma* which immediately follows in the *Expositiones*:

> Est, inquit, proprium et speciale causae omnium, quae est super omnia bonitas, uocare ad participationem suam ea quae sunt; unde uocat a non esse per excellentiam, non per priuationem, ad esse per substitutionem⁶⁸⁸.

Eriugena’s interpretation of this passage from the *De caelesti hierarchia*, chapter four, is already fully formed in book three of the *Periphyseon*. There, Eriugena argues that God has no need of any matter outside of himself:

> Et de seipsa [i.e., bonitas quae unitas et trinitas est] seipsam facit; non enim indiget alterius materiae, quae ipsa non sit, in qua seipsam facit. Alioqui impotens uideretur et in seipso imperfectus, si aliunde acciperet apparitionis et perfectionis suae auxilium…⁶⁸⁹

that God is, himself, the matter of creation:

> Ac per hoc, et ipsa materies, de qua legitur mundum fecisse, ab ipso et in ipso est; et ipse in ea, quantum intelligitur ea esse⁶⁹⁰.

and that God is called nothing through his excellence:

> Dum ergo incomprehensibilis intelligitur, per excellentiam nihilum non immerito uocitatur⁶⁹¹.

What the *Periphyseon* adds to the interpretation of the *Expositiones* is a return to *apophasis*, which is the starting point of Eriugena’s teaching on creation. For Dionysius, God, as cause of all beings, is the being of all things: τὸ γὰρ ἐἶναι πάντων ἐστὶν ἢ

---

⁶⁸⁸ Exp. IV, 86-89.
⁶⁸⁹ *Periphyseon* III, 2461-2464.
⁶⁹⁰ *Periphyseon* III, 2467-2469.
⁶⁹¹ *Periphyseon* III, 2549-2550.
Yet, according to Eriugena, God is the nothing from which all things are made. Thus, the movement of creation is the inverse of the movement of theology, which is an upward motion from being to non-being, from affirmation to negation. Creation, which begins with nothing and ends in being, is a downward motion which moves from non-being to being, and therefore, from negation to affirmation.

Diuina igitur bonitas quae propterea nihilum dicitur quoniam ultra omnia quae sunt et quae non sunt in nulla essentia inuenitur, ex negatione omnium essentiarum in affirmationem totius uniuersitatis essentiae a se ipsa in se ipsam descendit, ueluti ex nililo in aliquid, ex inessentialitate in essentialitatem, ex informitate in formas innumerabiles et species.

However, since God is both nothing and the being of all things, creation is self-creation:

*Creat igitur omnia quae de nililo adducit ut sint ex non esse in esse; creatur autem quia nihil essentialiter est praeter ipsam, est enim omnium essentia*. And finally, since God is unknowable as superessential and comprehensible as the being of all things, every created effect may be called a theophany:

Dum ergo incomprehensibilis intelligitur, per excellentiam nihilum non immerito uocitatur. At uero in suis theophaniis incipiens appare, ueluti ex nililo in aliquid dicitur procedere; et quae proprie super omnem essentiam existimatur, proprie quoque in omni essentia cognoscitur. Ideoque omnis uisibilis et inuisibilis creatura theophania (id est diuina apparitio) potest appellari.

Eriugena’s (re-)interpretation of Dionysian *apophasis* and his application of negative theology to his own concept of *ex nililo* led him to maintain a doctrine of

---

692 CH IV, 20.16-17.
693 *Periphyseon III*, 2569-2575.
695 *Periphyseon III*, 2549-2555.
creation that is entirely absent from the Dionysian corpus. Nevertheless, the elements of this doctrine are Dionysian through-and-through. Indeed, even the pantheistic expression that God is the being of all things comes from the *Corpus Areopagiticum*, even though the pseudo-Areopagite is clear that this is simply an expression of God’s causality, not of his substantial or essential identification with his effects. Eriugena’s incorporation of certain Dionysian themes led to further reinterpretations of the pseudo-Areopagite, such as the created world as a manifestation of the divine, or theophany.

### 4.4 Theophanies

#### 4.4.1 Theophany in the Corpus Areopagiticum

The term *theophania* has come to fascinate the minds of Eriugena scholars in the past century or so. The term is one of the Irishman’s many transliterations of Greek terms he found in the *Corpus Areopagiticum*. Nevertheless, we would be misguided were we to conclude from the Greek, Dionysus origin of the term that this term plays a central role in the Dionysian corpus. The term θεοφανεία is relatively infrequent in the works of the pseudo-Areopagite, occurring a total of 12 times. Nor does Dionysius devote much energy to explaining the term or its function in his system.

---


697 DN I, 110.16, 114.9, 118.5; DN X, 215.14; CH IV, 22.2, 22.4, 22.8 and CH VII, 27.11; EH III, 90.1, EH IV, 103.21 and EH V, 113.22; Ep VIII, 171.4.
Theophanies generally function in the Dionysian corpus—as the word itself indicates—as visible manifestations of the divine. The Greek term is often used by the pseudo-Areopagite in conjunction with an adjective or noun referring to vision:

τῆς μὴν ὀρατῆς αὐτοῦ θεοφανείας...

ἐν μιᾷ τῶν μυστικῶν τῆς συμβολικῆς θεοφανείας ὁράσεων...

ἐν ταῖς ἱεραίς τῶν μυστικῶν ὁράσεων θεοφανείαις...

Thus, Dionysius says theophanies make visible the invisible divinity, giving form to the formless:

'Ἡ πάνσοφος δὲ θεολογία τὴν ὁρασιν ἐκείνην, ἦτις ἐν ἐαυτῇ διαγεγραμμένην ἀνέφαινε τὴν θειὰν ὡς ἐν μορφώσει τῶν ἀμορφώτων ὁμοίωσιν, ἐκ τῆς τῶν ὀραντῶν ἐπὶ τὸ θείον ἀναγωγῆς εἰκότως καλεῖ θεοφάνειαιν ὡς δι’ αὐτῆς τοῖς ὁρῶι θείας ἐγγινομένης ἐλλάμψεως καὶ τι τῶν θείων αὐτῶν ἱερῶς μυσμένων.

Theophanies are revelations of mystical visions (τῶν μυστικῶν ὁράσεων). And the context in which he generally uses this term reveals what precisely the pseudo-Areopagite intends by these visions. At De diuinis nominibus I, 114.7-11, the mystical vision in question is the transfiguration of Christ after the resurrection:

Τότε δὲ, ὅταν ἄφθαρτοι καὶ άθανατοι γενώμεθα καὶ τῆς χριστοειδοῦς καὶ μακαριωτάτης ἐφικώμεθα λήξεως, «πάντοτε σὺν κυρίῳ» κατὰ τὸ λόγιον «ἐσομέθα» τῆς μὲν ὀρατῆς αὐτοῦ θεοφανείας ἐν πανάγνοις θεωρίας ἀποπληρωμένοι φαντάστοι φαντασμάτων μαρμαρυγάς ἄμας περιαγαζοῦσας ως τους μαθητὰς ἐν ἐκείνῃ τῇ θειοτάτῃ μεταμορφώσει...

And following this, in the same chapter of the De diuinis nominibus (118.4-7), the theophany in question is God’s appearance to Moses in the burning bush of Genesis:

---

698 DN I, 114.9.
699 DN I, 118.4-5.
701 CH IV, 22.5-10.
In the *Corpus Areopagiticum*, then, theophanies are simply visible manifestations of the invisible divinity in physical forms, exemplified by the transfiguration and the burning bush of *Genesis*—they are closely connected to the sensible appearances of the divine in scripture. Dionysius’ concept of theophany does not go much beyond this. Eriugena, in his *Periphyseon*, elevates this Dionysian term to a far greater importance than it is given by the pseudo-Areopagite.

### 4.4.2 Theophany in Eriugenae

Eriugena’s identification of the name ‘nothing’—itself, an Eriugenian innovation—with the *ex nihilo* of creation, together with the Dionysian maxim that the divinity is the being of all things (*esse enim omnium est super esse diunitas*), permits him to assert that creation is, first, a self-creation⁷⁰². In creating *ex nihilo*, the divinity is creating from itself, and, therefore, creating itself. Second, this self-creation represents a self-affirmation of the divinity⁷⁰³. For, creation is a movement from nothing to something (*ueluti ex nihilo in aliquid*), and, therefore, an affirmation of a negation. Finally, creation

---

⁷⁰² *Periphyseon* I, 498-500: *Creat igitur omnia quae de nihilo adducit ut sint ex non esse in esse; creatur autem quia nihil essentialiter est praeter ipsam, est enim omnium essentia.*

⁷⁰³ *Periphyseon* III, 2569-2575: *Diuina igitur bonitas quae propterea nihilum dicitur quoniam ultra omnia quae sunt et quae non sunt in nulla essentia inuenitur, ex negatione omnium essentiarum in affirmationem totius uniuersitatis essentiae a se ipsa in se ipsam descendit, ueluti ex nihilo in aliquid, ex inessentialitate in essentialitatem, ex informitate in formas innumerabiles et species.*
as self-affirmation is also a movement from the divine incomprehensibility to the appearance of God in all created reality—that is, a divine self-manifestation. And, it is in this sense that all created reality, not only the transfiguration of Christ before his disciples or the appearance of God to Moses in a burning bush, may be called a theophany.

While Eriugena’s extension of the application of the notion of theophany reaches beyond the scope of the term as used by Dionysius, the role played by the theophanies in Eriugena’s philosophy overlaps the role played by the divine ideas or paradigms in Dionysius’ philosophy.

### 4.4.3 Theophanies and the Divine Ideas

Dionysius generally avoids speaking directly about the Neoplatonic divine ideas, which, when he does refer to them openly, he calls paradigms. Nevertheless, the paradigms play a central role in the Dionysian system—they act as intermediaries between God and his creation.

---

704 *Periphyseon* III, 2549-2555: *Dum ergo incomprehensibilis intelligitur, per excellentiam nihilum non immerito uocitatur. At uero in suis theophanis incipiens apparere, ului ex nihilo in aliquid dicitur procedere; et quae prope super omnem essentiam existimatur, proprie quoque in omni essentia cognoscitur. Ideoque omnis uisibilis et inuisibilis creatura theophania (id est diuina apparitio) potest appellari.*

705 *Cf. DN V, 188.6ff; One imagines that the pseudo-Areopagite was afraid of betraying his real identity by speaking so plainly of a doctrine so central to pagan Neoplatonism. Indeed, the only time Dionysius speaks of the ideas as such (DN V, 188.11), he seems to betray his pseudonym, referring to Clement, presumably of Alexandria, who was born around 150 AD, well over a hundred years after the convert of Saint Paul would have been born.*
This role has two purposes. On the one hand, the paradigms mediate God’s creative activity, defending the divine creator from direct contact, as it were, with the multiplicity of creation.

Αὐταὶ μὲν αἱ κατὰ τὴν ἀφθεγκτὸν ἐνωσὶν τε καὶ ὑπαρξὶν ἐνωσείς τε καὶ διακρίσεις. Εἰ δὲ καὶ θεία διάκρισις ἐστὶν ἡ ἀγαθοπρέπης πρόοδος τῆς ἐνωσεως τῆς θείας ὑπερηφανείας ἑαυτὴν ἀγαθότητι πληθυόσης τε καὶ πολλαπλασιαζούσης, ἤμωνει μὲν εἰσὶ κατὰ τὴν θείαν διάκρισιν αἱ ἄσχετοι μεταδόσεις, αἱ ουσίαςεις, αἱ ζωότηται, αἱ σοφοποιήσεις, αἱ ἀλλαὶ δωρεῖ τῆς πάντων αἰτίας ἀγαθότητος, καθ’ ἃς έκ τῶν μετοχῶν καὶ τῶν μετεχόντων ὑμεῖται τὰ ἀμεθέκτως μετεχόμενα.706

In this sense, Dionysius calls the paradigms ‘gifts’, and their mediation preserves the unparticipated character of the divine.

'Αλλ' αὐτοείναι καὶ αὐτοζωήν καὶ αὐτοθεότητα φακαν ἀρχικῶς μὲν καὶ θείως καὶ αἰτιατικῶς τὴν μίαν πάντων ὑπεράρχικαν καὶ ὑπερωῦσιον ἁρχήν καὶ αἰτίαν, μεθεκτῶς δὲ τὰς ἐκδιδομένας ἐκ θεοῦ τοῦ ἀμεθέκτου προοντικάς δυνάμεις τὴν αὐτοουσίαν, αὐτοζωίαν, αὐτοθεόσαιν, ον τὰ ὄντα οἰκείως ἑαυτοὶς μετέχοντα καὶ ὄντα καὶ ζώντα καὶ ἐνθεά καὶ ἐστι καὶ λέγεται καὶ τὰ ἄλλα ωσάυτως.707

And Dionysius often indicates this causal aspect of the paradigms with the Greek suffix –ποιον.708

Καὶ τὶ δεὶ περὶ τούτων λέγειν; ᾫπου γέ τινες τῶν θείων ἡμῶν ἵεροδίακαλλω καὶ τῆς αὐτοαγαθότητος καὶ θεότητος ὑποστατὴν φαί τὸν ὑπεράγαθον καὶ ὑπέρθεεν αὐτοαγαθότητα καὶ θεότητα λέγοντες εἶναι τὴν ἀγαθοποιίαν καὶ θεοποιίον ἐκ θεοῦ προεληθυίμων δωρεάν καὶ αὐτοκαλλος τὴν αὐτοκαλλοποιίαν χῦσιν καὶ ὅλον κάλλος καὶ μερικού κάλλος καὶ ὅλος καλά καὶ ἐν μέρει καλά, καὶ ὅσα ἄλλα κατὰ τὸν αὐτόν εἰρηται καὶ εἰρήσεται τρόπων δηλοῦντα προοιοσίς καὶ ἀγαθότητας μετεχομένας ὑπὸ τῶν ὄντων, ἐκ θεοῦ τοῦ ἀμεθέκτου προοιοσίας ἀφθόνῳ

706 DN II, 128.14-129.3.
708 καλλοποιίος, DN IV 151.1, 5, 8, CH II, 14.16, CH II, 17.2, CH VII 29.8; οὐσιοποιίος, DN I 113.4, DN II 131.10, DN V 180.12, DN V 181.13, DN V 182.18, DN V 187.3, DN V 188.7, 18, CH VII 28.20, CH XIII 47.8, CH XIV 50.11; ζωοποιίος, DN V 181.13, DN VI 190.9, DN VI 193.2, CH IV 20.18, CH XV 54.9, CH XV 56.11, CH XV 58.10.
χύσει καὶ ὑπερβλυξοῦσας, ἵνα ἀκριβῶς ὁ πάντων αἰτίος ἐπέκεινα ἢ πάντων, καὶ τὸ ὑπερουσίου καὶ ὑπερφυεῖς πάντη ὑπερέχοι τῶν καθ’ ὁποίαν ποτὲ οὐσίαν καὶ φύσιν.⁷⁰⁹

This causal aspect of the ideas is accompanied by a noetic aspect, an upward mediation which complements the downward mediation of paradigms as causative. The ideas preserve the divine transcendence of the thearchy over created intellects by acting as the object of our positive knowledge of the divinity. For the divine is in itself unknowable. Thus when we speak of God as ‘good’ or ‘being’ we refer not to the supersubstantial substance but to the substance-making (οὐσιοποιὸν) procession of the thearchy.

Μετίτεον δὲ ύπον ἐπὶ τὴν ὄντως οὐσιαν τοῦ ὄντως ὄντος θεωμυκήν οὐσιολογίαν. Τοσοῦτον δὲ ὑπομισθήσαμεν, ὅτι τὸ λόγῳ σκοπὸς οὐ τὴν ὑπερουσίου οὐσίαν, ἢ ὑπερουσίος, ἐκφάινειν, ἀρρήτον γὰρ τοῦτο καὶ ἀγνωστόν ἠστι καὶ παντελῶς ἀνέκφαντον καὶ αὐτὴν ὑπερέχον τὴν ἔνωσιν, ἀλλὰ τὴν οὐσιοποιὸν εἰς τὰ ὄντα πάντα τῆς θεαρχίκης οὐσιαρχίας πρόδον ὑμνήσαι.

Καὶ γὰρ ἡ τάγμαθε ϑεωμυμία τὰς ὅλας τοῦ πάντων αἰτίου προσδόσεων ἐκφάινουσα καὶ εἰς τὰ ὄντα καὶ εἰς τὰ ὄντα ἔκτεινεται καὶ ὑπὲρ τὰ ὄντα καὶ ὑπὲρ τὰ ὄντα ἔστιν. Ἡ δὲ τοῦ ὄντος εἰς πάντα τὰ ὄντα ἔκτεινεται καὶ ὑπὲρ τὰ ὄντα ἔστιν. Ἡ δὲ τῆς ζωῆς εἰς πάντα τὰ ἔστιν. Ἡ δὲ τῆς σοφίας εἰς πάντα τὰ ἔστιν. Ἡ δὲ τῆς λογικῆς καὶ αἰσθητικῆς ἕκτεινεται καὶ ὑπὲρ πάντα τοῦτα ἔστιν.⁷¹⁰

In the Periphyseon, the ideas, or primordiales causae⁷¹¹, hold an intermediate position between Creator and creation as do the paradigms in the Dionysian corpus. The initial fourfold ‘division of nature’, which launches the Periphyseon—

---

⁷⁰⁹ DN XI, 223.4-14.
⁷¹⁰ DN IV, 180.8-181.6.
⁷¹¹ Eriugena borrows this nomenclature from Augustine; cf. De Genesi ad litteram, VI, 10 and 11; cf. Robert D. Crouse, “‘Primordiales Causae’ in Eriugena’s Interpretation of Genesis” in Johannes Scottus Eriugena, The Bible and Hermeneutics. Proceedings of the Ninth International Colloquium of the Society for the Promotion of Eriugenian Studies,
Videtur mihi diuisio naturae per quattuor differentias quattuor species recipere, quarum prima est in eam quae creat et non creatur, secunda in eam quae et creatur et creat, tertia in eam quae creatur et non creat, quarta quae nec creat nec creatur\textsuperscript{712}. —, reserves a place specifically for the primordial causes:

...prima, ut arbitror, in causa omnium quae sunt, quae deus est, intelligatur; secunda uero in primordialibus causis; tertia in his quae in generatione temporibusque et locis cognoscuntur\textsuperscript{713}.

Nevertheless, when Eriugena explains his fourfold division more simply by dividing nature into that which is and that which is not, it becomes clear on which side of this latter division the causes lay. For, this simpler division, says Eriugena, can be understood in five different ways\textsuperscript{714}. According to the first of these ways, everything which appears to either sense or intelligence is said to be, while that which flees all sense and reason, because of its excellence, is said not to be\textsuperscript{715}. Eriugena includes amongst the latter not only God in his eminence but also the primordial causes, which exist in God:

Nam sicut ipse deus in seipso ultra omnem creaturam nullo intellectu comprehendit tur, ita etiam in secretissimis sinibus creaturae ab eo factae et in eo existentis consideratus incomprehensibilis est\textsuperscript{716}.

\textsuperscript{712} \textit{Periphyseon} I, 19-22.
\textsuperscript{713} \textit{Periphyseon} I, 36-38.
\textsuperscript{714} \textit{Periphyseon} I, 51-52.
\textsuperscript{715} \textit{Periphyseon} I, 53-59: \textit{Quorum primus uidetur esse ipse per quem ratio suadet omnia quae corporeo sensui uel intelligentiae perceptioni succumbunt uere ac rationabiliter dici esse, ea uero quae per excellentiam suae naturae non solum sensum sed etiam omnem intellectum rationemque fugiunt iure uideri non esse, quae non nisi in solo deo et in omnium rerum quae ab eo condita sunt rationibus atque essentiis recte intelliguntur.}
\textsuperscript{716} \textit{Periphyseon} I, 65-68; Although the \textit{primordiales causae} are not specifically named, the reference to \textit{secretissimis sinibus} makes it clear what Eriugena has in mind; \textit{cf. Periphyseon} I, 111-112: \textit{in suis causis praecedentibus in secretissimis naturae sinibus}. 
Thus, in Eriugena, the ideas have lost their role as mediators in the knowledge of God, for they are just as unknown in themselves as God is. This shift from the intelligibility to the incomprehensibility of the divine ideas appears to be an effect of the presence of the ideas in the divinity, where they subsist with and in God, a unity above every number and order:

...ipsae per seipsas omnium quae sunt primordiales rationes uniformiter et incommutabiliter in urbo dei, in quo factae sunt, unum et id ipsum ultra omnes ordines omnemque numerum aeternaliter subsistunt.  

The result is that, because the causes are contained within the divinity, and the divinity is incomprehensible, the causes too must be incomprehensible.

Further, the causes not only lose their role as mediators between man and God in divine science, they also lose their role, in the *Periphyseon*, as mediators between God and man in creation. Both of these roles are taken up by the Eriugenian theophanies.

The beginning of book one of the *Periphyseon* introduces the question of angelic knowledge. The *Alumnus* expresses concern over the opinion of Augustine that the angelic natures consider the primordial causes first in God, then in themselves, then in creatures.

Satis plane, nisi me paulisper turbaret quod a sancto Augustino in examero suo dictum uidetur, hoc est, angelicam naturam ante omem creaturam dignitate non tempore conditam fuisse, ac per hoc et aliorum omnium praeter suimet primordiales cuasas, hoc est prinpicalia exempla quae græci ΠΡΩΤΟΤΥΠΑ nominant, prius in deo considerasse, deinde in seipsa, deinde ipsas creaturas. Nam suimet causam, priusquam in speciem propriam procederet, cognoscere non uluit.

---

717 *Periphyseon* III, 319-322.  
718 *Periphyseon* I, 154-161.
The problem, of course, is that Eriugena has just claimed that the causes are just as unknowable as God himself. Thus, the Nutritor introduces the theophanies, no longer as a means of defending the incomprehensibility of God, which is no longer threatened inasmuch as the causes stand between God and creation, but that of the causes themselves.

In angelicis uero intellectibus earum rationum theophanias quasdam esse, hoc est comprehensibiles intellectuali naturae quasdam diunas apparitiones, non autem ipsas rationes, id est principalia exempla, quisquis dixerit non, ut arbitrator, a ueritate errabit. Quas theophanias in angelica creatura sanctum Augustinum ante omnium generationem inferiorum se uisus non incongrue dixisse credimus. Non ergo nos moueat quod diximus quia angeli et primum in deo, deinde in seipsis inferioris creaturae causas uident. Non enim essentia diuina deus solummodo dicitur, sed etiam modus ille, quo se quodammodo intellectuali et rationali creaturae, prout est capacitatis uniuscuiusque ostendit, deus saepe a sancta scriptura uocitatur. Qui modus a graecis theophania (hoc est dei apparitio) solet appellari.\(^{719}\)

Whereas the causes seem to be the first effects and appearances of the divine for Dionysius, for Eriugena, it is the theophanies which are the first appearance of the causes. Eriugena compares theophanies to the primordial causes in the same manner as he says imaginations are related to sensible things:

Vt enim ex inferioribus sensibilium rerum imagines, quas graeci ΦΑΝΤΑΣΙΑΣ uocant, anima recipit, ita ex superioribus, hoc est primordialibus causis, cognitiones, quae a graecis ΘΕΟΦΑΝΙΑΙ, a latinitis divinae apparitiones solent appellari, sibi ipsi infigit, et per ipsas quandam de deo notitiam percipit, per primas causas dico.\(^{720}\)

The intellect cannot know the causes substantially (quid substantialiter sunt), but only that they are.

\(^{719}\) Periphyseon I, 179-191.
\(^{720}\) Periphyseon II, mg. 143, 580-584.
…non ut intelligat quid substantialiter sunt (hoc enim superat omnem animae motum), sed ut uniuersaliter cognoscat quia sunt inque suos effectus ineffabili processione profluunt\textsuperscript{721}.

However, we can see here that the theophanies are not simply the intelligible manifestations or revelations of the causes, but the very effects \textit{(in suos effectus profluunt)} of the causes. And, in this way, the theophanies represent mediators in creation; not, however, between God and created reality, but between the causes, and created reality.

Eriugena’s use of theophanies, and their usurpation of the roles previously played by the primordial causes or paradigms, is subtle. One the one hand, the paradigms remain the first created effects of the divine (the second member of the ‘division of nature’). Nevertheless, by incorporating the ideas into the \textit{Verbum}, the causes take on divine qualities which belong to the godhead alone, especially incomprehensibility and causal transcendence. It is partially Eriugena’s combination of Augustine and Dionysius which brings about the originality of his doctrine of theophanies. However, it is interesting to note that, if the pseudo-Areopagite’s intention was to purge Procline neoplatonism of its overcrowded hierarchies of causal mediators, Eriugena has taken a step back towards Dionysius’ masters, Proclus and Iamblichus\textsuperscript{722}.

\textbf{4.5. Dissimilar Symbols}

\textsuperscript{721} \textit{Periphyseon} II, 1587-1590.
\textsuperscript{722} Regarding the pseudo-Areopagite’s polemic against Proclus (or Procline neoplatonism), \textit{cf.} especially Corsini, “Il trattato,” 162 \textit{ff}. 
The originality of Eriugena’s incorporation of the Dionysian system stems, in many instances, from his desire to harmonize the pseudo-Areopagite with his other sources: Maximus Confessor (and, through Maximus, Gregory Nazianzen), Gregory of Nyssa, and especially Augustine. Nevertheless, certain Dionysian themes undergo a reinterpretation at the hands of the Irish philosopher through the simple difficulty in interpreting the pseudo-Areopagite himself—in some cases due to the obscurity of the style or themes of the Greek corpus, in other cases due to problems associated with the Greek manuscript tradition. Eriugena’s reinterpretation of the Dionysian dissimilar symbols is the result of both of these sorts of difficulties.

At the beginning of the De diuinis nominibus, Dionysius insists that theology ought not to pass beyond the boundaries of what is revealed by scripture.

However, one might protest, as does the hypothetical objector of chapter two of the De caelesti hierarchia, that the compositions used by scripture to describe the invisible and unknowable to reveal the holy intellects, are inappropriate, and that theologians ought to use more honourable and noble forms to describe the immaterial cause of all material things.

---

724 DN I, 108.6-8.
καὶ ὑπερκειμένων οὐσιῶν καὶ μὴ ταῖς οὐρανίαις καὶ θεοειδέσιν ἀπλότητι
tὰς ἐπὶ γῆς ἐσχάτας περιτιθέντας πολυμορφίας...\textsuperscript{725}

Were one to bring such an objection, responds Dionysius, then it would suffice to point
out that the way of divine revelation is twofold: διττός ἐστι τῆς ἱερᾶς ἐκφαντορίας ὁ
τρόπος\textsuperscript{726}. The first way, the proper, proceeds through images which are similar, the
second uses dissimilar forms to represent the invisible:

ὅ μὲν ὡς εἶκος διὰ τῶν ὦμοίων προιῶν ἱεροτύπων εἰκόνων, ὁ δὲ διὰ τῶν
ἀνομοίων μορφοποιίῶν εἰς τὸ παντελῶς ἁπεικὸς καὶ ἀπεμφαίον
πλαττόμενος.\textsuperscript{727}

The argument which follows is extremely convoluted, and the situation is exacerbated by
a corruption in the textual tradition of the Greek corpus.

Sometimes, says Dionysius, scripture praises the divine as ‘reason’, ‘intellect’ or
‘being’, inasmuch as the cause of these, or as ‘light’ and ‘life’:

Ἀμέλει καὶ τὴν σεβασμίαν τῆς ὑπερουσίαν θεαρχίας μακαριότητα τῶν
ἐκφαντορικῶν λογίων οἱ μυστικαὶ παραδόσεις ποτὲ μὲν ὡς λόγον καὶ νοῦν
καὶ οὐσίαν ὑμνοῦσι, τὴν θεοπρεπὴ λογίσφημα καὶ σοφίαν αὐτῆς δηλούσαι
καὶ ὦτῶς ὦμοιον ὑπαρξεῖν καὶ τῆς τῶν ὦτων ὑπάρξεως αἰτίάς ἀληθινήν,
καὶ ὡς φῶς αὐτὴν ἀναπλάττουσι καὶ ζωῆν ἀποκαλοῦσι...\textsuperscript{728}

And while these names are, indeed, amongst the most honourable and surpass any
material forms, they, yet, fall short of the true revelation of the divine:

τῶν τοιοῦτων ἱερῶν ἀναπλασμάτων σεμνοτέρων μὲν ὄντων καὶ τῶν
προσύλων μορφώσεων ὑπερκεισθαί πως δοκοῦσων, ἀποδεόντων δὲ καὶ
οὕτω τῆς θεαρχικῆς πρὸς ἀλήθειαν ἐμφερείας...\textsuperscript{729}

\textsuperscript{725} CH II, 10.13-21.
\textsuperscript{726} CH II, 12.1-2.
\textsuperscript{727} CH II, 12.2-4.
\textsuperscript{728} CH II, 12.4-9.
\textsuperscript{729} CH II, 12.9-12.
Therefore, scripture sometimes uses negations, naming the divine ‘invisible’ or ‘infinite’ or ‘ungraspable’:


Finally, since the divine is not a being (as the cause of all being), negations are more proper expressions for it:


Therefore, the pseudo-Areopagite concludes, since negations are truer than affirmations, dissimilar forms are more appropriate than similar symbols to signify the divine incomprehensibility.


Dionysius’ argument wanders somewhat, and the conclusion is elliptical—he does not state precisely why the superiority of apophasis over cataphasis assures the superiority of dissimilar symbols over similar ones. The point seems to be that similar symbols are related to dissimilar symbols as affirmations are related to negations. Dissimilar symbols, like negations, guard the transcendence of the divine—whether angelic or thearchic. The holy scriptures give honour when they fill the heavenly orders

---

730 CH II, 12.14-17.
731 CH II, 12.17-20.
732 CH II, 12.20-13.3.
with dissimilar formations, and through these they reveal their transcendence over all material things.

Τιμῶσι τοιγαρόν, ὅπως αἰσχους ἀποπληρώσαι τὰς οὐρανίας διακοσμήσεις αὐτῶν λογίων ἵερογραφία ταῖς ἀνομοίοις αὐτῶν ἁρμονιότητι ἐκφαίνονται καὶ διὰ τούτων ἀποδεικύσαι τῶν ὑλικῶν ἀπάντων ὑπερκομήως ἐκβεβηκύναι.\(^{733}\)

It is the very deformity of the dissimilar symbols which recalls the divine transcendence.

καὶ ὑπονύττουσα τῇ δυσμορφίᾳ τῶν συνθημάτων ὡς μήτε θεμιτοῦ μηδὲ ἀληθοῦς δοκοῦσα εἶναι μηδὲ τοῖς ἀγαν προσώλοις, ὑπὸ τοῖς οὕτως αἰσχροῖς ἐμφερῆ πρὸς ἀληθείαν ἐστί τὰ ὑπερουράνια καὶ θεῖα θεάματα.\(^{734}\)

The difficulty of the argument is made more complex by a corruption in the Greek manuscript tradition. Where Dionysius introduces *apophasis* at 12.14 (ποτὲ δὲ ταῖς ἀποφατικῶς ἐκφαντωρίαις), the manuscripts read ἀνομοίοις.\(^{735}\) Eriugena translated the passage accordingly:

Aliquando uero *dissimilibus* manifestationibus ab ipsis eloquis supermundane laudatur eam invisibilem, et infinitam, incomprehensibilemque uocantibus, et ea ex quibus non quid est, sed quid non est, significatur.\(^{736}\)

Eriugena is forced to explain the fact that the pseudo-Areopagite has introduced examples of negations (ἀόρατον αὐτὴν καὶ ἀπειρόν καὶ ἀχώρητον ἀποκαλούντων

\(^{733}\) CH II, 13.4-7.  
\(^{734}\) CH II, 13.18-21.  
\(^{735}\) Two manuscripts, Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale gr. 438 and Vatican, Biblioteca Apostolica, Palatinus gr. 123, read ἀποφατικῶς ἀνομοίοις; cf. *app. crit. ad loc*. The original reading, ἀποφατικῶς, printed by Heil-Ritter as the conjecture of Langerbeck, is assured by the *scholion* of Maximus (PG 4, 40D3-6): Ἀόρατον αὐτὴν. Ὡτι τὰ κατὰ ἀποφασιν λεγόμενα ἐπὶ Θεοῦ, οἶνον ἀόρατος, ἀπειρός, καὶ τὰ τοιαῦτα, ἀνομοία ἐστι. δηλοῦσι γὰρ οὐ τί ἐστιν, ἀλλὰ τί οὐκ ἐστιν ὁ Θεὸς.  
\(^{736}\) PL 122, 1041B15-C5.
καὶ τὰ <λοιπὰ> ἐξ ὀνύ τί ἐστιν, ἀλλὰ τί οὐκ ἐστιν σημαίνεται) as examples of dissimilar symbols. He does this by dividing the second mode of divine manifestation into two parts: *Secundus, inquit, modus diuinarum manifestationum, quibus in diuinis scripturis superessentialis diuinitas supra omnem mundum laudatur, duplex est*737. Either, he says, the divine is understood through dissimilar forms, or it is expressed by those forms which express not what it is but what it is not.

Aut enim per dissimiles formas et inconuenientes longissimeque ab ipsa, ut prediximus, distantes imaginatur, aut per ea ex quibus non quid est, sed quid non est, significatur, innuitur, dum inuisibilis et infinita et incomprehensibilis uocatur738.

The result of his interpretation is that Eriugena creates a closer bond between dissimilar symbols and *apophasis* than the pseudo-Areopagite seems to have intended. For Eriugena, dissimilar symbols are not material forms which are merely further from the divine, less honourable, and, therefore, clearly inadequate to fully express the transcendent divinity; Eriugena gives the nature of dissimilar symbols a specific form: that of *impossibilia*.

If negations are true, says Eriugena, while affirmations are metaphorical—for it is true to call God invisible, but it is not, properly speaking, true to call God visible—then why should we be surprised if dissimilar forms—not simple or natural ones, but those composed and confused and deformed—are more significative of the divine than are absolute, simple images, which are free from confusion?

Ac si diceret: Sì uera est negatio in diuinis rebus, non autem uera sed metaphorica affirmatio; uere enim dicitur Deus inuisibilis, non autem visibilis uere ac proprie dicitur, similiter infinitus, incomprehensibilis uere de eo prædicatur, finitus uero

---

737 Exp. II, 475-478.
738 Exp. II, 478-482.
et comprehensibilis non proprie, sed modo quodam loquendi: quid mirum, si
naturalibus simplicibusque formis longe dissimiles, mixtæ, confusae,
deformesque plus ad diuina et ineffabilia ualeant significanda, quam absolutæ, et
simplices, omnique confusione carentes naturalium formarum imaginationes\textsuperscript{739}.

The composite or mixed symbols which Eriugena has in mind are images
composed of two simple, natural symbols, which in combination are impossible or
monstrous:

Et quod de effigie uolatilis hominis diximus, idipsum de lione uituloque pennoso,
item de aquila humano uultui configurata, caeterisque confusis figuris, seu in
eodem genere superfluis, ut animalia illa senas alas habentia, est intelligendum\textsuperscript{740}.

Such symbols, by their very inconceivability, prevent the theologian confusing
significans with significatum:

Dum uero in eisdem uisionibus pennati hominis ac uolitantis imaginem inuenio in
significatione celestium uirtutum seu ipsius diuinitatis, ueluti celeri uolatu omnia
penetrantis, non facile fallor, quoniam in natura rerum uisibilium pennatum
hominem et uolitantem nec uidi, nec legi, nec audiui. Est enim monstrosum et
omnino humana natura alienum\textsuperscript{741}.

Thus, Eriugena concludes, dissimilar symbols represent a kind of negation: \textit{Vt
\textit{enim hec omnia naturales abnegant formas, ita celestes uirtutes his omnibus speciebus
careere manifestissime insinuanti}\textsuperscript{742}.

Eriugena’s theology of dissimilar symbols has taken on a scope rather beyond that
given it by Dionysius. While the problem of interpreting the pseudo-Areopagite on this
particular occasion originates with a corrupt reading in the Greek manuscripts, the

\textsuperscript{739} Exp. II, 526-535.
\textsuperscript{740} Exp. II, 571-575.
\textsuperscript{741} Exp. II, 547-552.
\textsuperscript{742} Exp. II, 575-577.
originality of Eriugena’ interpretation is consistent with his over-all incorporation of the
Corpus Areopagiticum.

4.6. Conclusion

Prior to the mystics of the later-12th and early-13th centuries, Eriugena was influenced by
Dionysius more than was any other medieval master. He incorporates the pseudo-
Areopagite into all of his writings which post-date his introduction to the Dionysian
corpus, and his master work, the Periphyseon, is very much a development of his
Areopagitism. However, in his interpretations of Dionysius, Eriugena is never servile.
When he sees connections between the non-being of creation and apophasis, connections
which Dionysius never made, Eriugena indicates them. The resulting doctrines may not
be precisely those of Dionysius, but they certainly may be called ‘Dionysian’, even if
they are strictly speaking Eriugenian.

Further, as far as Eriugena remains the main conduit of Dionysian philosophy and
theology (i.e., through the 12th century), Eriugenianism is rather stronger than
Dionysianism in the Latin West. The themes which exercised the mind of Eriugena—
creation, apophasis, theophanies, the two theologies—are the same as those which
appealed to Thierry of Chartres and Clarambald of Arras (especially apophasis), of Hugh
of Saint Victor (especially the two theologies) and Alan of Lille (especially theophanies).
Eriugena’s double role as translator/commentator secured his position as the spokesman
for Dionysius for four centuries.
General Conclusion

All evidence—the fact that the lemmata of the Expositiones present the text of M, that the text of the commentary makes it clear that Eriugena was reading M when he composed his Expositiones—points to the fact that Eriugena corrected his Versio Dionysii, and to the continued existence of the corrected Versio in the manuscripts from the M recension. It is impossible at this time to say whether or not Eriugena intended the translation of M to stand alone, as we find it in the manuscripts that belong to this family, or whether these manuscripts are the product of a later contributor who copied out the lemmata from the Expositiones without the commentary itself. In either case, the authenticity of the corrections of M cannot be put into question.

Given that Eriugena must be at the origin of M, the origin of T becomes even more difficult. Several factors seem to favor the conclusion that Eriugena was the author of this recension as well. First, the quotations of Dionysius which are found in the Periphyseon seem to favor T. Second, as Dondaine has shown, many of the corrections in T have been suggested by the text of the Expositiones. Finally, Anastasius read the Versio in a T manuscript. If Eriugena or Charles the Bald was responsible for sending this manuscript to Rome for approval, one would expect this text to contain the work of Eriugena (why would Eriugena have sent the translation of someone else to Rome for approval?). The possibility of Anastasius’ authorship is ruled out by the existence of T manuscripts (Bo, Ct, T and Vr) which witness the recension prior to the papal librarian’s contribution.

It remains difficult to explain two sets of corrections (T and M), which are entirely independent of one another—why correct the text a second time without incorporating
the first set of corrections? The evidence seems to favor the conclusion that Eriugena is
directly responsible for $T$, while $M$ was extracted from the *Expositiones* in the later 9th or
early 10th century. The origin of $T$ can be placed before 875, when Anastasius sent his
*corpus*, based on $T$, to Charles the Bald. Indeed, this recension can be witnessed in its
original, pre-Anastasian form in the manuscript $T$. That $M$ was simply copied from the
*Expositiones* is supported by the fact that several $M$ manuscripts (Ox, for example) have
mistakenly preserved words to introduce the *lemmata*, such as *inquit*. Nevertheless, both
$T$ and $M$ must be considered the authentic work of Eriugena.

The existence of these three recensions together with the corrections which
characterize $T$ and $M$ open the way for new research. First, and most urgently, a critical
edition of the *Versio* is needed. Although Floss’ edition presents the text of $M$, a
perfectly authentic text, it fails to provide a historically useful edition. Without any
reference to $A$, for example, the text as it is found in PL 122 is useless to the modern
scholar interested in Eriugena’s translation practices, the depth of his knowledge of
Greek, etc. $M$ alone provides a deceptive picture of these. To the historian, interested in
the *Versio* as it was read in 13th century Paris, Floss’ edition is of no value. The same
arguments could be made for an edition which supplied only the text of $A$ or of $T$.

Whether the goal is to present the *Versio* as Eriugena intended it, or to present the
text as it was known to the Middle Ages, the critical edition of the *Versio Dionysii* cannot
present one recension alone. Certainly $A$ and $M$ present the work of Eriugena, but $T$ had
a rather wide readership during the Middle Ages. Thus, the critical edition of the *Versio
Dionysii* must present all three recensions. Such an edition will satisfy the needs of
historians and philologists alike. The publication of such an edition would permit deeper
exploration of several of the subjects presented in this study. An edition which presents
the three recensions in parallel columns—after the manner of Jeauneau’s edition of the
*Periphyseon*—would allow for further work on Eriugena’s development as a hellenist
and a translator. The question of Eriugena’s development also contributes to our
understanding of Eriugena as commentator. As Roques has shown, for Eriugena, the
roles of translator and interpreter often overlap. Certainly an edition which highlights the
changes of M and refers the reader to the readings of Pa will provide further evidence of
this phenomenon.

Several questions regarding the manuscripts and their content require further
research as well. Until now, studies of the continued interest in the Dionysian *corpus*
during the Middle Ages have been limited to a handful of names, authors who either
wrote commentaries or quoted the pseudo-Areopagite in their own original works.
However, the apparatus of A provides evidence of an active and careful reading of
Dionysius in the *Versio* of Eriugena in the 9th century. A thorough examination of this
apparatus and its sources would paint a fuller picture of 9th century Areopagitism743.

The Eusebian extracts, which are found in many of the T manuscripts, and which
are closely associated with both the Greek and the Latin Dionysius, require further
investigation. The presence of the Latin extracts in some of the earliest manuscripts of
the *Versio* suggests a close connection between Eriugena’s translation of the pseudo-
Areopagite and the translation of these selections from Eusebius. Eriugena, himself, may
have been responsible for translating these passages, and if he was not, someone close to

743 The same may be said of a continued study of T. For, although Eriugena was the
source of its corrections, T was almost certainly compiled by another hand—perhaps an
associate of the Irishman, or simply an interested reader.
him (chronologically and philosophically if not geographically) most certainly was. An
dition of these extracts will contribute to our understanding of the Hellenism of the 9th
century—indeed, if Eriugena is not the author, then these extracts provide even stronger
evidence of the study of Greek in the 9th century than do the Greek verses of Martin of
Laon or the psalter of Sedulius Scottus.
Bibliography

SECONDARY SOURCES:


Gregory, Tullio. “Nota sulla dottrina dell ‘teofanie’ in Giovanni Scoto Eriugena” Studi Medievali, 3a serie, 4 (1963), 75-91


Luscombe, David. “Denis the Pseudo-Areopagite in the Middle Ages from Hilduin to Lorenzo Valla,” in *Fälschungen im Mittelalter: Internationaler Kongress der*


PRIMARY SOURCES:

ALAN OF LILLE


AVGVSTINE


PSEUDO-AVGVSTINE


CLARAMBALD OF ARRAS


JOHN SCOTTVS ERIUGENA

Iohannis Scotti Eriugenae Opera quae supersunt omnia. Patrologia Latina 122.


**DIONYSIVS THE PSEVDO-AREOPAGITE**

*Dionysii Areopagitae opera omnia quae extant.* *Patrologia Graeca* 3.


**GILBERT OF POITIERS**


**GREGORY THE GREAT**


**HILDVIN**


**HINCMAR**


**HUGH OF SAINT VICTOR**
Hugo de Sancto Victore. *Commentariorum in Hierarchiam Caelestem S Dionysii Areopagitae. Patrologia Latina* 175, coll. 923-1154C.

Hugo de Sancto Victore. *De Sacramentis Christianae Fidei. Patrologia Latina* 175, coll. 173-618B.


**JOHN OF SALISBURY**


**JOHN SARRAZIN**


**JOHN OF SCYTHOPOLIS**


**MAXIMVS CONFESSOR**


RICHARD OF SAINT VICTOR

Richardus S Victoris. *In Apocalypsim Johannis Libri Septem. Patrologia Latina* 196, coll. 683-888B.

THIERRY OF CHARTRES


WILLIAM OF LVCCA