



**HAL**  
open science

# The two Byzantine translations of Thomas Aquinas' *De rationibus fidei*: remarks in view of their on-going editio princeps

Marie-Hélène Blanchet

## ► To cite this version:

Marie-Hélène Blanchet. The two Byzantine translations of Thomas Aquinas' *De rationibus fidei*: remarks in view of their on-going editio princeps. Searby, Denis. *Never the Twain Shall Meet?*, Latins and Greeks learning from each other in Byzantium. [Proceedings of the International Conference Stockholm, 24-26 June 2015], De Gruyter, pp.115–129, 2018, *Byzantinisches Archiv, Series philosophica* 2, 978-3-11-055973-6. 10.1515/9783110561074-127. hal-03738987v2

**HAL Id: hal-03738987**

**<https://hal.science/hal-03738987v2>**

Submitted on 15 Dec 2022

**HAL** is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.

« The two Byzantine translations of Thomas Aquinas' *De Rationibus Fidei*: remarks in view of their on-going *editio princeps* » (Marie-Hélène Blanchet, CNRS, Paris)<sup>1</sup>

Historians often use the term “estrangement” to describe the evolution of the relations between Eastern and Western Europe during the Middle Ages: they consider that ignorance gradually prevailed between the two parts of medieval Christendom, which, at a certain time, diverged and were unable to understand each other. Yet, what was true at the time of the schism in the 11th century was no longer valid in the 14th century, when interaction on several levels between Byzantium and the West had intensified again. The analysis of the relations between the Byzantine-Slavic East and the West in the late Middle Ages must therefore be based on a different paradigm than that of misunderstanding and mutual hostility. The idea that the Byzantines despised and ignored the West must be substituted with another approach taking into account the continuous contacts between Constantinople and the Latins, especially those who had settled in the Eastern Mediterranean after 1204 and those who were conducting business in the Byzantine capital.

Intellectual exchanges have never been as intense and fruitful between these two worlds as they were during the 14th and 15th centuries. Historians are well aware of how much Renaissance Italy owed to the arrival, in the 15th century, of Byzantine scholars with their collections of Greek manuscripts containing the original texts of Plato and Aristotle. Less well known, however, is the movement in the opposite direction, from Western to Eastern Europe, that preceded it in the 13th and 14th centuries. It allowed the introduction and spread of Western culture in Byzantium and created the conditions for a renewed dialogue. From the late 13th century, the main means of this intellectual rapprochement consisted of translating Latin works into Greek, both tales of chivalry and philosophical or theological treatises. From 1354 to the end of 1360s, fifteen treatises of Thomas Aquinas, especially the two *Summae*, were thus made available to Greek scholars. In Constantinople, this magnum opus of Western scholastics became a subject of debate and was from then on the focus of most of the intellectual life in Byzantium for nearly a century.<sup>2</sup> Even though this unprecedented cultural transfer from the West to the East met with resistance, expressed especially in the religious

---

<sup>1</sup> I would like to thank John Demetracopoulos, Raúl Estangüi Gómez, and Nikos Melvani for their help while writing this article.

<sup>2</sup> For the main studies about Thomism in Byzantium, see Papadopoulos 1967, Papadopoulos 1974, Fyrigos 2004, Demetracopoulos 2010, Demetracopoulos 2012 (2), and Plested 2012.

field, it still shows that a form of intellectual and religious acculturation of Latin thought in the Orthodox world was possible at that time.

The work of Thomas Aquinas was a privileged vehicle for the penetration of Latin thought among Byzantine scholars. His treatises were translated into Greek, read, commented upon and used both by the Byzantine advocates of the Latin doctrine and by their detractors. In the absence of a critical edition of these translations,<sup>3</sup> it remains very difficult to detect the cases of borrowings from Aquinas by the Byzantine authors, especially as his name is not usually mentioned when he is quoted. Establishing a critical edition of all these translations is the task currently undertaken by an international team under the supervision of John Demetracopoulos in the research project *Thomas de Aquino Byzantinus*.<sup>4</sup>

Within this framework, I am personally in charge of a short Thomistic treatise: Thomas Aquinas' *DRF* is a succinct exposition of the sound principles of the Christian faith composed around 1260.<sup>5</sup> It is an apologetic treatise against the Muslims, the Armenians and the Greeks, and its fourth chapter is especially dedicated to the question of the procession of the Holy Spirit. Two 14th-century Greek versions of this text are extant, which is an exceptional phenomenon among the Byzantine translations of Thomistic works. Ten manuscripts containing these translations have so far been identified (the text's length varies from 14 to 26 folios depending on the manuscripts). Version A, to be found in 5 manuscripts, was made by Demetrius Kydones, the most famous translator of Aquinas' treatises in the second half of the fourteenth century. The most complete title of his version (version A) is: "Ten chapters by the blessed Thomas addressed to a certain Cantor of Antioch, translated from the Latin language into Greek by kyr Demetrios Kydones" (Τοῦ μακαριωτάτου Θωμᾶ κεφάλαια δέκα πρὸς τινα ψάλτην Ἀντιοχείας, μετενεχθέντα ἀπὸ τῆς Λατίνων γλώττης εἰς τὴν Ἑλλάδα παρὰ κυροῦ Δημητρίου τοῦ Κυδώνη). Version B is also preserved in 5 manuscripts, without any date, and can be attributed to a hitherto unknown translator of Aquinas named Atoumes. The most

---

<sup>3</sup> Only five volumes have been published (15, 16, 17A, 17B and 18) with title *Δημητρίου Κυδώνη Θωμᾶ Ἀκινάτου Σόμματα θεολογικῆ ἐξελληνισθεῖσα* between 1976 and 2002 within the series *Corpus philosophorum Graecorum recentiorum*, in Athens, under the supervision of E. Moutsopoulos: they correspond to a partially critical edition of the first half of *ST*, II<sup>a</sup> II<sup>ae</sup>.

<sup>4</sup> *Thomas de Aquino Byzantinus* (<http://www.rhul.ac.uk/Hellenic-Institute/Research/Thomas.htm>) is an international research project dedicated to the publication of critical editions of all the works of Thomas Aquinas translated into Greek in the 14th and 15th centuries (almost all of them unedited), as well as all the Byzantine treatises written in the 14th and 15th centuries in support of or against Aquinas (some of them unedited). All volumes will be published in a subseries of the *Series Graeca* of the *Corpus Christianorum* published by Brepols Publishers (<http://www.arts.kuleuven.be/byzantium/english/ccsg>). See the presentation of the project in Demetracopoulos 2012 (1), 101–124, and the report of the progress and activities of the project during the last two years in Demetracopoulos – Dendrinou 2014, 13–22.

<sup>5</sup> See the Latin critical edition supervised by the *Commissio Leonina*: Thom. Aquin., *DRF*, ed. H.-F. Dondaine, Roma 1968, B57–B73. See also the German translation by L. Hagemann and R. Gleis, the English translation by J. Kenney and the French translation based on this edition by G. Emery.

complete title of this other version is: “Treatise about the reasons for the faith composed by brother Thomas from Aquino to the Cantor of Antioch” (Διάληψις περὶ τῶν λόγων τῆς πίστεως ἐκδοθεῖσα παρ’ ἀδελφοῦ Θωμᾶ ἐκ τοῦ Ἀχίνου πρὸς ψάλτην Ἀντιοχέα).<sup>6</sup> I will present the information that I have been able to collect so far about each version, and then I will draw a very brief comparison between some passages of the two translations.

## Dating

We know little about the chronology of Kydones’ translations, except that he finished *SG* in 1354 and *ST I<sup>a</sup>* in 1358.<sup>7</sup> In the manuscripts which contain Kydones’ translation of *DRF*, there is no marginal note to indicate the date of its composition. Nevertheless, one manuscript seems to be very close to, and possibly contemporary with Kydones’ work: it is *Marcianus gr. app.* II, 9 (coll. 1438). It contains 318 ff., the translation of *DRF* extends through ff. 298<sup>f</sup>–317<sup>r</sup>. This manuscript was described first by Mioni and recently by Kislas:<sup>8</sup> it contains several anti-unionist treatises by Nilus Kabasilas, some documents related to the so-called “Photian council” in 880,<sup>9</sup> one anti-Latin treatise by Barlaam, and Kydones’ translation of *DRF*. It is remarkable to find a translation of Thomas Aquinas in such an anti-Latin collection of texts. Kislas stated that this manuscript belonged to the library of the Dominican monastery of Saints John and Paul at Constantinople, and had been copied between 1362 and 1364.<sup>10</sup> He confused the Constantinopolitan monastery with the convent of Saints John and Paul (San Zanipolo) at Venice: the manuscript was in fact kept in the library of this Venetian convent before being transferred to the Marciana Library in 1789.<sup>11</sup> But we have no information about the place where it was copied. Kislas’ dating is also doubtful, as it is based on a misinterpretation of the data provided by the watermarks: he himself explains that there are seven watermarks used within the manuscript, whose dating range from 1347 to 1371.<sup>12</sup>

---

<sup>6</sup> About these two versions, see Papadopoulos 1967, 56–60.

<sup>7</sup> Glykofrydi-Leontsini 2003, 178 (with the quoted bibliography); Fyrigos 2004, 32. For the place of Kydones’ translation within the context of the history of Byzantine Thomism, see Demetracopoulos 2010, 829–847.

<sup>8</sup> Mioni 1967, 92–94; Nil Kab., *Spir.*, ed. T. Kislas, Paris 2001, 159–161.

<sup>9</sup> About the use of such documentation in the anti-Latin polemics during the 14th century, see Fanelli 2016.

<sup>10</sup> Nil Kab., *Spir.*, 159–160 Kislas: “ce manuscrit provient de la Bibliothèque du Monastère dominicain Saints-Jean-et-Paul à Constantinople. Il a été écrit entre 1362 et 1364 par un copiste principal et deux copistes secondaires”. Kislas (161) adds that *DRF* was copied lastly: “V<sup>e</sup> étape (ff. 298–317) : le copiste a terminé son travail avec la traduction de Thomas d’Aquin et le florilège patristique”.

<sup>11</sup> Jackson 2011, 8; 18, n° 64; 69–70, n° 45. This manuscript was part of the first list of manuscripts personally acquired by the Dominican Gioachino Torriano before his death in 1500 (n° 64), so it entered Zanipolo before that date. It remained there afterwards and is mentioned in the inventory made by Giovanni Filippo Tomasini (n° 45) in the mid-seventeenth century.

<sup>12</sup> See Nil Kab., *Spir.*, 160 n. 28 and 31 Kislas.

Moreover, the same watermarks are to be found in different parts of the manuscript, in the beginning as well as in the end, where *DRF* is contained. So it is impossible to assume that *DRF* would belong to a fully independent codicological unit, which would in the end have been bound into that manuscript.<sup>13</sup> We therefore cannot assign a precise date for the production of that manuscript: it must be dated to the third quarter of the 14th century, which doesn't help much for giving any precise *terminus ante quem* for Kydones' translation of *DRF*.

Strange as it may seem, we have much more information about the other version, version B, because this translation was used by two authors from the mid-fourteenth century. First, this version of *DRF* was refuted by a strongly anti-Latin polemicist, Matthew Angelos Panaretos.<sup>14</sup> Very little is known of Panaretos: he lived in Constantinople in the mid-fourteenth century and produced abundant anti-Latin literature, including a treatise against the *Filioque* which consists of a linear refutation of Chapter IV of *DRF*,<sup>15</sup> and another treatise against the doctrine of purgatory which likewise is a response to Chapter IX of *DRF*.<sup>16</sup> Now, the Greek version used by Panaretos for his two refutations was not that of Demetrius Kydones, but the other translation, version B. No historian until now had tried to identify the Greek text used by Panaretos, even not Buda, the editor of his treatise against the *Filioque*. Since Panaretos quotes verbatim many passages from Aquinas' text, it is very easy to compare the manuscripts of the two versions in order to identify which translation he used: it is that of version B both for Chapter IV of *DRF* and for chapter IX.<sup>17</sup>

Another mention of this translation is made in the treatise by Nilus Kabasilas *On the procession of the Holy Spirit*, also an antithomistic treatise in which Nilus strove to refute the Latin syllogisms with systematic counterarguments.<sup>18</sup> The author quotes several times *SG* and *ST* according to Demetrius Kydones' translation; but he also refers in one case to *DRF* by explicitly mentioning it with its long title: "About the reasons for the faith to the Cantor of

---

<sup>13</sup> The same argument applies to the copyists, especially the main one who copied folios in the beginning as well as in the end of the manuscript. See also Jackson 2011, 18: "The several parts of Marc. II, 9 were all done at the same place and close to the same time".

<sup>14</sup> About Panaretos, see *PLP* 21649. See especially Risso 1914, Buda1956, Blanchet 2012.

<sup>15</sup> This treatise was published in a non-critical edition based on one only manuscript and translated in Italian in Pan., *Proc.*, ed. C. Buda, in *Archivio storico per la Calabria e la Lucania* 26 (1957), 291–323 ; 27 (1958), 3–33.

<sup>16</sup> This treatise is still unpublished: I'm preparing its critical edition, and also a critical reedition of the above quoted Panaretos' treatise about *Filioque*, within the framework of the project *Thomas de Aquino Byzantinus* (cf. *supra* n. 4).

<sup>17</sup> The translation of version B differs clearly from that of Kydones: see an example below.

<sup>18</sup> About Nil Kabasilas, see *PLP* 10102. For the edition of his treatises, see Nil Kab., *Proc.*, ed. E. Candal, Città del Vaticano 1945 and Nil Kab., *Spir.* Kislak.

Antioch” (Περὶ τῶν τῆς πίστεως λόγων πρὸς τὸν ψάλτην Ἀντιοχέα).<sup>19</sup> His quotation of *DRF* in his text is as follows: οὕτως ἢ ἡμετέρα πίστις ἀναγκαίους λόγοις δείκνυσθαι οὐ δύναται, ὅτι τὴν ἀνθρωπίνην διάνοιαν ὑπερβαίνει.<sup>20</sup> As noted by E. Candal, it corresponds to Chapter 2 of *DRF* and it stands for the Latin sentence: “fides nostra sicut necessariis rationibus probari non potest quia humanam mentem excedit [...]”,<sup>21</sup> that is “just as our faith cannot be proved by necessary reasons, because it exceeds human mind”. This Greek translation is that of version B, as we can find it for instance in *Marcianus gr.* 147, fol. 1<sup>v</sup>. By comparison, the translation by Kydones in version A gives the following text: ὡσπερ ἀδύνατον τὴν πίστιν ἀναγκαίους λόγοις ἀποδειχθῆναι, ὡσάν τὴν ἀνθρωπίνην διάνοιαν ὑπερβαίνουσιν.<sup>22</sup>

The fact that Nilus Kabasilas has also used version B allows us now to determine a *terminus ante quem* for the translation, since Nilus died in 1363 and wrote his own treatise between 1358 and 1361.<sup>23</sup> In fact, one could hesitate between 1361 and 1363 for the completion of Nilus’ treatise, but it seems more likely, as proposed by Kislas, that Nilus had completed his work before going to Thessaloniki, where he held the Metropolitan see from the end of 1361 or the beginning of 1362 on. This data provides also additional information: we almost completely ignore the context in which Panaretos was working, but we know much better about Nilus’. He was in Constantinople when he wrote his treatise, so he must have had access to the translations of Thomas Aquinas’ works while he was there. Demetrius Kydones was his former pupil, therefore Nilus was certainly able to obtain many Thomistic texts through him: Kydones, in his *Apologia*, informs us that he indeed provided Nilus with Thomistic works.<sup>24</sup> This suggests that Nilus may not have directly got a copy of version B, but perhaps through Kydones, via a manuscript copied for him.

In this respect, *Marcianus gr.* 147, which will be fully described by Athanasopoulos,<sup>25</sup> is a very interesting case. As explained by Athanasopoulos, this manuscript was commissioned by Kydones from the copyist with whom he worked mostly, namely Manuel Tzykandyles.<sup>26</sup> Now I would like to insist on the fact that this manuscript contains a translation of *ST I<sup>a</sup> II<sup>ae</sup>* by

<sup>19</sup> Nil Kab., *Proc.*, 206, 24–25 Candal.

<sup>20</sup> Nil Kab., *Proc.*, 206, 25–26 Candal.

<sup>21</sup> Nil Kab., *Proc.*, 207, n. 1, Candal.

<sup>22</sup> *Marcianus gr. app.* II, 9 (coll. 1438), fol. 299<sup>v</sup>.

<sup>23</sup> See Nil Kab., *Spir.*, 83–84 Kislas.

<sup>24</sup> Dem. Kyd., *Apol.*, ed. G. Mercati, Città del Vaticano 1931, 391, 28–31.

<sup>25</sup> Within the research project *Thomas de Aquino Byzantinus*, Panagiotis Athanasopoulos is in charge of the critical edition of Demetrius Kydones’ translation of *ST I<sup>a</sup> II<sup>ae</sup>*. One of the main manuscripts of this translation is also *Marcianus gr.* 147, and Athanasopoulos already presented some information about it in his lecture during the conference in Stockholm, which he will publish within the framework of his critical edition. See also Mioni 1981, 207–208.

<sup>26</sup> About Manuel Tzykandyles, see Mondrain 2004, 250–263.

Kydones (ff. 17<sup>r</sup>–491<sup>v</sup>) as well as version B of *DRF* (ff. 1<sup>r</sup>–14<sup>v</sup>). So this translation of *DRF* by an hitherto unknown author was also copied by Manuel Tzykandyles,<sup>27</sup> and most probably for Demetrius Kydones. This means that Kydones must have been interested in this other translation of *DRF* and have had access to it. It is too early at this stage of my research to be able to say whether Kydones might have known and used this translation when he composed his own: it is impossible at this point to establish which one of the two translations was first elaborated. In any case, version B circulated in the same scholarly milieu as Kydones' translations, namely in our case through Nilus Kabasilas and Manuel Tzykandyles.

To sum up, we know that version B was available in Constantinople before 1361. Neither Nilus Kabasilas nor Matthew Angelos Panaretos mentioned the author of the translation they used. The text was transmitted to the circle of the latinophile intellectuals of the capital through the same distribution channels as Kydones' translations. However, these indications do not help much to determine the date and place of the composition of version B. Indeed, it could be Constantinople in the 1350s, but, although it is very unlikely, we cannot completely exclude the possibility that it was composed somewhere else, and possibly before the discovery of Thomas Aquinas' works in Constantinople in the 1350s.

#### The translator of version B

I owe many thanks to Professor Demetracopoulos who informed me, when he examined the above mentioned *Marcianus gr.* 147 in the Marciana Library in Venice, that there was a very interesting marginal note concerning the translator. In this manuscript, on fol. 1<sup>r</sup>, one can indeed read in the margin the following sentence: “this translation from Latin is by Atoumes” (αὕτη ἢ ἐκ τοῦ λατινικοῦ ἐρμηνεῖα τοῦ Ἀτούμη ἐστίν). In this sentence, Atoumes is obviously a proper name, the name of the translator. This information was until now unpublished (E. Mioni didn't transcribe this marginal note in his catalogue)<sup>28</sup> and it arouses some perplexity at first: no Atoumes is known within the circle of the Kydones brothers or more generally in the milieu of the Byzantine intellectuals who were interested in Latin culture.

So who could be Atoumes? This is a tricky prosopographical problem that I will not treat in detail here,<sup>29</sup> but rather briefly. The Atouemai are an old well-known family coming from Armenia, who entered into an alliance with Emperor Basil II in the 11th century and then

---

<sup>27</sup> As shown by Athanasopoulos, Manuel Tzykandyles himself was the copyist in charge of the first part of the manuscript, ff. 1<sup>r</sup>–85<sup>v</sup>.

<sup>28</sup> Mioni 1981, 207–208. Now see Blanchet 2016, 17–37.

<sup>29</sup> For more details see Blanchet 2016, 25–37.

became a genuine aristocratic Byzantine family.<sup>30</sup> It seems that the name Atoumes could be a variant of Atouemes, both names coming from the Armenian first name Atom: there still remains a debate among the specialists,<sup>31</sup> but from an onomastic point of view, the two patronymic names are close and can be related.

My research was first of all based on *PLP* and also on other sources, where I finally found 12 personages named either Atouemes or Atoumes who were active during the 14th century.<sup>32</sup> There is no evidence to suggest that any of these individuals could have known Latin and been able to perform a translation. Even if we examine this list in more detail in order to focus at least on those who seem to have had an intellectual activity, we can find only two copyists of liturgical manuscripts,<sup>33</sup> one of the sons of Theodore Metochites,<sup>34</sup> one anti-Palamite named Theodore Atouemes<sup>35</sup> and one otherwise unknown correspondent of John Chortasmenos in 1407.<sup>36</sup> The best candidate within that list would be Theodore Atouemes, a very young man in 1351, when he was condemned as an anti-Palamite and went into exile in Cyprus: at that time, he was to become a scholar and a theologian, but we have no information concerning his life after he settled in Cyprus.<sup>37</sup>

On the other hand, there is a famous intellectual who knew both Greek and Latin very well, and who must have been familiar with scholastic theology: it is Simon Atoumanos, who was first a Byzantine monk in the Stoudios' monastery, then became a Latin bishop in Gerace in Calabria in 1348, and later a Latin archbishop in Thebes.<sup>38</sup> He was an accomplished translator, especially since he was the author of a Latin translation of *De cohibenda ira* by

---

<sup>30</sup> See Cheynet 2006, 219–226. In the 14th century, they were not any more linked to Armenia, their name only might have recalled their Armenian origin.

<sup>31</sup> See Jordanov 2006, 71–72, n° 68 and Cheynet – Théodoridis 2010, 36–38, n° 24 and 25.

<sup>32</sup> See Blanchet 2016, 26.

<sup>33</sup> *PLP* 1643 and *PLP* 1645 (Ἀτουέμης Κωνσταντῖνος and Ἀτουέμης Μιχαήλ): two brothers, known as copyists in Crete in 1310 according to a note in *Patmiacus* 891, fol. 289<sup>v</sup>.

<sup>34</sup> *PLP* 1640 (Ἀτουέμης Ἀλέξιος): he has to be identified with Alexios Laskaris Metochites (*PLP* 17977), who was not only *mezas domestikos* in Constantinople in 1357, but also related to the emperor and a high-ranking member of the court. He was the son of Theodore Metochites, the famous *mesazon* in the reign of Andronikos II: for this identification, see R. Estangüi Gómez 2014, p. 307, n. 119. Alexios Atouemes Laskaris Metochites must have been involved in the project of the Union of the Churches in 1355: he is indeed mentioned, together with his two brothers, as having received a letter from Pope Innocent VI thanking him for his commitment to the Union in Constantinople: see Halecki 1930, p. 43–49. I am grateful to Raúl Estangüi Gómez for this information.

<sup>35</sup> *PLP* 1642 (Ἀτουέμης Θεόδωρος).

<sup>36</sup> *PLP* 1649 (Ἀτουέμης).

<sup>37</sup> Theodore Atouemes is mentioned in a letter of Gregory Akindynos (Akin, *Epist.*, ed. A. Constantinides Hero, Washington 1983, 204–209, Letter 49, here 208, 53–58), in the *Tome against the palamites* by Arsenius of Tyrus (Ars., *Tomus*, éd. I. Polemis, in *Jahrbuch der Österreichische Byzantinistik* 43 [1993], 261, 241–242) and in a *Dialogue* by Philotheus of Selymbria (Phil., *Dial.*, ed. M. Bakalopoulou, Athens 1992, 251–254). See also documents edited by Mercati 1931, 222–223, and Darrouzès 1959, 17.

<sup>38</sup> See *PLP* 1648; Fedalto 2007<sup>2</sup>.



Plutarch, that he dedicated to Cardinal Pietro Corsini in 1373.<sup>39</sup> Another important translation is attributed to him, namely the translation of the Bible from Hebrew into Greek, which can be found in *Marcianus gr.* 7.<sup>40</sup> It must be added that Simon Atoumanos was also linked with the Byzantine latinophile intellectuals, especially with Demetrios Kydones, and according to their correspondence, he stayed in Constantinople some time before 1364.<sup>41</sup> Simon Atoumanos would thus have the right profile, but he does not have the right name. The name “Atouman” (Ἀτουμάν / Ἀτουμάνης, Ἀτουμάνου) was used by several Byzantine historians (for instance Nicephore Gregoras, John Cantacuzene and Kritoboulos of Imbros) to refer to the Ottoman emirs, especially Osman (Othman), the founder of the dynasty.<sup>42</sup> It was thought to be a name of Turkish origin,<sup>43</sup> and it is documented in Byzantium.<sup>44</sup> From the onomastic point of view, it thus seems difficult to identify the name Atoumes (or Atouemes) with Atoumanos.

Thus, it remains impossible to find out the identity of the translator Atoumes. Let us hope that future progress in the research on the Greek translations of Thomas Aquinas’ works will help to resolve that question.

#### Elements for a comparison of the two translations

For the last part of my presentation, I will briefly deal with the texts themselves. The existence of two different Greek versions from the same period, both unpublished, will offer the rare opportunity to compare them and observe in detail the choices of each translator. Which rendering of Aquinas’ vocabulary do these translations display? Could some of his terms have given rise to misinterpretation? Do both translations come up against the same difficulties? Only a thorough analysis of the method of each translator will enable us to answer these questions, so for the moment I will just examine a few passages of the two

<sup>39</sup> Fedalto 2007<sup>2</sup>, 155.

<sup>40</sup> See Mercati 1916. This attribution is still confirmed by subsequent bibliography: D. De Crom wrote recently in this sense a « Postscript : the authorship of the *Graecus Venetus* translation » in the end of his article: D. De Crom 2009, here 299–301.

<sup>41</sup> We possess three letters sent to him by Demetrios Kydones: Dem. Kyd., *Epist.*, éd. R.-J. Lœnertz, Città del Vaticano 1956–1960, I, 125–128, n° 93 ; 139–141, n° 103 ; II, 117–123, n° 226 (german translation by F. Tinnefeld, Stuttgart 1982, I/2, 353–360, n° 59 ; 404–410, n° 69 ; and Stuttgart 1991, II, 145–155, n° 203). Letter 93 (59 in Tinnefeld) is dated from summer 1364 and refers to Atoumanos’ recent stay in Constantinople.

<sup>42</sup> See the examples given by Mercati 1916, 26–27.

<sup>43</sup> Simon Atoumanos was reputed to have had a Turkish father: in a letter dated to 11th September 1380, Peter IV of Aragon insisted that pope Urbain VI should remove Atoumanos from the archbishopric of Thebes, and he added that “the archbishop was himself born in Constantinople, and his father was a Turk and his mother a schismatic” (“archiepiscopus ipse de Constantinopoli ortus est paterque eius fuit turcus et mater eius cismatica”). This could be mere slander coming from Peter IV of Aragon.

<sup>44</sup> There are two other persons named Atoumanos in the 14th century in *PLP*: see *PLP* 1646 and *PLP* 1647.

translations and focus on the choice and consistency of the technical vocabulary and the literal or paraphrastic character of the translations.

The example I mentioned previously, that is the sentence quoted by Nilus Kabasilas, is quite significant:<sup>45</sup>

Latin	Version A (Kydones)	Version B (Atoumes)
“fides nostra sicut necessariis rationibus probari non potest quia humanam mentem excedit...”	ὥσπερ ἀδύνατον τὴν πίστιν ἀναγκαίους λόγοις ἀποδειχθῆναι, ὡσὰν τὴν ἀνθρωπίνην διάνοιαν ὑπερβαίνουσιν...	οὕτως ἢ ἡμετέρα πίστις ἀναγκαίους λόγοις δείκνυσθαι οὐ δύναται, ὅτι τὴν ἀνθρωπίνην διάνοιαν ὑπερβαίνει...

We find in this sentence some technical words which are translated in the same way by both translators, as is almost always the case in the entirety of the two translations: “fides” is translated into “πίστις”; “ratio” into “λόγος”; “necessarius” into “ἀναγκαῖος”; “humanus” into “ἀνθρώπινος”; there could have been several choices for “mens”, but the word is translated in the two versions into “διάνοια” (whereas “νοῦς” is usually used for “intellectus”); and “excedit” is also translated into the same Greek verb “ὑπερβαίνω”. So it is obvious that both translators respect a constant technical vocabulary, apparently the same one. In this sentence, the differences are only syntactic: “ἀδύνατον” in version A stands for “οὐ δύναται” in version B, which is closer to the Latin “non potest”. In version B, the expression “ὅτι τὴν ἀνθρωπίνην διάνοιαν ὑπερβαίνει” is an exact imitation of the Latin “quia humanam mentem excedit”, word for word, even if in Greek this structure does not sound completely natural; version A employs there a participial phrase, as would normally be expected in Greek: ὡσὰν τὴν ἀνθρωπίνην διάνοιαν ὑπερβαίνουσιν. In this case, there is no problem concerning the meaning of the sentence. Both translators understood correctly the Latin text and both are also very close to the text: they translated *ad verbum* without losing the meaning of the text.<sup>46</sup>

I can give an example where it is not the case (*DRF*, Chapter 1):

Latin	Version A (Kydones)	Version B (Atoumes)
-------	---------------------	---------------------

<sup>45</sup> See *supra* n. 20, 21 and 22.

<sup>46</sup> According to Glycofrydi-Leontsini 2003, 182, this is generally Kydones’ method of translation, that is a translation *ad sententiam*, since his primary concern was to capture the meaning of Aquinas’ text, and if possible also a translation word for word, *ad verbum*.

Thom. Aquin., <i>DRF</i> , B57	<i>Marcianus gr. app.</i> II, 9 (coll. 1438), fol. 299 <sup>f</sup>	<i>Marc. gr.</i> 147, f. 1 <sup>v</sup>
“Circa meritum vero quod ex libero dependet arbitrio, asseris tam Saracenos quam nationes alias necessitatem actibus humanis imponere ex praescientia vel ordinatione divina...”	δυσχυρίζη [...] ἀλλὰ καὶ περὶ τὰς τοῦ αὐτεξουσίου ἡρτημένας ἀνταποδόσεις, τοῖς τε ἄλλοις καὶ τοῖς σαρακηνοῖς οὐκ ὀλίγην εἶναι τὴν πλάνην, τὸν θεῖον προορισμὸν ἢ τὴν πρόγνωσιν λέγουσι ταῖς ἀνθρωπίναις πράξεσιν ἀνάγκην ἐπιτιθέναι...	Περὶ τὴν πολιτείαν δὲ διαβεβαιοῖ, ὡς ἐξ ἐλευθέρας γνώμης ἐξήρτηται τοσοῦτον τοὺς σαρακηνοὺς ὅσον καὶ ἄλλας γενεὰς ἀνάγκην ταῖς ἀνθρωπείαις πράξεσι ἐπιτιθέναι ἐκ τῆς προγνώσεως ἢ διατάξεως τῆς θείας...
“Concerning merit, which depends on free will, you assert that the Muslims as well as the other nations assign a necessity to human actions because of God’s fore-knowledge or decree...”	“You state [...] that, also concerning the rewards that depend on free will, the error made by the others as well as the Muslims is not a small one: they say that God’s providence or fore-knowledge assigns a necessity to human actions...”	“Concerning the way of life, you assert that it depends on free opinion that the Muslims as well as the other nations (should) assign a necessity to human actions because of God’s fore-knowledge or decree ...”

Here, the translator of version B did not correctly understand the whole sentence, as he considered “quod ex libero dependet arbitrio” to be an object clause of the verb “asseris”. So because of this mistranslation, the meaning is lost and the sentence is nonsense. He also chose to translate “meritum” by “πολιτείαν”: this word usually means rather “way of life”, but in patristic literature it could also have the sense of “good deeds”, which is much closer.<sup>47</sup>

The translator of version A, i.e. Kydones, understood somewhat better, but his translation of “merit” is also rather loose: he used “ἀνταποδόσεις”, that is “rewards”, to translate “merit”, whereas he used “αὐτεξούσιον” for “free will”, which is correct. He also introduced the notion of “providence” (προορισμός), which was not explicit in the Latin text. The general

<sup>47</sup> See Estienne 1831-1865, VI/2, col. 1350 C, s.v. πολιτεία: “Porro πολιτείας nomine saepe intelliguntur quae solent Theologi *bona opera* appellare”.

meaning of the sentence is not as bad as in version B, but in this case, Kydones did not remain so close to the text and chose to translate *ad sententiam*. We must notice that there is an addition in his version of the text: “οὐκ ὀλίγην εἶναι τὴν πλάνην” (“the error is not a small one”): it might not be due to him, as he usually does not add phrases to the original text, but to his Latin model, which would have had a text similar to “non parvum esse errorem”.<sup>48</sup> This could then be a sign that the two translators did not work on the same Latin model.

In conclusion, the process of translating Latin works into Greek was in itself a sign of deep curiosity towards Western thought in Byzantium. One of the challenges we face, while editing and commenting on these texts, is to analyze how Aquinas was understood through these translations and how he could then be used and quoted by Byzantine theologians from across the religious spectrum, even the fiercest anti-Latins.

#### Abbreviations

*DRF* – Thomas Aquinas, *De Rationibus Fidei*

*PLP* – *Prosopographisches Lexikon der Palaiologenzeit*, erstellt von E. Trapp, Wien 1979-1996.

*SG* – Thomas Aquinas, *Summa contra Gentiles*

*ST* – Thomas Aquinas, *Summa Theologiae*

#### Primary sources

Akin, *Epist.* – *Letters of Gregory Akindynos*, ed. A. Constantinides Hero, Washington 1983.

Ars., *Tomus* – Arsenius of Tyrus, *Tome against the palamites*, in I. Polemis, *Arsenius of Tyrus and his Tome against the palamites*, in *Jahrbuch der Österreichische Byzantinistik* 43 (1993), 241–281.

Dem. Kyd., *Apol.* – Demetrios Kydonès, *Apologia I*, in Mercati 1931, 359–403.

Dem. Kyd., *Epist.* – Démétrius Cydonès, *Correspondance*, ed. R.-J. Lœnertz, Città del Vaticano 1956–1960, 2 vol. (german translation by F. Tinnefeld, Stuttgart 1981-2003, 5 vol.).

Nil Kab., *Proc.* – *Nilus Cabasilas et theologia s. Thomae de processione Spiritus Sancti*, ed. E. Candal, Città del Vaticano 1945.

Nil Kab., *Spir.* – Nil Cabasilas, *Sur le Saint-Esprit*, ed. T. Kislas, Paris 2001.

---

<sup>48</sup> There is no mention of such an addition in the *apparatus* of the Latin critical edition (Thom. Aquin., *DRF*, B57), so it will require an in-depth analysis within the Latin manuscript tradition.

Pan., *Proc.* – Matthiew Panaretos, *De processione*, in C. Buda, *Il tomismo a Bisanzio nel secolo XIV. Una polemica bizantina del secolo XIV*, in *Archivio storico per la Calabria e la Lucania* 26 (1957), 291–323 ; 27 (1958), 3–33.

Phil., *Dial.* – Φιλόθεος Σηλυβρίας. *Βίος καὶ συγγραφικό ἔργο*, ed. M. Bakalopoulou, Athens 1992.

Thom. Aquin., *DRF* – Thomas Aquinas, *De Rationibus Fidei ad Cantorem Antiochenum*, ed. H.-F. Dondaine, in *Opera omnia*, 40, pars B, Roma 1968 (Editio Leonina), B57–B73 (German translation by L. Hagemann and R. Gleis, Altenberge 1987 [Corpus islamochristianum, Series latina 2] ; English translation by J. Kenney, in *Islamochristiana* 22 [1996], 31–52; French translation by G. Emery, Paris 1999).

## Secondary sources

M.-H. Blanchet, *Éliminer Thomas d'Aquin : le projet antithomiste de Matthieu Ange Panaréto*, in A. Speer – P. Steinkrüger (ed.), *Knotenpunkt Byzanz. Wissensformen und kulturelle Wechselbeziehungen, 37. Kölner Mediaevistentagung, Köln 14-17 September 2010*, Berlin 2012 (Miscellanea Mediaevalia, 36), 452–465.

M.-H. Blanchet, *Atoumès, un nouveau traducteur byzantin de Thomas d'Aquin*, in A. Berger [et al.] (ed.), *Koinotaton doron. Das späte Byzanz zwischen Machtlosigkeit und kultureller Blüte (1204-1461)*, Berlin 2016 (Byzantinisches Archiv, 31), 17–37.

C. Buda, *Influsso del tomismo a Bisanzio nel secolo XIV*, in *Byzantinische Zeitschrift* 49 (1956), 318–331.

J.-C. Cheynet, *De Tziliapert à Sébastè*, in *Studies in Byzantine Sigillography* 9 (2006), 213–226.

J.-C. Cheynet – D. Théodoridis, *Sceaux byzantins de la collection D. Théodoridis. Les sceaux patronymiques*, Paris 2010.

J. Darrouzès, *Lettre inédite de Jean Cantacuzène relative à la controverse palamite*, in *Revue des Études Byzantines* 17 (1959), 7–27.

D. De Crom, *The Book of Canticles in Codex Graecus Venetus 7*, in N. De Lange – J. G. Krivoruchko – C. Boyd-Taylor (ed.), *Jewish Reception of Greek Bible Versions. Studies in their Use in Late Antiquity and the Middle Ages*, Tübingen 2009 (Texts and studies in medieval and early modern Judaism, 23), 287–301.

J.A. Demetracopoulos, *Demetrius Cydones' translation of Bernardus Guidonis' list of Thomas Aquinas' writings and the historical roots of Byzantine Thomism*, in A. Speer – D. Wirmer (ed.), *1308. Eine Topographie historischer Gleichzeitigkeit*, Berlin 2010 (Miscellanea Mediaevalia, 35), 829–881.

J.A. Demetracopoulos, *The Influence of Thomas Aquinas on Late Byzantine philosophical and theological thought: À propos of the Thomas de Aquino Byzantinus Project*, in *Bulletin de philosophie médiévale* 54, 2012, 101–124.

J.A. Demetracopoulos, *Thomas Aquinas' Impact on Late Byzantine Theology and Philosophy: The Issues of Method or „Modus Sciendi“ and „Dignitas Hominis“*, in A. Speer – P. Steinkrüger (ed.), *Knotenpunkt Byzanz. Wissensformen und kulturelle Wechselbeziehungen*,

37. *Kölner Mediaevistentagung, Köln 14-17 September 2010*, Berlin 2012 (Miscellanea Mediaevalia, 36), 333–410.
- J.A. Demetracopoulos – C. Dendrinou, Thomas de Aquino Byzantinus, in *Bulletin de philosophie médiévale* 56 (2014), 13–22.
- R. Estangüi Gómez, *Les Tzamplakônes, grands propriétaires fonciers à Byzance au 14<sup>e</sup> siècle*, in *Revue des Études Byzantines* 72 (2014), 275–329.
- H. Estienne, *Thesaurus Graecae Linguae, post editionem anglicam novis additamentis auctum, ordineque alphabetico digestum tertio ediderunt Carolus Benedictus Hase, Guilielmus Dindorfius et Ludovicus Dindorfius*, Paris 1851-1865 [first edition 1572].
- M. Fanelli, *Un'omelia inedita del patriarca Callisto I e l'uso dei testi conciliari foziani nella disputa contro i Latini alla metà del 14o secolo*, in *Revue des Études Byzantines* 74 (2016) (under press).
- G. Fedalto, *Simone Atumano. Monaco di Studio, arcivescovo latino di Tebe. Secolo XIV*, Brescia 2007<sup>2</sup>.
- A. Fyrigos, *Tomismo e antitomismo a Bisanzio (con una nota sulla Defensio S. Thomae adversus Nilum Cabasilam di Demetrio Cidone)*, in A. Molle (ed.), *Tommaso d'Aquino († 1274) e il mondo bizantino*, Venafro 2004, 27–72.
- A. Glycofrydi-Leontsini, *Demetrios Cydones as a translator of Latin texts*, in C. Dendrinou [et al.] (ed.), *Porphyrogenita. Essays on the history and literature of Byzantium and the Latin East in honour of Julian Chrysostomides*, Aldershot 2003, 175–185.
- O. Halecki, *Un Empereur de Byzance à Rome*, Varsovie 1930.
- D. Jackson, *The Greek Library of Saints John and Paul (San Zanipolo) at Venice*, Tempe [AZ] 2011 (Arizona Center for Medieval and Renaissance Studies. Medieval Renaissance Texts and Studies, 391).
- I. Jordanov, *Corpus of Byzantine seals from Bulgaria. II, Byzantine seals with family names*, Sofia 2006.
- G. Mercati, *Se la versione dall'ebraico del codice Veneto Greco VII sia di Simone Atumano, arcivescovo di Tebe. Ricerca storica con notizie e documenti sulla vita dell'Atumano*, Rome 1916.
- G. Mercati, *Notizie di Procoro e Demetrio Cidone, Manuele Caleca e Teodoro Meliteniota ed altri appunti per la storia della teologia e della letteratura bizantina del secolo XIV*, Città del Vaticano 1931.
- E. Mioni, *Bibliothecae Divi Marci Venetiarum codices Graeci manuscripti. I, Pars prior: Classis I – Classis II, Codd. 1-120*, Roma 1967.
- E. Mioni, *Bibliothecae Divi Marci Venetiarum codices Graeci manuscripti. I, Thesaurus antiquus, codices 1-299*, Roma 1981.
- B. Mondrain, *L'ancien empereur Jean VI Cantacuzène et ses copistes*, in A. Rigo (ed.), *Gregorio Palamas e oltre: studi e documenti sulle controversie teologiche del XIV secolo bizantino*, Firenze 2004, 249–296.
- S. Papadopoulos, *Ἑλληνικαὶ μεταφράσεις θωμιστικῶν ἔργων. Φιλοθωμιστὰ καὶ ἀντιθωμιστὰ ἐν Βυζαντίῳ*, Athens 1967.

S. Papadopoulos, *Thomas in Byzanz. Thomas-Rezeption und Thomas-Kritik in Byzanz zwischen 1354 und 1453*, in *Theologie und Philosophie* 49 (1974), 274–304.

M. Plested, *Orthodox readings of Aquinas*, Oxford 2012.

P. Risso, *Matteo Angelo Panareto e cinque suoi opuscoli*, in *Roma e l'Oriente* 8 (1914), 91–105, 162–179, 231–237, 274–290; 9 (1915), 112–120, 202–206 ; 10 (1915), 63–77, 146–164, 238–251; 11 (1916), 28–35, 76–80, 154–160.