Aleksandar Anđelović

BETWEEN THE LITERAL AND THE LITERARY: SOCIAL BACKGROUND, LINGUISTIC COMPETENCE, AND THE BIBLE IN THE LATE-ANTIQUE LATIN TRANSLATIONS OF THE *VITA ANTONII*

MA Thesis in Comparative History, with a specialization
in Late Antique, Medieval, and Renaissance Studies.

Central European University

Vienna

May 2021

BETWEEN THE LITERAL AND THE LITERARY: SOCIAL BACKGROUND, LINGUISTIC COMPETENCE, AND THE BIBLE IN THE LATE-ANTIQUE LATIN TRANSLATIONS OF THE *VITA ANTONII*

by

Aleksandar Anđelović

(Serbia)

Thesis submitted to the Department of Medieval Studies,

Central European University Private University, Vienna, in partial fulfillment of the

requirements of the Master of Arts degree in Comparative History, with a specialization in

Late Antique, Medieval, and Renaissance Studies.

Accepted in conformance with the standards of the CEU.

_____Claudia Rapp_____
Chair, Examination Committee

_____Cristian-Nicolae Gaşpar, György Geréby _____
Thesis Supervisors

_____
Examiner

_____
Examiner

Vienna
May 2021

BETWEEN THE LITERAL AND THE LITERARY: SOCIAL BACKGROUND, LINGUISTIC COMPETENCE, AND THE BIBLE IN THE LATE-ANTIQUE LATIN TRANSLATIONS OF THE *VITA ANTONII*

by

Aleksandar Anđelović

(Serbia)

Thesis submitted to the Department of Medieval Studies,

Central European University Private University, Vienna, in partial fulfillment of the

requirements of the Master of Arts degree in Comparative History, with a specialization in

Late Antique, Medieval, and Renaissance Studies.

Accepted in conformance with the standards of the CEU.

_____David Movrin, Mark Edwards_____
External Readers

Vienna
May 2021

BETWEEN THE LITERAL AND THE LITERARY: SOCIAL BACKGROUND, LINGUISTIC COMPETENCE, AND THE BIBLE IN THE LATE-ANTIQUE LATIN TRANSLATIONS OF THE *VITA ANTONII*

by

Aleksandar Anđelović

(Serbia)

Thesis submitted to the Department of Medieval Studies,

Central European University Private University, Vienna, in partial fulfillment of the

requirements of the Master of Arts degree in Comparative History, with a specialization in

Late Antique, Medieval, and Renaissance Studies.

Accepted in conformance with the standards of the CEU.

_____
External Supervisor

Vienna
May 2021

I, the undersigned, **Aleksandar Anđelović**, candidate for the MA degree in Comparative History, with a specialization in Late Antique, Medieval, and Renaissance Studies declare herewith that the present thesis is exclusively my own work, based on my research and only such external information as properly credited in notes and bibliography. I declare that no unidentified and illegitimate use was made of the work of others, and no part of the thesis infringes on any person's or institution's copyright. I also declare that no part of the thesis has been submitted in this form to any other institution of higher education for an academic degree.

Vienna, 25 May 2021

Aleksandar Anđelović
Signature

Abstract

The present study explores verbatim biblical quotations in the two fourth-century translations of the Greek *Life of Antony* into Latin produced by an anonymous translator and Evagrius of Antioch, respectively. Careful comparison of these translations of the biblical material that was clearly identified as the word of God and thus unlikely to be the subject of a free and creative approach on the part of the translators, yields new insights, not only about the contrasting approaches taken by the two translators but also about their respective literary, linguistic, and theological backgrounds. By offering evidence that the anonymous translator was familiar with the Greek Bible but unacquainted with contemporary Latin versions of the Bible, this study demonstrates that the text of the Bible regarded as authoritative by him was not in Latin but in Greek. Moreover, the study further argues that the anonymous translator's mechanical and mirror renderings of several specifically Greek syntactical structures suggest that he was not a native speaker of Latin. His word-for-word approach was thus not the result of his conscious decision to be 'accurate,' but rather a reflection of his insufficient command of the language into which he was translating. In addition, this study shows that, unlike his anonymous counterpart, Evagrius used for his translation a Latin version of the Bible for which textual parallels can be found in other late antique Latin works, and that he rhetorically embellished and stylistically upgraded the language of the Bible in Latin available to him at the time. This study also provides evidence that Evagrius made use of the older, anonymous translation of the *Life* in producing his own version.

Acknowledgements

The unusual circumstances caused by the pandemic in which I wrote this thesis called for continual support more than ever before, which, fortunately, I have never lacked. This support empowered me to see these studies through, despite all the obstacles.

I would first like to recognize the immense help of my supervisors, Cristian Gaşpar and György Geréby, who provided me with invaluable assistance in refining research questions and hypotheses. Without their professional guidance, this thesis and its scholarly contributions would not have been realized. I also wish to express my deepest gratitude to the faculty and staff of the Department of Medieval Studies at CEU, that not only inspired me to develop critical thinking and provided me with different perspectives and new ideas in scholarship, but also offered a sympathetic ear during these trying times. These include Anna Somfai, Baukje van den Berg, Csilla Dobos, Dora Ivanišević, István Perczel, Stephanos Efthymiadis, and Zsófia Göde.

These times would have been much more strenuous to withstand without the company of my classmates and friends Ágnes, Dunja, Eszter, Eylül, Giorgi, Glenn, Marcoandrea and Sebastian. Riding bikes in Budapest with Debraj and Faeza, funny talks in analyzing society around us with Müberra, discussing the final writing process with Anja, as well as endless conversations with Konstantin, filled these two years of my studies and research with fun, creativity, and unforgettable moments. Special acknowledgement goes to Maria, my biggest and warmest support throughout our joint academic journey in Budapest and Vienna.

A debt of gratitude is owed to my family, and especially to my ever-supporting grandparents for their unconditional encouragement. I also thank my parents for all their love and support. Without them I would never have made it to this watershed in my academic career. I dedicate this thesis to them.

Table of contents

List of Abbreviations

LXX   Septuagint version of the Bible

NRSV   New Revised Standard Version, English translation of the Bible

OLD   *Oxford Latin Dictionary*

TLL   *Thesaurus linguae Latinae*

VA   *Vita Antonii*, the original Greek *Life of Antony* by Athanasius

VC   *Vigiliae Christianae*

VE   *Versio Euagriana,* Evagrius's Latin translation of the *VA*

VV   *Versio uetustissima,* the anonymous Latin translation of the *VA*

1. Introduction

1.1 The Greek *Life of Antony*: Normative Text, Hagiographic Model, and Literary Creation

The *Life of Antony* (*VA*)[1] is a hagiographic text written in the mid-fourth century in Greek[2] and usually attributed to Athanasius, the patriarch of Alexandria (d. 373 CE).[3] It describes in detail the life of one of the founding fathers of the Egyptian monasticism, Saint Antony (250-356). The text narrates how the protagonists embraced an ascetic lifestyle after giving away all his belongs, how he withdrew into the Egyptian desert, where he resisted temptations and fought demons. The narrative also includes Antony's long discourses on demonology, spirituality, and monastic conduct addressed to his fellow monks, and ends with a description of Antony's death at the age of 105.[4] Although Antony was not the first monk, the *Life* played an essential role in promoting him and his lifestyle as normative in the early Christian monastic milieus and, for that reason, Antony came to be regarded early on as *the* founder of monasticism.[5]

---

[1] In this thesis I have adopted the spelling of Antony's name as used by Timothy Barnes, Peter Brown, Averil Cameron, Alan Cameron, Samuel Rubenson, David Brakke, as well as in the latest English translation of the *Life*.

[2] The critical edition of the Greek *Life of Antony* (*VA*) I will be using in this thesis is Atanasio di Alessandria, *Sant'Antonio Abate: La sua vita*, ed. Gerhardus J. M. Bartelink, Italian trans. Luca Bruzzese (Bologna: Edizioni San Clemente and Edizioni Studio Domenicano, 2013), which is based on the the Greek text of the *VA* published by Bartelink, *Vie d'Antoine*, *Sources chrétiennes* 400 (Paris: Éditions du Cerf, 2004).

[3] Athanasius's authorship of the *Life of Antony* has been the subject of numerous debates. Apart from Athanasian paternity, the question has also been whether the Greek text we have is a revision of an original, now lost, Coptic text, and whether the Syriac *Life* that we have translates an original Copticising Greek text or an original Coptic; for a brief overview, see Andrew Louth, "St. Athanasius and the Greek Life of Antony," *Journal of Theological Studies* 39 (1988): 504-5. Given the lack of evidence of any other *Vorlage* than the extant Greek *Life* we have, I agree with David Brakke that the extant Greek *Life of Antony* is the earliest form of Antony's biography; see his "The Greek and Syriac versions of the *Life of Antony*," *Le Muséon* 107 (1994): 53. In any case, both the translators whose work I discuss in the present thesis worked with the Greek text that they believed to have been authored by Athanasius. For my current purposes, therefore, the question whether there existed an earlier redaction of the *Life of Antony* in Coptic or 'Copticizing' Greek is irrelevant.

[4] For the outline of the *Life* according to chapters, see William Harmless, *Desert Christians: An Introduction to the Literature of Early Monasticism* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004), 61.

[5] The *Life* itself mentions that there were monks at the time when Antony embarked on his monastic quest. Antony has been regarded primarily as the founder of anchoritic asceticism: the *Life* emphasizes not only *how*, but also *where* Antony practiced his ascetic life, i.e., in the desert; see Elizabeth Ann Clark, *Reading*

Athanasius fashioned Antony as a serene and charismatic monk living in solitude, at whom all visitors, Christians and 'pagans' alike, admired as they listened to his wise words, and whose lifestyle represents a role model for the *uita Christiana*. In the opening lines of the text, Athanasius stated that Antony was brought up in a Christian way (χριστιανικῶς) and that he did not learn letters (γράμματα) but was taught by God alone.[6] The whole narrative is characterized by Antony's firm faith, which was constantly an object of constant demonic assaults and temptations, which, owing to their vivid description and thoughtful and systematic arrangement throughout the *Life*, became popular in art and literature. Of course, our hero, with God's help, successfully overcame all the temptations and assaults.[7] Alongside the descriptions of Antony's combats, temptations, spiritual teaching and his ascetic lifestyle, Athanasius embedded elements of his own theology and political agenda in the *Life*. As a prominent figure in the tumultuous ecclesiastical politics of the fourth century, Athanasius's career was marked by repeated exiles,[8] and it was during his third exile (356-62) that he composed the *Life.*[9] This

---

Renunciation: Asceticism and Scripture in Early Christianity (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1999), 27-28.

[6] This does not mean that Athanasius's intention was to present Antony as illiterate, but rather to stress that Antony did not need to travel and learn the "letters" as 'pagans' do. The emphasis here is on Antony as being taught by God alone. Athanasius's attitude to and usage of traditional 'pagan' values have been the subjects of several scholarly discussions. While traditional 'pagan' concepts are explicitly renounced in the *Life*, Athanasius tacitly used some non-Christian sources. On the concepts of illiteracy as opposed to 'pagan' παιδεία and on education in Christian monastic milieus, see Samuel Rubenson, *The Letters of St. Antony: Monasticism and the Making of a Saint* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1995), 40 and 141-44; see also Philip Rousseau "Antony as Teacher in the Greek Life," in *Greek Biography and Panegyric in Late Antiquity,* eds. Tomas Hägg and Philip Rousseau (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2000), 90-92, as well as David Movrin "The Scriptures are Sufficient for Instruction: Interpreting παιδεῖα in Athanasius' *Vita Antonii*," *Živa Antika* 59 (2009): 17-40, and Samuel Rubenson, "Philosophy and Simplicity. The Problem of Classical Education in Early Christian Biography," in *Greek Biography and Panegyric*, 110-139.

[7] On the role of demons and demonology in the *Life of Antony*, see Plácido Alvarez, "Demon Stories in the Life of Antony by Athanasius," *Cistercian Studies* 23 (1988): 101-118, and Robert Penkett, "Discerning the Divine and the Demonic in the Life of Antony," *Reading Medieval Studies* 24 (1998): 79-94. On demonology in early Christianity with a special emphasis on demons and their role in Athanasius's *Life of Antony*, see the seminal study by David Brakke, *Demons and the Making of the Monk* (Cambridge-London: Harvard University Press, 2006).

[8] For a chronology of Athanasius's life, see David Brakke, *Athanasius and the Politics of Asceticism* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1995), xvi-xvii; also, Timothy D. Barnes, *Athanasius and Constantius: Theology and politics in the Constantinian Empire* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2001), xi-xii. For Athanasius's theological ideas and his position within the church politics of the fourth century, see Brakke, *Athanasius and the Politics*, as well as Khaled Anatolios, *Athanasius* (New York: Routledge, 2004).

[9] For the dating of the Greek *Life of Antony*, see Leslie W. Barnard, "The Date of S. Athanasius' 'Vita Antonii'," *VC* 28, no. 3 (1974): 169-75.

work eventually became Athanasius's "ultimate weapon in his anti-Arian work during this exile."[10]

Our knowledge about the 'historical' Antony is limited to speculation.[11] Scholarship has therefore focused rather on questions such as *how* Antony's figure is fashioned in the *Life*, whom he is associated with, how the *Life* functions as anti-Arian propaganda, etc. In other words, the text of the *Life* and its function became central points in modern scholarship. The *Life* became immensely influential in the later Christian tradition and it is therefore not surprising that it has attracted much scholarly attention. A wide range of studies explore, for instance, issues of textual criticism, the authorship of the *Life*, its original language and genre, and its sociological and theological aspects; other studies place the text in the contexts of early Christianity and the cult of saints and hagiography in Late Antiquity.[12] As the first complex hagiographic text on asceticism,[13] the *Life of Antony* "became one of the most influential examples of how to write the *Life* of a saint for all later hagiographers in Western as well as Eastern Christendom."[14] It has formed "not only the image of Antony but also largely that of monasticism in the Christian tradition."[15] It was translated into various languages, including Georgian, Coptic, Armenian, Old Church Slavonic.[16]

---

[10] Brakke, *Athanasius and the Politics*, 13 and 137. A more elaborate discussion of Arianism and Athanasius's anti-Arian campaign are beyond the scope of this thesis. For an overview of anti-Arian elements in the *VA* as well as in other works written by Athanasius see Louth, "St. Athanasius and the Greek Life of Antony," 504-09. On the Arians and Athanasius in general, see Brakke, *Athanasius and the Politics,* 129-41.

[11] As Brakke notes, "the *Life* is more an expression of his [Athanasius's] own views than a thoroughly reliable source for information about the real Antony"; see his *Athanasius and the Politics*, 201.

[12] Rubenson, *The Letters of St. Antony*, 126-27.

[13] On genre of the *VA*, see Averil Cameron, "Form and Meaning: The *Vita Constantini* and the *Vita Antonii*," in *Greek Panegyric and Biography,* 72-88.

[14] David Brakke, Introduction to "Athanasius of Alexandria, *Life of St. Antony of Egypt*," in *Medieval Hagiography: An Anthology,* ed. Thomas Head (New York: Routledge, 2001), 4.

[15] The literature on the *Life* is too large to be listed here. For the latest overview on Antonian scholarship, see James Corke-Webster, "The First Hagiographies: The *Life of Antony*, the *Life of Pamphilus*, and the Nature of Saints," in *The Hagiographical Experiment: Developing Discourses on Sainthood*, eds. Christa Gray and James Corke-Webster (Leiden and Boston: Brill, 2020), 29-62; moreover, "Bibliografia" in the Italian version of Bartelink's *Sources Chrétiennes* edition of the *VA*, 13-29 provides an updated thematic bibliography up to 2012.

[16] For the editions see ibid., 16-18.

With the growing interest in Egyptian monasticism in the West, [17] the *Life* was translated twice into Latin over the course of the two decades following Antony's death in 356 and the production of the Greek original.[18] The first and oldest translation was produced by an anonymous translator shortly after the hermit's death; the second translation was prepared by Evagrius, a prominent Christian intellectual from Antioch, some fifteen to twenty years after the first translation in ca. 374. The differences between the two translations, primarily in terms of their language-registers and the translators' attitudes to translation, present an optimal subject for philological investigation. In this thesis, I will focus on these two Latin translations; their general features and reception history will be the topic of the following three sections, where I will also introduce the aim of the thesis and my main research hypotheses.

1.2 The Anonymous Latin Translation: General Features and Reception History

Evagrius's translation of the *Life of Antony* was long believed to be the only translation from Greek into Latin, until 1914, when Dom André Wilmart, a French Benedictine medievalist and liturgist, found a non-Evagrian Latin translation of the *Life* [BHL 609e] in a manuscript in the Archives of the Chapter of Saint Peter in Rome.[19] He identified the text as an eleventh-century copy of the oldest Latin translation of the Greek *Life of Antony* produced some twenty years before Evagrius's translation, i.e. shortly after the production of the Greek

---

[17] Claudia Rapp has distinguished three ways in which information on saints and monks traveled from the Greek East and Egypt to the Latin West: sub-literary transmission, cultural translation and formal translation; see "Hagiography and Monastic Literature between Greek East and Latin West in Late Antiquity," in *Cristianità d'Occidente e cristianità d'Oriente* (Spoleto: CISAM, 2004), 1251. For Latin in the East see ibid., 1228-38.

[18] There are several contemporary attestations of the early existence of the *Life* translated in Latin: Jerome ca. 377 and Rufinus of Aquileia ca. 400 noted that the *Life* had been translated into Latin, while ca. 395 Jerome explicitly identified Evagrius of Antioch as the translator of the Greek *Life* into Latin, see Lois Gandt, "A Philological and Theological Analysis of the Ancient Latin Translations of the *Vita Antonii*" (Ph.D. diss., Fordham University, 2008), 2.

[19] Available online in the digital database of the Vatican Library, shelfmark Arch. Cap. S. Pietro. A.2, https://digi.vatlib.it/view/MSS_Arch.Cap.S.Pietro.A.2, last accessed April 15, 2021. For a detailed description and discussion of this manuscript, see Paola Supino Martini, *Roma e l'area grafica romanesca (secoli X-XII)* (Alessandria: Edizioni Dell'Orso, 1987), 68-73.

Life.[20] Evagrius himself, in the Prologue to his translation, alluded to an earlier translation, denouncing it for its literal translation style, which, in his view, meant to convey form, not meaning. In this thesis, by offering evidence from both translations, I attempted to show that Evagrius alluded in his Prologue exactly to this oldest anonymous translation.[21] Indeed, immediately after its discovery, the anonymous translation received criticism for its literal approach and word-for-word translation of the Greek into Latin, and already Wilmart characterized the text found in the eleventh-century manuscript as "literal and rough" in comparison to Evagrius's translation.[22]

The first modern edition of the text was published twenty five years after its discovery.[23] The editor Gérard Garitte scorned the anonymous translation for its word-for-word approach and attempted to correct numerous readings he considered to be 'errors' in the manuscript.[24] Garitte's edition was later followed by three critical editions: one by Henricus Hoppenbrouwers with a French translation in 1960,[25] one by Gerhardus J. M. Bartelink in 1974 accompanied by an Italian translation and an introduction by Christine Mohrmann,[26] and the most recent in 2018 by Lois Gandt, which I will be using in the present thesis.[27] It should be noted that Hoppenbrouwers, Mohrmann, and to a lesser extent Bartelink, were members of the so-called

---

[20] That the anonymous translation precedes Evagrius's remains unchallenged; see André Wilmart, "Une version latine inédite de la vie de saint Antoine," *Revue bénédictine* 31 (1914): 164.

[21] See below pp. 43-47.

[22] Wilmart, "Une version latine inédite," 172.

[23] Gérard Garitte, *Un témoin important du texte de La vie de s. Antoine par s. Athanase: la version latine inédite des Archives du Chapitre de S. Pierre à Rome* (Bruxelles and Rome: Palais des Académies and Academia Belgica, 1939).

[24] This approach was questioned by Bartelink, see his "Observations de critique textuelle sur la plus ancienne version latine de la Vie de saint Antoine par saint Athanase," *Revue bénédictine* 81(1971): 92-95.

[25] Henricus Hoppenbrouwers, *La plus ancienne version latine de la vie de saint Antoine par saint Athanase: Étude de critique textuelle* (Nijmegen: Dekker & van de Vegt, 1960). Later, Hoppenbrouwers published an article in which he discussed further the profile of the anonymous translator and his approach to translation, see Henricus Hoppenbrouwers, "La technique de la traduction dans l'Antiquité d'après la première version latine de la Vita Antonii," in *Mélanges Christine Mohrmann: Nouveau recueil offert par ses anciens élèves* (Utrecht: Spectrum, 1973), 80-95.

[26] *Vita di Antonio*, ed. Gerhardus J. M. Bartelink (Milano: Fondazione Lorenzo Valla, 1974; repr. 2003).

[27] *Vitae Antonii Versiones latinae. Vita beati Antonii abbatis Evagrio interprete. Versio uetustissima*, ed. Pascal H. E. Bertrand and Lois Gandt (Turnhout: Brepols, 2018); Gandt's critical edition of the *VV* is printed on pp. 107-77.

Nijmegen School, an influential group of scholars whose research into early hagiography was informed by the controversial notion of Latin as a Christian *Sondersprache,* implying that Christians spoke a 'special' form of Latin in Late Antiquity as opposed to 'non-Christian varieties' of Latin.[28] Another offspring of the Nijmegen School, Ludovicus T. A. Lorié, wrote an important study on the spiritual terminology of the anonymous translation, calling the language of the anonymous translation "the Latin of the Christian spiritual life."[29] Another valuable study to be mentioned here is Lois Gandt's PhD dissertation on the two Latin translations of the *Life of Antony*, in which the author compared the two Latin translations and provided a solid philological and theological analysis of both texts. Gandt followed the theory of Lorié that "the anonymous translation of the *VA* exemplifies the early Christian Latin that was prevalent in the late fourth century."[30] In this thesis, my hypotheses about the anonymous translation are formulated against the theory that it is an exemplar of a 'Christian' and 'monastic' Latin. Instead, I will offer other explanations and reasons that might have prompted the anonymous translator's word-for-word approach to translation.[31]

The anonymous translator did not provide any information about the circumstances in which he produced his translation, nor does he tell us at whose request and for whom he translated the *Life*.[32] Unlike his later counterpart Evagrius, the anonymous translator is thus a completely unknown figure.[33] Nevertheless, since the discovery of his translation, there have

---

[28] For a brief overview of the theories developed by the so-called Nijmegen school, see Philip Burton, *The Old Latin Gospels: A Study of their Texts and Language* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000), 153-54. The notion of 'Christian' Latin as *Sondersprache* is now outdated and it never lacked critics; see, for example, the most recent publications on this topic, Tim Denecker, "Among Latinists: Alfred Ernout and Einar Löfstedt's responses to the 'Nijmegen School' and its Christian *Sondersprache* hypothesis," *Historiographia Linguistica* 45, no. 3 (2018): 325-62, as well as id., "The Nijmegen School and its 'Sociological' Approach to the So-Called 'Sondersprache' of Early Christians: A Preliminary Historiographical Study," *Latomus: revue d'études latines* 77, no. 2 (2018): 335-57.

[29] Ludovicus T. A. Lorié, *Spiritual Terminology in the Latin Translations of the* Vita Antonii*, with Reference to Fourth and Fifth Century Monastic Literature* (Utrecht: Dekker & van de Vegt, 1955), 5.

[30] Gandt, "A Philological and Theological Analysis," 74.

[31] See below pp. 43-46.

[32] That the anonymous translation was produced for a Roman audience was suggested by Wilmart, "Une version latine inédite," 173; there is, however, no conclusive evidence to support this hypothesis.

[33] For the little that is known about the anonymous translator, see Gandt's edition of the *VV*, 205-08.

been several attempts to uncover his identity. Henricus Hoppenbrouwers speculated that the translator was in fact a prominent Egyptian monk named Isidore;[34] Lois Gandt, the most recent editor of the anonymous translation, has identified him with another well-known Egyptian monk, Ammonius, basing her arguments on Ammonius's erudition and knowledge of the Bible.[35] While I agree that the author of the anonymous translation was most probably an Egyptian monk,[36] it is very unlikely that we will ever be able to establish his identity. Rather than attempting to identify him with well-known figures of fourth-century Egyptian monasticism, our knowledge about the anonymous translator should be gleaned from the very text of the translation.

1.3 The Evagrian Latin Translation: General Features and Reception History

In contrast to his anonymous counterpart, the author of the other Latin translation of the *Life of Antony* Evagrius (320-394), a Christian intellectual from Antioch in Syria, is a well-known figure.[37] His life and career are relatively well-documented in both the extant ancient sources and modern scholarship.[38] He was born to a high-ranking curial family in ca. 320 and was certainly a man of influence.[39] Just the names with which Evagrius has often been connected suffice to suggest that he was a member of what is commonly regarded as the late-antique elite: Evagrius visited Rome, where he had contacts with pope Damasus; he travelled

---

[34] Hoppenbrouwers, "La technique de la traduction," 91-95. Isidore was a prominent fourth-century desert ascetic and later presbyter in Alexandria, who often acted as a host for pilgrims, see Lois Gandt, "A Philological and Theological Analysis," 293.

[35] Another fourth-century desert ascetic and one of the Tall Brothers, the four monks from Nitria known for their exceptional height as well as for their erudition, see ibid., 298.

[36] Primarily because of his familiarity with the Egyptian desert, as rightly noticed by Gandt, "A Philological and Theological Analysis," 73.

[37] Not to be confused with his contemporary, Evagrius of Pontus.

[38] He is mentioned in the writings of Libanius, Basil of Caesarea, Ambrose and Jerome; see the "Introduction" to *Early Christian Lives*, ed. and trans. Caroline White (London: Penguin Books, 1998), 5. For a complete overview of Evagrius's life, see Stefan Rebenich, *Hieronymus und sein Kreis: Prosopographische und sozialgeschichtliche Untersuchungen* (Stuttgart: Franz Steiner Verlag, 1992), 52-75.

[39] On Evagrius's origins and social status, see ibid., 52-56.

to Vercelli with the bishop Eusebius, who introduced Evagrius to Hilary of Poitiers; Evagrius is also said to have energetically acted against Auxentius, the 'Arian' bishop of Milan, the predecessor of Ambrose. Finally, in Italy, probably in Aquileia, Evagrius established close ties with Jerome and later became one of Jerome's most important patrons, hosting the latter at his estate Maronia outside Antioch in Syria.[40] Jerome, in his turn, recommended translating non-scriptural texts sense-for-sense and not word-for-word, alluding to Evagrius's translation of the *Life* in his well-known letter to Pammachius, in which he discussed methods of translating.[41] Evagrius was also actively involved in the ecclesiastic controversies of his hometown of Antioch, in particular in the so-called Meletian dispute.[42] He was even consecrated as bishop of Antioch, yet what he achieved during his episcopate is unknown. The exact date of Evagrius's death is uncertain. According to Jerome, he was still alive in 392; the year of his death is generally assumed to have been 393-394.[43]

Although Evagrius had an influential political and ecclesiastical career, his name has first and foremost been associated with his translation of the *Life of Antony* into Latin [BHL 609].[44] In the prologue to his translation, Evagrius stated that his translation was produced at the request of his friend Innocentius, saying "Evagrius the priest sends greetings in the Lord to Innocentius, his dearest son. [...] I have translated, as you requested, the life of the blessed

---

[40] See Stefan Rebenich, "Hieronymus und Evagrius von Antiochia," in *Studia Patristica 28*, *Papers presented at the Eleventh International Conference on Patristic Studies held in Oxford 1991*, ed. Elizabeth A. Livingstone (Leuven: Peeters, 1993) 80.

[41] *Epist.* 57.6, *Liber de optimo genere interpretandi (Epistula 57)*, ed. Gerhardus J. M. Bartelink (Leiden: Brill, 1980), 14. See also David Movrin, "Hieronimov prevajalski credo," *Keria* 2, no. 2 (2000): 47–56.

[42] For a full description of the Meletian-Pauline schism in Antioch, the ideological and theological debates that surrounded it, as well as Evagrius's involvement in it, see Pascal H. E. Bertrand, "Die Evagriusübersetzung der *Vita Antonii*: Reception - Überlieferung – Edition. Unter besonderer Berücksichtigung der *Vitas Patrum*-Tradition" (Ph.D. diss., Utrecht University, 2005), 25-27.

[43] Bertrand, "Die Evagriusübersetzung," 27.

[44] The critical edition of Evagrius's translation (*VE*) that I will use in this thesis is *Vitae Antonii Versiones latinae. Vita beati Antonii abbatis Evagrio interprete. Versio uetustissima*, ed. Pascal H. E. Bertrand and Lois Gandt (Turnhout: Brepols, 2018); Bertrand's critical edition of the *VE* is printed on pp. 3-103.

Antony [...]."[45] This helps us date Evagrius's translation: given that Innocentius died in 374,[46] Evagrius must have finished his translation by 373/374, but a more precise date, unfortunately, cannot be established.

The Evagrian translation was widely read throughout the Middle Ages, as witnessed by the more than four hundred manuscripts in which it survives. Its popularity was certainly one of the reasons why the oldest anonymous translation fell into oblivion in the Middle Ages.[47] In stark contrast to the anonymous translation, Evagrius's translation, probably written for a late-antique elite readership, was composed in a high register of Latin. Evagrius employed various rhetorical techniques, cited classical authors such as Vergil, Sallust,[48] and Horace, and produced a free translation 'according to sense' (*ad sensum*),[49] rather than a literal one such as the earlier anonymous translation.

Evagrius's translation has been edited repeatedly from the sixteenth until the twentieth century by Rosweyde, Bernard de Montfaucon, Migne, and others.[50] In 2005, Pascal H. E. Bertrand published an extremely valuable dissertation on the history of Evagrius's translation and, taking into account manuscripts from the eighth to the fifteenth century, produced a critical edition of Evagrius's text. His edition was published in 2018 together with Gandt's edition of the anonymous translation, which I will use in this thesis.[51] Despite the criticism for the anonymous translation, Evagrius's more polished translation has not received wide attention

---

[45] *VE* Prol. (ed. Bertrand, 3): *Presbyter Euagrius Innocentio charissimo filio in Domino salutem*. [...] *vitam beati Antonii te petente ita transposui* [...].

[46] See Bertrand, "Die Evagriusübersetzung," 27, and Rebenich, *Hieronymus und sein Kreis*, 60-1. Innocentius was certainly a close friend of Evagrius and Jerome; for example, Jerome, reporting Innocentius's death, described Innocentius as "one of his [Jerome's] two eyes" (*ex duobus oculis unum perdidi*) and "half of his soul" (*partem animae meae* [...] *febrium ardor abstraxit*), see *Epist.* 3.3, http://www.patrologia-lib.ru/patrolog/hieronym/index.htm, last accessed May 1, 2021.

[47] See Garitte, *Un témoin*, 1.

[48] For the use of Sallust and Vergil in Evagrius's translation, see Bernd R. Voss, "Bemerkungen zu Euagrius von Antiochien, Vergil und Sallust in der *Vita Antonii*," *VC* 21, no. 2 (1967): 93-102.

[49] See "Introduzione," in the Italian *Source Chrétiennes* volume of the *VA*, 114-15.

[50] For an overview of pre-modern editions of Evagrius's translation, see Gandt, "A Philological and Theological Analysis," 8-11.

[51] See above n. 27 and 44.

in modern scholarship. Jean Leclercq has focused on the reception of Evagrius's representation of Antony in medieval literature,[52] while Bartelink has explored the rhetorical techniques employed in Evagrius's description of demons.[53] In her dissertation on the two Latin translation of the *Life*, Lois Gandt has discussed the rhetorical embellishments and revisions of the Greek *Life* found in the Evagrian text.[54] In this thesis, I will further support arguments made by previous scholars about Evagrius's rhetorical skills and provide insights into Evagrius's attitude to the Bible as well as his familiarity with the Bible in Latin, the language of which he oftentimes attempted to stylistically upgrade and rhetorically embellish.

1.4 The Object of the Thesis and Research Hypotheses

As part of a wider intention to fashion Antony and his lifestyle as normative in monastic milieus, Athanasius often quoted from both the Old and the New Testament.[55] Drawing on the Bible proved to be an effective technique for presenting Antony as emulating biblical ideals and figures such as Elijah, Elisha, Moses, Paul, and Christ himself.[56] Most scholars claim that there are about two hundred biblical quotations and allusions in the *Life of Antony*, while some argue for as many as four hundred.[57] Despite the different numbers, they all agree that there

---

[52] Jean Leclercq, "Saint Antoine dans la tradition monastique médievale," in *Antonius Magnus Eremita 356-1956*, ed. Basilius Steidle (Rome: Herder, 1956), 229-48.

[53] G. J. M. Bartelink, "Einige Bemerkungen über Evagrius' von Antiochien Übersetzung der 'Vita Antonii,'" *Revue bénédictine* 82 (1972): 98-105.

[54] Gandt, "A Philological and Theological Analysis," 183-235.

[55] The text of the Greek Old Testament used in this thesis is the latest edition of Rahlfs's standard edition of the LXX: *Septuaginta, id est Vetus Testamentorum graece iuxta LXX interpretes*, ed. Alfred Rahlfs, 2nd ed. Robert Hanhart (Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 2006). The text of the Greek New Testament used in this thesis is *Novum Testamentum Graece,* 28th edition, ed. Christos Karakolis et al. (Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 2012).

[56] On the role of the Bible in the *Life*, see David Movrin, "*Christiana vita, Christi scriptura:* Retelling the Bible in the *Life of Antony*," in *Retelling the Bible*: *Literary, Historical, and Social Contexts*, eds. Lucie Doležalová and Tamás Visi (Frankfurt-New York: Peter Lang, 2011), 275-85. For a brief overview of the biblical figures with whom Athanasius associated Antony, see Harmless, *Desert Christians*, 69-70.

[57] That there are around two hundred biblical quotations and allusions is noted by Bartelink, "Die literarische Gattung der 'Vita Antonii.' Struktur und Motive," *VC* 36, no. 1 (1982), 52; as well as by Harmless, *Desert Christians*, 69, who writes that there are "more than two hundred" scriptural references. On the other hand, one of the two editors of the latest English translation of the *Life,* Tim Vivian, states that there are "four hundred references or allusions to the Bible," basing his argument on a "rough count"; see "Introduction," in *The Life of Antony by Athanasius of Alexandria: The Coptic Life and The Greek Life*, trans. Tim Vivian and Apostolos N.

are hundreds of scriptural references in the Greek text. The analysis of all the biblical material in the *Life* and in its two Latin translations thus lies beyond the scope of an MA thesis. In the present thesis, I therefore focus on the biblical passages quoted in the *Life* by Athanasius verbatim, i.e., with no or minimal change in respect to their original formulation in the Greek Bible. More specifically, I will concentrate on the same quotations in the two Latin translations to explore how the two translators, each in his own way, rendered them from Greek into Latin as part of their versions of the *VA*.[58] Despite its promising potential for research, the biblical material as found in the two Latin translations of the *Life* has received little or no scholarly attention. Lorié's study on the spiritual terminology of the anonymous translation, in his own words, "is not concerned with the Bible translations but the anonymous's own personal Latin,"[59] while Lois Gandt has explored the philological and theological similarities and differences between the two translations, yet without analyzing and comparing the two translations in regard to their usage of the Bible.[60]

The translations of the verbatim biblical quotations in the Greek *Life of Antony* offer excellent starting points for a meaningful philological comparison. The two translators were less likely to adopt a free, creative approach to translation when rendering what was clearly identified in the Greek original as a direct quotation from the Scripture, i.e., the word of God, than when translating the other parts of Athanasius's text. As such, the translations of verbatim biblical quotations from Greek into Latin have the potential to reveal more about our two

---

Athanassakis (Kalamazoo, Michigan: Cistercian Publications, 2003), xxvi. This is not to say that Athanasius did not employ references from non-Christian tradition, although these are undoubtedly outnumbered by scriptural references; see Movrin, "The Scriptures are Sufficient for Instruction," 30-33.

[58] I found a number of errors pertaining to biblical quotations in the most recent Gandt-Bertrand edition of the two Latin translations. These are mostly verbatim biblical quotations in the two translations that were not recognized as such in the edition or *vice versa*; for example, the anonymous translator's *cum steterit peccator in conspectu meo, insurdabar et humiliabar et tacebam a bonis* (*VV* 27, ed. Gandt, 129) is a literal translation of Psalm 38:2-3: Ἐν τῷ συστῆναι τὸν ἁμαρτωλὸν ἐναντίον μου, ἐκωφώθην καὶ ἐταπεινώθην καὶ ἐσίγησα ἐξ ἀγαθῶν, but it has not been recognized as such in Gandt's edition. In such cases, I indicated so.

[59] Lorié, *Spiritual Terminology,* 7.

[60] Gandt, "A Philological and Theological Analysis," 82-83.

11

translators' individual approach to translation and about their linguistic, cultural, and theological background than is known so far.

The first, obvious research question, albeit one that has been rarely asked by scholars, is whether the first, anonymous translator of the *Life of Antony* used any of the existing Latin translations of the Bible to translate the biblical quotations he found in the Greek original or he translated them himself, without taking recourse to the translations already available. My inventory of verbatim biblical quotations in the *versio vetustissima* and in Evagrius's Latin translation has demonstrated that, in most cases, the anonymous translator's renderings of the biblical quotations do not match any of the Latin versions of the Bible available at the time. My main working hypothesis is that the anonymous translator's ignorance of the contemporary versions of the Bible in Latin was a consequence of the fact that the translator was not a native speaker of Latin.

Furthermore, the wording of the Latin versions of biblical quotations that the anonymous translator provides in his translation as an additional material and which are absent from Athanasius's text very often correspond exactly to the wording of the relevant passages in the Greek Bible, and only exceptionally with other Latin versions of the same passages. This suggests that the Bible text that the anonymous translator used and was exposed to in a liturgical and a private context was not in Latin but in Greek. In addition, the anonymous translator's mechanical[61] translations of certain Greek verbs and nouns into Latin and his mirror rendering of a number of syntactic structures from Greek into Latin, both in a biblical context and in other parts of his translation, further support my hypothesis that the author of the oldest translation was not a native speaker of Latin. Although the question of whether Greek or another language

---

[61] The term *mechanical* in this thesis is used as equal to non-idiomatic and word-for-word approach to translation, resulting in automatic equivalence between words translated from one language to another, in this case from Greek into Latin, as opposed to language choice that is seen as idiomatic and dynamic. This terminology is also used by James N. Adams, see, for instance, his *Bilingualism and the Latin Language* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004)*,* 37.

was the anonymous translator's native language cannot be answered conclusively, the kind of insufficient command of Latin as target language found in the anonymous translation is a usual feature of translations produced by bilingual speakers. Thus, in contrast to what has been assumed about the language of the anonymous translation as an exemplar of 'early Christian' and 'monastic' Latin, my hypothesis is that the bilingualism of the anonymous translator may explain his literal approach to translation and some of the linguistic features of his version of the *VA*.

The text of Evagrius's translation of the *Life* has not been fully scrutinized for all the possible information about its author and his context either. My study has revealed that, in stark contrast to his anonymous counterpart, Evagrius used a version of the Bible for which many textual parallels can be found in the works of other Latin authors of Late Antiquity. It is also apparent that he felt free to rhetorically upgrade the Latin of the biblical versions available to him in the second half of the fourth century. In addition to this, in this thesis I will discuss several examples of biblical quotations from the *Life* from both Latin translations that strongly suggest that Evagrius had read and made use of the oldest anonymous translation while working on his own translation of the *Life*. This discussion is meant to provide further clarification on the relation between the two translations.

2. Biblical Quotations and the Bible in Latin in the Fourth Century

Considering that quoting the Bible in Athanasius's *Life of Antony* encompassed various quoting techniques and resulted in a wide range of forms, before analyzing and discussing biblical quotations in the Greek text and its two late-antique Latin translations, it is first necessary to elaborate on the criteria used in this thesis for classifying and studying quotes from the Bible and their features.[62] In addition, as the two Latin translations will not be treated in isolation, in the second section of this chapter I will attempt to place the anonymous translator and Evagrius in the wider context of using the Bible in Latin at the time when they worked on their translations, i. e., in the second half of the fourth century.

2.1 Quoting the Bible: Terminology, Typology, Techniques

The study of biblical quotations in patristic texts is a complicated task, primarily because of the wide variety of techniques used by their authors to refer to the text of the Bible: they range from a simple explicit mention of a figure or an event from the Scriptures, making an allusion to these with or without introducing an actual quotation, all the way to quoting fragments or entire verses of the Scripture and modifying them either intentionally or unintentionally, or quoting verbatim, without a single modification, a text as it stood in the various versions of the Bible available in this period.[63]

---

[62] As Gordon Fee notes, text critics "need to devise a set of criteria, or guidelines, by which to assess the degrees of certainty or doubt with regard to any patristic citation"; see Gordon D. Fee, "The Use of the Greek Fathers for New Testament Textual Criticism," in *The Text of the New Testament in Contemporary Research,* eds. Bart D. Ehrman and Michael W. Holmes (Grand Rapids: W. B. Eerdmans, 1995), 201.

[63] Speaking of the Latin Fathers, Philip Burton called this a "unique problem with patristic citations," *The Old Latin Gospels*, 4. That there are difficulties of "determining the accuracy with which a Father cites Scripture" when using patristic citations for biblical textual criticism has also been noted by Houghton, see "'Flattening' in Latin Biblical Citations," in *Studia Patristica 45. Papers from the Fifteenth International Patristics Conference*, ed. Jane Baun et al. (Leuven: Peeters Publishers, 2010), 271.

As mentioned in the Introduction, there are over two hundred biblical quotations in the *Life of Antony.* In identifying these quotations, I have relied on biblical apparatus provided in the latest critical edition of the Greek text by Bartelink,[64] whose work in identifying all the possible biblical quotations, allusions, and references in the Greek text is impressive and praiseworthy. Around ninety of them are specific quotations or allusions where there is no doubt that Athanasius had in mind particular passages in the Bible when writing, which he referred to intentionally and with full knowledge of their original wording and context. More than half of these are verbatim quotations, i.e., passages that Athanasius cited with no alteration to the lexical choice and word order of the biblical original.[65] For instance, when Athanasius's Antony advised his fellow monks on how to react when they see demons, he stated: *Ἐν τῷ συστῆναι τὸν ἁμαρτωλὸν ἐναντίον μου, ἐκωφώθην καὶ ἐταπεινώθην καὶ ἐσίγησα ἐξ ἀγαθῶν. Καὶ πάλιν· Ἐγὼ δὲ ὡσεὶ κωφὸς οὐκ ἤκουον, καὶ ὡσεὶ ἄλαλος οὐκ ἀνοίγων τὸ στόμα αὐτοῦ. Καὶ ἐγενήθην ὡσεὶ ἄνθρωπος οὐκ ἀκούων.*[66] Athanasius quoted here word-for-word and without any revisions, i.e., verbatim, two passages from the Psalms, 38:2-3 and 37:14-15. He added "and again" (καὶ πάλιν) between the two quotations to separate them as two individual passages from the Psalms.

In addition to such verbatim biblical quotations, I will also include in my analysis the instances when Athanasius changed the biblical word order or where his lexical choice is slightly different than that of the Bible, as long as it is clear that he intended to quote a particular passage from the Bible.[67] There are numerous reasons why Athanasius made these such

---

[64] See "Introduzione – Capitolo 2," in his critical edition of the *VA*, 92.

[65] Verbatim seems to be an appropriate term for the purpose of the discussion offered here. The term is similarly and repeatedly used by Hugh Houghton; see, for instance, his *Augustine's Text of John: Patristic Citations and Latin Gospel Manuscripts* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2011), 42.

[66] *VA* 27.2-3 (ed. Bartelink, 238), "'While the sinner stood before me I kept quiet and humbled myself and did not speak of what was good.' And again, 'I was like the deaf person and did not listen; I was like a mute and did not open my mouth. I became like a person who does not hear.'" (trans. Vivian and Athanassakis, 121).

[67] This is what Carroll D. Osburn calls "adaptation," defined as follows: "Reference to a biblical passage, which exhibits verbal correspondence to the Greek NT, but which has been adapted to fit the Father's discussion and/or syntax." See "Methodology in Identifying Patristic Citations in New Testament Textual Criticism," *Novum Testamentum* 47, no. 4 (2005): 315. Osburn deals mainly with the citations in the Greek Fathers and offers a very

changes. For instance, when Antony says to his disciples *Μὴ χαίρετε, ὅτι τὰ δαιμόνια ὑμῖν ὑποτάσσεται, ἀλλ' ὅτι τὰ ὀνόματα ὑμῶν γέγραπται ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς,*[68] Athanasius quoted from the Gospel of Luke 10:20, with only one, yet important and intentional alteration; he changed "the spirits" (τὰ πνεύματα) from Luke 10:20 to "the demons" (τὰ δαιμόνια), so as to fit the quotation into Antony's overall discourse on demonology. The lexical correspondences of the rest of the quotation leave no doubt that Athanasius had a particular passage from the Bible in mind, in this case, Luke 10:20.

Apart from such obvious ideologically motivated modifications, Athanasius also slightly changed some grammatical constructions in order to align and adjust the scriptural text to the grammar and context of the relevant passage in the *Life*. Thus, in the same speech to his fellow monks, Antony says: *ἵνα, καθὼς γέγραπται, μὴ παντὶ πνεύματι πιστεύωμεν.*[69] Athanasius here clearly indicated that he referred to the Bible by "as it is written" (καθὼς γέγραπται). His lexical choice and word order are identical to 1 John 4:1, with one minor difference: the biblical πιστεύετε "you [may not] believe" became πιστεύωμεν "we [may not] believe," fitting the biblical quotation into Antony's discourse. [70] As such, this biblical quotation as *Vorlage* provides equally reliable material for comparative analysis of its translations into Latin as a verbatim biblical quotation that does not involve any textual change. In this case, we are dealing with an example of quotation accompanied by adaptation to the new context or, to use the very apt term coined by Hugh Houghton, *flattening*, i. e., "the process of arriving at a universally applicable form of a biblical verse for use out of context."[71]

---

detailed and precise terminology for studying biblical quotations and their usability for textual criticism, see ibid., 318.

[68] *VA* 38.3 (ed. Bartelink, 270): "Rejoice not that the demons submit to you but that your names are written in heaven" (trans. Vivian and Athanassakis, 141).

[69] *VA* 38.5 (ed. Bartelink, 270): "so that, as it is written, 'we may not believe every spirit.'" (trans. Vivian and Athanassakis, 141).

[70] Exactly the same change occurs in *VA* 55.8, where Athanasius quotes Gal. 6:2 in the form ἀλλήλων μὲν τὰ βάρη βαστάζωμεν, while the original form of the verb in Gal. 6:2 is βαστάζετε.

[71] Houghton, *Augustine's Text of John,* 68. Many other instances of such quoting by flattening can be found in Augustine. For example, all Latin biblical manuscripts that quote John 5:22 read *neque enim pater iudicat quemquam sed iudicium omne dedit filio*, "For nor does the Father judge anyone, but he has given all judgement

Flattening is also an apt description for other, analytically more interesting quoting techniques. It was not uncommon, for example, that verbal parallelism between multiple biblical passages prompted both Greek and Latin patristic writers to come up with an abridged form that combined in one version several passages in the Bible that share one or more key phrases. This type of flattening, i.e., adapting several similar biblical quotations to the context of a work by shortening them, often suggests that a writer or preacher quoted from memory. Thus Athanasius, again narrating about demons, wrote: *Παρεκάλουν γάρ, ὡς ἐν τοῖς εὐαγγελίοις γέγραπται, τὸν Κύριον, λέγοντες· Ἐπίτρεψον ἡμῖν ἀπελθεῖν εἰς τοὺς χοίρους*.[72] The explicit reference to the Gospels indicates that Athanasius was well aware of the origins of this quotation; however, he did not quote any passage from the Gospels verbatim. In fact, what Athanasius quoted here is one composite quotation resulting from three Gospel passages (Matt. 8:31, Mark 5:12, and Luke 8:32) that share key words and narrate the same events.[73] Quotations of this type are particularly interesting for my current purposes as they raise the question of how the two Latin translators rendered such compound quotations: did they follow Athanasius's formulations or did they prefer to identify an exact passage from the Bible on their own and translate it as such? In this specific case, for example, Evagrius's translation is *Daemones autem rogabant eum dicentes: Si eicis nos, mitte nos in gregem porcorum*,[74] which corresponds strictly to the formulation of Matt 8:31, while the anonymous translator rendered

---

to the Son." When Augustine quoted John 5:22, he quoted it as *pater non iudicat quemquam sed omne iudicium dedit filio* "the Father does not judge anyone, but he has given all judgement to the Son." See ibid., 68-69. For more examples of flattening, primarily in Augustine, see id., "Flattening," 272-276.

[72] *VA* 29.5 (ed. Bartelink, 246): "'they begged' the Lord, as it is written in the Gospels, saying, 'Allow us to depart into the swine.'" (trans. Vivian and Athanassakis, 127). A similar case can be found in *VA* 37.3, where Athanasius quotes Matt. 4:10 as *Ὕπαγε ὀπίσω μου, Σατανᾶ· γέγραπται γάρ· Κύριον τὸν θεόν σου προσκυνήσεις, καὶ αὐτῷ μόνῳ λατρεύσεις*, while Matt. 4:10 starts with only *Ὕπαγε Σατανᾶ*, without *ὀπίσω μου*. Athanasius' *ὀπίσω μου*, preceded by *Ὕπαγε*, is attested in Matt. 16:23. This is an obvious example of Athanasius quoting from memory and connecting two passages from the Bible by analogy.

[73] Matt 8:31: οἱ δὲ δαίμονες *παρεκάλουν αὐτὸν λέγοντες*, Εἰ ἐκβάλλεις *ἡμᾶς*, ἀπόστειλον *ἡμᾶς εἰς τὴν ἀγέλην τῶν χοίρων*. Mark 5:12: *παρεκάλεσαν αὐτὸν λέγοντες*, Πέμψον *ἡμᾶς εἰς τοὺς χοίρους*; Luke 8:32: *παρεκάλεσαν αὐτὸν ἵνα ἐπιτρέψῃ αὐτοῖς εἰς ἐκείνους εἰσελθεῖν*.

[74] *VE* 29 (ed. Bertrand, 37), "The demons asked him saying, 'if you cast us out from here, send us into the herd of pigs.'" (trans. White, 28).

Athanasius's formulation rather literally, as *rogabant enim Dominum ut scriptum est in Euangelio, dicentes: Permitte nos uel in porcos ire.*[75]

Verbal correspondence, especially between the Gospels, could result in a reverse situation as well, i. e., in quoting several passages from the Bible that share key words and phrases, thus producing a chain of quotations that triggered each other. We can find examples of this technique in Athanasius, too. In describing Antony's way of life, Athanasius quoted several passages from the Gospels:

> Τοῦτο γὰρ εἶναι τὸ λεγόμενον παρὰ τοῦ Σωτῆρος· *Μὴ μεριμνήσητε τῇ ψυχῇ τί φάγητε, μηδὲ τῷ σώματι τί ἐνδύσησθε. Καὶ ὑμεῖς μὴ ζητεῖτε τί φάγητε ἢ τί πίητε, καὶ μὴ μετεωρίζεσθε· ταῦτα γὰρ πάντα τὰ ἔθνη τοῦ κόσμου ἐπιζητοῦσιν. Ὑμῶν δὲ ὁ πατὴρ οἶδεν, ὅτι χρῄζετε τούτων ἁπάντων. Πλὴν ζητεῖτε τὴν βασιλείαν αὐτοῦ, καὶ ταῦτα πάντα προστεθήσεται ὑμῖν.*[76]

Athanasius started with quoting Luke 12:22 verbatim,[77] then quoted Luke 12:29-30, also verbatim,[78] and then went on to quote Luke 12:30-31 but combined with Matt. 6:31-33,[79] due to the presence of common key words and phrases, such as not to worry about eating and drinking, "nations of the world" or the "Gentiles," and "striving for God's kingdom." This strategy was most probably intentional; scholarship has offered various speculations about the

---

[75] *VV* 29 (ed. Gandt, 132), "for they begged' the Lord, as it is written in the Gospels, saying, 'Allow us to depart into the swine.'"

[76] *VA* 45.7 (ed. Bartelink, 290), "For this is what was said by the Saviour: 'Do not worry about your life, what you will eat, or about your body, what you will wear. Do not go on striving for what you will eat or what you will drink, and do not go on worrying. For the nations of the world strive after all these things, and your Father knows that you need all of them. Instead, seek his kingdom, and all these things will be given to you as well.'" (trans. Vivian and Athanassakis, 155)

[77] Μὴ μεριμνᾶτε τῇ ψυχῇ τί φάγητε, μηδὲ τῷ σώματι τί ἐνδύσησθε, "do not worry about your life, what you will eat, or about your body, what you will wear." All English translations of the Bible come from the NRSV unless specified otherwise.

[78] Καὶ ὑμεῖς μὴ ζητεῖτε τί φάγητε καὶ τί πίητε, καὶ μὴ μετεωρίζεσθε: ταῦτα γὰρ πάντα τὰ ἔθνη τοῦ κόσμου ἐπιζητοῦσιν, "And do not keep striving for what you are to eat and what you are to drink, and do not keep worrying. For it is the nations of the world that strive after all these things"

[79] Μὴ οὖν μεριμνήσητε λέγοντες, Τί φάγωμεν; ἤ, Τί πίωμεν; ἤ, Τί περιβαλώμεθα; πάντα γὰρ ταῦτα τὰ ἔθνη ἐπιζητοῦσιν: οἶδεν γὰρ ὁ πατὴρ ὑμῶν ὁ οὐράνιος ὅτι χρῄζετε τούτων ἁπάντων. ζητεῖτε δὲ πρῶτον τὴν βασιλείαν [τοῦ θεοῦ] καὶ τὴν δικαιοσύνην αὐτοῦ, καὶ ταῦτα πάντα προστεθήσεται ὑμῖν. "Therefore do not worry, saying, 'What will we eat?' or 'What will we drink?' or 'What will we wear?' For it is the Gentiles who strive for all these things; and indeed your heavenly Father knows that you need all these things. But strive first for the kingdom of God and his righteousness, and all these things will be given to you as well.

purpose of this type of quoting, such as that the aim of the 'chain' quotations was to imply that the exegesis of the Scriptures is to be found in the Scriptures themselves.[80]

For my analysis, it is furthermore relevant to consider the ways in which biblical quotations are introduced and signaled, both in the Greek original and in its two Latin translations. In the patristic period, the Bible is rarely quoted without an introductory formula or at least without some identifying tag. Athanasius used numerous ways to introduce such quotations: from simple particles (ὅτι, γὰρ, δέ)[81] to introductory formulas (λέγων, ἔλεγεν, ὡς εἶπεν, τὸ λεγόμενον, ἀπεκρίνατο), very often combined with a statement that what is being quoted is according to what is "written [in the Bible]" (καθὼς γέγραπται, κατὰ τὸ γεγραμμένον, ὡς γέγραπται). Additionally, it was not uncommon that Athanasius made a direct reference to a particular book of the Bible, e. g. ὡς ἐν ταῖς Παροιμίαις γέγραπται "as it is written in the Book of Proverbs."[82]

The ways of introducing the Bible in the two Latin translations is a precious clue for the translators' own knowledge of the Bible, as well as, possibly, to that of their audiences. There are several instances where both translators deemed it necessary to make a direct reference to a passage in the Bible, while such a reference is absent from the Greek original. The anonymous translator mostly used *scriptum est, dicit* or *dictum ubi dicit* to introduce Bible quotations, but he also used additional material, such as attributing the qualifier *sanctus* to the apostle Paul when identified as the author of a quoted biblical passage.[83] Evagrius, on the other hand, also used expressions such as (*quod*) *scriptum est, dicit, ait*, and *dicens*, while also

---

[80] For instance, Houghton notes that "Augustine frequently develops 'chains' of citations which share the same key word," and that one of Augustine's "most characteristic practices is 'concordance exegesis,' based on the principle of *scriptura sui interpres*, which gives rise to chains of citations sharing the same key word." See Houghton, *Augustine's Text of John*, 65 and 77. Athanasius might have aimed at achieving the same effect.

[81] For more particles used for quoting the Bible in patristic writers, see Osburn, "Methodology in Identifying Patristic Citations," 319.

[82] "The fact that a phrase is introduced as a quotation is a stronger indication that the preacher is invoking scriptural authority than a direct correspondence with any exemplar." See Houghton, *Augustine's Text of John*, 68.

[83] See below pp. 50-51.

resorting to various rhetorically embellished formulations, such as *secundum sententiam Scripturarum, iuxta eloquia diuina, iuxta eloquium dicentis*. Differences such as these in the lexical choices of the two translators in the way they introduce quotations from the Bible, as well as their decisions to identify or not as source a particular book in the Bible, will also be discussed and analyzed in the present thesis.

2.2 The Latin Translations of the *Vita Antonii* and the Bible in Latin in the Fourth Century

In establishing the two translators' familiarity (or lack thereof) with the versions of the Latin Bible available in the fourth century, the key determinant in my discussion is the level of concurrence between the wording of the biblical quotations in the two Latin translations and that of other late-antique works in Latin that quote the same biblical passages.[84] Thus, in order to compare and analyze the biblical material in the two translations, it is important to place both the anonymous translator and Evagrius within a wider context of the use of the Bible in Latin in the time when they produced their translations, i.e., the second half of the fourth century.

At the time when the anonymous translator and Evagrius translated the *Life*, the text and the canon of the Bible in Latin was not defined by universal and officially imposed standards. Rather, it was characterized by multiplicity and regional preferences, and, as such, calls for a *caveat*: one should not expect the two translators of the *Life* to have used the same version of biblical text(s) in Latin. As early as the end of the second century, the Bible was translated from Greek into Latin in Roman Africa,[85] and these early, usually literal translations,

---

[84] The main tool I have used for the research of the biblical material in patristic writers is the searchable textual database Library of Latin Texts (LLT), available online at http://clt.brepolis.net/llta/pages/Search.aspx.

[85] Whether the Old Latin versions of the Bible originate from one single initial Latin translation that then underwent numerous revisions or they were all copied from multiple versions, has been the subject of scholarly discussions. For instance, Hugh A.G. Houghton, *The Latin New Testament: A Guide to its Early History, Texts, and Manuscripts* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2017), 12-13, notes that there was probably one single initial

followed the Greek syntax and word-order of their originals;[86] apart from Africa, the Old Latin

translations circulated elsewhere. A common name attributed to these Old Latin translations of

the Bible is Vetus Latina, which was not a homogenous nor unitary single-volume work, but

rather a collection of Latin translations of numerous biblical books that circulated in various

individual manuscripts.[87] In addition, the Old Latin versions remained in circulation long after

Jerome produced his translation, now commonly known as the Vulgate.[88] Jerome's project did

not immediately carry the day; his Vulgate version became the 'standard' Latin Bible only in

the sixteenth century after the council of Trent, and, what is more, the Vulgate is only partly

Jerome's work.[89] After he had "won the financial support of the Roman bishop Damasus for

his ambitious project,"[90] Jerome's revision of the Bible began at the time of his stay in Rome

between the years 382 to 385 with the translation of the Gospels, which, as he himself indicated,

he only minimally revised from the Old Latin versions.[91] Jerome's biblical quotations thus

---

Latin translation. For a general discussion on the question of multiple versions and a single version of the Vetus Latina, see Julio Trebolle Barrera, "1.4.1 Vetus Latina," in *Textual History of the Bible*, *The Hebrew Bible*, ed. Armin Lange and Emanuel Tov, vol. 1A (Leiden: Brill, 2016), 321-322.

[86] For the books of the Old Testament, the earliest Latin versions of the Bible adhered to the LXX as their model, which was considered to be an inspired translation; see Pierre-Maurice Bogaert, "The Latin Bible," in *The New Cambridge History of the Bible. From the Beginnings to 600*, eds. James C. Paget and Joachim Schaper (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2013), 509. Regarding study of the Old Latin Gospels, for example, there is "no standard method of analyzing ancient translations that can be applied to the Old Latin Gospels"; see Burton, *The Old Latin Gospels,* 82.

[87] For a description and discussion of the whole situation of the Vetus Latina translations in several parts of Europe – Spain, Africa, North Italy, and Gaul – see Houghton, *The Latin New Testament,* 19-31. For a very vivid description of the use of the Bible, the production of books, and the abundance of copies of Christian Scripture in Augustine's time, see id., *Augustine's Text of John*, 22-28.

[88] The text of the Vulgate used in this thesis is *Biblia Sacra iuxta vulgatam versionem*, ed. Robert Weber, 5th ed. by Roger Gryson (Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 2007). This edition is also available, without the critical apparatus, in a searchable electronic format in the Library of Latin Texts (LLT).

[89] See Burton, *The Old Latin Gospels*, 6.

[90] See Stefan Rebenich, "Jerome: The 'Vir Trilinguis' and the 'Hebraica Veritas,'" *VC* 47, no. 1 (1993): 51. On the beginnings of the project of translating the Bible today known as the Vulgate and Jerome's motivations for it, see Catherine Brown Tkacz, "Labor Tam Utilis: The Creation of the Vulgate," *VC* 50, no. 1 (1996): 42-72. See also Adam Kamesar, *Jerome, Greek Scholarship, and the Hebrew Bible: A Study of the* Quaestiones Hebraicae in Genesim (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1993).

[91] He described his work on the Gospels in his letter to Pope Damasus, writing that Damasus prompted him to undertake a "new work" (*nouum opus*, the opening words of the preface), to edit "copies of the Scriptures scattered throughout the world" (*exemplaria scripturarum toto orbe dispersa*) using Greek sources; see Houghton, *The Latin New Testament*, 32. Jerome usually clearly indicated his translation methods and techniques in his prologues, see Bogaert, "The Latin Bible," 514; also Frans Van Liere, *An Introduction to the Medieval Bible* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2014), 100. On Jerome's vehement defense of *Hebraica veritas* and his fame as *vir trilinguis* see Rebenich, "Jerome: The 'Vir Trilinguis,'" 50-77. For more on Jerome's attitude to

represent Old Latin readings to a significant extent with regard to the New Testament and, less so, in respect to the Old Testament. For several centuries after the anonymous and Evagrius worked on their translations, the Old Latin versions of the Bible coexisted with Jerome's Vulgate.[92] Thus, even the complete Vulgate version of the Latin Bible is always a combination of the two traditions, i. e., of the Old Latin and Jerome's own translations and revisions.[93]

Apart from the very text of the Vulgate and from preserved manuscripts, our (incomplete) knowledge of the so-called Vetus Latina versions comes from biblical quotations as well, attested in the works written in Latin in the patristic period.[94] The Old Latin translations widely circulated among writers and preachers quoting the Bible, who would have rather used available Latin translations of the Scriptures than translate from scratch. It should be emphasized that the patristic authors by no means used the same text of the books of the Bible, but rather different versions of various books of the Bible in Latin. For the purpose of the discussion offered in the present thesis, however, the attestations of the Old Latin versions in the works of patristic authors are valuable in order to determine whether a writer quoting the Bible in Latin in the fourth century had access to *any* of the many versions in circulation, or he translated them by himself. The following example should illustrate these claims. When Athanasius quoted the Psalm 124:1,[95] it was rendered by the anonymous translator as *fidens super Dominum ut mons erat Sion*.[96] Such a formulation of Ps. 124:1 is unattested outside the anonymous translation, which suggests that its author did not make use of any of the versions

---

translation, see Teppei Kato, "Jerome's Understanding of Old Testament Quotations in the New Testament," *VC* 67, no. 3 (2013): 289-315.

[92] For examples, see Van Liere, *An Introduction,* 80-81.

[93] "When new copies were made, readings from the Vetus Latina were sometimes introduced into the text of the Vulgate; the result was sometimes a "contamination" between the two traditions," see ibid., 89.

[94] For the insights the Latin fathers offer into the biblical texts of the third and fourth centuries, see Hugh A. G. Houghton, "The Use of the Latin Fathers for New Testament Textual Criticism," in *The Text of the New Testament in Contemporary Research: Essays on the Status Quaestionis*, eds. Bart D. Ehrman and Michael W. Holmes (Leiden: Brill, 2012), 375–405.

[95] *VA* 51.5: πεποιθὼς ἦν ἐπὶ Κύριον ὡς ὄρος Σιών (ed. Bartelink, 310), "because he put his trust in the Lord, he was like Mount Sion." (trans. Vivian and Athanassakis, 169).

[96] *VV* 51 (ed. Gandt, 147), "trusting in God he was like Mount Sion."

of Ps. 124:1 in Latin available at the time. On the other hand, Evagrius rendered it as *qui confidunt in Domino, sicut mons Sion,*[97] which is, in identical form, quoted by Ambrose,[98] Augustine,[99] Hilary of Poitiers,[100] Jerome,[101] and it was also used for the Vulgate version. It is hard to believe that Evagrius incidentally offered the Latin version of Ps. 124:1 with exactly the same word choice and word order as the authors listed above. Rather, this example strongly suggests that Evagrius made use of one of the Latin versions of the Psalm 124:1 available in the second half of the fourth century.

I do not aim at reconstructing the text of the Bible that any of the authors writing in Latin in the patristic period used. Still, it was important to emphasize that despite Jerome's complaints about numerous manuscripts and inconsistent versions and wordings of the Scriptures,[102] the biblical quotations of other Latin patristic authors make up a stable comparison material, insofar as they can show if and which of our two translators of the *Life of Antony* made use of *any* version of the Scriptures in Latin *at all*. As mentioned in the introduction to this section, the two translators' familiarity (or lack thereof) with the versions of the Latin Bible available in the fourth century forms the basis for several hypotheses I make in this thesis. An elaboration on the hypotheses and arguments supporting them are offered in a thorough comparative analysis of the biblical quotations in the anonymous and Evagrian translations, which follows in the next chapter.

---

[97] *VE* 51 (ed. Bertrand, 57), "those who trust in the Lord are like Mount Sion." (trans. White, 41)

[98] *In Psalm.* 47.5. The abbreviations used in this thesis are made according to the *TLL* index, online accessible at http://www.thesaurus.badw.de/tll-digital/index/a.html.

[99] *In Psalm.* 124.2.

[100] *Tract.* 124

[101] *In Is.* 1.2.

[102] Jerome complained about the inconsistency (*vitiossima varietas*) of manuscripts: see Bogaert, "The Latin Bible," 505-506. Jerome's concern was that "each and everyone at will adds to it or leaves out as seems right to him, and there is no way that what is in disagreement can be true," (*In Ios.*), trans. Van Liere, *An Introduction*, 83.

3. Comparative Analysis of the Verbatim Biblical Quotations in the Two Latin Translations of the *Vita Antonii*

3.1 Literal, Literary, and in Between: The *Modus Operandi* of the Two Translators

As mentioned in the Introduction, my initial research question is whether the biblical quotations in Latin that the anonymous translator rendered from Greek as part of his translation of the *Life* are attested in other works written in Latin in Late Antiquity, or he translated the biblical quotations by himself. The same research question was then applied to Evagrius and his translation. The answer to this determines if and to what extent the anonymous translator and, on the other hand, Evagrius, used any Latin translation of the Bible that circulated in Late Antiquity.

My preliminary study has revealed that the anonymous translator's renderings of the biblical quotations, in most cases, are unparalleled in other texts that quote the Bible in Latin. This surprising fact can be explained as a deliberate choice to ignore existing translations (possible, but unlikely); another possibility is that the text of the Bible that the anonymous translator used in private and liturgical contexts was not in Latin. This would further suggest that the anonymous translator was not a native speaker of Latin.

On the other hand, the inventory of the biblical quotations in Evagrian translation of the *Life* demonstrates that, in stark contrast to the author of the oldest translation, Evagrius used a version of the Bible for which numerous textual parallels are attested in the works of other late-antique authors writing in Latin. At the same time, the investigation of the biblical quotations in Evagrius's text shows that Evagrius attempted to improve rhetorically and stylistically the language of the biblical versions in Latin available to him at the time. There

are also several instances where he demonstrably reproduced *ad litteram* existing biblical versions down to their specific grammatical features and lexical choices, even though he was aware that these stood in stark contrast with his own high-register usage.

A further remarkable feature of the *modus operandi* of the two translators, which has not been explored to date, are the specific ways in which our two translators insert the quotations from the Bible into their texts, often providing them with exact textual references and exegetic commentary absent from the Greek original. Such additions are important as they allow us to speculate about the motivations of the two translators as well as about their individual knowledge of the Bible.

In what follows, I will present several case studies of verbatim biblical quotations and their translations in the two Latin versions of the *Life*, which will illustrate and provide evidence for the statements made above.

In chapter 48.3 of the *VA*, when describing the miracles performed by Antony, Athanasius justified them with a quote from the Gospels: Πολλά τε καὶ ἄλλα δι' αὐτοῦ πεποίηκεν ὁ Κύριος, ὁ λέγων· Αἰτεῖτε, καὶ δοθήσεται ὑμῖν.[103] The anonymous translator rendered this as follows: *Multa et alia per seruum suum Dominus fecit qui dicit: Postulate et dabitur uobis.*[104] Evagrius, on the other hand, translated the same passage as *Multa et alia miracula per illum Dominus operatus est, et merito: qui enim promisit in Euangelio: Petite et dabitur uobis.*[105] The biblical quotation in Athanasius's Greek text reproduced verbatim Matt. 7:7 or Luke 11:9, and the different ways in which the two translators rendered this short biblical

---

[103] *VA* 48.3 (ed. Bartelink, 298) quoting Matt. 7:7, Luke 11:9: "Many other things through him [Antony] did the Lord, who says: 'Ask, and it will be given to you.'" trans. Vivian and Athanassakis, 161-63, slightly modified.

[104] *VV* 48 (ed. Gandt, 145): "Many other things through his servant did the Lord, who said: 'Require and it will be given to you.'" Translations of the *VV* from Latin into English are mine, unless otherwise indicated.

[105] *VE* 48 (ed. Bertrand, 54): "The Lord also worked many other miracles through Antony, and justly so, for He who promised in the Gospel, *Ask and it will be given to you*" (trans. White, 38).

passage illustrate very well their different *modus operandi* throughout their texts.[106] First, the way in which the anonymous translator, on the one hand, and Evagrius, on the other, introduce the quotation is particularly interesting. While the anonymous, apart from translating "through him" (δι' αὐτοῦ) as "through his servant" (*per seruum suum*),[107] simply renders Gk. ὁ λέγων "[the Lord,] who says" as "[the Lord] says (*dicit*)," Evagrius used a different verb, *promisit*, "he promised." This enhances the meaning of the original and can be considered an exegetic translation, as opposed to the simple translation of the anonymous translator. What is more, Evagrius also added a precise textual reference *in Euangelio* "in the Gospel," absent from both the Greek original and the earlier anonymous translation. There are two possible justifications for this intervention in the text of the *VA*: Evagrius may have wanted to demonstrate his accurate knowledge of the Bible or, more probably, he deemed it necessary to provide his readers with an immediately identifiable context. This further raises the question of what the makeup of his intended readership could have been that made necessary such an indication about the origin of the biblical passage quoted. Possible alternatives are that his intended audience was made up of (recent) converts to Christianity and/or elite non-Christians unfamiliar with the Bible, or an elite readership already familiar with the Bible for whom he was providing not just instruction, but also reassurance about the message of the text (*promisit*) as a means of articulating a specific Christian identity.

As for the quotation itself, the difference between the verbal forms *postulate* used by the anonymous and Evagrius's *petite* is telling; *petite et dabitur uobis* was the 'standard' rendering of this biblical passage, widely used in the late-antique texts that quote it, and, in addition to Evagrius, also attested in the revised Old Latin Gospels that became part of the

---

[106] In the Bertrand-Gandt edition this passage is not recognized as a verbatim biblical quotation.

[107] Lorié's claim that the anonymous's *seruus* always corresponds to Athanasius's Gk. δοῦλος (slave) is therefore incorrect, as evidenced by this biblical quotation of the *VA*, where the anonymous translator's *per servum* corresponds to Gk. δι' αὐτοῦ ("through him"), cf. Lorié, *Spiritual Terminology*, 87.

26

Vulgate, as well as in Ambrose,[108] Ambrosiaster,[109] Arnobius,[110] Augustine,[111] Hilary of Poitiers,[112] and Jerome.[113] The choice of the anonymous translator, *postulate*, is never attested outside his translation, which suggests that the anonymous translator translated without the knowledge of and appeal to any existing Latin translation of the Gospels. Evagrius, on the other hand, was undoubtedly familiar with the established, widely circulating version of the Bible in Latin, which he shared with other Christian writers of his time.

This example further shows that the anonymous translator may have operated with a standard equivalence between the Greek verb αἰτέω "ask for, demand," which he always translated with Lat. *postulare*, both in passages that are direct quotations from the Bible and in the other parts of the *VA*.[114] This translation choice, other than illustrating the literal nature of the anonymous translation, also offers us a precious clue as to the linguistic background of the translator, who elsewhere constructed the Latin verb *postulare* with a direct object in the accusative (*Dominum* "the Lord"),[115] a usage rarely attested in standard Latin,[116] where an indirect object in the ablative with the preposition *a* "from," would have been the more common option, as in Evagrius's rendering of the same construction illustrates.[117] The peculiar choice of the anonymous translator can be explained as a mirror translation of the Greek syntactic

---

[108] *Cain et Ab.* 1.6.

[109] *Quaest.* 115.82.

[110] *Praedest.* 3.12.

[111] *In Psalm.* 139.17.

[112] *Tract.* 60.4.

[113] *In Matth.* 1.

[114] See, for example, the reference to John 16:23-24 in *VA* 83.3 (ed. Bartelink, 404): 'Αἰτεῖτε, καὶ λήψεσθε.' "Ask and you will receive." (trans. Vivian and Athanassakis, 237) and *VV* 83 (ed. Gandt, 169): *Postulate et accipietis*. Compare this to the non-biblical context in *VA* 29.3 (ed. Bartelink, 249): Εἰ γὰρ ἴσχυσεν, οὐκ ἂν ᾔτησεν. "If he had had power, he would not have asked." (trans. Vivian and Athanassakis, 125) and *VV* 29 (ed. Gandt, 132): *si enim ualuisset, non postulasset*.

[115] *VA* 83.3 (ed. Bartelink, 404): αἰτήσητε τὸν Πατέρα, in *VV* 83 (ed. Gandt, 169) translated as *postulaueritis Patrem meum*.

[116] On the standard usage of *postulare* see the *OLD*, 1557, s.v. *postulo*, section 1. For the very few attested examples of the so-called ablative of person see Einar Löfstedt, *Commento Filologico Alla* Peregrinatio Aetheriae (Bologna: Pátron Editore, 2007), 274-275.

[117] *VE* 34 (ed. Bertrand, 40): *ab auxiliatore Domino postulare*.

27

structure, where the verb "to ask for" (αἰτέω) is normally constructed with the accusative.[118]

This kind of equivalence is a usual feature of translations produced by bilingual speakers with insufficient command in the target language.[119]

More examples of such non-standard translation of biblical material into Latin by the anonymous translator can be found elsewhere in his translation of the *Life of Antony.* Athanasius's Antony is well known for the episodes in which he resists temptations by demons, and in one such instance Athanasius describes Antony's firm faith that saved him from the demons, quoting Romans 8:35: οὐδέν με *χωρίσει ἀπὸ τῆς ἀγάπης τοῦ Χριστοῦ.*[120] The anonymous translator rendered this as *non separabo a caritate Christi,*[121] while Evagrius translated it as *nullus me separabit a caritate Christi.*[122]

Although not taken verbatim from the Bible by Athanasius, in the Greek original this is clearly a reference to the Epistle to the Romans, where the passage is formulated as a question: "who will separate us from the love of Christ?"[123] The exact translation of this biblical passage, in the form of a question and with strict correspondence to the formulation in the original, "who will separate us from the love of Christ?" (*quis nos separabit a caritate Christi?*) can be found in Augustine,[124] Jerome,[125] Ambrose,[126] Ambrosiaster,[127] in Rufinus's

---

[118] See *Diccionario Griego – Español*, vol. 1, 2nd ed., ed. Francisco R. Adrados (Madrid: Instituto de Filología, 2008), 121-122, s.v. Αἰτέω.

[119] Apart from mirror translations, the anonymous translator also employed mechanical translations, for example, his *de cetero* used automatically as an equivalent of Gk. λοιπόν, either in a biblical quotation or elsewhere in Athanasius's text; see, for example, *VA* 6.4 (ed. Bartelink, 170): οὐδεμία μοι λοιπόν ἐστι φροντὶς περὶ σοῦ, "*From now on* I am not going to pay any attention to you" (trans. Vivian and Athanassakis, 73), and the anonymous translation *nulla de cetero sollicitudo est de te, VV* 6 (ed. Gandt, 113), "no care about you *anymore.*" The same equivalence occurs with λοιπόν in *VA* 3.7, 4.2, 6.1, 7.7, 14.7, 23.6, 25.3, 31.1, 37.2, 50.9, 90.6, 91.9 and *de cetero* in the corresponding chapters of *VV.* For more examples of the anonymous translator's mechanical translations, see below pp. 47-58.

[120] *VA* 9.2 (ed. Bartelink, 182), "nothing 'will separate me from the love of Christ'" (trans. Vivian and Athanassakis, 81).

[121] *VV* 9 (ed. Gandt, 125), "I will not separate from the love of Christ."

[122] *VE* 9 (ed. Bertrand, 15), "no one will separate me from the love of Christ" (trans. White, 15).

[123] Rom. 8:35.

[124] For instance, *Epist.* 145.

[125] *In Matth.* 4.

[126] *In Psalm.* 43.46.

[127] *In Rom.* 8.35.

translations from Greek,[128] as well as later, in the Vulgate version. Even though in the Greek text of the *VA* Athanasius reformulated this biblical quotation and structured it rather as a statement and, in my view, as his answer to the original question "who/what will…? (τίς)," with "nothing will…" (οὐδέν), this did not prevent Evagrius from recognizing this quotation from Romans, as he quoted exactly the same Latin version of Rom. 8:35 that was used by the authors mentioned above. The only difference between his translation and the form quoted by other authors is that in his text the words are not phrased as a question, since he adjusted his translation to the form of the Greek original. This strongly suggests that Evagrius was familiar with the existing form of Rom. 8:35 as it circulated in Latin and as it was quoted by other Christian authors of his time and, therefore, known to his elite readership.

The anonymous translator, on the other hand, does not seem to have been aware of Rom. 8:35 in Latin form quoted by the Christian authors mentioned above. Rather, he formulated it as a separate sentence, with "I will not separate (*non separabo*) myself." His usage of Lat. *separare* in this passage is intriguing. This verb was usually transitive in Latin,[129] as Evagrius and other authors mentioned above used it, i.e., "no one/who will separate me," and was almost never used intransitively in its active form as here.[130] That the anonymous translator was not familiar with the existing version of Rom. 8:35 in Latin is further supported by another feature of his usage. In chapter 40.5 of the *VA*, Athanasius again draws on the same biblical quotation.[131] Unlike Evagrius, who used the same existing Old Latin translation as in

---

[128] *Orig. princ.* 3.1.

[129] See *OLD*, s.v. *separo*. Although not with reference to this particular verb, the development of an intransitive form of a Latin verb from an initially transitive one was not uncommon in late Latin; see Adams, *Bilingualism*, 467.

[130] *Separabo/separabimus* appears a few times in Augustine, yet it is always related to an object in the accusative case, so not intransitive: *separabimus superbiam ipsam* (*De nat. et grat.* 29.33) and *separabo me* (*Enarr. in Ps.* 99.10). The form of the anonymous translator (*separabo*) instead of an expected passive such as *separabor* is also intriguing; it could be explained either as due to his lack of familiarity with the proper use of passive/medium verbal forms in Latin or, equally possible, as a scribal error in the transmission of the *VV*, where the final *-r* could have easily been omitted by accident.

[131] *VA* 40.5 (ed. Bartelink, 276).

VA 9.2, nullus me separabit a caritate Christi, the anonymous translator rendered this as *nihil me separabit ab agape Christi*.[132] Here, he not only uses the verb *separare*, "to separate," transitively (*separabit me*), but he also resorted to a mere transliteration of Gk. ἀγάπη as *agape* instead of providing a Latin equivalent.[133] The anonymous translator's way of dealing with Gk. ἀγάπη can be regarded as an example of code-switching between Greek and Latin, and as such might well represent a precious trace of the Greek-Latin bilingualism of the anonymous translator.[134] The evidence I presented so far of the anonymous translator's ignorance of the existing versions of the Bible in Latin suggests that the text of the Bible that he regarded as authoritative was in a language other than Latin.

My hypothesis is that the Bible he used was in Greek. This is supported by a number of instances in the anonymous translation where the translator produced a very different text both in regard to the original Greek text of the *VA* and to Evagrius. In such instances, we find the anonymous translator either omitting a portion of the Greek text or adding a full(er) form of a biblical quotation absent from Athanasius's text. What is more, in the latter case, the anonymous's Latin translation very often corresponds exactly to the wording of the relevant passage in the Greek Bible. In what follows, I will discuss two such examples.

Athanasius's Antony was particularly fond of giving instructions to his disciples on their lifestyle and conduct, for which he used many biblical quotations.[135] In one of these episodes, in chapter 91.5 towards the end of the *Life*, Antony, after falling ill, summoned his

---

[132] *VV* 40 (ed. Gandt, 139): "nothing will separate me from the *agape* (love) of Christ."

[133] Lorié lists other borrowings from Greek in *VV*, see his *Spiritual Terminology,* 6.

[134] On code-switching between Greek and Latin, see Adams, *Bilingualism*, 34. In this sense, I disagree with Lorié's claim about *agape* in *VV* that "it is quite possible that the use of a word in a given Greek passage was to the translator the last ounce to tip the scale in favour of the Greek word, which was already current among the Latins," cf. *Spiritual Terminology,* 18.

[135] As Philip Rousseau notes, this "'conversational' aspect of Antony's career" and "his teaching demanded a sharing of information." See his "Antony as Teacher," 95. Lois Gandt claims that Antony "had competent knowledge of Scripture," see "A Philological and Theological Analysis," 107. In my view, we cannot know to what extent the 'real' Antony knew the Bible by heart, but what one can claim is that Athanasius certainly did possess competent knowledge of Scripture, as evidenced by the numerous biblical passages he included into Antony's discourse addressed to his fellow monks, such as the one in chapter 91.5.

fellow monks and delivered his final words: Σπουδάζετε δὲ μᾶλλον καὶ ὑμεῖς ἀεὶ συνάπτειν ἑαυτούς, προηγουμένως μὲν τῷ Κυρίῳ, ἔπειτα δὲ τοῖς ἁγίοις, *ἵνα μετὰ θάνατον ὑμᾶς εἰς τὰς αἰωνίους σκηνάς, ὡς φίλους καὶ γνωρίμους, δέξωνται*.[136] The anonymous translator rendered this as *Satagite itaque et uos semper adiungere uos prius omnium quidem Domino deinde et sanctis, ut post dormitionem uestram suscipiant uos in aeternis tabernaculis.*[137] Evagrius translated the same passage as *in hoc autem magis estote solliciti ut Domini praecepta seruetis, ut post mortem uestram sancti quique quasi amicos et notos in aeterna uos recipiant tabernacula*.[138]

Athanasius took the Italicized part from the parable of the dishonest manager from the Gospel of Luke, which reads as follows: Καὶ ἐγὼ ὑμῖν λέγω, ἑαυτοῖς ποιήσατε φίλους ἐκ τοῦ μαμωνᾶ τῆς ἀδικίας, *ἵνα ὅταν ἐκλίπῃ δέξωνται ὑμᾶς εἰς τὰς αἰωνίους σκηνάς*.[139] Thus, the part of Luke 16:9 that Athanasius used to construct this sentence is "so that... they may welcome you into the eternal tabernacles" (δέξωνται ὑμᾶς εἰς τὰς αἰωνίους σκηνάς), in the middle of which he inserted "as friends and companions" (ὡς φίλους καὶ γνωρίμους). Evagrius translated the Greek text as it stood, together with the biblical quotation and Athanasius's addition: "so that after your death the saints may receive you into the eternal tabernacles like friends and companions." This, however, does not mean that Evagrius did not recognize Luke 16:9 here, as his Lat. *recipiant in aeterna tabernacula* ("may receive you into the eternal tabernacles")

---

[136] *VA* 91.5 (ed. Bartelink, 424): "Make every effort yourselves always to be united, especially with the Lord, and then with the saints, *so that* after your death *they will receive you into the eternal tabernacles* as friends and companions." (trans. Vivian and Athanassakis, 251, slightly altered).

[137] *VV* 91 (ed. Gandt, 174), "You yourselves be all the more eager always to be together, primarily with the Lord, and then with the saints, *so that* after your death *they receive you into the eternal tabernacles*."

[138] *VE* 91 (ed. Bertrand 100), "Instead you should be concerned to keep the Lord's commandments *so that* after your death the saints *may receive you into the eternal tabernacles* like friends and companions." (trans. White, 67, slightly altered).

[139] Luke 16:1-13. Luke 16:9, "And I tell you, make friends for yourselves by means of dishonest wealth so that when it is gone, they may welcome you into the eternal homes."

31

matches the version of the biblical passage quoted by Tertullian,[140] Ambrose,[141] Rufinus,[142] Gaudentius of Brescia,[143] Augustine,[144] Jerome,[145] and later in the Vulgate version.[146]

Unlike Evagrius, the anonymous translator translated the quotation from Luke 16:9 as "so that... they receive you into the eternal tabernacles," without Athanasius's "as friends and companions" (ὡς φίλους καὶ γνωρίμους). This raises the question of why he did not translate the whole sentence. The exact formulation of Luke 16:9 in the Greek New Testament provides us with the answer: "so that... they may welcome you into the eternal homes" (ἵνα... δέξωνται ὑμᾶς εἰς τὰς αἰωνίους σκηνάς), without Athanasius's addition "as friends and companions." This is exactly what the anonymous translator translated. The translator's decision to follow the biblical text rather than Athanasius's expanded version of it suggests that, when recognized as such, the Bible was the ultimate authority to him, and that he (intentionally or not) did not alter his translation of what he recognized as biblical passage to suit Athanasius's context.[147]

Another noteworthy example of material in the anonymous translation that is entirely different from both Athanasius's Greek original and Evagrius's translation is to be found in another one of Antony's speeches addressed to his monks, this time at the beginning of the *Life.* In this discourse, Athanasius's Antony discusses traditional philosophical topics (the definition of virtue, the transient nature of wealth and success, etc.),[148] as well as the

---

[140] *Fug.* 13.
[141] *Off.* 3.22.
[142] *Orig. in Exod.* 9.2.
[143] *Tract.* 21 18.5.
[144] *In Ps.* 65.20.
[145] *Epist.* 54.12.
[146] For this reason, I believe that *ut... in aeterna uos recipiant tabernacula* in Evagrius's translation should have been acknowledged as a direct biblical quotation in the Bertrand-Pascal edition, given that it was indicated as a direct biblical quotation in the case of the anonymous translator, see *VV* 91 (ed. Gandt, 174).
[147] The possibility that the Greek text on which the anonymous translator worked may have had the 'canonical version' of the biblical passage, i.e., without Athanasius's addition ὡς φίλους καὶ γνωρίμους, should be discarded, as the apparatus to Bartelink's edition does not list any manuscript of the Greek text that contains such an omission; see *VA* 91.5 (ed. Bartelink, 424 with the apparatus *ad loc*.). Therefore, the anonymous translator's omission was intentional rather than accidental.
[148] *VA* 16-20. Rousseau, "Antony as Teacher," 95.

importance of an unceasing daily ascetic discipline. To corroborate his statements, he again refers to the Bible: Οὕτω καὶ ἐν τῷ Ἰεζεκιὴλ ἠκούσαμεν.[149] In the original, this reference to a passage from the Book of Ezekiel is vague and does not contain the actual biblical text it alludes to.

Evagrius rendered the passage exactly as it stood in the Greek original: *Quod prophetica per Ezechielem uoce testatur.*[150] The anonymous translator, on the other hand, expanded the original reference with several quotations from Ezekiel which, as said above, he could not have found in the Athanasian text that served as basis for his translation: *Sic enim et in Ezechiel propheta audiuimus dicentem Dominum: Iustus si recesserit a iustitia sua et fecerit facinus, uiuo ego dicit Dominus, quia non memorabo iustitiae eius sed in eo quod fecit, in illo morietur.*[151] Interestingly, although constructed as one sentence, this biblical passage as quoted by the anonymous translator is actually a combination of phrases taken from at least three passages of the Book of Ezekiel (which is particularly known for its repetitive phraseology). These are as follows: Ezek. 3:20 (cf. 18:24 and 26): "when the righteous turn away from their righteousness and commit iniquity,"[152] Ezek. 33:13: "none of their righteous deeds shall be remembered; but in the iniquity that they have committed they shall die,"[153] and the oft-repeated formulation found, for instance, in Ezek. 5:11: "(as) I live, says the Lord."[154]

Even though the phrase "I live, says the Lord" (*uiuo ego dicit Dominus*) is present as such in Jerome's translation of Ezekiel, later included in the Vulgate, I consider it unlikely that

---

[149] *VA* 18.3 (ed. Bartelink, 212), "Thus we have also heard in Ezekiel." (trans. Vivian and Athanassakis, 103).

[150] *VE* 18 (ed. Bertrand, 25), "as testified by the words of the prophet Ezechiel." (trans. White, 21).

[151] *VV* 18 (ed. Gandt, 123), "Thus we have also heard in the prophet Ezekiel the Lord saying: *If a righteous person turns away from his righteousness and commits a crime, as I live says the Lord,* [I am telling you] *that I will not remember his righteousness, but in what he did, in that he will die.*"

[152] Ezek. 3:20 (ἐν τῷ ἀποστρέφειν δίκαιον ἀπὸ τῶν δικαιοσυνῶν αὐτοῦ καὶ ποιήσῃ παράπτωμα), 18:24 (ἐν δὲ τῷ ἀποστρέψαι δίκαιον ἐκ τῆς δικαιοσύνης αὐτοῦ καὶ ποιήσῃ ἀδικίαν), 18:26 (ἐν τῷ ἀποστρέψαι τὸν δίκαιον ἐκ τῆς δικαιοσύνης αὐτοῦ καὶ ποιήσῃ παράπτωμα ἐν τῷ παραπτώματι).

[153] Ezek. 33:13 (πᾶσαι αἱ δικαιοσύναι αὐτοῦ οὐ μὴ ἀναμνησθῶσιν· ἐν τῇ ἀδικίᾳ αὐτοῦ, ᾗ ἐποίησεν, ἐν αὐτῇ ἀποθανεῖται).

[154] Ezek. 5:11(Ζῶ ἐγώ, λέγει κύριος).

the anonymous translator and Jerome shared the same existing version of the Bible. Rather, I believe that the anonymous translator quoted Ezekiel here from memory and directly from the Greek. Such 'hybrid' quotation, or flattening, is characteristic of quotations from memory.[155] The anonymous translator associated Athanasius's vague reference to Ezekiel with some of the most well-known phrases of the Book of Ezekiel, such as the formula "I live, says the Lord" (*uiuo ego dicit Dominus*),[156] a word-for-word translation from Gk. ζῶ ἐγώ, λέγει κύριος into Latin, which the anonymous translator used as a link between the other two quotations that he supplied from the text of Ezekiel. This formula is attested no less than thirteen times in the Book of Ezekiel alone.[157] The other quote, "if a righteous turns away from his righteousness and commits a crime" (*Iustus si recesserit a iustitia sua et fecerit facinus*) is 'flattened' out of at least three quotations similar to each other.[158] Given that the wording of the anonymous's quotations from Ezekiel is unattested elsewhere in Latin, the most likely explanation for the way in which the anonymous translator rendered all this additional material is that it was a result of his quoting the Book of Ezekiel from memory and from a language other than Latin, very likely from Greek.[159]

Why the anonymous translator added several biblical quotations that are absent from the Greek original remains unknown.[160] One possible justification for such an intervention is

---

[155] For the process of flattening see Houghton, "Flattening," 271-276.

[156] Bartelink noted that this formula is found several times in the Old Testament, and also in the New Testament to introduce an oath of God, and also that the text of the anonymous translator differs considerably from that of Ezek. 18:24 in the Vulgate version, where there is no *uiuo ego* but *uiuet* with *iustus* as a subject; see his commentary in *Vita di Antonio*, 210, n. 14.

[157] "Ezek. 5:11, 14:16, 18, 20, 16:48, 17:16, 19, 18:3, 20:31, 33, 34:8, 35:6, 11: see Katrin Hauspie, "ζῶ ἐγώ, λέγει κύριος, εἶ μήν. Dans la Septante d'Ézéchiel," *Bulletin of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies* 36 (2003): 4, n. 2. Ezek. 20:3 and 33:11, 27 only have "(As) I live" without "says the Lord." This formula is attested in the New Testament as well, for instance in Rom. 14:11.

[158] Ezek. 3:20, 18:24, 18:26; see above n. 152.

[159] For instance, the use of the verb in 1st pers. sg. "I will not remember" (*non memorabo*) as a translation for Gk. 3rd pers. pl. οὐ μὴ ἀναμνησθῶσιν, unattested in other Christian writers of the time who quoted from Ezekiel, was influenced by the 1st person sg. "I live" (*uiuo ego*).

[160] The possibility that actual full quotations from Ezekiel may have been present in the initial text of the Greek *Life* should be discarded, as there are no manuscripts of the Greek *Life* that attest such a version of the text; see *VA* 18.3 (ed. Bartelink, 212 with the apparatus *ad loc*.). There is also no trace of these quotations in Evagrius's translation.

that he deemed it necessary to provide his readers with immediately identifiable quotations. This suggestion is supported by the fact that the above-discussed example is by no means singular; there are several other places in his translation where he added biblical quotations or references absent from the Greek text.[161] This further raises the question of what the makeup of his intended readership could have been. The anonymous translator regarded a biblical reference without quotation insufficient for his readers to understand the full context of this part of the *Life of Antony*, from which one can further deduce that he may have viewed his target readership as not familiar enough with the Bible. Other possible explanations might be that the anonymous translator's normal practice when quoting the Bible was to do so in full or that he wished to demonstrate his own knowledge of the Bible by quoting it in fuller form.

The examples discussed so far illustrate that the anonymous translator did not use existing versions of the biblical text in Latin. We will now shift our focus to his counterpart, Evagrius, and his handling of biblical material in his Latin translation of the *VA*, which, in contrast to that of his earlier, anonymous counterpart, is characterized by Evagrius's familiarity with existing versions of the Bible in Latin and by his intention to stylistically upgrade these existing versions.

In a discourse on demonology, Athanasius's Antony gives instructions to his fellow monks on the proper conduct when facing demons. One of Antony's main guidelines is that they must not let anger and desire rule over them because ὀργὴ ἀνδρὸς δικαιοσύνην θεοῦ οὐ κατεργάζεται.[162] Here, Athanasius drew once again on the Bible and quoted verbatim a passage from the Epistle of James in order to lend credence and authority to Antony's speech and

---

[161] See also *VA* 17.5, where the anonymous translator added the whole text of Eccles. 4:8, 6:2, absent from Athanasius's text, or *VA* 51.1, where he added a reference absent from the Greek original "as it is written in Job" (*ut scriptum est in Iob*). For other such interventions of the anonymous translator, see Gandt, "A Philological and Theological Analysis," 82-83.

[162] *VA* 21.1 (ed. Bartelink, 21). James 1:20: "Human anger does not produce the righteousness of God." (trans. Vivian and Athanassakis, 109).

teaching in general. The anonymous translator rendered this as *ira hominis iustitiam Dei non operatur*,[163] while Evagrius translated it as *iracundia uiri iustitiam Dei non operatur*.[164] In spite of the apparent similarities of the two translations which are almost identical for the second half of the quotation, i.e., *iustitiam Dei non operatur*,[165] the difference between *ira hominis* and *iracundia uiri* in the first half is telling.

The anonymous translator's "anger" (*ira*) juxtaposed to "of a (hu)man" (*hominis*) is a literal translation of Gk. ὀργὴ ἀνδρός "anger of a man," with a wording (*ira hominis*) that is unattested in other contemporary Christian Latin texts which quote this passage. On the other hand, it seems that the circulating Latin version of James 1:20 in the fourth century was *ira uiri iustitiam Dei non operatur*, as attested in John Cassian and Jerome,[166] with *uir* as in Evagrius, not the *homo* of the *VV*, which represents a low-register usage in Latin, where, by the fourth century, *homo* had replaced *uir* in the meaning "man."[167] By using *uir* here, Evagrius shows that he was familiar with the existing Latin translation of James 1:20; in addition, he seems not to have been content with the already existing Latin version of James 1:20 and therefore stylistically upgraded *ira* to *iracundia*. It is noteworthy that the only author who used *iracundia uiri* apart from Evagrius was Augustine, in his quotation of James 1:20, in a work that certainly postdates Evagrius' translation.[168] It is therefore tempting to suggest that Augustine, who

---

[163] *VV* 21 (ed. Gandt, 125), "The anger of man does not produce the righteousness of God."

[164] *VE* 21 (ed. Bertrand, 27), "The anger of man does not work the righteousness of God." (trans. White, 22.)

[165] The Vulgate version has the same wording: *ira enim uiri iustitiam Dei non operatur*. This, however, does not mean that the anonymous translator was familiar with James 1:20 in the Latin formulation that was later used for the Vulgate version. In fact, there are not too many other ways to translate Gk. δικαιοσύνην θεοῦ οὐ κατεργάζεται (or οὐκ ἐργάζεται) into Latin than *iustitiam dei non operatur*.

[166] *Inst.* 8.1; *In Matth.* 1.

[167] Leonard R. Palmer, *The Latin Language* (London: Faber and Faber, 1954), 169. *Homo* instead of *uir* is attested as early as Plautus and Petronius, which suggests its low-register usage. At some point, Lat. *uir* was completely replaced by *homo,* as witnessed by the lack of its descendants from Romance languages, see *TLL,* vol. 6.3 (Leipzig: Teubner, 1936-1942), s.v. *homo,* coll. 2880, I B.

[168] The expression *iracundia uiri* is attested in Augustine's works twice, both times in a context where it is clearly identified as a verbatim biblical quote: in *Ep.* 250, which, unfortunately, cannot be dated with any certainty (see the "Introduction" to *St. Augustine, Letters 204-270,* vol. 5, trans. Wilfrid Parsons (Washington D. C.: The Catholic University of America Press, 1956), xi), but also in his *C. adv. leg.* 20.41, which can be dated to ca. 420; see John K. Coyle, *Manichaeism and Its Legacy* (Leiden: Brill, 2009), 297, n.1.

elsewhere mentioned to have heard accounts of the *Life of Antony*,[169] may have read Evagrius's translation. This is an obvious, but not the only instance when Evagrius, as a prominent Christian intellectual, was well familiar with an existing Latin source for the biblical material he translates from Greek, which he nevertheless improved stylistically. In what follows, I will discuss another example where Evagrius identified a biblical quotation in Antony's discourse and then produced a high-style translation in Latin.

Elaborating on the previously given instruction to his fellow monks not to let anger into their souls, Athanasius's Antony advised them that, upon noticing demonic attacks, they must not let fear rule over them either, but that such fear should rather be driven away and replaced by tranquility and joy. As often, Athanasius emphasized and lent authority to Antony's message by drawing on the example of biblical characters such as "Abraham, [who] rejoiced when he saw the Lord,"[170] and John the Baptist: καὶ Ἰωάννης, γενομένης φωνῆς παρὰ τῆς θεοτόκου Μαρίας, ἐσκίρτησεν ἐν ἀγαλλιάσει.[171] Athanasius alludes here to the well-known story of the Visitation,[172] an episode from the Gospel of Luke where Mary, who was pregnant with Jesus, visits her relative Elizabeth, who was pregnant with John, later known as the Baptist. The only part that Athanasius took word-for-word from Luke is "leapt for joy" (ἐσκίρτησεν ἐν ἀγαλλιάσει).[173]

---

[169] *Conf.* 8.15, 8.29.

[170] *VA* 36.4, (trans. Vivian and Athanassakis, 137).

[171] *VA* 36.4 (ed. Bartelink, 266), "and John 'leapt for joy' when the voice of Mary, the Mother of God, reached him" (trans. Vivian and Athanassakis, 137).

[172] Luke 1:39-56.

[173] Luke 1:44: ὡς ἐγένετο ἡ φωνὴ τοῦ ἀσπασμοῦ σου εἰς τὰ ὦτά μου, ἐσκίρτησεν ἐν ἀγαλλιάσει τὸ βρέφος ἐν τῇ κοιλίᾳ μου. "For as soon as I heard the sound of your greeting, the child in my womb leaped for joy." Also, a very similar phrase occurs in the Gospel four verses earlier, Luke 1:41: καὶ ἐγένετο ὡς ἤκουσεν τὸν ἀσπασμὸν τῆς Μαρίας ἡ Ἐλισάβετ, ἐσκίρτησεν τὸ βρέφος ἐν τῇ κοιλίᾳ αὐτῆς, "When Elizabeth heard Mary's greeting, the child leaped in her womb."

The anonymous translator rendered this phrase rather literally as *et Iohannes post uocem Mariae quae Dominum peperit gestauit in exultatione*.[174] The wording of *gestauit in exultatione* is strange and unattested elsewhere.[175] Evagrius's translation, on the other hand, is much more elegant: *et Iohannes, cum Mariam superuenisse sentiret, quae in sacro uentris hospitio uniuersitatis gestabat parentem, exsultauit necdum natus in gaudio*.[176] Evagrius's *exultauit... in gaudio* ("leapt in joy") for ἐσκίρτησεν ἐν ἀγαλλιάσει seems to have been the existing Latin version of Luke 1:44, as witnessed in Ambrose[177] and Quodvultdeus.[178] However, where they used a simple epithet "baby" (*infans*), Evagrius expanded it into "while not yet born" (*necdum natus*).

For a full understanding of Evagrius's translation of this passage, it is important to note that in Luke 1:44 what follows "leapt for joy" and its grammatical subject "the child" (τὸ βρέφος) i.e. John the Baptist, and what is not mentioned by Athanasius, is "in my womb" (ἐν τῇ κοιλίᾳ μου). In my view, it is Evagrius's knowledge of the full phrase "the child *in my womb* leapt for joy" from Luke 1:44, combined with the intention to translate Athanasius's attribution "the God-bearer" (θεοτόκος) to Mary, that resulted in Evagrius's elaborate rhetorical structure "Mary, she who bore the progenitor of the universe in the guest-room of her holy womb" (*quae in sacro uentris hospitio uniuersitatis gestabat parentem*).

Evagrius employed various strategies in translating biblical material from Greek into Latin. Towards the end of the *Life of Antony*, Athanasius recounts how Antony sat on the

---

[174] *VV* 36 (ed. Gandt, 136-137, slightly altered - I retained Bartelink's reading *post uocem*, which is that of the manuscript, against *post uocum* printed in Gandt's edition), "and John after the voice of Mary, who gave birth to the Lord, leapt in joy."

[175] Bartelink, *Vita di Antonio*, 224, n. 16, thinks that this should be explained as the result of a confusion of either the anonymous translator or some later copyist between two Latin verbs, *gestare* "carry a child in the womb" and *gestire* "leap up, exult."

[176] *VE* 36 (ed. Bertrand, 42), "and when John sensed that Mary had arrived (she who bore the progenitor of the universe in the guest-room of her holy womb), he leapt for joy even before he was born." (trans. White, 32).

[177] *In Luc*. 1.

[178] *C. Iud. par. Ar.* 4.14.

mountain where he used to pray, contemplate, and practice ascetic discipline in solitude, when

he was importuned by crowds of people visiting him to be healed. Thus, once, Antony met

some judges and their prisoners and, as usual when people came to him asking for advice,

spoke his wise words. In particular, he advised the judges for whose benefit he quoted the

Bible: καὶ εἰδέναι, ὅτι οἵῳ κρίματι κρίνουσιν, κριθήσονται.[179] Athanasius here embedded into

his text a reference to the Sermon on the Mount from Matt. 7:2: "For in the same way you

judge others, you will be judged."[180] Athanasius used a quotation from Christ's Sermon to

create an analogy with his hero, Antony, who also dwelled on a mountain. The only difference

between the biblical account and Athanasius's narrative is that while Athanasius used the third

person plural (κρίνουσιν, κριθήσονται), recording what Antony said to his visitors, in the Bible

Christ's words are delivered directly to his audience, with verbs in the second person plural

(κρίνετε κριθήσεσθε). The rendering of *VA* 84.6 in the anonymous Latin translation is quite

literal: *et scire quia quali iudicio iudicauerint, tali iudicari habent.*[181] It suggests that its author

either decided not to translate the quotation as if from the Bible but as a usual part of

Athanasius's text, or that he did not recognize Matt. 7:2 in the Greek text of his original.

Evagrius, on the other hand, translated the whole passage as *nec ignorare eos debere quod*

scriptum est: *Quocunque iudicio iudicaueritis, in eo iudicabitur de uobis.*[182] It is clear that

Evagrius recognized the words from the Bible here, as signaled by his introduction of the quote

with the phrase "as it was written" (*quod scriptum est*), which is absent from the Greek original.

Furthermore, he quoted the existing version of Matt. 7:2 in Latin, i.e., (*in*) *quo iudicio*

---

[179] *VA* 84.6 (ed. Bartelink, 406), "and to realize that they were to be judged with the same judgement with which they judged" (trans. Vivian and Athanassakis, 239).

[180] Matt. 7:2: ἐν ᾧ γὰρ κρίματι κρίνετε κριθήσεσθε.

[181] *VV* 84 (ed. Gandt, 170), "and to know that with the judgement they judge, with the same they will be judged." Note that the anonymous translator here uses an alternative for the standard future tense, the analytical form *habent iudicari*, specific to late Latin, see Adams, *Bilingualism,* 743.

[182] *VE* 84 (ed. Bertrand, 93), "that they should bear in mind the words of Scripture, *By whatever justice you judge, by that you will be judged*" (trans. White, 63, slightly altered).

iudicaueritis iudicabitur de uobis, which is attested by Tertullian,[183] Petrus Chrysologus,[184] Augustine,[185] Hilary of Poitiers,[186] and Jerome.[187]

In addition, Evagrius altered the already existing version of Matt. 7:2 in Latin and created a slightly different syntactic structure for the quotation by adding two pronouns, "whichever" (*quocunque*) and "in that" (*in eo*).[188] While the first pronoun in the ablative (*quocunque*) is the expected way to say "by whichever" in 'standard' Latin, the second of Evagrius's interventions in the text, *in eo*, may suggest that Evagrius was familiar with Hebraisms in Latin, i. e., with the specific biblical usage as established by literal translations of biblical texts into Latin.[189] The preposition *in* followed by a noun or pronoun in the ablative case (in this case *eo*) in instrumental or modal sense ("with," "by means of") was not commonly used in standard, high-register Latin, where the simple non-prepositional ablative would be the norm. Another possible explanation is that Evagrius's *in eo* serves as a standard locative construction, given that *iudicium*, apart from "judgement," meant also "trial" and "tribunal."

In my view, the most plausible interpretation of Evagrius's *quocunque* and *in eo* is that, first, *in eo* might have been inspired by specific linguistic usage generated by and attested only in the context of the Latin Bible translations or their conscious imitations,[190] and, second, that reworking into *quocunque* is a counterpart made by eliminating existing Hebraism. Another example from Evagrius's translation that might be interpreted as using the preposition *in*

---

[183] *Pudic.* 2.

[184] *Serm.* 145.

[185] *De serm. Dom.* 2.59.

[186] *In Matth.* 5.14.

[187] *In Matth.* 5.14.

[188] There is a number of manuscripts that do not read *quocunque* but *in quocunque* and *in quo*, as well as manuscripts with omission of *in eo*, see ed. Bertrand, 93 with the apparatus *ad loc*. Still, the majority of manuscripts and the modern edition went for the correlative construction *quocunque iudicio – in eo*.

[189] From Hebrew בְּ, see W. E. Plater, and H. J. White, *A Grammar of the Vulgate, Being an Introduction to the Latinity of the Vulgate Bible* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1926), 20-21. Arnobius, for instance, has Matt. 7:2 with two pronouns and both are preceded by *in*: *quia in quo iudicio iudicaueris, in eo tibi iudicabitur*, *Ad Greg.* 19.

[190] See, for example, Judg. 15:15-16: *interfecit in ea* [*maxilla*] *mille uiros*, "struck down with a jaw a thousand men," Lk. 22:49: *in gladio*, "with a sword," and Ps. 2:11: *seruite Domino in timore*, "serve the Lord with fear."

followed by a noun/pronoun in the ablative case in instrumental or modal sense ("with, by means of") is his translation of Prov. 24:15: *ne seducamini in saturitate uentris*.[191] That Evagrius himself added *in* is supported by the wording of Proverbs 24:15 in other writers writing in Latin, who all have it without *in*.[192]

The examples discussed above defined more closely the profiles of the two translators and the ways in which they positioned themselves in relation to the Greek text they translated. Even though the verbatim biblical quotations that the translators found in the Greek text of the *Life of Antony* and rendered in Latin present a stable and reliable material for comparison, we need to keep in mind that the two translators may not have used two identical texts of the *VA* but worked on slightly different textual versions. The following example will offer a further explanation of this issue.

In chapter 20 of the *Life*, where Athanasius discussed the nature of virtue, bringing together Stoic, Platonic, and Origenist elements in a Christian perspective,[193] he again, as many times before, supports his statements by quoting the Bible: *Εὐθείας ποιεῖτε τὰς τρίβους ὑμῶν*.[194] The wording "make [the] paths straight" (Εὐθείας ποιεῖτε τὰς τρίβους) is clearly a direct biblical quotation from passages such as the Gospel of Matthew 3:3: "make straight his paths"[195] and Isaiah 40:3: "make straight the paths of our God."[196] Still, in Matt. 3:3 and Isa. 40:3 this expression occurs in two different contexts; while the part "make the paths straight" (Εὐθείας ποιεῖτε τὰς τρίβους) is identical, Matt. 3:3 has "*his* paths" (τὰς τρίβους αὐτοῦ) and Isa. 40:3 "the paths *of our God*" (τρίβους τοῦ θεοῦ ἡμῶν). These two biblical passages were often quoted by patristic authors in Latin. The Vulgate version renders Matthew 3:3 as *rectas*

---

[191] *VE* 55 (ed. Bertrand, 60-61), "do not be seduced by the fullness of the stomach." (trans. White, 43).
[192] Lucifer Calaritanus *(Non conu.* 6.26), Augustine (for instance *Serm. ad pop.* 306C), Sulpicius Severus *(Chron.* 1.16) and John Cassian *(Conl.* 14.17).
[193] Vivian and Athanassakis, *VA*, 105, n. 140.
[194] *VA* 20.7 (ed. Bartelink, 218), "Make your paths straight." (trans. Vivian and Athanassakis, 107).
[195] Matt 3:3: εὐθείας ποιεῖτε τὰς τρίβους αὐτοῦ.
[196] Isa. 40:3: εὐθείας ποιεῖτε τὰς τρίβους τοῦ θεοῦ ἡμῶν.

facite semitas eius, and so do Jerome,[197] Ambrose,[198] and Augustine,[199] while Cyprian,[200] Ambrosiaster,[201] and Jerome[202] provide attestations for *semitas dei nostri,* which comes from Isa. 40:3.

The two translators of the *VA* recognized the expression in Athanasius's text as a quote from the Bible; the anonymous translator rendered it as *rectas facite semitas ipsius,*[203] while Evagrius translated it as *rectas [...] facite semitas uestras.*[204] Although both translations look similar, the only difference between them, i.e., the anonymous's "his" (*ipsius*) and, in Evagrius's case, "yours" (pl.) (*uestras*), offers a precious clue for the present analysis. As neither translator used the wording "the paths of our God" (τρίβους τοῦ θεοῦ ἡμῶν, *semitas dei nostri*) from Isa. 40:3, this is unlikely to be the source here and, consequently, it can be argued with some certainty that both the anonymous translator and Evagrius identified Matt. 3:3 in the Greek text they were translating.

When it comes to the wording of the two translations, "his paths" (*semitas ipsius*) is used by the anonymous translator, whereas "your (pl.) paths" (*uestras*) is used in Evagrius's translation. Given that the anonymous translator is unfamiliar with contemporary versions of the Bible in Latin, as I have established in the first part of this chapter, it is likely that he associated Matt. 3:3 with the wording of the Greek Bible and translated "his paths" (τὰς τρίβους αὐτοῦ) with the pronominal form *ipsius,* in contrast with other attested Latin versions, which have *eius* in this passage. As for Evagrius, his *uestras* "your" (pl.) is a direct translation of Athanasius's text, which has "your" (pl.) (ὑμῶν). What can explain such different translations

---

[197] *Epist.* 57.9.
[198] *In Psalm.* 48.1.
[199] *Cons. Euang.* 12.25.
[200] *Testim.* 2.6.
[201] *Quaest. test.* 57.
[202] *In Is.* 17.62.
[203] *VV* 20 (ed. Gandt, 124): "Make his paths straight."
[204] *VE* 20 (ed. Bertrand, 27): "Make your paths straight." (trans. White, 22, slightly altered).

42

of the same Greek original? The answer lies in the manuscript tradition of Athanasius's *VA*. Five manuscripts of the Greek text read here "make *his* paths straight," (εὐθείας ποιεῖτε τὰς τρίβους αὐτοῦ),[205] the wording that we find in the anonymous translation, while the rest of the manuscripts of the Greek *VA* used by Bartelink for his critical edition have ὑμῶν, "your" (pl.), which Evagrius translated as *uestras*. This difference clearly shows that *VV* and *VE* have as their respective *Vorlage* manuscripts belonging to two branches of the tradition. The case of Matt. 3:3 in Athanasius's text and in its two Latin translations demonstrates the importance of studying the manuscript tradition as part of any investigation into the differences in translation techniques identifiable in the two late-antique Latin translations of the *VA*. Therefore, it is very probable that at the time when the two translators produced their translations, the manuscript of the Greek text of the *Life of Antony* used by the anonymous translator was not entirely identical with the manuscript source of Evagrius's translation.[206]

In the prologue to his translation, Evagrius himself alluded to an earlier Latin translation when he wrote that "a literal translation made from one language to another conceals the meaning" and that he "tried to avoid this in translating," and he also added that he "translated in such a way that nothing should be lacking from the sense."[207] Still, to my knowledge, there has been no evidence offered to confirm that Evagrius alluded exactly to this oldest anonymous translation of the *VA*;[208] Bertrand has even claimed that the question of whether Evagrius actually knew the first Latin translation or not cannot be answered from Evagrius's words [209] Such indications, in fact, can be found, and the analysis provided here aims to offer conclusive evidence that Evagrius not only had the earlier anonymous translation "on his mind when

---

[205] See the apparatus to Bartelink's critical edition, 218, line 25.

[206] As opposed to Gandt's assumption that the two translators worked with "substantially identical Greek manuscripts," see her "A Philological and Theological Analysis," 16, n. 72.

[207] *VE* Prol. (trans. White, 7).

[208] Gandt has rightly noted that there are at least three revisions in Evagrius's translation that suggest that Evagrius was in possession of the oldest translation, but she considered such evidence "too limited to be conclusive"; see "A Philological and Theological Analysis," 186-87.

[209] See his "Die Evagriusübersetzung der *Vita Antonii*," 28.

alluding to literal translation,"[210] but that he translated the *VA* while utilizing exactly this anonymous translation.

In the famous episode of Antony's debate with certain unnamed philosophers, he asks them whether they think he is a foolish or a wise person: εἰ δὲ νομίζετέ με φρόνιμον εἶναι, γίνεσθε ὡς ἐγώ... εἰ δὲ ὑμεῖς πρὸς ἐμέ, γίνεσθε ὡς ἐγώ, χριστιανὸς γάρ εἰμι.[211] Athanasius here twice quoted verbatim "become like me" (γίνεσθε ὡς ἐγώ) from the Epistle to the Galatians.[212] The anonymous translator rendered this as *si autem ad sapientem ut arbitramini, imitamini me* [...] *Sed quia ab se ad me uenistis uos, estote ut ego: Christianus ego sum enim*.[213] Evagrius translated it as *si autem putatis me sapientem esse et sapientia bonum est, imitamini quae probatis* [...] *sed quia uos ad me quasi ad sapientem uenistis, estote sicut et ego sum, Christiani*.[214]

As we can see, neither translator rendered in the same way the two occurrences of the same biblical formula, γίνεσθε ὡς ἐγώ, which appears twice in the same form in the Greek original. The anonymous translator rendered the first instance as "imitate me" (*imitamini me*) and the second as "be like me" (*estote ut ego*).[215] Interestingly, one finds a very similar rendering in Evagrius's translation: the first "become like me" was translated as "imitate what you approve of" (*imitamini quae probatis*) and the other as "be as I am" (*estote sicut et ego sum*). It remains unclear why the anonymous translator decided not to translate the same biblical quotation twice with the same wording, but in Evagrius's case there is little doubt that

[210] Lorie, *Spiritual Terminology*, 2-3.

[211] *VA* 72.4-5 (ed. Bartelink, 370), "If you think I am wise, become like me [...] since you have come to see me, become like me: I am a Christian." (trans. Vivian and Athanassakis, 209).

[212] Gal. 4:12.

[213] *VV* 72 (ed. Gandt, 161), "If you thought you came to the wise man, imitate me [...] But since you have come to me, become like me."

[214] *VE* 72 (ed. Bertramd, 79), "But if you think I am wise and that wisdom is good, imitate what you approve of [...] but since you have come to me in the belief that I am wise, become like me, Christians." (trans. White, 54, altered).

[215] In Gandt's edition of the *VV* this was not recognized as a direct biblical quotation.

he depended on the anonymous translation. He translated the same biblical quotation differently because that is what he found in the oldest translation and then decided to follow.

Moreover, Evagrius's words from the prologue that he "tried to avoid" a literal approach to translating still applies here too, as he seems not to have been content with the rendering he found in the anonymous translation and stylistically improved it. His "imitate what you approve of" (*imitamini quae probatis*) reflects a rather different understanding of the simple biblical precept "become like me" and stands in contrast to the anonymous's "imitate me" (*imitamini me*). Evagrius's "be as I am" (*estote sicut et ego sum*) is the wording of Gal. 4:12 that circulated in Latin in Late Antiquity, as attested in Cyprian,[216] Marius Victorinus,[217] Ambrose,[218] Rufinus,[219] Augustine,[220] Jerome,[221] and in the Vulgate version. As in most cases, the wording of the anonymous translation, i.e., *imitamini me* and *estote ut ego*, is otherwise unattested in other Latin versions of this biblical passage, which suggests that the anonymous translator produced it on his own and without any apparent knowledge of existing versions of the Bible in Latin. It is also notable that the anonymous translator used *enim* at the end of the sentence, which almost never happens in standard Latin;[222] this is a further strong indication that the anonymous translator was not a native speaker of Latin.

We find another example that strongly suggests that Evagrius translated the *VA* while also reading the oldest anonymous translation, in his translation of the chapter 21.1 of the *VA*, where Athanasius combines two biblical quotations, James 1:20 and James 1:15, without specifically introducing the latter one: Γέγραπται γὰρ ὅτι *ὀργὴ ἀνδρὸς δικαιοσύνην θεοῦ οὐ*

[216] *Epist*. 55.15.
[217] *In Gal.* 2.4.
[218] *In psalm.* 10.7.
[219] *Orig. in psalm.* 38.2.1.
[220] *Epist*. 208.
[221] *In Gal.* 2.4.
[222] See *TLL,* vol. 5 (Leipzig: Teubner, 1953), s.v. *enim,* col. 575, *tertio loco.*

κατεργάζεται· ἡ δὲ ἐπιθυμία, συλλαβοῦσα, τίκτει ἁμαρτίαν.[223] The anonymous translator inserted "and again" (*et iterum*) between the two quotations from James: *ira uiri iustitiam Dei non operatur*, et iterum: *Concupiscentia concipiens parit peccatum.*[224] Evagrius, next, took *et iterum* from his predecessor:[225] *iracundia uiri iustitiam Dei non operatur*, et iterum: *Desiderium concipiens parit peccatum.*[226]

The discussion presented above aimed to explore the most conspicuous features of the two translations that reflect and explain the motivations, skills, and knowledge of the Bible of the two translators. First, it has shown that the anonymous translator's renderings of the biblical quotations in most cases do not match any of the Latin versions of the Bible in circulation in mid- and late-fourth century, while the wording of his renderings often corresponds to the wording of the Bible in Greek. This further suggests that the text of the Bible to which the anonymous translator was exposed was not in Latin but most probably in Greek, and that the bilingualism of the anonymous translator should not be discarded as a possible explanation for his literal approach to translation. Evagrius's rendering of the biblical quotations, on the other hand, has many parallels in the works of other Christian authors writing in Latin in Late Antiquity, which suggests that, unlike his earlier counterpart, he did indeed use existing Latin translations of the Bible and occasionally upgraded their language. The analysis of a number

---

[223] *VA* 21.1 (ed. Bartelink, 220): "For it is written: 'Human anger does not produce the righteousness of God,' and 'desire, when it has conceived, gives birth to sin.'" (trans. Vivian and Athanassakis, 107-09).

[224] *VV* 21 (ed. Gandt, 125).

[225] It is also possible that Greek manuscript used by the anonymous translator may have actually contained the words corresponding to *et iterum* in this passage of the *VA*, however such a reading is not attested in the extant manuscripts of the Greek text.

[226] *VE* 21 (ed. Bertrand, 27). Note that Evagrius, just as he did in James 1:15 by using *iracundia* instead of *ira* (see above, pp. 36-37), here he again rhetorically upgraded an already existing Latin version of James 1:15 by changing *concupiscentia* for *desiderium;* what is more, Evagrius never used *concupiscentia* in his translation of the *VA*. It is worth stressing that *concupicentia* "desire/yearning/coveting" is a lexical item so prominent in Latin in Christian context, usually as a translation of Gk. ἐπιθυμία, as here in the *VA*, and mostly with a negative connotation, implying lust and corporeal desire, primarily by Augustine; for a short overview of the understanding and usage of *concupiscentia* by patristic authors, see Timo Nisula, *Augustine and the Functions of Concupiscence* (Leiden, Brill, 2012), 33-35. Jerome was not reluctant to using *concupiscentia*, see Matthew A. Kraus, *Jewish, Christian, and Classical Exegetical Traditions in Jerome's Translation of the Book of Exodus. Translation Technique and the Vulgate* (Leiden: Brill, 2017), 168-170. What prompted Evagrius to completely avoid *concupiscentia*, although intriguing, remains unknown.

of interventions by the two translators, both by inserting additional biblical material and by providing textual references absent from the Greek original, has shed light on the knowledge of the Bible of the two translators and on the possible makeup of their intended readership. Also, further evidence demonstrated that Evagrius made use of the oldest anonymous translation.

In the following section I will present and discuss translations of biblical quotations where the translator's approach can be called minimally invasive; they can be found, as expected, primarily in the anonymous translation. The aim of my analysis is to provide a better understanding of what the literal approach to translation embraced by the anonymous translator involves and how it worked in practice.

3.2 The Anonymous Translator's Literal Approach

After the discussion in the previous chapter that presented the *modus operandi* of the two translators, the main focus of the present section will be the anonymous translator and his literal approach to translation. He has been, as mentioned in the Introduction, considered too "literal."[227] This claim indeed holds true, and, in order to explain what "literal" actually means when speaking about the anonymous translator's word-for-word approach and what the possible reasons for or, as we will see, limitations to translate word-for-word were, several examples will be discussed where he mechanically translated certain Greek verbs and nouns into Latin, regardless of the context of the sentence in which they appear. Also, certain phrases and terms in his translation will be singled out which reflect either the translator's concern to be precise, that is, to convey a specific meaning when translating, or his hesitation in lexical choices in translating from Greek into Latin. Additionally, the analysis of Evagrius's Latin

---

[227] See above pp. 4-5.

renderings of the same words and phrases of the Greek original will explain why the translations found in the *VV* do not constitute idiomatic Latin.

In describing the devil's first and, as usual in the *VA*, unsuccessful attack on Antony and in praising Antony's resistance and perseverance with the Lord's assistance, Athanasius quoted 1 Corinthians 15:10: ὥστε τῶν οὕτως ἀγωνιζομένων ἕκαστον λέγειν· Οὐκ ἐγὼ δέ, ἀλλ' ἡ χάρις τοῦ θεοῦ ἡ σὺν ἐμοί.[228] The anonymous translator rendered this as *ita ut singuli taliter certantium dicerent: Non ego autem, sed gratia Dei qui mecum est.*[229] On the other hand, Evagrius translated it as *ut singulis ita certantibus apostolicum liceret proferre sermonem: Non ego autem, sed gratia Dei quae mecum est.*[230]

A case in point for the present discussion is primarily the way in which the two translators rendered Athanasius's introduction of this biblical quotation. The anonymous's *ita ut singuli taliter certantium dicerent* ("so that each of those who struggle like this could say") is rather a verbatim and mirror translation of the word order of Gk. ὥστε τῶν οὕτως ἀγωνιζομένων ἕκαστον λέγειν. As we can see, his translation of the Gk. λέγειν "to say" is simply *dicere* "to say.". This is not surprising in itself, however, the anonymous translator's lexical choice for the occurrences of the verb λέγειν in the Greek original was always *dicere*.[231]

---

[228] *VA* 5.7 (ed. Bartelink, 166), "so that each of those who struggle like *this* can say 'It is not I but the grace of God that is in me.'" (trans. Vivian and Athanassakis, 69, slightly altered and emphasis added).

[229] *VV* 5 (ed. Gandt, 112), "so that each of those who struggle like this could say: 'It is not I, but the grace of God who is with me.'"

[230] *VE* 5 (ed. Bertrand, 10), "so that any individual who became involved in this struggle could cite the words of the Apostle, 'Not I, but the grace of *God* which is with me.'" (trans. White, 12, slightly altered).

[231] Gk. λέγειν in the *VA* appears in various present-stem forms ninety-eight times, which is not surprising given that the *VA* quotes the Bible extensively and one of the main formulae that introduce a biblical quotation is "saying" (λέγων), with thirty occurrences in the *VA*. To give just one example where the anonymous translator automatically translates λέγειν to *dicere*, *VA* 39.1: Ἐβουλόμην μὲν οὖν σιωπῆσαι καὶ μηδὲν ἐξ ἐμαυτοῦ *λέγειν*, ἀρκεῖσθαι δὲ μόνοις τούτοις. Ἵνα δὲ μὴ νομίσητε ταῦτά με *λέγειν* ἁπλῶς, translated in *VV* 39 *Et uolebam quidem tacere et nihil ex me dicere, arbitrans sufficere ista quae dicta sunt. Sed ne putetis me ista simpliciter dicere.* Compare this with Evagrius's rendering of the same passage, *VE* 39: *Volueram quidem iam finire sermonem et silentio premere quaecumque meae acciderant paruitati. Sed ne putetis frustra me commemorasse.* Apart from this example in *VA* 39.1, the anonymous translator's literal equivalence between λέγειν and *dicere* appears another ten times: 7.7, 8.3, 16.3, 18.1, 26.3, 28.3, 60.9, 65.8, 66.7, and 69.4. In these cases Evagrius either avoided translating λέγειν completely, used *dicere* twice, or offered stylistically upgraded equivalents, such as *referre, edicere, dicens uel mente concipere.*

On the other hand, Evagrius's translation of Athanasius's introduction to 1 Corinthians 15:10 is much more elaborate and stylistically upgraded. First, by adding *sermo apostolicus* "the apostle's discourse/words" he provided a reference to Paul, which is missing from the Greek original. Then, unlike the anonymous translator, he rendered λέγειν "to say" not simply as *dicere,* but as *proferre* "to cite/quote," a term less general and more perspicuous as a quotation tag than *dicere.*

As for the translations of 1 Corinthians 15:10 itself, the two translators' renderings have only one minor, but very important difference: the relative pronoun. Evagrius's feminine form *quae* "which/that" in *sed gratia Dei quae mecum est* refers to *gratia* "grace," and as such is a direct translation of Gk. ἡ, which agrees in gender with ἡ χάρις. The anonymous translator, however, writes *sed gratia Dei qui mecum est* with a masculine relative pronoun, that is to say, he understood and construed the relative as referring to *Deus* "God", not to *gratia* "[his] grace."

There are several possible explanations for this difference. First, we need to exclude the possibility that the anonymous translator, unlike Evagrius, was translating from a Greek text of the *VA* which had the masculine form of the relative ὅς instead of the feminine ἡ; among the extant manuscripts on which Bartelink based his critical edition of the Greek text, none attest a version of the Greek *VA* without the relative pronoun ἡ. Another possible explanation is that one of the scribes of the anonymous translation wrote *qui* instead of *quae*, which is, in my opinion, unlikely and beyond proof. A third possibility is that the anonymous translator mistakenly construed and translated ἡ with θεός instead of χάρις, and that Evagrius, faced with the resulting text in the anonymous translation, simply corrected *qui* to *quae*, yet this is also beyond proof. The explanation that seems the most likely to me is the following: the anonymous translator might have known a version of the Bible in Greek that contained no relative pronoun at all (ἀλλ' ἡ χάρις τοῦ θεοῦ σὺν ἐμοί), and this influenced his interpretation of Athanasius's syntax in the passage under discussion here. In fact, such a version of 1 Cor.

49

15:10 in Latin without any relative pronoun, i. e., *sed gratia dei mecum*, is attested by Ambrosiaster, [232] Augustine in all his works, the Vulgate version, and Rufinus in his translations from the Greek. That the Latin versions with and without the relative pronoun *quae* coexisted is not surprising, as there are corresponding versions of the Greek text of the New Testament that do not contain a relative pronoun in this passage and read ἀλλ᾽ ἡ χάρις τοῦ θεοῦ σὺν ἐμοί,[233] which is exactly the version that the anonymous translator might have known.

After the narrative of Antony's first combat with the demons, Athanasius described Antony's lifestyle and his initial ascetic practices. Here, he discussed Antony's attitude to virtue and how he continuously made progress by working harder helped in this by meditation on the Bible: ἐπιλέγων ἑαυτῷ τὸ τοῦ Παύλου ῥητὸν συνεχῶς· *Τῶν ὄπισθεν ἐπιλανθανόμενος, τοῖς δὲ ἔμπροσθεν ἐπεκτεινόμενος.*[234] Athanasius here drew on Paul's epistle to Philippians 3:13, which the anonymous translator rendered as *dicens assidue sancti Pauli dictum*: *Ea quae retro sunt obliuiscens, ad ea autem quae in priore sunt me superextendens.*[235] Evagrius's version of the same passage is *supra memorati doctoris sermonum recordabatur, qui ait: Praeterita obliuiscens et in futurum conualescens.*[236]

The lexical choices in the two translations of Athanasius's introduction of this biblical quotation are again noteworthy. First, the anonymous translator resorts to simple *dicens – dictum.* Second, while in the Greek original the apostle Paul is simply mentioned by name, the anonymous translator attributes "saint" (*sanctus*) to Paul; this is not the sole example of such added qualification, as *Paulus sanctus* and *Apostolus sanctus* are attested six times in the anonymous translation, making Paul the figure most often called "saint" in this text, even more

232 *In Cor.* 15.10.
233 See *Novum Testamentum Graece*, 548, with the critical apparatus *ad loc*.
234 *VA* 7.11 (ed. Bartelink, 176), "reflecting continually on what Paul said: 'We are forgetting what lies behind and straining forward to what lies ahead.'" (trans. Vivian and Athanassakis, 77).
235 *VV* 7 (ed. Gandt, 114, slightly altered - I retain the corrected form *assidue* proposed by most modern editors instead of *assiduae* in the ms., preferred by Gandt), "constantly saying the saying of saint Paul: 'Forgetting those things that are behind and, instead, straining forwards to things that are ahead of me.'"
236 *VE* 7 (ed. Bertrand, 13), "he bore in mind the words of the learned man I mentioned earlier who said, *Forgetting the past and growing strong in the future.*" (trans. White, 14).

CEU eTD Collection

so than Antony himself.[237] On the other hand, Evagrius does not transate Paul's name at all, but rather refers to him as the "above-mentioned teacher" (*supra memoratus doctor*), since he had mentioned him four sentences earlier as *Apostolus*.[238] Also, Evagrius's *recordari* "to bear in mind, be mindful of" is again much more precise and appropriate as a translation of Greek ἐπιλέγω in this context than the anonymous translator's *dicere* "to say."

The two translators' renderings of the Philippians 3:13 are likewise telling. There are some similarities between the anonymous translator's version and versions of this passage quoted by other patristic writers. Augustine almost always used *ea quae retro sunt obliuiscens,* which corresponds to the anonymous translation, but on one instance he had *praeterita* instead of *ea quae retro sunt*,[239] just as Rufinus did,[240] while *in futurum* is also attested by Jerome,[241] a reading closer to Evagrius's rendering. The anonymous translator's wording is thus much more likely due to his literal translation from Greek than to any familiarity with the same source in Latin for Phil. 3:13 that Augustine, Rufinus, Jerome and Evagrius used. It should also be noted that Gk. ἐπεκτεινόμενος "straining forward" was translated by the anonymous translator as *superextendens*; this verb in this context was used only by the anonymous translator and otherwise is rarely attested in the Latin versions of the Bible,[242] and it closely mirrors the structure of the Greek verb it translates with both prefixes of the Greek verb matched by Latin equivalents, *super* for ἐπ- and *ex* for εκ-.

Lastly, given that personal pronouns are absent from the second part of the quotation as quoted by Athanasius in the Greek *VA,* the presence of personal pronoun *me* in the *VV* is in my view a precious pointer to the anonymous translator's knowledge of the Bible. In the Greek

---

[237] See Gandt, "A Philological and Theological Analysis," 84-85; also, Lorié, *Spiritual Terminology*, 86-87, as well as Hoppenbrouwers, "La technique de la traduction," 22.
[238] *VE* 7 (ed. Bertrand, 13): *secundum Apostoli praeceptum dicentis.*
[239] *In euang. Ioh.* 9.3.
[240] *In Rom.* 6.11.
[241] *In Is.* 15.54.
[242] See Bartelink's commentary in *Vita di Antonio*, 200, n. 49.

51

original of the New Testament, what precedes the part of Philippians 3:13 that Athanasius quoted reads as follows: "I do not consider *myself* (ἐμαυτὸν) yet to have taken hold of it."[243] The anonymous translator seems to have been familiar with the Bible in Greek, which he quotes from memory when translating the *VA*.[244]

Mechanical translations of certain Christian key terms in Greek are to be found throughout the *versio vetustissima*. In one of the numerous discourses on demonology Antony delivered to his fellow monks, he discussed the nature of the demons' malice, but he also claimed that they nevertheless cannot do any harm to those who worship God. Athanasius again lent authority to his hero's words by quoting verbatim from the Bible (Sir. 1:25): βδέλυγμα γὰρ ἁμαρτωλῷ θεοσέβεια[245] and without introducing the quote as such, but rather making it a part of the sentence in the *VA* and adding an explanatory copula "because" (γὰρ), the role of which is to make clear that the sentence quoted presents an authoritative argument for previous statements made by Antony. The anonymous translator recognized the Bible here, as proved by the introduction which precedes his translation: *scriptum est enim: Abominatio impii Dei cultura.*[246] Evagrius also signalled the biblical quote[247] in his translation: *secundum quod scriptum est: Quia abominatio est pietas peccatori?*[248]

The two translators' renderings of Sirach 1:25 match in only one word, i. e., *abominatio*. This biblical passage was not widely quoted in Latin in Late Antiquity, yet there is a precious attestation in Jerome that reads *abominatio enim peccatori est pietas*,[249] which is, in a

---

[243] Ἐγὼ ἐμαυτὸν οὐ λογίζομαι κατειληφέναι.

[244] It should be noted that the Vulgate version of this passage also has a second *me* precisely in the portion quoted by Athanasius: *in priora extendens me*, attested also in Augustine, *Spec.* 35, though I do not think this could have prompted the presence of *me* in the anonymous translation.

[245] *VA* 28.7 (ed. Bartelink, 242): "for godliness is an abomination to a sinner" (trans. Vivian and Athanassakis, 123).

[246] *VV* 28 (ed. Gandt, 131), "for it is written: 'the worship of God is abomination for an impious person.'"

[247] Two are the explanations for Evagrius's introduction to the Sir. 1:25, otherwise absent from the Greek original: Evagrius did so either because he recognised the biblical quote himself or, more likely, because he found it already tagged in the the *VV*, which, in my opinion, he consulted when working on his own translation.

[248] *VE* 28 (ed. Bertrand, 35), "following what is written: 'for piety is an abomination to the sinner.'"

[249] *In Am.* 2.5.

somewhat different word-order,[250] the same Latin version that was quoted by Evagrius. This textual parallel in Jerome leaves no doubt that Evagrius was familiar with an already existing version of Sir. 1:25 in Latin.[251] The anonymous translator, on the other hand, is the only author that in a Latin version of Sir. 1:25 has *impii* and *Dei cultura*. It remains unknown what motivated the anonymous's lexical choice, i.e., *impius* as a translation of Gk. ἁμαρτωλός "sinner," instead of *peccator* as he usually does in *versio vetustissima* when translating Gk. ἁμαρτωλός and its cognates ἁμαρτία and ἁμαρτάνειν.

The anonymous translator's expression *Dei cultura* as a translation for Gk. θεοσέβεια meaning "religiosity, godliness, worship" seems to be another example of automatic translation. While Evagrius rarely uses the noun *cultura*, and never as a translation of Gk. θεοσέβεια,[252] there are five other instances in the *versio vetustissima* where the anonymous translator equated the nominal group *Dei cultura* or its related expression *Deum colere* and Gk. θεοσέβεια/θεοσεβοῦντας/θεοσεβεῖν.[253] Although the anonymous translator did use *Dei cultura* elsewhere in *VV*,[254] he seems to have been using *Dei cultura* and the related expression *Deum colere* mostly to render Gk. θεοσέβεια and its cognate grammatical forms.[255]

---

[250] Evagrius's translation of the biblical quotation formed as a question was his intervention, so-called *erotema*, see Gandt, "A Philological and Theological Analysis," 192-193. It is a part of a wider discourse in Evagrius's translation of the chapter 18 of the *VA* which consists of several questions directed to Satan, unlike in the Greek original, where Antony delivers his speech to monks speaking of the demons in third person plural. This is also a hint to Evagrius's brilliant rhetorical technique and an example of 'free' translation.

[251] The identical wording of this biblical quotation in Evagrius and Jerome, but not in other Latin authors is intriguing. Given that Sir. 1:25 is quoted in Jerome's commentaries on the minor prophets, the composition of which is dated ca. 393, later than Evagrius's translation of the *VA* (ca. 373), Jerome may have been inspired to use Evagrius' formulation after reading his translation of the *VA*. Still, given that we do not have many attestations of Sir. 1:25, it is equally possible that both Evagrius and Jerome used an already existing translation, for which, as it happens, we do not have other attestations.

[252] Three times in total, in *VE* 22 for Gk. φαντασία, in *VE* 50 he translated Gk. βραχύτατόν τινα τόπον εὑρὼν ἐπιτήδειον, ἐγεώργησεν as *grandum culturae aptum reperit locum,* and in *VE* 76 where he used *cultura* as a part of an expanded exegetic translation.

[253] *Dei cultura* for θεοσέβεια from *VA* 11:1, 44:3, and 80:1; *diligentes Dei culturam* for the participle θεοσεβοῦντας from *VA* 28.5; and *Deum colere* for the infinitive θεοσεβεῖν from *VA* 77.2.

[254] In *VV* 30 for Gk. εὐσέβεια and in *VV 54* for Gk. ἐφόδια.

[255] Bartelink also commented on the anonymous's use of *cultura*, see his commentary in *Vite dei Santi*, 255, n. 74, and 257, n. 77. In addition, the anonymous translator widely employed the noun *religio* in *VV*. On the distinction between *cultura* as the 'objective idea' and worship and *religio* as 'subjective meaning' in the anonymous translation see Lorié, *Spiritual Terminology* 71-72. On *religio* in the anonymous translation see ibid., 188, n. 33. In *VV*, *religio* is mostly used as a part of the nominal group *studium religionis* as a translation of Gk. ἄσκησις, see Gandt, "A Philological and Theological Analysis," 128.

Fashioning Antony as fully adherent to 'orthodox' theology was a powerful weapon in Athanasius's anti-Arian campaign.[256] In chapter 69 of the *VA*, he wrote that "the Arians lied and said that Antony held the same beliefs as they."[257] Here, Athanasius "depicted Antony as responding to this claim by appearing in Alexandria and publicly denouncing Arian thought,"[258] which he characterized as "ungodly."[259] As usually when treating important theological issues, Athanasius lent authority to Antony's words by quoting the Bible: Ὅθεν μηδεμίαν ἔχετε κοινωνίαν πρὸς τοὺς ἀσεβεστάτους Ἀρειανούς· *Οὐδεμία γὰρ κοινωνία φωτὶ πρὸς σκότος*.[260] The anonymous translator rendered this as *unde nolite habere cum impiis, ipsi Ariani, ullam communicationem, nulla enim communicatio lucis cum tenebra.*[261] Evagrius's translation of the passage reads as follows: *cum Arianis sit uobis nulla coniunctio. Quae enim societas luci ad tenebras?*[262]

The two translators' renderings differ significantly, both in the translation of what precedes the biblical quotation in Athanasius's text and in that of the biblical passage itself. It should be noted, first, that Athanasius's "for 'light has no fellowship with darkness'" is not a verbatim biblical quotation, but rather his reworking of a question into a negative statement.[263] The biblical quotation that Athanasius "flattened" here is 2 Corinthians 6:14, which reads: "what fellowship can light have with darkness?" (τίς κοινωνία φωτὶ πρὸς σκότος).[264] As it now becomes clear, this is exactly what Evagrius translated as a question. In other words, he

---

[256] For Arianism and Athanasius's anti-Arian campaign, see above pp. 2-3 and n. 10.

[257] Trans. Vivian and Athanassakis, 205.

[258] Ibid., 135.

[259] Note that Athanasius here uses the adjective ἀσεβής "ungodly, godless," as opposed to εὐσεβής and θεοσέβεια mentioned above. These opposing terms play an important role in Athanasius's theological discourse and in his anti-Arian propaganda.

[260] *VA* 69.4-5 (ed. Bartelink, 362), "As a result, you are to have no fellowship with the godless and iniquitous Arians, for 'light has no fellowship with darkness'." (trans. Vivian and Athanassakis, 205).

[261] *VV* 69 (ed. Gandt, 159, slightly altered - I retained Bartelink's reading *communicationem*, which is that of the manuscript against *communicatione* printed in Gandt's edition): "Hence, do not have with the godless, the Arians, any fellowship, for light has no fellowship with darkness."

[262] *VE* 69 (ed. Bertrand, 76), "You must have nothing to do with the Arians. *For what fellowship can there be between light and darkness?*" (trans. White, 52).

[263] The same as in the case of *VA* 9.2 "nothing 'will separate me from the love of Christ'," and Rom. 8:35 "who will separate us from the love of Christ?" see above, pp. 28-30.

[264] ἢ τίς κοινωνία φωτὶ πρὸς σκότος;

recognized 2 Corinthians 6:14 in the Greek text, and decided to translate the rhetorical question of the biblical original, not Athanasius's negative 'answer' to it. Furthermore, it seems likely that Evagrius did not simply translate the Bible anew here, but rather used an already existing version of 2 Cor. 6:14 in Latin attested in Rufinus' translation of Origen,[265] Paulinus of Nola,[266] Chromatius,[267] Augustine,[268] and in Jerome.[269]

In contrast to Evagrius's translation, the rendering of the anonymous translator reflects his low-register Latin usage[270] and is otherwise unattested, which suggests that the translator translated without prior knowledge of existing versions of the Bible in Latin. While Gk. κοινωνία "fellowship," which appears twice in the Greek original, was translated by Evagrius first as *coniunctio* and then, in keeping with the established form of 2 Cor. 6:14 in Latin in Late Antiquity, as *societas,* the anonymous translator used *communicatio* in both instances. Although *communicatio* was not uncommon as a Latin translation for Gk. κοινωνία[271] in biblical contexts, my research indicates that in the *versio vetustissima* the anonymous translator used *communicatio* and *communicare* as the standard equivalent for κοινωνία and κοινωνέω of the Greek original, whereas Evagrius's translation of the same passages renders these terms with a more lexical variety, in a more idiomatic and rhetorically elaborated fashion.[272]

---

[265] *Orig. in Leu.*. 4.4.

[266] *Epist.* 1.8.

[267] *In Matth.* 31.

[268] *Spec.* 32.

[269] *In Is.* 14.52.

[270] The apposition in nominative *ipsi Ariani* is, according to Bartelink, a low-register construction, see his commentary *ad loc.* in *Vite dei Santi*, 253, n. 12. Also, in *cum tenebra*, the use of *tenebrae, -arum* in singular is rarely attested in standard Latin, see ibid., n. 13, as well as the *OLD*, 2115, s.v. *tenebrae*.

[271] See *TLL,* vol. 3 (Leipzig: Teubner, 1906-1912), s.v. *communicatio,* coll. 1953, I A.

[272] Thus, in *VA* 94.1 (Καὶ μηδεμία ἔστω ὑμῖν κοινωνία πρὸς τοὺς σχισματικούς), the anonymous translator has: *et non sit uobis communicatio cum schismaticis* (*VV* 94). Compare this to Evagrius's rendering of the same passage: *Schismaticorum quoque et haereticorum uenena uitate.* (*VE* 91) Further examples are *VA* 89.4 μηδὲ κοινωνίαν ἔχειν τινὰ πρὸς τοὺς Ἀρειανούς with the anonymous translator's *VV* 89: *Neque aliquam communicationem habueritis cum Arianis*, in contrast to *VE* 89: *neque cum Arianis in commune iungamini*. See also *VA* 74.4: ἀνείληφε σῶμα ἀνθρώπινον ἵνα, τῇ ἀνθρωπίνῃ γενέσει κοινωνήσας, ποιήσῃ τοὺς ἀνθρώπους κοινωνῆσαι θείας καὶ νοερᾶς φύσεως and the two translator's renderings of κοινωνέω in *VV* 74: *assumpsit corpus humanum ut per communicationem humanae natiuitatis faciat communicare cum diuina illa et intelligibili proprietate* and *VE* 74: *ob salutem nostram humanum corpus assumpserit, ut societate mortalitatis nos ueheret ad caelum participesque naturae caelestis efficeret.*

Although the discussed examples point to the challenges and linguistic limitations the anonymous translator faced, which resulted, as shown above, in a rather mechanical and simple word-for-word translation style, this is not to say that the author of the oldest translation was indifferent to conveying meaning and context when translating. On the contrary, there are several instances in the *versio vetustissima* that reflect the translator's concern for accuracy.

In the narrative on Antony's first days in ascetic life, Athanasius describes the hermit as an already chaste and hard-working young man, as if predestined for an ascetic lifestyle. Antony, according to Athanasius, as a part of his ascetic discipline, worked with his hands, and this is justified by an appeal to 2 Thessalonians 3:10: ἀκούσας· Ὁ δὲ ἀργὸς *μηδὲ ἐσθιέτω*.[273] This the anonymous translator rendered as *quod audiuit scriptum esse: Vacuus autem et otiosus non manducet*.[274] Evagrius translated the passage rather differently, as *sciens scriptum esse: Qui non operatur, non manducet*.[275]

Notice how the two translators rendered Athanasius's words that precede the biblical quotation. The anonymous's *audiuit* "[he] heard," is a literal translation of Gk. ἀκούσας "having heard," while Euagrius opted for *sciens* "knowing/being aware [that]."[276] using a verb which changes and intensifies the meaning of the original from "hear" to "know."[277]

On a more important matter, it is particularly telling that the anonymous translator added to his translation *quod scriptum esse* "[he heard] that it is written," words absent from the Greek original. This points to the fact that he clearly signaled a quotation from the Bible,

---

[273] *VA* 3.6 (ed. Bartelink, 158), "having heard 'Let the lazy person not eat.'" (trans. Vivian and Athanassakis, 63).

[274] *VV* 3 (ed. Gandt, 110), "for he heard it is written: [the one who is] idle and inactive will not eat."

[275] *VE* 3 (ed. Bertrand, 7), "for he was aware that it says in the Bible, *He who does not work, will not eat.*" (trans. White, 10).

[276] *Sciens scriptum esse* was used by Jerome in his letter to Marcella (*Epist.* 24.4), verbatim, also as an introduction exactly to this quotation from the Bible, with the difference of *nec* instead of *non*. Provided that Evagrius finished his translation at 373 the latest, as indicated by Bertrand, "Die Evagriusübersetzung der *Vita Antonii*," 27, while Jerome's Letter to Marcella is dated to 384, Evagrius and Jerome most probably used the same source for their translations of 2. Thess 3:10, or, less likely, Jerome used Evagrius's translation of the *VA* for his translations of some biblical quotations.

[277] This is Evagrius's translational and rhetorical technique that we already had a chance to see, e. g., in the case of *promisit* rather than *dicit*, see *VE* 48, see above p. 26.

which is an indication of his familiarity with the text. The fact that Evagrius preserved the additional *scriptum esse* is another indication that, I believe, supports my hypothesis that he had had direct acquaintance with the oldest translation when working on his own translation.[278]

Both Latin translations of 2 Thess. 3:10 have *non manducet* "should not eat," but render the first part of the quote in Athanasius' reworked version in different ways; both *otiosus* of the anonymous translator and Evagrius's *qui non operatur* correspond to Gk. ἀργός "lazy," but Evagrius's translation comes closer to the original wording of 2 Thess. 3:10 in Greek: "[anyone] unwilling to work."[279] Evagrius seems to be using here some existing version of this biblical passage in Latin, because the same wording, as mentioned above, is attested by Jerome.

The anonymous translator, however, rendered Gk. ἀργός "idle, free from [work]," with both *otiosus* and *vacuus,* two nouns of similar meaning. As I see it, the fact that the anonymous translator deemed it necessary to add *vacuus* to *otiosus*, an already literal translation from an adjective ἀργός, suggests his desire to translate with the utmost accuracyand his concern to convey the information as well as context from Athanasius's text to his readers.[280] Another plausible explanation for the presence of a double translation of one Greek word, in this case adjective ἀργός, is that it may be a symptom of the translator's hesitation in a language in which he was not proficient. In both cases, it is tempting to imagine the anonymous translator working with what today would be called a dictionary, seeing both *otiosus* and *vacuus* as possible translations for ἀργός, and then decided to just use them both.[281] A third possible explanation for the presence of this double translation is that one of the two Latin words might have been

---

[278] See above pp. 43-47.

[279] εἴ τις οὐ θέλει ἐργάζεσθαι μηδὲ ἐσθιέτω.

[280] In this sense I agree with Bartelink, who explains *vacuus et otiosus* as the anonymous translator's indecisiveness, putting both 'just in case,' see his commentary *Vite dei santi*, 193, n. 25.

[281] Of course, that the anonymous translator used a glossary, or a dictionary is, although probable, beyond any proof. Yet, it is possible that he might have operated with some kind of a Greek-Latin bilingual glossary that merged Greek words and phrases with Latin ones in a form of a vocabulary list, which was not uncommon in late-antique Egypt among Greek speakers at an early stage of learning Latin, see, for example, Adams, *Bilingualism*, 735. On Greek-Latin glossaries as Latin-learning material in general, see Eleanor Dickey, *The Colloquia of the Hermeneumata Pseudodositheana* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2012), 11-12.

a marginal gloss which, at some point during the textual transmission of the *VV*, was integrated in the main text. This is not the only place in the oldest translation where the translator, roughly speaking, elaborates on Athanasius's wording by offering two lexical choices for one term, as in chapter 7 he translated Gk. σκληροτέραις [ἀγωγαῖς] "to even more strenuous [disciplines]" as *severiter et duriter*. I would therefore speculate that offering terms of similar meaning as translations of one term might well suggest the translator's (in)competence in target language, which is in his case Latin. Finally, Latin not being his native language would thus perfectly explain the issues the anonymous translator faced when translating as well as the solutions he came up with.

The discussion offered in this chapter intended to highlight the anonymous translator's non-idiomatic and rather mechanical translating, as well as to provide possible reasons that may explain the translator's decision or, more accurately, his limitations which motivated his option to translate word-for-word. The explanation offered here builds on my main working hypothesis, according to which the anonymous translator was not a native speaker of Latin and had limited competence in the language. By contrasting his translations to Evagrius's renderings of the same passages, I intended to show what an idiomatic translation (as opposed to a mirror and mechanical word-for-word rendering), produced by an educated speaker of the language, may have looked like. In the next section, the main focus will be Evagrius, his rhetorical techniques, and revisions he made both to the Greek original and to the oldest anonymous translation.

3.3 Evagrius's Rhetorical Technique and Revisional Work

As already shown, Evagrius's translation stands in stark contrast to the oldest anonymous translation, both in terms of practical output and theoretical views. In the examples discussed in the previous chapter, I have had the opportunity to engage with a few examples of

Evagrius's translation technique so as to emphasize, by contrast, the unidiomatic nature of the anonymous translator's work. The focus of this chapter, however, will be Evagrius's translation technique and the rhetorical devices by which he made many more revisions to the Greek text when compared with the *versio vetustissima*. Furthermore, there are several instances in which one could argue that Evagrius was much more literal than the anonymous translator, which goes to show that the dividing line between literal and free translation is not always as starkly drawn as we might think it is. The following discussion will examine several examples from the *versio Evagriana* to show how free translation, as opposed to literal one, functions. Ultimately, I intend to show that Evagrius's decision to adopt such an approach to translation was not of a purely stylistic nature, but that the reasons might be ideological as well.

In one of many addresses delivered to his fellow monks on ascetic and spiritual life, Athanasius's Antony draws on Paul's Epistles to the Romans (8:28) and to the Corinthians (1 Cor. 15:31), respectively: Παντὶ τῷ προαιρουμένῳ τὸ ἀγαθὸν *συνεργεῖ ὁ θεὸς εἰς τὸ ἀγαθόν*. Εἰς δὲ τὸ μὴ ὀλιγωρεῖν ἡμᾶς καλὸν τὸ τοῦ ἀποστόλου ῥητὸν μελετᾶν, τό *Καθ᾽ ἡμέραν ἀποθνῄσκω*.[282] What the anonymous translation offers is a literal rendering of Athanasius's passage: *omni uolenti bonum Deus cooperatur in bono.* [...] *bonum est meditari Apostoli dictum quod dicit Cotidie morior.*[283] *Versio Evagriana,* however, provides us with a rather different translation of the same passage: *omni proponenti bonum et deus cooperatur.* [...] *Apostoli praecepta replicemus quibus se mori quotidie testabatur.*[284]

First, it is worthy of note that Romans 8:28 actually reads *τοῖς ἀγαπῶσιν τὸν θεὸν πάντα συνεργεῖ ὁ θεὸς εἰς τὸ ἀγαθόν,*[285] and that the second part of the quotation, i. e., συνεργεῖ ὁ θεὸς

---

[282] *VA* 19.1-2 (ed. Bartelink, 214), "God helps everyone to do good who deliberately chooses to do good. Now with regard to losing heart, it is good for us to meditate on the Apostle's statement: 'I die daily.'" (trans. Vivian and Athanassakis, 103, slightly changed).

[283] *VV* 19 (ed. Gandt, 123), "To everyone who wants good God assists in good. [...] It is good to meditate on the Apostle's saying which says 'I die daily.'"

[284] *VE* 19 (ed. Bertrand, 25), "To everyone who deliberately chooses [to do] good God helps as well. [...] let us reflect upon the Apostle's words when he claims that he dies each day." (trans. White, 21, slightly altered).

[285] "To those who love God, [he] helps in all respects towards [doing] good."

εἰς τὸ ἀγαθόν "God helps towards good," is the only part that Athanasius quoted verbatim. This paraphrase of Rom. 8:28 is either a result of Athanasius's quoting from memory or of his rhetorical strategy in quoting. The first part of Athanasius's passage, i. e., παντὶ τῷ προαιρουμένῳ τὸ ἀγαθὸν "to everyone who deliberately chooses to do good," is thus added by Athanasius himself, and it is this wording that is particularly interesting for the analysis of our two translators' renderings of this passage of the *VA*.

The anonymous translator's rendering is rather literal, preserving even the word order of the Greek original; the translator kept the two instances of the Greek term τὸ ἀγαθὸν and, as a result, has *bonum* twice in his translation, the second occurrence, i. e., *in bono,* implying that the anonymous was translating verbatim. Most probably, he did so without recourse to any existing source for Rom. 8:28 in Latin, as *in bono,* in the ablative, in this biblical verse is not attested elsewhere outside the *versio vetustissima.*[286] Also, Athanasius's προαιρέω, a key philosophical term in Antony's discourse meaning "to choose deliberately" was translated in the *versio vetustissima* with a simple *velle* "to want."

Evagrius, for his part, not only has only one instance of *bonum,* omitting the ἀγαθόν of the actual biblical quote and retaining Athanasius's, but he also seems to have understood the meaning of Athanasius's προαιρέω. Instead of rendering it with a simple "to want," he translated it with *propono,* which implies primarily moral choice and likewise has a more specific meaning than the anonymous translator's simple *velle.*[287] By deciding to translate παντὶ τῷ προαιρουμένῳ as *omni proponenti,* Evagrius is in a sense more literal than the anonymous translator, however for totally different reasons than the latter in the examples discussed in the previous section. Evagrius seized the depth and moral meaning of Athanasius's use of the verb προαιρέω, at the same time reducing both Athanasius's two occurrences of τὸ

---

[286] The Vulgate version, for instance, has *quoniam diligentibus Deum omnia cooperantur in bonum,* while Augustine (e. g., *Civ.*18.51) writes *et diligentibus eum omnia cooperatur in bonum.*

[287] See the *OLD,* 1644, s.v. *propono,* 11A.

ἀγαθὸν and the anonymous translator's two *bonum* into one *bonum,* probably to avoid repetition and stylistically upgrade this quotation.[288]

Regarding the second biblical quotation from Paul's epistles in this passage of the *VA*, i. e., 1 Corinthians 15:31, Athanasius quoted it verbatim: καθ' ἡμέραν ἀποθνῄσκω.[289] While the anonymous translator's rendering matches all the other attestations of 1 Cor. 15:31 in Latin from Late Antiquity,[290] Evagrius, by writing *se mori quotidie testabatur*, decided to incorporate the biblical quotation into the specific syntactic context of his rendering of Athanasius's passage. The two translators' rendering of this biblical quotation is too short draw any general conclusions based on them.

As it was previously the case with Athanasius's προαιρέω translated as *propono* in the *versio Evagriana*, in a similar way Evagrius here revised Athanasius's μελετᾶν "to meditate on [the Apostle's statement]."[291] While the anonymous translator translated it simply with *meditari*, Evagrius's lexical choice was *replicare* "to think about and duplicate, to go over and over again [the Apostle's saying].[292] *Replicare* was not Evagrius's lexical choice made out of purely esthetic reasons, I would say, but also a philosophical concept. A ruminative and repetitive nature of *replicare* enhances the meaning and message of Athanasius's quote "I die every day" (καθ' ἡμέραν ἀποθνῄσκω),[293] which itself emphasizes the importance of

---

[288] Another example where Evagrius shortens a biblical quotation is in *VE* 55, where he rendered 2 Cor. 13.15, Ἑαυτοὺς ἀνακρίνετε, ἑαυτοὺς δοκιμάζετε and the anonymous translator's *uosmetipsos scrutamini, uosmetipsos probate,* as *diiudicate uosmetipsos et probate*.

[289] "I die every day."

[290] The Vulgate has the same wording, as well as Tertullian (*Resurr.* 48.54), Rufinus (*Orig. in Rom.* 5.8), Jerome (*In Is.* 12.41 and *Epist.* 60.19) and Augustine (*Epist.* 157.40). This, however, does not mean that the anonymous translator shared the same source with the aforementioned authors writing in Latin, the anonymous translator could have translated this on his own, as there are no many other ways to translate καθ' ἡμέραν ἀποθνῄσκω but *cotidie morior*.

[291] On μελετᾶν with the meaning "meditatively uttering the words of the Scripture (and especially the Psalms)," see Vivian and Athanassakis, 177, n. 331.

[292] See *OLD,* 1785, s.v. *replico*, 3.

[293] Speaking the use of *replicare* by Hugh of St. Victor, Emily Runde has noted that "his use of *replicare* enforces a sense of cyclical movement, of turning over and unrolling, and of repetition. If they are not to be forgotten or to decay through long disuse (*longa intermissione obscolescat*), remembered things must be revisited, even literally recollected and put to use." See her "Ways of Reading and Framing Collection in Late Medieval England," (Ph.D. diss., University of California, 2014), 31. *Replicare* in general puts a strong emphasis on memory, and as such also means "to recount [events]." Evagrius used *replicare* four times in his translation of the

repetitiveness and constancy for ascetic discipline. Emphasizing certain concepts, at times staying close to the Greek original, while sometimes highlighting Athanasius's message by offering a different verb but also keeping the original meaning, as is the case with *replicare*, suggests Evagrius's not only different theoretical, but also different philosophical approach to translation than it was the case with the anonymous translator.

In the description of the hermit's character, Athanasius recounts how Antony, despite his physical appearance not being any different than that of other monks, was recognizable for the tranquility and purity of his soul. For the purpose of displaying Antony's character as perfectly matching with biblical ideals of spiritual purity and tranquility, Athanasius quoted a passage from the Book of Proverbs without any revisions such as those discussed above: καρδίας εὐφραινομένης πρόσωπον θάλλει· ἐν δὲ λύπαις οὔσης σκυθρωπάζει. [294] The anonymous translator rendered this as *corde gaudente, facies hilaritas est; in tristitia autem constituto, maesta facies.*[295] In contrast, Evagrius translated Prov. 15:13 as *corde laetante uultus floret, in maerore constituto tristatur.*[296]

Starting from the anonymous translator, his wording of Prov. 15:13 is unattested outside the *versio vetustissima* which strongly suggests that it does not reproduce existing Latin translations of the passage. The translator went for a literal rendering of the biblical quotation, where even the word order from Greek was preserved. The genitive absolute, Gk. καρδίας εὐφραινομένης "when heart rejoices," was translated to Latin with ablative absolute *corde gaudente*, while ἐν δὲ λύπαις οὔσης [καρδίας] "however being/placed in sorrow" was rendered

---

VA, and, apart from the case discussed here, the other three times (*VE* 39, 65, and 82) he used it in the meaning "to recount [an event]." It is worth mentioning that in *VE* 82 (ed. Bertrand, 90), he did not translate anything literally from Greek, but rather quoted Vergil verbatim (*Aen.* 2.12): *horret animus replicare quae gesta sunt*, "the mind recoils from repeating what happened." (trans. White, 61).

[294] *VA* 67.6 (ed. Bartelink, 356-357), "A glad heart makes the face bloom, but [being in] sorrow, it makes for a sad countenance." (trans. Vivian and Athanassakis, 201, slightly changed).

[295] *VV* 67 (ed. Gandt, 158), "When the heart rejoices, the face is [all] cheerfulness; but when it is in sadness, the face is sad."

[296] *VE* 67 (ed. Bertrand, 74), "When the heart rejoices it makes the face bloom, but being placed in sorrow, the countenance is sad."

as *in tristitia autem constituto* [*corde*]. It is intriguing, however, that for rendering the two Greek verbs in indicative form, θάλλει "to flourish" and σκυθρωπάζει "to be of a sad countenance," instead of two verbal forms, the translator drew on one noun, *hilaritas*, and one adjective, *maesta*. There are several possible explanations for such a lexical choice by the anonymous translator. First, rather than out of stylistic reasons, what made him translate two verbal forms with a noun and an adjective might have been the lack of verbs in the anonymous translator's Latin vocabulary that would correspond to Gk. θάλλει and σκυθρωπάζει. This is, unfortunately, beyond proof, as these two verbs appear only once in the *VA*. Since there is no doubt that the anonymous translator understood the meaning, another explanation is that he might have felt that nominal forms might better express the meaning of the original.[297] If the latter, it could be argued that the anonymous translator was everything but literal here. On the other hand, Evagrius, with his two indicatives, *floret* and *tristatur* for Gk. θάλλει and σκυθρωπάζει, is far more literal than the anonymous translator in this case.[298] It goes without saying that, in this particular instance, Evagrius's 'literality' came about for completely different reasons than was the case with the anonymous translator. While in the case of the latter, it was mostly linguistic barrier that prompted the translator's 'literality,' in Evagrius's case it was his skill in handling with ease the task of translating from Greek into Latin by employing different translation strategies.

The icing of the cake is the way Evagrius rearranged and altered the wording of the anonymous translation, at the same time without losing anything of the meaning from the Greek text, thus producing a wordplay in which he took the anonymous translator's *in tristitia maestas*

[297] Rufinus, for example, (*Orig. in Cant.* 4) for the translation of this passage from the Proverbs used *facies florida*, and not verbal form: *cordis laeti facies florida, in tristitiis autem positi maestus est uultus*.

[298] Another example in which Evagrius could be argued to have been more literal than the anonymous translator is in his rendering of a passage from *VA* 83.2: μετάβηθι ἐντεῦθεν, καὶ μεταβήσεται, in which he preserved the two forms of the same Greek verb and rendered the passage as *transfer te et transferetur*, as opposed to the anonymous translator's *transi hinc illic, et transferetur*. It is noteworthy that Cassiodorus later (*In psalm.* 55) used the same phrase *corde laetante uultus floret,* which might well mean that he read Evagrius's translation of the *VA*.

and transformed it into *in maerore tristatur*. Here, it should also be mentioned that Gk. πρόσωπον "face, countenance," appears four times in chapter 67 of the *VA*, and each time the anonymous translator rendered it as *facies*, while Evagrius made use of both *facies* and *uultus* interchangeably.

When translating, Evagrius further made several seemingly minor revisions to both the wording of the Greek original and that of the oldest translation, that nonetheless reflect the translator's skills and rhetorical techniques. In one of the numerous discourses on the temptations delivered to his fellow monks, Athanasius's Antony points to his claim that demons are in fact weak by recalling a dialogue between himself and Satan, who, quoting the Psalm 9:7 verbatim, said to Antony: Οὐκ ἀνέγνωσαν, ὅτι *τοῦ ἐχθροῦ ἐξέλιπον αἱ ῥομφαῖαι εἰς τέλος, καὶ πόλεις καθεῖλες*.[299] The anonymous translator indicated that he recognized a biblical quotation here and rendered the passage from the *VA* quite literally: *aut non legerunt quod scriptum est inimici defecerunt frameae in finem et ciuitates eorum destruxisti*?[300] A similar wording is to be found in Evagrius's translation: *Rogo, non legistis quia defecerunt inimici frameae in finem, et ciuitates eorum destruxisti*?[301]

Both translations of the Psalm 9:7 look similar. However, Evagrius's revision in terms of changing the word order from the anonymous translator's *inimici defecerunt frameae* into *defecerunt inimici frameae* is noteworthy. In my opinion, it is likely that the change of the word-order in his translation was Evagrius's attempt to avoid confusion among his readers between *inimici* as genitive sg. and *inimici* as nominative pl. This confusion may occur from

---

[299] *VA* 41.3 (ed. Bartelink, 278), "Have they not read 'The swords of the enemy have failed unto the end: and their cities thou hast destroyed.'?" I provided my own translation for this passage and, for the quotation from the Psalter, I used the translation of the Douay-Rheims version, which I find more accurate than the one in Vivian and Athanassakis, 147, which reads as follows: "Have you not read 'The enemy have completely abandoned their swords; you have sacked their cities.'?" This is inaccurate insofar as it translates ἀνέγνωσαν as a second-person form "have *you* not read," and it also renders τοῦ ἐχθροῦ ἐξέλιπον αἱ ῥομφαῖαι by making the "enemies" the subject of the sentence, unlike the original, where "the swords" is the subject.

[300] *VV* 41 (ed. Gandt, 140), "Have they not read what is written: 'The swords of the enemy have failed unto the end, and you have sacked their cities.'?"

[301] *VE* 41 (ed. Bertrand, 47), "I ask you, have you not read, *The enemy's swords are broken for ever and you have destroyed their cities*?" (trans. White, 34).

64

reading the anonymous translation as it preserves the Greek word-order, yet the confusion is absent from the Greek original as it is clearly indicated that "of the enemy" (τοῦ ἐχθροῦ) is a possessive genitive qualifying the subject "the swords" (αἱ ῥομφαῖαι). Another explanation would be that Evagrius was fully aware of the unusual occurrence of two nouns (*inimici frameae*) being divided by a verb (*defecerunt*) in Latin, as produced in the anonymous translation born out of a mirror translation of the Gk. τοῦ ἐχθροῦ ἐξέλιπον αἱ ῥομφαῖαι. In this case, he might have unobtrusively corrected the word-order of the anonymous translation, keeping with expectations of native Latin speakers as to the form.[302]

One revision by Evagrius is particularly noticeable, and that is his use of *rogo* "I ask [you]," absent from Satan's line addressed to Antony in the original, and Evagrius's consequent change of the verb in third person pl. "[have] they [not] read" (οὐκ ἀνέγνωσαν) to the verb in second person pl. "[have] you [not] read" (*non legistis*). In other words, apart from turning the devil's words into an emphatic question by using *rogo*,[303] Evagrius reshaped the words of Satan into a more effective statement "have *you* not read?" (*legistis*) addressed directly to Antony and his monks, and not, as we saw in the Greek original, in a somewhat distanced address to Antony about a third entity (οὐκ ἀνέγνωσαν). Such a change of speech in the words of a character (Satan) in known context (dialogue with Antony) is a good indication of Evagrius's skill to employ character-making, i. e., *ethopoeia*, which he does in this whole passage of the *VE* in the dialogue between Antony and Satan. In my view, as *ethopoeia* was one of the preliminary exercises used in the study of rhetoric (*progymnasmata*),[304] Evagrius may have

---

[302] Also note that only in the anonymous and Evagrius's translation we find [*ciuitates*] *eorum* ("their [cities]"). Augustine, for instance, (*In psalm.* 9.8) has the version *ciuitates destruxisti* without *eorum*. In my opinion, this is another proof that Evagrius consulted the anonymous translation, as there are no manuscripts of the Greek text of the *VA* nor of the Bible that contain anything that would correspond to Latin *eorum* (such as αὐτῶν).

[303] Evagrius was particularly fond of reshaping Athanasius's wording into a list of oftentimes rhetorical questions, see below n. 250. Such an employment of questions is known as *erotema*. Alongside *erotema*, Evagrius in his translation also made use of *ekphrasis, apostrophe*, and *asyndeton*, see Gandt, "A Philological and Theological Analysis," 187-195.

[304] For *ethopoeia* see Aphthonius the Sophist's definition and example in George A. Kennedy, *Progymnasmata: Greek Textbooks of Prose Composition and Rhetoric* (Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature,

learned *ethopoeia* in one of the schools of rhetoric in his hometown of Antioch. If so, Evagrius would have studied rhetoric primarily in Greek, the acquired rhetorical skills of which he would then have applied when translating from Greek into Latin.[305]

Evagrius was particularly fond of reshaping the formulations of the *VA* in his translation by employing his rhetorical training, even when this meant translating a quotation from the Bible rather differently than other writers writing in Latin in Late Antiquity. In a famous episode from the *VA,* where Antony, after his fame reached even the emperors, received letters from Constantine, Constantius, and Constans expressing their wishes to hear from Antony in return,[306] Athanasius construed the monastic figure as not caring about worldly things such as letters from the emperors. While all the monks were amazed by the news that Antony attracted the attention of the emperors, Antony simply disregarded the three emperors' letters, saying that the emperors are also humans and that thus there is nothing to be amazed at. According to Athanasius's Antony, the monks should be amazed at God's deeds, who διὰ τοῦ ἰδίου Υἱοῦ λελάληκεν ἡμῖν.[307] Athanasius here alluded to Paul's epistle to the Hebrews 1:2 (ἐλάλησεν ἡμῖν ἐν υἱῷ), and, in my opinion, quoted it from memory.[308] The anonymous translator's literal rendering of this is *per suum Filium locutus est nobis*,[309] while Evagrius translated Athanasius's passage and the allusion to Heb. 1:2 as *per Filium suum propriis Ecclesias*

2003), 115-7. On several types of *ethopoeia* as well as on the extent of creativity the employment of *ethopoeia* in rhetorical discourse offers, see Ruth Webb, "The *Progymnasmata* as Practice," in *Education in Greek and Roman Antiquity*, ed. Yun L. Too (Leiden: Brill, 2001) 304-7.

[305] We do not know whether Evagrius studied rhetoric in Greek or in Latin, nor in which school. Socrates (*H. E.* 6.3) mentioned certain Evagrius to have been studying with Libanius in Antioch, but identifying this Evagrius with Evagrius the translator of the *VA* is beyond proof, see Arthur P. Urbano, "Formed by *Paideia*: Christians and Greeks Learning Together," in *The Philosophical Life: Biography and the Crafting of Intellectual Identity in Late Antiquity* (Washington D.C.: The Catholic University of America Press, 2013), 51, n. 88. Also, we know very little about when and with whom Evagrius learned Latin. Gandt believes that he acquired these skills in Latin "during the decade he spent in Italy," see "A Philological and Theological Analysis," 184.

[306] For a detailed discussion on the dating and historicity of the emperors' letters to Antony, see Bartelink's commentary in *VA* 81, 392-93, n. 1.

[307] *VA* 81.3 (ed. Bartelink, 394), "has spoken to us through his own Son." (trans. Vivian and Athanassakis, 229).

[308] I see the signs of this in the fact that Athanasius changed the tense of the verb λαλέω from an aorist (in the New Testament), to a perfect and the original ἐν υἱῷ into διὰ τοῦ ἰδίου.

[309] *VV* 81 (ed. Gandt, 167), "through his own Son he spoke to us."

ditauerit eloquiis.[310] While the translation found in the *versio vetustissima* is literal,[311] Evagrius's stands out for its rhetorically elaborated translation of Heb. 1:2.

Rather than translating "[he] spoke to us" ἐλάλησεν ἡμῖν / λελάληκεν ἡμῖν as such and as the anonymous translator did, Evagrius went for "[He] enriched the churches with His own utterings" (*propriis Ecclesias ditauerit eloquiis*). Evagrius altered the word-order in such a way that his rendering of Heb. 1:2 resulted in an exegetical translation and rhetorically embellished biblical quotation. Additionally, his use of the verb *ditare* "to enrich" in this phrase shows that Evagrius attempted to elevate the translation of the verb λαλέω "to speak" from simple *locutus est*, as the anonymous translator rendered it, to "enriched with His own utterings" (*propriis eloquiis ditauerit*). Also, *ditare* was, in identical form in which Evagrius employed it, i. e., in perfect subjunctive and in third person sg., used by Horace in a similar (albeit, of course, non-Christian) context of speeches and words enriching [an object], yet whether this was Evagrius's conscious imitation of Horace or not is unknown.[312]

Lastly, Evagrius's lexical choice of the noun *eloquium* "speech" designating the word of God, also reveals more about the translator's education and training in Latin. *Eloquium* in biblical contexts, as *eloquium, eloquium sacrum* or *eloquium diuinum,* appears eight times in Evagrius's translation of the *VA*. This phrase seems to have been widespread in the late-antique Latin translations of and commentaries on the Bible, as it is attested in the works of Ambrose,[313] Rufinus,[314] Petrus Chrysologus,[315] Jerome;[316] the champion of using *eloquia diuina* was

---

[310] *VE* 81 (ed. Bertrand, 88), "and that through His Son He enriched the churches with His own words." (trans. White, 60).

[311] Although the anonymous translator's rendering of διὰ τοῦ ἰδίου Υἱοῦ λελάληκεν ἡμῖν sounds close to the Vulgate version and to Augustine who has *locutus est nobis in filio* (*Pecc. mer.* 1.27), I doubt that the anonymous translator was familiar with the same version of Heb. 1:2 in Latin that Jerome and Augustine used, as there are no many other ways to translate λελάληκεν ἡμῖν than *locutus est nobis*.

[312] *Ars* 55: *cum lingua Catonis et Enni sermonem patrium ditauerit*, "when the language of Cato and Ennius has enriched our native tongue" (trans. https://www.poetryfoundation.org/articles/69381/ars-poetica, last accessed May 1, 2021).

[313] *Fid.* 5, prolog.

[314] *Apol. adv. Hier.* 2.47.

[315] *Serm.* 113.

[316] *Epist.* 21.37.

Augustine.[317] Denoting an attempt at stylistic elaboration, *eloquia diuina* might well have been a linguistic marker of the educated (Christians), which Evagrius undoubtedly was. Thus, only from the example *propriis Ecclesias ditauerit eloquiis*, one can grasp Evagrius's literary artistry that enabled him to produce such free translations in high-Latin.[318]

Back to the episode in which Antony debates with 'pagan' philosophers over the 'true faith,' pointing to their 'erroneous' beliefs, he attempts to offer proofs for his 'only true' worship of God. Athanasius's Antony stresses that, if the philosophers are expecting to hear logical proofs made out of wordy fabrications, he will not offer any, and elaborates on this by quoting 1 Corinthians 2:4: ἡμεῖς μὲν οὐκ *ἐν πειθοῖ σοφίας* Ἑλληνικῆς, ὡς εἶπεν ὁ διδάσκαλος ἡμῶν, ἀποδείκνυμεν.[319] The anonymous translator's rendering of this passage is *nos quidem non in suadela sapientiae paganorum, ut dixit magister noster, probamus*,[320] while Evagrius translated it as *ecce nos, ut dixit Doctor noster, non in gentili persuasione ... suademus*.[321]

First, it is noteworthy that the anonymous translator translated Athanasius's "our teacher" (διδάσκαλος ἡμῶν), i. e., the apostle Paul, as *magister noster*, while for Evagrius he was *doctor noster*. The anonymous translator's *magister* is a literal translation of Gk. διδάσκαλος; Evagrius's lexical choice was, however, by no means literal nor accidental, as he used *doctor* not only here, but also in places where Paul is not named διδάσκαλος in the Greek

---

[317] For instance, *In psalm.* 145.13.

[318] Note also how Evagrius translates what precedes this quotation in the *VA*, the simple Greek ἄνθρωπος γάρ ἐστιν ("for he is a human"): *Licet enim diuersa sit dignitas, attamen eadem nascendi moriendique conditio est.* "For although we are different in rank, yet our mortal condition is the same" (trans. White, 59). This is a true example of the so-called free translation, when the original is expanded for exegetic purposes, as opposed to the word-for-word translation.

[319] *VA* 80.1 (ed. Bartelink, 388), "we will not offer proof by means of "plausible wisdom" of Greeks, as our teacher said." (trans. Vivian and Athanassakis, 227, slightly altered, from "'plausible greek wisdom'" to "'plausible wisdom' of Greeks," as Gk. Ἑλληνικῆς "Greek" is not a part of the biblical quotation 1 Cor. 2:4 and it was added by Athanasius in the *VA*).

[320] *VV* 80 (ed. Gandt, 166, slightly altered – *suadilla* from Gandt's edition and the manuscript to *suadela*, conjectured by Bartelink, *Vita di Antonio,* 150) "we will certainly not prove *by the persuasion of the wisdom* of the pagans, as our teacher said."

[321] *VE* 80 (ed. Bertrand, 86), "look how we convince not by means of the gentiles' attempts at persuasion [...] as our teacher said." (trans. White, 58, slightly altered, from 'pagans' to 'gentiles'). Evagrius's rendering of 1 Cor. 2:4 was not recognized as a direct biblical quotation in the latest edition by Bertrand.

original.[322] Although it is true that *doctor* is similar to *magister* in the meaning "teacher," Evagrius's usage of *doctor*, always coming with *noster, sermonum,* or *eloquium* in the *VE*, and always referring to Paul, implies that Paul for Evagrius was primarily a teacher in Christian context;[323] other prominent Latin patristic authors, with whom, as I have shown in this thesis, Evagrius shared versions of the Bible in Latin, thus called Paul *doctor gentium* "the teacher of the gentiles."[324]

Furthermore, it is striking that the adjective "Greek" (ἑλληνική [σοφία]) was translated with the term *paganus* in *versio vetustissima*, while in Evagrius's translation it was rendered by *gentilis.* Though the discussion of all the terms for "non-Christians" in Late Antiquity and an overview of their history and semantic development deserve separate discussion,[325] in the context of the *VA* and its translations, Athanasius's Ἕλλην "Greek," and the translators' *paganus* and *gentilis*, were all used as negative religious qualifications for non-Christians.

The anonymous translator resorted to *paganus* eleven times in his translation, whereas he used *gentilis*/*gentes* three times but only as translations for ἐθνικός/τὰ ἔθνη,[326] which is certainly not the same as Gk. ἑλληνικός.[327] The anonymous translator thus seems to have been operated with an equivalence between Ἕλλην/ἑλληνικός and *paganus*. Evagrius, on the other hand, used the adjective *gentilis* thirteen times in the *VE*, as opposed to *paganus* that is mentioned only three times in the *versio Evagriana*.[328] Thus, in stark contrast to the anonymous translator, Evagrius operated with both options available to him, i. e. *paganus* and *gentilis*. The

---

[322] *VE* 7: *doctor sermonum*, *VE* 55: *doctor eloquium.*

[323] "St. Paul speaks of himself as a doctor of the Gentiles in faith and truth (1 Timothy 2:7), and *Doctor gentium* is one of the titles given him in the liturgy. In the early Church, teachers in the catechetical schools were known as *doctores audientium* (Cyprian, *Ep.* 29); and finally, in the course of time, some of the most illustrious theologians were designated as 'Doctors of the Church.'" https://www.newadvent.org/cathen/05072b.htm, last accessed May 18, 2021.

[324] Ambrose (*Noe* 8.25), Rufinus (*Orig. in. gen.* 3.4), Augustine (*Epist.* 157.11), Jerome (*In Gal.* 1.1).

[325] For a detailed overview and discussion on *paganus* and on its relation to *gentes, gentiles, nationes*, etc., see Alan Cameron, *The Last Pagans of Rome* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011), 14-25.

[326] *VV* 13, 45, and 69.

[327] See Bartelink's commentary *ad loc.* in *Vite dei Santi*, 253, n. 70.

[328] In *VE* 70 and 72 for Gk. Ἕλλην and in *VE* 82 for ἐθνικός. Similar is the case of Ambrose, for instance, who used *gentes* nineteen times and never *pagani*, see Cameron, *The Last Pagans*, 16.

69

CEU eTD Collection

reason why *gentilis*, and not *paganus*, was still Evagrius's favorite term for translating Gk. Ἕλλην/ἑλληνικός or ἐθνικός/τὰ ἔθνη might have been that the meaning "non-Christian" for *paganus* was a semantic neologism, as reported by Augustine.[329]

As far as their translations of the biblical quotation are concerned, the anonymous translator is the only one to use *suadela* "persuasion" to translate Gk. πειθώ in this context, which points to high probability that he was not aware of the existing versions of 1 Cor. 2:4 in Latin. On the other hand, Evagrius's *persuasio* indicates that he was familiar with an already existing version of 1. Corinthians 2:4 in Latin, as witnessed by Ambrose and Jerome.[330] What is particularly puzzling, however, is not that Evagrius's translation, as it usually happens, has parallels in other writers writing in Latin in Late Antiquity, but that he completely avoided translating Athanasius's "wisdom" (σοφία), deeming it sufficient to translate only Gk. πειθώ "persuasion."

Gk. σοφία, "wisdom," appears four times in the *VA*. In all four occurrences, the anonymous translator translated it simply as *sapientia*, regardless of context and without any revisions to the Greek text. Such a word-for-word translation is probably due to the translator's adoption of 'one-word-one-concept' strategy, in which σοφία always equals *sapientia*. On the other hand, Evagrius, as mentioned above, did not translate σοφία from the Greek original at all. Judging by Evagrius's competence in translating from Greek into Latin, the possibility that he simply overlooked such an important term in Antony's debate over philosophers as σοφία, should be, in my opinion, discarded. Rather, a closer look into his rendering of Gk. σοφία throughout his translation offers further explanations for Evagrius's particular choice in this case and explains how he employed *sapientia*.

---

[329] *Epist.* 184A.5: *quos uel gentiles uel iam uulgo usitato uocabulo paganos appellare consueuimus*.

[330] Ambrose, *In psalm.* 47.24.1: *non in persuasione sapientiae uerbi*; Jerome: *Adv. Rufin.* 1.17: *non in persuasione uerborum*.

Out of the four instances where σοφία appears in the Greek text, Evagrius translated it only once as *sapientia* and, even then, he added to it the explanatory term *mundi* "of [this] world."[331] Most of the times in the *VA*, Gk. σοφία is mentioned with a negative connotation and in a polemic context, in Antony's long speeches against non-Christians who relied on the "wisdom" of words and this world, as opposed to his 'true' faith. Evagrius's reluctance to present "wisdom" as necessarily negative becomes even more obvious when one notices that he attempted to incorporate the noun *sapientia* in other places in his translation where there was no Gk. σοφία in corresponding passages of the Greek original: three times, he employed *sapientia* with a positive connotation: in a translation of Gk. φρόνησις as one of the Christian ideals that "lead to heaven," then of Gk. νοῦς in Athanasius's words of praise for Antony's intelligence, and in a phrase *sapientia bonum est* as an addition in the form of an exegetic translation.[332] On the other hand, in Evagrian translation there are exactly three occurrences of *sapientia* in a negative connotation: apart from *sapientia mundi* mentioned above, he used it as *uana et confutata sapientia* as well as *mundana sapientia*.[333] This is to say, Evagrius was fully aware of what "wisdom" (σοφία) meant in Athanasius's discourse and theology and of its connotations. When used alone, *sapientia* in Evagrius's translation is always presented as a virtue and an advantage; when needed to present it as an 'empty' wisdom of non-Christians, Evagrius clearly indicated so by adding explanatory terms. It seems as if Evagrius wanted to find a balance between Athanasius's presentation of Gk. σοφία as a 'sin,' and what *sapientia* really meant in Evagrius's daily life.

The discussion provided in this chapter offered further evidence for Evagrius's rhetorical education and supported the hypothesis that Evagrius, a member of the highly educated in Latin, stood in stark contrast with the anonymous translator. Furthermore, the

---

[331] *VE* 78.
[332] *VE* 17, 85, and 72.
[333] *VE* 80 and 93.

discussed examples showed that Evagrius made revisions to both the Greek text from which he was translating and to the oldest anonymous translation, as well as that he was not reluctant to employ his rhetorical skills and techniques in translating the Bible either. This section also discussed instances in which Evagrius could be considered to have been more literal than the anonymous translator. Lastly, it has been demonstrated how Evagrius systematically employed certain terms in different contexts so as to reshape the connotations of that terms.

Conclusion

Ever since the discovery of the manuscript containing the oldest anonymous Latin translation in the Chapter of St. Peter's in Rome, the scholarly stances towards the two Latin translations of the *Life of Antony* were fixed and viewed them as striking contrasts. It has not been disputable that the anonymous translation stands for a literal and an excessively wordy translation, and that, on the other hand, Evagrius's final product is a literary, free, elegant, and stylistically improved translation, composed in high-style Latin by a prominent fourth-century Christian intellectual from Antioch. While all these indeed hold true, a couple of crucial research questions remained to be asked in order to assess (primarily) the anonymous translator's individual attitude to translation. First and foremost, *why* did the author of the oldest translation employ a word-for-word literal approach in translating the *Life* from Greek into Latin? Was it his preference or, rather, the only translating technique that he was able to offer? If the latter, what could have been the linguistic background that prompted the translator sufficiently educated in both Greek and Latin to translate the *Life of Antony*, yet without producing a more idiomatic and elegant translation into Latin?

The biblical material makes up a large and important part of Athanasius's discourse in the *Life of Antony*. Furthermore, this material was identified as the word of God by both translators and as such was less likely to adopt a free, creative approach to translation than other parts of the *Life*. A thorough examination of the biblical quotations in the two Latin translations thus has the potential to provide answers to the research questions stated above. What is more, it gives further insights into Evagrius's translation technique and his attitude to the Scriptures. For this purpose, I explored all the verbatim biblical quotations that the anonymous translator and Evagrius of Antioch rendered from Greek into Latin in their versions of the *Life*, each in his own way.

The first, introductory chapter chronologically presented the three texts that form the core of the present thesis. The starting point was a survey of the original Greek *Life of Antony*, its author Athanasius of Alexandria, and details on its dating. I also looked at Athanasius' display of Antony as the protagonist of the narrative, and the influence of the *Life* in the centuries to come. My focus then shifted to the two Latin translations of the Greek *Life*, their general features, and reception history. The first subchapter concentrated on the anonymous translation and its author, its discovery in the eleventh-century manuscript, and its dating. A large part of this section offered an overview of the previous scholarship on the anonymous translation and its unanimous characterization as too literal, noting that the anonymous translator and his work have mostly been associated with the notion of 'Christian' Latin as *Sondersprache,* developed by the Nijmegen school. Before the present study, the notion of 'Christian' and 'monastic' Latin, although considerably outdated, has not been challenged with regard to the anonymous translator's terminology and his word-for-word translation from Greek into Latin.

The following section then reviewed general features of Evagrius's translation, previous studies on it, and its rich reception history. A short survey of Evagrius's life as well as of the prominent figures associated with his name, particularly that of Jerome, was necessary to portray Evagrius as a member of a late-antique elite. Following the review of the two translations and the main differences between them, the closing section of the first chapter stated the object and the main hypotheses of the present study.

The methodological approach of the thesis was explained further in the second chapter. Scriptural references studied in this research encompassed a wide variety of techniques employed by the writers of the patristic period. For this reason, it was indispensable to elaborate on the typology and set of criteria used for studying the specific ways in which the Bible was quoted in Greek by Athanasius and in Latin by the anonymous translator and Evagrius. This

74

chapter listed all the types of the Bible-quoting techniques employed by Athanasius in the *Life*, which could range from a simple mention of a figure or an event from the Scriptures, alluding to them, with or without introducing a quotation, altering the quotations either intentionally or unintentionally, to quoting by following the exact word order as it is in the Bible. This last type of quoting, verbatim, was discussed in more detail. Since the two translators and their usage of the Bible for the purpose of translating the biblical material from Greek into Latin were not treated in isolation, the second chapter placed the anonymous translator and Evagrius within a broader context of the use of the Bible in Latin at the time of their production of the translations, i. e., the second half of the fourth century. This part of the study offered a short discussion on the Vetus Latina and the Vulgate versions. It was emphasized that despite the multiplicity and variety of the versions of biblical books circulating in Latin in the fourth century and the lack of officially imposed standards thereof, the biblical quotations found in the works of patristic authors writing in Latin present a reliable source for determining whether a writer quoting the Scriptures in Latin in the fourth century had access to any of the many versions in circulation. This was important to note as it served as the base for establishing the key research determinant in this study, i. e., the extent of the two translators' familiarity with the versions of the Bible in Latin available and circulating in the second half of the fourth century.

The third chapter is the main chapter of this study. It elaborated on the hypotheses and provided arguments in their support. To conduct this research and to make claims with certainty, the verbatim biblical quotations of the two translations were not chosen haphazardly for the analysis. Instead, I investigated in detail all the verbatim biblical quotations found in the two translations and compared them to the corresponding places in Greek original. There were roughly ninety verbatim quotations, thirty from the Old Testament and twice as much from the New Testament. For the present study, I selected out of this exhaustive inventory only

the examples which reflect the most remarkable features of the translations and illustrate the modus operandi of the translators.

Firstly, my analysis has shown that the anonymous translator rendered the biblical quotations he found in the *Life of Antony* from Greek into Latin by himself, as his renderings are unparalleled in other texts that quote the Bible in Latin. Moreover, I highlighted the exact verbal correspondence in the word order between several passages in the Greek Bible and the anonymous translator's renderings of the biblical quotations, which is otherwise absent from Athanasius's text. In this way, my study has demonstrated that the anonymous translator was familiar with the Greek Bible, yet ignorant of the contemporary versions of the Bible in Latin. From this, I concluded that the Bible text that the anonymous translator was exposed to and that he regarded as authoritative was not in Latin but in Greek. Furthermore, the anticipations that the anonymous translator was not a native speaker of Latin proved correct jointly with the other significant discovery of this study: that he was, in fact, bilingual. This also perfectly explains his word-for-word translation from Greek into Latin. A thorough analysis of the anonymous translator's mirror and mechanical translations of many terms and several syntactic structures from Greek resulting in non-idiomatic Latin support the hypothesis that the translator was a bilingual speaker with insufficient command of the language into which he was translating.

Moreover, this study has also shown that Evagrius was using the version of the Bible of which numerous textual parallels are attested in the works of other authors writing in Latin, such as Cyprian, Tertullian, Jerome, Augustine, Rufinus, Ambrose, etc. Evagrius's rhetorical education and his translating *ad sensum* has been noted by various scholars. My study has additionally shown that Evagrius also occasionally stylistically upgraded the language of the existing versions of the Latin Bible, as if he was not content with the material available to him. Thus, he attempted and, in my view, succeeded to exercise his mastery in rhetoric also on the

text that was by him and his Christian contemporaries considered sacred. The investigation of Evagrius's renderings of biblical quotations from Greek into Latin brought about other important discoveries along the way. Even if Evagrius's close ties with Jerome were acknowledged before, this study has shown that Evagrius and Jerome frequently shared specific wordings of the Bible in Latin that no other Latin author used. Further, it has been revealed that some of Augustine's works that are definitely posterior to Evagrius's translational activity feature specific wordings identical to those found Evagrius's translation of the *Life*. Although this is by no means conclusive, it might be still tempting to interpret this evidence as suggesting that Augustine, who otherwise mentioned to have heard accounts on the *Life of Antony* in his *Confessions*, may have read precisely Evagrius's translation. Finally, the present study provided evidence that Evagrius translated the *Life* while having access to the oldest anonymous translation.

All three, Athanasius, the anonymous translator, and Evagrius, had a direct, constant, and intimate relationship with the Scriptures, which they read, chanted, meditated upon on a daily basis, and thereby retained in memory. On these grounds, the investigation of the ways the two translators chose to articulate the text they considered to be sacred led to precious discoveries about their linguistic, ideological, and theological backgrounds. Rather than looking for 'historical facts' and attempting to 'reveal' identities, this study focused on the very texts, which proved to be a fertile research material. This case reminds us of the importance and potential of returning to texts for any philological research. I hope the analyses and conclusions presented in this study will prompt new perspectives and discussions about the two Latin translators and their work on the celebrated *Life of Antony*.

Bibliography

Primary sources

Athanasius. "Life of Antony." In *Early Christian Lives*. Translated and edited by Caroline White, 1-71. London: Penguin Books, 1998.

――――. *Sant'Antonio Abate: La sua vita.* Edited by Gerhardus J. M. Bartelink, Translated by Luca Bruzzese. Bologna: Edizioni San Clemente and Edizioni Studio Domenicano, 2013.

――――. *The Life of Antony by Athanasius of Alexandria: The Coptic Life and The Greek Life.* Translated by Tim Vivian and Apostolos N. Athanassakis. Kalamazoo, Michigan: Cistercian Publications, 2003.

――――. *Vita di Antonio*. Edited by Gerhardus J. M. Bartelink. 1974. Reprint, Milano: Fondazione Lorenzo Valla, 2003.

Augustine. *Letters 204-270,* vol. 5. Translated by Wilfrid Parsons. Washington: The Catholic University of America Press, 1956.

Jerome, *Liber de optimo genere interpretandi (Epistula 57)*. Edited by Gerhardus J. M. Bartelink. Leiden: Brill, 1980.

Novum Testamentum Graece. 28th edition, Edited by Christos Karakolis et al. Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 2012.

Septuaginta, id est Vetus Testamentorum graece iuxta LXX interpretes. Edited by Alfred Rahlfs, Second Revised Edition by Robert Hanhart. Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 2006.

Vitae Antonii Versiones latinae. Vita beati Antonii abbatis Evagrio interprete. Versio uetustissima. Edited by Pascal H. E. Bertrand and Lois Gandt. Turnhout: Brepols, 2018.

Secondary sources

Adams, James N. *Bilingualism and the Latin Language.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004.

Alvarez, Plácido. "Demon Stories in the Life of Antony by Athanasius." *Cistercian Studies* 23 (1988): 101-18

Anatolios, Khaled. *Athanasius*. New York: Routledge, 2004.

Barnard, Leslie W. "The Date of S. Athanasius' 'Vita Antonii.'" *Vigiliae Christianae* 28, no. 3 (1974): 169-75.

Barnes, Timothy D. *Athanasius and Constantius: Theology and politics in the Constantinian Empire*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2001.

Barrera, Julio Trebolle. "1.4.1 Vetus Latina." In *Textual History of the Bible*, *The Hebrew Bible*, edited by Armin Lange and Emanuel Tov, vol. 1A, 319-331. Leiden: Brill, 2016.

Bartelink, Gerhardus J. M. "Die Literarische Gattung der 'Vita Antonii." Struktur und Motive." *Vigiliae Christianae* 36, no. 1 (1982): 38-62.

———. "Einige Bemerkungen über Evagrius' von Antiochien Übersetzung der 'Vita Antonii.'" *Revue bénédictine* 82 (1972): 98-105.

———. "Observations de critique textuelle sur la plus ancienne version latine de la Vie de saint Antoine par saint Athanase." *Revue bénédictine* 81 (1971): 92-95.

Bertrand, Pascal H. E. "Die Evagriusübersetzung der *Vita Antonii*: Reception – Überliefung – Edition. Unter besonderer Berücksichtigung der *Vitas Patrum*-Tradition." Ph.D. Dissertation, Utrecht University, 2005.

Bogaert, Pierre-Maurice. "The Latin Bible." In *The New Cambridge History of the Bible. From the Beginnings to 600*, edited by James C. Paget and Joachim Schaper, 505-26. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2013.

Brakke, David. "Athanasius of Alexandria, *Life of St. Antony of Egypt.*" In *Medieval Hagiography: An Anthology*, edited by Thomas Head, 1-30. New York: Routledge, 2001.

———. "The Greek and Syriac versions of the *Life of Antony*," *Le Muséon* 107 (1994): 29-53.

———. *Athanasius and the Politics of Asceticism*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1995.

———. *Demons and the Making of the Monk*. Cambridge-London: Harvard University Press, 2006.

Burton, Philip. *The Old Latin Gospels: A Study of their Texts and Language*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000.

Cameron, Alan. *The Last Pagans of Rome*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011.

Cameron, Averil. "Form and Meaning: The *Vita Constantini* and the *Vita Antonii*." In *Greek Biography and Panegyric in Late Antiquity,* edited by Tomas Hägg and Philip Rousseau, 72-88. Berkeley: University of California Press, 2000.

Clark, Elizabeth A. *Reading Renunciation: Asceticism and Scripture in Early Christianity*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1999.

Corke-Webster, James. "The First Hagiographies: The *Life of Antony*, the *Life of Pamphilus*, and the Nature of Saints." In *The Hagiographical Experiment: Developing Discourses on Sainthood*, edited by Christa Gray and James Corke-Webster, 29-62. Leiden and Boston: Brill, 2020.

Coyle, John K. *Manichaeism and Its Legacy*. Leiden: Brill, 2009.

Denecker, Tim. "Among Latinists: Alfred Ernout and Einar Löfstedt's Responses to the 'Nijmegen School' and its Christian *Sondersprache* Hypothesis." *Historiographia Linguistica* 45, no. 3 (2018): 325-62.

———. "The Nijmegen School and its 'Sociological' Approach to the So-Called 'Sondersprache' of Early Christians: A Preliminary Historiographical Study," *Latomus: revue d'études latines* 77, no. 2 (2018): 335-57.

Diccionario Griego – Español, vol. 1. Edited by Francisco R. Adrados. Madrid: Instituto de Filología, 2008.

Dickey, Eleanor. *The Colloquia of the Hermeneumata Pseudodositheana*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2012.

Fee, Gordon D. "The Use of the Greek Fathers for New Testament Textual Criticism." In *The Text of the New Testament in Contemporary Research,* edited by Bart D. Ehrman and Michael W. Holmes, 191-207. Grand Rapids: W. B. Eerdmans, 1995.

Gandt, Lois. "A Philological and Theological Analysis of the Ancient Latin Translations of the *Vita Antonii*." Ph.D. Dissertation, Fordham University, 2008.

Garitte, Gérard. *Un témoin important du texte de La vie de s. Antoine par s. Athanase: la version latine inédite des Archives du Chapitre de S. Pierre à Rome*. Bruxelles and Rome: Palais des Académies and Academia Belgica, 1939.

Harmless, William. *Desert Christians: An Introduction to the Literature of Early Monasticism.* Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004.

Hauspie, Katrin. "ζῶ ἐγώ, λέγει κύριος, εἶ μήν. Dans la Septante d'Ézéchiel." *Bulletin of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies* 36 (2003): 3-25.

Hoppenbrouwers, Henricus "La technique de la traduction dans l'Antiquité d'après la première version latine de la Vita Antonii." In *Mélanges Christine Mohrmann: Nouveau recueil offert par ses anciens élèves*, edited by Christine Mohrmann, 80-95. Utrecht: Spectrum, 1973.

———. *La plus ancienne version latine de la vie de saint Antoine par saint Athanase: Étude de critique textuelle.* Nijmegen: Dekker & van de Vegt, 1960.

Houghton, Hugh A. G. "'Flattening' in Latin Biblical Citations." In *Papers from the Fifteenth International Patristics Conference*, edited by Jane Braun et al., 271-76. Leuven: Peeters Publishers, 2010.

———. "The Use of the Latin Fathers for New Testament Textual Criticism." In *The Text of the New Testament in Contemporary Research: Essays on the Status Quaestionis*, edited by Bart D. Ehrman and Michael W. Holmes, 375–405. Leiden: Brill, 2012.

———. *Augustine's Text of John: Patristic Citations and Latin Gospel Manuscripts*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2011.

———. *The Latin New Testament: A Guide to its Early History, Texts, and Manuscripts*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2017.

Kamesar, Adam. *Jerome, Greek Scholarship, and the Hebrew Bible: A Study of the* Quaestiones Hebraicae in Genesim. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1993.

Kato, Teppei. "Jerome's Understanding of Old Testament Quotations in the New Testament." *Vigiliae Christianae* 67, no. 3 (2013): 289-315.

Kennedy, George A. *Progymnasmata: Greek Textbooks of Prose Composition and Rhetoric.* Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2003.

Kraus, Matthew A. *Jewish, Christian, and Classical Exegetical Traditions in Jerome's Translation of the Book of Exodus. Translation Technique and the Vulgate*. Leiden: Brill, 2017.

Leclercq, Jean. "Saint Antoine dans la tradition monastique médievale." In *Antonius Magnus Eremita 356-1956*, edited by Basilius Steidle, 229-48. Rome: Herder, 1956.

Löfstedt, Einar. *Commento Filologico Alla* Peregrinatio Aetheriae. Bologna: Pátron Editore, 2007.

Lorié, Ludovicus T. A. *Spiritual Terminology in the Latin Translations of the* Vita Antonii, *with Reference to Fourth and Fifth Century Monastic Literature*. Utrecht: Dekker & van de Vegt, 1955.

Louth, Andrew. "St. Athanasius and the Greek *Life of Antony*." *Journal of Theological Studies* 39 (1988): 504-09.

Movrin, David. "*Christiana vita, Christi scriptura:* Retelling the Bible in the *Life of Antony*." In *Retelling the Bible*: *Literary, Historical, and Social Contexts*, edited by Lucie Doležalová and Tamás Visi, 275-85. Frankfurt-New York: Peter Lang, 2011.

———. "Hieronimov prevajalski credo," *Keria* 2, no. 2 (2000): 47–56.

———. "The Scriptures are Sufficient for Instruction: Interpreting παιδεῖα in Athanasius' *Vita Antonii*." *Živa Antika* 59 (2009): 17-40.

Nisula, Timo. *Augustine and the Functions of Concupiscence*. Leiden, Brill, 2012.

Osburn, Carroll D. "Methodology in Identifying Patristic Citations in New Testament Textual Criticism." *Novum Testamentum* 47.4 (2005): 313-43.

Oxford Latin Dictionary. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012.

Palmer, Leonard R. *The Latin Language.* London: Faber and Faber, 1954.

Penkett, Robert. "Discerning the Divine and the Demonic in the *Life of Antony*." *Reading Medieval Studies* 24 (1998): 79-94.

Plater, William E. and Henry J. White. *A Grammar of the Vulgate, Being an Introduction to the Latinity of the Vulgate Bible.* Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1926.

Rapp, Claudia. "Hagiography and Monastic Literature between Greek East and Latin West in Late Antiquity." In *Cristianità d'Occidente e cristianità d'Oriente*, 1221-80. Spoleto: Centro italiano di studi sull'alto medioevo, 2004.

Rebenich, Stefan. "Hieronymus und Evagrius von Antiochia." In *Studia Patristica 28, Papers presented at the Eleventh International Conference on Patristic Studies held in Oxford 1991,* editet by Elizabeth A. Livingstone, 75-80. Leuven: Peeters, 1993.

―――. "Jerome: The 'Vir Trilinguis' and the 'Hebraica Veritas,'" *Vigilae Christianae* 47, no. 1 (1993): 50-77.

―――. *Hieronymus und sein Kreis: Prosopographische und sozialgeschichtliche Untersuchungen*. Stuttgart: Franz Steiner Verlag, 1992.

Rousseau, Philip. "Antony as Teacher in the Greek Life." In *Greek Biography and Panegyric in Late Antiquity,* edited by Tomas Hägg and Philip Rousseau, 89-109. Berkeley: University of California Press, 2000.

Rubenson, Samuel. "Philosophy and Simplicity. The Problem of Classical Education in Early Christian Biography." In *Greek Biography and Panegyric in Late Antiquity,* edited by Tomas Hägg and Philip Rousseau, 110-39. Berkeley: University of California Press, 2000.

―――. *The Letters of St. Antony: Monasticism and the Making of a Saint.* Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1995.

Runde, Emily Christina. "Ways of Reading and Framing Collection in Late Medieval England." Ph.D. Dissertation, University of California, 2014.

Supino Martini, Paola. *Roma e l'area grafica romanesca (secoli X-XII)*. Alessandria: Edizioni Dell'Orso, 1987.

Thesaurus linguae Latinae. Leipzig: Teubner, 1900-.

Tkacz, Catherine Brown. "Labor Tam Utilis: The Creation of the Vulgate." *Vigiliae Christianae* 50, no. 1 (1996): 42-72.

Urbano, Arthur P. *The Philosophical Life: Biography and the Crafting of Intellectual Identity in Late Antiquity*. Washington D.C.: The Catholic University of America Press, 2013.

Van Liere, Frans. *An Introduction to the Medieval Bible.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2014.

Voss, Bernd R. "Bemerkungen zu Euagrius von Antiochien, Vergil und Sallust in der *Vita Antonii*." *Vigiliae Christianae* 21, no. 2 (1967): 93-102.

Webb, Ruth. "The *Progymnasmata* as Practice." In *Education in Greek and Roman Antiquity*, edited by Yun L. Too, 289-316. Leiden: Brill, 2001.

Wilmart, André. "Une version latine inédite de la vie de saint Antoine." *Revue bénédictine* 31 (1914): 163-173.