

Planoudes, Holobolos, and the Motivation for Translation

Elizabeth A. Fisher

THE LITERATURE of other cultures did not attract the scholars and savants of Byzantium, nor did the effort of translating Latin literature into Greek appeal to them. The Greek literary inheritance from antiquity provided abundant resources in *belles lettres*, biography, historical writing, and technical treatises. This rich inheritance satisfied Byzantine aesthetic, scholarly, and practical needs and supplied literati both with abundant literary models and with virtually inexhaustible subjects for scholarly study. As a result, through the centuries Byzantines had no motivation to translate literature from any other language including Latin, the language of the ancient Roman Empire. There were, however, a few exceptions to this general rule. Translations of Justinian's Latin texts in law and jurisprudence appeared soon after the originals, and some Latin religious works were available in Greek, translated in south Italy during the eighth century—the *Dialogues* of Gregory the Great, the writings of Cassian, and miscellaneous saints' lives and passions.¹ A significant number of translations representing a variety of genres first appeared in Constantinople after the restoration of Byzantine rule to the city in 1261. In the late thirteenth century the famous polymath Manuel/Maximos Planoudes (*ca* 1255–1305) translated entire works of Latin

¹Cyril Mango, "La Culture grecque et l'Occident au VIII^e siècle," *I problemi dell' Occidente nel secolo VIII* (*Settimane di Studio del Centro Italiano di Studi sull' Alto Medioevo* 20.2 [Spoleto 1973]) 696–710; Adolf Lumpe, *Reallexikon der Byzantinistik* A.1.4 (1970) 323–324.

theology, rhetoric, and *belles lettres*, rendering them into sophisticated literary Greek. Planoudes, however, was neither the first nor the only Greek scholar of his time to undertake such an extraordinary task. Recent scholarship has identified Planoudes' senior contemporary Maximos/Manuel Holobolos (born *ca* 1245, died 1310–1314) as the first to translate Latin literary works during this period.² Like Planoudes, Holobolos played a significant role in the public life of Constantinople and in its intellectual circles.³ This study will consider the motives which induced these two scholars to divert time and attention from their other responsibilities in order to translate Latin literature, an activity which had virtually no place in traditional Byzantine scholarship.

Modern scholars have suggested a variety of motives for the translations of Planoudes and Holobolos, basing their deductions upon the genres represented by the several translations. I propose to examine possible motives for each type of translation separately. After considering the obvious reasons for translating Latin theology in the late thirteenth century, I shall proceed to the more problematic reasons for adding translations of Latin rhetorical works to the already substantial inventory of rhetorical writings in Greek. Because a recent edition of a letter by Holobolos illuminates his motives for translating Latin rhetorical treatises, I shall offer my translation of this difficult Greek text and comment upon its significance.⁴ Finally, I shall

²Paul Canart, "A Propos du Vaticanus Graecus 207," *ICS* 7 (1982) 271–298.

³The careers of these two scholar monks both compare and contrast with one another; for a detailed picture of Planoudes' life and career see C. N. Constantinides, *Higher Education in Byzantium in the Thirteenth and Early Fourteenth Centuries* (Nicosia 1982) 66–89, and Gianpaolo Rigotti in Manolis Papatomopoulos *et al.*, edd., *Αύγουστίνου Περί Τριάδος βιβλία πεντεκαίδεκα ἄπερ ἐκ τῆς Λατίνων διαλέκτου εἰς τὴν Ἑλλάδα μετήνεγκε Μάξιμος ὁ Πλανούδης* (Athens 1995) xv–lviii; for Holobolos see Constantinides 52–59.

⁴Anastasios Kh. Megas, ed., *Maximus Planudes, Boethii De philosophiae consolatione, in linguam Graecam translata* (Thessalonika 1996) 391–396, and most recently Manolis Papatomopoulos, *Anicii Manlii Severini Boethii De consolatione philosophiae traduction grecque de Maxime Planude* (Athens 1999)

turn to Planoudes' possible reasons for translating Latin belletristic literature, a puzzling question which has intrigued several generations of scholars and has prompted them to offer a wide spectrum of explanations for the phenomenon. Collecting and assessing their suggestions in the context established by Holobolos' contemporary discussion of his motives for translation will advance our understanding of Planoudes' reasons for translating Latin literary works.

Planoudes translated two Latin theological texts, Augustine's *De trinitate*⁵ and the anonymous *De duodecim abusivis saeculi*.⁶ The unionist debates initiated by Michael VIII and continued under his successor Andronikos II encouraged Greek participants in the discussions to seek a greater understanding of Latin theological positions. Planoudes' two translations gave Byzantine readers easy access to widely circulated popular ideas regarding religion in *De duodecim abusivis saeculi* and to western views on the nature of divinity and the procession of the Holy Spirit in Augustine's *De trinitate*.⁷ As Nigel Wilson suggests, either Michael VIII or Andronikos II may have pressed Planoudes to make these translations, since the question of the procession of the Holy Spirit was intensely relevant not only for Michael VIII's negotiations leading to the Union of Lyon (1274) but also at the time of the Byzantine Council of Blachernae (1285), called specifically to address the *filioque* question.⁸ These theological translations were consulted both by Planou-

127–132. This very interesting text was first published on the basis of one late manuscript by Max Treu, "Manuel Holobolos," *BZ* 5 (1896) 554–559.

⁵ Editio princeps by Papatomopoulos *et al.* (*supra* n.3).

⁶ G. N. Giannakes, ed., "Μαξίμου Πλανούδη μετάφραση τοῦ Περὶ τῶν δώδεκα βαθμῶν τῆς Παραχρήσεως τοῦ ψεύδο-Αὐγουστίνου," *Δωδώνη* 3 (1974) 219–256.

⁷ Cf. Rigotti (*supra* n.3) XLV–LIV, and Hans Georg Beck, "Besonderheiten der Literatur der Paläologenzeit," *Art et société à Byzance sous les Paléologues* (Venice 1971) 44.

⁸ Nigel Wilson, *Scholars of Byzantium*² (London 1990) 230; cf. *ODB* I 515.

des' contemporaries and also by later generations, as evidenced by numerous readers' annotations in the manuscripts.⁹

All the translations of Latin rhetorical and grammatical treatises surviving from the late thirteenth century have traditionally been assigned to Planoudes, an attribution still maintained by some scholars.¹⁰ Paul Canart, however, has demonstrated that Boethius' *De topicis differentiis* (hereafter *Dtd*) and his *De hypotheticis syllogismis* (hereafter *Dhs*) were translated before 1265–1268, the date of the earliest manuscript containing them.¹¹ *Vat. gr.* 207, produced when Holobolos (born *ca* 1245) was a young scholar and Planoudes (born *ca* 1255) was still a child, names Holobolos as translator of the two Boethius texts in its table of contents. Canart's decisive attribution of these two translations to Holobolos confirms the opinion of Max Treu, who demonstrated numerous correspondences between the prefatory letter introducing them and the style, vocabulary, and imagery of Holobolos' other writings.¹² The modern editor of the translations, Dimitrios Z. Nikitas, confidently assigns them both to Holobolos.¹³

Both Planoudes and Holobolos had professional reasons for translating Latin treatises on grammar and rhetoric, since both were prominent educators who equipped their students with skills in grammar and rhetoric, the traditional tools required for advancement and success in public life and imperial service.¹⁴

⁹Wolfgang O. Schmitt, "Lateinische Literatur in Byzanz: Die Übersetzungen des Maximos Planudes und die moderne Forschung," *JÖBG* 17 (1968) 132.

¹⁰*E.g.*, Wilson (*supra* n.8) 224–225.

¹¹Canart (*supra* n.2) 271–298.

¹²Treu (*supra* n.4) 558–559.

¹³Dimitrios Z. Nikitas, *Eine byzantinische Übersetzung von Boethius "De hypotheticis syllogismis"* (Hypomnemata 69 [Göttingen 1982]) 39–40, 45–47, and *Boethius De topicis differentiis και οι βυζαντινές μεταφράσεις των Μανουήλ Όλοβόλου και Προχόρου Κυδώνη* (Corp.Phil.Med.Aev.Byz. 5 [Athens 1990]) LXXXI–LXXXII.

¹⁴*Cf.* Ruth Webb, "A Slavish Art? Language and Grammar in Late Byzantine Education and Society," *Dialogos* 1 (1994) 93–99, esp. n.69.

Holobolos was about twenty when in 1265 Michael VIII Palaiologos accepted the recommendation of the patriarch Germanos III and designated the young scholar as teacher of logic in the fledgling Patriarchal Academy located at the Church of the Holy Apostles. The Patriarch reasoned that the Church needed to provide high-quality rhetorical training for Byzantine participants in union negotiations with the West, and that Holobolos was ideal for the task, being “naturally talented and brim-full of eloquence” (τῷ Ὀλοβόλω, εὐφυσεῖ γε ὄντι καὶ πλήρει λόγων, Pachymeres 4.14).¹⁵ At this point in his public career, Holobolos also delivered several panegyrics for the Emperor before being disgraced in 1273 as an opponent of ecclesiastical union.¹⁶

From sometime in the 1280’s until his death *ca* 1305, Planoudes too trained students in rhetoric and grammar. He supervised a school in Constantinople, probably teaching advanced students himself while relying upon others, perhaps his own senior students, to instruct the younger pupils.¹⁷ Rhetoric and grammar were an essential focus both of Planoudes’ school and of his own scholarship. His grammatical treatise *Concerning the Syntax of the Parts of Speech* (Περὶ συντάξεως τῶν τοῦ λόγου μερῶν) is a useful and predictable element in Planoudes’ pedagogical activities. Surprisingly, however, Planoudes incorporated in this work sections translated from the *Institutio grammatica* of Priscian, implicitly acknowledging that he recognized not only the close linguistic relationship between Latin and Greek but also the quality of

¹⁵Georges Pachymères *Relations Historiques* II, ed. Albert Failler (Paris 1984) 369.7–11.

¹⁶Constantinides (*supra* n.3) 53–57; for the published orations of Holobolos see Max Treu, *Manuelis Holoboli Orationes 1–2* (Programm des Königlichen Victoria-gymnasiums zu Potsdam 1906), and L. Previale, “Un panegirico inedito per Michele VIII Paleologo,” *BZ* 42 (1942) 1–49.

¹⁷The location of the school, often designated as the Chora or Akataleptos monastery, is unclear; *cf.* Constantinides (*supra* n.3) 68–70.

Priscian's grammatical analysis and presentation.¹⁸ Planoudes' metrical translation of the *Disticha Catonis* also contributed to the teaching of grammar and rhetoric in his school. The morphology, syntax, and vocabulary of its pithy aphorisms simultaneously offered students an arena for practicing their grammatical skills and a tonic for nurturing their moral character. For example, the fifty-five terse maxims prefacing Book I of the *Disticha Catonis* illustrate various imperative constructions and forms, such as the subjunctive for prohibition, "Don't join a serious conversation unless you are invited" (#7 Μὴ πρότερον εἰς βουλὴν παρέλθῃς πρὶν ἂν κληθεῖς), and the irregular imperative "Regard your professor with fear" (#11 Τὸν καθηγητὴν δέδιθι), while the bulk of the work consists of two-line sententiae demonstrating various examples of notable syntax and morphology like "Be especially attentive and don't be betrayed to sleep/ for much rest nurtures disasters" (1.2 Ἀγρύπνει τὸ πλεόν, μηδ' ὕπνοις ἔκδοτος ἔσσο· μακρὸν γάρ τ' ἀνάπαυμα τροφὴν παθέεσσι χορηγεῖ) and "I think that the foremost of the virtues is holding one's tongue/ and that the man who knows how to keep prudent silence is close to God" (1.3 Πρωτίστην ἀρετῶν οἶμαι τὸ γλῶσσαν ἐπίσχειν· ἐγγύθι δ' ὄντα Θεοῦ, τὸν σὺν λόγῳ εἰδότα σιγᾶν).¹⁹

Planoudes' two translations from the Latin rhetorical tradition offer very few clues to his motives for selecting them. The *Disticha Catonis* may be interpreted as a pedagogue's *jeu d'esprit*, because it exemplifies the sort of playful grammatical material still employed in language classrooms to instruct students while amusing them. Successive generations of teachers endorsed the pedagogical value of the Greek *Disticha Catonis*, for it survives in two recensions and many manuscripts, and it

¹⁸Cf. Carl Wendel, "Planudes, Maximus," *RE* 20 (1950) 2209.

¹⁹Citations from Vicentius Ortoleva, ed., *Maximus Planudes, Disticha Catonis in Graecum translata* (Rome 1992) 2, 4.

frequently accompanies the fifteenth-century translation of the *Ianua*, a handbook of grammar attributed to Donatus.²⁰ Planoudes' decision to translate an excerpt from Priscian's *Institutio* and to incorporate it into his own grammatical essay is puzzling, however, since the Greek rhetorical tradition provided him with rich resources to draw upon. Perhaps Planoudes happened upon the passage from Priscian while he was composing *Concerning the Syntax of the Parts of Speech* and adopted it as a particularly succinct expression of useful concepts.

Unlike Planoudes' excerpt from Priscian, Holobolos' two rhetorical translations from Latin are complete and free-standing works; unlike Planoudes' translation of the *Disticha Catonis*, Holobolos' translations assume an audience of mature students. *Vat. gr.* 207, the earliest manuscript containing Holobolos' rhetorical translations, preserves a single patron's selection of sophisticated Greek works on science (Euclid's *Elements*, Cleomedes' *On Meteors*), philosophy (Ammonios' commentary on the *Isagoge* of Porphyry, works of ps.-Dionysios), and rhetoric (Sopater's *Διαίρεσις ζητημάτων*, Kyros' *Περὶ διαφορῶς στάσεων* and Μέθοδος ἐπὶ τὰς εὐρέσεις τῶν στάσεων, Aristotle's *Topics*, fragments of a glossary).²¹ Aristotle's *Topics* immediately precedes Holobolos' two translations from Boethius on related subjects, *De topicis differentiis* and *De hypotheticis syllogismis*, a pungent reminder that the Greek literary tradition contained abundant rhetorical resources of lasting value and did not need to be supplemented by translations from Latin. However, the later manuscript tradition of *Dtd* indicates that this translation, at least, had lasting appeal for Greek readers. In Holobolos' own lifetime, the historian and rhetorician George Pachymeres (born 1242, died ca 1310) cited Holobolos' translation of *Dtd* in his discussion of rhetorical *topoi*, comparing Boethius' treat-

²⁰Cf. Schmitt (*supra* n.9) 134–135, 142–145.

²¹Canart (*supra* n.2) 272–274.

ment favorably with Aristotle's,²² and an additional twenty-one copies of *Dtd* produced in later centuries demonstrate its enduring popularity: four manuscripts survive from the fourteenth century, eight from the fifteenth, eight from the sixteenth, and one from the seventeenth.²³

Generations of users emphatically endorsed Holobolos' decision to translate *Dtd*, although its companion translation *Dhs* languished and survives in only two thirteenth-century manuscripts.²⁴ We can infer that Holobolos anticipated a need for such handy rhetorical training manuals, and we are fortunate that he discusses his reasons for translating both *Dtd* and *Dhs* in a rhetorically refined prefatory letter introducing the two translations and surviving in four manuscripts.²⁵ To advance our understanding of Holobolos' motivations as a translator, I offer my translation of this extremely interesting but very convoluted translator's preface. I have based my translation upon the text of Ppathomopoulos and supplemented his source citations as well as emended his punctuation where I judged appropriate. Parentheses within the translation indicate words and phrases which I have supplied for clarity in English, although they are not obviously implied by the Greek text. For the reader's convenience I then give the Greek.²⁶

The highly excellent *Division Concerning Dialectical Topics* of the Latin scholar Boethius, translated by the most estimable Rhetor (and) gentleman, Maximos Holobolos²⁷

²²Dimitrios Z. Nikitas, "Boethius, de differentiis topicis: eine Pachymeresweiterbearbeitung der Holobolos-übersetzung," *ClMed* 38 (1987) 267–287.

²³Nikitas, *Dtd* LXXXIII–LXXXIV.

²⁴Nikitas, *Dhs* 24.

²⁵*Vat. gr.* 207 is the archetype of *Paris Bibl. Nat.* 2094, *Paris Bibl. Nat.* 2097, and *Florence Riccardiani* 50; cf. Ppathomopoulos (*supra* n.4) 127–132.

²⁶For the text see Ppathomopoulos (*supra* n.4) 130–132.

²⁷Title preserved only by *Vat. gr.* 207; heading preserved in *Cod. Riccard.* 50 f.58^r cited by Megas (*supra* n.4) 391: πιστολή τοῦ σοφωτάτου κυροῦ Μαξίμου τοῦ Πλανούδη πρὸς τοὺς ὁμήλικας περιέχουσα τὰ περὶ Βοητίου τοῦ Ῥωμαίου καὶ

Preface

(1) My dearest friends, would gold and silver be the object of your efforts, (or) again would aromatics, which the sense of smell wisely prefers to them, be the much more valuable goal of your search, if you commanded me to the best of my ability to traverse the land of Havilah²⁸ and of India to obtain aromatics from the one place, costly gold and silver from the other? If I wished to avoid breaking the bonds of our friendship, would I not be obliged to welcome graciously your assignment, to undertake the trouble of the journey, and to make haste in every possible way to accomplish what you assigned me?

(2) When the object of your desire is rhetoric, that which is our constant preoccupation, could I be found completely unresponsive and eager to procrastinate? And yet in the one case the thing sought was gold and aromatics, a material possession which is not valued to the highest degree; toil on behalf of these desiderata would have been estimated to be great and time-consuming if I were preparing to lead an expedition around a land so far distant, to cleave so many watery paths of the sea, and to survey the cities of many men like that Ithakan of many trials.²⁹ The benefits, however, would not extend in any commensurate degree to others, but would be limited only to those involved in giving and receiving (the object of desire).

(3) However, in this case the object at hand is so great—the most important, most valuable, and supremely superior of all things on the earth—and the trouble involved is only moderate, (while) the benefit is richly abundant and accrues not only to the giver and receiver but also to many others. Would I not (then) thoroughly rouse myself to achieve what pleases you, gentlemen? Would I not apply my abilities (in a manner) agreeable to your wishes, so that with the two of us in perfect agreement due to the fact of our friendship we might accomplish our common goal and arrive at the best possible end?

(4) And how could this be a (choice between) balanced alternatives for a mere mortal who loves rhetoric, who honors friendship as a great thing, and who places great value upon serving his true friends?

τινα προλεγόμενα τῆς παρούσης βίβλου (Letter of the most learned gentleman, Maximos Planoudes, to his associates, containing observations concerning the Roman Boethius and some prefatory remarks on the present book.)

²⁸ Εὐιλιάτ, famous in Scripture for its gold, emeralds, and rubies: Gen 2:11–12.

²⁹ *Od.* 1.3. πολύτλας is a common epithet of Odysseus: *Il.* 8.97, 9.676, etc.

(5) For these reasons, O Friendship, I have fulfilled your assignment, gladly accepted the toil associated with it, and extracted from the language of Italy the treatise by the Roman author Boethius *Concerning Dialectical Topics*,³⁰ which is eagerly studied by the Italians. I have conveyed the treatise into Greek and grafted it from the wild olive of the (Italians') language—as one might say because it is both unproductive in its literary texts and also earthy in its speech—onto the cultivated olive—I mean, onto our rhetorical language—which is evergreen, luxuriant, and, as the Psalmist says, fruitful.³¹

(6) (I did this) not because our own dialectic now needs even the minimal support from that (Latin) source—no more than the great light-bringing (sun) needs, so to speak, the light of a lamp—but so that what we already possess in sufficiency we might also have to a superabundant degree and so that the nature of the rhetorically sophisticated works produced by the Italians might not entirely escape the notice of those who are also children of Ausonia [*i.e.* Roman Italy] and who of all people are especially zealous to acquire literary works.

(7) But let these remarks suffice for my prologue. I have a few cursory observations about the philosopher Boethius, namely that he was a Christian as well as a philosopher, a contemporary of Gregory the Great,³² the Dialogos, who was at the helm of the Church in Rome when Maurice completed his imperial reign.

(8) This Boethius is considered a major figure by scholars of rhetoric among the Italians because his career was distinguished and his writings both abundant and widely renowned. He held important magistracies in Rome and authored many excellent works. Furthermore, he wrote commentaries on various works of Aristotle and in addition reclaimed with the powerful light of clarification, so to

³⁰Holobolos' Latin exemplar contained only the first three books of *De topicis differentiis* and did not give its correct title; see Nikitas, *Dtd* LXXXII.

³¹Ps. 51:10; *cf.* Rom. 11:17–24, where Paul portrays gentile converts as the wild olive grafted onto the true olive of Judaism; I am grateful to Denis Sullivan for pointing out this parallel passage.

³²Pope 590–604; Boethius lived 480–524. The source of Holobolos' faulty chronology is mysterious, since some thirty years later Planoudes had access to accurate biographical information on Boethius, as he demonstrates in the [Βοήθου βίος] which precedes his translation of the *De consolazione philosophiae* (*cf.* Papathomopoulos [*supra* n.4] LXXVI). Has Holobolos or his source conflated Gelasius I (492–496) with his more famous successor, Gregory I?

speak, what is murky and difficult of access in his writings on dialectic. Moreover, he also wrote indispensable observations *Concerning the Division of General Terms* and followed Theophrastos and Eudemos in working out a short treatise of multiple sections *Concerning Hypothetical Syllogisms*.³³ God willing, I shall shortly translate a sampling of these works into our Greek language.

(9) This Boethius also engraved in his own treatise entitled *Concerning Consolation* the perfect image of Philosophy—I use such an expression) to describe this work for those unfamiliar with it as containing something worthy of discussion.

(10) The philosopher described Philosophy as a woman, dignified in demeanor (and) beautiful to behold.³⁴ He did not portray her beauty in embellishment and artifice, but without cosmetic enhancement and in its natural state; she is so lofty in stature that she penetrates the heavens with her head while also piercing the surface of the earth with her feet and reaching its inmost depths.³⁵

(11) The craftsman both wove a delicate garment for Philosophy and made this written work dark, not as a superficial feature but as a natural attribute. The garment was undamaged down to a dignified mid-calf point, but thereafter it was all in shreds and tatters. Two letters divided the front of it into parts. The Greek letter *theta* was inscribed from neck to hip, and *pi* was written next below it.

(12) In my opinion, Boethius portrayed Philosophy as a woman because the word is feminine in gender—although her intellect is by no means weak and womanish, but both noble and heroic—or because she might bear a multitude of offspring without any experience whatsoever of old age, since the powers above have allotted her immortality.

(13) (Boethius described her as) “dignified in demeanor” (§10), for what is in fact more dignified and wiser than the demeanor of a philosopher? (Philosophy’s) beauty is not artificial, since she has been adorned with natural graces and shares her particular loveliness with the other branches of learning and artistry; she

³³ *I.e.*, the *Dtd* and *Dhs*. Several of Boethius’ translations and commentaries on Aristotle’s rhetorical works survive, as do five of his own treatises on peripatetic logic.

³⁴ In §10–15 Holobolos specifies and explicates the contents of Boethius, *Philosophiae consolationis* 1.1.

³⁵ *Hom. Il.* 4.442–443; I am grateful to John Ziolkowski for identifying this allusion.

passes through water, she cleaves the air, she traverses the ethereal realm, she enters heaven, she fixes her footsteps even so far as the foundations of the earth. Indeed, Philosophy hastens everywhere; she apprehends divine matters and categorizes all worldly human affairs, she describes with accuracy matters which transcend this world.

(14) (Boethius described her) “delicate garment” (§11) in order to replicate philosophical perceptions, dark because these perceptions are deep, obscure, and inscrutable, or because the mind’s ability to see, already disrupted by gazing upon material reality, takes its own measure against the words of Philosophy and withdraws again into itself.

(15) The skirts of her garment are in tatters because among the devotees of Philosophy, one masters this part of her, one that, another another part, the remainder the part remaining, and none of them gains mastery of the whole portion but only of its mere tip. The letter *pi* takes its place on the lower section of the garment and *theta* on the upper because *theory* mounts upon *practical* application and is, so to speak, superior to it.³⁶ The form of the letters is Greek because the Greeks are the most philosophical of all people.

(16) But let these remarks stand, so to speak,³⁷ as a preface for now. At this point we must return to our purpose and investigate how this industrious work horse of Philosophy, Boethius,³⁸ takes up the plow of (rhetorical) division and cleaves the rich and fertile fields of dialectic (§8), or rather cultivates and works carefully the areas of division established by the great Themistius and by Marcus Tullius, also known as Cicero.³⁹

(17) Next we must harvest our share of the knowledge thus derived and render the first-fruits of our thanks to Christ our God, from whom “we live and move and have our being” [Acts 17:28].

³⁶ The division of philosophy into theoretical and practical branches derives from later Neo-platonism and profoundly influenced the Byzantine conception of the subject through the writings of John of Damascus. Cf. D. O’Meara, *ODB* III 1658–1661.

³⁷ Reading *στήτω ὡσάν* for the manuscripts’ *στήτωσαν*.

³⁸ I have transferred the author’s metaphor exploiting the pun upon the name *Boétios* and *βοῦς* “ox” into a more common English idiom.

³⁹ For Cicero cf. *Dtd* 1.4.32 (Nikitas p.101.15) = Latin *PL* 64.1177D; for Themistius cf. *Dtd* 2.10.1 (Nikitas p.126.28–30) = *PL* 1194B; also cf. *Dtd* 3.7.4–22 (Nikitas p.141.8–142.23) and Holobolos scholion 266 (Nikitas p.203).

Βοετίου φιλοσόφου Λατίνου περὶ τόπων διαλεκτικῶν διαίρεσις ἀρίστη μεταγλωττισθεῖσα παρὰ τοῦ ἀξιολογωτάτου ῥήτορος κυροῦ Μαξίμου τοῦ Ὀλοβόλου

Προοίμιον

1. Ἄρα, ὦ φίλων ἄριστοι, ἂν χρυσὸς ὑμῖν καὶ ἄργυρος ἐσπουδάζετο, ἂν τὰ τῶν ἀρωμάτων αὐθις ἐζητεῖτο πολυτιμότερα καὶ ὄνπερ ὄσφρησις οἶδε μᾶλλον ἀντιλαμβάνεσθαι, εἴτ' ἐμοὶ πρὸς ἰσχύος ἔχοντι τὴν γῆν διελθεῖν Εὐλάτ καὶ τὴν Ἰνδικὴν ἐπετάττετε, ἴν' ἐντεῦθεν μὲν τὰ τῶν ἀρωμάτων μετακομίσαιμι, ἐκεῖθεν δὲ τὸν τιμαλφῆ χρυσόν τε καὶ ἄργυρον, οὐκ ἄφειλον, εἴπερ ἔθελον τοὺς τῆς φιλίας μὴ παραθραῦσαι θεσμούς, εὐγνώμωνως ὑποδέξασθαι τὴν ὑμετέραν ἐπιταγὴν καὶ τοῦ καμάτου τῆς ὁδοιπορίας ἀπάρξασθαι καὶ τὸ ἐπιταχθέν μοι σπεῦσαι τρόποις ἅπασι διαπράξασθαι;

2. Λόγου δὲ πεφυκτός τοῦ ζητουμένου, περὶ οὗ διηνεκῆς ἡμῖν ἢ φροντίς, ἀνήκοος ὅλως αὐτὸς εὐρεθεῖην καὶ τὴν ἀναβολὴν ἀσπαζόμενος, καίτοι γ' ἐκεῖ μὲν χρυσὸς καὶ ἀρώματα τὸ ζητούμενον ἔκειτο, ὑλικόν τι χρῆμα καὶ τοῖς μάλιστα μὴ τιμώμενον, ὃ δ' ὑπὲρ τούτων κόπος πολὺς τε καὶ χρόνιος ἐμεμέτρητο, εἴπερ ἔμελλον γῆν μὲν οὕτω κειμένην ἀπωτάτω περιηγήσασθαι, θαλάττης δ' ὑγρά τοσάδε διατεμεῖν κέλευθα καὶ πολλῶν ἀνθρώπων ἄστυα κατιδεῖν κατὰ τὸν πολύτλαν ἐκείνον τὸν Ἰθακήσιον, τὰ δὲ τοῦ κέρδους αὐθις οὐχὶ καὶ πρὸς ἑτέρους ὀποσονοῦν διετείετο, ἀλλ' οἷς ἦν τὸ διδόναι καὶ τὸ λαμβάνειν μόνοις ὀρίζετο.

3. Τοσοῦτου δ' ὄντος ἐνταῦθα τοῦ προκειμένου λόγου, τοῦ μεγίστου καὶ τιμιωτάτου καὶ τῶν κατὰ κόσμον ἀπάντων ὑπερκοσμίου, μετρίου τοῦ κόπου, πλουσίου τοῦ κέρδους, οὐκ εἰς τὸν διδόντα καὶ τὸν λαμβάνοντα μόνον, ἀλλὰ καὶ εἰς ἄλλους πολλοὺς διαβαίνοντος, οὐχὶ τὸ δοκοῦν ὑμῖν, ὦ ἄνδρες, ἀνύσαι διανασταίην ὀλοσχερῶς, οὐ τῆ ὑμετέρᾳ βουλήσει σύνδρομον καὶ αὐτὸς προσθεῖην τὸ δύνασθαι, ἴν' ἀμφοτέρων ὡς ἀφ' ἑνὸς συνδραμόντων διὰ τὸ τῆς φιλίας ταῦτόν τὸ ζητούμενον ἀποτελεσθεῖη καὶ εἰς πέρας ἀποβαίῃ χρηστόν;

4. Καὶ ποῦ ἂν εἴη τοῦτο κατάλληλον βροτῶ λόγον φιλοῦντι, φιλίας τὸ μέγα χρῆμα τιμῶντι καὶ φίλους ἀληθεῖς θεραπεύειν ποιουμένῳ περὶ πολλοῦ;

5. Διὰ τοι ταῦτα τὴν ὑμετέραν, ὦ φιλότης, ἐπιταγὴν ἐκπληρῶν καὶ χαριέντως τὸν ὑπὲρ ταύτης μόχθον ἀναδεχόμενος, τὴν τοῦ Λατίνου Βοετίου *Περὶ τόπων διαλεκτικῶν* πραγματεῖαν σπουδαζομένην παρ' Ἰταλοῖς, τῆς τούτων φωνῆς ἀποθλίψας πρὸς τὴν ἑλληνίδα μεταπεπόρθευκα, ἐξ ἀγριελαίου ἂν τις εἴπη διὰ τε τὸ μὴ τῶν λέξεων γόνιμον καὶ τὸ τῆς φράσεως χθαμαλόν, πρὸς τὴν καλλιέλαιον μετεγκεντρίσας,

τὴν ἡμετέραν φημὶ λεκτικὴν, τὴν ἀειθαλῆ τε καὶ τηλεθώωσαν καί, κατὰ τὴν ψαλτωδομένην, κατάκαρπον.

6. οὐχ ὡς δεομένης τάχα τῆς παρ' ἡμῖν διαλεκτικῆς καὶ τῆς ἐντεῦθεν κἂν τὸ βραχὺ συγκροτήσεως, εἴπερ οὐδ' ὁ μέγας φωσφόρος, ἴν' οὕτως εἴποιμι, λυχνιαίου χρήζει φωτός, ἀλλ' ἴν' ὦνπερ ἔχοιμεν ἰκανῶς τούτων καὶ ὑπερεκπερισσοῦ εὐποροῖμεν καὶ τὰ παρ' Ἱταλοῖς σεμνολογούμενα, τίνα πεφύκασι, μὴ πάνυ καὶ τοὺς τῶν Αὐσόνων παιδῶν διαλανθάνοιεν, οἷς εἴπερ τισὶν ἄλλοις ἢ τῶν λόγων κτήσις ἐξαιρέτως πέφυκε περισπούδαστον.

7. Ἄλλὰ ταῦτα μὲν προοιμίῳ χάριν ἀρκείσθω μοι· περὶ δὲ τοῦ φιλοσόφου Βοετίου βραχέως καὶ ἐπιτροχάδην λέγομεν, ὡς χριστιανὸς ἦν ὁ ἀνὴρ καὶ φιλόσοφος, σύγχρονος τῷ μεγάλῳ Γρηγορίῳ τῷ Διαλόγῳ, τῷ τότε τοὺς τῆς ἐν Ῥώμῃ ἐκκλησίας οἴακας ἰθύνοντι, ὅτε καὶ Μαυρίκιος ἐν τῇ Κωνσταντινουπόλει τὰ τῆς βασιλείας σκῆπτρα διήνυε.

8. Φέρεται δὲ πολὺς οὗτος ὁ Βοέτιος τοῖς φιλολογοῦσι τῶν Ἱταλῶν διὰ τε τὸ τοῦ βίου περιφανές καὶ τὸ τῶν λόγων δασιλές τε καὶ περιώνυμον· μεγάλας γὰρ ἀρχὰς ἐν τῇ Ῥώμῃ τετέλεκε καὶ πολλοὺς καὶ γενναίους λόγους δεδημιούργηκεν, ἔτι δὲ καὶ Ἀριστοτελικὰς ἐτέρας βίβλους ἐξηγησάμενος, πρὸς ταύταις καὶ τῆς λογικῆς πραγματείας τὸ νύκτερον καὶ δυσπρόσιτον πολλῶν τῷ φωτὶ τῆς σαφηνείας, ὡς εἰπεῖν, ἐξημέρωσεν· ἔτι δὲ καὶ *Περὶ τῆς καθόλου διαιρέσεως ἀναγκαῖα* τίνα γέγραφε καὶ πολυσχιδῆς *Περὶ ὑποθετικῶν συλλογισμῶν* Θεοφράστῳ καὶ Εὐδήμῳ ἀκολουθήσας ἐξεπονήσατο συγγραμμάτιον· ἐξ ὧν ὀλίγα Θεοῦ διδόντος μετὰ μικρὸν εἰς τὴν ἡμετέραν μεταφθογγίσω διάλεκτον.

9. Οὗτος ὁ Βοέτιος καὶ εἰκόνα Φιλοσοφίας, ἵνα καὶ ταύτην ὡς τι λόγου φέρουσαν ἄξιον τοῖς μὴ εἰδόσι τὰ περὶ αὐτῆς διαγράψωμαι, τῇ οἰκείᾳ βίβλῳ τῇ οὕτως ἐπιγεγραμμένῃ *Παραμυθητικῇ* ἐνεχάραξε.

10. Γυναῖκα μὲν οὖν τὴν Φιλοσοφίαν ἔγραψεν ὁ φιλόσοφος, σεμνὴν τὸ ἦθος, ὠραίαν τὴν ὄψιν· τὸ κάλλος αὐτῆς οὐ κομμωτικὸν οὐδὲ τεχνητὸν ἀνεπλάσατο, ἀλλ' αὐτοβαφές, ἀλλ' αὐτοφυές· τὴν ἡλικίαν ἐς τὸσον διήκουσαν, ὡς τῇ κεφαλῇ μὲν διεισδύνειν τοὺς οὐρανούς, τοῖς δὲ οἱ ποσὶ τὴν τῆς γῆς ἀντιτυπίαν διατορεῖν καὶ μέχρι τῶν μυχαϊτάτων φθάνειν αὐτῆς.

11. Ὑφανεν ὁ τεχνίτης τῇ Φιλοσοφίᾳ καὶ λεπτὸν τὸ χιτώνιον, ἔγραψε τοῦτο καὶ μέλαν, οὐχ οἶον τὸ ἐξ ἐπιπολῆς, ἀλλ' οἶον τὸ ἐν γενέσει· ἠκεραιοῦτο τὸ χιτώνιον ἄχρι καὶ κνημῶν τῆς σεμνοτάτης αὐτῶν, τὸ δὲ μετ' αὐτὰς ἅπαν διέρρηκτο καὶ διέσπαστο· διττῶ γράμματε τὸ ἔμπροσθεν διεμεριζέτην αὐτοῦ· θῆτα τὸ παρ' Ἑλλησι στοιχεῖον κεχάρακτο ἀπὸ τραχήλου καὶ ἐς ὀσφῦν, τὸ πῖ δ' ἐξῆς καὶ κάτωθεν ὑπεγέγραπτο.

12. Γυναῖκα τὴν Φιλοσοφίαν εἰκόνισεν, οἶμαι, Βοέτιος διὰ τὸ θῆλυ τῆς

κλήσεως, κἄν οὐδὲν μαλακὸν αὐτῆ φρονῆ καὶ θηλυπρεπές, ἀλλὰ γενναῖόν τε καὶ ἥρωικόν· ἢ ὅτι μυρίους ἀποτέκοι παῖδας, κἄν παντελῶς τὸ γῆρας ἠγνόησεν, ἐπειδὴ καὶ τὴν ἀθανασίαν ἄνωθεν ἐκληρώσατο.

13. Σεμνὴν τὸ ἦθος· τί γὰρ ἦθος φιλοσόφου σεμνότερον ὄντως καὶ σωφρονέστερον; οὐκ ἐπιτηδευτὸν τὸ κάλλος αὐτῆς, ἐπειδὴ φυσικαῖς κεκόσμηται χάρισι, καὶ ταῖς ἄλλαις ἐπιστήμαις καὶ τέχναις τῆς οἰκείας μεταδίδωσιν ὠραιότητος. διεπέρασεν ὕδωρ, ἔτεμεν ἀέρα, αἰθέρα διήλθεν, εἰσέδου τὸν οὐρανόν, ἔπηξε τὰς βάσεις μέχρι καὶ τῶν πυθμένων τῆς γῆς· πανταχοῦ καὶ γὰρ Φιλοσοφία διέδραμε· κατενόησε τὰ θεῖα, τὰ ἀνθρώπινα διεμέρισε πάντα τὰ ἐν κόσμῳ, τὰ ὑπὲρ κόσμον ἐξηκριβώσατο.

14. Λεπτὸν αὐτῆς τὸ χιτῶνιον, κατὰ τὴν τῶν φιλοσόφων νοημάτων ἐμφέρειαν· κορόν, διὰ τὸ βαθὺ τούτων καὶ σκοτεινόν τε καὶ δυσθεώρητον ἢ ὅτι τὸ τοῦ νοῦς ὀπτικόν, τῆ πρὸς τὴν ὕλην ἐνατεινίσει διασκεδασθέν, τοῖς λόγοις τῆς Φιλοσοφίας συγκρίνεται καὶ εἰς ἑαυτὸ καὶ πάλιν συνάγεται.

15. Διέρρωγε τὰ κράσπεδα τοῦ χιτῶνος, ὅτι τῶν ἐραστῶν τῆς Φιλοσοφίας ὁ μὲν τοῦδε τοῦ μέρους αὐτῆς, ὁ δὲ τοῦδε, ἄλλος ἄλλου, ὁ λοιπὸς τοῦ λοιποῦ καὶ οὐδεὶς τὸ μέρος ὅλον, ἀλλὰ καὶ τούτου τὸ ἄκρον μόνον ἐσπάσατο. τὸ πῖ στοιχεῖον τὴν κάτω τοῦ χιτῶνος εἴληχε χώραν, τὸ δὲ θῆτα τὴν ὑπερθεν, ὅτι καὶ θεωρία τῆς πράξεως ἐπιβαίνει καὶ οἶον ταύτης ὑπερανίσταται. οἱ δὲ χαρακτήρες τῶν γραμμάτων ἑλλήνιοι, ὅτι περ Ἑλληνες τῶν ἐθνῶν ἀπάντων φιλοσοφώτατοι.

16. Ἄλλ' ὡς ἐν παρόδῳ καὶ τὰ τοιαῦτα λεχθέντα στήτω ὡσὰν ἐνθαδί· ἀπάρτι δ' ἐπανιτέον πρὸς τὸν σκοπὸν καὶ θεωρητέον ὅπως ὁ ἐργατικὸς τῆς Φιλοσοφίας οὗτος βοῦς, ὁ Βοέτιος, τὸ τῆς διαιρέσεως ἀναλαβόμενος ἄροτρον τοὺς πίνοντας τε καὶ πολύχοας τόπους τέμνει τῆς διαλεκτικῆς, μᾶλλον δὲ πῶς, διαιρεθέντας παρὰ τοῦ μεγάλου Θεμιστίου καὶ τοῦ Μάρκου Τουλλίου τοῦ καὶ Κικέρωνος, οὗτος καλλιεργῆ καὶ ἐπιμελῶς ἐξεργάζεται.

17. Ἐξῆς δὲ τοῦ ἐντεῦθεν καρποῦ τῆς γνώσεως μεταληπτέον καὶ τὴν εὐχαριστίαν ὡς ἀπαρχὰς ἀποδοτέον Χριστῷ τῷ Θεῷ ἡμῶν, ἐξ οὗ καὶ ζῶμεν καὶ κινούμεθα καὶ ἐσμέν.

Holobolos' intended audience for this preface emerges clearly from the text. He addresses a group of his "best" (§1) and "true" (§4) friends, serious students of rhetoric who eagerly desire rhetorical knowledge as others might long for vast riches

(§1–3). Holobolos confides that rhetoric is also his “constant preoccupation” (§2), observing that it is “supremely superior” to all other earthly concerns as well as beneficial to a wide public (§3). He uses the “Attic” dialect⁴⁰ and employs numerous rhetorical devices both to display his own skills and to flatter the educated taste of his audience.

The preface opens with a set of three interlocking *à fortiori* arguments illustrating that effort and attention are better expended on rhetorical studies than on accumulating wealth (§1–3).⁴¹ Two of these contain rhetorical questions (§1, 3), a favorite device which Holobolos uses elsewhere in this essay (§4, 13). The preface contains allusions to Homer (§2, 10) and to Scripture (§5, 17), as well as a deft macaronic pun relating Boethius’ name to the Greek word βούς (§16) and the learned circumlocution “children of Ausonia” (§6) used to describe contemporary Byzantines.⁴² The striking metaphor of the wild and the cultivated olive trees applied to the Latin and Greek literary traditions (§5) further increases the rhetorical appeal of Holobolos’ prefatory remarks. Originating in Paul’s comparison of Judaism and Christianity, the metaphor occurs elsewhere in Holobolos’ own writings applied to the combination of literary works or traditions from contrasting stylistic levels;⁴³ Holobolos’ affection for this image may reflect his respect for the imperial house of Theodore Laskaris, deposed by Michael VIII Palaiologos in 1260. Theodore Laskaris had characterized

⁴⁰ For an analysis of Holobolos’ atticizing vocabulary and syntax see Nikitas, *Dhs* 25–26.

⁴¹ For an analysis of this argument see Nikitas, *Dhs* 45 n.73.

⁴² The usage Ausonia = Byzantium became popular in the twelfth century when imperial designs on Norman Italy fostered a sense of Byzantine kinship with the ancient Roman territory of the “Ausonians,” cf. E. A. Fisher, “Ovid’s *Metamorphoses*, Planudes and Ausonians,” in *Arktouros: Hellenic Studies Presented to Bernard M. W. Knox*, edd. Glen W. Bowersock et al. (New York 1979) 445–446. For additional examples see *Lexikon zur byzantinischen Gräzität II* (*DenkschrWien* 250 [1996]) 232–233.

⁴³ Examples quoted by Treu (*supra* n.4) 559.

philosophy as the wild olive, knowledge of God (θεογνωσία) as the cultivated, in his Ἐγκώμιον εἰς τὴν μεγάλοπολιν Νίκαιαν.⁴⁴

Holobolos acknowledges that the cultured and educated audience which eagerly awaits his rhetorical translations will know nothing of the original Latin author, his biography, or his other intellectual accomplishments. Accordingly, Holobolos presents a brief sketch of Boethius' career and writings (§7–9), specifically mentioning his rhetorical commentaries on Aristotle, the master of rhetoric, and lingering with obvious interest and enjoyment over an *explication de texte* of the opening chapters of Boethius' *De consolazione philosophiae* (§10–15). Curiously, Holobolos does not suggest that he will translate this work in the passage where he describes his plans to translate Boethius' rhetorical works (§8). He left that task for Planoudes, whose annotated translation of *De consolazione philosophiae* is considered among his best and is assigned to the 1290s.⁴⁵ (It seems that Planoudes and Holobolos used the same annotated manuscript of *De consolazione philosophiae*, since Scholion 14 to Planoudes' translation resembles §15 of Holobolos' preface and since Planoudes' scholia were translated directly from his Latin exemplar.)⁴⁶

Despite their fervent interest in Boethius' rhetorical writings, Holobolos and his Greek audience were also keenly aware of their own distinguished literary tradition, which already offered numerous excellent works on rhetoric. Holobolos exerts special effort to avoid even the appearance of disparaging or diminishing the value of that tradition, observing that his audience will now have rhetorical works not simply "in sufficiency" but "to a

⁴⁴ Cf. Nikitas, *Dtd* CVIII n.9.

⁴⁵ Cf. Papathomopoulos (*supra* n.4) XLVI–XLVII.

⁴⁶ Papathomopoulos (*supra* n.4) XLVIII; scholion 14 (Papathomopoulos 100): Π στοιχείον· τῷ μὲν Π τὸ πρακτικὸν δηλοῦται φιλοσοφίας, τῷ Θ δὲ τὸ θεωρητικόν· εἰς γὰρ ταῦτα καὶ διαιρεῖται, ὅθεν καὶ καλῶς λέγεται πρᾶξιν εἶναι τῆς θεωρίας ἐπίβασιν, ἀφ' ἧς, ὡς διὰ βαθμῶν κλίμακος τῆς ἀλληλουχίας τῶν ἀρετῶν, πρὸς τὴν τῶν θείων κατανόησιν ἔστιν ἀνιέναι.

superabundant degree” and noting that Byzantines, the “children of Ausonia,” are in fact heirs to a double literary tradition, both from classical Greece and also from imperial Rome (§6). In order to establish Boethius’ credentials for an audience indifferent to Latin literature, he observes that Boethius’ “career was distinguished and his writings ... renowned” (§8) and also mentions specifically Boethius’ two Greek sources, Aristotle (§8) and Themistios (§16), as well as his Latin source, Cicero (§16). Admiration for Boethius and his writings led Holobolos to emphasize the Latin author’s value in a punning epithet upon “Boethius” and the Greek word for “helper,” βοηθός, inserted at the head of his *Dtd* translation: “Beginning of the *Dialectical Topoi* of Boethius; in fact, friend, educated persons among the Latins write <the name of > this philosopher as ‘Boethos,’ a reliable helper among the coils of logic, for syllogisms, and for the *topoi* of dialectic” (Ἀρχὴ τῶν διαλεκτικῶν τόπων τοῦ Βοητίου· τὸνδε τὸν φιλόσοφον, φίλε, / στερρὸν βοηθὸν ἐν λογικοῖς πλεκτάναις, / πρὸς συλλογισμούς, πρὸς τόπους διαλέκτων).⁴⁷

Holobolos’ enthusiasm and admiration for Boethius, his *De consolatione philosophiae*, and his rhetorical writings is contagious; in fact, Holobolos himself seems to have contracted a high regard for the Latin author from western scholars. He speaks of these scholars several times in oblique terms through the preface. They “eagerly study” the *Dtd* (§5 πραγματεῖαν σπουδαζομένην παρ’ Ἰταλοῖς), they are heirs to a “rhetorically sophisticated” body of literature (§6 τὰ παρ’ Ἰταλοῖς σεμνολογούμενα), and they are “scholars of rhetoric” themselves (§8 τοῖς φιλολογοῦσι τῶν Ἰταλῶν). The respectful and collegial tone of these references to western scholars contrasts markedly with Holobolos’ frankly anti-Latin sentiments bluntly expressed in a metrical note at the conclusion of *Dtd*: “Throttle the Italians and their proud ways, friend, by mastering them with these coils of

⁴⁷ Nikitas, *Dtd* 93.

syllogism" (τῶν συλλογισμῶν ταῖσδε πλεκτάναις, φίλε, / τραχηλιῶντας Ἰταλοῦς κρατῶν, πνίγε).⁴⁸ His general prejudice against the Latins and their language occasionally emerges in his scholia to *Dtd*⁴⁹ and even finds tactless expression in his orations to that powerful exponent of pro-western initiatives, Michael VIII Palaiologos.⁵⁰

How did the anti-Latin Holobolos meet Latin scholars and come to respect them? His contacts were evidently in the Dominican and Franciscan houses which continued to exist in Byzantine Constantinople under Michael VIII, when both communities mingled freely with the Greek population of the city; the unitate monks were finally expelled by Andronikos II.⁵¹ Holobolos, in spite of his fierce aversion to western incursions upon Byzantine cultural territory, enjoyed a productive scholarly relationship with such Latins. The Dominican scholar Simon of Constantinople, whose fluency both in Latin and in Greek was noted by his contemporary Philip of Pera, addressed a tract on the procession of the Holy Spirit to Holobolos in the 1290s.⁵² Although Simon wrote from Negroponte in Frankish Greece,⁵³ his acquaintance with Holobolos may be traced through the Dominican house at Constantinople, the city which gave him his name. It was from such Latin scholars as Simon that Holobolos learned of Papias, the eleventh-century Lom-

⁴⁸ Ioannes Mercati, *Franchi de' Cavaleri, Codices Vaticani Graeci I* (Rome 1923) 251; discussed by Nikitas, *Dtd* CIX.

⁴⁹ Nikitas, *Dtd* CVI–CVIII.

⁵⁰ Nikitas, *Dhs* 42 n.45.

⁵¹ Cf. Guillelmus Adae, *De modo Saracenos exstirpandi ... Recueil des historiens des croisades* II (Paris 1906) 548. Although Guillaume Adam provides no precise date for the expulsion of Latin monastics from Constantinople, the passage is interpreted as a reference to the events of 1307 both by Raymond Loenertz, *La Société des Frères Pègrinants I* (Rome 1937) 47, and by Girolamo Golubovich, *Biblioteca Bio-Bibliografica della Terra Santa e dell' Oriente Francescano II* (Florence 1906) 552.

⁵² Nikitas, *Dhs* 50–51.

⁵³ Antoine Dondaine, "'Contra Graecos': premiers écrits polémiques des dominicains d'Orient," *Archivum fratrum praedicatorum* 21 (1951) 405–406.

bard whose *Elementarium doctrinae rudimentum* he quotes in his own scholia to the *Dtd*.⁵⁴ The library of the Dominican or Franciscan house at Constantinople may have provided Holobolos with the Latin manuscripts which introduced him and later Planoudes to Latin texts, and the educated Latin monks of these communities may have been the teachers who instructed first Holobolos, then Planoudes, in the intricacies of the Latin language and introduced them to Latin literature.

We may now consider the motives which induced Holobolos and Planoudes to translate Latin. Both responded to practical needs of their contemporaries in thirteenth-century Byzantine intellectual circles, Holobolos with translations of rhetorical works, and Planoudes with translations from both theology and rhetoric. Planoudes, however, also translated Latin literary texts which fulfilled no obvious practical need: Boethius' *De consolatione philosophiae*, Ovid's *Heroides* and his *Metamorphoses*, Cicero's *Somnium Scipionis* with Macrobius' *Commentary*, and two works which have left only traces (four lines from Satire 10 of Juvenal and mangled fragments of Ovid's amatory poems).⁵⁵ In view of Holobolos' extravagant admiration for Boethius' *De consolatione philosophiae* expressed in the prefatory letter

⁵⁴ Nikitas, *Dtd* CVIII.

⁵⁵ These literary translations have all been published: Ovid's *Heroides*, Manoles Papathomopoulos, ed., *Μάξιμος Πλανούδης Μετάφρασις τῶν Ὀβιδίου Ἐπιστολῶν* (*Peleia* 1 [Iannina 1976]); Cicero's *Somnium Scipionis*, Annamaria Pavano, *Maximus Planudes, M. Tullii Ciceronis Somnium Scipionis in graecum translatum* (Rome 1992); Boethius' *De consolatio philosophiae*, Anastasios Kh. Megas, ed., *Boethii De consolatione, in linguam Graecam translati/ Maximus Planudes* (Thessalonika 1996), and Papathomopoulos (*supra* n.4); Ovid's *Metamorphoses*, J. F. Boissonade, *Publii Ovidii Nasonis Metamorphoseon libri xv graece versi a Maximo Planude et nunc primum editi* (Paris 1822) (a critical edition of the *Metamorphoses* translation by Manoles Papathomopoulos is currently in press at the Academy of Athens; Anastasios Kh. Megas, *Maximus Planudes, Ovidii Metamorphosen Libri XV in linguam Graecam translati* I–II, published in Thessalonika, is not available to me); fragments of Juvenal Satire 10, S. B. Kugéas, "Maximos Planudes und Juvenal," *Philologus* 73 (1914) 318–319; fragments of Ovid's amatory poems, P. E. Easterling and E. J. Kenney, *Ovidiana Graeca. Fragments of a Byzantine Version of Ovid's Amatory Works* (PCPS Suppl. 1 [Cambridge 1965]).

translated above, the fact that Planoudes rather than Holobolos translated the work emphasizes the contrast between Holobolos' narrowly practical motives for translating Latin and Planoudes' broader intentions. As intense scholarly activity in the late twentieth century has made Planoudes' translations available in modern editions, scholars have continued to evaluate them in search of clues to Planoudes' motives for translation. I propose to collect and systematize the suggestions of modern scholars in order to assess the insights they provide. Finally, I shall offer comparative material from the work of the prolific nineteenth-century writer and adventurer, Sir Richard F. Burton. His translation of *The Book of the Thousand Nights and a Night* corresponds to significant features of Planoudes' literary translations, and Burton's stated agenda for translation supports the suggestions of scholars who have seen a conscious cultural purpose in Planoudes' translations of seemingly useless literary works.

Modern scholars have observed that Planoudes' four complete literary translations represent "best-sellers" in the medieval West and would surely have been recommended by any educated Latin scholars in the East known to Planoudes. Cicero's *Somnium Scipionis* with Macrobius' *Commentary* was central to the interpretation of dreams, visions, and allegory in the medieval West;⁵⁶ western scholarship of the twelfth and thirteenth centuries focused so intently upon the poetry of Ovid that Ludwig Traube famously labelled the period *aetas Ovidiana*;⁵⁷ and Boethius' *De consolazione philosophiae* enjoyed wide and enduring appeal in the West, as demonstrated by its

⁵⁶ Renate Blumenfeld-Kosinski, "Introduction: The Middle Ages," in *The Politics of Translation in the Middle Ages and the Renaissance* (Tempe 2001) 22.

⁵⁷ For a full discussion and bibliographical survey of Ovid in the intellectual life of twelfth- and thirteenth-century Europe, see Jane Chance, *Medieval Mythography II* (Gainesville 1994) 1–96, 231–252. I am grateful to Annemarie Weyl-Carr for this reference.

survival in some four hundred Latin manuscripts and in medieval translations into Anglo-Saxon, French, and English.⁵⁸

The subject matter, presentation, and style of these translations responds to Byzantine scholarly interests during Planoudes' time. Philosophy, as represented by Boethius' *De consolatione philosophiae*, was the central concern of higher education, the *Somnium Scipionis* with Macrobius' *Commentary* contains astronomical lore relevant to contemporary Byzantine science,⁵⁹ and the *Heroides* and *Metamorphoses* collect and adapt mythological trivia in a manner useful to students of Greek literature and pleasing to masters of mythological detail.⁶⁰ In addition, all four literary translations are accompanied by scholia which imply that Planoudes expected his Greek audience to consider these works worthy of serious study and scholarly investigation. To a Byzantine audience immersed in the study of classical Greek literature, these works also represent an extension and reinterpretation of the Greek tradition. All four works draw material from Greek sources and successfully amalgamate Greek philosophy or mythology into a new and challenging Latin cultural matrix. Cicero translated sections from Plato in the *Somnium Scipionis*,⁶¹ Ovid imaginatively cast the subject matter of Greek mythology into epic and epistolary form in the *Metamorphoses* and *Heroides*, and Boethius revived the mixture of prose and poetry sometimes termed "Menippean" while drawing his philosophical material from Plato, Aristotle, the Neoplatonic philosophers, *et al.*⁶² In addition, the literary translations possess their own stylistic appeal. Planoudes' *De consolatione philosophiae* skillfully and

⁵⁸ Papathomopoulos (*supra* n.4) XXI, XXIV.

⁵⁹ Schmitt (*supra* n.9) 137.

⁶⁰ Wendel (*supra* n.18) 2243; Wilson (*supra* n.8) 231.

⁶¹ Marcello Gigante, "Massimo Planude Interprete di Cicerone," *Atti del I Congr. Inter. di Studi Ciceroniani* II (Rome 1962), rpt. *Scritti sulla civiltà letteraria bizantina* (Naples 1981) 112; and Annamaria Pavano, "Caratteri stilistici della traduzione planudea del *Somnium Scipionis*," *Sileno* 14 (1988) 167-168.

⁶² Papathomopoulos (*supra* n.4) XXXIII, XLII-XLVI.

elegantly reflects Boethius' integration of poetry and prose,⁶³ and Planoudes' *Somnium Scipionis* demonstrates its own stylistic enhancements in the use of rhetorical figures and in vocabulary choice,⁶⁴ as does his *Metamorphoses*.⁶⁵ Although students of these translations have noted Planoudes' occasional lapses in diction and inaccuracies in Latin as well as his stylistic virtues as a translator, the translations leave the overall impression that they were intended to take their place as serious works of Greek literature.

The nature and quality of the translations therefore suggest that Planoudes intended them to be used by scholars like himself, who would find their contents relevant to their own interests and who would appreciate their elegant rhetorical style. These considerations argue against the view that Planoudes translated them purely for private motives. The first editor of the *Metamorphoses* portrayed the translations as Planoudes' practice exercises for learning Latin,⁶⁶ and a recent scholar considers the *Metamorphoses* translation Planoudes' private rhetorical exercise in paraphrasing between languages and genres (Latin to Greek, poetry to prose), never intended for circulation.⁶⁷ However, the autograph manuscripts of Planoudes' *Metamorphoses* and *Heroides*⁶⁸ reinforce the impression made by the translations themselves that Planoudes designed them for a discriminating audience, since both

⁶³ Papat homopoulos (*supra* n.4) XLIX–LIII.

⁶⁴ Pavano (*supra* n.61) 160–163.

⁶⁵ Elizabeth A. Fisher, *Planoudes' Greek Translation of Ovid's Metamorphoses* (New York 1990) 69–98.

⁶⁶ Boissonade (*supra* n.55) x.

⁶⁷ Albrecht Dihle, "Zu den Ovid-Übersetzungen des Maximus Planudes," in *Ovid, Werke und Wirkung: Festgabe für Michael von Albrecht*, ed. Werner Schubert (Frankfurt 1999) II 995, 999–1002.

⁶⁸ *Vat. regin. gr.* 132 and 133. Alexander Turyn identified these autographs in a personal letter to N. G. Wilson; cf. Manoles Papat homopoulos, "À propos de la Métaphrase Planudéenne des Héroides d'Ovide," *Φίλτρα. Τιμητικός τόμος Σ. Γ. Καψυμένου* (Thessalonika 1975) 118.

autographs are meticulously formatted, neatly annotated, and presented in a careful calligraphic hand.⁶⁹

Some scholars have inferred broad cultural motives for Planoudes' translations from Latin literature. Hans Georg Beck suggests that Planoudes intended to enrich the literary repertoire of his educated contemporaries, slightly weary of the static canon of Greek literature so familiar to them.⁷⁰ To Marcello Gigante, Planoudes was a thoughtful impresario of Latin culture, conscious of his mission to present well-regarded western works of high literary value to his scholarly Greek colleagues.⁷¹ Philip Stadter observes that Planoudes' translations gave Greek readers a better understanding of the western mindset.⁷² These three *aperçus* are fully consistent with the sophisticated literary style of the translations and suggest a conscious cultural purpose behind them. Perhaps Planoudes hoped to temper his compatriots' general dislike of the Latins and their ways by presenting works of Latin literature not only fully comparable in quality and interest to the venerable masterpieces of the Greek literary tradition but also representing an authentic aspect of the cultural life of the West.

Is such a purpose for translation plausible in thirteenth-century Byzantium? Ideally, it would be possible to compare Planoudes' translation activity with that of other Byzantine scholars of the Palaiologan period who translated comparable foreign literary works and explained their motivation for doing so. Unfortunately, no such translations exist. I would therefore like to offer an alternative based in British literature of the nineteenth century. Sir Richard F. Burton's unexpurgated version of

⁶⁹ I am grateful to the staff of the Vatican Library for the opportunity to examine these manuscripts in the summer of 2000.

⁷⁰ Beck (*supra* n.7) 45.

⁷¹ Gigante (*supra* n.61) 105–107.

⁷² Philip A. Stadter, "Planudes, Plutarch and Pace of Ferrara," *IMU* 16 (1973) 159.

the *Arabian Nights*, privately published in 1885–1888 by the Burton Ethnological Society under the title *The Book of the Thousand Nights and a Night*, yields fruitful results when compared to Planoudes' literary translations.⁷³ Since Planoudes has left us no discussion either of his techniques or of his intentions as a translator, these may only be inferred from the translations themselves and from the cultural and historical circumstances under which he worked. In contrast, Sir Richard Burton prefaced his translation by discussing extensively his translation technique, the circumstances surrounding his translation, and, most useful for this study, his motives and intentions as a translator.⁷⁴

Although Byzantines of the thirteenth century and Englishmen of the nineteenth were constrained by historical circumstance to interact with members of a foreign culture, the culture of the Latin West was no more familiar in Constantinople than the culture of the Arab world in London. Burton focuses upon the consequences of such cultural ignorance as he laments, "Apparently England is ever forgetting that she is at present the greatest Mohammedan empire in the world ... and her crass ignorance concerning the Oriental peoples which should most interest her, exposes her to the contempt of Europe as well as of the Eastern world" (preface, xxvi). We might imagine Planoudes complaining with equal justice, "Although we Greeks must deal with the Latins as men of power and influence, our people know nothing of their culture and are rightly derided for this willful ignorance." Planoudes and Burton set about to remedy

⁷³ Undoubtedly, other translations in other literary traditions could be identified which resemble Planoudes'. However, I have chosen Burton's *Arabian Nights* because English prose of the nineteenth century, like Greek of the thirteenth, was based upon the study of ancient classical literature and adhered to classical canons of style. English literature is also relatively more familiar to me than other literary traditions of the West.

⁷⁴ For the reader's convenience, I cite Burton's preface as reprinted in the Modern Library edition (New York 2001) xxiii–xxxvi.

this situation using notably similar strategies. Both invested significant effort to translate lengthy works of no obvious utilitarian value but of great significance to the cultures which produced and valued them. Planoudes translated four “best sellers” of the medieval Latin West, and Burton observes that *The Thousand Nights* enjoyed universal popularity throughout the Arab world (xxiv–xxv). Since neither translation appears with text in the original language but both are annotated, the translators did not intend their audiences to study the language of the original works but rather the content. Accuracy in translation and readability were thus important. Analysis of Planoudes’ translations reveals that they are fairly literal versions of the original Latin texts but also elegant contributions to contemporary Byzantine literature; Burton articulates the goal of such a translation when he observes, “the object of this version is to show what “The Thousand Nights and a Night” really is. Not ... by straining *verbum reddere verbo*, but by writing as the Arab would have written in English ... My work claims to be a faithful copy of the great Eastern Saga-book, by preserving intact, not only the spirit, but even the *mécanique*, the manner and the matter” (xxviii). Burton concludes his prefatory remarks with a statement of cultural purpose for his translation which also asserts its political utility: “He will not think lightly of my work when I repeat to him that with the aid of my annotations ... the student will readily and pleasantly learn more of the Moslem’s manner and customs, laws and religion than is known to the average Orientalist ... He who would deal with [Moslems] successfully must be, firstly, honest and truthful and, secondly, familiar with and favourably inclined to their manners and customs if not to their law and religion” (xxxv–xxxvi).

Planoudes’ Byzantine compatriots, forced into interaction with the West by historical circumstance, could only succeed in

that interaction if they tempered their traditional dislike and distaste for unfamiliar and offensive Latin customs with some understanding and appreciation of Latin culture. Planoudes, like Burton, presented his compatriots with a literary key to a foreign culture, so they might “deal successfully” with its members. Like Burton and (to a lesser degree) like Holobolos, Planoudes was a scholar with a cultural mission motivated by positive political goals.

Translation could indeed be a high mission, but it need not be a grim one. Holobolos implies and Burton clearly expresses pure personal pleasure in the process of translating serious literature from a foreign culture’s language into his own. Burton opens his preface by confiding, “This work, laborious as it may appear, has been to me a labour of love, an unfailing source of solace and satisfaction” (xxiv). Albrecht Dihle has suggested that Planoudes also found genuine intellectual satisfaction in translating, because he regarded the process as a stimulating extension of the traditional Byzantine rhetorical exercise in paraphrasing between various linguistic levels of Greek. Planoudes, however, took paraphrase into a new dimension by moving between two literary languages, Latin and Greek.⁷⁵

I do not intend to imply by this comparison of Planoudes’ and Burton’s translations that their personalities and lives were at all similar. Burton was a quirky individualist with a taste for the exotic and unconventional, a rather tragic figure who notes bitterly in his preface the “despotism of the lower ‘middle-class’ Philister who can pardon anything but superiority” and admits “professionally speaking, I was not a success” (xxv). Planoudes, in contrast, fulfilled the duties of a teacher, scholar, and monk with quiet distinction and died revered by his students and his fellow scholars alike.⁷⁶ It is only the motives of Burton

⁷⁵ Dihle (*supra* n.67) 994–995, 1002.

⁷⁶ Cf. Constantinides (*supra* n.3) 87–88.

the translator that may realistically be extended to Planoudes as well. The ambitious cultural goals of these two translators as well as the more limited scholarly motives of Planoudes' contemporary Holobolos were realized in translations which established a basis for respect and intellectual community between two very different cultures with conflicting political aspirations. The admirable spirit uniting Holobolos, Planoudes, and Burton challenges contemporary scholars to emulate their motives in the midst of the new and troubling cultural conflicts so familiar today in our shrinking world.⁷⁷

January, 2003

Department of Classical and Semitic
Languages and Literatures
The George Washington University
Washington, DC 20052
eaf@gwu.edu

⁷⁷ I am grateful to Denis Sullivan and to anonymous readers for *GRBS*, whose insightful comments and perceptive criticism have improved this article immeasurably.