

- Perczel, *Notes*: I. Perczel, *Notes sur la pensée systématique d'Évagre le Pontique*, dans: M. Girardi – M. Marin (éds), *Origene e l'alessandrinismo cappadoce (III-IV secolo) (Quaderni di «Vetera Christianorum»)*, Bari, 2002, p. 277-296.
- Perczel, *Une théologie*: I. Perczel, *Une théologie de la lumière: Denys l'Aréopagite et Évagre le Pontique*, dans: *Revue des Études Augustiniennes* 45 (1999), p. 79-120.
- Uthemann, *Protologie und Eschatologie*: K.-H. Uthemann, *Protologie und Eschatologie. Zur Rezeption des Origenes im 4. Jahrhundert vor dem Ausbruch der ersten origenistischen Kontroverse*, dans: W.A. Bienert – U. Kühneweg (éds), *Origeniana Septima. Origenes in den Auseinandersetzungen des 4. Jahrhunderts (Bibliotheca Ephemeridum Theologicarum Lovaniensium, 137)*, Leuven, 1999, p. 417-458.

Munitiz 2004

IN THE STEPS OF ANASTASIIUS OF SINAI:
LATER TRACES OF HIS *EROTAPOKRISEIS*

JOSEPH A. MUNITIZ

Certain writers have the good fortune to produce works, which may not be of first-class value, but which somehow satisfy the needs of very many readers. This is the phenomenon, dear to publishers, of the “best-seller”. And something of this sort seems to have happened with the collection of “questions-and-answers” (*erotapokriseis*) that originated around the year 700 and was attributed to Anastasius of Sinai. It was copied and re-copied, then adapted and revised, and later translated (at least into Slavonic, but probably into other languages), excerpted and further adapted. Thus apart from the “Original Collection” (which contained just over one hundred *erotapokriseis*) other derivative collections exist, the most widespread being that of (probably at first) twenty-three questions (with *florilegia* of other patristic texts attached), later expanded to eighty-eight questions. This was combined with the Original Collection to form “Collection a”, that was eventually published in the Migne edition (PG 89). But smaller collections (b, c and d) also appeared, their link with the Original Collection varying in strength. The evidence for this process is spread through literally hundreds of manuscripts spanning many centuries¹. However, it is more difficult to find explicit references to, or comments on, the Anastasian *erotapokriseis*, and usually the evidence is indirect.

¹ M. Richard first identified the Original Collection (*Bulletin d'Information de l'Institut de Recherche et d'Histoire des Textes* 15 [1967-68], p. 39-56 [subs. publ. *Opera Minora* III, Turnhout – Leuven, 1977, n. 64]), and distinguished it from the others. He collected information about some hundred manuscripts that contain Anastasian *erotapokriseis*. For an independent survey, cf. M.V. Bibikov, *Vizantijskij Prototip Drevn'ejshej Slav'anskoj Knigi*, Moscow, 1996. Further information on some of the adaptations made of the original collection is given in my edition forthcoming in the *Corpus Christianorum. Series Graeca*.

λουθεῖν γνησίως δυνάμενον, ὡσαύτως δὲ καὶ εἴ τις τῶν ὑστέρων
Ἄναστασίῳ συνάδει τῆς ὁμοίας ἕξεως ὄν⁴⁸.

Even if Gennadius is using a version of Anastasius equipped with florilegia, and therefore not the original collection, he is aware of the influence that Anastasius has had. Clearly his reaction is that of a professional speculative theologian to one whose primary interest was pastoral, but his intellectual calibre forces him — despite his respect for the sanctity of Anastasius — to voice his dissent on this particular point.

CONCLUSION

The popularity of Anastasius, the starting point of this investigation, has received even further confirmation. At various points of Byzantine history — and probably there are several more — we find his *erotapokriseis* being mentioned explicitly as a well-known work of reference. However hints were also noticed that his work failed to win unqualified approval. As far as one can see, they are not mentioned by John Damascene. They had to be “revised”, or were most lavishly praised by authors whose own credentials were slightly dubious, or who seem driven by a hidden agenda (to win support for a view not universally accepted) — as in the case of Blemmydes. The verdict of Gennadius — “a saint, yes, a theologian, no” — is where this study leads us. But then, Anastasius seems to have been aiming at a different audience, one made up of simple believers, whether religious or lay, rather than theologians. The title that fits him most is that of “spiritual father”, and here his *erotapokriseis* probably deserve their popularity.

⁴⁸ L. Petit, X.A. Sideridès, M. Jugie (eds.), *Gennade Scholarius, Œuvres complètes*, vol. 1, Paris, 1928, p. 440, 21-29 [my italics].

THE INTRODUCTION OF OLD CHURCH SLAVONIC TO THE FIRST BULGARIAN EMPIRE: THE RÔLE OF SS CYRIL AND METHODIUS*

BRONWEN NEIL

I. INTRODUCTION: THE EVOLUTION OF OLD CHURCH SLAVONIC

The development of an alphabet for the early Slavonic language, traditionally ascribed to Constantine (the saint later known as Cyril) (c. 826-869) was a momentous one for the history of the Slavs. Constantine and his brother Methodius, natives of Thessalonike and speakers of the local Slavic dialect, were the first chosen for the Byzantine mission to Moravia in 863 by Emperor Michael III. Methodius, then living as a monk on Mt Olympus, had administrative experience from his period as governor of a Byzantine province. Constantine, a priest and former *chartophylax* (librarian and archivist) of the patriarch of Constantinople, was a brilliant linguist, trained in rhetoric and Christian philosophy. Together they translated Scriptures and liturgical texts from Greek into what is now called ‘Old Church Slavonic’ (OCS), the first written codification of a number of dialects which were mutually intelligible. Our sources for the circumstances of this significant linguistic event are unfortunately mostly of a hagiographical nature, if they are Slavonic, and openly hostile, if they are Byzantine. Both obscure the political dimensions of this process of acculturation. Michael’s commission is presented, in the ninth-century Slavonic *Life of Constantine* and the eleventh-century *Life of Kliment of Ochrid*, simply as the imperial response to the request of the Moravian prince Ratislav for a teacher who could teach them in their own language ‘the true Christian religion’¹. Just who had the better

* The research for this paper was undertaken with the support of a Fellowship from the Australian Research Council. I am indebted to Prof. Judith Herrin for suggesting the subject, and to Dr Jan van Ginkel for comments on the draft.

¹ *Vita Constantini*, ch. 14, ed. P.A. Lavrov, *Materialy po Istorii Voznikoveniya Drevneyshey Slavyanskoy Pis'mennosti*, in: *Trudy Slavyanskoy Komissii*, I, Leningrad, 1930. Other editions include F. Pasternek, *Dějiny Slovanských Apostolů Cyrilla a Methoda*, Prague, 1902; F. Grivec and F. Tomšić, *Constantinus et Methodius Thessalonicenses: Fontes*, Zagreb, 1960; and a French translation by F. Dvornik, *Les Légendes de Constantin et de Méthode vues de Byzance*, Prague, 1933.