



✓  
**ANALECTA  
BOLLANDIANA**

**REVUE CRITIQUE D'HAGIOGRAPHIE**

**TOME 91**

**PUBLIÉ PAR**

**BAUDOIN DE GAIFFIER, FRANÇOIS HALKIN  
PAUL DEVOS, JOSEPH VAN DER STRAETEN**

**BOLLANDISTES**

Tous droits de reproduction strictement réservés pour tous pays

IMPRIMERIE CULTURA · WETTEREN · BELGIQUE

**B - 1040 BRUXELLES  
SOCIÉTÉ DES BOLLANDISTES  
24, BOULEVARD SAINT-MICHEL  
1973**

## ABRÉVIATIONS

- BHG* = *Bibliotheca hagiographica graeca*. Editio tertia, curante F. HALKIN. Bruxellis, 1957. Tomi tres.
- BHG<sup>a</sup>* ou *BHG<sup>n</sup>* = *Auctarium Bibliothecae hagiographicae graecae*, par F. HALKIN. Bruxelles, 1969.
- BHL* = *Bibliotheca hagiographica latina antiquae et mediae aetatis*. Bruxellis, 1898-1901. Tomi duo. — *Eiusdem Supplementi editio altera auctior*. Ibidem, 1911.
- BHO* = *Bibliotheca hagiographica orientalis*. Bruxellis, 1910.
- Catal. Graec. Germ.* = *Catalogus codicum hagiographicorum graecorum Germaniae Belgii Angliae*. Bruxellis, 1913.
- Catal. Graec. Paris.* = *Catalogus codicum hagiographicorum graecorum bibliothecae nat. Parisiensis*. Bruxellis, 1896.
- Catal. Graec. Vatic.* = *Catalogus codicum hagiographicorum graecorum bibliothecae Vaticanae*. Bruxellis, 1899.
- Catal. Lat. Brux.* = *Catalogus codicum hagiographicorum bibliothecae regiae Bruxellensis*. Pars I. Codices latini membranei. Bruxellis, 1886-1889. Tomi duo.
- Catal. Lat. Paris.* = *Catalogus codicum hagiographicorum latinorum... qui asservantur in bibliotheca nationali Parisiensi*. Bruxellis, 1889-1893. Tomi quattuor.
- Catal. Lat. Rom.* = *Catalogus codicum hagiographicorum latinorum bibliothecarum Romanarum*. Bruxellis, 1909.
- Catal. Lat. Vatic.* = *Catalogus codicum hagiographicorum latinorum bibliothecae Vaticanae*. Bruxellis, 1910.
- Comm. martyr. hieron.* = *Commentarius in Martyrologium hieronymianum*. Bruxellis, 1931 (*Acta Sanctorum Novembris*, t. 2, pars posterior).
- Comm. martyr. rom.* = *Martyrologium romanum... scholiis historicis instructum*. Bruxellis, 1940 (*Acta Sanctorum, Propylaeum ad Acta SS. Decembris*).
- Mss grecs Paris* = *Manuscrits grecs de Paris, Inventaire hagiographique*, par F. HALKIN. Bruxelles, 1968.
- Synax. Eccl. CP.* = *Synaxarium Ecclesiae Constantinopolitanae*, ed. H. DELEHAYE. Bruxellis, 1902 (*Acta Sanctorum, Propylaeum ad Acta SS. Novembris*).

## QUATRE MARTYRS DE NOVIODUNUM (SCYTHIE MINEURE)

Une nouvelle basilique vient d'être découverte, en 1971, sur le territoire de la bourgade de Niculițel en Roumanie, à quelques kilomètres de la ville danubienne d'Isaccea (l'antique *Noviodunum*). Les fouilles en cours en ont déjà dégagé une partie, ainsi que la crypte aménagée sous l'autel. A l'intérieur de celle-ci, à gauche, on lit ces mots peints en lettres rouges de 7 à 8 cm de haut :

†  
*MARTYPEC XPICTOY*

et, sur le mur de droite, cette autre inscription, de même couleur et ayant elle aussi les caractéristiques paléographiques du IV<sup>e</sup>-V<sup>e</sup> siècle :

†  
*MARTYPEC*  
*ZOTIKOC*  
*ATTALOC*  
*KAMACIC*  
*ΦΙΛΙΠΠOC*<sup>1</sup>

A l'intérieur de la crypte, une grande caisse en sapin, relativement bien conservée, renfermait les squelettes des quatre martyrs en assez bon état de conservation, leurs têtes exceptées<sup>2</sup>.

Le jeune archéologue Victor-H. Baumann, qui a inauguré ainsi sa carrière avec éclat, a vainement essayé d'identifier les martyrs Zoticos, Attalos, Kamasis et Philippe. Seul Philippe, nous dit-il,

<sup>1</sup> Voir le hors-texte à la fin de cet article.

<sup>2</sup> Victor-Heinrich BAUMANN, *Considerații preliminare asupra bazilicii creștine din satul Niculițel (jud. Tulcea)*, dans *Pontica*, t. 5 (Constanța, 1972), p. 547-564 (avec 12 fig. et résumés en français et en allemand), et *Bazilica cu « martyricon » (sic) din epoca romanității țării, descoperită la Niculițel (jud. Tulcea)*, dans *Buletinul Monumentelor Istorice*, t. 41, II (1972), p. 17-26 avec 16 illustrations.

## « ORATIONES CYPRIANI »

H. von Soden, qui a analysé sommairement la tradition manuscrite des deux longues prières connues sous le nom d'*Orationes Cypriani*<sup>1</sup>, n'a pu connaître l'usage qu'en ont fait deux lettrés du moyen âge. Abusivement convaincus que les *Orationes* étaient dues à l'évêque de Carthage, ils s'en sont servis pour étoffer le récit de sa Passion : l'un a mis les deux prières sur les lèvres du martyr juste avant son exécution (voir le ms. 35 du Séminaire de Trèves ; XIII<sup>e</sup> s.) ; l'autre s'est contenté de reproduire, dans le même contexte, une recension courte de l'*Oratio secunda* (voir le ms. XIII<sup>e</sup> de la Valli-celliana ; XI<sup>e</sup> s.).

Les *Orationes Cypriani* comptent parmi les expressions les plus caractéristiques du genre littéraire représenté, dans les chansons de geste, par le « credo épique » ou la « prière du plus grand péril »<sup>2</sup>.

Guy PHILIPPART

<sup>1</sup> Dans *Texte und Untersuchungen*, N.F., t. 10/3 (1904), p. 222. Édition des deux *Orationes* par W. Hartel (dans le *CSEL*, t. 3/3, 1871, p. 144-151) ; édition améliorée de l'*Oratio II* par Harnack (dans *Texte und Untersuchungen*, N.F., t. 4/3b, 1899). Pour Harnack, les deux prières sont du gallo-romain Cyprien (vers 400) ; pour d'autres, elles ont un original grec. Sur les prières prêtées à « Cyprien », tant en Orient qu'en Occident, voir *Reallexikon für Antike und Christentum*, t. 3 (1957, col. 474-475, 479-480) ; voir aussi la *BHG* et son *Auctarium*, nos 460-461e et 2090. — A. Wilmart a découvert l'*Oratio II* parmi les sources du manuel de prières de S. Jean Gualbert (voir *Revue Bénédictine*, t. 48, 1936, p. 281, n. 1).

<sup>2</sup> Le rapprochement entre les *Orationes* et le « credo épique », qui m'a d'abord été suggéré par le P. de Gaiffier, ne paraît pas avoir été signalé jusqu'ici. Sur le genre littéraire du « credo épique » voir les travaux d'E.-R. Labande (dans le *Recueil de travaux offerts à M. Clovis Brunel*, t. 2, 1955, p. 62-80), de J. Frappier (*Les chansons de geste du cycle de Guillaume d'Orange*, t. 2, Paris, 1965, p. 132-140) et de G. Raynaud de Lage (dans *Romania*, t. 93, 1972, p. 568-570). Le P. de Gaiffier a analysé ce type de prière dans la littérature hagiographique (voir *Subsidia hagiographica*, n° 43, 1967, p. 58-60) et L. Gougaud a réuni une abondante documentation sur sa présence dans la liturgie (dans les *Ephemerides liturgicae*, t. 49, 1935, p. 25-27).

## AN EARLY SYRIAC LIFE OF MAXIMUS THE CONFESSOR<sup>1</sup>

To James Drescher  
aet. LXX.

What little that is known of the Life of Maximus the Confessor has to be gleaned from the highly eulogistic Greek biography<sup>2</sup>, chance remarks in various writings of Maximus himself<sup>3</sup>, and occasional details to be found in other sources. The Syriac Life published below, which is almost certainly of Maronite origin, now happily throws some further light, from a totally unexpected angle, on certain periods of Maximus' life, and provides us, among other things, with completely new information about the events leading up to the *Ekthesis*.

The document in question is described in its title as a *taš'itā*, or 'narrative', 'history', and, since numerous Syriac Lives of saints are similarly entitled 'histories', I have for convenience throughout

<sup>1</sup> Abbreviations : HEFELE-LECLERCQ = C. HEFELE - H. LECLERCQ, *Histoire des Conciles* ; MANSI = J. D. MANSI, *Sacrorum Conciliorum Nova et Amplissima Collectio* ; MS = J. B. CHABOT (ed.), *Chronique de Michel le Syrien* (rp Brussels, 1963) ; SHERWOOD = P. SHERWOOD, *An Annotated Date-List of the Works of Maximus the Confessor* (= *Studia Anselmiana* t. 30, 1952) ; STRATOS II = A. N. STRATOS, *Byzantium in the Seventh Century*, II : 634-641 (Amsterdam, 1972) ; STRATOS IV = A. N. STRATOS, *To Byzantion ston z' aiōna*, IV : 642-668 (Athens, 1972) ; VAN DIETEN = J. L. VAN DIETEN, *Geschichte der Patriarchen von Sergios I. bis Johannes VI. (610-715)* (Amsterdam, 1972). I take the opportunity to thank Père P. Devos for a number of valuable comments, and for adding the references to VAN DIETEN, which was not available to me.

<sup>2</sup> *BHG*<sup>3</sup>, no 1234. In several recensions ; see R. DEVRESSE, *La Vie de S. Maxime le Confesseur et ses recensions*, in *Anal. Boll.*, t. 46 (1928), p. 5-49. Details of the related Georgian Life are given by PEETERS in *Anal. Boll.*, t. 32 (1913), p. 456-9.

<sup>3</sup> See especially SHERWOOD, p. 24-56.

referred to the work as a 'Life', even though it should probably not be classified as a 'Life' in the technical sense of that word.

Although the writer of the Life is an opponent of Maximus' dyothelete theology and cannot resist here and there inserting an opprobrious epithet, his narrative is on the whole remarkably matter of fact, having none of the usual characteristics of Lives of arch-heretics, and there seems no good reason why we should not believe his credentials (given in §§ 5 and 11) and accept that the author was indeed a certain George<sup>1</sup> of Resh'aina, a member of Sophronios' clergy, and eyewitness to some of the events he describes. And even should his credentials not be accepted, the Life is definitely an early one, for the manuscript which contains it has been dated by Wright to the seventh or eighth century<sup>2</sup>, and it is certainly not the author's autograph.

The Syriac Life of Maximus is to be found in a unique manuscript in the British Museum, *BM Add. 7192*, ff. 72<sup>b</sup>-78<sup>b</sup><sup>3</sup>. In its present form this codex consists of two separate manuscripts<sup>4</sup> of completely different provenance: ff. 1-50 consist of a seventh century<sup>5</sup> manuscript of part of the polemic against Damian by the Syrian Orthodox Patriarch of Antioch, Peter of Callinikos<sup>6</sup>, while ff. 51-78 contain a collection of six short texts, four of which are specifically anti-dyothelete in character, in a seventh/eighth century<sup>5</sup> hand. The Life, sadly incomplete at the end, comes last in the collection.

The various texts to be found in the second half of Add. 7192 are as follows:

- (1) ff. 51<sup>a</sup>-57<sup>b</sup>: Fragment of the *Julian Romance*; published by HOFFMANN in *Julianos der Abtrünnige*, pp. 242-59 (cp also NÖLDEKE, in *ZDMG*, t. 28 (1874), p. 660-74).

<sup>1</sup> See below, p. 332f.

<sup>2</sup> See note 5.

<sup>3</sup> ROSEN-FORSHALL, *Catalogue...*, p. 83-4 (no 51).

<sup>4</sup> See WRIGHT, *Catalogue...*, p. 1206; this was not recognized by ROSEN-FORSHALL (BAUMSTARK was no doubt misled by this into stating that the anti-Maximianist questions in the second half of the manuscript were of Jacobite origin: *Geschichte der syrischen Literatur* (Bonn, 1922), p. 247).

<sup>5</sup> These dates are WRIGHT's (and seem to me highly plausible); ROSEN-FORSHALL dated the manuscript (as a whole) to the 10th century, which is far too late.

<sup>6</sup> See BAUMSTARK, *op. cit.*, p. 177.

- (2) ff. 57<sup>b</sup>-65<sup>b</sup>: Astronomical and meteorological work ascribed to Dionysios the Areopagite; published by KUGENER in *Actes du XIV<sup>e</sup> Congrès International des Orientalistes, Alger 1905* (Paris, 1907), pp. 137-98 (text on pp. 146-64).
- (3) ff. 66<sup>a</sup>-<sup>b</sup>: An acephalous text containing a series of reasons why « we » censure the (VIth) Council. This interesting text is published by me in *Oriens Christianus*, t. 57 (1973), under the title *A Syriac fragment on the Sixth Council*.
- (4) ff. 66<sup>b</sup>-71<sup>a</sup>: Questions to be posed to the Maximianists on their belief in two wills (in Christ); containing 26 sections.
- (5) ff. 71<sup>a</sup>-72<sup>b</sup>: Questions to be posed to the Maximianoi on their belief in two operations (in Christ); containing 11 sections.
- (6) ff. 72<sup>b</sup>-78<sup>b</sup>: The Life of Maximus, published below.

The title of the Syriac Life at once indicates its monothelite<sup>1</sup> provenance, thanks to the epithet given to Maximus: « The history concerning the wicked Maximus of Palestine who blasphemed against his creator, and whose tongue was cut out ». It is intriguing that the words « wicked » and « blasphemed » have been carefully scratched out by a later reader: one may speculate that this took place at a time when the Maronites were keen to rebuff charges that they were monothelites; unfortunately nothing is known of the later history of the manuscript.

After the text and translation I give a commentary on points which arise immediately from the text, while the more general discussion of authorship, use of the Life by later Syriac writers, and its significance, are left until the end.

In the few places where I depart from the text of Add. 7192 the reading of this manuscript is given in the apparatus. The translation aims to be literal rather than literary. For convenience of reference section numbers have been introduced.

<sup>1</sup> I employ the terms 'monothelite' and 'dyothelete' simply for convenience, and *sine ira et studio*.

















### Translation

The narrative concerning the wicked Maximos of Palestine, who blasphemed against his creator and his tongue was cut out.

1. This Maximos was from the village of Heşfin, for it was there that this bitter tare was born, his father being a Samaritan from Sychar (ŞKR), while his mother was a Persian, the slave-girl of a certain Jew named Zadok from the town of Tiberias. Now the father of this Maximos used to go and sell his work in Tiberias — he was a maker of linen, and he sold luxurious goods — and when he was in Tiberias, next door to the house of Zadok, he committed adultery with the Persian slave-girl, for she was very pretty. And when she became pregnant she told him on the next occasion that he came to sell his work : « Either ransom me from my master before he notices my state and disgraces me, or I will inform on you at once, and they will seize you and you will become an object of ridicule and scorn ; for I am certainly pregnant ». He, being placed in an awkward position, took two hundred darics and ransomed her from Zadok her master.

2. When his relations and fellow Samaritans saw what he had done they were in great consternation, and they all met together and told him : « Either allow us to burn this pregnant woman in order to remove the disgrace from us and our people, or we will expel you from our community ». But he was unwilling to consent to them in this, saying « Although I agree to do what you want, I shall not carry it out to-day ». They, however, were plotting to kill him, and the girl with him, secretly ; but when he learnt of their plot against him, he made his escape by night, taking her with him. He arrived at the above-mentioned village of Heşfin and entered it, going to the house of a priest called Martyrios (MRTWR). He stayed with him for two years, and he and his wife were secretly baptized by him, Maximos' father receiving the name Theonas instead of Abna, and his mother the name Mary instead of ŞNDH — for that was her name in Persian. Now this Martyrios who baptized them was the son of the maternal uncle of Gennadios (GND), the governor who was at that time in charge of Tiberias and all the surrounding area, and it was through his authority that he (Martyrios) escaped any punishment from the Samaritan people.

3. When this fruit of wickedness (i.e. Maximos) was born, this priest Martyrios gave him the name of Moschion (MWSKY) at baptism. The priest Martyrios also gave his parents a place in Heşfin, settling them near himself, on church property. Nine years later his father died of dropsy, leaving his children to the priest Martyrios to act as guardian (*curator*) to them. His mother also

died a year after her husband, as a result of a fall from a pomgranate bush, leaving behind three children in all, two boys and one girl. His sister fell into the grate of a hearth and was badly burnt, as the result of which she died.

4. The priest Martyrios took Moschion to the monastery of Palaia Lavra, where the abbot Pantoleon received him. His younger brother died in this monastery, three years after Moschion's novitiate, as the result of a bite he received from a vicious camel belonging to some orientals who were staying there ; this occurred on the day of the adoration of the holy Cross. Moschion's teacher Pantoleon changed his name to Maximos, after the son of his (Pantoleon's) nephew, of whom he was very fond, but who had died while still a child : it was in memory of him that he gave the name to this rascal.

5. Now this priest Martyrios of Heşfin wrote a record about this Maximos and his father. All this was related to me by the priest Eulogios (ʾWLWGYS), who was closely acquainted with the affairs of the persons mentioned, and who turned his back on their wicked teaching. And all this I have diligently set down — I, Gregorios (GRYGWRY) from Resh'aina, a disciple of Sophronios the bishop of Jerusalem ; I have set down these records for (the benefit of) the faithful : they represent what I have seen, heard, and taken over from persons who are worthy of credence.

6. Now this Pantoleon poured out and filled this disciple of his, Maximos, with the entire bitterness of his evil teaching, finding in him a vessel capable of receiving all the foul dregs of his blasphemy. For I frequently encountered this man full of hateful things, both in disputes and in sophistic discourses, for he was full of a murderous pride, and his tongue was swift in deceitful replies ; for Sophronios used to praise Maximos as someone endowed with a lofty understanding.

7. After his teacher the wicked Origenist Pantoleon had died, this wretch made manifest his fraud, relying henceforth on the leaders and authorities who had accepted the foul teaching of his master. Furthermore he had the opportunity for Sophronios, who had previously been captivated by his error, to show forth his own wickedness openly : Maximos reminded Sophronios, who was in the same error, of the letter in which « Arkadios the archbishop of Cyprus showed you contempt ».

8. Now Sophronios, in that he held a grudge against Arkadios, readily accepted all that the rascal had to say, and Maximos (then) told Sophronios : « Send and gather for me those who are in doubt about this, and I will unite them with a defence ». This Sophronios at once sent a letter to Arkadios, inviting him to send to the holy Kyros of Alexandria and to Honorios patriarch of Rome and to Sergios patriarch of Constantinople, (saying) that there should be a synod and gathering of bishops wherever they liked, and they should make trial of these things, saying « It is not pleasing to the Lord that we should consume the revenues of the sheep and of the church, while there is an upheaval of dissension in our midst ; why

should we come to destruction on behalf of the flock which the head shepherd has entrusted to us? »

9. For there was disagreement and dispute between the patriarchs over this foul doctrine, and Maximos did not cease from causing trouble and disturbance until he had completely corrupted the place where he was and its whole neighbourhood with his foul teaching, saying that « we should not say 'who wast crucified for us' in the Trisagion ». And he wrote four books, acknowledging in them two wills and two energies and two minds, acknowledging everything to do with Christ to be double, apart from the matter of the persons (*qnume*) only.

10. When the holy Arkadios received the letter from Sophronios' notary and from the deacon John, who was going round the churches (*ms sing.*) of Mount Sinai, and when he had read it, he did not delay from carrying this out, and he wrote off sending (letters) to the above-mentioned patriarchs. The holy Kyros of Alexandria did not shrink from the labour of the journey, but came at once without any delay to Arkadios in Cyprus, together with five bishops from his jurisdiction. Honorios sent his deacon Gaios, a virtuous man, wise in understanding and illustrious in the divine scriptures; Sergios, the chaste patriarch of Constantinople, sent to them his archdeacon Petros. And when they (all) arrived in Cyprus Arkadios sent to Sophronios saying « Come to us now, and we will make inquiry into the matters over which the church is disturbed ».

11. When Maximos learnt which bishops were there in Cyprus he was afraid to go (himself), saying « I cannot undertake this to-day, but let Anastasios, my pupil, go with you (*singular*), and I will give him a book on this subject ». So we set off and arrived in the island of Cyprus — I, George, and two of my pupils, together with eight other bishops from Sophronios' jurisdiction.

12. When we arrived they received us with great joy and fitting honour, and on the following morning we sat down to make inquiry into this matter. After much had been said some of the bishops were saying that « we should accept Maximos' doctrine », while others said « No, it is pernicious »; and they decided to put this doctrine down in writing and send it to the victorious emperor Heraklios. When they had done this they sent it by the hands of Georgios (GYWRGY), the archdeacon of the holy Arkadios, bishop of Cyprus, and of Leon, the deacon of the holy Kyros of Alexandria, and of Elias, the notary of Sophronios. Now Sophronios was also afraid of the disturbance that had taken place there because of him shortly before.

13. Those who gathered were forty six persons. When the letter in which Maximos' doctrine was outlined had been written, the holy Arkadios, remembering what had happened to Sophronios' letter which had previously been sent to him, said: « Everyone who accepts this doctrine and believes it from his heart shall be anathema ».

14. Sophronios says to him: « What then do you want — that this should reach the emperor? » Arkadios replies to him: « It is

because of your lack of belief, and because of the false doctrine you and your companions hold, in that you resist the truth ». The holy Kyros of Alexandria, however, gave orders and silenced the dispute by means of a veto, saying: « We did not assemble so as to make strife, but to inquire into and uncover the truth, and to lay bare and refute error ». And thus everyone left for his own city and country, awaiting the outcome of the (letter) that had been sent.

15. When the above-mentioned men reached the imperial city they entered before the victorious emperor Heraklios, and the letter containing the doctrine of Sophronios and the rascal Maximos was read out in their presence, whereupon they perceived that it was alien to the entire Christian teaching. The emperor at once made a document called an 'Edict', and sent it to the four (patriarchal) sees. In it he rejected this despicable doctrine and ordered it to be brought to naught as being pernicious, and he laid down in the definition he made that everyone who confessed (this doctrine), or believed on such lines, should be ejected from his position.

16. When this order from the emperor arrived and was received by the four sees and all the bishops, they added the signatures of their agreement, and anathematized everyone who added or subtracted anything. Thereupon all who held this doctrine were in fear, and in this way there was peace until the death of the victorious emperor Heraklios, and (the doctrine) came to nothing and faded out.

17. Now Maximos confined himself in a small cell out of fear of the emperor and the patriarchs who had anathematized his teaching. Serving him was Anastasios his pupil, as well as his own disciple Sergios. He stayed in this cell until the Arabs appeared and took control of Syria and many other areas.

18. And because heresy is accustomed to join forces with paganism, and to take strength to establish itself as a result of some punishment sent, this wretch (i.e. Maximos), seeing that the land was in the control of the Arabs and there was no longer anyone to restrain and nullify his doctrine, manifested his fraudulence once again openly, and began to sow his teaching among certain individuals in the regions of Syria. And because the victorious emperor Heraklios had died, together with Konstantinos his son and Herakleon and his mother, and Konstans son of Konstantinos, (still) a young child, had received the Roman empire, and because Africa was in rebellion against the emperor at this time, Maximos was encouraged, and at once took Anastasios and the other brethren with him, and they went up and came to Africa.

19. Now Anastasios was well known in these regions, having been born there, as we mentioned before. They set off and arrived at a monastery at the upper tip of Africa, called in Latin Hippo Diarrhytus (PN' ZRTWS), where some students from Nisibis were living. The abbot of the monastery was Esha'ya, and there was his son, called Isho'. There were about eighty seven monks there, and they were Nestorians; and when they found that Maximos and Anasta-



sios agreed in their teaching with Nestorios their master, they received them and agreed with their doctrine. (Thus) they led astray the whole of Africa, and there was no one who disputed with them in Africa, apart from one God-loving recluse whose name was Luke; through him they were refuted by God's might, and he immediately sent (message) about them to Constantinople. It was to this recluse that the holy Makarios, patriarch of Antioch, addressed three books against the doctrine of Maximos.

20. After they had sown their tares and led astray as many as they could in Africa, even deceiving the eparch there, whose name was George (GYWRGY), they then removed from there and came to Sicily, fear of the Arabs having disturbed them — for by their agency the wrath of God had reached the whole of Africa. And when they had made the rounds of all the islands of the sea, they then went up to Rome itself, and by means of their deceitfulness even Martinos the patriarch there was ensnared, and he fully accepted his doctrine, with the result that he gathered a synod of 190 bishops to confirm the doctrine of Maximos.

21. And he anathematized the patriarchs of Constantinople because they had refused to agree with him. For this reason the emperor Konstans was angry with him and sent for him and brought him to the imperial city, urging him to change from his pernicious doctrine. When he remained unpersuaded (the emperor) sent him into exile to Lazika, in the time of the holy Pyrrhos (PWRY), patriarch of that city, and of Makedonios of Antioch; and there he died an evil death. For it was not at Konstans' orders that he became patriarch, but through the fraudulence of some documents he had forged; and through the wiles of a clever man who was a *patrikios*, called Theodoros, he came down to Constantinople.

22. And (all) this 'RMG[.]BWLQR', who succeeded Theodoros the emperor's brother, told me when he came down to pray in the holy city Jerusalem, when there was peace between Mo'awia, the Arab emir, and the emperor Konstans. And all the other things which I am about to write down concern Maximos and Anastasios and those monks who fled from Africa in the face of the Arabs, and went up to Rome to the afore-mentioned Martinos; for I have taken great care to write down this history truthfully.

23. After Maximos went up to Rome the Arabs seized control of the islands of the sea, and entered Cyprus and Arvad, ravaging them and taking (their inhabitants) captive; and they gained control over Africa and subdued virtually all the islands of the Mediterranean (*lit.* the sea). For, following the wicked Maximos, the wrath of God punished every place which had accepted his error.

24. The students who had been in the monastery of Hippo Diarrhytus (PN' ZRTWS), which we mentioned above, fled in front of the Arabs, and came up to Rome, where they were received by Martinos as having the same faith as he, and he gave them a monastery, called in the Latin tongue *Cellae novae* (QLWNWBWS), which means

'nine cells'. And they remained in their error, leading astray all they could.

25. And when Maximos saw that Rome had accepted the foul mire of his blasphemies, he also went down to Constantinople at the time when Mo'awia made peace with the emperor Konstans, having started a war with Abū Turāb, the emir of Hirta, at Šiffin, and defeated him. The emperor Konstans was in Azorbaijan ('DR-WYGN), and at that point Maximos entered Constantinople, hoping to corrupt it too with his deception, just as everywhere else.

26. Maximos immediately went and stayed at a convent of nuns, called Plakidias (PLQYDS), which was in the city; and through his wickedness he was able to lead them astray away from the truth, and he [taught] them his pernicious belief, and he [ ] in the throw[ing] of the offering of [ ]...

### Index of Names

(numbers refer to sections)

- |   |  |
|---|--|
| Abna ('BN'; father of Maximus) 2.                   | (iii) (eparch of Africa) 20.                         |
| Abū Turāb ('BW TWRB; i.e. 'Alī) 25.                 | Gregorios (GRYGRY; corruption of George (i)?) 5.     |
| Africa 18-20, 22-23.                                | Herakleon (HRQLWN) 18.                               |
| Alexandria 8, 10, 12, 14.                           | Heraklios (HRQLY) 12, 15-16, 18.                     |
| Anastasios (pupil of Maximos) 11, 17-19, 22.        | Hešfin (HŠPYN) 1-3, 5.                               |
| Antioch 19, 21.                                     | Hippo Diarrhytus (PN'ZRTWS) 19, 24.                  |
| Arabs (ṬYY') 17-18, 20-24.                          | Hirta 25.  |
| Arkadios ('RQDYS; bishop of Cyprus) 7-8, 10, 12-14. | Honorios 8, 10.                                      |
| 'RMG [.]BWLQR' (?) 22.                              | Isho' ('son' of Esha'ya) 19.                         |
| Arvad ('RWD) 23.                                    | Jerusalem 5, 11, 22.                                 |
| Azorbaijan ('DRWYGN) 25.                            | Jew(s) 1.  |
| Cellae novae (QLWNWBWS) 24.                         | John (YWHNN; deacon) 10.                             |
| Constantinople 8, 10, 19, 21, 25.                   | Konstans 18, 21-22, 25.                              |
| Cyprus 7, 10-12, 23.                                | Konstantinos 18.                                     |
| (see also K)  | Kyros (QWR'; patriarch of Alexandria) 8, 10, 12, 14. |
| Elias (notary of Sophronios) 12.                    | Lazika 21.   |
| Esha'ya (abbot) 19.                                 | Leon (deacon of Kyros) 12.                           |
| Eulogios ('WLWGYS; priest) 5.                       | Luke (recluse) 19.                                   |
| Gaios (deacon of Honorios) 10.                      | Makarios (patriarch of Antioch) 19.                  |
| Gennadios (GND; governor of Tiberias) 2.            | Makedonios (patriarch of Antioch) 21.                |
| Georgios (GYWRGY)                                   | Martinus (pope) 20, 22, 24.                          |
| (i) (author) 5? 11.                                 | Martyrios (MRTWR; priest) 2-5.                       |
| (ii) (archdeacon of Arkadios) 12.                   |  |

- Mary (MRYM; mother of Maximus) 2.  
 Maximos *passim*.  
 Mo'awia 22, 25.  
 Moschion (MWSKY; Maximus' name at birth) 3-4.  
 Nestorians 19.  
 Nestorios 19.  
 Nisibis 19.  
 Origenist 7.  
 Palaia Lavra (PL' LBR'; i.e. St Chariton) 4.  
 Pantoleon (abbot of Palaia Lavra) 4, 6-7.  
 Persian(s) 1-2.  
 Petros (archdeacon of Sergios) 10.  
 Plakidias (PLQYDS) 26.  
 Pyrrhos (PWRY; patriarch of Constantinople) 21.  
 Resh'aina 5.  
 Rome 8, 20-25.
- Samaritan(s) 1-2.  
 Sergios  
 (i) (patriarch of Constantinople) 8, 10.  
 (ii) (disciple of Maximus) 17.  
 Sicily 20.  
 Šiffin (ŠPYN) 25.  
 Sinai 10.  
 ŠNDH (Maximos' mother) 2.  
 Sophronios (patriarch of Jerusalem) 5-8, 10-15.  
 Sychar (ŠKR) 1.  
 Syria 17-18.  
 Theodoros  
 (i) (patrikios) 21.  
 (ii) (brother of Heraklios) 22.  
 Theonas (T'WNWS; father of Maximus) 2.  
 Tiberias 1-2.  
 Zadok (ZD WQ; Jew, of Tiberias) 1.

### Commentary<sup>1</sup>

1. *Hešfin*: in the Golan, east of Lake Tiberias; cp F. M. ABEL, *Géographie de la Palestine* (Paris, 1938), t. II, p. 298.  
*was born*: i.e. 580<sup>2</sup>.

*Persian slave girl*: since Justinian Jews were not allowed to own Christian slaves<sup>3</sup>, and so the word 'Persian' is significant (i.e. Zoroastrian).

*200 darics*: the term 'daric' seems to be confined to Syriac sources at this period<sup>4</sup>; it is not clear to what it is equivalent<sup>5</sup>.

<sup>1</sup> For the general background see (e.g.) L. DUCHESNE, *L'Église au VI<sup>e</sup> siècle* (Paris, 1926), ch. XI-XII, and R. AIGRAIN and L. BRÉHIER in *Histoire de l'Église* (ed. A. FLICHE - V. MARTIN), t. V (Paris, 1938).

<sup>2</sup> That Maximus was 75 in 655 is stated in *PG* t. 90, col. 128; cp V. GRUMEL, *Maxime le confesseur*, in *Échos d'Orient*, t. 26 (1927), p. 25.

<sup>3</sup> J. JUSTER, *Les Juifs dans l'empire romain* (Paris, 1914), t. II, p. 77.

<sup>4</sup> E.g. (ed.) R. RAABE, *Petrus der Iberer*, p. 101; (ed.) J. B. CHABOT, *Chron. anon. ad annum 1234*, I, p. 216; H. POGNON, *Inscriptions sémitiques*, no 82 (of AD 507-8).

<sup>5</sup> The normal price for an adult slave at Byzantium was about 20 nomismata, cp A. HADJINIKOLAOU-MARAVA, *Recherches sur la vie des esclaves dans le monde byzantin* (Athens, 1950), p. 90; compare also E. ASHTOR, *Histoire des prix et des salaires dans l'Orient médiéval* (Paris, 1969), p. 58, 88-9, 498-9, for slave

2. *ŠNDH*: I know of no parallels to the name.

*Gennadios*: otherwise unknown. For the form (GND), compare Armenian *Gind*.

*Samaritan people*: there had been a number of serious uprisings earlier in the century; cp F. M. ABEL, *Histoire de la Palestine* (Paris, 1952), p. 355ff.

3. *Moschion* (MWSKY): this former name of Maximus is not known from other sources.

4. *Palaia Lavra*: i.e. St Chariton, founded by Chariton in the mid fourth century, 2½ km NE of Tekoa; cp S. VAILHÉ, *Répertoire alphabétique des monastères de Palestine*, in *ROC*, t. 5 (1899), 524-5, and IDEM, in *Bessarione*, t. 3 (1897/8), 50-8; also H. LECLERCQ in *DACL VIII*, 2, cols 1970-3. Nothing is known of its history in the late sixth and early seventh century, and the name of the abbot is new.

*Adoration of the Cross*: 14th September.

5. *Eulogios*: otherwise unknown.

*Gregory*: probably a corruption of George (thus § 11): see p. 332ff.

*disciple*: the description is a little surprising for a self-confessed adversary of Sophronios' theological views, but the term need not necessarily have any reference to doctrinal opinions. Alternatively, Gregory/George may, like Eulogios, have altered his position early in the controversy, or have regarded Sophronios as having changed his views (this is perhaps hinted at in § 7).

*Sophronios*: Patriarch of Jerusalem 634-8. On his life see especially S. VAILHÉ, *Sophrone le sophiste et Sophrone le patriarche*, in *ROC*, t. 7 (1902), pp. 360-85, and 8 (1903) pp. 32-69; also G. BARDY, in *DTC XIV*, 2 (1941) s.n. If Sophronios the patriarch is the same person as Sophronios the sophist, his friendship with Maximus is easily explained: Sophronios the sophist was a monk of the monastery of St Theodosios, not far from St Chariton's. In his writings Maximus mentions Sophronios only three times<sup>1</sup>; at one point<sup>2</sup> he speaks of Sophronios who, having recently become Patriarch of Jerusalem, had inopportunistically brought up the question of the energies: could this have been on the occasion of the Cyprus synod (see below), which Maximus finds it embarrassing to attend? Note that according to Pyrrhos<sup>3</sup> it was Sophronios who first raised the issue of the two energies.

6. *this man*: ambiguous — either Pantoleon or (more likely) Maximus.

7. *Origenist*: the Palaia Lavra had been involved in the Origenist controversies of the mid sixth century<sup>4</sup>. That Maximus had a good

prices in the early Islamic period. For payment by a third party to secure manumission, see HADJINIKOLAOU-MARAVA, *op. cit.*, p. 111.

<sup>1</sup> See SHERWOOD, p. 28-9.

<sup>2</sup> *PG* t. 90, col. 332.

<sup>3</sup> S. *Maximi disputatio cum Pyrrho*, in *PG* t. 91, col. 291.

<sup>4</sup> Cp MS II, p. 433 = IV, p. 423.



knowledge of Origenism is shown by his able refutation of its errors<sup>1</sup>; he was in fact himself accused of Origenism at one point, according to the Greek Life<sup>2</sup>.

*captivated*: the usual picture is of Sophronios influencing Maximus, not *vice versa*<sup>3</sup>.

*Arkadios*: cp R. AIGRAIN in *DHGE* s.n.; for Maximus' references to Arkadios see SHERWOOD, *op. cit.*, p. 62<sup>4</sup>.

*letter of Arkadios*: no such letter survives, but it is very possible that it represented the reply to Sophronios' letter to him on the Trisagion, which survives in extract in Syriac translation<sup>5</sup>. In this letter Sophronios polemicises against the addition of « who was crucified for us » to the Trisagion, evidently in fairly general use in Cyprus<sup>6</sup>; Sophronios represents the issue to Arkadios as a choice between following Peter the Akephalos<sup>7</sup> and the Council of Chalcedon<sup>8</sup>, and the tone of the letter is sometimes such that one can understand that Arkadios might have taken offence, especially since Sophronios can hardly have been patriarch at that time (the letter clearly antedates the main period of the monoenergist controversy).

**8. *inviting him***: why this should have been left to Arkadios is not clear; could it be that Sophronios was not yet Patriarch (although he evidently was by the time the other bishops had arrived in Cyprus; see below)<sup>9</sup>?

*Kyros*: patriarch of Alexandria 630/1-643/4. In this text he is always referred to as *hasya* (the normal honorific for a metropolitan), and never as patriarch. Formerly bishop of Phasis, he was appointed to the see of Alexandria in 630/1 with orders from Heraklios to come to some form of union with the monophysites in Egypt. He was later regarded by the dyotheletes as one of the protagonists of the monothelete party.

*Honorios*: pope from 625-38.

*Sergios*: patriarch of Constantinople from 610-38. Note the absence of Antioch: on the death of the dyophysite Anastasios II in 609 the see was left vacant, since Heraklios evidently had hopes of reaching some sort of union with the monophysites in the east. What was the outcome of these talks (especially those with Athanasios

<sup>1</sup> Cp SHERWOOD, p. 31-2, and *idem*, *The earlier Ambigua of St Maximus the Confessor and his refutation of Origenism* (= *Studia Anselmiana* t. 36, 1955), p. 72ff.

<sup>2</sup> 23 = *PG* t. 91, col. 93-4.

<sup>3</sup> E.g. SHERWOOD, p. 6.

<sup>4</sup> Arkadios died between 638 and 643: cf P. VAN DEN VEN, in *Anal. Boll.*, t. 67 (1949), p. 430-1, and in *La Vie ancienne de S. Syméon le Jeune* (= *Subsidia hagiographica* t. 32, 1962), p. 101-2.

<sup>5</sup> *BM Or.* 8606, ff. 127<sup>a</sup>-140<sup>b</sup>; the translation was made in Edessa in 720/1.

<sup>6</sup> See below, on § 9.

<sup>7</sup> Cp HEFELE-LECLERCQ, 3.1, p. 333-4.

<sup>8</sup> f. 132<sup>b</sup>.

<sup>9</sup> p. 323f.

'the camel-driver') is not clear, but in any case no Chalcedonian patriarch was appointed until 639 (Makedonios)<sup>1</sup>. The author of our Life clearly did not recognize Athanasios' successor John, and regarded the see as vacant.

**9. *Trisagion***: the famous addition to the Trisagion, « who was crucified for us », made by the monophysite Peter the Fuller, was evidently accepted by many Chalcedonians as well in the east, being used by them in the Antioch region during the patriarchate of Ephrem<sup>2</sup>; likewise Sophronios' letter to Arkadios (see above, § 7) shows that the addition was in use among Chalcedonians in Cyprus in the early decades of the seventh century, and according to Michael the Syrian the issue was the cause of open schism among the Chalcedonians of Syria in 727<sup>3</sup>.

*four books*: Maximus' open activity in the controversy at this early date is probably anachronistic, for his first openly anti-monothelete works date only from the 640s<sup>4</sup>.

**10. *John***: otherwise unknown, as are the other lesser clergy mentioned in this paragraph.

*Petros*: see VAN DIETEN, p. 77.

**11. *afraid to go***: see commentary on § 5.

*Anastasios*: well known from other sources.

*Georgios*: contrast § 5, and see below, p. 332f.

*other bishops*: this suggests that George too was of episcopal rank. Sophronios, who was well advanced in years by now, evidently did also go to Cyprus, cp §§ 13-14.

**12. *George... Leon... Elias***: not otherwise known.

*disturbance*: it is not clear to what this refers.

**15. *edict*** ('ydyqtwn): Is this the Ekthesis of 638? Since, however, it is now evident that Sergios' *psephos* of 634 was a very similarly

<sup>1</sup> At an interview with the Emir 'Amr, on 9th May 639, the Syrian Orthodox Patriarch John was regarded as representing the Chalcedonians as well as his own flock: cp F. NAU, *Un colloque du patriarche Jean*, in *Journal asiatique*, XI<sup>e</sup> sér., t. 5 (1915), p. 252-3 (= tr. p. 263).

<sup>2</sup> Ap. Photios § 228 (ed. R. HENRY, IV, p. 115). On the subject see especially J.-M. HANSENS, *Institutiones liturgicae* (Rome, 1932) II, p. 108-51; S. JANERAS, *Les Byzantins et le trisagion christologique*, in *Miscellanea Liturgica... G. Lercaro* (Rome, 1967), II, p. 469-99 (esp. 489ff); also V. GRUMEL, *L'auteur et la date de composition du tropaire ho monogenēs*, in *Échos d'Orient*, 1923, p. 411-2. — In view of the Chalcedonian use of the christological addition, the attribution to the monophysites of several inscriptions from Syria containing it is not fully certain (e.g. *Inscriptions grecques et latines de la Syrie*, t. II, nos 289, 357, 633, 500; III, no 747; IV, no 1726; V, no 2543 [no 2528 has an interesting variant formula, ὑπαχθεῖς δι' ἡμᾶς]). There was a great deal of polemical literature on the subject.

<sup>3</sup> MS II, p. 492-3 = IV, p. 457-8.

<sup>4</sup> SHERWOOD, *passim*. It does not seem possible to identify these four works.

worded document<sup>1</sup>, I am inclined to think that the writer has fused the *psephos* and the *ekthesis* here. This would seem to be supported by the following considerations:

(a) the *psephos*, which was mainly concerned with banning the discussion of the operations, was acceptable to the dyotheletes (to use an anachronistic term): Sophronios duly avoided the prescribed terminology in his synodicon<sup>2</sup>, and Maximus openly praised Sergios for the document<sup>3</sup>. This would suit the ensuing statement in our Life (§ 16) that the four sees accepted the 'edict', for this would hardly be true of the *ekthesis* (most of the holders of the sees in fact died that year, 638).

(b) while the *psephos* was evidently regarded as an authoritative document, and one with imperial backing<sup>4</sup>, it does not appear to have contained any penal clauses, which are implied by the word 'ejected' in our Life; this would, however, eminently suit the *ekthesis*<sup>5</sup>.

In the commentary to §§ 17-18 it is suggested that there may be indications that the synod in Cyprus took place c. 634, around the time that Sophronios came to the patriarchal throne. If there is anything in this, it would appear that the *psephos* was the immediate outcome of this synod.

16. *received by the four sees*: this would suit the *psephos*, but not the *ekthesis* (see on § 15). (It is actually not known whether Honorius' successor, Severinus, condemned the *ekthesis* prior to his own death in August 640).

17. *cell*: where? see below for a suggestion.

*Sergios*: not otherwise known.

*Arabs ... Syria*: the dating is vague: probably some time after the battle of the Yarmuk (636) is intended (Jerusalem did not fall till 638), but in any case this implies that the 'edict' of § 15 cannot simply have been the *ekthesis*, which was only published in 638.

17-18. There is apparent conflict here with what is known from other sources about Maximus' movements at this period. It should be noted that the writer is somewhat hazy about the chronology, since he apparently considered the accession of Constans II (641) to be close in time to the rebellion of Gregory in Africa (647), unless

<sup>1</sup> SHERWOOD, p. 10.

<sup>2</sup> GRUMEL, in *Échos d'Orient*, t. 32 (1929), p. 24ff.

<sup>3</sup> Ep. 19; see SHERWOOD, p. 37-8; GRUMEL, *art. cit.*, p. 31ff.

<sup>4</sup> MANSI XI, 537 (Ep. Sergii ad Honorium): *ἐφ' οἷς ἀντίγραφον πανευσεβῆ κέλευσιν τοῦ πανηγύριον αὐτοῦ ἐδεξάμεθα κράτους...* Cp GRUMEL in *Échos d'Orient*, t. 31 (1928), p. 10ff, and JUGIE in *DTC* X, 2316-7.

<sup>5</sup> Cp the *Gesta* of Sergios, referring to the *Ekthesis*, and quoted at the Lateran Council (649): (anyone who uses the prescribed terminology)... *πάσης εἶναι πεπαισμένον ἱερατικῆς τε καὶ λειτουργίας ὀρίζομεν* (there follow corresponding penalties for monks and laity): MANSI, X, 1000-1.

the 'rebellion' in question has something to do with the recall of the prefect George, c. 642<sup>1</sup>.

Until Devresse published the end of Maximus' Epistle 8<sup>2</sup> it was usually thought that Maximus arrived in Africa about 640 (thus, for example, Diehl)<sup>3</sup>, but the end of this letter, written from Carthage, gives an exact date, the fifteenth indiction, which must be 632. On the basis of this Sherwood<sup>4</sup> suggests that Maximus came to Africa c. 628/30, and the normal assumption is that he remained there continuously until he went to Rome. Perhaps, however, one should envisage two stays in Africa<sup>5</sup>. This in fact would be a necessary deduction if we could be sure that Maximus was in Alexandria with Sophronios in June 633, but this is not entirely certain<sup>6</sup>. In any case, it would seem clear from Maximus' correspondence<sup>7</sup> that he was in close touch with Sophronios in Africa.

It should be stressed that the Syriac Life gives us no information of Maximus' whereabouts at the time of the Cyprus synod, and there is nothing to prevent one from supposing that he was in fact in Africa at the time, and that his suggestion to Sophronios that he try and get a synod held was made, either in Alexandria (if indeed Maximus went there), or in Africa itself, and that some time between then (633) and 641 he returned to Syria-Palestine, where, according to § 18, he was active shortly after the Arab invasions. In the absence of further evidence, however, all this must remain in the realm of speculation.

18. *Heraklios*: died 11 February 641.

*Konstantinos*: died (of poison?) after a few months reign on 24 May 641.

*Herakleon*: he is so called in Theophanes; his proper name was Heraklios (reigned 25 May - end September 641).

*mother*: Martina, disgraced in October 641<sup>8</sup>.

*Konstans*: II, 641-68; he held sole rule from 9 November 641.

*rebellion*: this did not take place till 647<sup>9</sup> (unless the reference is to the recall of the prefect George in c. 642). Compare the telescoping of the same events in the *Anonymous Chronicle ad annum 1234*: « at the turn of the year (sc. after the accession of Constans II,

<sup>1</sup> See under § 18.

<sup>2</sup> *La fin inédite d'une lettre de S. Maxime*, in *Revue des sciences religieuses*, t. 17 (1937), p. 25-35.

<sup>3</sup> C. DIEHL, *L'Afrique byzantine* (Paris, 1896), p. 548.

<sup>4</sup> SHERWOOD, p. 6.

<sup>5</sup> Compare perhaps the Greek Life: *PG* t. 90, cols 75/6 with 81/2.

<sup>6</sup> SHERWOOD, p. 28-9, 52; he is doubtful.

<sup>7</sup> References in SHERWOOD, p. 28-9.

<sup>8</sup> For the background to this see STRATOS II, ch. v.

<sup>9</sup> STRATOS IV, p. 69-70 places it late 646/early 647.

AG 954) Gregorios, patrikios of Africa, rebelled; the same year the Arabs entered Africa »<sup>1</sup>.

19. *mentioned before*: not in the work as we have it; cp p. 332. His African origin is not otherwise known.

PN'ZRTWS: i.e. Hippo Diarrhytos (Bizerta). The transcription (despite the nominative ending -tos) is based on the ablative *Ippone Zare/ito*<sup>2</sup>. The monastery is apparently otherwise unknown.

*Nisibis*: One might conjecture that these were followers of the discredited Henana († c. 610), once head of the Nisibis theological school. Note also the (earlier) connection between Nisibis and North Africa implied by the dedication of the Latin translation of the theological manual of Paul of Nisibis, made by Junilius, to Primasius, bishop of Hadrumetum<sup>3</sup>.

*Esha'ya*: not otherwise known. From other sources it is known that Maximus was in close contact with Thalassios, abbot of a monastery near Carthage<sup>4</sup>.

*son Isho'*: presumably the relationship was spiritual. For a possible identification of Isho', see p. 328.

*Luke*: a letter from Makarios, patriarch of Antioch, to Luke is mentioned in the course of the Acts of the Sixth Council<sup>5</sup>. Note that no mention is made of the famous dispute between Maximus and Pyrrhos<sup>6</sup>, which took place in July 645.

*Makarios*: ? - 685. He was a successor on the patriarchal throne to Makedonios, who died some time after 654<sup>7</sup>, and between Makedonios and Makarios a certain George held the see for an unknown period. Makarios was, of course, the main protagonist for the monothelete party at the Sixth Council. Although deposed at the Council, he would still have been recognised as Patriarch until his death by the monotheletes.

20. *George*: Maximus' good relationship with the eparch George is well known, and a letter addressed to him survives<sup>8</sup>.

<sup>1</sup> Ed. CHABOT, I, p. 266.

<sup>2</sup> For examples of this form, see P. J. MESNAGE, *L'Afrique chrétienne* (Paris, 1912), p. 39-40. A certain Donatus was bishop of Hippo Diarrhytos in 646, cp MANSI X, 939.

<sup>3</sup> PL t. 68, col. 15ff. For Syrian refugees in seventh century Africa, see also R. DEVRESSE, *L'Église d'Afrique durant l'occupation byzantine*, in *Mélanges d'archéologie et d'histoire*, t. 57 (1940), p. 156-7.

<sup>4</sup> Cp H. LECLERCQ, *L'Afrique chrétienne* (Paris, 1904), II, p. 303.

<sup>5</sup> MANSI XI, 513/4, 515/6; HEFELE-LECLERCQ, 3, I, p. 499; cp H. G. BECK, *Kirche und theologische Literatur im byzantinischen Reich* (Munich, 1959), p. 433.

<sup>6</sup> PG t. 91, cols. 287-354.

<sup>7</sup> See on § 21.

<sup>8</sup> PG t. 91, col. 363ff; for other references to George in Maximus' writings, see DEVRESSE in *Revue des sciences religieuses*, t. 17 (1937), p. 32 (with note 3). Cp also STRATOS IV, p. 65.

*Sicily*: a visit to Sicily is implied in one of Maximus' letters<sup>1</sup>.

*Arabs... Africa*: the Arab invasion of Africa took place in 647-8.

*Rome*: the implication is that Maximus spent some time in Sicily and 'the islands' before eventually reaching Rome.

*Martin*: July 649-655. Note that Martin's predecessor, Theodore, was of Palestinian origin<sup>2</sup>.

*synod*: i.e. the Lateran Synod, 5-31 October 649. Caspar<sup>3</sup> showed that the initiative for holding the synod in fact went back to Theodore, and he stresses the important background role of the Greek dyothelete monks who had fled to Rome, prominent among whom, of course, was Maximus<sup>4</sup>.

*190 bishops*: the number is given as 109 in Michael the Syrian<sup>5</sup> and Barhebraeus<sup>6</sup>, and one of these figures will be a corruption of the other: since totally independent sources give 105<sup>7</sup> and 150<sup>8</sup>, the smaller figure should be preferred.

21. *patriarchs of Constantinople*: i.e. Sergios, Pyrrhos and Paul. These men are specifically anathematized, along with Kyros and Theodore of Pharan, in the 18th canon<sup>9</sup>.

*Lazika*: other sources give the Cherson. There is probably a confusion in the author's mind with Maximus' place of exile.

*Pyrrhos*: now on the patriarchal throne of Constantinople for the second time: this provides a date between 8/9 January and 1 June 654.

*Makedonios*: Grumel<sup>10</sup> dates his patriarchate from 639 to some time after 649. The synchronism in the Syriac Life here shows that he was still alive in the first half of 654.

*death*: 655.

*not at Konstans' orders*: Martin was consecrated on 5 July 649 without waiting for imperial approval: compare MANSI X, 852: *irregulariter et sine lege episcopatum surripuisset*. For the political background to Martin's activities, see especially CASPAR, *art. cit.*,

<sup>1</sup> PG t. 91, col. 133.

<sup>2</sup> L. DUCHESNE, *Liber pontificalis*, I, p. 331.

<sup>3</sup> E. CASPAR, *Die Lateransynode von 649*, in *Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte*, t. 51 (1932), p. 75-137.

<sup>4</sup> Cp also W. M. PEITZ, *Maximos Confessor*, in *Historisches Jahrbuch*, t. 38 (1917), p. 213-36, 429-58. For further connections between Rome and Palestine, see commentary to § 24.

<sup>5</sup> MS II, p. 431 = IV, p. 421.

<sup>6</sup> *Chron. Eccl.* (ed. ABBELOOS-LAMY), col. 277.

<sup>7</sup> MANSI X, 863/4.

<sup>8</sup> Theophanes (ed. DE BOOR) I, p. 331; this will itself be a corruption of 105, the figure in MANSI.

<sup>9</sup> MANSI X, 1157-60. Cp also MS and Barhebraeus *locis cit.*

<sup>10</sup> *La chronologie* (Paris, 1958), p. 447.



p. 125, and the same writer's *Geschichte des Papsttums* II (Tübingen, 1933), p. 553ff<sup>1</sup>.

*documents... forged*: nothing more of this is known.

*Theodoros*: it is not clear whether the phrase 'he came down to Constantinople' refers to Martin's time as *apokrisiarios* in the imperial city (under Pope Theodore), or to his arrest at Constans' orders. If the former, the Theodore might be the friend of that name with whom he corresponded; if the latter, this Theodore will be Theodoros Kalliopas, the exarch, who arrested Martin and dispatched him to Constantinople.

22. 'RMG [']BWLQR': I have been unable to identify this person. 'RMG possibly represents Remigius, while [']BWLQR' (there are traces of an initial *aleph*) can hardly be other than Abu'l QR', who succeeded: *lit.* 'who (was) after'.

*Theodoros*: Heraklios' brother was in command of the Byzantine forces in Syria in the 630s, but fell from favour perhaps after the defeat at the River Yarmuk (636)<sup>2</sup>.

*peace*: it is not clear which peace is meant; see on § 25.

23. *Cyprus and Arvad*: 649-50<sup>3</sup>.

*Africa*: 647-8.

24. *cellae novae*: otherwise known as St Saba, on the Aventine, and here given the pseudo-etymology *cellae novem*. It was one of the three monasteries in seventh century Rome which housed monks of oriental origin; cp F. ANTONELLI, *I primi monasteri di monaci orientali*, in *Riv. arch. crist.*, t. 5 (1928), p. 114-8<sup>4</sup>. Our passage constitutes one of the earliest references to the monastery.

For the transcription (QLWNWBWS), with a false nominative ending -os, compare PN'ZRTWS in § 19.

The Acts of the Lateran Council<sup>5</sup> mention the presence in Rome of John the abbot of St Saba (presumably the mother house in Palestine), Theodore, 'the abbot of the venerable *lavra* in Africa', and various other foreigners. If Isho' (§ 19) is a hypocoristic for Isho'yahb, it is just possible that this Theodoros and he are the same person<sup>6</sup>. It appears not to have been noticed by Antonelli and others that a certain deacon-monk Leontios from *cellae novae*

<sup>1</sup> The Greek Life of Martin (ed. PEETERS in *Anal. Boll.*, t. 51 (1933), p. 225-62) is silent about events prior to his election.

<sup>2</sup> Nothing is known on the end of his life.

<sup>3</sup> Cp STRATOS IV, p. 48.

<sup>4</sup> Cp also G. FERRARI, *Early Roman Monasteries*, p. 281-90, and H. LECLERCQ in *DACL*, t. XIV.2, 3015, and XV.1, 204f.

<sup>5</sup> MANSI X, 903, 909.

<sup>6</sup> A. EHRHARD, *Das griechische Kloster Mar Saba in Palästina*, in *Römische Quartalschrift*, t. 7 (1893), p. 39 note 3, suggests that the *Theodoros abbas presbyter* of MANSI X, 909, might have been abbot of St Saba in Rome; this seems unlikely in view of his earlier mention in MANSI X, 903.

was present at the last session of the Sixth Council<sup>1</sup>: could this possibly be the Leontios, abbot of St Saba, who was author of the life of Gregory of Agrigentum?<sup>2</sup>

For Rome as a place of refuge for dyothelete monks from the Orient, see CASPAR, *art. cit.*, 116f, and above, on § 20.

25. *peace*: formal peace was not made until 659, and this may be the peace referred to in § 22; here, however, an earlier truce must be meant. Probably the two year truce, made in 651<sup>3</sup>, is intended, for even though this hardly squares with the mention of Şiffin (see below), it is likely, on other grounds, that Maximus was in Constantinople by 653 (see below).

*Abū Turāb*: The nickname ('dustman')<sup>4</sup> of 'Alī b. Abī Ṭālib (in Syriac sources usually referred to as 'Abbas<sup>5</sup>).

*Hirta*: i.e. Kufa.

*Şiffin*: the famous battle of Şiffin between Mo'awia and 'Alī, in 657. The chronology of this paragraph has evidently been telescoped.

*Azerbaijan*: What does this refer to? Constans seems to have led an expedition to Armenia in 652<sup>6</sup>, but none to Azerbaijan at this time appears to be known.

*entered Constantinople*: from other sources it would appear that Maximus arrived in Constantinople about 653<sup>7</sup>. This would fit with the mention of the 'peace', if the two year truce of 651 was intended, and the date might be narrowed down to 652, if the emperor's absence in Azerbaijan referred to his Armenian campaign of that year. c. 653 is also the *terminus ante quem* for his arrival if a reference to the patriarch Paul, to be found in the Arabic version of Michael the Syrian's account of Maximus<sup>8</sup>, is historical, for Paul died in 653.

26. *Plakidias*: no monastery of Plakidia is mentioned in R. JANIN's *La géographie ecclésiastique de l'empire byzantin*, I. iii *Les églises et monastères* (Paris, 1953). Accordingly it seems very likely that the *Oikos tes Plakidias*, or *Ta Plakidias*, is meant, for this was the residence of the papal *apokrisiarioi* from the sixth century onwards<sup>9</sup>. The presence of nuns there is otherwise unknown, and their mention here is perhaps to be explained as the result of an omission in our text of the Life (see below).

<sup>1</sup> MANSI XI, 629-30.

<sup>2</sup> PG t. 98, cols 549-716; BHG no 707.

<sup>3</sup> Cp STRATOS IV, p. 49-50. I am grateful to Dr M. Hinds for discussing some of the chronological difficulties involved at this point.

<sup>4</sup> Cp T. NÖLDEKE, in *ZDMG*, t. 52 (1898), p. 29-30.

<sup>5</sup> E. g. *Chron. anon. ad annum 1234* (ed. CHABOT), I, p. 278.

<sup>6</sup> So E. W. BROOKS in *Cambridge Medieval History* II (1913), p. 393, and STRATOS IV, p. 36; J. LAURENT, *L'Arménie entre Byzance et l'Islam* (Paris, 1919), p. 201, however, dates the campaign to 654.

<sup>7</sup> Cp GRUMEL in *Échos d'Orient*, 1927, p. 30.

<sup>8</sup> See p. 339.

<sup>9</sup> Cp R. JANIN, *Constantinople byzantine* (Paris, 1950), p. 135.

*offering*: for the episode being described at this point where the manuscript breaks off, see the accounts in Michael the Syrian and the Anonymous Chronicle, which are quoted in full below, p. 339.

The accounts in Michael the Syrian and the Anonymous Chronicle, which are otherwise clearly dependent on the Syriac Life (see below), part company with our text over Maximus' stay in Constantinople, and read<sup>1</sup>:

But Maximus came to Constantinople, and when the emperor Constans heard his teaching, he gathered together a synod and he disputed with Constantine of Perge, who demonstrated that he (*sc.* Maximus) agreed with Nestorius and Theodore (*sc.* of Mopsuestia), and they rebuked him. And when he refused (*sc.* to keep silence) the emperor ordered that they shut him up in a convent of women, so that he might be ashamed. (There follows the episode described at the end of § 26 of the Life, for which see p. 339-40).

It is not clear from this account when the synod took place: it need not necessarily have been immediately after Maximus' arrival, and indeed cannot have been if the emperor was absent then, as our Life states. From other sources it would appear that there was a considerable gap between Maximus' arrival in the capital and the interrogation, which is usually dated to 655<sup>2</sup>. It is indeed tempting to identify the synod of the Syriac chroniclers with the interrogation, but there are several difficulties which call for hesitation. A little further on in the Arabic version of Michael the Syrian<sup>3</sup> mention is made of Paul as the patriarch while Maximus was shut up in the convent (*i.e.* after the synod); if this is historical, it would mean that the synod must have been held before the end of 653, for Paul died that year. A second difficulty is that, in Michael the Syrian, the protagonist of the monothelites at the synod was Constantine, bishop of Perge (apparently not otherwise known), whereas at the interrogation it was Theodosios, bishop of Caesarea in Bithynia. Again, while in Michael the Syrian the synod resulted in Maximus' confinement in a convent in Constantinople, the interrogation led to his exile<sup>4</sup>, an event which, according to Michael the Syrian, only came later.

The mention of Paul in the Arabic version of Michael's *Chronicle* could be explained away, either as an interpolation (which seems unlikely), or as an anachronism (possibly he was originally mentioned in connection with Maximus' arrival in the capital, an event which,

<sup>1</sup> I quote Michael; for the slightly different account in the Anonymous Chronicle, see below, p. 339.

<sup>2</sup> Late 654/early 655, according to GRUMEL, in *Échos d'Orient* 1927, p. 30.

<sup>3</sup> See MS II, p. 436.

<sup>4</sup> Initially to Byzias, then to Perbera, and finally (662) to Lazika.

on other grounds, certainly seems to have taken place during his lifetime). Likewise the different protagonists could be explained as belonging to different stages in the 'trial': Theodosios to the actual interrogation, and Constantine to the meeting which decided on the verdict. The different outcomes, however, are much harder to explain away, and I am inclined to think that the synod and the interrogation should be kept separate, and not be taken as referring to one and the same event.

However this particular problem is resolved, there still remains the question whether the different accounts to be found in our Syriac Life and in Michael and the Anonymous Chronicle can be reconciled between themselves, quite apart from their relationship with Greek sources. As far as the Life is concerned, *Ta Plakidias* is a likely place for Maximus to have settled on his arrival in Constantinople, in view of its connection with Rome, but the mention of nuns there is problematic; again, the mention of the emperor's absence would fit well with the period of at least a year during which Maximus was left unmolested (as the Greek sources imply). Turning to Michael and the Anonymous Chronicle, it should be noted that they do not say when the synod (absent from our Life) took place, and there is in fact nothing in their text to rule out the possibility of a gap between Maximus' arrival and the synod, the only difficulty being the « convent of women », where he was confined, for this, on the surface, would appear to be identical with the « convent *tēs Plakidias* » in the Life, in view of the ensuing events which are described as having taken place there in all three Syriac texts.

No obvious explanation for this state of affairs suggests itself, and I would put forward the following hypothesis as a possible solution. Elsewhere in their account Michael and the Anonymous Chronicle follow the Syriac Life very closely (see below), and so the presumption is that they do so here too; in that case, however, their text of the Life must have been fuller than that which comes down to us in Add. 7192. This longer text, which will have contained the reference to the synod, has, I suggest, fallen out in our text of the Life by a form of homoioteleuton, thanks to the running together of Maximus' original place of residence, *Ta Plakidias* (*not* otherwise known to have had nuns) with the convent to which he was later confined (after the synod).

Thus the events of Maximus' stay in Constantinople, as described in the original form of the Life, may be reconstructed as follows: on his arrival Maximus stayed in the residence of the papal *apokrisiarioi*, *Ta Plakidias*, and took the opportunity of the emperor's absence from the capital to propagate his ideas unopposed. On the emperor's return, however, a synod met and condemned his teaching, and as a result of this he was confined to a convent of nuns<sup>1</sup>. There

<sup>1</sup> For a connection between Maximus and some nuns, see SHERWOOD, p. 43 (where, however, the letter in question is dated to Maximus' African stay).



his continued troublemaking eventually led to his interrogation, mutilation and exile.

In our text of the Life a scribe has jumped from the *Ta Plakidias* to the convent of nuns, and subsequently identified the two, squeezing out, in the process, the intervening events, including the synod. In Michael and the Anonymous Chronicle, on the other hand, all reference to Maximus' first place of residence in Constantinople has been omitted as unimportant, and the narrative continues immediately with the synod and his confinement in the nunnery.

If there is anything in this suggestion (whose hypothetical nature I would stress), one might compare the situation implied by § 19, where the author remarks that he has already mentioned Anastasios' African origin. Nothing of this, however, survives earlier in the text as we have it, and one must suppose that, either the author is merely being careless (which is a little unlikely in such a short text), or that a sentence containing this information has fallen out of § 11, where Anastasios is first mentioned.

How much of the Syriac Life has been lost at the end is difficult to say. All that the dependent accounts in Michael and the Anonymous Chronicle show is that the narrative was continued up to his death in exile. Since, however, the last years of Maximus' life are comparatively well documented in Greek sources<sup>1</sup>, the loss of the end of the Syriac Life is made rather less regrettable than had some other part been missing.

#### The author

The author gives his name on two separate occasions. In § 5 he states that he, GRYGWRY of Resh'aina, disciple of Sophronios, had recorded the details of Maximus' life « for (the benefit of) the faithful ». In § 11, however, we find the statement that « I, GYWR-GY, and two of my pupils arrived in Cyprus together with eight other bishops from Sophronios' jurisdiction ».

It seems likely that GRYGWRY (Gregorios) and GYWRGY (Georgios) in fact represent one and the same person, and that one of the spellings is a corruption of the other, — easy enough in the Syriac transliteration, and indeed a not infrequent one in Greek<sup>2</sup>. On internal grounds alone it is impossible to tell which of the two is correct, but from two quite different sources we know

<sup>1</sup> E.g. the *Hypomnesticon* of Theodore, and the letter of Anastasios on the death of Maximus, edited by R. DEVREESE in *Anal. Boll.*, t. 53 (1935), p. 49-80, and t. 73 (1955), p. 5-16, respectively.

<sup>2</sup> An example in MANSI XI, 223, cp 231.

of two Georges who were active in the monothelete cause, one of whom may quite possibly be identical with the author or our Life :

1. In the course of the famous dispute in the Sixth Council about the authenticity or not of the letters of Mennas and Vigilius in the Acts of the Fifth Council<sup>1</sup>, the bishop of Isaurian Seleucia, Makrobios, declared in the course of the fourteenth session<sup>2</sup> that he had been given a manuscript of the Acts of the Fifth Council by the *magister militum*, Philip, and that he had discovered that an interpolation had been made in the text of the seventh session of this Council (i.e. in the supposed letters of Vigilius to Justinian and Theodora). On enquiry, Makrobios ascertained that Philip had lent the manuscript to Stephen, who was the main associate of Makarios, the Patriarch of Antioch, in the monothelete cause at the Sixth Council; Makrobios then decided to visit the patriarch himself, and with him he found the monk George in the course of writing out some text: Makrobios observed that George's hand was identical with the hand that had written out the interpolated text. The Council thereupon cross-questioned George, who was present, and he replied that when Makarios and Theodore had been discussing matters of faith, they had brought from the patriarchal archives in Constantinople the letters of Pope Vigilius; these George had copied. Some time later Philip, the *magister militum*, showed Stephen a codex of the Acts of the Fifth Council and asked him if it was a reliable copy; Stephen replied that it was missing something, and at Philip's request and Stephen's bidding, George had inserted the letters of Pope Vigilius.

2. BM Add. 14535 ff. 1-20 are described by Wright<sup>3</sup> as containing a monophysite florilegium directed against the Nestorians, and this provenance is accepted by A. Guillaumont, who has recently published the dispute between an « Orthodox » and the Nestorian Paul of Nisibis<sup>4</sup>; this dispute, which features on ff. 16-20 of the

<sup>1</sup> Extracts from these two letters (which do not feature in the surviving acts of the Fifth Council) are to be found in an anti-dyothelite florilegium (in Syriac), preserved in BM Add. 14535, ff. 3<sup>a</sup>, 9<sup>b</sup>; on this manuscript, see below.

<sup>2</sup> MANSI XI, 591-2; HEFELE-LECLERCQ, 3.1, p. 504-5.

<sup>3</sup> WRIGHT, *Catalogue...*, p. 796-8.

<sup>4</sup> In *Justinien et l'Église de Perse*, in *Dumbarton Oaks Papers*, t. 23/4 (1969/70), p. 39-66 (p. 52 on the manuscript); cp *Un colloque entre orthodoxes et théologiens nestoriens de Perse sous Justinien*, in *CRAIBL* 1970, p. 201-7.

manuscript, took place under Justinian. The first two items<sup>1</sup> of the manuscript, however, suggest that Wright's attribution is incorrect; the first two texts are unfortunately acephalous, but the contents show that the aim of the florilegium in these two sections was to combat the doctrine of the two wills and the two operations. Now, while the monophysites were certainly opposed to the dyothelete position and evidently wrote against it<sup>2</sup>, several of the texts quoted in this florilegium are by Chalcedonian writers<sup>3</sup>, and one extract is actually from a work « Against Severus and Julian ». Thus the florilegium in Add. 14535 must be of monothelete (Chalcedonian), not monophysite, origin.

The author of the piece against the Severans and Julianists is in fact described as being a certain *hasya* George (GYWRGY) the monk, and two other extracts contained in this part of the florilegium are attributed to him. The first of these is taken from a « Book addressed to Abraham bishop of Resafa », while the other is a long piece taken from a work entitled « On the matter of the operations ». It is clear that this George was a leading apologist for the monothelete cause.

We thus know of two Georges who played a role in the religious controversy of the mid-seventh century. On the whole it seems unlikely that the monk George who figures in the Acts of the Sixth Council could be the same person as the author of our Life of Maximus, for the latter states that he himself was present at the synod in Cyprus, which must have been held sometime between 634 and 638; he can hardly have been much under 35 at the time, which would mean that he would have been approaching 80 when the Sixth Council met. At such an advanced age it seems unlikely that he would have been present (if he was still alive).

That the George of the monothelete florilegium might be identified with our author is a much more plausible hypothesis. This George is described as *hasya*, which is the normal honorific title for a bishop. Now in § 11 of the Syriac Life of Maximus, the author relates that he « and eight *other* bishops » set off for Cyprus,

<sup>1</sup> ff. 1<sup>a</sup>-7<sup>b</sup>, 8<sup>a</sup>-12<sup>b</sup>.

<sup>2</sup> Cp p. 337.

<sup>3</sup> E.g. the alleged letters of Mennas and Vigilius from the Fifth Council; note also an extract from a letter of St Symeon the Stylite of *Mons admirabilis*, to Barlaha the *stratelates* (apparently not otherwise known, cp P. VAN DEN VEN, *Les écrits de S. Syméon le Jeune*, in *Le Muséon*, t. 70 (1957), p. 1-57).

where they were received with « fitting honour »: the implication of the word « other » is that the author himself was also a bishop. In this case we have two bishops prominent in the monothelete cause, one definitely called George (the author of the extracts in the Florilegium), the other either George or Gregory (the author of the Syriac Life); although certainty is impossible on the evidence available, I would suggest that the correct name of the author of the Syriac Life of Maximus was George, and that he is to be identified with the *hasya* George of the Florilegium.

One of the remarkable features about the Syriac Life is the care with which the author gives his sources of information<sup>1</sup>. Thus, for the early part of Maximus' life he is dependent on the priest Eulogios, who is stated to have been personally acquainted with Maximus, Martyrios and Pantoleon. There also appears to have been some written narrative by Martyrios, about Maximus' childhood, but of this our author evidently knew only from Eulogios (§ 5).

It is not clear from § 6 whether the author personally knew Pantoleon: on the whole I am inclined to think that this section refers to Maximus, not Pantoleon (see commentary *ad loc.*). In any case he certainly had first hand knowledge of Maximus at about the time of the synod in Cyprus, and for this period the « we » narrative indicates that he was an eyewitness to the events in Cyprus; in this connection it is hardly without significance that over a quarter of what survives of the Life is devoted to this episode.

No particular source is mentioned for the period of Maximus' stay in Africa, unless the word « this » in § 22 is intended to include it; there, however, the reference may well be more restricted, and concern only the details about Martin's accession as pope and his exile, which are said to have come from the mysterious 'RMG [JBWLQR', when the latter came on pilgrimage to Jerusalem, probably in the late 650s, some time after Martin's death (655; cp commentary). The author of the Life was clearly in Jerusalem or its vicinity at the time, and must have been a person of considerable local importance.

Nothing very certain can be said about the date of composition of the Life. A *terminus post quem* is provided by (a) Maximus'

<sup>1</sup> He also emphasizes the diligence with which he has undertaken the work (§§ 5 and 22).

death, in 662, and (b) the mention of the « Three books » addressed to Luke the recluse, and written by Makarios the patriarch of Antioch (65?-681(685)): this work dates from before 680, since it is referred to in the course of the Sixth Council.

A *terminus ante quem* of c680 (very approximately) is provided by considerations of the author's age. We have seen above that he must have been born at about the turn of the century, and it is thus unlikely that his literary career would have continued very much after 680. One might accordingly hazard the guess that his work dates from shortly before the Sixth Council met, and just possibly it may have been composed with this in mind. But even if none of the author's credentials are accepted, the composition of the work can hardly be lowered by more than about fifty years, seeing that the manuscript which contains it is to be dated at the *latest* to the eighth century, and it is certainly not the author's autograph.

#### Original language

It is likely, but not entirely certain, that our Life was originally written in Syriac: the correct spelling of place names such as Heṣfin and Ṣiffin, and the de-hellenized forms of certain Greek proper names (e.g. GND < Gennadios, MRṬWR < Martyrios) all point to Syriac as being the original language. But there remain certain rather insignificant features, such as the use of *hu hana* (δ αὐτός?)<sup>1</sup> and enclitic *hd(a)* (<τις ?)<sup>2</sup>, which suggest at least the possibility of a Greek original, although parallels can be found in more or less contemporary works definitely composed in Syriac. Taking the evidence as a whole, it would seem best to suppose that the Life was indeed written in Syriac, but by someone who was bilingual in Syriac and Greek: this in fact would be very likely to apply to a native of Resh'aina who worked in Palestine<sup>3</sup>.

<sup>1</sup> §§ 1-3, 5-8, 18; could at least the preponderance of this usage in the opening sections be due to George's use of Martyrios' written account of Maximus' youth (§ 5; probably in Greek)?

<sup>2</sup> §§ 1, 8, 19, 21, 24, 26. Compare also the use of ܡܚܘܢ ( § 6 end), where it may possibly have the sense of *δοξάζω* 'consider', rather than 'praise' (for ܡܚܘܢ 'consider' as a translation calque of *δοξάζω* cp my *The Syriac Version of the Pseudo-Nonnos Mythological Scholia* (Cambridge, 1971), p. 42).

<sup>3</sup> The author must have known Greek well if he attended the synod in Cyprus and functioned as a bishop within the patriarchate of Jerusalem.

#### Use of the Life in the Syriac Chronicles

One important piece of information about the provenance of the Syriac Life comes from one of the three medieval Syriac Chronicles which mention Maximus<sup>1</sup>. Comparing the Syriac Life with the sections about Maximus to be found in the Chronicles of Michael the Syrian, the anonymous chronicler *ad annum 1234*, and Barhebraeus, it at once becomes obvious that all their information about Maximus is derived ultimately from our Life. The Syriac Life was not, however, used directly, for both Michael the Syrian and the anonymous chronicler state<sup>2</sup> that their source is a refutation of the heresy of Maximus by a certain Shem'un, a priest of the (Syrian Orthodox) monastery of Qenneshre<sup>3</sup>. The anonymous chronicler, alone of the two, adds at the end of the relevant section some further important details, stating that, while he had employed Shem'un's work, Shem'un had used « Maronite books against the Maximians »<sup>4</sup>. Since, apart from material drawn from Shem'un about the Origenist origins of the 'Maximian heresy', the Syriac chronicles contain almost *no*<sup>5</sup> information that is not to be found in the Life, we may reasonably deduce that the author of our Syriac Life was in fact a Maronite. The significance of this will become apparent below.

The Syriac chronicles also provide some indication of what the ending of the Life, missing in Add. 7192, must have contained.

A careful comparison of the contents and wording of the three chronicles concerned indicates that Michael the Syrian and the anonymous chronicler drew upon Shem'un independently, while Barhebraeus evidently only used Michael as his source. To demonstrate the relationship of Michael and the anonymous chronicler to the Syriac Life (via Shem'un) their two sections on Maximus are juxtaposed, and verbal quotations of the Life are given in italics. The sections in the Life referred to are given between the two columns.

<i>Michael</i> <sup>6</sup>	<i>Life</i>	<i>Anon. chron.</i> <sup>7</sup>
Concerning the heresy of Maximus	we discovered, in the refutation of it made by the priest Shem'un of the monastery of Qenneshre,	Concerning the heresy called that of the Maximians, which later took hold among the Chalcedonians, we discovered, in the refutation of it made by a certain priest Shem'un of the monastery of Qenneshre,

<sup>1</sup> i.e. Michael the Syrian, the Anonymous Chronicle *ad annum 1234* and Barhebraeus.

<sup>2</sup> MS II, p. 433 = IV, p. 423; *Chron. anon. ad annum 1234*, I, p. 264.

<sup>3</sup> Cp BAUMSTARK, *Gesch. der syr. Literatur*, p. 247, and note 5 above.

<sup>4</sup> t. I, p. 267 (top).

<sup>5</sup> Cp p. 330f.

<sup>6</sup> MS IV, p. 423f.

<sup>7</sup> t. I, p. 264f.



that he says that its beginning (lay with) Theodore of Mopsuestia, (and) afterwards took hold among the monks of (two) monasteries beside Jerusalem, one of which was named the Palaia Lavra, the other Nea Lavra. These (monks) were ensnared in the doctrines of Origen.

(there follows in both texts the story of how their Origenism was reported to the emperor Justinian by a visiting monk from Mesopotamia, Sergius, as the result of which they were driven from their monasteries).

And after these things the Patriarch Mennas gathered the fifth synod, and he anathematized everyone who speaks of two wills or two energies in Christ; he also anathematized the wicked Theodore of Mopsuestia, out of whose foul writings this doctrine was established. The synod also anathematized the heresy of the Agnoetai, who also admit two wills and two energies. The emperor Heraklios also issued an edict anathematizing everyone who speaks of two wills and two energies.

In the time of Konstans, the grand child of Heraklios, there sprang up disciples of Plato, whose leader was Maximus,

from YSPYN, a village in 1 the district of *Tiberias*. He went up to Africa and 18 found (some) Nestorian pupils; on seeing 19 that he agreed with their teaching, they received him.

that he says that it took its first beginnings from the heretic Theodore, but afterwards took hold among certain monks from two monasteries beside Jerusalem,

who were ensnared in the doctrines of Origen.

And after these things the synod, known as the fifth, was gathered, and they anathematized at it everyone who speaks of two wills and two energies in Christ.

And after the death of Heraklios, when his grandson Konstans was on the throne, at this time there sprang up like darnels and appeared disciples of this heresy, whose leader was Maximus, after whom the heresy gained its name and was called. This man's birthplace was YSPYN, a village in the district of *Tiberias*. When 18 Maximus went up to Africa he found there certain Nestorian students from *Nisibis*; on seeing that this teaching agreed with that of Nestorios their master, they received him.

Maximus went up to Rome 20 He also went to Martin the and led astray Martin the Patriarch of Rome, and led Patriarch, him astray. And when the

24 Nestorian students fled and came to Rome to Martin, and he received those students and he received them as people holding the same opinion as he, and gave them a monastery.

But Maximus came to Constantinople, 25 and began teaching his doctrine. Then, when the emperor Konstans heard about his teaching, there gathered together a synod of the whole Roman world, and when they had disputed with Maximus

and when the emperor Konstans heard his teaching, he gathered together a synod

and he disputed with Konstantinos of Perge, who showed that he (Maximus) agreed with Nestorios and Theodore, and they rebuked him.

And when he refused

the emperor ordered that they shut him up in a convent of women, 26

so that he might be ashamed.

But the wicked man led astray the nuns, so that they

did not receive the offering (i.e. communion) offered up by the abbas in charge of them, on the grounds that the Holy Spirit had not descended on it, nor on that of the Patriarch Paul [thus Arabic].

These women used to throw it into the soles of their shoes just as Maximus had taught them.

He also went to Martin the Patriarch of Rome, and led him astray. And when the Arabs entered Africa these Nestorian students fled and came to Rome to Martin, and he received them as people holding the same opinion as he, and gave them a monastery to live in. But Maximus went down to Constantinople, and began teaching his doctrine. Then, when the emperor Konstans heard about his teaching, there gathered together a synod of the whole Roman world, and when they had disputed with Maximus

and rebuked him on many accounts, he did not turn back from his wickedness. Then the emperor ordered that he be shut up in a convent of women, and as to shame him.

But Maximus contrived to lead astray the nuns too (so that they followed) his doctrine, and he bade them not receive the offering (i.e. communion) offered up by the abbas in charge of them, for he used to tell them that the Holy Spirit had not descended on it<sup>1</sup>.

These miserable women used to throw it into the soles of their shoes in the way that Maximus had taught them.

<sup>1</sup> For a somewhat analogous incident where the epiklesis is said to have been ineffective, see the *Chronicle of Seert* (PO 13, p. 572) § 94: Baršauma, bishop of Susa, castigates the catholicos Isho'yabh of Gedala for celebrating the liturgy in Constantinople: 'how could the Holy Spirit descend on a plain altar that had not yet been consecrated (sc. by a Nestorian bishop); no, by my life, It did not descend on the sacrifice you offered up in Constantinople.'

And when the practice was revealed, the emperor ordered them to be dragged through the city and burnt by fire, while Maximus' tongue was cut out. But he did not keep quiet,

but began writing letters; and when this became known, the emperor ordered that his right hand be cut off. And again he began writing with his left, then they cut off his left,

and he was sent into exile. [cp MS IV, p. 428]

And he was not considered worthy of any of the ranks of the church of God.

There is here only one detail connected with Maximus' life which is in open conflict with the Syriac Life: the mention of a synod held in Constantinople on — or sometime after — Maximus' arrival, as the result of which Maximus is confined in the convent. The difficulties raised by the two different accounts have already been discussed in the commentary, where a solution, that would remove the discrepancy between the Syriac Life and the Chronicles, was suggested.

### Significance

The significance of the Syriac Life of Maximus can be viewed from two different standpoints: the value of the Life (if any) as a source of information about Maximus himself, and the light it sheds on the monothelete opposition in general. These two points are best considered separately.

1. The most dramatic difference between the Syriac and Greek Lives lies in the account of Maximus' early years. According to the Greek Life he was born in Constantinople of an aristocratic

And when the practice was reported and made known to the emperor, he ordered them to be dragged through the city and burnt by fire, while Maximus' tongue was cut out. But even so he did not cease from his iniquity, but began writing letters; and when it was reported,

his right hand was cut off. And again he began writing with his left, and the emperor ordered that his left hand also be cut off, and he sent him into exile, to the Armenian Caucasus (QWQWS), and there he died.

Shem'un of Qenneshre took this history from the writings of the Maronites against the Maximians, and we found it in his book. How the Romans (i.e. Byzantines) reintroduced and accepted this heresy, we will state later on.

family, and after a thorough education was called to imperial service as first secretary; later he became, first monk, then abbot of a monastery in Chrysopolis (opposite Constantinople). In the Syriac Life, by contrast, he was of low birth, was both born and brought up in Palestine, and became a monk in the famous monastery of St Chariton. Now it should be remembered that our only source hitherto for almost all the events of Maximus' life prior to his arrival in Rome has been the highly eulogistic Greek Life, apart from one or two scattered references in Maximus' letters. We now have two sources, one written by an admirer, the other by an enemy, and in principle each should be treated with equal suspicion by the historian.

In evaluating the Syriac Life two factors in particular need to be taken into consideration. In the first place one must ask how reliable is the Life in the places where it can be checked from other sources, and secondly, what credence, if any, can be given to the claim that it was written by a contemporary. Owing to the paucity of sources for seventh century history, very little of the factual information contained in the Life can be checked, but it will have been seen from the commentary above that in §§ 18ff, from Maximus' arrival in Africa onwards, the narrative fits well into the picture, as far as this can be reconstructed from other sources. After § 19 only on two minor points is there conflict on factual data: in § 20 it is said that 190 bishops attended the Lateran Council, but in the Acta the figure is given as 105, while both Michael the Syrian and Barhebraeus give 109 (of which 190 may well represent a corruption); and in § 21 Martin's place of exile is said to have been Lazika (in the Caucasus), while all other sources give Cherson (usually taken to be the Cherson in the Crimea). Neither of these points is of sufficient gravity to warrant wholesale rejection of the rest of the narrative.

Turning to the writer's credentials, my own impression — and the subjective nature of this should be stressed — is that, on the one hand, there are no obvious reasons for rejecting them, and on the other hand, the whole tone of the narrative seems perfectly consonant with the claim. Moreover, we have seen above that it is quite possible that the author is to be identified with an anti-dyothelete writer, *hasya* George, already known from another source.

If one does accept the writer's credentials — as I would feel we must — it then becomes very hard to reject in its entirety the



story of Maximus' Palestinian origin<sup>1</sup>, although it is quite possible that the details of his birth and parentage may have attracted certain mythical attachments. More important, however, is the information about the synod in Cyprus, for this is something on which we have absolutely no other sources at all. Whatever view one takes of the Life as a whole, this synod, which is reported in considerable detail, can hardly be dismissed as a figment of the imagination. While it is unfortunate that the precise date of this gathering is not clear, there seems little doubt that the 'edict' in which it resulted must in part, at least, refer to the *Ekthesis*<sup>2</sup>. Important too is the picture given by the Life of Maximus' relationship to Sophronios. What meagre information there is from other sources has suggested that Sophronios was in the forefront of the opposition to the 'monoenergist' theology, and that Maximus played a rather minor role throughout the 630s. The Syriac Life, however, makes Maximus into the *éminence grise* behind Sophronios (who, one should remember, was very advanced in years when he came to the patriarchal throne); at the same time Maximus is depicted as unwilling to come out into the open, excusing himself from attending the synod in Cyprus. This action would seem consonant with the hesitation about publically committing himself that can be felt in his writings of this early period. It is of course possible that the author of the Life, influenced by Maximus' later moral leadership of the dyothelete party, has been led to push back, anachronistically, his influence into the 630s, although one should remember that it is precisely in this period that the author claims to have had personal knowledge of Maximus<sup>3</sup>.

For the period of Maximus' peregrinations in Africa and the West, the Syriac Life simply fills in numerous details (all plausible enough in themselves) into the general outline of events that is available from other sources. Among other things the Life confirms the impression, gained elsewhere, that the dyothelete refugees

<sup>1</sup> Even if the Life were not by a contemporary, the date of the manuscript containing it makes it most unlikely that the Life is later than, say, c. 730, precisely a time when the arrival of Greek captives into Palestine would have made any false statement about Maximus' origin open to immediate attack.

<sup>2</sup> See the commentary for details.

<sup>3</sup> There certainly seems to be an anachronism in the mention of two wills in § 9.

from Africa and the East were an influential force behind the Lateran Council of 649.

The details concerning Maximus' stay in Constantinople in the 650s are a little obscure in the Syriac texts as we have them, but if the reconstruction, suggested at the end of the commentary, is correct, we are provided with details of a 'trial' prior to his 'first' interrogation in 655.

2. Irrespective of whether or not it is of value as a historical source for Maximus' life and times, the Syriac Life is of considerable importance for the light it indirectly sheds on the opposition to the dyothelete theology in the East.

The sources we have for the history of the religious controversy are almost entirely dyothelete, and it is well known that, where theological issues have been the concern in the history of the church, objectivity is not a virtue that one can expect to detect in the sources on the subject, whether contemporary or not<sup>1</sup>. Indeed, reading through the Acta of the Sixth Council, one is struck in particular by two facts. In the first place, the name of Maximus, who is known to have been a protagonist of the dyothelete theology, both from his own writings, and from the name of « Maximians » later given to the dyotheletes by their opponents, hardly receives any mention at all. Secondly, the monothelete opposition appears to be confined to Makarios, the non-resident patriarch of Antioch, and his immediate entourage. This latter, apparent, state of affairs has been made much of by well-meaning apologists for the Maronite church, who, in their eagerness to disprove medieval accusations that this church had once had monothelete connections, like to stress that Makarios' theological position need not necessarily have reflected that of his flock, far away in Syria. According to this school of thought, the dyothelete/monothelete issue was only introduced into Syria-Palestine in 727, with the arrival of Greek prisoners into the country. Previous to this date « la question monothélite n'était pas encore soulevée en Syrie »<sup>2</sup>.

The passage in Michael the Syrian on which this view rests in fact states that previous to 727 the 'heresy of Maximus (together

<sup>1</sup> This of course applies just as much to modern 'Histories of the Church'.

<sup>2</sup> Thus P. DIB in *DTC* x, 12; cp also S. VALLHÉ, *Origine religieuse des Maronites*, in *Échos d'Orient* 4 (1900), p. 100-2, and *L'Église maronite du V<sup>e</sup> au IX<sup>e</sup> siècle*, in *Échos d'Orient* 9 (1906), p. 257-67, 344-61.

with the Byzantine objection to the addition to the Trisagion) *had not been accepted at all*<sup>1</sup>. In other words the great majority of Chalcedonians in Syria and Palestine had previously been, not just passively monothelete, but actively opposed to the dyothelete theology. This is in fact borne out, both by the polemic texts contained in Add. 7192, and by the existence of the hitherto unrecognized monothelete florilegium in Add. 14535<sup>2</sup>. The former include, not only our Life, claiming to be written by a contemporary, but also a specific condemnation of the Sixth Council, which, to judge by its contents, can hardly date from very long after the event<sup>3</sup>; while the latter contains excerpts from the writings of a certain *hasya* George (who, as we have seen, may possibly be identical with the author of the Syriac Life), among which there figures one called « On the matter of the operations », a title which strongly suggests that it belongs to the early stages of the controversy, before the issue of the will(s) had dominated the scene.

Moreover, it should be recalled that, in his account of the Sixth Council, Michael the Syrian complains<sup>4</sup> of its unrepresentative nature, with no one present from Egypt, Syria, Palestine and Armenia. The obvious implication is that, had they been present, the outcome might have been very different.

While it would now seem, in the light of these new anti-dyothelite texts, that the Maronites (Beth Maron)<sup>5</sup> had from the beginning, or almost from the beginning, of the controversy, been opposed to the dyothelete theology, at the same time this hostile attitude appears to have been characteristic of the *entire*, or almost the *entire*, Chalcedonian community in Syria-Palestine until the third decade of the eighth century. The active gains made by the dyotheletes among the Chalcedonian population in the area were, no doubt, greatly increased with the advent of the Greek prisoners in 727, but it is probable that the dyotheletes had already been active in the east, especially in the large cities, for some years previous to 727, for in 721/2 a certain Constantine, a

<sup>1</sup> MS IV, p. 457-8: *ܕܡܫܟܝܢ ܕܥܘܠܡܝܢ ܕܥܝܪܐܢܐ ܕܥܝܪܐܢܐ*.

<sup>2</sup> Cp above, p. 333f.

<sup>3</sup> Cp my edition, *A Syriac Fragment on the Sixth Council*, in *OC*, t. 57 (1973).

<sup>4</sup> MS II, p. 452 = IV, p. 434.

<sup>5</sup> The Syriac Life of Maximus is, by implication, actually described as Maronite by Shem'un (see above, p. 337); it is hard to see how else the other anti-dyothelite texts can be designated.

deacon in Edessa, translated into Syriac a letter by Sophronius addressed to Arkadios of Cyprus<sup>1</sup>. Although the subject of this letter is in fact the Trisagion, and not the issue of the operations and wills, it seems most unlikely that a work by one of the main proponents of the dyothelete theology would have been translated into Syriac without any awareness of his doctrinal position. Moreover, it is clear from Michael the Syrian<sup>2</sup> that the issue over the Trisagion was closely linked to that of the wills and operations, and without any doubt it is this that will have proved far the most controversial amongst all but professional theologians, in that it was intimately connected with liturgical worship.

Summing up the whole situation, one can say that the picture of the opposition, as painted by the dyothelete sources, is not a little misleading, and it seems likely that Michael the Syrian's accusation that the Sixth Council was not fully representative of Chalcedonian opinion was not without justification. Furthermore, it would appear that the history of the Maronite and Melkite communities in this period needs to be looked at in a rather different perspective: rather than the Melkites representing a continuum of 'orthodoxy', with the Maronites separating from them (at whatever precise date) under monothelete influence, the new evidence from these Syriac texts strongly suggests that the theological continuum, among the Chalcedonian communities of Syria-Palestine, is in fact represented by the Maronites, with the Melkites separating themselves from them under the influence of dyothelete Byzantium in the early eighth century<sup>3</sup> — an initial step that was to be followed by the complete Byzantinization of the Antiochene rite in the eleventh and following centuries.

<sup>1</sup> In BM Or. 8606 (see commentary to § 7).

<sup>2</sup> MS II, p. 492 = IV, p. 457-8.

<sup>3</sup> This would fit in with the fact that occasional traces of monothelete theology are preserved in much later Melkite liturgical and canonical books: see M. RAJJI, *Le monothélisme chez les Maronites et les Melkites*, in *Journal of Ecclesiastical History*, t. 2 (1951), p. 38-42 (the liturgical text in question is published by M. BLACK, in *A Christian Palestinian Horologion (= Texts and Studies, n.s. 1, 1954)*, p. 409 (tr. p. 124), cp. p. 10-12). RAJJI somewhat implausibly claims that monothelete views were only found among a *minority* of Melkites and Maronites (p. 42): while this was certainly the case from the ninth century onwards, it seems unlikely, in face of the evidence now available, that this was so in the seventh and early eighth centuries.

*Conclusion*

« Un mélange de détails bizarres, même saugrenus », was how R. Devreesse described the information about Maximus contained in Michael's Chronicle <sup>1</sup>. Our Syriac Life turns out to be the source for these « détails bizarres », and one may ask whether this discovery warrants any reconsideration of Devreesse's harsh judgement. As has been seen, much depends on whether or not one accepts the writer's claim to be a contemporary of Maximus. If one accepts this — and to me there seems to be no valid reason why one should reject it — then the Syriac Life will be a source of great importance for events of Maximus' life and times, for it will have been composed within a couple of decades, at the most, after his death. But even if the writer's credentials are not accepted at their face value, the Syriac Life is no late compilation, for it is found in a manuscript which has plausibly been dated to the eighth — or even the seventh — century, and so it should be placed at least on a par with the panegyric we have in the Greek Life.

Needless to say, by no means all the issues raised by this new Syriac Life of Maximus have been discussed here, but it is hoped that enough has been said to demonstrate its considerable interest and (I believe) importance.

Cambridge  
Faculty of Oriental Studies

Sebastian BROCK

<sup>1</sup> In *Anal. Boll.*, t. 46 (1928), p. 14-5, note 2.

## "GÉNÉALOGIE DE LA VIERGE" EN GÉORGIEN

Dans le codex A-95 (x<sup>e</sup> siècle) de Tbilisi <sup>1</sup>, qui contient les lectures pour la première moitié de l'année liturgique, on lit au 2 février une courte notice sur la Généalogie de la Vierge. Malgré les nombreuses contradictions et obscurités contenues dans ces quelques lignes, il nous a paru intéressant de les confronter à une série de parallèles puisés dans les traditions grecques, syriaque et slavonne. C'est en effet la seule voie qui permette de rendre un sens acceptable à un texte aussi oblitéré par les erreurs de copie ou de traduction. D'ailleurs, il n'est pas facile d'identifier les sources des anciens recueils géorgiens : la comparaison avec les parallèles peut jeter quelque lumière sur l'origine de la notice géorgienne. Tel est le second avantage que nous espérons tirer de cette étude <sup>2</sup>.

Nous procéderons d'abord à l'énumération et à la description brève des généalogies grecques, syriaque et slaves. Ensuite, nous donnerons le texte géorgien avec sa traduction littérale latine ; enfin, nous commenterons et expliquerons chacun des paragraphes grâce au contenu des autres notices.

### 1° *La lettre de Jules l'Africain* (= **JA**).

Bien que Jules l'Africain (vers 240) n'entende pas exposer la généalogie de la Vierge, mais concilier la lignée de Joseph selon

<sup>1</sup> Pour la bibliographie de ce manuscrit, voir G. GARITTE, *L'homélie géorgienne d'Hésychius de Jérusalem sur l'Hypapante*, dans *Le Muséon*, t. 84 (1971), p. 353. Description dans F. D. ŽORDANIA, *Opisanie Tiflisskago cerkovnago Muzeja*, t. 1 (Tiflis, 1903), p. 103, n° 19. Le manuscrit est écrit en minuscule archaïque.

<sup>2</sup> Voir la singularité des pièces géorgiennes dans les collections parallèles *Anal. Boll.*, t. 90 (1972), p. 365 et 63-99, t. 91 (1973), p. 59-73 ; t. 89 (1970), p. 159-176 ; dans *Le Muséon*, t. 80 (1967), p. 121-138 ; t. 84 (1971), p. 354-394, surtout p. 353-355.