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Abstract:

Part I

Anastasius Bibliothecarius, papal librarian, translator and diplomat, is one of the pivotal figures of the ninth century in both literary and political contexts. His contribution to relations between the eastern and western church can be considered to have had both positive and negative ramifications, and it will be argued that his translations of various Greek works into Latin played a significant role in achieving his political agenda, complex and convoluted as this was. Being one of relatively few Roman bilinguals in the latter part of the ninth century, Anastasius found that his linguistic skills opened an avenue into papal affairs that was not closed by even the greatest breaches of trust and violations of canonical law on his part. His chequered career spanning five pontificates will be reviewed in the first chapter. In Chapter 2, we discuss his corpus of works of translation, in particular the Collectanea, whose sole surviving witness, the Parisinus Latinus 5095, has been partially edited in this study. This collation and translation of seven documents pertaining to the life of Maximus the Confessor provides us with a unique insight into Anastasius' capacity as a translator, and into the political and cultural significance of the commissioning and dedication of his hagiographic and other translated works in general. These seven documents will be examined in detail in Chapter 3, and compared with the Greek tradition, where that has survived, in an effort to establish the codes governing translation in this period, and to establish which manuscripts of the Greek tradition correspond most closely to Anastasius' (lost) model. In Chapter 4, we analyse consistency of style and method by comparison with Anastasius' translation of the Historia Mystica attributed to Germanus of Constantinople. Anastasius' methodology will be compared and contrasted with that of his contemporary John Scotus Eriugena, to place his oeuvre in the broader context of bilingualism in the West in the ninth century.

Part II contains a critical edition of the text with facing English translation and historical and linguistic annotations.
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INTRODUCTION

This study focuses on two pivotal figures in the history of relations between the eastern and western churches: Maximus the Confessor, the great theologian of Constantinople, and the translator who brought several of his works to the West, Anastasius Bibliothecarius, the notorious right-hand man of the church of Rome. The meeting of these two figures across a divide of two centuries provides an aperture through which we see two very different thought-worlds, separated by a formidable language barrier. Anastasius’ attempt to surmount this barrier, and his reasons for doing so, will be the subject of the following chapters, which serve to set the scene – historically, linguistically and theologically – of the seven texts edited and translated in Part II.

Anastasius’ roles as papal librarian, translator and diplomat will be considered in the first chapter, in an attempt to delineate the political agenda behind his activities as a translator. In particular, his antagonism towards Photius and his party in Constantinople in the 860s and 870s sheds some light on Anastasius’ ambitions and failures in the domains of papal primacy and the Bulgarian question. A sketch of the history of the office of bibliothecarius reveals the scope for innovations by a person of adequate linguistic talent and sufficient connections. Anastasius’ relationship with the Frankish monarchy also points to the mercurial nature of papal politics in this period, when allegiances were constantly made and broken over territorial issues, with the Franks pushing for control over formerly Byzantine territories, and the Muslim threat ever more real.

In the second chapter, we move to the sociolinguistic context of Anastasius’ work, examining why he chose the texts he did, how accessible the Greek originals were, and the politics of commissioning and dedication, in an effort to identify the role of social networks in the diffusion of texts. The uniqueness of Anastasius’ knowledge of Greek, both in Italy and in the West generally, will be considered, especially within the context of contemporary literary activities among the Irish circle in Francia.

Next we turn to a detailed analysis of the texts concerning the life of Maximus
themselves: their historical background, their manuscript traditions, both Greek and Latin, and the relationship between the two. The issue of papal primacy, it is suggested, was the key link between Maximus and Anastasius. Our new edition of the texts allows a fresh look at the complex relationship between the papacy and the imperial party up to the time of the Sixth Ecumenical Council in 681. We will examine the degree to which Anastasius was faithful to his model, and how far that aids us in the reconstruction of the original Greek text.

Finally, we turn to the broader context of Anastasius’ translations, to test our findings on his translation methodology in the Collectanea against that employed in other works: the Sermo Theodori Studitae de sancto Bartholomeo, the Historia Tripertita and the Historia Mistica of Germanus of Constantinople. These will be measured against contemporary critiques of the translations of Anastasius’ great literary rival, John Scotus Eriugena. By this means, we hope to identify a yardstick against which to measure Anastasius’ self-criticism.

With this mise en scène, we come to the drama itself, unfolded in the seven texts pertaining to Maximus’ controversy with the eastern church authorities over the doctrinal issue of the number of wills in Christ. The accounts of Maximus’ and his disciple’s trial in Constantinople in 655, their subsequent exile until the final trial in 662, followed by torture and the renewed hardship of exile until their deaths, tell us something of the politics of dissent in the Byzantine empire in the seventh century. We see much the same attempt to manufacture consent in operation under the rule of Michael III during the Photian controversy. However, this is not to detract from the theological significance of Maximus’ and his supporters’ dyothelite position, the strength of which ultimately prevailed at the Sixth Ecumenical Council. Anastasius’ attempt to mediate the terms of the controversy to the West, with only the inadequate theological vocabulary available in Latin at that time, is remarkable for its courage, if not for its unfailing clarity (and one hopes the same may be said for the English translation!). The documents constitute a valuable witness to both the history of the seventh-century monothelite controversy, and translation activity in the late ninth century.
Chap. 1: Anastasius Bibliothecarius – papal librarian, translator and diplomat

Introduction

Throughout his outstanding career as papal librarian, translator and diplomat, Anastasius "le tout-puissant",1 "l'éminence grise de la politique romaine",2 demonstrated that he must have been one of the few qualified for his position, or he would not have been continually reinstated after falling from papal grace so many times. His valuable connections with some of the most influential characters in Roman politics of the day, including his uncle Arsenius, apocrisiarius of Emperor Louis II, and an elastic political conscience were also valuable assets in the complex world of political relations between the papacy and the Frankish kingdoms. Our main sources for his life are the letters and prefaces of the Librarian himself, and the letters of Popes Nicholas I, Hadrian II, John VIII and Emperor Louis II; the Liber Pontificalis – Vitae Nicolai et Hadriani, and Annales Bertiniani of Hincmar of Rheims. These texts provide valuable information on the role of the papal librarian in the ninth century, and the various domains of power to which the incumbent was given access. Anastasius’ presence in a diplomatic role was crucial for the outcome of the Fourth Council of Constantinople in 869/870, which brought to a head papal dissatisfaction with the Photian party, imperial attitudes towards papal primacy and the Bulgarian question. Anastasius’ involvement in these three issues during the pontificate of Nicholas reveals his close relationship with the pontiff and the other major seat of power in the West at this time, the court of Carolingian Emperor Louis II.

Anastasius’ Career in the Roman Curia

Anastasius' career in the Roman church began when he was created Cardinal of S. Marcello, by Pope Leo IV in 847.3 Several months later, Anastasius left Rome for reasons which may have had to do with his links with the imperial party in Rome, which supported the eastern Carolingian emperor Lothar and his son Louis II, King of

---

1 As he has been called by Lapôtre, L'Europe et le Saint-Siège à l'époque carolingienne. 1: Le pape Jean VIII (Paris, 1895), repr. in Études sur la Papauté, 2 (Turin, 1978), p. 292.

2 Larchet, p. 140, n. 67.

3 The best accounts of Anastasius' chequered career are those of Arnaldi, Dizionario, pp. 25-37, and Davis, LP III, Introduction to the Life of Leo IV, pp. 104-105, 250-252 et passim.
Italy, in their opposition to Leo, who had been elected without the approval of the emperor. Anastasius was excommunicated on 16 December 850 by a council in Rome presided over by Pope Leo, and received the anathema on 19 June 854. The anathema was also to apply to "all those who wanted to offer him any assistance or comfort in—God forbid—his election to the honour of the pontificate." Throughout this period, Anastasius refused to obey the pope's injunction to return to Rome for trial, and stayed in exile around Aquileia for five years. Upon Leo's death in July 855, Anastasius marched on Rome with an army of supporters, including Arsenius and imperial legates of Louis II, to install himself on the papal throne in contempt of all due processes of election. After only three days as anti-pope, Anastasius was deposed by supporters of the properly-elected candidate, Benedict III. He was later readmitted to lay communion by Benedict.

Under Benedict's successor Nicholas, the papal candidate chosen by Louis II, and perhaps even in the time of Benedict III, Anastasius was made abbot of the Roman church of S. Maria in Trastevere and was adopted as Nicholas' unofficial secretary and private adviser. Upon the inauguration of Nicholas' successor Hadrian II on 14 December 867, Anastasius was restored to the priesthood, and soon after was elevated

---


5 Davis' translation in *LP III*, Introduction to the *Life of Leo IV*, p. 105, of *Annales Bertiniani*, p. 93.

6 Arsenius bishop of Orte (855-868), Anastasius' uncle and the father of Eleutherius, held the office of Roman apocrisarius, established by Louis II, from 848 or 849. This office was created by order of the Frankish emperor Lodhar in 824, and did not endure beyond the ninth century (J. Pargore, *DACL*, vol. 1, part 2, 'Apocrisiaire', col. 2553). Arsenius persuaded Nicolaus bishop of Anagni and Mercurius the master of the soldiers to assist him in his scheme to install Anastasius in the pontificate, according to Duchesne 2, p. 141 = *LP III*, *Life of Benedict*, 106, cc. 6-7, pp. 169f.

7 Duchesne 2, pp. 141-143 = *LP III*, *Life of Benedict III*, cc. 8-16, pp. 170-174.


9 *MGH VII*, p. 399, 7-8.

10 The first mention of this is in the *Annales Fuldisenses*, ed. F. Kurze, *MGH Scriptores Rerum Germanicarum* (Hannover, 1891), p. 61, in a letter to Nicholas from the bishops of Lorraine, Gunther and Theutgaut, after their condemnation at the Roman synod of October 863: "with your assistant Anastasius at your side, once a priest, condemned for ambition and deposed and anathematised, by whose underhanded influence your fury was aroused." (...*assistente lateri tuo Anastasio, olim presbytero ambitus damnato et anathematizado, cibus scelerato magisterio tuus praecipitatatur furor.*

11 Duchesne 2, p. 175 = *LP III*, *Life of Hadrian*, 108, c. 10, p. 264. Anastasius was restored at the same time as Zacharias of Anagni, deposed and excommunicated in 863 for trespassing on his assignment at
to the official position of *bibliothecarius sanctae romanae ecclesiae*, as Hincmar of Rheims records: *Isdem vero Eleutherius, consilio, ut fertur, fratris sui Anastasii, quem bibliothecarum Romanae ecclesiae in exordio ordinationis suae Adrianus constituerat*... 12

This passage of the *Annales Bertiniani* has been interpreted by previous scholars as referring to Eleutherius as Anastasius' brother (*fratris*). As Hincmar earlier in the same passage refers to Arsenius as father of Eleutherius, this was seen by many scholars to contradict the testimony of Anastasius himself in his letter to Ado bishop of Vienna that Arsenius was his uncle (and Eleutherius therefore his cousin). Anastasius' text unfortunately contains a lacuna almost at the crucial point (*Pendet autem anima eius [sc. Hadriani] ex anima avunculi mei, vestri vero ... Arseniti*) 13 and has been taken by some to have originally meant that Arsenius was Anastasius' father. 14 This interpretation was rejected by Perels. 15 Arnaldi raises the possibility that Arsenius was both stepfather and uncle of Anastasius, making Eleutherius his half-brother and cousin. 16 According to Lapôte's restoration of the text, Ado, bishop of Vienna, was a nephew of Arsenius, a possibility which Arnaldi rejects. Davis reviews their arguments briefly and settles for the testimony of Hincmar. 17 We might bear in mind that *frater* can mean "cousin" as well as "brother" (although usually referring to the son of a paternal uncle, 18 rather than a maternal one as Arsenius was to Anastasius, and usually where the context makes it clear that this is what is meant). Since Hincmar does not explicitly make a filial connection between Anastasius and Arsenius, the text would not then contradict Anastasius' own testimony. It would suit Hincmar's purposes to make the bond between Anastasius and the condemned murderer of the pope's wife and daughter appear as close

---

the Council of 861 in Constantinople, where Ignatius was condemned by Photius (on the 861 council, see Duchesne 2, pp. 158-159 = LP III, *Life of Nicholas*, c. 40, p. 222 and p. 212, n. 37).


14 E.g. Lapôte, pp. 323-326.


16 Arnaldi, *Dizionario*, p. 25.

17 *LP* III, p. 169, n. 9.

18 *Thesaurus Linguae Latinae*, v. 6, part 1, pp. 1254-55 gives *patru filius* as one definition of *frater*. 

13
as possible, and this may be one reason for his having chosen this ambiguous word rather than the more usual consobrinus. If Arsenius were indeed Anastasius' father, it would be strange that there is no mention of it in any of Anastasius' letters, or in the Liber Pontificalis.

The fortunes of the newly-appointed papal librarian changed again in 868 when he was accused of complicity in a plot to abduct the pope's wife and daughter. Anastasius' cousin Eleutherius, on the advice of his father Arsenius, abducted Hadrian's daughter, and took the pope's wife Stephania along as a hostage. Having married Hadrian's daughter who was betrothed to someone else, he then killed both her and her mother, apparently at the suggestion of Anastasius.\textsuperscript{19} The anathema of 854 was renewed and Anastasius was again deprived of the priesthood on 12 October, 868.\textsuperscript{20} He seems to have been exonerated from this charge within two years, because we find him addressing his translation of the Acts of the Eighth Ecumenical Council (869-870)\textsuperscript{21} to Pope Hadrian II in 871, under the title of Abbas et summae ac apostolicae vestrae sedis bibliothecarius.\textsuperscript{22} He is also referred to as "the librarian of the apostolic see" in the Life of Hadrian II at the time of his presence at the final session of the council.\textsuperscript{23} This may be evidence of Frankish imperial pressure upon Hadrian, and his own need for Frankish support in the face of increasing hostility from the Greeks over the deposition of Photius, and the Bulgarian question. Anastasius arrived in Constantinople in time to attend the last session of the council, in February 870. He had probably spent his years of exile at the court of Louis II, since he had been sent to the imperial capital in an imperial delegation with two other apocrisiarii: Suppo, leader of the gonfalonieri, and Euard, Louis' steward.\textsuperscript{24} These three were sent by Emperor Louis II to arrange a marriage contract

\textsuperscript{19} As recorded by Hincmar, Annales Bertiniani, p. 92; Nelson, p. 145.

\textsuperscript{20} Annales Bertiniani, pp. 94-96; Nelson, pp. 148-150; testimony against Anastasius was given by his relative Ado (p. 149).

\textsuperscript{21} So called in the West, but not recognised as ecumenical by the eastern church.

\textsuperscript{22} MGH VII, p. 403, 23-24.

\textsuperscript{23} Duchesne 2, p. 181 = LP III, c. 42, p. 280; as also in the list of those present at the Tenth Session in the acts of the Council redacted by Anastasius: PL 129, 148. On the authorship of this life, possibly by John Immonides, a close friend and supporter of Anastasius, see Davis, LP III, p. 249. The story of the kidnapping of the pope's wife and daughter is completely omitted from the Life of Hadrian, suggesting that the author was indeed a supporter of Anastasius.

\textsuperscript{24} These two are listed with Anastasius among those present at the Tenth Session of the Council, in the Acta, PL 129, 148.
between Louis' daughter Ermengarde and Emperor Basil's son Constantine. Louis II may have also used Anastasius in his negotiations with Basil for naval support against the Saracens, whom he had repelled in 847 and 852 near Benevento. The negotiation of the marriage-alliance required the approval of the pope, according to Anastasius' prologue to the Acts of the Council. Anastasius was not, however, part of the official papal delegation to the Council, and his role there in supervising the official Latin translation of the Greek conciliar acts was in an unofficial capacity, which suggests that he had not yet been restored to favour in the papal court.

On his return, he was sent to Naples on a double diplomatic mission, with a papal and imperial mandate along with Bertarius. He continued to hold the position of bibliotecarius under the following pope, John VIII, presumably up until his death between 877 and 880.

The Office of Papal Librarian as a Vehicle for Cultural Exchange

The latter half of the ninth century was a period of great political upheaval in the Roman empire of East and West, and one of rapid change for the papacy, involved in negotiations with the rulers of both over the terms of territory, protection and doctrinal disputes. In the complex networks of political and cross-cultural relations between Rome and the Franks in the West, and Constantinople in the East in the late 800s, bilingual skills were a valuable asset which few had the means to attain, to any degree of fluency, written or spoken. The potential of the office of papal librarian for facilitating cultural exchange was most fully realised by Anastasius, bibliotecarius from 867 or 868 until the late 870s.

---

25 ODB, 'Louis II', p. 1252. The letter of Louis II to Basil of 866 (MGH VII, ed. W. Henze, pp. 386-394) was probably written by Anastasius, although some scholars have claimed that it is a fabrication by Anastasius made under John VIII (see W. Henze, Preface to Ludovici II. Imperatoris epistola ad Basilium I. Imperatorem Constantinopolitanum missa, MGH VII, p. 386.)

26 Anastasius describes himself as ferentem etiam legationem ab apostolisis meritis decorato praesulatu vestro (MGH VII, Ep. 5, p. 410, 17); and further on, adds: (ibid., 19-21) In tam pio negotio et quod ad utriusque imperii unitatem, immo totius Christi ecclesiae libertatem pertinere procul dubio credebatur, praecipue summi pontificii vestri quaerebatur assensus.

Offices in the Papal Administration

The highest officials of the Lateran administration in the late eighth century were the seven iudices de clero, among whom the bibliothecarius was not numbered. The iudices were the primicerius notariorum, the chief secretary who supervised the notaries and the papal library and archives in the seventh century; his deputy the secundicerius; the sacellarius or paymaster, and the arcarius or treasurer, who looked after financial matters; the primus defensorum who was the head of the defensores, who defended the legal rights of the poor and oppressed, and later the rights of the church in general; the nomenclator whose duties remain obscure, but by the tenth century seems to have had the charge of orphans and the oppressed; and finally the vestiarius, who was in charge of much of the church’s wealth.

Six of these offices survived at least into the later ninth century, when the Liber Pontificalis uses the terms iudices de clero, iudices palatini and iudices ordinarii synonymously. The vestiarius was replaced by the vicedominus, the master of ceremonies and steward of the papal palace, and the protoscrinarius, who first appears in 861 in charge of the scrinia, i.e. the offices of the notaries, who wrote papal documents, oversaw the papal archive and functioned as the secretariat for papal synods. The Liber Diurnus seems to equate the papal archive with the Lateran scrinium, as interpreted by Noble, but the text may be taken to mean that the archive was kept in the secretarial office. According to Noble, no sharp distinction between the scrinarii and the notarii can be discerned in the sources. It seems reasonable to infer that Anastasius, who entered the service of the papal curia probably in 862 under

28 Noble, p. 237. Leo III used his nomenclator, bibliothecarius, vestiarius and cubicularius as judges, according to Jaffé 2525.

29 Noble, pp. 218f.


31 Noble, p. 219, states, “They (i.e. notaries) were often among the pope’s closest advisers and frequently served as his personal envoys. Their use as envoys, often on sensitive missions, probably resulted from their knowledge of state secrets gained through their secretarial work...Notaries were always clerics, usually sub-deacons, and under the Republic were quite regularly noblemen.”
Pope Nicholas I,\textsuperscript{32} initially held the position of \textit{notarius} or \textit{scrinarius}.\textsuperscript{33} By the late ninth century, the \textit{primicerius} and the \textit{protoscrinarius} oversaw the duties of papal correspondence and the keeping of papal records, and a separate office had developed for the care of the papal library, that of \textit{bibliothecarius}.

\textit{History of the Office of Bibliothecarius}

The history of this office is rather obscure, and has to be reconstructed from occasional oblique references in the sources, mainly in the \textit{Liber Pontificalis} and the \textit{Regesta Pontificum Romanorum}. The latter source adds to the confusion because it includes spurious records from a later date than that under which they are listed. Thus all major scholars of the history of the papal library offer different suggestions for the identity of the first bearer of this office as a distinct and exclusive one. According to Leclercq, it is at the end of the seventh century or the beginning of the eighth that a \textit{bibliothecarius}, as distinct from the \textit{primicerius}, was charged especially with the care of books.\textsuperscript{34} This began when Pope Sergius entrusted care of his library to the subdeacon and \textit{sacellarius} Gregory, who was to become pope in 717. De Rossi, following Pitra, agrees that Gregory was the first \textit{bibliothecarius}, but we may note that this was not a permanent and exclusive office at this stage.\textsuperscript{35} According to de Rossi, the \textit{bibliothecarius} was effected in his own right as men of higher office, mostly suburbicarian bishops, began to assume the office. From the early ninth century the \textit{bibliothecarius} began to sign subscriptions to papal correspondence, along with the \textit{primicerius}.\textsuperscript{36} Anastasius was probably the only \textit{bibliothecarius} from the ninth century onwards who was not also a bishop. He himself provides some useful information about the office in his description of the duties of the \textit{chartophylax} in the church of Constantinople, which he likens to the office of \textit{bibliothecarius} in Rome.

\textsuperscript{32} Perels, \textit{Anastasius}, pp. 215f.

\textsuperscript{33} There is one instance of the signature of an \textit{Anastasius notarius et scrinarius sanctae Romanae ecclesiae} (Jaffé 2675A), on April 18, 859, but Santifaller, p. 53, stated that this mention of him is taken from a later document (Jaffé 3381) produced under John VIII.

\textsuperscript{34} H. Leclercq, 'Rome: Bibliothèque et Archives pontificales', \textit{DACL} 14/2, col. 3107, n.1.

The *chartophylax* introduced visitors to the patriarch, presented representatives to church councils, received all letters sent to the patriarch except those sent by other patriarchs, and approved and presented to the patriarch all candidates for bishoprics, other clerical orders and higoumenates.37

Schramm suggested that the first permanent and exclusive *bibliothecarius* dated from 829,38 that is, from the holding of the office by Bishop Leo under Pope Gregory IV. Noble, citing Santifaller, claims that this exclusive office first appeared in the pontificate of Hadrian I, whose *bibliothecarii* were Zacharias (773), Theophylact (781) and Anastasius (787), “who appear to have charge of the library alone.”39 It seems to have escaped Noble’s attention that the documents in which Zacharius and Anastasius are mentioned are definitely spurious, according to Santifaller, and that the mention of Theophylact is of dubious authenticity. It must be for this reason that Santifaller names Sergius as the original *bibliothecarius sanctae sedis apostolicae*, in December 817 during the pontificate of Paschal I. Sergius’ name is found in annotations which officially date papal privileges. All the clerical officials of the papal chancellery who were made responsible for signing papal privileges came from noble families. We may note that Sergius is mentioned in the *Annales Regni Francorum* as an envoy of the pope to Emperor Louis the Pious in 823, the first indication of the ambassadorial function of this office.40 Since the papacy did not have a regular diplomatic institution in the early Middle Ages,41 any of the major office holders could be seconded to this role, as was later the case for Anastasius.

---


37 Mansi 16, 38D: *Sine illo praeterea nullus praesulum aut clericorum a foris veniens in conspectum patriarchae intromittitur, nullus eclesiastico conventui praesentatur, nullus epistola patriarchae missa recipitur, nisi forte a ceteris patriarchis mittatur, nullus ad praesulatum vel alterius ordinis clericatum, sive ad praepositorum monasteriorum provekitur, nisi iste nunc approbet et commendet, atque de illo ipsi patriarchae suggerat, et ipse praequent.*


39 Noble, p. 221.


41 Noble, p. 239: “The papal *apocrisiarii* resident at the capital from the fifth century to the 730s were not ambassadors.” They remained “essentially messengers” (see p. 239, n. 145) without plenipotentiary powers until the twelfth century.
Anastasius assumed the office of *bibliothecarius* soon after the consecration of Hadrian II on December 14, 867. His role was extended to “prefect of the archive and papal library.” In a letter to Bishop Ado to inform him of Hadrian’s election, Anastasius gives as his title *sanctae Romanae ecclesiae bibliothecarius*. In this letter he requests Ado to encourage the new pope to follow in the footsteps of his predecessor Nicholas, thereby revealing his own keen interest in the issue of papal primacy. The first papal document in which we find his name dates from 25 February 868, where *Anastasius Bibliothecarius sanctae summae sedis apostolicae* is named as the *datarius* of Hadrian’s letter (Jaffé 2904). He also served this function of dating papal correspondence under Pope John VIII, in whose pontificate he remained as *bibliothecarius*, as we find in Jaffé 3033, 3034 and 3104. The last mention of his name in this capacity is in a letter dated 29 May, 877. A new *bibliothecarius*, Zacharias, appears on March 29, 879, probably as successor to Anastasius.

The fact that the abbot of Santa Maria in Trastevere came to be elevated to such a position in the papal court after a failed attempt at the papal throne in 855 seems at first astonishing. We find a veiled reference to this in his preface to a Latin translation of Leontius of Neapolis’ Greek *Life of John the Almsgiver*, which he dedicated to Nicholas, between the date of his inauguration as pope in December 858, and 862. In this letter to Nicholas, Anastasius quoted *Ecclesiastes*, 3, 22: *Do not seek things that are above you and do not examine things that are stronger than you*, explaining that he feared to take up a translation which exceeded the powers of his small intellect. The dedication of this translation to Nicholas can be seen as an effort to ingratiate himself with the new pope, and a guarantee that he had abandoned his grand ambitions, and turned his skills to humbler and more spiritual pursuits.

Whether or not Nicholas was convinced, we cannot be sure, but he must have recognised a person of remarkable talents in Anastasius, not least with regard to his linguistic abilities, at a time when fluency in Greek, either written or spoken, was difficult to find amongst non-Greeks in the West. Anastasius’ links with the imperial court of the Franks would also have been seen as useful to Nicholas. Thus in spite of

---

42 Santifaller, p. 56.
43 Santifaller, p. 59.
his murky past during the pontificates of Leo IV and Benedict III, Anastasius entered the service of the papal curia in 862.

Political context of the Ninth-Century Papacy

The political nature of Anastasius' position was a function of the highly political role of the papacy in the complex relations between the Franks, Italy and the Byzantine empire in the ninth century. These can only be dealt with briefly here. The best sources of information for this period are the Annales Bertiniani, written (for this period) by Hincmar bishop of Rheims, the Lives of Nicholas and Hadrian II recorded in the Liber Pontificalis, and various letters exchanged between the papacy, the Franks and the Byzantine court of Michael III (842-867) and Basil I (867-886). As well as the continuing question of papal jurisdiction and patrimonies, under Nicholas I there was an increased insistence on the primacy of the church of Rome over the other four churches in the pentarchy: Constantinople, Antioch, Alexandria and Jerusalem. Under the program which Ullmann has called "papal theocracy", Nicholas claimed supreme authority in all matters of government, as the chief dispenser of doctrine and law, in both the spiritual and temporal spheres. This claim to primacy was justified as divinely ordained, as an extension of the powers Christ gave to Peter (in Matt. 16, 18) of binding and loosing in heaven and on earth. Each pope was to be regarded as the heir of Peter by position, regardless of his personal or moral worth for this office. The pope alone was truly "the vicar of God distributing power on earth".44 Hence Anastasius' ambition for the papacy, and after he had abandoned all hope of that, for control over papal records and correspondence. His knowledge of Greek made him invaluable in papal communications with the East, and enabled him to translate various works of cultural and political significance into Latin.

From the time of the adoption of the regal-sacerdotal model of kingship by the Frankish kings from Pepin onward, the papacy attempted to convince the Frankish rulers to accept this program. This entailed a responsibility on the Franks' part to offer

military protection to the see of Rome and its territories, a responsibility which the Franks often chose not to recognise. Pope Stephen undertook to cross the Alps in order to anoint Pepin and his family in 754, thus confirming his kingship and at the same time requesting aid against the Lombard threat.\textsuperscript{45} Pepin and his sons were granted the honorific title, "Patrician of the Romans". At Charles the Bald's coronation in 875, John VIII expressed the hope that Charles would “provide security to the Roman people and exalt the Roman church”.\textsuperscript{46} By extension, the pope as head of the Frankish church claimed full jurisdictional powers over Frankish bishops. This was resisted both by the Frankish emperors, and by many of their clergy. Particularly outspoken on this issue was Hincmar, bishop of Rheims, in the kingdom of West Francia, ruled by Charles the Bald (843-877).

This conception of the personal sovereignty of the pope gave obvious grounds for conflict with the East. In the "cesaropapist" framework of late antiquity and the early medieval period, the Constantinopolitan emperor considered himself both king and priest, thus head of the Roman empire and head of the one church, God's vicar on earth, exercising divinely ordained power and authority over all his subjects, including the bishop of Rome. The issue was not a new one, and had come to a head under Patriarch Tarasius, uncle of Photius, who at the time of the Council of Nicaea II (787) claimed the title of "ecumenical patriarch" which the Romans translated as "universal" and took to be a claim to the headship of the whole church, which Hadrian I describes as "ridiculous".\textsuperscript{47} Anastasius himself points out, in his translation of the Acts of the Eighth Ecumenical Council, that he had often reproached the Greeks for their constant use of this term, but understood that it did not carry the implications for primacy that were assumed from the Latin translation of the term.

Pope Nicholas is the first to refer to the Forged Decretals of Isidore, which purported to be decrees of Isidore of Seville (d. 636) concerning protection of episcopal

\textsuperscript{45} Noble, pp. 87ff. examines the political and religious implications of this event. See his summary of previous literature on the subject on pp. 275-76.


\textsuperscript{47} Mansi XII, 1074A-1075B.
rights by appeal to the papal primacy. These are thought to have been invented in c. 850, and may have been brought to Rome by Rothad II, deposed from his see of Soissons by Hincmar of Rheims in 862. In 868 Hincmar, bishop of Laon and nephew of Hincmar of Rheims, "who had quarreled with Charles the Bald and with his own uncle about the extent of royal rights over church property, had sent to Rome (with arguments based on the Forged Decretals) and gained Hadrian's support." 49 Perels has convincingly demonstrated Anastasius' involvement in the redaction of both Nicholas' and Hadrian's correspondence with the Frankish emperor Louis II and the eastern emperors, Michael and his successor Basil. 50 In his preface to the Acts of the Eighth Ecumenical Council, Anastasius affirms that he was the dictator of the letters from Nicholas I and Hadrian II to Constantinople: 51

Nam pene omnia, quae ad praesens negotium pertinent quaeque a sede apostolica
Latino sermone prolata sunt sive quae in huius synodi codice sive quae in alis
voluminis continentur, ego summis pontificibus obsecundans, decessori scilicet
vestro ac vobis, exposui...

His hand is clearly seen in Nicholas' letter to Michael of September 28, 865, in response to a letter from Michael which was "filled with blasphemies." 52 The pope’s letter offers a clear display of what Banniard labels "linguistic nationalism" but what I would prefer to call "cultural imperialism". Michael’s letter unfortunately does not survive, so we have to reconstruct its content from the context. The influence of Anastasius on Nicholas’ letter is revealed in several phrases which are identical to those used by Anastasius on other occasions. It is worth quoting a long passage of this tirade against Michael in translation, for the political insights it affords.

But you have reached such a point of fury that you inflict insult on the Latin language, calling it in your letter a barbarian and Scythian tongue... Now, if you

48 Ep. 66a, MGH VI, pp. 379-381 in a letter to the Roman synod to demonstrate that Rothad had been unjustly deposed (24 December, 864). As Davis, LP III, p. 236, n. 128, remarks, "Whether Nicholas knew they were forgeries is an unresolved question."

49 Davis, Introduction to the Life of Hadrian II, LP III, p. 257.

50 Perels, Anastasius, pp. 242-305.


call Latin a barbarian and Scythian tongue because you do not understand it, consider how ridiculous it is to call yourself emperor of the Romans, and not to know the Roman tongue...Finally, if you label the...language barbarian because it produces too many barbarisms when translated into Greek diction by translators, it is not the fault of the Latin language, but in our opinion, the fault of the translators who did not, as was necessary, try to render the meaning from the sense, but violently tried to reproduce it word for word...How much you detract from your honour if you do not use this language willingly and with complete understanding in your prayers and offices. Therefore, cease to call yourself emperor of the Romans since in your opinion they are barbarians, whose emperor you claim to be. For the Romans use this language which you call barbarian and Scythian.53

Michael’s description of Latin as a “barbarian” language was calculated to infuriate the pope, by challenging old Rome’s right to define barbarians as those speaking a language other than Latin. Michael’s use of the term recalls its Greek origins (barbaroi), and so challenges one of the very foundations on which Rome’s notion of its own superiority had long rested. The adjective “Scythian” is probably used in its classical sense of the stereotypical barbarian beyond the borders of empire, ironically much closer geographically to the new Rome than to its old rival.

In the final line of the passage translated above, we read that the Romans “use” (utuntur) Latin. Banniard has interpreted this use of the present tense in 865 as evidence that Latin was the general language of communication, that is vertical communication between the literary and non-literary strata of Roman society, for at least 150 years longer than it was used for this purpose in Gaul, being replaced there by the proto-Romance dialect that became old French.54 Banniard presents a convincing argument for this dating which is much later than traditional accounts by Romance philologists, using a contrastive typology of Latin and proto-Romance forms at the levels of morphology and syntax, and placing the breakdown of vertical

54 M. Banniard, Viva Voce. Communication écrite et communication orale du IVe au IXe siècle en Occident latin, Institut des Etudes Augustiniennes (Paris, 1992), pp. 545f., and p. 534 for a chronological schema of linguistic change in the Latin West.
communication and the abandonment of passive competence in classical forms at around 800 in Gaul and a couple of generations later in Spain. Communication within the literary strata continued in Latin of course, at least as late as 960 in Italy, to judge from the testimony of Gonzon of Novarre.\textsuperscript{55}

The exchange between Michael and Nicholas took place in the middle of the Photian controversy between Ignatius, patriarch of Constantinople, and his rival Photius, in which the involvement of Anastasius was of signal importance for future relations between the papacy and Constantinople. The whole affair called into question Roman papal primacy over the universal church, the promotion of which was one of the primary objectives of Nicholas' pontificate, with the unwavering support of Anastasius.

**Anastasius Bibliothecarius and the Photian Schism**

For seven years Anastasius was constantly employed in a propaganda war against Photius, up until the Council of 869/70, as he confirms in the introduction to his translation of the acts of that council.\textsuperscript{56} Anastasius and Photius (c. 810-893/894) were contemporaries, and perhaps saw each other as personal rivals: they were both high-level functionaries in the civil service, Photius in charge of the Imperial Chancery as *protoasekretis* before his elevation to the patriarch throne,\textsuperscript{57} and Anastasius as librarian.

\textsuperscript{55} Banniard presents a lovely anecdote in the form of a letter written by Gonzon to the monks of St Gall, where he paid a brief and not very happy visit in c. 960. After complaining of his host's lack of hospitality, he goes on to criticise the monks of the community, namely one "petty boy" who, upon hearing Gonzon use an accusative case where he should have used the ablative, and thinking such an error unpardonable in one so respected for his erudition, observed that Gonzon was "an old man who deserved to be whipped". Naturally Gonzon was cut to the quick, and writes in his own defence that he was sometimes handicapped by his use of the vulgar tongue, which was close to Latin. The text of PL 136, 1285ff. appears in part and in translation in Banniard, *op. cit.*, Appendix 3, p. 548. We can safely assume that such problems were not troubling Anastasius a century earlier.

\textsuperscript{56} Preface to his translation of the *Acts of the Eighth Ecumenical Council*, Ep. 5, MGH VII, p. 410, 22-25: *Det ergo nutu actum est, ut tanti negotii cum loci servatoribus apostolicae sedis et ipsæ fine gauderem et veniens fructuum in exuilatione portarem manipulos, qui per septennium ferme pro eo indefesse laboraveram et per totum orbem verborum semina sidule scribendo disperseram.*

translator and dictator of papal correspondence. Photius was a person of great erudition and learning, and a prolific writer and collator, as witnessed by his *homilies*, Lexikon, Amphilochia, Mystagogy of the Holy Spirit and above all the Bibliotheca, an extensive collection of reviews of classical and Christian literature. As Lemerle has convincingly demonstrated, Photius was not a teacher in the imperial academy, as once thought. He was the nephew of the Patriarch Tarasius, and may have been related by marriage to the empress Theodora. As well as his literary works, various letters of Photius survive, and have been recently edited by B. Laourdas and L. Westerink.

The main issues involved in the schism between Photius and the Roman church, were those of papal primacy and jurisdiction over the nascent church of Bulgaria. Photius, the iconophile patriarch of Constantinople, succeeded Ignatius (847-858) in 858, the outcome of years of struggle between Ignatius and his enemies. Pope Nicholas protested, and sent delegates to a council in Constantinople on the issue in 861. Unfortunately, there was not one among the legates who could understand Greek, and thus the mission to reinstate Ignatius failed miserably. The pope deposed and excommunicated Photius in 863. Photius, in what Dvornik calls his “worst mistake”, retaliated with an anathema upon the pope in 867. He held the patriarchal throne until that year, when he was deposed by the new emperor Basil I, who had murdered Michael III. Ignatius, called out of exile, was reinstated, and held the throne until his death in 877, whereupon Photius succeeded him until his final exile was imposed in 886. Ignatius had initially had Roman support but showed himself hostile to Rome on the question of the Bulgarian church, which had asserted its autonomy from the Roman church in 870. Photius probably returned from exile in 873, and was reconciled with

---


61 MGH VII, Pref. 5, p. 405, 27-32.

62 Dvornik, *Photian Schism*, p. 433. See also pp. 120-4, 128-31, 141-3 on the Synod of 867.

63 After the council of 869-870, Ignatius consecrated a bishop for the Bulgarians, which fact is omitted from the Liber Pontificalis Vita Hadriani, as Davis notes, *LP* III, p. 291, n. 141.

64 Dvornik, *Photian Schism*, pp. 163f. and 172f.
the emperor, who appointed him as tutor to his children. Ignatius and Photius seem to have been reconciled before the former's death on 23 October, 877, upon which Photius was restored as patriarch. The alleged "second schism" with Rome which was thought to have taken place after the Council of 879-880 has been demonstrated by Dvornik to be a fabrication of past scholarship which sought to vilify this saint of the eastern church.65

The Bulgarian Question

According to a letter from Nicholas to Louis the German's representative, Bishop Salomon of Constantia, in mid-864, Boris, Khan of the Bulgars (852-888), had promised Louis the German that he would receive Christianity from the Apostolic See through Frankish agency.66 This seems to have been stipulated in the terms of a peace treaty Boris made with Louis against Byzantium in 862. This step alarmed the Byzantine emperor, who could not afford to have a vassal of the western powers on his doorstep. Boris yielded to the pressure of Byzantine military force in 863, and was obliged to accept Byzantine missionaries who baptised many Bulgarians from 864-866.67 Boris himself was officially baptised by members of the church of Constantinople in 865 or 866, and took the name of his godfather, the emperor Michael III, as his Christian name.68 Photius' letter of instruction to Boris dates from this period (865/866).69 In this letter Photius outlined the duties of a Christian ruler in lofty terms, presenting norms for court ceremonial and detailed instructions on how Boris should dress and behave towards his subjects. Photius also expounded the Christian doctrines upheld at the seven ecumenical councils in complicated theological language which would have been largely lost on the new convert.70

---

65 Dvornik, Photian Schism, pp. 202-236.
66 MGH VI, Ep. 26, p. 293, 5-8. This is treated by V. Gjuzelev, "La Bulgarie médiévale et l'Europe occidentale (IXe-Xle s.)," in Medieval Bulgarie, Centre culturel du monde byzantin (Villach, 1988), p. 215.
67 V. Gjuzelev, "The Adoption of Christianity", in Medieval Bulgarie (see previous note), p. 133.
68 V. Gjuzelev, ibid., p. 129.
70 Gjuzelev, "The Adoption of Christianity", op. cit., p. 138, puts it thus: "Patriarch Photius' endeavour to reveal before Knyaz Boris, who had quite a pragmatic attitude to the new religion, the profound and quite
Due to the tight control exercised upon the Bulgarian church by the Byzantine patriarch, and the Byzantine refusal to allow Boris his own patriarch, the ruler turned back towards the West in 866. In August of that year, Boris invited the Frankish missionaries of Charles the Bald into Bulgaria, and consulted Nicholas in a letter on the problems of a pagan society converting to Christianity. In his famous reply, Nicholas dealt with Boris' 106 questions about the changes Boris would have to make among his newly Christianised people. Nicholas dealt with each of these questions seriously, including queries over whether the Byzantine clergy were right to forbid baths on Wednesdays and Fridays; whether the Bulgarians had to take off their belts (with swords attached) for communion; whether they were allowed to make prayers for rain, or to wear trousers, their customary attire. These questions show that the problems uppermost in Boris' mind were practical ones, rather than theological matters of trinitarian or christological doctrine. In his reply, Nicholas impressed upon the Bulgarians the universal authority of the see of Rome. The motives behind his reply are obvious: Nicholas was eager to regain jurisdiction over the formerly Roman sees of Illyricum, part of which lay in Bulgaria. Authority over the nascent Bulgarian church would ensure Rome some security against future Byzantine expansion. Boris was well-pleased by Nicholas' response, and expected to achieve his aim of attaining an autocephalous archbishopric, which would give his church the independent status it needed, situated as it was between the three great powers of Francia, Rome and Constantinople. He was however to be disappointed. His request for an independent archbishopric under Formosus was refused, since Formosus was already bishop of Porto. Formosus headed a mission to Bulgaria in 866, with Paul, bishop of Populonia, bearing Latin liturgical books and the civil code. Hadrian II also refused to allow Boris Formosus as archbishop, or his second choice of candidate, the legate Marinus. Although

abstract theological disputes about the nature of the Holy Trinity, the ideological rudiments of Christianity and its philosophical essence, is surprising." I find this endeavour not so much surprising for a man like Photius, as inappropriate to his readership.

71 Ep. 99, MHG VI, pp. 568-600. See also Ep. 100, MGH VI, pp. 600-609, to Hincmar, which deals with the Bulgarian question.

72 Duchesne 2, p. 165 = LP III, Life of Nicholas, cc. 73-74, pp. 243 f. and n. 58.


evangelisation had proceeded with much success under Formosus, in late 867 he was recalled to Rome, and the subdeacon Sylvester sent in his place. Boris refused to accept this substitute and turned to Constantinople, sending an embassy there in time for the last session of the so-called Eighth Ecumenical Council in February 870. In an extraordinary sitting of the council, from which Anastasius was excluded, the church of Constantinople ruled in its own favour on the question of jurisdiction over Bulgaria.\footnote{In Anastasius's translation of the \textit{Acts of the Eighth Ecumenical Council}, the Bulgarian legates are listed as present at the Tenth Session (PL 129, 148). An account of the extraordinary session from the Roman legates' point of view, and of its background, is the subject of a large part of the \textit{Life of Hadrian II}, Duchesne 2, pp. 182-185 = \textit{LP III}, n. 108, cc. 46-63, pp. 283-290. It concludes with the information that Grimwald had returned to Rome, very wealthy, saying he had been expelled from Bulgaria, and Greek priests welcomed in place of the Roman ones who were thrown out. However, Boris had given the papacy no notice of such an expulsion and treachery was suspected on the part of Grimwald (Duchesne 2, p. 185 = \textit{LP III}, c. 64, pp. 290-91.)}

Both Anastasius and Hadrian were furious, but unable to change the outcome.\footnote{Anastasius gives eloquent testimony to his outrage in his preface to the acts, MGH VII, p. 415, 6-21: 'So therefore, the Greeks, whenever they had an opportunity at the celebration of an ecumenical council, are clearly shown to have often acted thus, and sometimes by deletion (of sections of documents), sometimes by additions or alterations, sometimes in the absence of associates, sometimes in the secrecy of corners, at other times outside the synod or after the synod through their cunning, or rather, deception, they abuse the common sanctions and bend everything violently to their own will, as they see fit... Therefore, so that the swinish cunning, or better, deceit of the Greeks may not influence the present synod, let what I have said be enough of a warning.' (\textit{Sic igitur, sic Graeci accepta occasione celebratorum universalium conciliorum frequenter egisse clarescunt et nunc minuendo, nunc addendo vel mutando, nunc in absentia sociorum, nunc in abscondito angulorum, nunc extra synodom, nunc post synodom astutia sua immo fraudae communiibus sanctionibus abutuntur et ad suos libitum cuncta, quae sibi visa fuerint, etiam violenter inflectunt... Ne ergo Grecorum suatum astutia, quin potius dolositas, etiam circa praesentem synodom agat, haec me admonendi causa dixisse sufficiat.)}

Attempts made by papal representatives to the Council of 879-880 to reopen the issue were quickly scotched by Photius, and Bulgaria remained under Constantinopolitan jurisdiction with an autocephalous archbishop from 870 until Constantinople's invasion of Bulgaria in the reign of John Tzimiskes in 972, when the independent archbishopric was abolished. Relations between the Roman and Bulgarian churches were severed until the tenth century, and in the schism of 1054 Bulgaria, under the influence of Leo of Ochrid, sided with the Greek church.\footnote{I. Sofranov, 'Bulgarian Rite', \textit{New Catholic Encyclopaedia}, v. 2, p. 876.}

Anastasius' connection with Cyril and Methodius, missionaries to the Slavs, seems to have been a close and fruitful one. He helped Constantine-Cyril and Methodius to
arrange liturgies in Rome in Slavonic in 868, according to the *Vita Constantini*. At the request of the ruler Ratislav, they had been sent as missionaries to Great Moravia in 863 by Emperor Michael III, where they had some success, in spite of opposition from Frankish missionaries, through their use of Slavonic translations of the liturgy, canonical works and Scriptures. These were written in the Glagolitic alphabet, invented for the purpose. They were then summoned to the court of Nicholas in 867, and probably responded in part in order to obtain the ordination of some of their disciples. They arrived there after the pope's death on 13 November 867, but received a warm welcome from Hadrian II, particularly since they brought with them the rediscovered relics of Pope Clement, which were installed in the church of San Clemente in Rome. According to the *Vita Hadriani*, Hadrian had sent the bishops Dominic and Grimuald off to Bulgaria with the same hopes and intentions as previously held by Nicholas with respect to the infant church there. In a letter possibly redacted by Anastasius, Hadrian authorised the brothers Cyril and Methodius to translate the liturgy, Scriptures and other Christian works into Slavonic. This was later banned by Stephen V (885-891). Before Cyril-Constantine died in Rome on 14 February 869, he specifically enjoined

---


80 I think this is implied by Hussey, *ibid.*, p. 96: "When it became necessary to ordain some of their followers they could hardly approach any Frankish bishop so they travelled south." Cf. Davis, *LP III*, p. 254: 'After their first successes they were on the way to Constantinople with a group of neophytes to arrange for the organization of their church; in the winter of 866-867 they reached Venice and Nicholas invited them to Rome.' It would have been while they were in Venice that they received news of Basil's murder of Michael III on September 24, 867, and the deposition of Photius, according to F. Grivec, *Konstantin und Method: Lehrer der Slaven* (Wiesbaden, 1960), p. 77. This must have influenced their decision to seek the support of Rome for their mission to Bulgaria.


82 As Grivec maintains, *op. cit.*, p. 260. Grivec, pp. 78-82, cites the Slavic *Vita Constantini* as evidence that the Slavic priests had the help of Anastasius Bibliothecarius in performing a Slavic liturgy in the presence of Hadrian II at St Peter's Basilica, and of Bishop Arsenius, Anastasius' uncle, who was one of the "seven bishops", i.e. seven suburbanarian bishops who were advisors to the pope and belonged to the papal court. Bishop Formosus opposed the authorisation of the Slavic liturgy, according to *Vita Constantini*, ch. 17.


84 *Vita Constantini*, ed. F. Dvornik (see note 77 above), p. 380.
Methodius to return to his work in Great Moravia. This Methodius did, but was brought under increasing pressure by the Frankish missionaries who considered him an intruder on their territory. He was imprisoned until 873 when he was released at the insistence of the pope. After his death in 885, many of his disciples were sold into slavery or forced to flee. Clement and Naum escaped to Bulgaria, where they instituted the rite of Cyril and Methodius in Slavonic.

Towards the end of his life, Anastasius made a rapprochement towards his old adversary, as revealed in Photius' letter of reply, which arrived in Rome, according to Lapòtre, not before the spring of 879. Arnaldi suggests that Anastasius had probably died by then. His failing health is often mentioned in his later prefaces. Photius' letter expresses a regretful acknowledgement that political contingencies had precluded what could have been a sympathetic relationship. It reads as follows:

The competition starts from the starting line, as the proverb goes. Look, I do not complain of (wasted) usefulness or your intention. I see the time is past, and that riddle seems to describe this well, in depicting (opportunity) in the flesh as long-haired on the forehead and bald from behind. For when someone comes after the opportunity has passed, even if he pursues it with great skill, he cannot grasp it. But I commend you for your belated sympathetic intention. For friends ought not to measure grace by utility, but to judge goodwill by disposition.

Conclusion

The date of Anastasius' death is obscure, but seems to have occurred between 877 and 880. The last official mention of him occurs in a papal document from 29 May 877. Devos concurs with Lapòtre in suggesting a date of late 878 or early 879 for his

---

85 Arnaldi, Dizionario, p. 35.
86 PG 102, Ep. 66, 877D-880A. The text reads:

Ἄψε ἵππας μὲν σοι, τὸ παρομοίωτος, ὅ ἀγαθόν ὡψέ δὲ τῆς χρείας, καὶ τῆς γνώμης οὐ μέμφομαι. Τὸν καὶ πάντα ὃ ὤψε αὐτὸν, καὶ μοι δοκεῖ τότινον οὐκ ἀκινήτως ἡ συναγωνική ἡ ἀπεικάζουν λόγος, ἐμπροσθεν μὲν ἀκριβεῖσθαι, ὃποιοι δὲ κουράζοντες καὶ ἱστορικόν ἐν χρώμα, διαχρόνια, ἐπειδὰν γὰρ τις ὀπίσω τοῦ χρόνου γέννηται, κἂν μυρίας αὐτὸν ἐπιδιώκῃ, τέχναι, οὐκ ἔστιν αὐτοῦ περιδράσασθαι. Ἀλλ’ εὕρετε σοι καὶ τῆς διὰ βραδᾶς ἐλθούσης συμπαθίας προσκυνήσεως. Φύλων γὰρ, οὐχὶ τῇ χρείᾳ τὴν χάριν μετεῖν, τῇ προθεσί δὲ κρίνειν τὴν εὐνοίαν.

87 Santisfaller, pp. 56.
death, since the signature of a new bibliothecarius, Zaccharias of Anagni, appears on 29 March 879 (Jaffé 3230). He rejects the contention of Ertl that certain letters of Pope John VIII, composed after March 879 and as late as 882, have been redacted by the same author as those preceding, i.e. Anastasius. While we must concede that the appearance of a new librarian does not necessarily imply a distancing of Anastasius from the curia and from the functions of dictator, nor his death, as Arnaldi notes, the stylistic evidence presented by Ertl is not sufficient to make a definite attribution of authorship. Anastasius' failing health had for some years prevented him from taking an active role in papal affairs, and with the new pro-Byzantine policy of John VIII after the reinstatement of Ignatius and the definitive loss of the Bulgarian church to Roman jurisdiction, Anastasius' old policies would in any case have been in need of a major ideological overhaul.

88 P. Devos, 'Anastasius le Bibliothécaire, sa contribution à la correspondance pontificale; la date de sa mort', Byzantion 32 (1962), pp. 97-115.
89 So also Santifaller, p. 60.
91 Arnaldi, Dizionario, pp. 35-36.
Chap. 2: Anastasius’ Choice of works for Translation: Sociolinguistic and Political Context

Introduction

Anastasius’ works of translation cannot be treated as if they emerged in a cultural vacuum. A complex combination of political, personal and ecclesiastical considerations underpinned each choice of work, whether it was hagiographical, theological or historical. In many cases the Librarian responded to requests from others, usually of high rank within the church, whose patronage he needed or desired. The sources tell us little with regard to Anastasius’ early literary formation, except that he was brought up in Rome with Latin as his mother tongue.\(^1\) It is clear that he received an exceptional education, probably within a monastery, since public education had disappeared by the end of the sixth century.\(^2\) He began to acquire Greek at an early age.\(^3\) Anastasius' contact with the brothers Cyril and Methodius from 867 or 868 would have been valuable for the improvement of his linguistic skills. In his preface to the translation of the glosses of Dionysius the Areopagite, he mentions that Constantine-Cyril had committed to memory a codex of Dionysius' works, and had recounted it to his listeners at the time of his visit to Rome in 868.\(^4\)

Knowledge of Greek in Italy

The singularity of Anastasius' attainment of a solid grounding in Greek as part of his monastic education in Rome can only be appreciated with some understanding of the state of Greek literacy in the West in the ninth century. By the mid-fifth century, western knowledge of Greek had fallen into a steep decline even in Rome, and was virtually

\(^1\) MGH VII, Ep. 17, p. 440, 8-9, speaking of the Greek Passion of Dionysius the Areopagite: quam Romae legi, cum puer essem....


\(^3\) MGH VII, Ep. 9, p. 423, 11-12: ...ut nec ipsius linguae meae, in qua natus sum, ne dixerim alienae, vim penetrare sufficiam ac per hoc nunquam interpretandi quacunque ratione conamen arripere praesumpsisse...

\(^4\) MGH VII, Ep. 13, p. 433, 18-21: Constantinus philosophus qui ...totum codicem saepe memorati et memorandi patris memoriae commendaverat et, quantum utilitatis medulla eius habeat, auditoribus commendabat....
unknown in Spain, Britain and Ireland.\textsuperscript{5} But from the Greek expansion of Justinian up to the middle of the eighth century, when Ravenna fell to the Lombards (751), Rome was marked by Byzantine influence.\textsuperscript{6} Many communities of Greek monks were established in Rome, Sicily and Calabria after the Arab and Persian invasions of the East. Rome and Sicily were also refuges for many dyothelite monks in the late seventh century. Many more fled there during the iconoclastic controversy from the reign of the first iconoclastic emperor Leo III (717-741) until 843. Three popes of the seventh century spoke Greek, including Martin I, as did Gregory III, Zacharias and Hadrian I in the eighth century.\textsuperscript{7} The Italo-Greek contribution to the dyothelite resistance at the time of the monothelite controversy is evident in Maximus' letter to Sicilian monks whom he visited on his way to Rome; in Anastasius' letter to the monks of Cagliari who are asked to go to Rome to plead with the pope to abandon his support of the monothelites in Constantinople; and in the prominent role of Bishop Deusdedit of Cagliari, and to a lesser extent, his successor Justin at the Lateran Synod. When Pope Agatho convened a council of 125 bishops in Rome prior to the Sixth Ecumenical Council of 680/681 at the request of the emperor Constantine IV, there was a significant number of bishops from Calabria and Sicily in attendance. Thirteen in all subscribed to the proceedings of the Council.\textsuperscript{8} Constantine asked for up to twelve western bishops and representatives of the four Greek monasteries in Rome to be sent to the council in Constantinople.\textsuperscript{9} Agatho names several Greeks among the theologians chosen by him to expound the western position at the council. His legates were Bishop Abundatius of Paterno, Bishop John of


\textsuperscript{7} Thery, \textit{Scot Érigène}, p. 204.

\textsuperscript{8} Letter of Pope Agatho to Constantine IV (CPG 9418), ACO ser. II, vol. 2, 1, pp. 122-139; subscriptions are found on pp. 140-159.

\textsuperscript{9} \textit{Sacra Constantini IV imperatoris ad Donum papam} (CPG 9416), a. 678: ACO ser. II, vol. 2, 1, pp. 6,7-8,4.
Reggio, Bishop John of Portua; the priests Theodore and George of Rome, and the deacon John and subdeacon Constantine.\textsuperscript{10}

There were nine Greek or partially Greek monasteries in Rome by the early ninth century,\textsuperscript{11} including monks who had fled from the Arab invasions of Sicily, after the capture of Taormina in 902. Many Greek monks from Sicily also took refuge from the Arab and Norman threat in Calabria, especially in the mountainous regions. Follieri distinguishes two phases in the history of southern Italy in the tenth and eleventh centuries: the first period of the Arab presence, when there was sometimes peaceful coexistence but more often a mortal threat, through the incursions made from Sicily and Africa; and the second phase, when Calabria became a battle ground between the Byzantine forces, the Lombards, the Franks and the Normans.\textsuperscript{12} This period ended with the Norman conquest of Bari in 1071, after which they completed their conquest of the Italian peninsula. In the tenth and eleventh centuries, monastic centres like those of Grottaferrata and Reggio di Calabria became the transmitters and preservers of Hellenism in the West, through their production of Greek manuscripts. Lemerle rightly notes that it is difficult to make the distinction, in the Greek works copied in southern Italy in the tenth to eleventh centuries, between those that arose from a local ancient tradition, and copies that were made from manuscripts brought from the East.\textsuperscript{13} The copies made from the tenth to the thirteenth centuries of documents pertaining to the life of Maximus Confessor – the same documents that were translated earlier by Anastasius –, clearly belong to the latter category. Guillou has maintained that the establishment of Sicilian monastic colonies on the continent and their progression towards the north of Calabria and Lucania was provoked more by economic insecurity and a preference for seclusion, than by the cruelty of the new occupants.\textsuperscript{14} Lemerle maintains that the


\textsuperscript{13} Lemerle, p. 11, n. 26.

\textsuperscript{14} A. Guillou, 'Grecs d'Italie du Sud et de Sicile au Moyen Age: les Moines', Mélanges d'Archéologie et d'Histoire publiés par l'Ecole Française de Rome 75 (1963), p. 84.
original "régécisation" of southern Italy by the Sicilian monks from the time of the Arab invasions was initially only a religious movement, and for a long time remained limited in impact, and that only with the reconquest of southern Italy by the Macedonian emperors, from Basil I, was Hellenism reestablished in the region, this time coming from Byzantium.\textsuperscript{15}

Even after the papacy started to detach itself from the eastern emperor under Nicholas I, bilinguals were still essential for the continuation of the on-going doctrinal disputes with the East but were in very short supply. We have already noted the paucity of Greek known to the papal delegation to Constantinople in 861 during the Photian controversy, and among the papal legates to the Eighth Ecumenical Council in 869/870. Sansterre has suggested that Hadrian deliberately overlooked the many Greek monks in Rome as possible candidates for the delegation because their politics could not be relied upon in this delicate disciplinary matter, where an acceptance of Roman primacy was paramount for a successful outcome from the pontifical point of view.\textsuperscript{16} Rome acted as the diffuser of Greek texts brought from the East and circulated in the West, especially in Francia.\textsuperscript{17} Naples and the monastery of Montecassino were the other two most active centres of Greek studies and translations in Italy in this period.\textsuperscript{18}

\section*{Knowledge of Greek in the West}

The most active scholarship of Greek outside Italy in the eighth and ninth century flourished in Francia among a group of Irish scholars connected with the palace school of Charles the Bald and several cathedral schools like that of Laon. These scholars

\textsuperscript{15} Lemerle, pp. 12f.

\textsuperscript{16} Sansterre, p. 144.


\textsuperscript{18} See M. Fuiano, 'I Rapporti tra oriente ed occidente nell’attività culturale di Paolo Diacono della Chiesa Napoletana nel sec. IX’, \textit{Atti del 3\textsuperscript{9} congresso internazionale di Studi sull’Alto Medioevo}, 14-18 ott. 1956, Centro di Studi sull’Alto Medioevo (Spoleto, 1959), pp. 397-411.
included Sedulius Scotus, Martin Hibernensis, John Scotus, and Dungal. Contreni claims that there is sufficient evidence to posit the existence of a scriptorium at Laon in the ninth century: "Shortly after the turn of the ninth century, Laon scribes participated in some measure in the diffusion of texts brought to Francia from Rome." There is evidence of interest in Greek at Laon in the Greek-Latin glossary and grammar of Martin Hibernensis, Laudunensis 444. According to Contreni, "This manuscript formed the core of instruction on Greek at Laon during the third quarter of the ninth century." A Greek manuscript of the works of Dionysius the Areopagite in uncial script was among the gifts brought to Louis the Pious in Compiègne by the emperor Michael II in September 827. This was deposited at the Abbey of St Denys on 8 October 827, and was translated into Latin by Hilduin, Abbot of St Denys, between 832 and 835. Charles the Bald continued to promote the revival of literary studies begun under Charlemagne, and was the possessor of a substantial library, including some translations of Anastasius, as we will see.

**Works of translation**

Anastasius' works of translation may be divided into three categories, each of which will be considered in turn: 1. Hagiography, 2. Church Councils and Histories 3. Theological texts.

---

19 Contreni, p. 51.
20 Contreni, p. 38.
21 Lemerle, p. 6 and n. 14.
I. Hagiography

Leonardi has made the most extensive study of Anastasius' translations of hagiographical works,\(^{24}\) and his findings are summarised below:\(^{25}\)


2. *Life of Basil the Great, bishop of Caesarea* (330-379): defender of the church against the Arian heresy and against imperial power (Valens), not always in good relations with Rome (BHL 1022).

3. *Life of John the Calibite* (s. V): according to tradition his relics were transferred to Rome at the beginning of the seventh century (BHL 4358).


5. *Lives of Cyrus and John*: the former was, according to tradition, a soldier, the latter a doctor and then monk; both were martyrs of Alexandria during the persecution of Diocletian (beginning of s. IV). Their relics were transported to Rome after the Arab invasion (BHL 2077).

6. *Life of Stephen the protomartyr*: describing the transferal of his relics from Jerusalem to Constantinople after 415. The account follows the most imaginative tradition (BHL 7857-8), plus some sermons of Amphilochius, according to the preface.

7. *Life of Peter patriarch of Alexandria* (300-311): an opponent of the heretic Miletus; writer of anti-Origenist theology, killed by order of the emperor Maximianus (BHL 6698b). No preface has yet been discovered.

8. *Life of Acacius (a Roman martyr) and his companions*: crucified on Mt Ararat in Armenia, according to a legendary tradition, in the second century, under the emperor Hadrian (BHL 20c).


9. *Life of Pope Clement I* (end of s. I): exiled by Trajan to the Chersonese and martyred, transferal of his relics to Rome took place in 867-868 (BHL 1851). The text has not yet been traced but its preface exists.

10. *Passion of Demetrius of Thessalonika*: the martyr of 306, under Emperor Maximianus; this is a translation of the earliest preserved *Passion of Demetrius* by Photius (BHL 2122).

11. *Passion of Dionysius, bishop of Paris*: the martyr identified with the Areopagite since the ninth century, martyr (BHL 2184).

12. *Life of Bartholomew, apostle and martyr*: translation of the sermon of Theodore of Studios, hero of the iconoclastic controversy, who died in 826; Bartholomew’s relics were venerated at Benevento in the fourth decade of the ninth century (BHL 1004).

Leonardi distinguished two categories of saints in this list: the “new” Roman saints recovered from the East, such as Acacius, Clement and Martin, whose lives only survived in Greek, and those who were of eastern origin, especially Alexandrians such as Cyrus and John, John the Calibite\(^\text{26}\) and John the Almsgiver, Peter and Basil. These saints’ lives were chosen deliberately to counter Frankish influence on Roman hagiography, according to Leonardi: “Così non solo ritarda ulteriormente l’influenza franca a Roma, ma le originali esigenze romane trovano soddisfazione non dal patrimonio germanico ma da quello orientale.”\(^\text{27}\)

Leonardi speaks of Martin as the perfect example of resistance to the Byzantine state for the sake of the true faith of the church of Rome; he does not discuss Maximus since the documents pertaining to the life of Maximus are not included on his list above. Like the *Commemoratio* of Pope Martin, the rest of the *Collectanea*, including the documents pertaining to Maximus’ involvement in the monothelite struggle, highlights Roman orthodoxy in the face of Byzantine heresy. As Leonardi points out, “Una sottile linea politica e ideologica compare in queste agiografie, una

---

\(^{26}\) Although Anastasius seems to be under the impression that John was Roman, and that his own language was Latin, in his preface to the *Life*, MGH VII, p. 402, 12-13: ...merito fortassis offensus pia Romani hominis exempla non habere Romanos et, quem peregrina lingua praedicat, a propria pentius ignorari.
linea che tende a mettere in rilievo...le eresie dei cristiani d’Oriente e i soprusi del potere politico bizantino, per affermare in opposizione l’ortodossia e la libertà di Roma.”

For Anastasius, the criticism of the Byzantines for their cacodoxy, or “wrong faith” in the past, by which they had betrayed everything that was valuable in Byzantine culture, was still pertinent. The head of the Roman church assumed that its foundation by the apostle Peter made it responsible for keeping the universal church free of heresy by the firmness of its own right faith. This argument was also adduced by the Franks against the eastern emperor. As Louis II writes in a letter to Basil I, “emperor of the new Rome”, a letter probably drafted by Anastasius: “The Greeks for their ‘cacodoxy’, that is, wrong thinking, have ceased to be Emperors of the Romans – not only have they deserted the city and the capital of the Empire but they have also abandoned Roman nationality and even the Latin language. They have migrated to another capital and taken up a completely different nationality and language.”

In Anastasius’ translations for the Franks, he seeks to reinforce the authority of Rome over the Frankish church, which was contested by powerful bishops like Hincmar of Rheims, through the transmission of a rich patristic heritage shared with the Greeks.

Arnaldi also points to rivalry between Rome and Constantinople as motivating Anastasius’ choice of translations, arguing that his works represent a conscious effort to put the Roman church in a position to sustain, on a cultural level, the conflict with Byzantium. This argument is supported by Anastasius’ own words in the preface to

---

27 Leonardi, L’agiografia, p. 478.


29 See Nicholas’ letter to Michael, emperor of the Greeks, dated Sept. 25, 860, MGH VI, n. 82, p. 433, 22-26: et fidei robore solidatur atque precibus suis munire [Petrus] non cessat, ut errantium vesaniam rectae fidei norma reformare festinet necon intrepide eam consolidantes remunerare procuret, quatenus portae inferi, malignorum utique spirituum suggestiones atque hereticorum impetus, non praevaeant eiusdem ecclesiae unitatem refringere.


31 Arnaldi, Dizionario, p. 34
his translation of the *Life of John the Almsgiver*, which he presented to Pope Nicholas in order that Latin patristic literature “should not grieve for lack of the salt with which the Greeks are always boasting their language is flavoured”\(^{32}\). He “reappropriated” certain hagiographical works by translating several which were originally composed in Latin, but for which only a Greek translation survived, such as the *Passion of Dionysius*, attributed by Anastasius to Methodius, which was in fact a Greek version of the Latin *Passion* by Hilduin.\(^{33}\) His early works during the pontificate of Nicholas I, including the *Life of John the Almsgiver* (the early seventh-century Chalcedonian in the hot-bed of monophysitism) and a *Life of St Basil of Caesarea*, reveal his intention to exalt saints who were especially distinguished in the government of their church.\(^{34}\)

**Patronage and Social Networks in the Diffusion of Texts**

The *Passions* of Dionysius and Demetrius, patron saints of Paris and Thessalonike respectively, were translated for Charles the Bald at his request. The emperor’s request for a Latin *Passion of Dionysius* sprang from his desire to legitimate the Frankish claim to near-apostolic origins for the monastery of St Denys in Paris, made possible through the identification of its founder Denys with the first Bishop of Athens and with the sixth-century author of the *Divine Names* and *Ecclesiastical and Celestial Hierarchies*, whose works were transmitted under this pseudonym. As well as hagiographies, the Franks were intent upon collecting relics of saints during the eighth and ninth centuries, and two translations of relics from Rome to the Franks are recorded during Charles the Bald’s reign. In 862, Urban and Tiburtius were transferred to Auxerre, where they were received by the monks of St. Germain on the instruction of Charles, and in c. 875, the emperor had the bones of Pope Cornelius moved to Compiègne.\(^{35}\)

---

\(^{32}\) MGH VII, Pref. 1, p. 398, 3-4: *dummodo Latinitas se tanto non doleat esse sale privatam, quo Grecia se gaudent opime conditam.*


\(^{35}\) J. Smith, ‘Old Saints, New Cults: Roman Relics in Carolingian Francia’, *Early Medieval Rome and the Christian West*, St Andrew’s University, 11-15 June 1998. Publication of the proceedings is forthcoming.
The remaining works listed above were translated for churches of Rome or in close relation to Rome: the *Life of John Calibite* for bishop Formosus of Porto (868); the *Life of Peter of Alexandria* and the *Passion of Acacius and the 10000 martyrs* for Peter, bishop of Gabii (ante July 876); the texts on the finding of the relics of Pope Clement by Constantine the Philosopher, for his friend Gauderic (875), bishop of Velletri; the *Acts of Pope Martin* for Martin, bishop of Narni (874); the *Transferal of St Stephen* for Landulf, bishop of Capua (in minor Lombardia) (c. 874-875); the *Sermon of Theodore the Stoudite on the apostle Bartholomew* for Aio, bishop of Benevento (870-879), to commemorate the transfer of the relics of Bartholomew from Lipari to Benevento and their subsequent deposition in a new oratory there in 839; the *Life of John the Almsgiver* for Pope Nicholas I (dated 858-862); the *Life of Basil of Caesarea* for Ursus, subdeacon of the Roman church and doctor and servant of Nicholas I (858-867); the *Passion of Cyrus and John* for a certain priest of the church of those same saints (875). The recipients of Anastasius’ works were among the most powerful names in Rome in the late ninth century, and belonged to some of Rome’s strongest family factions: Ado of Vienna, not Anastasius' relative, as some have thought, was asked by Anastasius to exert pressure on the Gallic clergy to resist those who were trying to destroy the achievements of the late Nicholas in relation to the Frankish monarchy and clergy; Gauderic of Velletri was exiled from Rome along with Stephen of Nepi (later Hadrian's legate to the Fourth Council of Constantinople) and John Hymmonides, himself a hagiographer, who requested Anastasius’ translation of the *Collectanea*. Their exile, subsequent to the death of Nicholas, was the work of

---

36 Westerburgh, p. XI.

37 See Arnaldi, *Dizionario*, p. 25.

38 MGH VII, Ep. 3, p. 401, 15-17 reveal Anastasius’ uncertainty about whether Hadrian could be relied upon to uphold Nicholas’ policies on ecclesiastical disciplinary matters, especially the question of Lothar’s divorce: *Habemus autem praesulem Hadrianum nomine, virum per omnia, quantum ad bonos mores pertinet, valde strenuum et industrium, de quo adhuc, utrum ecclesiastica negotia omnia an partim curare velit, ignoramus.* On Nicholas’ and Hadrian’s refusal to grant Lothar a divorce, and his condemnation of the archbishops Gunther and Theutgaud, see Davis, *LP III*, p. 266, n. 36.

39 Most notably he was the author of the *Life of Gregory*, produced in the 870s: see G. Arnaldi, ‘Giovanni Immonide e la Cultura a Roma al tempo di Giovanni VIII’, *Bollettino del Istituto Storico per il Medio Evo* 68 (1956), p. 50. The *Life of Hadrian II* in the *Liber Pontificalis* has also been attributed to John by Lapôtre, with whom Arnaldi, *op. cit.*, p. 49, n. 2, concurs.

40 John Hymmonides was also called John the Deacon.
Lambert of Spoleto, possibly acting as an agent of Louis II. Louis acceded to Hadrian’s request that the exiles be restored to Rome.\textsuperscript{41} Gauderic commissioned the \textit{Life of Clement} from John Immonides, and was left to finish it himself after John died.\textsuperscript{42} Formosus was a powerful figure in Roman ecclesiastical politics, the bishop entrusted with the Bulgarian mission, and later pope (891-896), whom Anastasius seems to have supported as long as he complied with the wishes of Pope Nicholas. Anastasius showed himself most supportive in his letter to Formosus of 868, the preface to his translation of the \textit{Life of John Calibite}. There may be a veiled reference to Formosus’ sense of being used badly when he was recalled in that same year, in Anastasius’ closing wish “that Rome may learn at length not to spurn its own people, but to gather them in, not to persecute them but to embrace them, not to cut them with goads because of jealousy, but to love them from the depths of love.”\textsuperscript{43}

\section*{II. Church Councils and Histories}

In this category, there are four major works:

1. \textit{Chronographia tripartita} for John the Deacon (871-874)

2. \textit{Acts of the Eighth Ecumenical Council} for Pope Hadrian (871)

3. \textit{Acts of the Seventh Ecumenical Council} for John VIII (873)

4. \textit{Collectanea} for John the Deacon (including the \textit{Gesta Sancti Papae Martini}) (c. 874).

The conscious political agenda governing Anastasius’ activity as a translator is most obvious in his translation of the \textit{Acts of the Eighth Ecumenical Council}, at which the real issue at stake was recognition of the universal primacy of the Roman church. Anastasius seized the opportunity afforded by his presence as an imperial delegate, and proved indispensable to the papal delegation in interpreting and translating the

\textsuperscript{41} Duchesne 2, p. 176 = \textit{LP III}, 108, c. 13, p. 265 and n. 33.

\textsuperscript{42} MGH VII, Ep. 15, p. 436. This is noted by Arnaldi, \textit{op. cit.}, p. 79.

\textsuperscript{43} MGH VII, Ep. 4, p. 402, 23-24: \textit{discatque Roma tandem suoi non spernere, sed colligere, non insequi, sed amplecti, non invidiae stimulis cruentare, sed medullis caritatis amare.}
proceedings, since none of the papal delegation knew sufficient Greek for the task.\textsuperscript{44} He also had the foresight to make a personal copy of the acts of the council, by good fortune, since the official copy destined for Pope Hadrian II was stolen by pirates on the return voyage to Rome.\textsuperscript{45} Anastasius's Latin version is the only record that survives of this council which contributed greatly to the increasing division between East and West, culminating in the great schism of 1054. The council, which condemned Photius and his supporters, was later condemned by the eastern church.\textsuperscript{46}

His translation of the Acts of the Seventh Ecumenical Council, held at Nicaea in 787 to condemn iconoclasm, was dedicated to Pope John VIII in 873, the first year of his pontificate. In his preface addressed to the pope, Anastasius declares that it was not proper for the papal archives to hold a copy of the Acts of the Eighth Ecumenical Council, while they did not have a decent record of the Seventh Ecumenical Council. The version that was made in the time of Hadrian I (772-795) was a "word-for-word" translation, with no thought for the idioms appropriate to Latin and Greek.\textsuperscript{47} Anastasius remarks, "It was therefore judged by some as hardly worthy of reading, let alone transcribing."\textsuperscript{48} This first translation was deposited in the archives of the Lateran\textsuperscript{49} but no longer survives. Anastasius' interest in the events of the Seventh

\textsuperscript{44} Anastasius' preface to his translation of the acts, MGH VII, n. 5, p. 410, 29, and p. 415; cf. p. 405, 27-32 on the legates to the Council of 861, who did not understand the alterations to Pope Nicholas' letters to the council that were made in the Greek translation.


\textsuperscript{46} Leonardi, 'Anastasio Bibliotecario e l'ottavo concilio ecumenico', Studi Medievali 3/1 (1967), pp. 130-139, discusses the question of the council's ecumenicity in western and eastern eyes, and finds no clear declaration of invalidation. The proceedings of the fifth session of the council are edited in this article, pp. 153-162.

\textsuperscript{47} MGH VII, Ep. 6, p. 416, 17-22.

\textsuperscript{48} MGH VII, Ep. 6, p. 416, 22-23: Unde a quibusdam nec ipsa lectione, ut non dicam transscriptione, digna penitus indicatur.

\textsuperscript{49} Duchesne 1, p. 512 = LP II, Life of Hadrian, c. 88, pp. 168f.: "The noteworthy bishop bade them (i.e. the synod's decrees) be translated into Latin and deposited in the sacred library, and so created a worthy everlasting memorial to his own orthodox faith." (Quam synodum iamdici missi in greco sermone secum deferentes...praedictus egregius antistes in latino eam translaturi iussit, et in sua bibliotheca pariter recondi, dignam sibi orthodoxe fidei memoriam aeternam faciens.) Davis claims, ibid., p. 168, n. 183 that, "This was the Latin translation that offended the Frankish clergy and caused Charlemagne to oppose the Seventh Ecumenical Council with the famous Libri Carolini." This assumption is based on a passage from Hincmar of Rheims in his Opusculum LV capitulorum against Hincmar of Laon, PL 126, 360. However, A. Freeman, 'Carolingian Orthodoxy and the Fate of the Libri Carolini', Viator 16 (1985), pp. 68-69, 96-99 has made a good case for questioning the reliability of this source, written almost three
Ecumenical Council was inspired by the tense relations with Byzantium over the Photian dispute and over the issue of jurisdiction over Bulgaria. As the Librarian discovered, from examination of a Greek codex of the acts while he was in Constantinople during the Eighth Ecumenical Council, the Greek text had been mutilated in an effort to destroy any record of Hadrian I's criticism of Patriarch Tarasius for his swift elevation from layman to patriarch in one jump. These criticisms were preserved in the original records of Hadrian's synodical letter of 785 to Irene and Constantine IV, but not in the Greek translation that was read out at the Council and included in the Acts.

The other section that was omitted from Hadrian's letter concerned a request for restoration of the papal patrimonies of Sicily, Calabria and Illyricum, and for jurisdiction over the churches of those lands, which had been "stolen" by the Byzantine empire under Leo III. Wallach has interpreted these passages as referring to Anastasius' contemporaries, the supporters of Photius, rather than to the Greeks of the Seventh Ecumenical Council. While this is a possible interpretation of the two ambiguous references of Anastasius to this subject, it is by no means certain. One

---

50 In his translation of the Acts of the Seventh Ecumenical Council, Session II, Anastasius notes: "For since at that same time a patriarch had been made at Constantinople from among the laity, lest it seem to be reproached in public by the apostolic see, and be held against him as deserving reproach, offering an opportunity to the heretics to fight back, and through this means to make the synod over which he had presided useless, the Greeks did not allow those things which follow, both about not promoting laymen, and refuting other presumptions, to be cited in this synod, or to be included in the acts (Graeci namque quia eodem tempore ex laicis fuerat Constantinopoli patriarcha factus, ne publice ab Apostolica sede argui videretur, et adversum eum tamquam reprehensione dignum, haereticis repugnandi occasio praebetur, ac per hoc synodi, cui intererat, utilitas excluderetur, ea quae sive de non facienda laicorum promotione, sive de caeterarum praesumptionibus reductioibus subsequuntur, in synodo hac nec rectari, nec actis inseri passi sunt.)" (Mansi XII, 1073-74).


53 In his preface to the translation of the Acts of the Eighth Ecumenical Council, Anastasius writes: "In the codex of the seventh council, because bishops are often chosen from neophytes, against the canons of Constantinople, and at that time Tarasius was ordained patriarch from amongst the laity, they think the letter of pope Hadrian of blessed memory should be transcribed in such a way that nothing in it which the same most holy pope wrote pertaining to the said bishop or against neophytes should be found to have been written or translated into Greek." Porro in septimae synodi codice, quia saepe contra kanones Constantinopoli ex neophytes antistites provehuntrt et eo tempore Tarasius ex laicis patriarcha fuerat ordinatus, ita epistolam beatae recordationis papae Hadriani existimant transcribendam, ut nihil in ea
objection to Wallach's view is the fact that such criticism of Tarasius' uncanonical election has not been removed from Hadrian's letter to Tarasius, sent around the same time as the Synodical Letter, and also included in the acts of the Council, in the original Latin and in a Greek translation.\textsuperscript{55} Also it is not clear whether Wallach believes that the removal of the request for restoration of patrimonies and ecclesiastical jurisdiction also occurred during the Photian controversy, or earlier. The motive he assumes for the removal of papal criticism of Tarasius by Photius' supporters – to protect Photius from the similar charge levelled at him by Pope Nicholas – would obviously not apply to these issues. A third possibility is that the missing sections were removed from the manuscript at the time of the Council of Nicaea II, and were falsely ascribed to the period preceding the council of 869-870 by Anastasius, who was always eager for an opportunity to criticise Photius and his supporters. Since Hadrian had no response from the council over this issue, he refused to acknowledge the Acts of this council for some time, although he was in agreement with the stance taken over the restoration of icon veneration.\textsuperscript{56}

The first of Anastasius' translations of major historical works was the Chronographia Tripertita, compiled from the chronicles of Nikephoros, George Synkellos and Theophanes: all early ninth-century, iconophile sources. This collection of excerpts was dedicated to John the Deacon, the court historiographer under Pope John VIII, who intended to compile an encyclopaedia of church history. John's history does not survive, if it was ever completed, but the conciliar acts, the Chronographia Tripertita and the Collectanea of Anastasius were all destined to be included in it.

\textit{ex his quae ad praedictum praesulem vel contra neophytos idem sanctissimum pontifex scripserat, vel scriptum vel translatum Grece repperiatur.} (MGH VII, p. 415, 2-6.)

\textsuperscript{54} The reference to "the heretics" in Anastasius' translation of the Acts of the Seventh Ecumenical Council, translated above in n. 50, seems to me to be particularly problematic. If taken in the way I have translated the text above, i.e. "lest an opportunity be offered to the heretics of resisting, and the council over which he presided be judged useless" (\textit{ne...haereticis repugnandi occasio praebetur, ac per hoc synodi cui intererat, utilitas excluderetur}), "the heretics" clearly seem to be the iconoclast adversaries of Tarasius, and the council over which he presided is the second Council of Nicaea. If on the other hand, the text means "lest an opportunity be offered to oppose the heretics", i.e. lest the pope be allowed this reason for opposing the Photian party, then the council referred to must be the Council of 861.

\textsuperscript{55} However there is a marginal note from Anastasius' hand printed in Mansi XII, 1081: \textit{Et hinc quoque apud Graecos multa subtracta sunt, quae tamen sicut missa sunt, in archivio Romanae reperiantur ecclesiae}. He does not say that he has restored the missing parts, or what was their content.

\textsuperscript{56} He had not yet given a response at the time of his letter to Charles in c. 793.
Anastasius' Chronographia consisted of excerpts of the Chronographia of Theophanes which extended up to the year 813, the Opuscula historica of Patriarch Nikephoros and the Chronicle of George Synkellos. Anastasius' Chronographia Tripertita has been edited by de Boor, who found that, while it is an often inconsistent rendition of the Greek, Anastasius' version of Theophanes' Chronographia was based on an early and more reliable version of the original than now survives. For this reason, it has been useful in some places for establishing the original text where the direct transmission offers a degenerate version, although Anastasius unfortunately does not provide a full translation of his original.

The Collectanea, which may be considered the most important of his hagiographical works for its historical significance, was composed, according to Lapôtre, after 874, i.e. after Anastasius' translation of the Gesta Sancti Martini. The dedication to John the Deacon at least took place after the dedication of the Gesta Sancti Martini in September-October 874. As mentioned above in connection with Anastasius' hagiography, the decision to translate this collection of documents


58 Ed. C. de Boor, Nicephori Archiepiscopi Constantinopolitani Opuscula Historica, 2 vols. (Leipzig, 1880). It is also edited in the version of J. Bekker, Sancti Nicephori Patriarchae Constantinopolitani Breviarum Rerum post Mauriciam gestarum (Bonn, 1837; repr. Ann Arbor, 1988). This covers the seventh and eighth centuries from the death of Emperor Maurice. Nicephorus, Patriarch of Constantinople (806-815), was a continuator of Theophylact Simocatta.

59 George Synkellos' Chronicle covers the history of the world from creation up to the rule of Diocletian. It is edited by C. de Boor, Georgii monachi chronicon, 2 vols. (Leipzig, 1904; 2nd ed. with corrections by P. Wirth, Stuttgart, 1978).

60 De Boor, v. 2 (Leipzig, 1885).

61 De Boor, v. 2, pp. 401-435. Mango and Scott, op. cit., pp. xcvi f. draw our attention to the existence of two late ninth-century manuscripts of Theophanes, one of which was wrongly dated to the late tenth century by de Boor, and the other not used by him at all. These also offer an inferior text to that consulted by Anastasius.

62 De Boor, v. 2, pp. 413-415.

63 Lapôtre, Appendix altera, p. 456. Cf. Arnaldi, Dizionario, p. 34, who dates the Collectanea to the years 871-874.

64 The date given by Perels and Lachr, MGH VII, Ep. 8, p. 421; or, as Lapôtre claims in Appendix altera, p. 455, in the eighth indiction i.e. Sept. 874-Sept. 875. The Latin reads only Data indictione octava tempore domni Iohannis octavi papae. In the other codex of this text (Vallicellianus tomus IX, f. 166), the preface is dated to the fifteenth indiction under pope Marinus the younger (882-884), i.e. 882.
concerning the lives of Maximus the Confessor, Pope Martin and other martyrs of the monothelite controversy, must relate to their role in the ongoing struggle for power between Rome and Constantinople in the seventh century. In the prologue of the Collectanea,\(^{65}\) which is addressed to John the Deacon, Anastasius attempts to reduce many of the serious doctrinal conflicts between East and West, e.g. the question of the procession of the Holy Spirit, to simple linguistic misunderstandings. This oversimplification is in line with the new policy of relaxation of political tension with the East of John VIII (872-882). Nicholas I before him had been openly hostile to the Byzantine emperor, as witnessed in his letters to the emperor Michael.\(^{66}\) The dedication concludes with a statement of authorial purpose. Anastasius translated the Collectanea: "for the sake of constancy fit for imitation, in refutation of the small-minded in the cause of utmost orthodoxy, and the acknowledgment of the power of the Apostolic See against those who are bent on violently resisting it."\(^{67}\)

III. Theological Works

1. Revision of John Scotus Eriugena's translation of the works of Dionysius the Areopagite, with additional scholia by Maximus the Confessor and John of Scythopolis. Dedicated to Charles the Bald (23 March, 875).\(^{68}\)

2. Excerpts of the Mystagogia of Maximus Confessor, and the Historia Mystica attributed to Germanus, seventh-century patriarch of Constantinople.

These two translations were dedicated to Charles the Bald in the year of his coronation in Rome on December 25, 875. Other works dedicated to the Frankish king in the following year included the Passion of St Dionysius and the Passion of St Demetrius. Anastasius states in his prologue to the works of Dionysius the Areopagite

---

\(^{65}\) MGH VII, Ep. 9, pp. 423-426. This prologue dates to the end of 874, i.e. after the dedication of the Commemoratio to Bishop Martin of Narni. The Commemoratio was included in the Collectanea (see the end of Anastasius Bibliothecarius' preface to John the Deacon) but was sent separately to Bishop Martin.

\(^{66}\) MGH VI, Ep. 88, pp. 454-487, especially pp. 459, 5-460, 6, on the use of Latin.

\(^{67}\) "... gratia imitandae constantiae in causa maximae pietatis ad redargutionem pusillanimorum, et agnoscendae potestatis Apostolicae Sedis, contra eos qui ab ipsa quid violenter extorquere nituntur (cf. MGH VII, Ep. 9, p. 426, 11: gratia incitandae constantiae in causa maxime pietatis...)."

\(^{68}\) MGH VII, Ep. 13, pp. 430-34.
that he sought to render John Scotus' translation more intelligible, and so translated
the glosses by Maximus Confessor and John of Scythopolis which he added in the
margins of the translated codex. He found the glosses in a Greek manuscript in
Constantinople, during his sojourn there in 870. These glosses survive in five
Frankish manuscripts of John Scotus, which have not yet been edited, and in some
Vatican codices. Cappuyns has questioned whether Anastasius ever revised the
translation, maintaining rather that the Librarian only added the translated glosses. This
seems reasonable in light of the fact that no "original" versions of John's
translation have ever been found. The Collectanea was not dedicated to Charles the
Bald but ended up being copied in Laon before 895. Perhaps it was sent to Charles the
Bald before his death in 877.

The translation of the Mystagogia and the Historia Mystica raises the interesting
question of Frankish attitudes towards allegorical interpretations of scriptural and
liturgical texts. Maximus was already known to Charles the Bald through the
translations made by John Scotus of the Ambigua ad Johannem and the Quaestiones
ad Thalassium. John Scotus' first commissioned work for Charles was a translation of
the complete works of Dionysius the Areopagite, which was to improve upon the
earlier translation by Hilduin. This was followed by Gregory of Nyssa's De Hominis

---

69 Quapropter ipse merito anxius, coepi sedulus quaerere, si forte repperiri potuisset praeceptor quisquam vel aliquod scriptum, quo enucleante tantus pater nobis liquidus illucsceret et, quia iam per interpretis industriam linguae nostrae fuerat traditus, nostris quoque patulus redderetur perfectius intellectibus. Tum ecce repente parathesis sive scolia in eum, quae Constantinopolis postitus videram, ad manus venere...quaet videlicet in marginibus interpretati codicis eius, ut in Greco repperi,nox interpretata utcumque, donec a docto melius interpretentur, respondentibus signis interpres ego satis imperitus apposui. (ibid. p. 432, 9-17).


71 An edition by B. Suchla is forthcoming in Corpus Dionysiacum 3.1: Iohannis Scythopolitani prologus et scholia in opera Dionysii Areopagitae, and 3, 2: Scholia in opera Dionysii Areopagitae, as she reports in 'Verteidigung eines platonischen Denkmodells einer christlichen Welt', Nachrichten der Akademie der Wissenschaften in Göttingen 1 (Göttingen, 1995), pp. 1-28, where she discusses the philosophical, theological and historical significance of the glosses of John of Scythopolis.


Opificio, Epiphanius of Salamis' Ancoratus; the Ambigua ad Johannem and Quaestiones ad Thalassium of Maximus the Confessor. The Quaestiones were undertaken and completed around 860-862; the Ambigua were in circulation in 862-864. Later the Irish scholar composed his Periphyleon, in which he borrowed heavily from Gregory of Nyssa, and from Maximus' Ambigua ad Johannem.

Anastasius' translations of excerpts of the Mystagogia and of the Historia Mystica attributed to Germanus indicate a vital interest on the part of the Franks in eastern allegorical commentary on the liturgy. Amalar of Metz, author of two important works using the allegorical method, Codex geminus expositionis missae and Eclogae de ordine Romano, was condemned at the Synod of Quierzy (838) by Florus of Lyon, because he could not produce witnesses from the writings of the church Fathers to support his ideas. However, his exegesis continued to be popular, while that of Florus remained ineffectual. Anastasius' translations may be an attempt to supply the lack of testimony available in the first half of the ninth century. Interest in the works continued at least until the late ninth or early tenth century, when the two copies we have today were produced.

Conclusion

Anastasius completed most of his translations after 872 under Pope John VIII. During this period he maintained his position as bibliothecarius but the increase in his literary output suggests that his power in that office was somewhat diminished. In his later translations of hagiographical works, Anastasius is attempting to hold the Frankish imperial push for power over Rome in check by a reminder of Roman ecclesiastical authority, using Byzantine sources to strengthen Rome's hagiographical tradition. Towards the end of his career, he responds to Frankish requests for translations of the

---

74 Ed. E. Jeaneau, Ambigua ad Johannem Maximi Confessoris iuxta Iohannis Scotti Eriugenae latinam interpretationem, CCSP 18 (Turnhout, 1988).
75 Ed. C. Laga and C. Steel, Quaestiones ad Thalassium, CCSP 7 and 22 (Turnhout, 1980 and 1990).
76 Cappuyns, op. cit., p. 163; E. Jeaneau, 'Jean l'Erigène et les Ambigua ad Johannem de Maxime le Confesseur', Actes du Symposium sur Maxime le Confesseur, p. 344.
77 Cambriensis 711 (s. IX) and Parisinus latinus 18556 (s. IX /early s. X).
Passion of Dionysius and the Passion of Demetrius. Anastasius' translation of historical, theological and hagiographical works reveals his interest in appropriating the rich cultural inheritance of the Byzantine tradition to enhance the cultural resources of the Roman church, which were clearly inferior to those of the Greeks by the ninth century. His concern to defend the reputation of Latin as the language of the Roman church is clear in his redaction of Pope Nicholas' letter of 861 to Michael III, in which the pope informs the emperor that if he considers the Roman tongue "barbarous" he should cease to call himself emperor of the Romans. It is also possible that the Librarian chose to translate works that would supplement the Roman hagiographical tradition and historiographical sources available to the new Christian readership of the Bulgarian kingdom, which had in 866 turned to Rome. After Rome refused to supply the archbishop of his choice, Khan Boris turned back to Constantinople, and Hadrian and John VIII tried unsuccessfully to woo the Bulgars back. This may have been part of that attempt. After the Council of 870, John VIII had to accept the Byzantine jurisdiction over Constantinople as a fait accompli, and adopted a more conciliatory attitude towards the Greeks than he had previously maintained. An intermediary between western and Byzantine cultures, Anastasius' career and literary output bear testimony to the value of Greek-Latin bilingualism in this period, ultimately a more successful strategy for gaining personal power than marching on Rome with an army.

---

78 Arnaldi, Dizionario, p. 34.
Chap. 3: The *Collectanea* of Anastasius Bibliothecarius

**Introduction**

Anastasius Bibliothecarius's *Collectanea* includes a Latin version of six documents pertaining to the life of Maximus Confessor, and dates to the early 870s. Since our earliest Greek witness to any of the documents (*Vat. grec. 1912*, s. X) postdates the Latin, it has been necessary to establish the nature of the Greek text which Anastasius used to make his translations of the documents. Unfortunately none of the surviving Greek texts provide anything like a perfect match, but it has been possible to identify affinities between Anastasius' text and one of the two families of Greek manuscripts.

It was probably on his last voyage to Constantinople for the Eighth Ecumenical Council that he found and had copies made of the documents of the *Collectanea* under consideration here: three letters of Maximus and his disciples, the record of the trial of Maximus and the two Anastasii, the *Dispute* between Maximus and Theodosius, and a *Commemoration* of the sufferings and death in exile of Pope Martin, Maximus and his followers. A seventh document, *Testimonia of Pseudo-Hippolytus and Syllogisms*, is also included in the dossier, although it is theological rather than biographical in content, unlike the other six texts.

**Summary of the Documents in chronological order**

The seven documents, with the dates of their composition, are:

2. *Dispute between Maximus and Theodosius of Caesarea Bithynia* (CPG 7735): late 656 or before August 657.
4. *Letter of Anastasius (Apocrisiarius) to the monks of Cagliari* (CPG 7725): post 19 April 658. This only survives in Latin.
5. *Letter of Anastasius Apocrisiarius to Theodosius of Gangra* (CPG 7733): 665/666. This survives in Latin and partially in Greek
6. Testimonia of Hippolytus, Bishop of the Port of Rome (CPG 1916), and Syllogisms. The Testimonia survive also in Greek but the Syllogisms only in Latin.

7. Hypomnesticon of Theodore Spoudaeus (CPG 7968): end 668/early 669, after receipt of the Letter of Anastasius to Theodosius in 668.¹

A detailed introduction to each of these documents, together with a treatment of their authorship and dating, has been given in my article, "The Lives of Pope Martin I and Maximus the Confessor: Some Reconsiderations of Dating and Provenance."² The only documents not treated there are the Testimonia et Syllogismi appended to the Letter of Anastasius to Theodosius of Gangra. These two pieces will be considered in the context of a brief introduction to the historical background of the documents.

I. Background of the Documents

The Lives of Maximus and his Disciples

Maximus the Confessor's public confession of the orthodox position against the monothelite doctrine promulgated by the emperor Heraclius and his patriarchs began in c. 640.³ He arrived in North Africa soon after the accession of Emperor Constans II in 641.⁴ In a public debate with the Patriarch Pyrrhus in Carthage in July 645, Pyrrhus was won over, temporarily, to the orthodox position. Pyrrhus promised to go to Rome to declare his change of heart to Pope Theodore and followed him to Rome soon thereafter, in 645 or 646. He was accompanied by Anastasius his disciple, who seems to be the author of the Disputatio cum Pyrrho.⁵ The Syriac Vita Maximi relates that Maximus stopped at Sicily and other islands on the way.⁶ Until his first trial in Constantinople in 655, Maximus was involved in keeping up the resistance to monothelitism in Rome. Van Dieten asserts that he was in a monastery in Rome at the

³ Sherwood, Date-List, no. 60, p. 43, notes that Maximus' earliest attack on the Ecthesis of 638 was made in his letter of 640 to Abbot Thalassius.
⁴ Vita Maximi, Recension II, PG 90, 81C-D (c. XIV).
⁵ The author identifies himself as one of those who went to Rome with Maximus and Pyrrhus, in Disputatio cum Pyrrho, PG 91, 353A.
time of the presentation of the *Typus* there, 7 c. 649, on the basis of the account in the *Relatio Motionis* of Gregory the Patrician’s visit, at the bidding of the emperor, to Maximus in his cell, to seek his support in gaining papal approval of the *Typus*.

Anastasius Apocrisiarius was sent to Constantinople as apocrisiarius for Pope Theodore (642-649). He is mentioned in Maximus' *Tomus dogmaticus ad Marinum Presbyterum* as a vigorous defender of Honorius. 8 He was exiled to Trebizond in 647 or 648 for resistance against Paul, patriarch of Constantinople, who in 648 issued an interdict on the Palace of Placidia, the residence of the Roman apocrisiarius in Constantinople. 9 None of the sources says that Anastasius was exiled for refusing to sign the *Typus*, although this is the reason given in the *Hypomnesticon* for the exile of his two friends, the brothers Theodore and Euprepius, to the Chersonese, shortly after Anastasius was sent to Trebizond (*Hypo. 125/128*). 10

In 649, Pope Martin convoked the Lateran Council in Rome. Although Maximus himself was almost certainly there, his name only appears in the subscriptions to a *Libellus* which was included in the acts of the council. 11 However, there were certainly many of his sympathisers of the dyothelite persuasion, including Deudsedit, the Greek bishop of Cagliari. Soon afterwards, in 650 or 653, 12 Maximus and his disciple Anastasius the Monk were arrested in Rome, and set sail for Byzantium to face charges. On 17 June 653, Pope Martin was also arrested and taken by force to

---

7 Van Dieten, pp. 94-95.
8 *Opuscula*, PG 91, 244-45.
11 There are signatures of Maximus the monk and two monks called Anastasius in the subscriptions to the *Libellus* included in the acts of the Council; see Riedinger, ACO, ser. II, vol. 1, p. 57.
12 The author of the *Life of Maximus* (Recension II, PG 90, 85D-88A) claims that Maximus, Anastasius the Disciple and Anastasius Apocrisiarius were arrested with Martin, but hesitates over the date. The third recension offers the date "in the ninth year of Constans" i.e. 650, in the preceding paragraph (between section XVI and XVII of Recension II; ed. Devreese, *La vie*, pp. 22-23.) We know that Martin was arrested in Rome on 17 June 653 (Peeters, *Vita Martini*, p. 235). So Maximus and Anastasius the disciple were arrested in 650 or 653, according to the *Vita Maximi*. This source is the only one to indicate that Anastasius Apocrisiarius was with them at the time of their arrest. Until the third recension of the *Vita* has been dated, its veracity is open to question.
Constantinople. He arrived exactly three months later, and was met by two supporters, Theodore Spudaeus and his brother Theodosius of Gangra, who were to remain in contact with the Maximian party for another thirteen years. Martin was sentenced to exile and arrived in the Chersonese on 15 May 654, where he died on 16 September 655, thus becoming the last pope to be martyred. Euprepius also died in exile the following month on 26 October. Anastasius Apocrisiarius was transferred to Mesembria in the province of Thracia (now Bulgaria). He was at any rate there by the time of the dispute in August 656.

The trial of Maximus and his disciple Anastasius took place in 655, and is documented in the Relatio Motionis. As a result, Maximus was exiled to Bizya (mod. Vize, near the Turko-Bulgarian border), where he continued his anti-monothelite activities, holding a dispute with Theodosius, bishop of Caesarea Bithynia, in August 656. After winning Theodosius over to a temporary acceptance of his dyothelite arguments, Maximus suggested that the bishop persuade the emperor and the patriarch of Constantinople to write to Rome to declare their abjuration of the heresy to the pope (Disp. 447/449). Theodosius entreated Maximus to accompany him there if he were sent by the emperor and the patriarch, but Maximus demurred, saying that he did not know Latin well enough, and he would send in his place his disciple Anastasius the Apocrisiarius, who was then in exile in Mesembria. Theodosius objected that he


14 Peeters, Novembris 12, Propylaeum Decembris, Acta Sanctorum (1940), pp. 513-514, expresses a preference for the date of 13 April, 656, which is furnished by the Vita Martini, rather than the date of 16 September, 655, as in the Commemoratio and Hypomnesticon. In his earlier article, 'Une vie grecque du pape S. Martin I', AB 51 (1933), pp. 232ff., he was more hesitant, saying it was impossible to choose between the two dates.

15 In May of the same year (i.e. after the trial in Constantinople), according to Vita Maximi, Recension III (edited by Devreesse, La vie, p. 33, from Vat. grec. 453), at the same time as the emperor exiled Maximus to Bizya and the other Anastasius to Perberis. The confusion of chronology of events in Recension III makes it most unreliable as a source.

16 Disp. 454/455.

17 Or of both Anastasii, according to the Vita — the Anastasius in the Relatio Motionis is identified as the disciple who was with Maximus for 37 years, and the author of the Libellus against the Typus: Berthold in his translation of the Relatio Motionis seems to have assumed that both Anastasii were in Constantinople for the trial of 655: see G. C. Berthold, Maximus Confessor: Selected Writings, The Classics of Western Spirituality (New York, 1985), p. 27, c. 15. This is also what the Greek version of the RM suggests: see my translation infra, n. 2.
had quarrelled with Anastasius so Maximus agreed to comply with Theodosius’ wishes. In the event, Theodosius had changed his position by the time of the second session of interrogation in Rhecgium.

This passage shows striking similarities to the dénouement of Maximus' dispute with Pyrrhus in 645, where Pyrrhus is persuaded to declare his abandonment of monothelite doctrine at the papal court. In 645, Maximus did, as we know, leave North Africa for Rome. Anastasius the Apocrisiarius also would not have been able to leave Mesembria in 656 to go to Rome except by imperial dispensation, but he was a free agent until 647 or 648, when he was first sent into exile. The pope to whom Theodosius was to address his retraction was Eugenius I (654-657) who, at the time of the RM, was more interested in reconciliation with Byzantium, as opposed to Pope Theodore's strong stance against monothelitism at the time of the dispute with Pyrrhus. All these factors point to this passage in the Disputatio cum Theodosio being inspired by the earlier document. I conjecture that Anastasius Apocrisiarius, the assumed author of both Disputationes, has included this intentionally to strengthen Maximus' case against Theodosius, by making it look as if Theodosius had been won over. The succeeding train of events do not make this seem likely, either, since Theodosius immediately reopened the questioning, asking Maximus if there was no way in which he would speak of one will and activity in Christ.

Constans II was not impressed by Theodosius' defeat, and refused to make any appeal to Rome for forgiveness. Within the same month, Maximus was moved by imperial command to the monastery of St Theodore near Rhecgium, just outside Constantinople, where a second dispute with Theodosius and the patricians Epiphanius and Troilus took place (Disp. 606 ff.). He refused to enter into communion with the church of Constantinople while the heretics were still included in the prayers of the Anaphora, and the emperor refused to condemn the Typus. In consequence, he was then sent into exile in Thrace, first to Selymbria for two days, and then to another camp at Perberis, where we suppose he remained until his second trial in 662.

Anastasius the Monk was also sent into exile in Bizya after the first trial in Constantinople, and then transferred to Perberis; he was there at the time of the
dispute in Bizya. The *Disputatio cum Theodosio*, relating a word-for-word account of the debate with Theodosius, was composed circa 656/657, soon after it occurred. On April 19, 658, a date which has been correctly established by an amendment to previous editions of the text, Maximus, still in exile in Bizya, sent a letter of encouragement to Anastasius the Monk. Around the same time, Anastasius wrote to the monks of Cagliari, entreating their continued support. This letter survives only in Latin, and is attributed in the manuscript to the same Anastasius the monk and disciple of Maximus who was the recipient of the attached letter of Maximus. However, I agree with Bracke’s attribution of the letter to the Apocrisiarius, on the grounds of a close resemblance between the wording of the letter and of the *Syllogisms*, although we should note that the latter cannot definitely be attributed to the Apocrisiarius.\(^\text{18}\)

In 662, Maximus and the two Anastasii were recalled for their second trial in Constantinople, following which Maximus and Anastasius Apocrisiarius both had their right hands cut off and their tongues chopped out. They were then subjected to a humiliating procession through the imperial city, before all three were dispatched to Lazica on the south-east shore of the Black Sea, arriving on June 8. Maximus was moved to the camp at Schemaris (Tskikhe-Muris), i.e. the fortress of Muri in Lechkhumi near Tsageri,\(^\text{19}\) where he died on 13 August, 662. Anastasius the Monk was transferred to Scotoris, a fortress on the bank of the Scotori river, on the border of Abasgia and Apsilia, where he briefly saw Anastasius Apocrisiarius for the last time on 18 July. He died at, or in transfer to, Souania(e), on 22 or 24 July (*Ep. Anas.* 82/84, *Hypo.* 263) of the same year.

The author of the *Hypomnestic*\(^\text{20}\)*, writing in 668/669,\(^\text{20}\) states that Anastasius Apocrisiarius spent twenty years in his three exiles, from the sixth indiction of the past cycle (647/668) up to the tenth indiction of the present cycle.\(^\text{21}\) By his own

---


\(\text{19}\) I am grateful to Dr. Tamila Mgaloblishvili, Department of Manuscripts, Tbilisi, for supplying information about toponemes from Georgian sources, especially Kekelidze, pp. 25-36.

\(\text{20}\) Devreesse, *Hypomnestic*, p. 65.

\(\text{21}\) *Hypo.* 108/113.
account in the Ep. Anas. 61ff.,22 Anastasius was transferred from camp to camp for the next year (662/663), from Buculus, a fortress in Mesimiana (in Alania, northern Caucasus), to Thacyria (near Iberia) for two months, and then to various other tiny outposts. He spent the year of 663 in Phustas, a camp in the region of Apsilia and Mesimiania, and was being transferred to Schemaris in spring 664 when his trials were unexpectedly brought to an end by the intervention of the sympathetic patrician Gregory. Anastasius lived at Thousoumes (ancient Mokvi), at the foot of the Caucasus mountains, until his death on 11 October, 666. During his last year there,23 he wrote to Theodosius of Gangra by attaching a reed to the stump of his hand "with truly admirable skill".24 He begged his readers to find some pretence for coming to the region, with the real purpose of visiting him, but no-one made the journey before his death. The letter was not received until two years later, on 20 August 668, and survives in Latin and partially in Greek. It comes to us with the attachment of what Anastasius claimed to be eight excerpts from the Testimonia of Hippolytus, Bishop of the Port of Rome, and a collection of Syllogisms. These eight extracts are the only evidence we have that such a sermon existed. Perhaps there was never more to it than these excerpts, which Anastasius says he just had time to copy before the original was snatched from him in Constantinople. Given that Anastasius urges his reader to seek out the whole work, we must concede that he is guilty of false pretences if he is in fact the author of the extracts.25 The Testimonia survive elsewhere in Greek,26 but the

22 The Greek is edited by Devreesse, La lettre, pp. 5-16; Latin version in PL 129, cols. 659-664.
23 Devreesse, La lettre, p. 9. See Ep. Anas. 197/198 calendis Ianuarii octauae indictionis quae modo praeterit, a reference to the date of Stephen of Dora’s death on 1 January 665, of the eighth indiction “which has just passed”.
25 Peeters, ‘A propos de la versio arméenio de l’historien Socrate’ in Recherches d’Histoire et de Philologie Orientales, t. 1 (Brussels, 1951), p. 334 (and Bracke, p. 157, following him) says that Anastasius requested the whole codex to be sent to him in exile in Lazica, but this is not the case. Anastasius in fact asked for a copy of the acts of the Lateran Synod. He mentions that he is sending to Theodosius of Gangra a little scroll containing the eight extracts and urges him to seek out the whole work in Constantinople under the title given.
26 Two Greek codices, Bodleianus Miscellaneus 184 (s. XII) and Parisinus graecus 1144 (s. XV), are edited by Diekamp, Doctrina Patrum, Ch. 44, pp. 312-326 with a separate paraphrase of Extract 3 at Ch. 12, p. 300. PL 129, 665-673 gives the Greek version from Sirmond’s edition, which was found in the collection of Francis Turrianus (Sirmond, p. VI) and Latin of Anastasius from the same edition. The emended Latin and Greek versions of Combebis, based on Sirmond’s texts, are edited in PG 10, 829-840 and PG 90, 180-183.
Syllogisms are only extant in this Latin version.\textsuperscript{27} They consist of short extracts of the Testimonia, plus a long diatribe against the monothelites, very similar in wording to the prologue of the Testimonia, and probably by the same author – either Anastasius Apocrisiarius or a third party, such as Theodosius’ brother Theodore Spudaeus. Shortly after receiving this letter, Theodore Spudaeus composed the Hypomnemicon which commemorates those of the dyothelete party who had died in exile.

\textit{Anastasii Apocrisiarii Epistula ad Monachos Ascalonitas} (CPG 7734)

Anastasius Apocrisiarius’ letter to the monks (or monk) of Asculum\textsuperscript{28} is a collection of dogmatic definitions which bears some resemblance to Maximus’ \textit{In Isagogen Porphyrii et in Categorias Aristotelis} (CPG 7707[34]), Anastasius Sinaiticus’ Hodegos, and the \textit{Doctrina Patrum}. The sole manuscript witness to the letter, Vaticanus graecus 662, ff. 216-218, is partly illegible and has never been edited except for a few fragments of f. 216’ in PG 89, 1191-92. Anastasius’ letter contains at least five identical or near-identical definitions found in ch. 33 of the \textit{Doctrina Patrum} from Basil, Gregory of Nyssa, Gregory the Theologian and others.\textsuperscript{29} Only two of these have been identified by Diekamp as coming from the letter.\textsuperscript{30} The \textit{Doctrina Patrum} is a collection of citations from Maximus, Pseudo-Athanasius, John Damascene, Dionysius the Areopagite, Cyril, the three Cappadocians, Hierotheos and others.\textsuperscript{31} Diekamp dates the \textit{Doctrina Patrum} in its final form to between 685 and 726.\textsuperscript{32} Given that the Hodegos has been correctly dated to the 680s by Diekamp and

\textsuperscript{27} The version of Sirmind is edited in PG 10, 839-848, parallel with an improved Latin version by Combeffis and followed by emendations by Cladio Capperonier on the basis of a comparison of the Latin with the Greek of the Testimonia, cols. 847-852; and PL 129, 673-680, followed by Combeffis’ improved version of the Latin text, cols. 679-682, as published in PG 90, 187-194.

\textsuperscript{28} See Winkelmann, no. 150. For its date he refers to \textit{Ep. Anas.} (no. 151), correctly dated by Devreesse to the last year of Anastasius’ final period of exile, i.e. 665/666. A detailed description of \textit{Vat. grec. 662}, (s. XIII) is given by R. Devreesse, \textit{Codices Vatican Graeci} 3 (Vatican City, 1950), p. 102.

\textsuperscript{29} These are Diekamp, p. 254, 13-14; p. 255, 10-12; p. 258, 21-23; p. 262, 13; p. 264, 4-5.

\textsuperscript{30} I.e. p. 262, 13 and p. 264, 4-5.

\textsuperscript{31} Winkelmann, no. 126.

\textsuperscript{32} Diekamp, p. LXXX.
Uthemann, the direction of borrowing between the *Doctrina Patrum* and the *Hodegos* is difficult to determine; perhaps both authors borrowed from a common source or sources. John Damascene's *Dialectica* contains at least four similar or identical passages to Anastasius' letter to the Ascalonite monks, and it seems that John has borrowed from the *Doctrina Patrum*. John Damascene has also been put forward as the author of the *Doctrina Patrum*, as have Anastasius Sinaiticus and Anastasius the Apocrissarius. If the latter were the author, as Stiglmayr believed, the work would have a *terminus ante quem* of 666, the year of his death.

**Maximus, Martin and Roman Primacy**

Maximus' attitude towards the primacy of the Roman church over Constantinople, based on its doctrinal orthodoxy, was shaped by the support he gained in Rome for his struggle against monothelitism, particularly from Popes Theodore and Martin I. This implied a corresponding limitation on imperial claims to authority over the universal church. Thus one of the accusations brought against him at his trial by the imperial court in 655 was that he had claimed that the emperor was not also a priest. He denied this emphatically, pointing to all the activities of a priest which were not performed by the emperor. He was then asked, "Why do you love the Romans, and hate the Greeks?" He answered diplomatically that, as Christians are commanded not to hate

---


35. According to Diekamp, pp. LXVIIff.


anyone, he embraced the Romans as sharers of the same faith, and the Greeks as those speaking the same language as him.39 There could hardly be a clearer statement of his religious and political alliance. As Meyendorff writes, "Maximus' example of uncompromising resistance to Constans II made it difficult for later generations to interpret Byzantine imperial power in caesaropapistic terms."40

Maximus was concerned to defend Pope Honorius from the charge of heresy arising from his infamous letter to Sergius in response to the doctrine of monoenergism. Larchet makes the point in his chronological study of Maximus’ defence of Rome’s primacy that this lasted only as long as Rome continued to be the protector of orthodox faith. Larchet’s texts include the *Dispute with Pyrrhus*, the *Relatio Motionis*, the *Letter of Maximus to Anastasius*, the *Dispute with Theodosius* and the *Letter of Anastasius to the Monks of Cagliari*.41 In this last, Anastasius urges his readers to seek the support of “the men of old Rome, who are as solid as a rock in piety.”42 As Larchet notes,43 this phrase indicates that Rome deserves primacy not because of a special privilege due to her bishop but on the basis of her apostolic foundation by Peter and Paul, and of the orthodox faith of her church, by which is meant all the clergy and the laity. On the question of monoenergism and monothelitism all the popes since Honorius – and including Honorius, according to Maximus’ interpretation –, had upheld the orthodox position.44 Martin’s defence of this position, and his convocation of the Lateran Synod on the issue, together with his refusal to seek recognition of his election from the emperor Constans II, led to his arrest and death in exile. If this position were to be abandoned, Rome would forfeit her right to such a claim, and the true “catholic and apostolic church” would exist only among individuals of orthodox belief. Orthodox belief was defined by Maximus as that which accorded with patristic and conciliar tradition, not that which was

39 RM 437/441: Praeceptum habemus ne quenquam odio habemus. Diligo Romanos ut unam mecum habentes fidem; Graecos autem ut eadem qua ego lingua loquente.
40 J. Meyendorff, 'Maximus the Confessor', *New Catholic Encyclopedia*, v. 9, p. 233.
41 Larchet, pp. 148-176.
43 Larchet, pp. 168f.
44 I.e. Popes Severinus, John IV, Theodore and Martin, as noted by Larchet., p. 156.
promulgated by either the emperor and his patriarchate, or the bishop of Rome per se.\textsuperscript{45}

Unfortunately Larchet's analysis is marred by his inaccurate dating of two of these documents: the \textit{RM}, which he dated to May-June 654, and the \textit{Ep. Cal.}, dated to June 654, following the errors of previous scholarship.\textsuperscript{46} Like Devreesse, he suggested that the emissaries mentioned as arriving in Constantinople during this trial had come to obtain imperial approval of the election of Pope Eugenius, consecrated in August of that year.\textsuperscript{47} Anastasius' \textit{Ep. Cal.} is supposed by Larchet to have been written in June of that same year,\textsuperscript{48} when the pope has not yet made his intentions on the matter of monothelitism clear, prompting Anastasius' urgent request that his readers to go to Rome and drum up support from the faithful dyothelite community there. However, if we recognise that the \textit{RM} did not take place until 655, and that the \textit{Ep. Anas.} cannot have been written before the \textit{Ep. Max.} of 19 April, 658,\textsuperscript{49} then we have to concede, first of all, that Eugenius' legates arrived in Constantinople with a favourable attitude towards the patriarch and the church of Constantinople at least five months after the pope's consecration in August of the previous year, and after his condemnation of Peter's synodical letter. These \textit{apocrisiarii}, who came without a letter from the pope on the subject of monothelitism, were probably the resident ambassadors who were to replace those who had been evicted from the Palace of Placidia in 647 or 648 for

\textsuperscript{45} Larchet, p. 158, disagrees with Garrigues' premiss in 'Le sens de la primauté romaine chez saint Maxime le Confesseur', \textit{Istina} 21 (1976), p. 12 that Maximus accorded to the pope, as head of the church of Rome, infallibility in doctrinal matters.


\textsuperscript{47} Larchet, p. 163, n. 134, and Devreesse, \textit{La vie}, p. 29. It is not clear why Larchet thinks that the emissaries would have been seeking imperial approval two months before the election of Eugenius.

\textsuperscript{48} Larchet, p. 166: "Cette lettre, probablement datée de juin 654..." i.e. before the first trial of Maximus, and before the newly elected Pope Eugenius rejected the synodical letter of Patriarch Peter. However, the urgency of Anastasius' appeal to the monks to seek support in Rome would be just as well accounted for during the pontificate of Eugenius' successor Vitalian. The mention of the compromise formula of Peter from 657 or 658 also points to a correct dating of the letter to 658. The placement of the letter to Cagliari after the letter of Maximus to Anastasius, and its coda, also suggest that the collator arranged the documents in chronological order.

\textsuperscript{49} Larchet, p. 174, n. 162, accepts this date for the \textit{Letter of Maximus} on the basis of our new edition.
rejection of the Typus. Their imminent communion with the newly elected patriarch of Constantinople, Peter, thus indicated papal support for the Typus and perhaps also for a statement of monothelitism issued by Pyrrhus upon his second election in 653. This approval does not square with Eugenius' earlier actions soon after his consecration on 10 August 654, when he apparently rejected the synodical letter of Peter. Our only witness to this rejection is the Liber Pontificalis, which states that the pope succumbed to pressure from the people and Roman clergy to reject Peter's statement, which was unclear on the issue of the wills and operations of Christ. There is evidence in Disp. 756/759, however, that the pope had fallen out of favour with the imperial party by September 656, when the representatives of the Patriarch Peter and the emperor threaten that they will dispose of the pope and those who speak like him in Rome.

Secondly, Anastasius' evident anxiety when he wrote his letter was due to the uncertainty about the position of Vitalian, elected in June, 657. Anastasius writes that the apocrisiaries had been forced to join the imperial sect. Vitalian did not condemn the Typus in his synodical letter, and entered into communion with the church of Constantinople without apparent hesitation. When Maximus was interrogated by representatives of the emperor and Patriarch Peter in April 658, he was told that the five patriarchates, including Rome, were united. The threat made by Maximus' interrogators, as reported in the Letter of Maximus to Anastasius, that the monk would be condemned to death by the emperor with the command of the pope, is also evidence for Vitalian's unfavourable disposition towards the dyothelite party. Vitalian accepted Peter's compromise formula of two natural wills and one hypostatic will in Christ. Vitalian's accord with the imperial position seems to have remained unaltered: in 663, he welcomed Emperor Constans II to Rome. Thus we need to look further back than has previously been customary, to the early stages of Eugenius' pontificate, for

---

50 One of them was our Anastasius the Apocrisiarius. Duchesne 1, p. 336 = LP 1, Life of Martin, c. 1, p. 69 describes the expulsion of the apocrisiarit from the house of Placidia by Patriarch Paul II.

51 Peter was elected in June 654 after the death of Pyrrhus, who held the patriarchal throne for the second time from December 653 to 3 June 654.

52 The pope was not allowed to celebrate mass until he promised to reject the Synodical Letter: Duchesne 1, p. 341 = LP 1, Life of Eugenius, c. 2, p. 71.
evidence that the bishop of Rome had not in fact represented the "true catholic and apostolic church" since the condemnation of Martin to exile in 654.

Sixth Ecumenical Council of Constantinople AD 680/681

The Sixth Ecumenical Council of 680/681 upheld Maximus' doctrinal position, and shaped the future Byzantine attitude to this theological issue. Maximus himself however was not mentioned at this council, probably to spare imperial embarrassment over his recent condemnation and martyrdom. The florilegium brought by the Roman representatives of Pope Agatho was much the same as that used at the Lateran Synod of 649, and contained both orthodox and monothelite quotations. These citations were carefully compared with other versions in patriarchal books and those that the legates had brought from Rome, in order to ascertain their authenticity. Monothelite texts were likewise examined, and those which were found to be forgeries, such as the Letter of Menas to Pope Vigilius, were rejected. Macarius of Antioch and Stephen the monk, who had presented the monothelite case, were accused of producing false texts and anathematised. In the words of A. von Harnack (in translation) this was "the council of antiquarians and paleographists". This highly original exercise in literary criticism concluded with the condemnation of Cyrus of Alexandria, the four patriarchs of Constantinople — Sergius, Pyrrhus, Paul and Peter —, Theodore of Pharan and Pope Honorius. Even the Roman legates concurred with the anathema pronounced upon their former bishop.

II. Latin Manuscript Tradition

Our sole surviving copy of Anastasius' translation of these documents appears in a codex now held in the Bibliothèque Nationale, from the Cathedral library of Laon, which was closely connected with the Frankish emperor Charles the Bald. This is a copy made soon after the original translation of ca. 875, and before 895. The


manuscript has been beautifully copied in Carolingian minuscule script. It is possible that *Par. lat. 5095* is a direct copy of the autograph *Collectanea*, as it contains a gloss which appears to be that of the translator in the margin of f.12, concerning the word “imperium” in the *Letter of Maximus to Peter the Illustrious*:

\[ \text{ΗΓΕΜΟΝΙΑ quod hic codex grecus habet; in euangelio, imperium inuenimus interpretatum ut illud imperii Tiberii pro eo quod grecus habet ΗΓΕΜΟΝΙΑΣ.} \]

**Description of *Parisinus latinus 5095***:

Parchment; 292 mm. x 230 mm.; 35 ll.; 1 col.; 138 ff. (f. 2 is blank).

That the codex originally appertained to the Cathedral School of Laon we know from the colophon on the first folio: *Hunc librum dedit domnus Dido episcopus Deo et Sanctae Mariae. Si quis abstulerit iram Dei et eiusdem genetricis offensam incurrat.* This is almost identical to the *ex-dono* in several other manuscripts from the Cathedral School of Laon, as Contreni has noted,\(^5\) and dates the manuscript to the period between the composition of Anastasius' original ca. 875, and the death in 895 of Dido, bishop of Laon from ca. 882. Contreni believes that *Par. lat. 5095* is one of eight manuscripts which were produced at the Laon scriptorium in the late ninth century.\(^6\) In the late seventeenth century, the book came into the hands of Le Tellier, archbishop of Rheims (1668-1710) and friend of Colbert, head of the Bibliothèque du Roi in 1661. Le Tellier's name is noted at f. 1v in an annotation from 9 February 1891.\(^7\) It was transferred, along with the rest of Tellier's library, to the Bibliothèque Royale in Paris in 1682 or 1700,\(^8\) where it was listed in the catalogue as item 4062,2.

---

\(^5\) Contreni, p. 33, n. 15. One of these is *Laud. lat. 199* (ca. 820-840) which contains the oldest complete Latin translation of the *Acts of the Lateran Synod of 649*, from ff. 1r-138r. According to R. Riedinger, ACO ser. II, vol. 1, p. XIII, who has studied this manuscript from the library of Notre Dame de Laon, it was copied in St Amand, and may have been copied from the exemplar sent by Pope Martin to Bishop Amandus of Tongerin-Maastricht, or may have been the result of the efforts of Arn, abbot of St Amand (782) and later archbishop of Salzburg (789-821) to obtain a good text of the Council acts, as he also obtained the acts of the Sixth Council. See *Catalogue général des Manuscrits des Bibliothèques publiques Départements* 1 (Paris, 1849), p. 140 for the contents of *Laud. lat. 199*.

\(^6\) Contreni, p. 64, n. 90.


\(^8\) Devreesse, *La vie*, 1928, p. 9, n. 1 opts for the later date.
One section only of the Collectanea survives in another manuscript, the Vallicellianus Tomus IX (s. X/XI). This is the Gesta Sancti Papae Martini, together with the preface of Anastasius, dedicating the piece to Martin, Bishop of Narni, and dating to September-October 874, before the Collectanea was dedicated to John the Deacon, as Anastasius notes in his preface to the latter.

Profile of the Correctors

Two hands have added to the original copy: one a corrector (manus secunda) and the other a reviser (manus tertia). The corrections seem to be made on the basis of the original Latin, e.g. Disp. 32 praescientia praeientia a. corr. cod. The corrector has inserted missing words, changed or inserted letters. The reviser has systematically omitted instances of Grecisms e.g. ‘h’, e.g. horphodoxia (Ep. Anas. 204 et 222), horphodoxe (Ep. Anas. 102), horphodoxam (Ep. Anas. 275); presbiteros for presbyteros (RM 181), ‘k’ e.g. calumniatores for kalumniatores (Disp. 817), canonicae for kanonicae (Disp. 673). These revisions extend even to words like hymnos (Ep. Anas. 277) and hospes (Ep. Anas. 169). Stylistic revisions are also made in this hand, e.g. erasure of est (Syll. 514), and nostri (Syll. 451); cf. erasure of qui (Disp. 206), which was a genuine correction. Marginalia are mainly glosses on Greek words, e.g. collegium (Disp. 643) over synaxon; id est expositio (RM 366) over ekthesis (and RM 248); glosses on Eucratas (RM 232), and cacodoxia (Ep. Anas. 224). These seem to have been included in the original copy, and we may note that some Grecisms have escaped the reviser’s notice, e.g. Ep. Anas. Scholion 224 horphodoxia. Three of the longer marginalia in Disp. 768, 808, et 812, which explain the identity of characters in the text, are exact translations of glosses in Vat. grec. 1912, indicating that they have been translated directly from the Greek scholia. The reviser has emended the word order in some instances, e.g. pariter patriarchis (RM 385), vitae hominum (Disp. 59). The reviser is also responsible for orthographic


changes; e.g. Disp. 824 mendatio is corrected to mendacio; Ep. Anas. 137 solatium is corrected to solacium.

Contents of Parisinus Latinus 5095

The contents of the manuscript are recorded in brief in the Catalogus codicum manuscriptorum Bibliothecae Regiae. All the documents, except for the excerpt of St Augustine, pertain to matters of ecclesiastical governance in Gaul, Rome and Byzantium, and their collator thus shares a common interest with Anastasius. Hincmar of Laon was responsible for the two collections of papal letters that appear here. The inclusion of an excerpt from the letter of Nicholas to Emperor Michael is particularly interesting. This manuscript was one of twenty donated to the cathedral library of Laon by Dido. Among the others in his possession were a collection of the correspondence of Hincmar of Rheims, Charles the Bald and Popes Benedict III, Nicholas I and Hadrian II; a copy of the Liber Pontificalis; and two volumes of conciliar canons.

The two collections of papal letters made by Hincmar of Laons, as well as the Periocha (i.e. compendium) of Pope Nicholas’ letters and an extract from Augustine’s De diversis quaestionibus octoginta tribus, are all incorporated in a collection of the correspondence between Hincmar of Laon and his uncle, Hincmar of Rheims. This is followed by excerpts from the acts of three Gallic councils. The contents of this codex are as follows:

I. ff. 3-58* Collectanea of Anastasius Bibliothecarius.

II. ff. 59-76 Collection of papal letters, from Alexander, fifth pope after Peter.

III. ff. 76-78 From the Periocha V of Pope Nicholas, predecessor of the present

---


62 Contreni, pp. 63 and 73.

63 Contreni, pp. 33f. and pp. 72f. In Apparatus A, p. 170, item 21, and pp. 177f., items 184-187, outline most of the contents of Par. Lat. 5095, excluding the Letter of the Bishops of the Synod of Quierzy, and the excerpt from St Augustine.

64 PL 124, 1001-1022.
Pope Hadrian, to Michael, emperor of the Greeks.\(^{65}\)

IV. ff. 78-120 Letters of Hincmar of Rheims and Hincmar of Laon to each other.

V. ff. 87'-91' Collection of letters of the Roman Popes.\(^{66}\)

VI. ff. 106-110' General letter of Pope Nicholas I to all the archbishops and bishops of Gallia.\(^{67}\)

VII. f. 115'-117 Book 4, Chapter 84 of *Questions on the Trinity*, by Augustine of Hippo: Scholion on the words of the Apostle: *inuicem onera uestra portate*.\(^{68}\)

VIII. ff. 120-121 Chapters I-V of the Council of Tusey (a. 860).\(^{69}\)

IX. ff. 121-122 Subscriptions of the Gallic bishops at the Council.

X. ff. 122-130 Capitulary of King Charles the Bald at the Council of Pistas (i.e. Pitres) (a. 864): Chaps. I-XXXVII.\(^{70}\)

XI. ff. 130-137' Letter of the Bishops of the Synod of Carisiacum (i.e. Quierzy) to King Ludovico the Pious: Chaps. I-XV (a. 858).

**Previous Editions**

This was the manuscript used in the first edition of the *Collectanea* by Jacques Sirmond, who supplied the title of *Collectanea* to the collection.\(^{71}\) This edition was reprinted in 1696,\(^{72}\) incorporating notes of the editor using F. Combesis' edition of the

---

\(^{65}\) PL 124, 1022-1026. The six excerpts, identified by Perels, *NADG* 39 (1914), p. 50, are: (f. 76) a section from Nicholas' letter to Emperor Michael III concerning the Photian dispute (MGH VI, Ep. 86, p. 450); two excerpts (ff. 76-77') from Ep. 88 to Michael (MGH VI, pp. 470-471; pp. 480-481); and three excerpts (ff. 77'-78) from Ep. 90, also to Michael (MGH VI, pp. 496-497; 498; and 499).

\(^{66}\) This is edited in PL 124, 993-1002.

\(^{67}\) MGH VI, Ep. 71, pp. 392-400, the famous letter of Nicholas to the Gallic bishops on the subject of Rothad: see E. Perels, 'Die Briefe Papst Nikolaus' I', *NADG* 37 (1912), pp. 556f. and *NADG* 39 (1914), p. 51.

\(^{68}\) *De diversis questionibus octoginta tribus*, Quaestio 71 (CPL 289) as edited by A. Mutzenbecher, CCSL 44A (Turnhout, 1975), pp. 200-207.

\(^{69}\) These are edited in Mansi 15, 557-661.


\(^{71}\) Sirmond, *Anastasii bibliothecarii sedis apostolicae collectanea* (Paris, 1620), p. VI, where he indicated that his codex came ex *Bibliotheca Ecclesiæ Laudunensis*.

\(^{72}\) *J. Sirmondi Varia Opera* III (Paris, 1696).
Greek. The Greek was first published in 1675 with Combevis' own Latin version of the RM, Disp. and Ep. Max., and with Anastasius' translations of the Ep. Cal., Ep. Anas. and Hypo. Sirmond's edition was reprinted in 1677, and again in 1728 with an edition of the Greek texts then available. This is the version which was eventually included in Migne's Latin series. Two prefaces found in the Collectanea are edited in the collection of Anastasius' letters: the preface to the Gesta of Pope Martin, mentioned above, and the general introduction to the Collectanea which was dedicated to John the Deacon.

**Ratio edendi**

The principles adopted in editing these texts have been tailored to fit the peculiar situation of presenting a translation which pre-dates the original. Thus we have attempted to maintain Anastasius' text as closely as possible, occasionally suggesting additions to the text from the most reliable Greek readings. The scribal errors made in transmitting Anastasius' text have been corrected. Any unusual orthographic variants, such as charactrizet (Ep. Cal. 53; RM 294), charactrizant (Ep. Cal. 18), and nanque (RM 291), have been preserved, with a note to this effect in the apparatus criticus. Alterations to the Latin text by its first editor have been repaired, except as indicated in the apparatus criticus.

The variants in Sirmond's edition may be divided into the following categories: errors, orthographical corrections, improvements (actual and intended), additions and omissions. Under errors, we find: fuit for fiat (RM 134); substantialis for substantiales (Ep. Cal. 36); uiros for uos (Ep. Cal. 97); unitatem for unitionem (Ep. Max. 20); omissions include se (Ep. Cal. 110); orthographical corrections include coelis for caelis (RM 54); lacrymis for lacrimis (Ep. Cal. 101); characterizet for

---

73 F. Combevis, Opera Maximi 1 (Paris, 1675).
74 This is reprinted in PG 90, 109-206.
75 Maxima bibliotheca veterum patrum XII (Lyons, 1677).
76 J. Sirmondii Varia Opera III (Venice, 1728), pp. 284-402.
77 PL 129, 557-690, a reprint of Gallandius' Bibliotheca veterum patrum XIII (Venice, 1779).
78 MGH VII, Ep. 8, pp. 421-422; and MGH VII, Ep. 9, pp. 422-426, respectively.
characterizet (Ep. Cal. 53; RM 294); namque for nanque (RM 291); praeestitis for prestetis (Ep. Anas. 174) and Latinisation of Greek names, such as Magudam for Magudan (RM 50); Thomam for Thoman (RM 73); actual improvements include Romae for Rome (RM 102, 235); sibimet for simet (Ep. Cal. 103); operationem for operatione (Ep. Cal. 66); robustissimam for robustimam (Hypo. 184); pro pietate for proprietate (Hypo. 348); sedetque for sedetquae (Hypo. 376); possibly disiunctam for disiunctim (Ep. Cal. 75); less successful "improvements" include the addition of non at RM 337; imbuisset for in<hi>buisset (Hypo. 183); an unnecessary emendation of scit for dicit (RM 15); quae for quaue quae (Disp. 35). Other places in need of amendment have escaped the editor's notice, e.g. sancti<s> for sancti (Ep. Anas. 100); quintaeaeccimaes where decimaes is redundant (Ep. Anas. 89).

The present edition of the Latin text also improves on Devreesse's partial edition of the Ep. Anas., supplying several minor omissions and rectifying some slight departures from the manuscript as follows:

74 uel nono kalendas] om. Dev.
86 custodiae] om. Dev.
89 instantis] om. Dev.
91 dic] om. Dev.
100/101 gloriem et laudem] laudem et gloriem Dev.
108 quatinus] quatenus Dev.
131 consilio] concilio Dev.
135 quanquam] quamquam Dev.
137 solacium] solatium Dev.
141 Dei amicus] om. Dev.
149 Dei habeat] habeat Dei Dev.

Contents of the Collectanea

Anastasius himself tells us that he is responsible for the collation of the bulk of the Collectanea, but there are signs that he found some sections of the work already made into a dossier.79 These are the Gesta Sancti Martini (§10 below) and the six

79 As I argued in 'Lives', pp. 102-103.
documents which follow (§§11-16). We have argued elsewhere that the collator of this part of the *Collectanea* was most likely to have been Theodore Spudaeus, the "genuine brother" (in his own words) of Theodosius of Gangra. 80 We have established that he collated the first part of the *Gesta Sancti Martini* (§10.II). Theodosius and Theodore Spudaeus met Martin when he arrived under arrest in Constantinople on September 17, 653, and Theodore was therefore in a position to have also written the second part of the *Gesta Martini*, the *Commemoratio* (§10.III). 81 He then gathered together the *RM* (§11); the *Ep. Max.* (§12), to which he added an epilogue; the *Ep. Cal.* (§13); the *Disp.* (§14); the *Ep. Anas.* (§15.II), which was put together with the *Testimonia* (§15.IV) and *Syll.* (§15.V), which may have had different authors – the manuscript rubric attributes the *Syll.* to Anastasius and the *Testimonia* to Hippolytus, third-century Bishop of Portus Romanus –, and the *Hypomnesticon* (§16), which has already been attributed to his pen by Devreesse. 82 The collation was completed after Theodore and Theodosius received the *Letter of Anastasius* when they went to Lazica in 668 to visit him and the other holy sights. It may have been subject to a second edition later by the author of the rubric which cites the *Libellus Theodori Spoudaei S. Sophiae* as the source of the *Gesta Martini*. 83

The contents of the *Collectanea* are as follows:

1. ff. 3-5* Letter of Anastasius Bibliothecarius of the Apostolic See to John the Deacon of Rome.

Fragment from *Disputatio cum Pyrrha*, f. 5v. (= PG 91, 328B12-329A15)

2. ff. 5*-8*. Apologia of Pope John to the emperor Constantine, son of Heraclius, for Honorius, on account of one will in Christ (which detractors said that he spoke of). A retroversion from the Greek by Anastasius Bibliothecarius, according to Anastasius' preface to John Deacon, and CPL 1729 and CPG [9383]. The letter is also translated


81 *Ibid.*, pp. 104-105. Devreesse, *Hypomnesticon*, p. 50, suggests that Theodore Spudaeus and Theodosius of Gangra are the authors of a great part of the documents of the *Collectanea* i.e. the letter of Martin to Theodore Spudaeus *Quoniam agnovi*, the letter of the same to the same *Noscere voluit*, the *Commemoratio* and the *Hypomnesticon*. I am not sure, however, that Theodore Spudaeus can be called the "author" of the two letters of Martin.

82 Devreesse, *Hypomnesticon*, p. 50.

into two Arabic versions, with drastic departures from the Latin, according to Winkelmann.\textsuperscript{84}

3. ff. 8\textsuperscript{r}-10\textsuperscript{r} Selections from a letter of saint Maximus to Marinus the priest, making a defence of Honorius, among other things.

(CPG 7697.20) = PL 129, 568-574 (with Greek from PG 91, 228-245). Winkelmann, no. 60. This has not been edited as yet.

4. ff. 10\textsuperscript{r}-12\textsuperscript{r} Selections from a letter of the same saint Maximus, written to Peter the illustrious, where he makes mention of Pyrrhus and holy Sophronius, bishop of Jerusalem, and also Pope Honorius. (CPG 7697.12) = PL 129, 573-576. Winkelmann, no. 88, notes that Sherwood inferred from this letter that Peter had evidently asked Maximus how to conduct himself with the ex-patriarch Pyrrhus, especially as to the use of the patriarchal address most holy.\textsuperscript{85} Sherwood dates the letter to late 643 or 644. This is only found in Anastasius Bibliothecarius’ Latin version.

5. ff. 12\textsuperscript{r}-13 Excerpt from a letter of Saint Maximus concerning the procession of the Holy Spirit, written to the priest Marinus of Cyprus. CPG 7697, 10 = PG 91, 133-137 and PL 129, 577-578 (partim). Winkelmann, no. 93. The Latin and Greek versions are being edited by B. Markesinus.


7. ff. 15-15\textsuperscript{r} Copy of the proposal sent to Constantinople by Theodore, the most holy Roman pope. CPG [9388]= PL 129, 581-582. Winkelmann, no. 80. This survives in Latin only.

8. ff. 15\textsuperscript{r}-16\textsuperscript{r} Letter of Pope Theodore to the bishops who consecrated Paul, patriarch of Constantinople, when Pyrrhus was no longer patriarch. CPG [9389] = PL 129, 581-584. Winkelmann, no. 81. This survives in Latin only.

\textsuperscript{84} Nachträge, no. 69, p. 559.

\textsuperscript{85} Sherwood, Date-List, no. 76; p. 52.
9. ff. 16'-17' Commemoration of what the Roman legates did in Constantinople, taken from the letter of holy Maximus to Abbot Thalassius. CPG 7702 = Latin version of Anastasius Bibliothecarius. This will be included in the forthcoming edition of *Epistulae S. Maximi*, CCSG, by B. Markesinus.

10. ff. 17'-27' Exile of the holy Roman Pope Martin:

   I. ff. 17'-18' (Dedication) to the most famous and blessed Martin, bishop of the holy church of Narni, from Anastasius Bibliothecarius (BHL 5592)

   II. ff. 18-20' From those things which were written by Theodore Spudaeus of St Sophia, to the genuine brothers, holy Theodore and Euprepius (BHL 5593)

      i) f. 18-18' (First) Letter of Martin to Theodore (Spudaeus) his beloved brother, with true affection

      ii) ff. 18'–20' (Second) Letter of holy Martin (to Theodore of Spudaeus)

   III. ff. 20'-27' Commemoration of those things which were done...to Pope Martin, through a letter of a certain most devout Christian to those orthodox fathers in the West, in Rome and in Africa (BHL 5594; CPL 1734)

      i) f. 26-26' (Third) letter of Pope Martin to his dearest friend in Constantinople

      ii) ff. 26'-27 (Fourth) letter of Pope Martin to his dearest friend in Constantinople. Des. *De cetero uero, necessarium duxi etiam de diuiniter honoratis et illustratis patribus nostris et concertatoribus eius dilectioni uestrae significare*.

11. ff. 27'-33' Record of the trial held against lord Maximus the monk and his companion, before the leading men in the Council Chamber.

12. ff. 33-34 Letter of the same holy father Maximus to the monk Anastasius, his disciple.

   ff. 33'-34 Addendum to the letter by Anastasius or the compiler of the documents; inc. *Anastasius haec iussit mihi transcribere*...

13. ff. 34-35 Letter of the same holy monk Anastasius, the disciple of the holy abbot Maximus, to the community of monks established at Cagliari.
14. ff. 35-44 Volume containing a record of the teachings which were discussed between the holy Maximus and Theodosius, bishop of Caesarea Bithynia, and the consuls who were with him.

15. ff. 44-53 * Copy of the letter of the holy priest Anastasius, and apocrisiarius of older Rome, together with testimonia and syllogisms:

   I. f. 44* Prologue to the Letter from the monk and priest Anastasius to Theodosius of Gangra, given to Theodosius the priest from Gangra.

   II. ff. 44*-47* Letter from Anastasius to Theodosius of Gangra

   III. ff. 47*-48 Prologue to the attached holy testimonia

   IV. ff. 48-50 (Testimonia) of the holy Bishop Hippolytus of the Roman Port, from his treatise on theology and the incarnation, against the heretics Bero and Helicon (in eight sections) (CPG 1916)

   V. ff. 50-53* Syllogisms of the same holy Anastasius.

16. ff. 53*-58* Scholion or Hypomnematakion briefly declaring the achievements of the holy Maximus and of both Anastasii, and of holy Pope Martin, and of Theodore and Euprepius and others.

III. Greek Manuscript Tradition

Almost all of the early witnesses to the above texts come from Southern Italy, where they were copied before the end of the thirteenth century. Calabria, and particularly its mountainous areas, was the refuge of many Greek monks from Sicily in the tenth and eleventh centuries, fleeing the first wave of Arab invasions, and the subsequent Norman invasions. Others established themselves in Campania and Ottranto. These monks sought to preserve Byzantine culture by the transcription of Greek manuscripts, many of which have survived. The monastic centres of Reggio and

---


87 R. Devresse, *Les Manuscrits grecs de l'Italie méridionale*, Studi e Testi 183 (Vatican, 1955) treats more than 400 manuscripts from southern Italy, copied between the end of the tenth century and the end of the fifteenth.
Grottaferrata were especially active in the preservation of the Maximian tradition. Early copies of the Disputatio are found in Vaticanus graecus 1912 (s. X) of Calabrian provenance (A); Venetus Marcianus graecus 137 (s. X) of Italo-Greek provenance (M); Vaticanus graecus 1646 (a. 1118) copied by Nicholas of Reggio (V); Parisinus Coislinianus 267 (s. XII) from Southern Italy (C); Venetus Marcianus graecus 135 (s. XIII) from Southern Italy (R); Scorialensis graecus 273 (s. XCVII/XCVIII) from Southern Italy (S); and Vaticanus graecus 2064 (s. XII) from Reggio di Calabria (W).

The earliest witnesses to the Letter of Maximus are A, C, M, R, S and V. The Relatio Motionis is also found in these same six early manuscripts. The Letter of Anastasius to Theodosius of Gangra survives in only one Greek manuscript (A), which also contains an excerpt of the Acts of the Lateran Synod. The Hypomnesticon survives in two codices, Vaticanus graecus 1671 (s. X) which seems to have been copied in the monastery of Grottaferrata (F), and in a later Athoneite copy, Vatopedinus 475 (s. XIII+/s. XIV). Another document in the Greek collection, Contra Constantinopolitanos, found only in Greek, likewise survives only in two manuscripts, S and its copy C.

**Relationship between the Latin version and the Vita Maximi**

Two of the documents, Disp. and RM, are included verbatim in the third recension of the Vita Maximi, of which an edition is currently in preparation by Pauline Allen and myself. The third recension of the Vita Maximi has seventeen witnesses, the earliest dating to the eleventh century. The relationship between the Vita, the separate redaction of the two documents it includes, and the Latin version is one of great complexity. All attempts to find a consistent correlation between any member of the four families of the seventeen manuscripts transmitting the Vita, and any particular strand of the manuscript tradition of Disp. and RM, were inconclusive, although independent readings of X did supply the most agreements with the Vita version of Disp., and to a lesser extent, R and X showed agreement with the RM as it appears in the Vita. Likewise, the Latin translation, which most closely resembles X on a number of occasions where X carries an independent reading, did not align with
any particular manuscript(s) of the *Vita*, although it proved more similar to the two oldest families than to the younger two.

The Latin version very rarely reveals that its model shared the same reading as *X* and the *Vita*, e.g.

*Disp. 507*: naturam enim non affectum = *Vita* = σχέσιν γάρ, ἀλλ’ οὐ φύσιν *X*

The Latin reading in some places agrees with *X* but not the *Vita*, e.g.

*Disp. 109* gradiantur = βαδίσσοντι *X*; cf. *Vita* and Greek *Disp. 125* βαδίσσατε

Conversely, the Latin occasionally agrees with the *Vita* reading but not *X*, e.g.

*Disp. 203/204* et falsos prophetas et falsos doctores = *Vita*

cf. Greek *Disp. 232/233* καὶ 2 – πρεσβυδιδασκαλους om. *X*

Sometimes the Latin offers a better reading than either *X* or the *Vita*, e.g.

*Disp. 93/94* ob quam non communico thro no Constantinopolitano = Greek *Disp. 104*; om. *X* et *Vita*.

*Disp. 32/33* et sermonum et operum = Greek *Disp. 35/36* καὶ λόγων καὶ ἔργων;

cf. καὶ ἔργων καὶ λόγων *X* and *Vita* καὶ λόγων ἔργων.

**Relationship between the Latin and Greek texts**

**I. Disputatio**

I shall take the longest document first, the *Disputatio*, in order to show some of the problems we have encountered in trying to establish the relationship between the Greek tradition and the Latin text, and to demonstrate the significance of Anastasius’ Latin translation. Each of the documents has been transmitted in a different number and variety of textual witnesses. There are fourteen Greek witnesses to the document which survive in their entirety. In addition we have three fragments which survive in menologia, and several fragments from John Damascene. (With the exception of *N, D* and *W*, all the manuscripts transmitting the *Disputatio* contain more than one of the documents.) These manuscripts may be divided into two families – the first of which contains three manuscripts (*R* and its copy *O*, and *X*) deriving from a Constantinopolitan model, and copied in the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries. All the others belong to the second family of Italo-Greek stock, first copied in Byzantine monasteries in the south of Italy in the tenth through twelfth centuries. The earliest of
the Greek witnesses (A), contains in its original form a good text of the second family, but has been systematically corrected by a second and even a third hand on the basis of another text-type, one related to the later manuscripts R and O. The Athonite manuscript, Vatopedinus 475 (X), seems to come closest to Anastasius' Latin version, and to the model for the corrections of A, and may be representative of the original tradition, before it split into the south-Italian and Constantinopolitan branches.

R and O themselves contain a reworked and hagiographicised text, containing numerous gratuitous additions, and changing the word order for no apparent reason. Several mentions of Rome are included, while excluded from the other Greek manuscripts. Instead of referring to Maximus as "monk" or "father" they prefer to call him "the holy one": hagios or hostios. However, a close examination of the text of RO reveals that, despite the somewhat degenerate copy they represent, it is descended from the same text-type as that from which Anastasius made his translation. This Constantinopolitan model is characterised by the absence at the conclusion of the Disputatio of the official sentence of condemnation against the Confessor and the two Anastasii. Instead in the Latin we find an extended doxology as a conclusion to the document. In R and O, the doxology is placed some lines earlier in the mouth of Maximus, and is followed by the first part of the second sentence and the third sentence of condemnation. R and O omit Disp. 794/812, describing the end of Maximus' stay in Selymbria, his transfer to Perberis and his discussion with Troilus in Rhegium about John the Consiliarius' letter. This final section contains three scholia in the Latin, which are translations of identical scholia in Vaticanus graecus 1912 (Vatopedinus 475 does not contain the doxology). Vaticanus graecus 1912 shows no sign of correction in this final section of two sentences of condemnation, thus indicating that the earliest version of this text did not contain this appendix. Combefis' text in the PG represents a poor text belonging to the later south-Italian tradition, further degraded by editorial omissions and additions, and by typographical errors in Migne. It also contains the final condemnation which was a later addition made with the intention of tidying up and rounding off the narrative of the vicissitudes of Maximus and the two Anastasii. Combefis' provision of his own Latin translation of this Third Psephos, without acknowledgment of the fact, only adds to the potential confusion of those wishing to use this text as a source for seventh-century history.
The close connection between the Latin and the corrected version of \( A \) is demonstrated in the examples below, which allowed the correct reconstruction of the Greek text:

- \textit{Disp. 547 casus}

\[\text{μετάπτωσις} \] \textit{et \ μετάπτω \ in \ mg. \ A, \ μετάπτω \ R \ MS \ W \ ND.}

- \textit{Disp. 268: execrabilem heresim;}

\[\text{μισράς \ αἰρέσεως} \] \textit{post \ corr. \ et \ αἰρέσεως \ in \ mg. \ A; \ μισράς \ a. \ corr. \ A \ MS \ W \ ND, \ μινάς \ αἰρέσεως \ R}

- \textit{Disp. 565/566 non annihilatam;}

\[\text{oὐκ \ ἡτοιμαζόμενη} \] \textit{post \ corr. \ A, \ oὐχὶ \ τὸ \ μόνην \ MS \ W \ ND, \ oὐκ \ ἡτοιμω \ μόνην \ R.}

- \textit{Disp. 420/421 accepto... libro gestorum sanctae ac apostolicae synodi Romanæ}

Ῥώμης supplied in Greek from \( R, O, P \) and corrector of \( A \).

\section*{II. Relatio Motionis}

There is evidence from the \textit{Relatio Motionis} that Anastasius Bibliothecarius used a parent manuscript of \( R, O \) and \( X \). The corrector of \( A \) has not extended his efforts to the \( RM \), and thus \( A \) does not demonstrate the same affinities with Anastasius’ Latin as do \( ORX \) in this particular document.

- \textit{RM 128/129 ... a Deo coronata eius iussit tranquillitas}

“his crowned-by-God Serenity ordered”

\[\text{ΟΡΧ \ ή \ αὐτοῦ \ θεοστεφής \ ἐκέλευσεν \ γαλήνη.}\]

\( A \ MV \ CS \) read \( \text{πάλιν (MV S add \( η \)}}\).

- \textit{RM 255 ... per octauam indictionem} proves an interesting exception:

\( ORX \) read \( \text{ἐκτης “through the sixth indiction”, but the other Greek codices read correctly ὁγδόης.}\)

Manuscripts \( ORX \) and the corrector of \( A \) proved useful in establishing the identity of speakers in the extended dialogue of the \textit{Disputatio}, and \( ORX \) in identifying the speakers in the \textit{Relatio Motionis}. Rubrics for the speakers' names (Maximus, Theodosius and Troilus) are omitted in the second family. The Latin
follows A, O, R and X, although the names have often been spelt incorrectly in the first instance, and afterwards corrected e.g. Disp. 6, 27, 177, and 292 Maximus] in mg. cod. Sometimes confusion between the speakers has arisen through the lack of rubrics, e.g.

- **RM 422/423**: *Et dicit ei: "Ubi anathematizatus est a Romana synodo?"

  *Respondit: "In ecclesia Salvatoris et in Dei Genitricis."

Here the Latin follows ORX. PG has followed the other Greek codices, in which "by the Roman synod" is the beginning of the second speaker's reply. The Latin here also matches OR in the reply "In the church of the Saviour and of the Mother of God"; other Greek codices have εἰς τὴν θεοτόκον.

**Reconstruction of the Latin text**

It has sometimes been difficult to work out exactly what Anastasius had in front of him when the Latin differs markedly from the Greek that survives:

- **Hypo. 381/383 pretiosum scilicet illorum sanguinem effundentium, ueluti...[pro roseo]/profuso sanguine sancti Petri**

The Greek construction of Devresse, *Hypomnesticon*, p. 79, 19-21 is quite different:

τὴν δὲ αὐτὸν ἐκχυσιν τῶν τιμίων αἰμάτων αὐτῶν, ὡσπερ...τὴν τοῦ ἀγίου Πέτρου

"the outpouring of their holy blood, as...that of the holy Peter"

There are other instances where Anastasius has clearly misunderstood the Greek, such as:

- **Disp. 528/530 si propter unionem una naturarum voluntas effecta est, non est quippiam propter eandem causam una naturarum effectum natura?**

Cf. PG 90, 157 B: Εἰ διὰ τὴν ἐνωσιν μία τῶν φύσεων γέγονε θέλησις, τί δῆποτε διὰ τὴν αὐτὴν αἰτίαν μία τῶν φύσεων οὐ γέγονε φύσις.

"If on account of the union, one will of the natures was produced, why was one nature of the natures not produced on account of the same reason?"

Anastasius probably read τι ("something") for the interrogative particle τί, and so
misunderstood that the sentence was meant to be a question. He took *effectum* with the pronoun *quippium* rather than with *natura*.

- *Disp. 808/809* Johannes scripserit sibi de +accidentibus quibusdam quae sibi consulerent ac placerent+

Anastasius misunderstood the Greek ἡ συμβάσεις "treaty" for τὸ συμβεβηκός "chance event, happening". The Greek of PG 90, 169B (Ἰωάννης ἔγραψεν αὐτῷ περὶ συμβάσεως προταθείσης αὐτοῖς) may be translated as:

"John wrote to him about a certain treaty which was advised and pleased him."

- *Disp. 507* naturam enim non affectum urnituretis ratio non[.]uit.

This is an example of a case where the Latin, agreeing with $X$, is partly more correct than the majority Greek reading and partly less correct. The Latin, probably as the result of a scribal error, contains the verb *nonuit* for *nouit*; the object (*unitionem*) is omitted (τὴν ἐνωσίν is also omitted in Greek codices XNBD); and *naturam* and *affectum* are reversed, giving the correct sense, which is the opposite of the majority Greek reading (PG 90, 157A):

σχέσιν γάρ, ἀλλ'οὐ φύσιν ὑ τῆς ἀληθείας τὴν ἐνωσίν ἐπίστοταί λόγος..

"For the word of truth knows the union in disposition but not in nature."

There have been several places where omissions of longer passages can be supplied in the Latin from the Greek, e.g.:

- *Disp. 434/435* excituit <=> can be reconstructed as <uerba sanctorum Patrum recipere, it regula iussit, ad eum Romae de his>

"...(after God has roused you to compunction) <to accept the words of the holy fathers, as the canon decreed, (send a letter) to the one at Rome (i.e. the Pope) concerning these things>""

- *Disp. 726/727* <naturas ex quibus Dominus est, et congruentes ei duas>

(omitted by anablepsis)

"Let it be as you say, if we have anathematised those confessing two <natures from which the Lord exists, and two (natural wills and operations) fitting him>"
Textual reconstruction is made all the more difficult when no Greek survives, e.g.

- Hypo. 347/348 contra impietatem et [proprietate]/pro pietate.

“against impiety and in keeping with piety”

Cf. Greek, κατὰ τῆς <ἄσεβειας καὶ ύπὲρ τῆς> εὐσεβείας...

The phrase corresponding to *impietatem et pro* is omitted in the Greek and has been supplied from the emended Latin, but needs to be checked against the Georgian tradition which preserves a tenth-century *Life of Maximus*, not yet edited.

- Ep. Calaritanos 90/91 Vnde et talibus circumuenientes litteris, ei qui miserat, mittunt.

“Whence, they too are going around, sending such letters to him who had sent (them).”

It is not clear from the context who “him who had sent them” might be, and there seems to be no object for *mittunt*.

There are several errors which should probably be attributed to the scribe rather than to Anastasius, e.g.

- Ep. Anas. 289/290 [quam iussit]/quamuis sit temerarium dictu

“although it is bold to say it”.

**Conclusion**

The sole evidence for the existence of a dossier of Greek texts pertaining to the life of Maximus the Confessor and his followers is Anastasius’ translation of these documents as he found them. These documents constitute a unique source for the events surrounding Maximus and other lesser-known participants in the monothelitite controversy. By the edition of these Greek and Latin texts, it has been possible to establish the chronological relationship between the documents correctly for the first

---


89 Dr. Tamila Mgoblishvilli, Department of Manuscripts, Tbilisi, is currently working on the edition
time. It has been demonstrated that the Latin and the Greek versions of the text are related in complex and irregular ways across the six documents under examination. The Latin constitutes our earliest, sometimes our sole, witness to the text, and for this reason has been useful for the reconstruction of the Greek. In many cases in the Disputatio, the close connection between the Latin and two of the Greek manuscripts (the corrected version of A, and X) has enabled the establishment of the right reading where the Greek tradition diverges. These reconstructions have been undertaken on the basis that the translation of Anastasius was faithful to its original. The validity of this premiss across the Anastasian corpus of works in translation will be demonstrated in the following chapter.

of this and a twelfth-century Georgian Life of Maximus.
Chap. 4: Anastasius Bibliothecarius' translation technique

It is difficult to assess how Anastasius perceived the quality of his own translations. Although he often makes apologies for his rustic language, this may well be the false modesty of a familiar topos. The term *Romana rustica* was used in classical literature to designate the "bad" Latin spoken by the non-literary, whether citizens or barbarians. I suspect he used the phrase in its classical sense, but perhaps with knowledge of its changing meaning in Gaul, where it was used in the ninth century to describe early Romance as a language distinct from Latin. He sometimes claimed that he hesitated to translate a work because he feared that it would be beyond his small talent, but eventually capitulated because he preferred to be criticised for his grammar than for disobedience.

In his prologue to the *Collectanea*, with the modesty and self-deprecation that are characteristic of the dedicatory genre, Anastasius writes to John the Deacon:

On this account, although I recognise that I have such a lack of experience that I am not sufficient to penetrate the import of my own native language, not to mention a foreign one, for this reason I never presumed in any way to take up the challenge of translating (this)...look, I have made haste to satisfy you, as far as I can, clearly believing that you will correct any distortions of mine, and that you will polish anything that seems unrefined.

In his translation of the sermon of Theodore of Stoudios on St Bartholomew, Anastasius dares to compare himself with the great translator of Scripture, Jerome, when he says: "I know that certain persons, ignorant of the idioms of each language,

---

1 E.g. *rusticitatem* (MGH VII, p. 430, 5); *agresti sermone* (ibid., p. 437, 31); *rustica falce* (ibid., p. 423, 22).

2 Banniard, *Viva Voce*, p. 349: Gregory of Tours uses *sermo rusticus* to signify the written or oral register equivalent to *sermo humilis*.

3 E.g. MGH VII, p. 419, 16-18; p. 430, 2-4.

4 MGH VII, p. 423, 11-16: *Quapropter, qui tantae me imperitiae recognosco, ut nec ipsius linguae meae, in qua natus sum, ne dixerim alienae, vim penetrare sufficiam ac per hoc nunquam interpretandi quacunque ratione conamen arripere praesumpsissem,...satisfacere tibi ecce, pro viribus maturavi, credens plane a te corrigendum, quicquid meum distortum, poliendum, quicquid repertum fuerit impolitum.*
will criticise my translation, and I will suffer the same as that caelestis bibliothecae
cultor once suffered from his rivals" 5 a reference to Rufinus’ criticisms of Jerome’s
translation of the Bible. 6 The translation of Theodore the Stoudite is one of
Anastasius’ later works, completed after 869, when Anastasius had already made
himself unpopular with the Greeks at the Fourth Council in Constantinople.

An examination of the seven documents pertaining to the life of Maximus in the
Collectanea has led me to the conclusion that Anastasius has produced a fairly literal
but sometimes barely intelligible Latin translation, even following Greek word order
where this seems unnatural in Latin. He makes very few omissions, as far as one can
tell without ever having access to his actual sources. There are some obvious errors in
translation: for example, he occasionally errs in translating a Greek verb (e.g. Ep.
Anas. 29 Data uero est: Anastasius read ἀπεδόθη for ἀποδόθη), 7 or makes the subject
of the verb the wrong person (e.g. RM 304 dispensas; scripsi dispensai). Devreesse
describes his translation of the Hypomnemticon as “flottante” but says the Greek text
itself is abrupt and inelegant. 8 The Greek author himself apologises for his inadequacy
for the task. So we may put some of Anastasius’ lack of verbal finesse down to the
inadequacy of his sources and the highly complex nature of their philosophical and
theological content.

Although Anastasius claims in his prefaces to have adopted a free rather than
literal approach to translation, these documents provide many instances of a rather
heavy-handed and pedestrian technique, especially in dealing with difficult
theological passages.

Particles and Place Names

Anastasius is prone to overlook the subtleties of balancing particles with which the

5 MGH VII, Ep. 18, p. 442, 15-17: ...scio quosdam non scientes utriusque idiomata linguae
interpretationi meae derogaturus et me ea passurum, quae quondam ille caelestis bibliothecae cultor a
suis aemulis pertuit.

6 These criticisms were answered by Jerome in his Apologia contra Rufinum, ed. P. Lardet, CCSL 79
(Turnhout, 1982).

7 As noted by Devreesse, La lettre, p. 10, n. 4.

8 Devreesse, Hypomnemticon, p. 69.
Greek text is so liberally supplied, such as τε καὶ which are translated simply as et or ac (e.g. Syll. 125, 126, 128). His habit of expanding single Greek words into clauses often produces cumbersome results, e.g.:

1. *RM* 411/412 *si unum tantummodo ex his quae dicitis est verum* for Greek ἔαν ἐν μόνοις λέγεται εἶναι ἀληθὲς “if a single thing is said to be true”

2. *Disp.* 801 pedites duobus illis miliariis abierunt for Greek ἐπέζησαν τὰ δύο μίλια, whereas three lines earlier (798/799) he has translated a similar expression quite neatly by extra castra duobus milibus.

3. *Ep. Anas.* 48/49 qui tunc praesesse his qui illic erant sorte meruerat “who had at that time been chosen by lot to rule those who were there” for τοῦ τινικάτα τὸ ἀρχεῖν τῶν ἐνταύθα λαχάντος...

There are many errors in the translation of Greek place names, mostly obscure camps and forts around the Black Sea region; e.g. *Disp.* 175 Bizen for Bizyen, Hypo. 244 Chemareos for Schemareos, and *Ep. Anas.* 144 et 154 a. corr. cod. (cf. *Ep. Anas.* 57 Schemari) scenari a. corr. cod.), *Disp.* 640 Chalem for Chalcem, RM 340 Bellas for Bebbas, Hypo. 278 Batararu for Betararu(is). In summary, we may say that Anastasius' sometimes over-cautious, sometimes careless, translation has been more of a help than a hindrance in reconstructing the original Greek text of the documents, but that each document has to be taken on its own merits, as there is no fixed relationship between the Latin and the extant Greek manuscripts across the seven texts.

**Anastasius Bibliothecarius and John Scotus Eriugena: Literary Rivals**

The Librarian’s criticisms of his contemporary John Scotus Eriugena (d. 870) give us some idea of the criteria applied to his own works of translation. The Irish philosopher and theologian was commissioned by Charles the Bald to translate the Greek works of Dionysius the Areopagite, Gregory of Nyssa, and two works of Maximus the Confessor: *Ambigua ad Johannem*, which dealt with difficult passages of the works of Gregory of Nazianzus and a few passages of Dionysius the Areopagite, and *Quaestiones ad Thalassium*, an exegesis of obscure passages from Scripture. Eriugena's translation of Dionysius the Areopagite was sent to Rome by
Charles the Bald for papal approval, at Pope Nicholas' request, in 867 at the latest.  Anastasius sent it back in 875 with revisions, and a translation of glosses on Dionysius' works by Maximus Confessor and John of Scythopolis. In his preface he expressed his amazement that John should even attempt to translate the philosopher and theologian Dionysius: "It is a wonder that a man so barbarian at the ends of the world, as far as we may believe he was from the speaking of another tongue, was able to grasp such things by his intellect and to translate them into another language." His reaction conveys more than a hint of xenophobia, and we may note that he levels the same charge of barbarity (barbarus vir) at the Irishman as the emperor Michael levelled at the Romans. He criticised Eriugena's work for being too literal (verbum de verbo elicere procuravit) and for conserving in Latin certain linguistic structures proper to Greek: "he did not presume to abandon the structure of the word" (non praesumpsit verbi proprietatem deserere) with the result that "what he took up to translate, he presented still needing to be translated" (quem interpretaturus susceperat, adhuc redderet interpretandum.) We hear in his criticism an echo of the well-known treatise on translation by Jerome in his letter to Pammachius, when Anastasius comments that a translator (interpres) should not translate word for word, but should attempt to render the sense from the meaning intended (non verbum a

9 H. Bett, Johannes Scotus Eriugena: A Study in Mediaeval Philosophy (Cambridge, 1925), p. 11 dates Nicholas' request to c. 860. Perels also suggests a date of 860-861 in his edition of Nicholas' letter to Charles, MGH VI, Ep. 130, pp. 651f. In this letter Nicholas suggests that John, although he is said to be greatly learned, once was rumoured not to have a proper understanding of some matters: licet multae scientiae esse praedicat, olim non sane sapere in quibusdam frequenti rumore diceretur. (ll. 20-22). This is probably a reference to his work Librum de divina praedestinatione adversus Gottescalcum of c. 851, as Perels notes on p. 651, n. 4, which many, including Hincmar of Rheims, thought went too far in the opposite direction in refuting Gotteschalk's error. Bett, p. 12, notes that Eriugena's mediating doctrine of the filioque was also suspect in Roman eyes, although it may not have been known at the time of Nicholas' letter.

10 On the question of authorship of these scholia, see H. Urs von Balthasar, Das Problem der Dionysius-Scholien, Kosmische Liturgie, 2nd revised ed. (Einsiedeln, 1961), pp. 644-72.

11 MGH VII, Ep. 13, p. 431, 18-20: Mirandum quoque est, quomodo ille vir barbarus, ille qui in finibus mundi positus, quanto ab hominibus conversatione, tanto credi potuit alterius linguae dictione longinquus, tala intellectu capere in aliamque linguam transferre valuerit.

12 A similar expression occurs in Nicholas' letter to Michael, MGH VI, Ep. 88, p. 459, ll. 24-25, of translators of Latin into Greek qui quando necesse est non sensum e sensu sed violenter verbum edere conantur e verbo.


verbo, sed sensum exprimere a sensu), avoiding use of linguistic structures which are not appropriate to the language of translation. Anastasius attempted to avoid this himself in his translations, although he admitted that he was often forced into it. In his preface to the Life of John the Almsgiver, he writes to Nicholas that he could not, nor ought he to have followed the idioms of the Greeks or their word order. He also criticised the first translator of the Acts of the Seventh Ecumenical Council for falling into the same trap. In the Acts of the Eighth Ecumenical Council, however, he freely admits that he translated word for word, presumably because the legalistic nature of the text required it.

Such criticisms correlate quite closely with the results of Théry's detailed linguistic analysis of this same translation by Eriugena. O'Meara notes that Eriugena's translation of Maximus shares many of the flaws of Maximus' own style, as criticised by Photius: "It is strongly marked ... by amplification and hyperbaton; it is prolix, unsure in vocabulary, unclear, rough and unredeemed by grace of figurative language." We may detect behind Anastasius' criticism of John's choice of translation some resentment that the Irishman had turned to Greek sources rather than Latin ones. Eriugena was more positive towards Constantinople than he was towards Rome, his rightful spiritual mother from Anastasius' point of view, as is clearly seen in the text of one of his poems:

Constantinopolis florens nova Roma vocatur
Moribus et muris Roma vetusta cadis,
Transit imperium, mansitque superbia tectum

---

18 MGH VII, Ep. 6, p. 416, 19-22: sed quod interpres pene per singula relictio utriusque linguae idiomate adeo fuerit verbum e verbo secutus, ut, quid in eadem editione intelligatur, aut vix aut nuncum possit adverter in fastidiumque versa legentum pene ab omnibus hac pro causa conternatur.
Cultus avaritiae te nimium superat.21

While no separate commentary on the Eucharist from Eriugena's pen survives, there were reports of such a work having existed.22 John's opinion that the Eucharist is non verum corpus et verus sanguis Domini, sed tantum memoria veri corporis et sanguinis eius is criticised by Hincmar in De praedestinatione, written in answer to John's work on the same subject. John certainly made such an opinion known in his Commentary on St John's Gospel.23 Charles had demonstrated an interest in the subject more than thirty years earlier when he received Paschasius Radbertus' revised De corpore et sanguine Domini, in 843 or 844, and a similar work on the subject of the presence of Christ in the liturgy from Ratramnus, also of Corbie, at his request in c. 840.24 Charles, continuing the reformation of the Frankish church and its liturgy begun by Charlemagne and Louis the Pious, desired uniformity of belief concerning the Christian mysteries.25 Anastasius demonstrated his awareness of this fact when he decided to offer his translation of excerpts of the Mystagogia of Maximus the Confessor, and the Historia Mystica, to Charles in the year of his coronation in Rome, 875. He asks Charles, "But what could be closer to divine wisdom than to know the power of the mysteries, by which we are filled with the faith, and by which we are instructed by pious practices towards piety?"26

21 PL 122, 1194B. Cited by D. Geanakoplos, Interaction of the "Sibling" Byzantine and Western Cultures in the Middle Ages and Italian Renaissance (New Haven-London, 1976), p. 143. This poem about the jealousy of old Rome towards new Rome, with its daring praise of Constantinople over Rome was made, according to Geanakoplos, in the context of the breach taking shape between East and West under Nicholas and Photius.

22 By Lanfranc, prior of Bec, on which see H. Bett, op. cit., p. 10 and n. 2.


24 Paschasius Radbertus, De Corpore et sanguine Domini, ed. Bede Paul, Corpus Christianorum Continuatio Medievalis 16 (Turnhout, 1969); Ratramnus, De Corpore et sanguine Domini, PL 121, cols. 103-171.


26 MGH VII, Ep. 14, p. 434, 18-20: Quid autem magis divinae sapientiae proximum quam mysteriorum nosse virtutem, quibus ad fidem imbuimur et ad pietatem sedulis exercititis erudimur?
Both the *Mystagogia* and the *Historia Mystica*\(^{27}\) belong to the Byzantine tradition of commentaries on the liturgy which begins with Pseudo-Dionysius the Areopagite's *Ecclesiastical Hierarchy* in the late fifth century, followed by Maximus Confessor's *Mystagogia* in the seventh century. The commentary on the liturgy made by Amalarius of Metz (c. 780 – 850/851) sprang from the same tradition, and its novelty in the West caused much protest, and finally condemnation of the author, at the Synod of Quierzy.\(^{28}\) We may assume that John's model would also have been modelled on the eastern allegorical approach. Maximus' commentary, which is entitled in the translation *Historia Mistica ecclesiae catholicae*, Anastasius found in an already excerpted Greek version, as he tells us in his preface to the two translations.\(^{29}\) In fact this résumé corresponds to the final chapter of the *Mystagogia* in the Migne edition.\(^{30}\) Anastasius's interest in the works of Maximus is also evidenced by his translation of the *Collectanea*, already studied in Chap. 3. Whether he found the two treatises together in the manuscripts he consulted is not known, but it is likely that his attention was drawn to Germanus through his interest in Maximus.

**Anastasius Bibliothecarius' translation of the *Historia Mystica* attributed to Germanus, Patriarch of Constantinople**

Anastasius Bibliothecarius' Latin translation of the *Historia Mystica* is a document of singular importance, linguistically and for the liturgical history of both East and West. If we accept the attribution of the text to Germanus, the eighth-century patriarch of Constantinople, following the sound reasoning of Borgia\(^{31}\) and Bornert,\(^{32}\) the original

---

\(^{27}\) Anastasius gives no title at all to his version, although the rubrics of the Latin manuscripts give the title of *Historia Mystica*, the same title given to the résumé of Maximus. Borgia adopts the Greek title meaning *Exegesis on the divine liturgy*, after the two manuscripts used in his edition, *Vaticanus graecus 790 (=Vat. grec. 790)* and *Neapolitanus graecus II B29 (=Neap. grec. 63)*. Brightman uses the title of another MS family (Bi): *Historia Mystagogica Ecclesiastica*.


\(^{30}\) PG 91, cols. 701-718, ch. 24.

\(^{31}\) Borgia, pp. 148-151, based on Anastasius's own testimony, liturgical evidence, and stylistic considerations.

\(^{32}\) R. Bornert, *Les commentaires byzantins de la divine liturgie du VIIe au XVe siècle*, Archives de l'Orient chrétien 9 (Paris, 1966), pp. 142-160 also uses historical witnesses and liturgical evidence, mainly regarding the rite of the prothesis, which was well-established in the ninth century, and which Bornert
Greek commentary on the liturgy dates to before 733, the approximate date of
Germanus' death. Thus, the Latin translation was produced within about 150 years of
the original, and it remains the earliest extant witness to the text, the earliest Greek
manuscripts being from the eleventh century. Within this time, the text had already
become "misérablement interpolé"\textsuperscript{33} to use Pétridès' words. I have examined the
relationship between the Latin version and the Greek manuscripts used in the two
editions that have been made by Borgia and Brightman, in order to establish the
validity of their respective claims to have reconstructed the original Greek text as far
as possible.\textsuperscript{34} Brightman admits that he had not seen any Greek manuscript (out of
approximately thirty-five known to exist) that corresponded exactly to Anastasius's
Latin.\textsuperscript{35} We must conclude that his original source has probably been lost.

Structure of the Commentary

The commentary has been divided up by Anastasius under sixty-three chapter
headings, which may be grouped as follows:\textsuperscript{36}

1. Ch. 1-9: the church building and furnishings
2. Ch. 10-12: praying towards the East and genuflection
3. Ch. 13-20: priestly dress
4. Ch. 21-27: the monastic habit
5. Ch. 28-31: the prothesis (preparation of the elements)
6. Ch. 32-63: the Liturgy proper
   • Ch. 32-45: the Liturgy of the Word
   • Ch. 46: dismissal of the catechumens

\textsuperscript{33} Pétridès, p. 294.

\textsuperscript{34} Brightman, p. 250; also Borgia, p. 146.

\textsuperscript{35} Brightman, p. 250.
• Ch. 47-63: the Liturgy of the Eucharist.

It is important to note that these chapter divisions are somewhat artificial, as are the headings given to each by Anastasius. These are absent from what Borgia believes to be the most ancient tradition of the Greek text (Vat. grec. 790). Only one third of the Latin headings match the Greek headings in Brightman's edition. Anastasius added another third, and omitted several. The remaining ones differ substantially from Brightman's headings, and are stripped of any allegorical terminology. It is possible that Anastasius' Greek model did not contain the headings or the division into sections seen in Brightman's text which is based on manuscripts from the twelfth century onwards. Anastasius has identified in his chapter headings four out of five interpolations in the text from Maximus' Mystagogia, but not the three citations from the letters of Isidore of Pelusium.\(^{37}\)

**Critical editions of the Greek and its Latin translation**

Several critical editions of the Greek and Latin versions of this text have been made since 1868 when Cardinal Pitra first discovered Anastasius' version in *Cambriensis 711* (s. IX) and *Parisinus latinus 18556* (s. IX\(^{ex}/s. X^{in}\)).\(^{38}\) In 1905 Cozza-Luzzi's edition of Pitra's full transcription was published,\(^{39}\) and in the same year Pétridès independently made an edition of the two manuscripts discovered by Pitra.

Brightman compared texts of four groups of Greek manuscripts with Anastasius's Latin to establish that Anastasius's Greek source(s) was closest to the group *Bi*, attributed to Basil of Caesarea. Brightman included in his edition all the variants of manuscripts in this group, plus variants from the printed versions of two

\(^{36}\) All chapter numbers are according to Pétridès' edition.

\(^{37}\) Maximus, *Myst.* 15 on the Closing of the doors (ch. 56); *Myst.* 17 on the Kiss of peace (ch. 55); *Myst.* 18 on the Creed (ch. 57); *Myst.* 21 on the End of the mass (ch. 62); [not *Myst.* 20 on the Lord's Prayer (ch. 61)]; Isid. Pel., *ep.* i, 122 on the "Cum spiritu tuo" (ch. 37); *ep.* i, 136 on the Omophorion (ch. 20); *ep.* i, 228 on Communion (ch. 63), ed. P. Evieux, *Lettres– Isidore de Péluse, Sources Chrétiennes, 422* (Paris, 1997).

\(^{38}\) Fragments of these were published in J.-P. Pitra, *Analecta Sacra Spicilegio Solamensi parata 2* (Frascati, 1884), pp. 208-210.

other groups (\(G\) and \(K\)) as well as any additions or omissions in the Latin text, from which he concluded that we do not have today a manuscript of the kind Anastasius consulted. Pétridès also suggests that Anastasius may have had access only to a resumé of a longer work, like that of the Mystagogia of Maximus. However, Brightman was able to identify two manuscripts in the group \(Bi\) which corresponded most closely with Anastasius’ Latin version: codices Paris. Anc. Fonds 1259A (s. XIV) and Paris. Anc. Fonds 502 (s. XII), which form the basis of his edition. When the two differ, Anastasius is closer to Paris. Anc. Fonds 1259A. Brightman also noted several occasions when the Latin did not seem to correspond to any manuscript reading available.

In 1911, Borgia edited two other Greek codices: Vaticanus graecus 790 (s. XIV) and Neapolitanus graecus 63 (1526). Parallel with the Greek text he placed Pétridès’ edition of the two Latin manuscripts. He included in the apparatus all variants of the manuscripts, and of Brightman's Greek text "secondo che più o meno l'uno, o l'altra si accostano al testo della versione (latina)." From an examination of both apparatus, it is obvious that Brightman's principal manuscripts are much closer to Anastasius' version than those used by Borgia.

Conclusions from Borgia and Brightman’s Studies

Two separate issues arise from Borgia and Brightman’s treatment of the text. The first is that of provenance: Brightman presents his text under the title of group \(Bi\) which ascribes the work to Basil of Caesarea, probably because it was a commentary on the

---

40 Groups \(Bi\) and \(Bii\) are attributed in their titles to Basil of Caesarea; \(G\) to Germanus of Constantinople, and \(K\) to Cyril of Jerusalem.

41 This would explain why \(Bi\) is shorter than the other three groups, but does not come from an earlier tradition from before Germanus.

42 Borgia, p. 152. He does this sometimes incorrectly (see for example p. 289, l. 5, p. 290, l. 36, p. 222, ll. 9-12 and l. 13), and with no mention of the variety of manuscript sources used by Brightman.

43 I found only five instances of omissions from Anastasius’s text noted by Brightman which are also omitted from Borgia’s Greek (almost all were of only one or two words). These are Brightman, p. 257, 10 τὸν πετούν; p. 259, 16 τὸν Ἰησοῦ; p. 264, 2 μοῦ; p. 387, 21 εὑρείτο καὶ καλ.; p. 393, 29 θεμέλιον. There was only one instance where Anastasius agrees with Borgia’s text rather than Brightman’s: p. 259, 10 κατὰ γὰρ /καὶ γὰρ (=Borgia) /et enim (Anastasius).
liturgy of Basil, or so the copyists thought. Borgia rejects previous attributions of the text to Basil, Cyril of Jerusalem, or a combination of writers, and presents a convincing argument for Germanus. As for the matter of authenticity, Brightman seeks to reconstruct the authentic original text used by Anastasius from a variety of manuscripts. Borgia, on the other hand, wants to establish the original uninterpolated text of Germanus. Since one of the manuscripts he uses does not contain the various borrowings from Maximus and Isidore mentioned above, he concludes that it represents the more authentic text. This manuscript also omits three other sections included by Anastasius which Borgia labels “interpolations”, on account of their style and content: ch. 31b (addition to the prothesis), ch. 35 (addition to the Trisagion), and the second half of ch. 32 (interior of the censor). He does not consider the possibility that this text may be an abridgment. He believes that Brightman's manuscripts are mutilated because, like the Latin version, they do not contain the consecration, prayers for the dead or the exegesis on the “Our Father” (ch. 41b-43), or the customary closing doxology. The doxology does in fact appear in Brightman just before the final section (ch. 63), which seems to have been misplaced. I do not believe that the evidence he presents warrants Borgia's claim that his is an older and purer version of the text.

**Analysis of Anastasius' translation**

Both Brightman and Borgia work on the assumption that Anastasius's translation is so

---


45 Also because the text is anonymous and lacks the question-and-answer series found in other manuscripts, and also in Brightman, although excluded by Anastasius: see Borgia, pp. 150-151.

46 Borgia also includes ch. 37 in this group, which is a citation from Isid. Pel., *ep. i*, 122. The content of the other three chapters probably reflects diversified local usage.

47 The consecration and a short section on the “Our Father” are included in Brightman's Greek, ch. 61 and 63. The “Our Father” is covered by an interpolation from Maximus (Myst. 20) in Anastasius's text.

48 The final paragraph of Brightman in ch. 63 is almost identical to the section on communion in Borgia, ch. 43, which ends with a doxology. The doxology has been added to the preceding ch. 62 in Brightman, which is a paraphrase of the first part of Borgia's ch. 43 on the “One is holy”. Anastasius omits both these sections, and substitutes ch. 21 of Maximus' *Mystagogia* on the “One is holy” and the communion, and two lines from Isidore of Pelusium on the communion (*ep. i*, 228). It is unlikely that Anastasius made these two interpolations himself. I would therefore conjecture that the text of Borgia and Brightman for these two sections is a later development, postdating Anastasius's text.
faithful to the Greek text that it can be reliably used to construct a retroversion, an assumption which I sought to verify. Anastasius’s variations can be classified as additions, omissions, the occasional gloss on a transliterated Greek word, and probable misreadings, such as πασίν for δόσιν. Other oddities in the Latin can be put down to errors by the copyists. The additions made are usually minor, of one or two words, as are the omissions, involving words like "Christ", "Lord", "God" and pronouns omitted where they are clear from the context. In short, no significant pattern emerged from these variants, so we must conclude that Anastasius was not tampering with the text proper, and may therefore be used as a reliable source for the original Greek.

A study of the allegorical terminology reveals that Anastasius often failed to distinguish between verbs like ἀντιτυπῶ "represent symbolically", and προτυπῶ "set forth as a type", both of which he translated with the same verb "praefigurare". His translations occasionally obscure the allegorical sense, or by

49 Ch. 7 cosmitis id est ornamentum for κοσμήτης "entablature"; cosmium id est ornamentum for κόσμιον "decoration".

50 Ch. 44 quartum simile aquilae volantis, Sancti Spiritus pedibus volantem praelectionem edisserens for τὸ δὲ τέταρτον ὄμοιον ἀετῷ πετομένῳ, τὴν διὰ τοῦ Ἁγίου Πνεύματος ἐπιταμημένην δόσιν οἰκενίζον (Borgia, ch. 32).

51 E.g. ch. 39 ac similiter "and similarly" instead of acsi milites "as soldiers" for ὦς στρατιώται.


53 I noted seventeen omissions in Anastasius’s text when compared with the Greek texts of Borgia and Brightman. The only omission of any length occurs at the end of ch. 59 (Brightman, p. 394, 8-9): τὸ ὡσαννὰ ἐστι σῶσον δὴ ὦς φῶς ὃ ἐργάσμενος εν ὄνοματι Κυρίου: "The hosanna means ‘save!’, the one who comes as light in the name of the Lord.” This extremely common etymology also appears in Germanus’s homily on the Dormition, dorm. III, 364D (cited by R. Bornert, op. cit., p. 158):

«ὡσαννὰ ἐν τοῖς ψυχότοις» ταοτέστι σῶσον δὴ ὃ ἐν ψυχότοις. Τὸ γὰρ ὡσαννὰ παρ’ Ἐβραίοις σῶσον δὴ μεθερμηνεύεται.

The other omissions are:
257, 6 νῦμψῃ Χριστοῦ; 258, 12 σωματοθείς; 258, 15 μου; 258, 24 Θεοῦ; 265, 6 βοώνων; 265, 17 καὶ Θεός; 265, 22 λογικὴ; 267, 4 αὐτό; 388, 13 πρίν; 388, 22 προσέχετε; 390, 3 ἐκ λίθου; 391, 4 νύκτην; 391, 10 καθαρέ; 393, 7 καὶ; 394, 13 δύνας; 394, 26 τὸ προσώπῳ.

54 There are only two instances of the verb ἀντιτυπῶ in Lampe, and both are from this text, so it is not surprising that Anastasius was unfamiliar with its meaning, as is evident in his translations:

ch. 1 praefigurans for ἀντιτυποῦσα "representing symbolically" is incorrect, (perhaps confusing ante "before" with ἄντι "responding, opposite"): Item ecclesia...praefigurans crucifixionem et sepulturem et resurrectionem Christi: “Likewise the church prefiguring Christ’s crucifixion, burial and resurrection...”
altering the syntax make the original construction unrecognisable. He has difficulty rendering idiomatic Greek terms idiometrically in Latin (e.g. est secundum for ἔστι κατὰ). On the whole he exhibits a wide range of vocabulary in the language of symbolic representation, but his translation is marked by a one-to-one correspondence with the Greek. Although Anastasius was not a philosopher but a translator and diplomat in the papal curia, he was usually able, with the basic theological training he received as a priest, to handle Greek theological vocabulary in such a way as to render most of its meaning in Latin, even though the text was, by the nature of its content, difficult to understand in any language, as the English translation by Paul Meyendorff reveals.

Comparison with Anastasius’ Methodology in other Translations

Westerburgh and de Boor have made the most comprehensive studies of Anastasius’ translation methodology, in the Sermo Theodori Studitae de Sancto Bartholomeo

ch. 5 exprimitur for ἀντιτύποις "represent symbolically" is correct but the syntax has been altered so that the typological relation between the earthly priests and the heavenly hierarchs is lost, leaving: Altare...in quo exprimitur spiritualis et administratoriae hierarchiae immaterialium et supernarum virtutum et terrarum ac materialis sacerdotum: “The altar on which the heavenly serving hierarchies of the immaterial powers above and the earthly and material priests are represented...”

ch. 42 praenuntiat for μνήμη is incorrect: odorifer fumus praenuntiat sancti spiritus suavitatem odoris praecendentem: “the sweet-smelling smoke foreshadows the fragrance of the holy spirit which precedes.”

ch. 50 exemplar for ἀντιτύπον is an inadequate rendition: quod est exemplar illius sancti monumenti altare et repositurum: “the altar and repository which is an exemplar of that holy tomb.”

All instances of προτύπωσε, by contrast, are correctly translated by praefigurare:

ch. 1 "the church in which are the mercy seat and the holy of holies: it is foreshadowed among the patriarchs...” (praefigurata for προτυπώθησε)

ch. 3 "(The holy table) was prefigured by the table of the old law, upon which was the manna, which is Christ the bread who descended from heaven." (praefigurata est for προτυπώθησε)

ch. 5 "the lamb Moses set forth as a type in Egypt" (praefiguravit for προτυπώσει)

ch. 48 "This Calvary was foreshadowed by Abraham when he... made an altar of stone...and placed his son on it" (praefigurata est for προτυπώθησε).

ch. 55 "the spiritual salutation foreshadows future harmony" (praefigurat for προτυπωσε).

55 He uses twenty-eight Latin verbs, nouns and clauses in all: praefiguro, ad/in similitudinem, est secundum, signifício, exprimor, subostendo, designo, denuntio, est significans, imaginor, interpretor, indicò, ad/secundum imitationem, in typum, ostendo, demonstro, praenuntio, intelligendus est, ostendens imaginem, exemplar, est pro, praescribo, innuo, praesigno, instinuo, imito.

Apostolo, and the Historia Tripertita respectively. Both these studies are limited by the fact that the Latin of Anastasius predates any of the Greek that survives. In his edition of that part of the Historia Tripertita which is an abridgement of Theophanis Chronographica, de Boor identifies two purposes which Anastasius gave for his work of translation in the preface to John the Deacon, by whom the work was commissioned. The first is to provide historical information then only available in Greek for John’s ecclesiastical history, purely out of goodwill towards his friend. The second is to produce a work that would be preserved and find a readership in the West. This second aim demanded a stylistic finesse which he could let go when he had the first aim in mind. De Boor remarks that when Anastasius sticks to his first purpose, his work tends to be more literal, and when he adheres to the second, his Latin departs significantly from the original. De Boor criticised Anastasius for having a grammatical and lexical knowledge of Greek that was inadequate for the task of translation, and for undertaking his work with too much haste and not enough care. The translation contains frequent inconsistencies, chains of transliterated Greek words although plenty of Latin equivalents were available, and numerous gaps and errors through obvious misreadings.

Westerburgh is slightly more generous in her assessment, always qualifying her judgements with the admission that she could not compare the translation with its original in an earlier form. She insists that Anastasius’ greatest flaw as a translator was his inability to translate sensum e sensu, freeing himself from the wording of the original. Instead, he has translated so much word for word, that “if there are passages freely translated, Anastasius has in some way or other misunderstood or

57 Westerburgh, ‘The Latin Translation compared to the Greek Original’, pp. 149-198; de Boor, ‘Die lateinische Uebersetzung des Anastasius Bibliotecarius’, v. 2, pp. 401-435.


60 De Boor, v. 2, pp. 415-416.

61 Westerburgh, p. 198.
misinterpreted the Greek original." She identifies numerous omissions, additions for clarifying the sense, inconsistencies, oversights, discrepancies arising from incorrect readings of the Greek, misinterpretations through mistaking one word for another and transpositions of word order. In his favour, and in the absence of his Greek model, we must make allowance for orthographical errors or lack of clarity in the Greek characters. He has "often succeeded in translating very intricate sentences correctly and in giving the adequate rendering of very rare words, while, on the other hand, he might go wrong in translating quite simple words and clauses." The wording of the Greek original, which is highly artificial, and its rich and varied vocabulary, also has to be taken into account.

Both de Boor's and Westerburgh's criticisms concur with those we have made of the Collectanea and the Historia Mystica and Mystagogia examined above, which, like the Historia Tripertita and the Sermo Theodori Studitae, required a free rather than literal rendition. The same categories of errors are to be found in all four works, and a similar sense of linguistic laissez faire pervades them all. However, these assessments concentrate on the failings, and do little justice to the success of Anastasius' undertakings. While his works may be hampered by occasional inaccuracies, they are on the whole comprehensible, and would certainly have achieved the purpose which he set himself: to create a Latin equivalent to the patristic and ecclesiastical literary patrimony of which the Greeks had been masters for too long.

Conclusion

From the number of his translated works which survive – nineteen of certain attribution, fourteen of which were requested by members of the Gallic and Italian clergy, many of whom were of episcopal rank, three of whom were popes, and one the Frankish emperor –, we may conclude that Anastasius' linguistic and literary talents were generally well-recognised, and made him one of the most important cultural intermediaries of his time. His contributions to the redaction of papal correspondence under Popes Nicholas, Hadrian and to a lesser extent John VIII, made

62 Westerburgh, p. 150.
63 Westerburgh, p. 197.
him a powerful player behind the political scene, and his involvement in the Eighth Council in Constantinople showed just what an asset a knowledge of Greek could prove in an age when communication between East and West was rapidly disintegrating. The number of cases in which recourse to the Greek version of these documents was essential for extracting any meaning from Anastasius' Latin\textsuperscript{64} indicates either that Anastasius was not faithful to his model(s) – whether through ignorance or negligence –, or that the quality of his model(s) was inferior to that of those witnesses to the Greek that are extant. In view of the findings of Westerburgh and de Boor mentioned above, it seems that Anastasius' translation efforts, at least in the latter part of his career, were commendable for their literal approach to the text. This was both the strength and the weakness of his style, and served him better in dealing with more factual, historical narrative than in grappling with abstruse theological passages whose terminology was unfamiliar, and in many cases still undeveloped, in the Latin West. The singularity of the Librarian's endeavour should be borne in mind by any reader who seeks to make an accurate and fair evaluation of the literary merit of the Latin texts which follow.

\textsuperscript{64} See for example \textit{RM} nn. 32, 35; \textit{Ep. Max.} n. 1; \textit{Ep. Cal.} nn. 2, 5, 8; \textit{Disp.} nn. 5, 9, 12, 13, 14, 16, 17, 47, 58, 59, 63, 66, 73, 83, 84, 100; \textit{Ep. Anas.} nn. 2, 5, 29, 33, 35, 38; \textit{Syll.} nn. 3, 5, 6, 11, 12, 21, 22, 26; \textit{Hypo.} nn. 2, 6, 13, 36, 37, 43, 51, 58, 59, 62, 65, 68.
PART II

THE TEXTS
Preface to the Translation

In translating this section of the Collectanea of Anastasius, I have tried to live up to Théry's dictum: "Le vrai rôle du critique, qui suppose ce long commerce de sympathie avec l'objet de son étude, est de percevoir ces paroles intérieures et de les rendre sensibles à ceux qu'un labeur trop précipité empêcherait d'entendre." This requires that the critical translator find the delicate balance between a rendition of the text that is so pedestrian that it makes insufficient allowance for English idiom, and a version so free that accuracy is sacrificed. The task is made even more difficult by the fact that we are dealing with the translation of a translation, and that the original Greek itself was often less than clear in its expression. This is particularly the case in the final three documents, Ep. Anas., Syll. and Hypo. The letter of Anastasius the Apocrisiarius, in spite of its author's official status, bears no evidence of literary flair. Its turgid style and frequent anacolutha have resulted in extremely long sentences which sometimes run for up to half a page. We have attempted to break these up where possible, but have often been forced to retain the unwieldy syntactic structures of the original in order to preserve the sense. The Syllogisms and Testimonia presented the greatest challenge of all, with their difficult theological content made even more obscure by the author's infelicity of phrase, and not helped at all by Anastasius' ignorance of the subject matter. The author of the Hypo., Theodore Spudaeus, apologises for his roughness of language and complete lack of instruction, and our translation can be no more refined than the original, whose interminable sentences are, as Devreesse put it, "enchevêtrées sans aucun souci d'élégance ou même de correction." As Devreesse rightly notes, these faults have been aggravated by the manuscript tradition. Anastasius has not attempted to correct his model, and for this reason, I have often reverted to the Greek text (where that is available) when that makes better sense than Anastasius' Latin. The primary objective of this translation was to provide a readable text. That being said, the limitations of both the Greek and the Latin have left their mark on the English version, and for that, I ask for the reader's forbearance.

1 Théry, 'Scot Érigène', p. 185.
2 Devreesse, Hypomnesticon, p. 65.
I have not considered it necessary to duplicate in the translation the notes on biblical and other sources which are found in the *apparatus biblicus et fontium* of the edition. Where I have referred to the Greek text, I mean that of the edition of Pauline Allen (forthcoming in CCSG). This unfortunately leaves the reader with no other Greek source than the Migne text (PG 90, 110-202), and for the *Hypo.* and *Ep. Anas.* the editions of Devreesse, from which the new edition sometimes deviates. For this inconvenience, I apologise, but in most places the existing editions will serve as a sufficient basis for comparison with the Latin. For the *Testimonia*, the Greek text consulted is that of the *Doctrina Patrum*. The following conventions have been used in the English translation: words that have been added for the sake of clarity are marked with round brackets (...). Words supplied from the Greek are in square brackets [...]. Words that need to be rejected in the translation are marked by pointed brackets <...>. In the Latin text itself, square brackets mark a word or letter that should be deleted. Pointed brackets signal an insertion. Crosses (+...+) mark passages where the Latin translation is unclear and cannot be restored from the Greek. Lacunae in the text are marked by asterisks in pointed brackets <***>.

---

Record of the trial of lord¹ Maximus, the monk, and his companion before the leaders in the council chamber.

On the day on which lord Maximus and the man with him² anchored in this royal city, around sunset, two imperial officials,³ together with ten palace guards,⁴ took them from the boat, naked and unshod, and imprisoned them in separate cells, separated from each other. And after several days, they brought them to the palace, and led the old man to the place where the senate was gathered, and a great crowd besides, and presented him in the midst of the seated leaders. And the sacellarius⁵ said to him with great rage and fury: "Are you a Christian?"

And Maximus said, "By the grace of Christ, God of all, I am a Christian."
And he said, "It is not true."
The servant of God answered, "You say [I am not], but God says that I am, [and remain] a Christian."

"And how is it," he said, "that you hate the emperor, if you are a Christian?"
In answer the servant of God said, "And how is this made clear? Indeed, hatred is a secret disposition of the mind, just as affection is."
And he said to him, "From your actions it has become obvious to all that you hate the emperor and his state. For you single-handedly betrayed Egypt and Alexandria and Pentapolis [and Tripoli] and Africa to the Saracens."

"And what is the proof of this?" he said.
And they led in the false witness John, who had been the sacellarius of Peter, the

¹ Latin *domnus* is an honorific title with no real significance. Here and elsewhere it has been translated as "lord."

² The Greek reads: οἱ σὺν αὐτῷ "the men with him" (PG 90, 109C), and in the Greek title: τῶν σὺν αὐτῷ "those with him" for "his companion" (PG 90, 109/110B).

³ Mandatores or subaltern officials employed for special missions. Imperial *mandatores* appear on seals from the seventh to the ninth centuries (*ODB*, p. 1281).

⁴ *Excubitores* were the imperial guards, a select corps created by Leo I under the command of a *comes excubitorum*, later known as the δομικες κτείς τῶν ἔχοντων, first mentioned in the sources in 765 (*ODB*, p. 646).

⁵ The sacellarius' role had by this time passed from the role of imperial treasurer to general controller of imperial affairs (J. Darrouzes, *Recherches sur les Officia de l'Eglise byzantine*, Archives de l'Orient chrétien 11 [Paris, 1970], p. 310).
contra Saracenos, et scripsit tibi tanquam ad seruum Dei loquens, certitudinem habens in te utpote in homine sancto, si des ei consilium abire. Et rescrissisti ei dicens, nil tale facere, quoniam non bene placitum est coram Deo ut imperio Heraclii et generis eius cooperetur res publica Romanorum. Dicit seruus Dei: «Siueritatem loquitur, utique habet et Petri ad me et meam ad ipsum epistolam, quae deferantur, et subiaceae poenis a legibus constitutis.»

Et dicit: «Ego non habeo epistolam, sed nec noui si omnino scripsit tibi. Verum haec in castris per illud tempus omnes loquebantur.»

Et dicit ad eum Dei seruus: «Si exercitus totus hoc fatebatur, quomodo tu solus super hoc me accusas? Vidisti me aliquando, uel ego te?»

At ille: «Nunquam.»

Tunc Dei seruus ad senatum conversus dixit: «Si iustum est tales adducere calumniatores uel testes, iudicate. In quo enim iudicio iudicaueritis, iudicabimini; et in qua mensura metimini, metietur de uobis, ait omnium Deus.»

Et post hunc adducunt Sergium Magudan, dicentem: «Ante annos nouem beatus abba Thomas ueniens Roma dicit mihi: Papa Theodorus misit me ad Gregorium patricium ut dicerem ei ne quisquam timeret. Seruus enim Dei | abba Maximus uident uisionem quod in caelis ad orientem et occidentem chori essent angelorum. <Et hi qui erant in oriente clamabant: Constantine Auguste, tu uincas! > Hi uero qui erant in occidente uocem emittebant dicentes: Gregori Auguste, tu uincas! et magis sonuit uox occidentalium quam orientalium uoces.»

Et tunc clamabat sacellarius: «Misit te Deus ut incendaris in

47/49 Matth. 7,2

50 Magudan] sed post u nam litteram erasit, forsitan n 55/56
Et - uincas!] suppleui e gr.
former prefect of the African province of Numidia, who said: "Twenty-two years ago, the grandfather of the emperor ordered Peter of blessed memory to raise an army and lead it into Egypt against the Saracens, and he wrote to you as to a servant of God, having confidence in you as a holy man, asking if you would advise him to depart. And you wrote back to him saying, "Do no such thing, because it is does not please God well for the Roman state to cooperate with the empire under Heraclius and his line." The servant of God said, "If he speaks the truth, he must have both Peter's letter to me and mine to him, which may be presented, and I will submit to the punishments set down by the law." And he said, "I do not have the letter, nor do I know if he even wrote to you. But everyone was talking about this in the camp at the time." And the servant of God said to him, "If the whole army was talking about this, how is it that you alone accuse me? Have you ever seen me before, or I you?" And he said, "Never."
Then the servant of God turned to the senate and said, "If it is just to call such slanderers as witnesses, you decide. For by the judgements you have made, you yourselves will be judged. And by the measure you have used, measure will be made of you, the God of all says."

And after him they led in Sergius Maguda, who said, "Nine years ago, the blessed father Thomas came from Rome and said to me, 'Pope Theodore sent me to Gregory the patrician to tell him that no-one should fear, for the servant of God father Maximus saw a vision in which there were choirs of angels in the

---

6 This refers to events of 633 ("if from a false accusation one may adduce evidence": Sherwood, Date-List, p. 40).

7 These letters do not survive, if they ever existed.

8 Cf. Greek, μὴ φοβηθῶνται πῶς "to fear nobody" (PG 90, 112B). Gregory, governor of Roman Africa, led an unsuccessful revolt against the Byzantine imperial government in 646. He was killed in the Arab incursions of 647. He presided over the dispute between Maximus and Pyrrhus in Carthage in July, 645.

9 The Latin abbas implies the meaning of "abbot", but there is no evidence to suggest that Maximus was in fact an higoumenos, apart from the Vita Maximi, PG 90, 73 A10-B22, where Maximus reluctantly is persuaded to become higoumenos of the monastery of Chrysopolis, which reads as no more than a topos. Anastasius' translation of the Greek ἀββᾶς "father" is therefore misleading, and I have translated in favour of the Greek sense of the term, wherever it occurs.
hic urbe."


Tunc dicit ei Trohilus: «Iocaris abba? Nescis ubi sis?»

Qui respondens ait: «Non iocor sed lugeo uitam meam hactenus conseruatam ut huiuscemodi experimentum praestigiorum percipiam.»

Et dicit domnus Epiphanius: «Deus nouit, bene facit deludens eis si uera non sunt.»

Post quem, sacellarius iterum cum ira dixit ad eum: «Absolute omnes mentiuntur, et tu solus uerum dicis?»

Et respondens seruus Dei audito uerbo cum lacrimis ait:

---

64/65 Matth, 18,7 68 cf. Sir. 10, 10; I Mac. 2, 63; Matth. 6, 30

75 patrici] patricie a. corr. cod. 80 sola] cod. supra l. m. sec.
82 Trohilus] scripsi gr. nisa et 231, 352, 407, 461; trohilus cod.
84 huiuscemodi] huiusmodi cod. a. corr. m. sec.; cf. 227
sky, to the East and the West. [And those in the East were shouting 'Constantine Augustus, may you conquer!'] But those who were in the West were sending forth these words: 'Gregory Augustus, may you conquer!' and the voice of those in the West was louder than the voice of those in the East.''

And then the sacellarius shouted, "God sent you to be burned in this city!"

The servant of God said, "I give thanks to God who cleanses me from all my voluntary wrongs by involuntary punishment. But woe to the world because of scandals. For it is necessary that scandals come, but woe to him through whom scandal comes. Truly such things ought not to be said in the presence of Christians, nor should those remain unpunished who invent such things to please human beings who are here today and gone tomorrow. These accusations ought to have been made when Gregory was alive, and he could have made known to him his devotion to him.\(^\text{10}\) But it would be just, if it appears (so) also to you,\(^\text{11}\) to enjoin the previous accuser to go away and bring back Peter the patrician, and for this man to bring the father Thomas, and for him to bring the blessed Pope Theodore. And then in the presence of all I would say to the patrician Peter, 'Tell us, lord patrician, did you ever write to me about this as your sacellarius says, or did I write to you?' And if he affirmed it, I would submit to punishment. Likewise, (I would say) to the blessed pope: 'Tell us, lord, did I ever recount a dream to you?' And if he accused me, it would his crime, not mine for seeing it, for a dream is not a voluntary act. But the law punishes only those acts which are voluntary, if indeed they are contrary to the law."

Then Troilus said to him, "Are you joking, father? Don't you know where you are?"

He responded saying, "I am not joking, but I grieve that my life should have been preserved so long that I should experience terrors of this kind."

And lord Epiphanius said, "God knows, he does well in mocking them if they are not true."

---

\(^{10}\) Sc. the emperor.

\(^{11}\) Compare the Latin, *si et ubis quoque uidetur* "if it seems also to you" with the Greek *εἰ καὶ ὅπιν παριστάθη* "if he is present among you/if it occurs to you" (PG 90, 113A).
«Potestatem habetis permittente Deo, et uiuificandi et mortificandi. Verumtamen si isti veritatem dician, et Satanas natura Deus est. Si autem non est, sicut nec est, nec isti veritatem dixerunt. Denique nec merear cum Christianis uidere aduentum supersubstantialis Dei, factoris uidelicet conditoris et creatoris et prouisoris ac iudicis et salvatoris uniuersorum, si somnium tale aut uidi aut alio referente audiui | excepta hora hac a domno Sergio dilecto imperii.»

Dein tertium calumniatorem proponunt Theodorum filium Iohannis dudum candidati cognomento Chila, qui gener est nunc domni Platonis patricii dicentem quia: «Collocutione inter nos Rom< a >e facta de imperio, detraxit quod dicebatur, muttiens et subsanationes faciens.»
Ad quem seruus Dei dixit: «Nunquam disputau praeecum, nisi semel cum sanctissimo presbytero domno Theocaristo, exarchi fratre, propter primicerium, iussus per litteras super hoc. Quod si repertus fuero mentiens, recipiam.»

Et post hunc quartum adducunt, Gregorium filium Photini dicentem quia: «Perrex Romam ad cellulam abbatis Maximi, et me dicente quia et sacerdos est imperator, dixit abbas Anastasius discipulus eius: Non sit dignus fore sacerdos.»
Et statim dicit ad eum seruus Dei: «Time Deum, domne Gregori, nil tale in huiuscemodi disputacione conservus meus locutus est,» et cum semet proieasset in terram, senatus dixit: «Sustinet seruum usetrum, et omnia dico uobis siciu dicta sunt, et arguat me si mentitus fuero. Hic dominus meus Gregorius ueniens Romam, dignatus est uenire ad cellulam serui uestri; quo uiso, sicut moris est mihi, proieci meipsum in terram et adorai eum et osculatus sum, et dixi ei post sessionem: Quae causa est desiderabilis aduentus domini

After him, the sacellarius said again to him in rage, "Is absolutely everyone lying, and you alone are telling the truth?"

And in answer, when he had listened to these words, the servant of God said, weeping, "You have the power of life and death, by God's permission. But if those men speak the truth, then Satan is by nature God. But if he is not, and he is not, neither do they speak the truth. Therefore, may I not be deemed worthy to behold with Christians the coming of God who is supersubstantial, the maker and founder and creator and provider and judge and Saviour of all, if I either saw such a vision or heard of it from another except now from lord Sergius, dear to the empire."

Then they brought forward a third false accuser, Theodore, surnamed Chila, son of the former candidate\(^\text{12}\) John, and who is now the son-in-law\(^\text{13}\) of lord Plato the patrician. He said, "At the discussion held in Rome between us about the imperium,\(^\text{14}\) he\(^\text{15}\) detracted from what was being said by his mutterings and derision."

The servant of God said to him, "I never argued with you except once, with the most holy priest Theocaristus, brother of the exarch, when I was ordered in a letter concerning this on behalf of the primicerius.\(^\text{16}\) If I am found to be lying about this, let me receive the penalty."

And after him, they brought in a fourth, Gregory son of Photinus, who said, "I came to Rome to father Maximus' cell, and when I said that the emperor is also a priest, the father Anastasius his disciple said, 'He is not worthy to be a priest.'"

\(^{12}\) Originally a military office, the title of kandidatos on seals "is usually connected with subaltern offices both in the army and the civil service." (ODB, p. 1100). This John does not appear in the Prosopography of the Later Roman Empire (AD 527-641), vol. 3b, by A. Jones, J. Martindale, and J. Morris (Cambridge, 1971).

\(^{13}\) Or "brother-in-law" (gener).

\(^{14}\) Cf. Greek περί τοῦ βασιλέως "about the emperor" (PG 90, 113C).

\(^{15}\) Sc. Maximus.

\(^{16}\) The primicerius was the head of a government department (Lampe, p. 1131). The primicerius notariorum was, at the end of the seventh century, the head of the notaries and the chancellery (Darroužès, op. cit., pp. 355f.) No record of the letter mentioned here survives.
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132 mendacio] correci, mendatio cod. 135 ablationem] -nem cod. supra l. m. sec. 137 post demptio signum interrogationis habet cod. 142 contentus] -ten- cod. supra l. m. sec. 142 quomodo] -do cod. supra l. m. sec. 147 obruncetur] scripsi, obrucetur cod. 149 Et] e cod. a. corr. m. sec.
And immediately the servant of God said to him, "Fear God, lord Gregory, my fellow-servant said no such thing in an argument of this kind." And when he had thrown himself on the ground, he said to the senate, "Bear with your servant and I will tell you everything as it was said, and let him accuse me if I lie. My lord Gregory here came to Rome and deigned to visit the cell of your servant. When I saw him, I threw myself to the ground, as is my practice, and I paid respects to him and embraced him, and I said to him after he was seated, 'What is the reason for the welcome arrival of my lord?' And he said, 'Our good ruler, who is strengthened by God, is concerned for the peace of the holy churches of God, and he sent a command to the divinely-honoured pope, also sending an offering to Saint Peter, encouraging him to unite with the patriarch of Constantinople. His Righteous Authority deigned to send this command through me, in my humility.' And I said, 'Glory to God who made you worthy of this service. But by what means did His Tranquillity, crowned by God, order the union to be made, if you know?' And you said, 'Under the Typus.' And I said, 'This is impossible, in my opinion. For the Romans do not allow the illuminating words of the holy Fathers to be carried away together with the impure words of heretics, or for the truth to be extinguished together with falsehood, or the light to be dispelled equally with the shadows. We will have nothing which may be worshipped if the divinely-revealed words are abolished.' And you said, 'The Typus does not effect the abolition of holy words, but it effects silence so that we may arrange peace.' And I said 'According to divine Scripture, silence is also a negation. For God said through David, There is no speech or conversation of which the words are not heard. Therefore unless speech about God is said and heard, nor does it exist at all according to Scripture.' And you said, 'Don't send me into the woods,' I am satisfied with the holy creed.' 'And how,' I said, 'can you be satisfied with the holy creed when you adopt the Typus?' 'And what harm is there in adopting the

---

17 The Typus of Emperor Constans II (CPG 7621), ACO II, i, pp. 208, 1 - 210, 15, was issued in 647/648 under the direction of Patriarch Paul II. It enjoined silence on the issue of the number of wills and activities in Christ.

18 This is the idiomatic equivalent of "Don't make matters more difficult for me." (In Greek, Μη βάλης με εις δάκας [PG 90, 116C]).
omnia et inuisibilium. Attende, dixi, paululum et disc
qualiter apud Niceam convenientium fides negetur. Factor
enim non esset Deus voluntate ac operatione naturali
priatus, si volens et non coactus fecit caelum et terram, si
ueritatem profert Davud in spiritu dicens: *Omnia quae cunque
uluit Dominus, fecit in caelo et in terra, in mari et in
omnibus abyssis.* Si autem dispensationis gratia una cum
credulitate nequam, salutaris demitur fides, separatio Dei fit
omnimoda, sed non unitas est huiusmodi species eius quae
dicitur dispensatio. Si quidem cras nefandi Iudaici dicent:
Dispensemus in altrutros pacem et uniamur, et amputemus
nos quidem circumcisionem, uos uero baptismum, et non
iam inuicem impugnemus. Hoc et Arriani aliquando
praetenderunt in scriptis sub magno Constantino dicentes:
Auferamus dictum unius substantiae et alterius substantiae,
et uniantur ecclesiae. Et non id admiserunt deifieri patres
nostri, sed eleugerunt potius persecutionem pati et mori quam
tacere uocem comprobantem unam Patris et Filii et Spiritus
sancti supersubstantiale deitatem, et haec cohíbente his
qui haec praetendebant magno Constantino, sicut a multis
refertur qui ea quae tunc gesta sunt studiose scripserunt. Et
nullus imperatorum potuit mediis uocibus suadere deilloquis
patribus ut convenirent in ea quae ipsi sectabantur, sed
expressis uocibus ac propriis et dogmati quod quaerabatur
congruis usi sunt, dicentes liquido quoniam sacerdotum est
quaerere ac diffinire de salutaribus ecclesiae catholicae
dogmatibus. Et dixisti: Ergo non est omnis Christianus
imperator etiam sacerdos? Et dixi: Non est. Neque enim
astat altari, neque post sanctificationem panis exaltat eum
dicens: "Sancta sanctis." Neque baptizat, neque chrismatis |

---

155/157 Ps. 134,6 165/166 cf. Ep. Ari et Euzoii ad
Constantinum imp. apud Socrates, HE I, 26, 2 (ed. Hansen, GCS,
1995), p. 74, 3-5, et Sozomen, HE II, 27, 6 (ed. Bidez, GCS,
Hansen, GCS, 1995), p. 155, 3-7, in quo loco attamen imperator
Constantius est 180 cf. Brightman, Liturgies Eastern and
Western, p. 538, n. 17

151 paululum a. corr. cod. 160 dispensatio] expectaueris
dispensationis
Typus and saying the creed? you asked. I said, 'Since the Typus obviously whittles away the creed.' And you said, 'How, in God's name?' 'Let us recite the creed,' I said, 'and find out how it is denied by the Typus.'

And you began to say, 'I believe in one God the Father almighty, maker of heaven and earth, of all things visible and invisible.' 'Wait a moment,' I said, 'and learn how the faith of those who gathered at Nicaea is denied. For God would not be the maker if he was deprived of his natural will and activity, if he made heaven and earth willingly and not forced, if David speaks the truth in the spirit, saying, The Lord made everything, whatever he wished, in heaven and on earth, in the sea and in all the abysses. But if the saving faith is removed together with a worthless belief, for the sake of an arrangement, a complete separation from God is made, but such an appearance of the so-called 'arrangement' is not union. Indeed, tomorrow the unspeakable Jews will say, 'Let us arrange peace with each other and be united, and we will get rid of circumcision, and you will cease baptism, and we will no longer fight against each other.' The Arians also once put this forward in writing under the rule of the great Constantine, saying, 'Let us do away with the saying "of one substance" and "of another substance", and let the churches be united.' And our God-bearing Fathers did not allow it, but they chose rather to suffer persecution and to die than to be silent on a term approving the single supersubstantial deity of the Father and the Son and the Holy Spirit, and with the great Constantine joining in attacking those who were issuing these words, as is recounted by many who diligently recorded the events of that time. And none of the emperors was able to persuade the God-speaking Fathers with equivocal words to agree with their own sects, but the Fathers used words that were clear and fitting and appropriate to the teaching in question, saying clearly that it is the business of priests to examine and define the saving teachings of the catholic church.' And you said, 'Isn't every Christian emperor also a priest?' And I said, 'He is not. For he doesn't stand at the altar, nor does he raise the bread after its sanctification, saying, "Holy things for the holy." He doesn't

---

19 Literally "you asserted" (Latin asseruisti).
confectionem patrat neque facit episcopos uel presbyteros, aut diaconos, neque limit ecclesias, neque indicia sacerdotii fert, superhumeral scilicet et Evangelium, quemadmodum imperii coronam et purpuram. Et dixisti: Et quomodo Scriptura regem et sacerdotem dicit esse Melchisedech? Et dixi: Vnius natura regis cunctorum Dei, natura etiam ob salutem nostram pontificis facti, unus erat typus Melchisedech. Quod si secundum ordinem Melchisedech alium dicis esse regem et sacerdotem, et reliqua praesume dicere, id est: Sine patre, sine matre, sine genealogia, neque initium dierum, neque finem uitae habentem, et aduerte quod ex hoc oriri ualeat malum. Alius quippe talis repperietur Deus incarnatus, secundum ordinem Melchisedech et non secundum ordinem Aaron salutem nostram perficiens. Verumtamen quid uolumus per multa discurrere? Inter sacras oblationes supra sanctam mensam, post pontifices et sacerdotes et diaconos omnemque sacramt ordinem, cum laici imperatores memorantur, dicente diacone: Et eorum qui in fide dormierunt laicorum, Constantini, Constantis et ceterorum. Sic autem et uiiorum memoriam facit imperatorum, post sacratos omnes.» Haec eo dicente, clamat Mennas: «Haec dicens scidisti ecclesiam.» Et dicit ad eum: «Si is qui dicit ea quae sanctarum sunt Scripturarum atque sanctorum patrum, scindit ecclesiam, qui adimit sanctorum dogmata, quid monstrabitur ecclesiae faciens, sine quibus nec dici ipsam ecclesiam est possibile?» Et consuersus sacellarius dixit hominibus exarchi cum clamore: «Dicite exarcho, huiusmodi hominem deebas dimittere uiuere ubi praeae?»

188 Heb. 5,6  190/191 Heb. 7,3  193 Heb. 5,6  200/201 cf. Brightman, Liturgies Eastern and Western, p. 538, n. 13
181 patrat] neque manus ponit forsitan supplendum sit e gr. presbiteros cod. e corr. m. sec.
baptise, or perform unction, [or lay hands], or make bishops or priests or deacons, or anoint churches, or bear the symbols of priesthood, namely the pallium and the gospel book, as (he bears) the crown and the purple of imperial office.' And you said, 'And why does the Scripture say that Melchisedech was king and priest?' And I said, 'Melchisedech was the single type of the one king of all by nature, God, and by nature also made high-priest for our salvation. But if you say that another is king and priest according to the order of Melchisedech, presume to say the rest also, that is: without father, without mother, without genealogy, nor having beginning of days, nor an end of life, and see what evil arises from saying this. For another such person will be found indeed, God incarnate according to the order of Melchisedech, but not achieving our salvation according to the order of Aaron. But why should we want to prolong our discourse? Emperors are mentioned with the laity in the sacred offerings over the holy table after popes and priests and deacons and every consecrated order, when the deacon says, 'And those of the laity who have gone to sleep in the faith, Constantine, Constans and the rest.' But so also he makes mention of the living emperors, after all the ones who are ordained."

When he had said this, Mennas shouted, "In saying this, you split the church!"

And he said to him, "If he who says this, which is from the holy Scriptures and the holy Fathers, splits the church, what will he who retracts the teachings of the saints be shown to do to the church, without which teachings it is not possible for the church to be so called?" And the sacellarius turned and said to the exarch's men\(^\text{20}\) with a shout, "Say to the exarch, 'Should you have let such a man live where you preside?'"

\(^{20}\) The secular exarch was the head of the exarchates created at the end of the sixth century in Carthage and Ravenna. However, it seems that here is meant the ecclesiastical exarch, the chief bishop of a civil diocese. This title was given to both metropolitans and patriarchs exercising authority over a wide area (\textit{ODB}, p. 767). Here it probably refers to the Patriarch of Constantinople, notwithstanding Kazhdan's claim that the title was abandoned by the sixth century in favour of "patriarch" (\textit{ODB}, \textit{ibid.}).
Et cum eduxissent eum foras, intromittunt discipulum, a quo, cum exegissent ut diceret contra magistrum quod tribulauerit Pyrrhum, respondit quieta uoce quae ueritatis erant quia: «Nemo honorauit Pyrrhum ut honorauit magister meus,» et iubetis clamare. Quia uero passus non est a decenti monachos reuendera uoce duertere, iubetur percuti ab his qui astabant, et pugnis summissum semimortuum reddiderunt. Quibus dimissis ad carceres, uenit ad senem Mennas, dicens in praeuentia principum: «Misit te Deus et duxit te huc, ut recipias quaeunque in alios fecisti seducens omnes in Origenis dogmata.»

Ad quem seruos Dei coram omnibus dixit: «Anathema Origeni, et dogmatibus eius et omni consentanee eius.»

Et dicit Epiphanius | patricius: «Destructa est, domne abba Menna, quaerimonia quae a te aduersus eum illata est, quoniam et si esset Origenianista, ex quo anathematizauit eum, ab huiuscemodi sese liberauit quaerela. Interim ergo tale dictum super eo ulterius non admittam.»

Et inductus est unusquisque ipsorum in locum, in quo custodiebatur.

Et eadem die circa tactum lucernae, Trohilus patricius et Sergius Eucratas qui erat super imperatoriam mensam, uenerunt ad seruunm Dei senem, et sedentes, iussu uerunt etiam illi sedere, et dixerunt ad eum: «Dic nobis, domne abba, motionem dogmatum quae inter te et Pyrrhum Rom<e>e et in Africa facta est, et quibus ei uerbis persuaseris anathematizare proprium dogma, et tuo pacisci.»

Et enarravit eis omnia per ordinem, quaeunque retinere memoria valuit. Addidit autem et hoc dicens: «Ego dogma proprium non habeo, sed commune catholicae ecclesiae.

---

212 ut diceret| add. in mg. m. sec. 215 iubetis] sic cod.; Anas. legit καλέσεται pro καλέσεται. 227 ergo] sic cod., an corrigendum ego e gr. 235 rome cod.

Scholia 231 tactum lucernae| id est circa uesperam 232 Eucratas] abstemiui: hoc est qui a temeto, id est a uino se abstinet
And when they had led him outside, they sent in his disciple. When they had demanded that he should testify against his master that he had oppressed Pyrrhus, he answered in a quiet voice what was the truth, that no-one respected Pyrrhus as his master did, and he was ordered\(^{21}\) to shout. But because he did not allow himself to deviate from the reverent voice that befits a monk, they ordered that he be struck by those standing around, and they left him half-dead from the blows he received. When they had been dismissed to prison, Mennas came to the old man, and said in the presence of the leaders, "God sent you and led you here to receive whatever you did to others, seducing everyone into the teachings of Origen."\(^{22}\)

The servant of God said to him in front of everyone, "Anathema to Origen and his teachings and everyone who agrees with him."

And Epiphanius the patrician said, "Lord father Mennas, the charge which you brought against him has been destroyed, since even if he was an Origenist, he freed himself from such a charge from the moment when he anathematised him. Meanwhile, therefore, I will no longer allow such a remark to be made about him." And each of them was led to the place where he was being guarded.

And on the same day, at about sunset, Troilus the patrician and Sergius Eufratases who was in charge of the imperial table, came to the elderly servant of God, and sitting down, they ordered him also to sit, and they said to him, "Tell us, lord father, of the examination of doctrine made between you and Pyrrhus at Rome and in Africa, and with what words you persuaded him to anathematise his own teaching and to agree to yours."

And he related everything he could remember, in the order in which it occurred. But he added this: "I do not have my own teaching, but (only) that common to the

\(^{21}\) Literally in Latin iubetis "you (pl.) order".

\(^{22}\) This was an insult often hurled in monastic circles. Maximus in fact wrote against the Origenists who followed Evagrian teachings on prayer and ascetic theology, but, as Louth remarks in Maximus, p. 38, "He was a critic with great sympathy for what he criticized" and often used Origenist language and concepts in his rejection of their intellectualism (see Louth, Maximus, pp. 66-68).
Neque enim moui uocem quamlibet, ut proprium meum dicatur dogma.«

Et post totam narrationem dicunt ei: «Non communicas throno Constantinopolitano?»

245 Et dixit: «Non communico.»

«Quamobrem non communicas?» dixerunt.

Respondit: «Quia sancta quattuor concilia eiecerunt per illa nouem Capitula quae facta sunt Alexandriae, et per Ecthesis quae in hac urbe a Sergio patrata est, et per Typum qui nuper, id est per sextam est indictionem expositus, et quia quae per illa dogmatizauerunt, per Ecthesis damnauerunt, et quae dogmatizauerunt per Ecthesis, per Typum irrita statuerunt, et deposuerunt semetipsum totiens. Illi igitur qui a se ipsis damnati sunt et a Romanis atque a synodo, quae post haec per octauam indictionem facta est, sunt depositi et sacerdotio denudati, qualia celebrant rogo mysteria? Aut qualis spiritus ad ea, quae a talibus celebrantur, aduenit?»

Et dicunt ei: «Ergone tu solus saluaris, et omnes peribunt?»

250 Et dixit: «Neminem damnauerunt tres pueri non adorantes iconam, cum hanc omnes homines adorarent. Non enim intendeant ea quae aliorum erant, sed intendebant quatinus ipsi non deciderent a uera pietate. Sic et Daniel missus in lacum leonum non damnauit quenquam eorum qui non adorauerant Deum secundum Darii sanctionem, sed quod suum erat intendit, et elegit mori, et non cadere a Deo, et a sua conscientia flagellari in praevigatione eorum quae legalia sunt natura. Mihiqve Deus non det | damnare quenquam, vel dicere quod solus ego saluer. Quantum autem ualeo, eligo mori, quam terorem habere in conscientia, quod in fidem quae in Deum est per quemlibet errauerim.

248 Satisfactio (CPG 7613), ACO ser. II, ii, pp. 594, 17 - 600,
20 248/249 Ecthesis (CPG 7607), ACO ser. II, i, pp. 156, 20 -
162, 13 249 Typos (CPG 7621), ACO ser. II, i, pp. 208, 1 -
210, 15 252/253 cf. Epistula Encyclica Martini Papae, ACO
Dan. 6,16 270/271 cf. Gal. 1,8

Scholion 248 Ecthesis] id est expositionem
catholic church. Nor have I ever spoken a word so that it could be called my own teaching."

And after the whole account they said to him, "Do you not communicate with the throne of Constantinople?"

And he said, "I do not communicate."

"For what reason do you not communicate?" they said.

He answered, "Because they rejected the four holy councils through the nine Chapters which were made in Alexandria, 23 and through the Ec thesis 24 which was composed by Sergius in this city, and through the Typus which was recently published, that is in the sixth indication. 25 And because what they posited as doctrine in those (Chapters), they condemned through the Ec thesis, and what they posited as doctrine in the Ec thesis, they made worthless through the Typus, and they brought themselves down so many times. Therefore those who were condemned by themselves and were deposed by the Romans and the synod which was held after this in the eighth indication, 26 and who were stripped of the priesthood, what sort of mysteries can they celebrate, I ask you? Or what spirit is present in the mysteries celebrated by such people?"

And they said to him, "Therefore are you the only one who will be saved, and will everyone else perish?"

And he said, "The three youths who did not worship the image condemned no one, although everyone else worshipped it. For they did not attend to others' concerns, but saw to it that they should not fall away from true piety. 27 So also Daniel, who was sent into the lions' den, did not condemn anyone of those who

---

23 The Nine Chapters declared the basis for the Alexandrian Pact of Union in June 633, a monoenergist compromise which provided the basis for reconciliation between the imperial church, represented by Patriarch Cyrus, and the Theodosian party.

24 The Ec thesis was issued by Sergius in 638, and was a modified version of the Psephos of 633, forbidding talk of one activity in Christ, which implied the destruction of the two natures, or of two activities in Christ which presupposed two persons with contrary wills.

25 I.e. in 647/648: see Winkelmann, no. 106.

26 I.e. Lateran Council of 649.

27 Here, Latin pietate has to be translated with the sense of "piety" rather than "orthodoxy"; cf. n. 30.
Dicunt ei: «Et quid facies cum Romani uniti Byzantiiis fuerint? Ecce enim heri uenerunt apocrisiarii Romani, et cras dominico die communicabunt patriarchae, ac per hoc omnibus manifestum fit quod tu subuerteris Romanos; denique te illinc ablato, mox consenserunt his qui hic sunt.»

Et dixit ad eos: «Hi qui uenere, praemium quoquomodo sedi Romaniae, quamuis communicent, eo quod non detulerint ad patriarcham epistolam, non faciunt, et non credo aliquando quod Romani uniantur istis, nisi confessi fuerint Dominum nostrum et Deum, secundum utrumque eorum ex quibus est <et in quibus est> et quae est, esse et natura voluntarium et operatorium habere salutis nostrae.»

Et dicunt: «Quod si conexit fuerint his Romani, quid facies?»

Et dixit: «Spiritus sanctus etiam angelos anathematizat, praeter id quod praedicatum est, quid innouantes.»

Et aiunt: «Vtique necessitas est uoluntates duci in Christo et operationes?»

Respondit: «Omnis necessitas est si dumtaxat pie reuera sapere uolumus. Nihil enim eorum quae sunt, sine operatione naturali subsistit. Sancti nanque patres manifeste dicunt non esse nec sciri sine substantiali operatione <sua quamquernue naturam. Quod si non est, neque cognoscitur natura sine operatione> quae hanc substantialiter characterizet, quomodo esse Christum aut agosci Deum natura ueraciter et hominem est possibile? Amisso quippe secundum sanctos patres fremibili, leo non iam leo, et latrabil, canis non iam canis, et alium quodcunque, perdito quod se naturaliter commendat, non uterius est quod erat.»

Et dicunt ei: «Nouimus uere quod ita sit; uerumtamen ne

---

291/293 locum non repperi; cf. Ep. Maximi ad Anastasium 31/32

did not worship God, in accordance with the edict of Darius, but concentrated on what concerned him, and he chose to die and not to fall away from God and (not) to be punished by his own conscience for transgressing those laws which are natural. May God grant to me not to condemn anyone, nor to say that I alone am saved. But as far as I am able, I choose to die rather than to have on my conscience the fear that I have strayed in any degree from faith in God."

They said to him, "And what will you do when the Romans have united with the Byzantines? For look, Roman apocrisaries arrived yesterday, and tomorrow on Sunday they will communicate with the patriarch, and through this it will become clear to all that you have subverted the Romans. And accordingly, when you have been removed from there, they will quickly consent with those who are here."

And he said to them, "Those who have come don't in any way prejudice the Roman see, although they may communicate, because they didn't bring a letter to the patriarch. And I'll never believe that the Romans will be united with them unless they have confessed our Lord and God to be according to each of those (natures) from which, [in which] and which he is, having the power of will and activity by nature, for our salvation."

And they said, "What if the Romans make an agreement with them, what will you do?"

And he said, "The Holy Spirit even anathematises angels who make any innovations to what has been preached."

And they said, "Is it particularly necessary to speak of the wills and activities in Christ?"

He answered, "It is absolutely necessary if indeed we wish to know piously in truth. For nothing which exists, exists without natural activity. For the holy

---

28 The apocrisaries of Pope Eugenius I, who had been elected in August 654.

29 There is no equivalent for habere in Greek (PG 90, 121B).

30 The Greek reads more correctly: ἔστιν κατά πρασίνον "to be orthodox according to truth" (PG 90, 121C). The Latin adverb πιetas and the noun pietas sometimes have to be translated with the sense of "according to orthodoxy" and "orthodoxy", but elsewhere retain their original meaning of "piously" and "piety".
contristes imperatorem qui propter pacem tantummodo fecit Typum, non in ademptionem cuiusquam eorum quae in Christo intelliguntur, sed ad pacem silentium uocum qu< a > e faciebant dissensionem dispensat.»

305  Et proiciens se Dei seruus in terram cum lacrēmis dixit: «Non debuerat contristari benignus et pius dominus aduersus humilitatem meam. Non enim possum contristare Deum, tacens quae nos loqui et confiteri praecepit. Si enim secundum sacratissimum apostolorum ipse est qui posuit in ecclesia primo apostolos, secundo prophetas, tertio doctores, perspicuum est quod ipse sit qui per istos locutus est. Per totam ergo sanctam Scripturam, tam scilicet Vetus quam Nouum Testamentum, sanctosque doctores ac synodos edocemur, uoluntatis et operationis tam in diuinitate quam in humanitate, incarnatum Deum esse capacem. In nullo enim eorum quibus ut Deus scitur, uel eorum quibus ut homo natura cognoscitur, excepto dumtaxat peccato, est imperfectus. Si autem perfectus est in utroque sicut in nullo ex ambobus est minoratus, manifeste totum ipsius adulterat sacramentum qui non confitetur eum esse quod est, cum existentibus sibi omnibus naturalibus idiomatibus <secundum utrumque eorum> ex quibus et in quibus et quae esse probatur.»

310  f. 31r

315  Et cum paululum tacuisser et ad inuicem innuissent, aiunt: «Vnde potes ostendere quod sanctas synodos abiciant hi qui sunt throni Constantinopleos?»

320  Qui dicit eis: «Iam partim ostensum est per ea quae Rom< a > e locutus sum ad dominum Gregorium ascretis, et nunc si placet dominatori ut hoc ostendatur, iubeat dari licentiām indigne seruo uestro, et facio notitiām librorum,

325

330

309/310 I Cor. 12,28 et cf. Eph. 4,11 317 Heb. 4,15

Fathers say clearly that there does not exist, nor is there known [any nature] without a substantial activity. [And if there is not, nor is known a nature without an activity] which characterises it according to substance, how is it possible for Christ to be, or to be truly acknowledged as, God and man by nature? For in fact, according to the holy Fathers, a lion which has lost its ability to roar is no longer a lion, and a dog which has lost its ability to bark is no longer a dog. And whatever else has lost what naturally constituted it, is no longer that which it was."

And they said to him, "We actually know that it is so, but do not grieve the emperor who made the Typus only for the sake of peace, not in order to deny any of those properties which are understood in Christ, but arranging, with a view to peace, for the silencing of voices\(^{31}\) which were causing dissension."

And throwing himself on the ground, the servant of God said, weeping, "The benevolent and pious lord ought not to be grieved by my humility, for I am not able to grieve God by being silent about what he instructed us to say and confess. For if according to the holiest apostle, he himself appointed in the church first the apostles, second the prophets, third the teachers, it is clear that it is he himself who spoke through the latter. Therefore, through the entire holy Scripture, that is, both the Old and New Testaments, and the holy teachers and the synods, we are taught that the incarnate God is capable of will and activity, both in his divinity and in his humanity. For in none of those by which he is known as God, or by which he is understood as man by nature, with the exception of sin alone, is he imperfect. But if he is perfect in each such that there is no diminishing of either, he who does not confess Christ to be that which he is – with all those natural and distinguishing characteristics existing in him [from both of those] from which and in which and which he is proved to be – clearly defiles the whole sacrament\(^{32}\) concerning him."

And they were silent for a moment, nodding to each other. Then they

\(^{31}\) Or "expressions" (Latin vocum).

\(^{32}\) Latin sacramentum, which does not give the intended sense of the Greek μυστήριον "mystery" (PG 90, 124B).
quoniam mei ablati sunt, et cunctis hoc manifestum facio sine qualibet praeitate uerborum.«
Et deinde cum alia multa dicta fuissent, in scripturales ac naturales et artificales conuersi sunt exercitiones et theorias, quibus delectati, hilariores effecti sunt, et coeperunt dicere: «Nouit dominus profecimus, et ex hoc uobis molestiam ingeremus.»

Porro domnus Sergius dixit ei: «Saepe ueni ad cellulam tuam in Bebbas et audii doctrinam tuam, et Deus auxiliabitur tibi, ne sollicitus sis. In uno uero solummodo contristas omnes, quia uidelicet multos facis separari a communione huius ecclesiae.»
«Est aliquis qui asserat,» ait Dei seruus, «quod dixerim: Ne communices ecclesiae Byzantiorum?»
Respondit domnus Sergius: «Hoc ipsum,» inquiens, «quo ipse non communicas, magna est ad omnes procul dubio uox non communicandi.»
Et Dei seruus: «Nil,» ait, «certius est quam conscientia quae accusat, et nil eo cui haec testimonium perhibet maiorem habet fiduciam.»
Ceterum cum audisset domnus Trohilus quod Typus anathematizaretur in toto occidente, dicit ad seruum Dei: «Bonum est quia pii dominatoris nostri opinio iniurii laceratur?»
Respondit seruus Dei: «Deus ignoscat his qui dominatori facere Typum persuaserunt, et his qui permiserunt.»
At ille: «Qui,» ait, «sunt qui persuaserunt, et qui sunt qui permiserunt?»
Respondit: «Hi qui erant ecclesiae suaserunt, et principes

said, "How can you prove that those on the throne of Constantinople have rejected the holy synods?"

He said to them, "It has already partially been shown through what I said at Rome to lord Gregory the secretary,\(^{33}\) and now if it pleases the emperor that this be shown, let him order that your unworthy servant be given permission, and I will make a list of books since mine have been taken, and I will make this clear to all without any verbal trickery."

And then when many other words had been spoken, they turned to scriptural and natural and technical\(^{34}\) problems and speculations. They were delighted by these, and became more cheerful, and they began to say, "God knows we have gained profit, and we will bring trouble to you."\(^{35}\)

Furthermore, lord Sergius said to him, "Often I came to your cell in Bellas,\(^{36}\) and I heard your teaching, and God will help you, so that you are not troubled. But on one single point you grieve everyone, namely that you make many separate themselves from the communion of this church."

"Is there anyone who claims," said the servant of God, "that I said, 'Do not communicate with the church of the Byzantines?'"

Lord Sergius answered, "The very fact that you yourself do not communicate, speaks loudly to all without a doubt that they should not communicate."

And the servant of God said, "Nothing is more certain than a conscience which accuses, and nothing is more reliable than that to which this conscience bears witness."

However, when lord Troilus heard that the Typus was anathematised throughout all the West, he said to the servant of God, "Is it good that the reputation of our

\(^{33}\) Cf. RM 150ff on Maximus' discussion with Gregory in Rome. The asekretis of the court replaced the referendarii (or imperial secretaries, an office created by Julian and generally thought to have disappeared after 600: see ODB, p. 1778), and "formed the upper echelon of imperial secretaries positioned higher than imperial notaries" (ODB, p. 204). The term first appears in the sixth century, and there is mention of an asekretis at the Third Council of Constantinople (680/681).

\(^{34}\) Cf. Greek τεχνική "grammatical" (PG 90, 124C).

\(^{35}\) Anastasius has not recognised the less common meaning of ἑξομεν "we refrain (from troubling you)" (PG 90, 124C).

\(^{36}\) Cf. Greek Βεββοτη. We have been unable to identify this place.
permiserunt. Et ecce sordes a sortibus in insontem et omni heresi purum excussa est. Sed consilium date ut faciat quod fecit piae memoriae quondam auus eius. Ille quippe sentiens quod in uituperium eius in occidente quidam prorupserunt, per epistolam liberum se fecit ab ecclesiae querimonia scribens: «Ecthesin,» inquit, «non est mea; neque enim ego uel dictaui uel iussi ut fieret, sed cum | hanc Sergius patriarcha composuissest, ante quinque annos prius quam ab oriente repedassem, deprecatus est me, cum ad hanc felicem perueni <s> > sem urbem, ut nomine meo proponeretur cum subscriptione, et suscepit deprecationem illius. Nunc uero cognoscens quod quidam super ea altercarentur, cunctis facio manifestum quia non est mea.» Hanc fecit iussionem ad beatum Iohannem pапam, condemnantem Ecthesin in his quae scripsarat tunc ad Pyrrhum. Et ex eo tempore ubique Sergii esse dicitur Ecthesin. Hoc faciat et is qui pie in nobis imperat, et permanebit omnino intermerata ab omni reprehensione opinio eius.»

Tunc mouentes capita siluerunt, hoc tantum dicentes: «Omnia difficilia et perplexa.»

His itaque et alis diuersis edictis, adorati et adorantes, cum omni hilaritate discesserunt.

Et rursus alio sabbato adduxerunt eos in palatium, et introducunt primo discipulum senis, conuenientibus tunc etiam duobus pariter patriarchis, et ducunt Constantinum et Mennan senis accusatores, exigentes a discipulo quo adquiesceret, his quae a se dicerentur. Ast discipulus cum fiducia omni ad senatum intrepide dixit: «Constantinum introducitis in secretarium palatii? Hic neque presbyter est, neque monachus, sed tribunus thymelicus.

---

366/373 Ep. Herac. ad Papam Iohannem IV (CPG 9382), PG 90, 125 A13-B6

369 oriente] o- supra l. cod. me, cum} mecum cod. a. corr. m. sec. 370 peruenisem cod. 385 patriarchis pariter a. corr. cod.

Scholion 366 Ecthesin] id est expositio
pious ruler should be damaged by slanders?"
The servant of God answered, "May God forgive those who persuaded the ruler to make the Typus and those who permitted it."
And he said, "Who are those who persuaded him and who are those who permitted it?"
He answered, "Those who were of the church persuaded him, and the leaders permitted it. But behold, defilement is shaken out from the guilty onto one who is innocent and pure of all heresy. But advise him that he should do what his grandfather of pious memory once did. He in fact, when he realised that certain people in the West were breaking out into censure of him, freed himself from the church's accusation by a letter37 saying, 'The Ecthesis is not mine, for I neither dictated it nor ordered that it be made, but when the patriarch Sergius composed it, five years before I returned from the East,38 he entreated me when I had come to this blessed city, that it be published in my name with my signature, and I undertook his request. But now that I realise that certain people are disagreeing over it, I make it clear to all that it is not mine.' He made this command to the blessed Pope John who had condemned the Ecthesis in his writings then to Pyrrhus.39 And from that time on, it is called everywhere 'the Ecthesis of Sergius'. Let him who piously rules over us also do the same, and his reputation will remain altogether untarnished by any reproach."
Then, shaking their heads, they were silent, saying only this: "It is all very difficult and perplexing." After these and various other words had been spoken, they paid their respects to each other and went away in great cheerfulness.

And again on the next Saturday they brought them to the palace, and they led in first the disciple of the old man, with the two patriarchs present together at that time. And they called Constantine and Mennas as accusers of the old man,

37 Letter of Emperor Heraclius to Pope John IV, dated 640/641 (CPG 9382); a fragmentum is edited in PG 90, 125 A13-B6.

38 Heraclius was involved in fighting the Muslim invasions in the mid 630s, when Damascus fell (635), followed by Jerusalem (638).

Innotuit Afris atque Romanis quales mulierculas pascens illuc uenerit. Nam et omnes didicerunt uersutias eius quas exercuit ut lateret, modo quod sorores suae fuerint dicens, modo quod ne communicarent ecclesiae Constantinopolitanae tulerit eas affirmans, ne uidelicet polluerentur heretica communione. Verum et si rursus sibi defeecerint epulae, et inueniret locum se non agnoscentem, eadem facit turpis lucrī gratia et sordidae voluptatis. Ingensque confusio est saltem loqui cum eo, his qui religiose uiuere uolunt."

Deinde interrogatus si Typum anathematizasset, intrepide dixit: «Non solum anathematizai, sed et libellum feci.»

«Ergone,» aiunt ei principes, «confiteris te male fecisse?»

At ille: «Non tribuat Deus ut quod bene et secundum ritum ecclesiae feci, dicam factum fuisses non bene.»

Et super multis interrogatus, cum respondisset secundum quod sibi largitus est Deus, educitur de secretario et introducunt senem, et dicit ad eum dominus Trohilus: «Dic abba. Vide dic veritatem, et miserebitur tui dominator. Nam si ad legalem inquisitionem uenerimus et inueniret saltem unum uerum ex his de quibus accusaris, lex occidet te.»

Et dixit: «Iam dixi et iterum dico, si unum tantummodo ex his quae dicitis est uerum, et Satanás Deus est; si uero non est Deus sed apostata, et ea super quibus accusor falsa sunt et minime subsistentia. Verum tamen quicquid iubetis facere, facite. Deum colens, non injuriām patior.»

Et dicit ei: «Non anathematizasti Typum?»

Respondit: «Multotiens dixi quia anathematizai.»

Et dicit ei: «Typum anathematizasti, imperatorem anathematizasti.»

Respondit Dei seruus: «Ego inquiens, «imperatorem non
anathematizau, sed chartam alienam ab ecclesiastica fide.»
Et dicit ei: «Vbi anathematizatus est a Romana synodo?»
Respondit: «In ecclesia Saluatoris et in Dei Geniticis.»
Tunc dicit ad eum praefectus: «Communicaes ecclesiae huic
an non communicas?»
Respondit et dixit: «Non communico.»
Dicit ei: «Quare?»
Respondit: «Quoniam foras eicet synodos.»
At ille: «Si foras inquit, «eicet synodos, quomodo in
diptychis recitantur?»
Et dicit: «Et qui prefectus est nominum, cum dogmata sint
eiecta?»
«Et potes,» ait, «hoc ostendere?»
Et dixit: «Si accepero licentiam et iusseritis, ostendetur hoc
oppido facile.»
Et tacentibus omnibus dicit ei sacellarius: «Quare diligis
Romanos, et Graecos odio habes?»
Respondens autem Dei seruus, ait: «Praeceptum habemus ne
quenquam odio habeamus. Diligo Romanos ut unam mecum
habentes fide; Graecos autem ut eadem qua ego lingua
loquentes.»
Et iterum dicit ei sacellarius: «Quot annorum dicis esse
te ipsum?»
Respondit: «Septuaginta quinque.»
Et dicit ei: «Quot annos habet tecum discipulus tuus?»
Respondit: «Triginta septem.»
Tunc unus clericorum exclamuit: «Retribuit tibi Deus, quaecunque fecisti beato Pyrrho.»
Ad quem nihil omnino respondit.

438/439 cf. Luc. 6,27
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condemned the emperor."
The servant of God answered him, saying, "I did not condemn the emperor, but a
document divorced from the faith of the church."
And he said to him, "Where was it condemned by a Roman synod?"
He answered, "In the church of the Saviour and in the church of the Mother of
God."\footnote{The churches of St. John Lateran and St. Mary Major in Rome.}
Then the prefect\footnote{The eparch of the city, i.e. the governor of Constantinople, was the successor of the late Roman urban prefect, and was in charge of judicial functions in the capital and its vicinity. He was responsible, as the chief of police, for order, decoration and ceremonial in the capital, and for jurisdiction over prisons (\textit{ODB}, p. 705.)} said to him, "Are you in communion with this church or aren't you?"
He answered and said, "I am not in communion."
He said to him, "Why?"
He answered, "Because it rejected the synods."
But he said, "If it threw the synods out, why are they listed in the diptychs?"
And he said, "And what is the use of names when the teachings have been
rejected?"
"And are you able," he said, "to show this?"
And he said, "If I obtain permission and you order it, this will be proved quite
easily."
And when they were silent, the sacellarius said to him, "Why do you love the
Romans and hate the Greeks?"
In answer the servant of God said to him, "We have a commandment not to hate
anyone. I love the Romans as those sharing the one faith with me, but I love the
Greeks as those speaking the same language as I do."
And again the sacellarius said to him, "How old do you say you are?"
He answered, "Seventy-five."
And he said to him, "How many years has your disciple been with you?"
He answered, "Thirty-seven."
Then one of the clerks exclaimed, "God has made retribution to you for what you
Cum autem tanta in secretario dicta fuissent, nullus penitus patriarcharum quicquam effatus est. Cunque sermo de synodo romana motus exitisset, clamat Demosthenes: «Non est firma synodus, eo qui hanc celebratit deposito.» Ad quod seruus Dei: «Non», inquit, «depositus est, sed expulsus. Nam quae sub gestorum serie synodica et canonica facta est actio continens eius diligentii relatione depositionem? Verumptamen etiam si canonice depositus exitisset, non faceret hoc praeudicia his quae orthodoxe secundum sacras regulas sunt firmata, quibus etiam quae scripta sunt a sanctae memoriae papa Theodoro congruunt.»

Et dicit his auditis dominus Trohilus: «Nescis quid dicas, abba. Quod factum est, factum est.»

Haec sunt quantum memoria retinet quae mota et dicta sunt, et tali ea, quae in illos gesta fuere, terminata sunt fine, dimissmo quoque sancto sene a secreto in carcerem. Postera uero die, quae fuit dominica, concilio facto, hi qui erant ecclesiae, persuaserunt piissimo imperatori hoc eos amaro et inhumano exilio condemnandos, et ab inuicem diuidendos, sanctum quidem senem penes Bizyen castrum Thraciae prouinciae, porro discipulam eius apud Perberim, quod exterius nec passu pedis Romanorum habet imperium, nudos, sine prouisione, sine causa, atque omni ad uiidendum occasione carentes, non approquinantes mari ne haberent ex misericordius usitationem. Et ita sunt nudi et sine alimentis, solam habentes spem Dei, et hoc omnes Christianos rogantes atque clamantes: Orate propter Dominum ut consummet Deus misericordiam suam cum humiditate nostra, et doceat nos. Nam et ipsi qui cum eo nauigant efferi experimentum accipient maris, uentis quidem et fluctibus scapha concussa, sed stabili penitus permanente.

---
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did to the blessed Pyrrhus."

He made no response at all to this man.

But when such words had been spoken in the council chamber, none of the patriarchs said anything at all. And when the topic of the Roman synod was brought up, Demosthenes shouted, "The synod is not ratified, since he who conducted it has been deposed."

To this the servant of God said, "He was not deposed but thrown out. For what conciliar and canonical action was performed under the series of acts, recording his deposition in a reliable account? However, even if he was canonically deposed, this would not prejudice what has been established in accordance with orthodox belief and holy decrees, with which the writings of Pope Theodore of blessed memory concur."

And when he heard this, lord Troilus said, "You do not know what you are saying, father. What is done is done."

This is an account, as far as we remember, of what was done and said, and the actions against them were brought to such a close, after which the old man also was sent out of the council chamber to prison. But on the next day, which was Sunday, after a meeting was held, those who were of the church persuaded the most pious emperor to condemn them to this 43 bitter and inhumane exile, and to separate them from each other, the holy old man being sent to a camp in Bizya in the province of Thrace, while his disciple was sent to Perberis beyond which Roman rule extends not a step further. They were naked, without supplies, without nourishment, and lacking any means of survival, nowhere near the sea lest they should be visited by people taking pity on them. And so they are (still), naked and without food, having their only hope in God, and asking this of all Christians, with cries: "Pray through the Lord that God might fulfil his mercy with our humility, and that he might teach us." For 44 even those who sail with him experience savage seas, when the boat is tossed by wind and waves, but it

43 I have followed the Greek ταύτην αὐτῷ κατακρίνα τὴν ἔξοραν (PG 90, 129A); hoc cannot agree with the dative exilio in Latin.

44 The Greek reads, continuing from the previous sentence: ἵματί δι... "and that he might teach us that even..." (PG 90, 129B).
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remains firmly steadfast. Indeed he allows them to be tried by great storms, to
prove their affection towards him, so that they shout in a loud voice, *Lord, save
us, we are dying! And so that they may learn to ascribe to him alone everything
which they know to be for their salvation, and so that they rely not on themselves,
and so that they may achieve great calm when the wind and waves have been
stilled. And he gives them into the midst of wolves, and orders them to enter
through the narrow gate, and to proceed on the narrow path, and he offers hunger
and thirst and nakedness, and chains and prison, and arrests and blows, and the
cross and nails, and vinegar and gall and spitting and slaps and blows and
derision, and suffering and many kinds of death, the end of which is the most
splendid resurrection, bringing peace with it to those who have suffered
persecution on account of him, [and joy to those who have been oppressed for his
sake], and ascent into heaven, and ascent\(^{45}\) to the Father’s supersubstantial
throne, and a destiny which is above every principality and power and virtue and
domination and every name which is named either in this age or the coming age.
May we all be made sharers of this, by the prayers and intercessions of Mary who
is above praise and to be venerated before all, the glorious and ever-virgin Mother
of God, properly and by nature, and by the prayers of the holy apostles, prophets
and martyrs. Amen.

\(^{45}\) Note the reconstruction of the Latin text here, as indicated in the *apparatus criticus*. 
Item eiusdem Sancti Abbatis Maximi ad Anastasium
monachum disc <i> pulum suum.</i>

Heri quod fuit octava decima mensis dies, qua solemnitas
agebatur | sanctae Mediae Pentecostes, patriarcha
significavit mihi dicens: «Cuius ecclesiae es?
Constantinopolitanae, Romanae, Antiochenae, Alexandrinae;
an Hierosolymitanae? Ecce omnes una cum subditis sibi
prouinciis adunatae sunt. Igitur si es catholicae ecclesiae,
unire, ne forte extraneam et nouam uiam conuersatione tua
repperiens, patiaris quod non speras.»

Ad quos dixi: «Catholicam ecclesiam Deus omnium esse
praenuntiavit rectam et salutarem fidei in se habitae
confessionem, Petrum beatum dicens in quibus se bene
confessus est. Verumtamen discam confessionem supra quam
omnium ecclesiarum facta est unitas, et ab eo quod bene
gestum est nequaquam alienabor.»

Et aiunt: «Licet non habeamus super hoc iussionem, dicimus,
ut efficieris penitus inexcusabilis. Duas fatemur operationes
ob diuersitatem, et unam propter unitionem.»

«Duas propter unitionem <unam> asseritis factas, an
praeter has,» dixi, «aliam?»

«Non,» inquiunt, «sed duas unam propter unitionem.»

«Caruimus,» dixi, «rebus, nobismetipsis sine subsistentia
fidem, et sine existentia Deum fingentes. Si enim in unam
confundimus duas propter unitionem, et rursus in duas
separamus unam propter differentiam, non erit unalitas neque
dualitas, operationibus inuicem separatis semper, et
patrantibus inoperatiuum et poenitus insubstantium eum cui
inerant. Quod enim ex natura nullum habet qui <non>
aufferi possit vel aliqua ratione uicissitudinis commutari et
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A letter of the same holy father Maximus to his disciple, the monk Anastasius. Yesterday, which was the eighteenth day of the month when the celebration of holy Mid-Pentecost was being celebrated, the patriarch signalled to me,¹ saying:

"Whose church do you belong to: that of Constantinople, Rome, Antioch, Alexandria, or Jerusalem? See, all are united, together with the provinces subject to them.² Therefore, if you belong to the catholic church, be united lest by chance you devise a strange and new path by your behaviour, and you suffer what you do not hope for."

To those I said: "The God of all pronounced the catholic church to be the right and saving confession of faith held in him, calling Peter blessed in the terms in which he (sc. Peter) confessed [him]³ well. But let me learn the confession upon which the unity of all churches was made, and I will in no way alienate myself from what was done well."

And they said: "Although we do not have an order concerning this, we say that you are made completely unpardonable. We confess two activities on account of diversity, and one on account of union."

"Do you assert that the two became [one] on account of union, or is there another besides these?" I said.

They said, "No, but two (made) one on account of union."

I said, "We have (been) deprived of things by inventing for ourselves a faith without substance and a God without existence. For if we conflate two into one on account of union, and again we separate one into two on account of difference, there will not be unity or duality, with the activities in turn always separated, and effecting him in whom they were present inactive and totally without substance. For what by nature has no movement which is [in]alienable, nor alterable by any vicissitude nor capable of decay, lacks all substance according to the Fathers, since is does not have an activity essentially characterising itself.⁴ For that reason I cannot say this, nor in

¹ In Greek, the sense of ἔγνωκεν μου is "made it known to me" (PG 90, 132A). The patriarch Peter (654-666) made his message known through delegates, not in person, on April 18, 658.

² This must refer to the rapprochement made between the papacy after the inauguration of Pope Vitalian (30 July 657) and Constantinopole.


⁴ Latin se, cf. Greek οὐρανό (PG 90, 132B).
intercidere motum, omni caret substantia secundum patres, non habens operationem substantialiter se charactrizantem. Hoc itaque dicere nequeo; neque enim sic edoctus sum a sanctis patribus confiteri. Quod libuerit uobis, potestatii cum sitis,faciae.»

«Ergo audi,» dixerunt. «Visum est dominatori et patriarchae per praecptum papae Romani ut anathematizeris nisi oboedias, et destinatam ab eis perferas mortem.»

«Quod a Deo ante omne diffinitum est saeculum, finem accipiat, ferens sibi gloriam ante omne saeculum scitam,» illis cum haec audirem respondebam. Et ut cognoscas et additamentum orationis et deprecationis facias Deo, manifesta tibi quae denuntiata sunt mihi exhibui, rogans quatinus haec domno Thio et sanctis patribus qui illic simul cum eo sunt, nota constitutas, eiusdem rei gratia.

Anastasius. Haec iussit mihi transcribere et nota facere sanctissimis uobis, quo et ex his motione comperta, communem omnes pro communi matre nostra, catholica uidelicet ecclesia, et nobis indignis seruis uestris afferatis Domino precem, ad roborandum omnes et nos quoque, in illa uobiscum perseuerantes secundum pie in ipsa praedicatam a sanctis patribus [h]o<\r>thodoxam fidem. Magnus enim in toto mundo timor habetur, cum haec persecutionem consonanter ab omnibus patiatur, nisi sua gratia consuete pr<\a>ester auxilium is qui semper auxiliatur, semen pietatis saltem seniori Romae relinquens, nobis non mentientem ad apostolorum habitam principem repropensionem suam confirmans.


fact have I been taught to confess thus by the holy Fathers; do what is pleasing to you since you are invested with power."

"Listen then!" they said. "It seems (just) to the ruler and the patriarch through the instruction of the Roman pope, that you be anathematized unless you obey, and that you endure the death planned by them."

When I heard this, I answered them, "May God bring to an end what has been defined by him before every age, bringing to himself the glory known before every age."

And that you may understand and that you may increase your prayers and intercessions to God, I have revealed to you the declarations made to me, asking that you present what you have found out to the Lord God and the holy fathers who are there together with him for the same reason.

Anastasius. He ordered me to transcribe these things and to make them known to you most holy people, in order that when you have found out about the trial from these, you might all bring a common prayer to the Lord on behalf of our common mother, that is the catholic church, and on behalf of us your unworthy servants, for strengthening everyone and us also, persevering with you in it, according to the orthodox faith rightly preached in it by the holy Fathers. For there is great fear in the whole world because this (church) endures persecution by all simultaneously, unless he offers aid by his customary grace, he who always comes to aid, leaving the seed of piety at least in older Rome, confirming the promise he made to the prince of apostles, which does not deceive us.

---

5 The Greek word order (ὁ κύριος θεός, PG 90, 132C) suggests that Thio may be the abbreviation for a proper name, perhaps Θοδόπος, which may refer to Theodore Spudaeus, who was involved in collating some of these documents, as discussed in Neil, Lives, pp. 103f.

6 On the problems associated with the identification of the author of this postscript, see Neil, Lives, p. 97. The subject of the following sentence is either Maximus ("Maximus ordered me, sc. Anastasius the Disciple, to transcribe this...") or Anastasius the Disciple, recipient of the letter ("Anastasius ordered me, sc. the compiler of these documents, to transcribe this..."). PG 90, 133-144 makes it clear that the editor thought that the postscript was supplied by Anastasius.

7 Or "who".
EPISTULA ANASTASII AD MONACHOS
CALARITANOS

Eiusdem sancti Anastasii monachi discipuli sancti abbatis
Maximi, ad commune monachorum apud Caralim
constitutorum collegium.

Multa scribere nos etiam praeter uotum tempus prohibuit,
omnia uero in uno nota facimus uerbo sanctissimis uobis. Hi
qui alterius sunt partis, diffinitione immobile ut est, et
propriae maxime professionis constitui paternam non malunt
doctrinam, sed alternis impelluntur opinionibus quas et
dinumerare operosum de cetero duco. Modo ergo ab
inexistentiis ad inconuenientiam translati sunt, id est ex eo
quod neque unam neque duas dicunt, ad praedicandum duas
et unam, id est tres in uno eodemque Christo uluntates et
operationes traduci, quod neque patrius, neque synodicus,
neque physicus sermo decreuit, sed neque priscorum et
deinceps hereticorum furer eatenus adinuenit, sciens inanem
tanquam uitio propio corruptam eandem opinionem.

Si enim diuersae ex diuersis composuim substantiis
characterizant naturaliter proprietates, utpote nullatenus
adempta naturarum diuersitate propter unitionem, sed salua
potius proprietate utriusque naturae et in unam personam et
unam subsistentiam concurrente, quemadmodum sancta
Chalcedonensis synodus ait, et is Deus ex Deo Patre, et
homo ex homine semper urigine matre, idem ipse existens
cognoscitur, iuxta naturam natus, quamquam incorporaliter et
sine causa, corporaliter autem ex hac propter causam,
saltem uidelicet nostram, quomodo possible est unam
eundemque personam, id est unum eundemque Christum
Dominum nostrum et Deum, super duas etiam alia secundum
ipsos proprietatem naturaliter figurari, ad certitudinem eorum
ex quibus et in quibus et quae est?

18/21 cf. Conc. Chalcedonense - Definitio fidei, ed. ACO ser. II,
i, p. 225, 14-16

2 Caralim] sic cod. 18 characterizant] sic cod. (cf. 53) 21
subsistentiam] substantiam cod. a. corr. m. sec. 22 is] hanc
vocem praecedid littera in rasura, forsitam h

Scholion 25 causa] hic causa ponitur pro ea quae rem antecedit
siue pro origine rei
A letter of the same holy monk Anastasius, disciple of the holy father Maximus, to the community of monks established at Cagliari.

Time prevents me from writing at length, although I would like to, but I will briefly make everything known to you, most holy people. Those who oppose (us) do not want the teaching of the Fathers to be established by a fixed definition, as it is, <and> of the most righteous confession of faith; rather, they are compelled by other opinions which I consider it laborious even to enumerate from the rest. Now therefore they have shifted from an impossible point of view to an inconsistent one; from saying, that is, that there are neither one nor two, to preaching two and one, that is, three wills and operations in one and the same Christ, which was decreed by neither the word of the Fathers nor by the synods nor in natural speech. Nor did the madness of heretics of old and thereafter reach such a pitch, knowing that the same view was foolish, (and) corrupted by its own vice.

For let us suppose that diverse properties characterise a thing composed of diverse substances according to nature, inasmuch as the diversity of natures is in no way removed by union, but rather what is proper to each nature being preserved and occurring together in one person and one hypostasis, just as the holy Council of Chalcedon stated; and let us suppose that he (sc. Christ) is understood to exist as one and the same, both God from God the Father, and man from a human, ever-virgin mother, born according to nature, although being incorporeal and without cause,¹ but born of her into a body for one reason: namely, our salvation. Given these suppositions, how can one and the same person, that is, one and the same Christ our Lord and God, be fashioned according to nature with yet another property in addition to those two, as they say, for the safeguarding of those from which and in which and which he is?

¹ The scholiast explains, "Here 'cause' stands for that which antecedes matter or for the origin of matter."
Si enim eadem creduntur etiam per aliam, id est per tertiam | quae et per dualitatem, voluntates et operationes
eius quae secundum naturam sunt, necesse est ut identitate
exhibitionis, indissimilitas cognoscatur existentiae, et sit
idem dubus una, id est alterutris, \(<***>\) tres, siue
naturales, siue substantiales; uerum naturales quidem non,
~sed secundum illos subsistentiales, aggregentque ob hoc
adversus eum iam aut tres substantias, aut totidem
subsistentias, et secundum ipsum aequi numeri proprietates,
increatam uidelicet et creatam et neutram, id est
inexistentem. Inexistentis enim est quod neutrius per naturam
participatur, ita ut etiam identitate quae ad eam, id est
tertiam, est, secundum illos inexistentes sint et duae naturae,
et naturales ipsius voluntates ac operationes. At vero si non
eadem sed alia, exceptis his ex quibus est credendus, in eo
per tertiam aiunt, eundem secundum eandem rursus proferunt
in inexistentiem, uelut is qui mediis inter \(<\text{utramque}\>\)
neutra[m] harum existat, increatam scilicet natura sua et
creatam substantiam atque virtutem: aut enim subsistentialem
volunt hanc esse, aut compositam, aut deuirilem, aut
unitoria propter adnationem. Nam non solum, ut dictum
est, hanc non existentem introducunt, quod secundum nihil
eorum ex quibus est natura hunc characterizet, uerum etiam
a naturali cognitione quam habet cum Deo et Patre, reddunt
externum; minus enim dicendum quia perhibet eum etiam
a congenita proprietate quam habet ad intemeratem matrem
et urginem alienum, quasi secundum neutrum horum habeat
compositam aut subsistentialem, aut deuirilem, aut unitoria
proprium voluntatem et operationem. Verum Patris quidem
incompositam sine principio habet, et substantialem atque

\[34\] indissimilitas\[35\] indissimulatas cod. a. corr. m. sec. 35 est\]
supra l. m. sec. 35 quaedam hic ecceiderunt ut uid., quia uerbum
sit singulariter effertur, tres...naturales...substantiales atum
pluraliter. 37 subsistentiales\[38\] correci, subsistentialis cod. 38
totidem\[39\] scriba prior scripsert\[40\] tod 45 exceptis his\[41\] in mg. m.
sec. 46 per tertiam\[42\] perertiam a. corr. cod. 47 utramque
suppleui cum Sirm. 48 neutra\[43\] correci cum Sirm., neutram cod.
53 characterizet\[44\] sic cod. (cf. 18)
For if the same wills and activities which are according to nature, are credited to him through yet another, that is, through a third, as through the duality, similarity of existence must be understood from identity of appearance; and there must be the same, one with two, that is three\(^2\) in each of them, whether natural or substantial. But indeed they do not use the term "natural", but "hypostatic", and on this account they now add to him either three substances, or as many hypostases, and properties of equal number accordingly, namely an uncreated one and a created one, and one that is neither (of the two), that is to say, one that is non-existent. For that is non-existent which shares in neither through nature, in such a way that even in the identity which belongs to the third (property), both his two natures and his natural wills and activities are non-existent, according to them. But if they say that it is not the same (will and operation) in him, but another apart from those from which he is to be believed (to be), through the third (property), they again reduce the same one according to the same (property), to non-existence, as one who exists in the middle between [both] (is) the neutral of these two, that is to say, the substance and capacity uncreated by its own nature, and created; for they want these\(^3\) to be either hypostatic, or composite, or "theandric";\(^4\) or unitary on account of the union.\(^5\) For not only do they introduce, as I have said, this non-existent (property) which characterises him according to none of those from which He is by nature, but they even place him outside the natural relationship which he has with his God and Father. For it is less correct that they hold him to be alienated even from the congenital property which he shares with his inviolate virgin mother, as if, according to the neutral of these, he has either a composite or hypostatic or theandric or unitary will and activity of his own. But in fact, he has from his Father a will and activity which are\(^6\) not composite, without beginning, and substantial and divine, but from his mother he has a will and activity which is by nature created and human.

\(^2\) Something has fallen out of the Latin here.

\(^3\) Literally "this", standing for "substance and capacity".

\(^4\) Latin de vivirem.

\(^5\) Locus maxime perturbatus.

\(^6\) Literally "is"; will and activity are treated grammatically as a single object.
diuinam, matris uero creatam natura et humanam.

Deinde etiam diuisas naturas ex quibus ipse est inferunt, quasi per operationem et non per subsistentiam sibi unitas innotescat, si propter unitatem unam operationem dogmatizent, quod hi qui in diisione corrupti sunt dicunt, affectuosam hanc esse operatione <m> fabulose fingentes. Sic autem et confusioni locum tribuentes, et deiuirilem secundum Seuerum male interpretantur, unam hanc sed non duas secundum unitonem, diuinam natura et uirilem, significare contendentes, et hac Deiuiri quandam naturam, sed non uirum factum Deum sibimet subinducunt, praesertim cum hoc praeuidens etiam uere deiphantor Dionysius, non unam vocauerit hanc, sed no|ua quadam deiuiri nobis cum dixerit operatione conuersatam, ostendens non alteram ab altera disiunctim, sed ambas per alterutras et alterutris connaturaliter adunatas, in eorum ex quibus et in quibus et quae erat certitudinem proferendas et, ut paterner dicamus, cum alterius communione horum utrumque, ita ut mirabiles quidem passiones, compassibilia uero proculubio miracula cognoscantur, per omnimodam coaptationem eorum quae ab eo naturaliter gesta sunt. Dupla enim omnia, et uera omnia, et unita omnia praedicant, in eo qui duplici est natura, ea quae secundum naturam sunt, Dei praecones et patres nostri. Quibus, ut dictum est, suum corrigerere nolentes sermonem, adhuc et senioris Romae propriae consentire sectae coegerunt apocrisiarios, unam super duas, id est tres secum praedicandi in eodem Domino nostro Iesu Christo voluptates et operationes, similem scientiae ligno gustum commissentes, quemadmodum et isti fidem ex bono et malo proferunt affectantibus. Vnde et talibus circumuenientes litteris, ei qui


Furthermore, they even infer that the natures from which he himself is, are divided, as if unity is known through activity and not through hypostasis, if they teach one activity on account of unity, as those profess who are corrupted in division, fabulously imagining this activity to be dispositional. But thus allowing room for confusion, [and] they wrongly interpret "theandric" as Severus does, contending that this signifies one but not two, according to the union, divine by nature and human, and they introduce for themselves by this (definition) some nature of the God-man, but not God made man. (They do so) even though Dionysius, revealer of God, who truly foresaw this, did not speak of "one" but described him\(^7\) as "changed by a certain new theandric activity for us", showing that one was not separate from the other but both were united together according to their natures through each other and in each other, being brought forth for the safeguarding of those from which and in which and which he was. And as we may say, like the Fathers, each of those had "communion with the other", indeed in such a way that marvellous sufferings and compassionate miracles are recognised as beyond doubt, through the complete adaptation of those things which were assumed by him according to nature. For the prophets of God and our Fathers predicate everything which is according to his nature as double and real and united in him who has a double nature. Unwilling to correct their own speech, as I have mentioned, to that of the Fathers, still they have forced even the emissaries of older Rome to consent to their own sect, and to preach with them one as well as two, that is three, wills and activities together in the same Lord Jesus Christ, mixing the taste like the taste of the tree of knowledge, just as these people offer a faith (mixed) of good and evil, to those who seize it. On this account, they send people to go around with such letters, to him who sent (them)\(^8\).

Therefore because the affairs of almost the whole church of God, which has been established as catholic and apostolic, are in great danger on account of these things, we pray on behalf of her and we beseech you, most holy people, that you do not despise her being in danger, but that you help her while she is labouring in the

---

\(^7\) Sc. Christ.

\(^8\) Anastasius has not understood this passage well. It would seem to be a reference to the apocriptaries sent forth from Constantinople with letters from the emperor or patriarch declaring monothelitism to be the orthodox position.
Quia ergo in magno propter haec periculo sunt res pene totius catholicæ et apostolicae Dei ecclesiae constitutaæ, pro ea deprecamur et obsecramus sanctissimos uos, ne hanc despiciatis periclitamentem, sed adiuuetis tempestatibus laborantem, scientes in tempore tribulationis dilectionem quæ in Spiritu sancto est nasci, et si possibile est uos transire citius, quasi alia pro causa, ad senioris Romæ pios et firmos ut petram uiros, qui uidelicet uobiscum tutores nostri sunt semper et propugnatores furentissimi ueritatis, obsecrare hos supplicatoris uocibus et lacrimis pro omnibus Christianis, quatinus mercedem a Domino sortiantur, omnibus similiter et si \textit{met absque nouitate recens inuenta seruantes orthodoxam fidem, et nihil super ea minus plusue suscipientes uel approbantes praeter quae diffinita sunt a sanctis patribus ac synodibus, ut boni studii sui aemulatione, hoc maximum cum Dei auxilio directe prosequentes opus, cum illis siue nunc, siue in die iudicii Dominum habeant debitorum; quem nimimum habuerunt in talibus creditorem, non aliud quid praeter se, sed se ipsum totum, totis uobis atque illis in aeternas delicas et refectionem donantem; quem et nos habere adversus Arrianos, qui continuantur hic, supplicate Deo, beati et nostræ ad Deum deductionis praesuii, cum simus egeni pauperes et indigni serui uestri.}

99 cf. Matth. 16, 18 102 cf. II Joh. 8 108/109 cf. Matth. 10, 32; Luc. 12, 8
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tempests, knowing that love which is in the Holy Spirit grows in the time of tribulation. And if it is possible, (we ask) that you go across <more> swiftly, as if for some other reason, to the pious men of older Rome, who are solid as a rock, who clearly always protect us like you do, and are most fervent fighters for the truth, to beseech them with supplicatory words and tears on behalf of all Christians, in order that they may gain reward from the Lord, preserving for all, as for themselves, the orthodox faith without newly-invented innovation, and taking up nothing more or less beyond those things, nor approving anything beyond that which has been defined by the holy Fathers and synods. So that, by emulation of the excellent zeal of the Fathers and the councils, correctly pursuing this greatest of works with the help of God, they also may have the Lord as their debtor both now and on the day of judgement; who was plainly their creditor in such things, giving nothing other than himself, but rather his whole self, giving all of you, and them, into eternal delight and restoration. And pray to God, blessed ones and forerunners of our approach to God, that we might hold against the Arians⁹ who are united here, since we are needy paupers and your unworthy servants.

---

⁹ The monothelites are also likened to Arians in RM, p. 6. Arian polytheism, a belief in God and the Son as two separate entities, seemed the logical conclusion of the Severan party's position that there was no distinction between acts of Christ as God, and acts of Christ as man, and that there was no natural will in Christ the man (cf. Maximus, Opus. 3, 49B, and 53B, translated in Louth, Maximus, pp. 194-196.)
DISPUTATIO INTER MAXIMUM ET THEODOSIUM
EPISCOPUM CAESARIAE BITHYNIAE

Tomus continens relationem de dogmatibus quae mota sunt inter sanctum Maximum et Theodosium episcopum Caesariae Bithyniae seu consules qui cum eo erant.

Quae mota sunt de immaculata nostra Christianorum fide atque subintroducta contrariorum noutate, inter abbatem Maximum et Theodosium episcopum Caesariae Bithyniae, necessarium duxi manifesta facere omnibus uobis qui in orthodoxia consistitis, ut cum certius de his scire uisi fueritis, glorificentis magis ac magis amatorem hominum Deum qui dat uerbum in aperitio oris timentium se, ne forte more solito ueritatis inimici, huic contraria diffamantes, corda uestra conturbent.

Igitur nono kalendas Septembrias quae nunc transacta est quartae decimae indicationis, exiuit ad eum in exilium in quo positus seruabatur, id est ad castrum Bizyae, praedictus episcopus Theodosius ex persona ut dixit Petri Constantinopolitani praesulis missus, necnon et Paulus ac Theodosius consules ut fissi sunt et ipsi ex persona imperatoris directi, et cum ascendissent ad praedictum monachum Maximum in locum in quo retrusus habebatur, sederunt et praeceperunt etiam et ipsi sedere. Aderat autem cum illis etiam episcopus Bizyae.

Et dicit ad eum Theodosius episcopus: «Quomodo habes abba?»

Et Maximum ad eum: «Sicut praestinuit Deus ante omnia saecula prouisioriam fore circa me dispensationem, sic habeo.» Theodosius: «Ergone praestinuit Deus ante omne saeculum quae circa singulos sunt?»

Maximum: «Si praeeciuit, utique et praestinuit.»

Theodosius: «Quid est hoc ipsum quod asseris praescriuit» et
Volume containing a record of the teachings which were discussed by the holy
Maximus and Theodosius, bishop of Caesarea Bithynia, and the consuls who
were with him.

I have considered it necessary to make known to all of you who stand firm in
orthodoxy the matters which were raised concerning the immaculate faith of
Christians and the innovation introduced by those contrary (to it), between father
Maximus and Theodosius, bishop of Caesarea Bithynia. (I have done this) so that,
when you are more informed about all of this, you may all the more glorify God,
who loves mankind, who puts words into the mouth of those who fear him, so that
enemies of the truth, slandering it in their usual way, do not disturb your hearts.

Therefore, on the ninth day before the Kalends of September\(^2\) of the
fourteenth indiction which has just passed, Bishop Theodosius whom I mentioned set
out, sent under the authority, as he claimed, of Peter the bishop of Constantinople,
to Maximus in the place of exile where he was held, that is, to the fort in Bizya. The
consuls Paul and Theodosius\(^3\) also (went with him), directed by the authority of the
emperor, as they claimed. And when they had gone up to the monk Maximus, whom
I have mentioned, into the place in which he was being held in concealment, they sat
down and ordered him also to sit. And the bishop of Bizya was with them as well.

And Bishop Theodosius said to him: "How are you, father?"

And Maximus (replied) to him: "As God pre-ordained before all ages that there be
a providential dispensation concerning me, that's how I am."
Theodosius: "What then? Did God pre-ordain circumstances which concern
individuals before all time?"

Maximus: "If he had foreknowledge, he certainly also pre-ordained."
Theodosius: "What is this assertion that he had foreknowledge and he pre-ordained?"

---

1 Literally seu "or".

2 I.e. August 24, 656.

3 Consul was an honorific title granted to two men appointed by the emperor each year to fulfil public duties
such as the provision of banquets, distribution of consular diplomas (until 541), and organisation of public games
(ODB, p. 525).
praedestinavit?"
Maximus: "Praescientia est cogitationum et sermonum et operum quae ex nobis sunt, praedestinatio uero eorum est quae ex nobis non accidunt."
Theodosius: "Quae sunt illa quae ex nobis sunt, et quae quae ex nobis non sunt?"
Maximus: "Ut liquido patet, omnia sciens dominus meus probando interrogat seruus suum."
Theodosius: "Per ueritatem Dei, ignorans et discere uolens percontatus sum differentiam eorum quae sunt ex nobis, et quae non sunt ex nobis, et qualiter quaedam sub praescientia Dei, quaedam uero sub praedestinatione consistant."
Maximus: "Ex nobis sunt voluntaria omnia, id est uirtutes et uitiae. Non ex nobis autem sunt illationes accidentium nobis poenalium modorum uel his contrariorum. Neque enim ex nobis est uel nocens languor uel laetificans sanitas, licet operatrices horum causae ex nobis existant; ut pura interm perantia causa est languoris, quemadmodum temperantia causa est sanitis, et regni caelestis causa mandatorum custodia, quemadmodum et ignis aeterni, horum transgressio."
Theodosius: "Ergone propter hoc tribularis in exilio isto quoniam digna quaedam hac tribulatione gessisti?"
Maximus: "Rogo ut Deus hac tribulatione remetiatetur excessus meos quibus ei peccavi in praeuariatione iustificatione uerorum mandatorum suorum."
Theodosius: "Non est etiam probationis causa tribulatio multis illata?"
Maximus: "Probatio sanctorum est, ut scilicet per tribulationes uitae hominum manifestentur affectus eorum qui sunt circa id quod est naturaliter bonum, sibimet insinuantes ignotas

56/57 cf. Rom. 5,3-4
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Maximus: "Foreknowledge pertains to the thoughts and speech and works which are from within us, but predestination pertains to what happens from outside of us."
Theodosius: "What are those matters which are from within us, and those which are not from within us?"
Maximus: "As it seems clearly, my lord who knows everything is interrogating his servant to test him."
Theodosius: "By the truth of God, I asked in ignorance, wishing to learn the difference between those matters which are from within us and those which are not from within us, and how some things are subject to the foreknowledge of God, but others to predestination."
Maximus: "Everything voluntary is from within us, that is to say, the virtues and vices. But circumstances brought upon us, as punishments or rewards, are not from within us. For harmful illness or gladdening health are not from within us, although the operating causes of these do originate from within us; for example, intemperance is the cause of illness in the same way as temperance is the cause of health, and keeping the commandments is the cause of the kingdom of Heaven, in the same way as transgressing them is the cause of eternal fire."
Theodosius: "What then? Is this why you are tried by this exile, because you have done something worthy of this suffering?"
Maximus: "I pray that, by this suffering, the Lord reassess my failings, by which I sinned against him in transgressing his commandments which offer sanctification."
Theodosius: "Isn't suffering borne by many for the sake of testing?"
Maximus: "Testing is proper to the saints, precisely so that through the sufferings of peoples' lives may be shown their dispositions, which concern what is naturally good, thus making known to them virtues which are unknown to everyone, as in the case
omnibus uirtutes suas, ut in Iob et Ioseph, siquidem alter ad manifestationem absconsae fortitudinis temptabatur, alter uero ad declarationem sanctificatoriae pudicitiae probabatur. Et omnis sanctus non sponte tribulatus, ad quasdam huiuscemodi dispensationes tribulatur, ut per infirmitatem qua permititur molestiam pati, superbum et apostatam draconem conculcit, id est diabolum. Patientia enim, probationis opus est in unoquoque sanctorum.»

The<o> dosius: «Per ueritatem Dei, bene dixisti, et confiteor utilitatem, et quaerebam in talibus semper disputare uobiscum. Sed quia pro alio capitulo ego et domini mei futuri patricii profecti sumus et per tot interualla locorum aduenimus, rogamus te quae a nobis proferuntur suscipere et totum orbem laetificare.»

Maximus: «Quae sunt haec domine? Vel quis ego et unde sum ut in his quae pretenduntur mihi consensus meus totum laetificet orbem?»

Theodosius: «Per ueritatem Domini nostri Iesu Christi, quod dico tibi ego et domini mei futuri patricii ex ore domini nostri patriarchae ac pii domini orbis auditiumus.»

Maximus: «Iubete domini mei dicere quae uultis et quae audistis.»

Theodosius: «Rogat imperator et patriarcha per nos cognoscere a te qua pro causa non communices throno Constantinopolitano.»

Maximus: «Habetis super hoc praeceptionem in scriptis a piissimo imperatore uel patriarcha?»

The<o> dosius: «Non debueras domine nobis incredulus esse; licet enim exiguus sim, sed episcopus audior, et isti domini mei pars senatus existunt. Nec uenimus ad temptandum te,

---
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of Job and Joseph; since the former was tested to show his hidden fortitude, but the latter was put to the test to demonstrate the chastity which made him a saint. And every saint who has suffered involuntarily is tested in accordance with such arrangements, so that through the weakness which allows him to suffer hardship, he might trample on the proud and apostate serpent, that is the devil. For endurance in each of the saints is the result of having been put to the test."

Theodosius: "By God’s truth you have spoken well and I confess its usefulness, and I always wanted to dispute with you in such matters. But because I and my lords, the patricians elect,⁴ have come for the sake of another small point, and we have come from such a distance, we ask you to take up our offer, and to make the world happy."

Maximus: "What is your offer, lord? Or who am I and from where, that my consent to what is offered to me may make the whole world happy?"

Theodosius: "Through the truth of our Lord Jesus Christ, what I am telling you, my lords the patricians elect and I heard from the mouth of our lord the patriarch and of the orthodox ruler of the world."

Maximus: "Lords, bid (him) to tell me what you wish and what you heard."

Theodosius: "The emperor and the patriarch ask through us to know from you why you do not enter into communion with the throne of Constantinople."

Maximus: "Do you have an order in writing concerning this from the most orthodox emperor or from the patriarch?"

Theodosius: "You shouldn’t doubt us, lord, for although I am lowly, I am called⁵ the bishop, and these my lords are part of the senate. Nor have we come to test you: far from it!"

---

⁴ I.e. the consuls Paul and Theodosius.

⁵ Latin audior, lit. "I am heard", a literal translation of the Greek idiom ἐπίσκοπος ἀκούω (PG 90, 140B).
absit."
Maximus: «Quoquomodo uenisissetis ad seruum uestrum, ego
absque omni reuerentia dico causam ob quam non communico
throno Constantinopolitano. Verum tamen etsi aliorum esset fas
percontandi qua pro causa, uestrum non esset qui me causam
certius nostis.
Scitis noui|tates quae factae sunt a sexta indictione transacti
circuli inceptas ab Alexandria per nouem Capitula a Cyro qui
nescio quo pacto illic factus est praesul, quae uidelicet firmata
sunt a throno Constantinopolitano, necon et alias
immutationes additionesque ac diminutiones quae factae sunt
in concilio a Sergio, Pyrrho ac Paulo qui ecclesiae Byzantii
praefuerunt; quas uidelicet nouas adinationes esse, omnis
noster orbis agnoscit. Hac pro causa non communico ego
seruus uester ecclesiae Constantinopolitanae. Tollantur
offendicula quae posita sunt a praedictis uiris cum eisdem ipsis
qui posuerunt haec, quemadmodum dixit Deus: Et lapides a
uia proicite, et planam et detriram atque ab omni spinosae
hereseos prauitate liberam uliam Euangelii gradiantur, et tum
inueniens quemadmodum erat incedo et ipse absque omni
hortatu humano. Donec autem super offendiculis positis et his
qui posuerunt ea gloriantur praesules Constantinopolitani,
nullus sermo uel modus est qui mihi persuadeat illis
communicare.»
Theodosius: «Nunquid malum quid confitemur ut separare te
huius rei causam[m] conueniat a communione nostra?»
Maximus: «Quia unam operationem dicentes deilatis et
humanitatis Dei et Salvatoris nostri Jesu Christi, confunditis
tam theologiae quam dispensationis sermonem. Si enim
credere oportet patribus qui asserunt Quorum est operatio

262, 4; Apoll. Laod., c. Diodor. ad Heracl. (CPG 3656), ed.
Lietzmann, Apollinaris von Laodicea und seine Schule, pp. 235-236
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Maximus: "In whatever way you have come to your servant, I tell you without any fear\(^6\) the reason why I do not enter into communion with the throne of Constantinople. However, even if it was right for others to ask (me) the reason, it is not right for you, who know the reason more certainly than I.

You know the innovations which have been made from the sixth indiction of the past cycle,\(^7\) beginning in Alexandria with the nine Chapters of Cyrus\(^8\) who was made - I don't know how - patriarch there. They have of course been ratified by the throne of Constantinople, as well as some changes and additions and deletions which were made in a council\(^9\) by Sergius, Pyrrhus and Paul who presided over the church of Byzantium,\(^10\) (and) which our whole world of course recognises as new inventions. For this reason I, your servant, am not in communion with the church of Constantinople. Let the offending (chapters) proposed by the said men be removed, together with those same men who proposed them, according to God's words: And throw the stones from the path. And let them walk the level and smooth path of the Gospel, free from every evil of thorny heresy, and upon finding that it was so, I myself also (will) advance without any human encouragement. But while the bishops of Constantinople pride themselves on those offending articles which have been proposed, and those who proposed them, there is no word or means to persuade me to enter into communion with them."

Theodosius: "Whatever evil do we confess that makes it appropriate for you to separate yourself for its sake from our communion?"

Maximus: "It is because in saying there is one activity of the divinity and humanity of our God and Saviour Jesus Christ, you confuse the language of theology and of the

---

\(^6\) Latin reverentia; cf. Greek ἄποστολή "reserve" (PG 90, 140C).

\(^7\) I.e. from 647, the year the Typus was issued.

\(^8\) I.e. the Satisfactio between Cyrus and the Theodosian party in Egypt (CPG 7613) dated 3 June 633.

\(^9\) Latin concilium; this is an incorrect translation of the Greek adverb συνοδυνακή, which can also mean "by synodical letters", such as the Letter of Patriarch Sergius to Cyrus of Alexandria (CPG 7605) which contains an analysis and rejection of the Satisfactio (see Winkelmann, no. 40).

\(^10\) The patriarchate of Constantinople was held by Sergius I (610-638), Pyrrhus (638-641), Paul II (641-653) and Pyrrhus (second term) in 654: see Van Dieten, pp. 1-105.
una, horum et substantia una, quaternitatem facitis sanctam
Trinitatem quasi congenita urbo facta carne ipsius, quae
etiam careat cognata identitate quam nobiscum et cum ea quae
se pererit naturaliter habet.

Et rursus perimentes operationes, et unam voluntatem
asseverantes deitatis ipsius et humanitatis, adimitis eius
bonorum distributionem. Si enim nullam habet, secundum illos
qui hoc sanxerunt, operationem, perspicuum est quod licet
uelit miseri non possit, detruncata nimirum eius operatione
bonorum, si dumtaxat operatione naturali excepta, nihil eorum
quae sunt operari uel agere constat.

Alia autem et carmin facitis voluntate quidem concreatrixem
omnium saeculorum et eorum quae sunt in eis, Patri et Filio
ac Spiritui Sancto, natura uero creatam, uel ut uerius dicamus
non habentem initium voluntate, si diuina voluntas sine initio
est utpote quae sit deitatis sine initio existentis, natura uero
recens, quod non solum omnem sensum excedit, sed et
omnem impietatem. Non enim dicitis absolute tantum unam
voluntatem, sed et istam diuinam. Diuinae uero voluntatis
nemo potest initium excogitare temporale uel finem, nam nec
diuinae naturae et cuius est substantialis voluntas.

Rursus autem aliam introducentes nouitatem, adimitis
omnimos omnia significantia et commendantia diuinitatem et
humanitatem Christi, legibus et typis sancientes neque unam
neque duas in eo voluntates aut operationes dicendas, quod rei
est essentiam non habentis; nihil enim eorum quae sunt, si
intellectuale est, priuatim voluntatem habente uirtute ac
operatione; si sensuale, sentiente operatione; si germinabile,
crescente ac alente operatione; si penitus inanimale est, et ea
quae ex more dicitur uita caret, operatione ac
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economy.\textsuperscript{11} For if one ought to believe the Fathers who say: ‘Those who have one activity have also one substance’, you make the holy trinity a quaternity, as if Christ’s flesh were made one being with the Word, and were lacking even the cognate identity which he has with us by nature, and with the woman who bore him.

And again, by destroying the activities, and asserting one will of his divinity and humanity, you take away the blessings he has bestowed (on us). For if he has no activity, according to those who ratified this, it is clear that he cannot be merciful, although he wants to, since the activity of his blessings is surely cut short, if in fact without natural activity, nothing which exists remains to have an activity or to perform.

But in another way,\textsuperscript{12} you also make the flesh, with regard to the will, the actual co-creator with the Father, Son and Holy Spirit, of all ages and of those which are in them; but with regard to the nature, (you render) the flesh created,\textsuperscript{13} or as we may say more truly, not having a beginning in respect to will, if divine will is without beginning, since what is of deity exists without beginning, but (making the flesh) recent with regard to nature. This exceeds not only all sense, but also all impiety. For you do not speak simply of only one will, but also of that will as being divine. But no-one is able to think up a temporal beginning or end of divine will, since there is no (beginning or end) of the divine nature whose will is according to substance.\textsuperscript{14} But again, introducing another innovation, you take away completely everything signifying and preserving the divinity and humanity of Christ, sanctioning with laws and decrees\textsuperscript{15} that neither one nor two wills or activities are to be spoken of in him, which is characteristic of something without essence; for nothing which exists, if it is rational, is deprived of a willing power and activity; if it is sensual, of a sentient

\textsuperscript{11} I.e. \textit{dispensatio} - this is a short-hand translation for the theological term which refers to the Incarnation as a dispensation of divine purpose. The terminology appropriate to describe the Incarnation is here contrasted with that appropriate to the Trinity.

\textsuperscript{12} Latin \textit{alias} cf. Greek \textit{άλλος} και δὲ, "let us put it another way" (PG 90, 141B).

\textsuperscript{13} Latin \textit{creatum} cf. Greek \textit{κτισθην} "creator" (PG 90, 141B).

\textsuperscript{14} Latin \textit{substantialis} cf. Greek \textit{όνομάθης} "proper" (PG 90, 141C).

\textsuperscript{15} Latin \textit{typi} for Greek \textit{τόποι} (PG 90, 141C), such as the \textit{Typus} of Emperor Constans II of 647/648 (CPG 7621).
o <p>portunitate, et indicat omnia quae sic sunt opitulatiua sensibus sensualium; operatio enim talium est subici utique uisui per apparitionem suam, auditui per sonum, odoratui per odorationem quandam amplexibilem, gustui per quosdam humores, et tactui per reciprocam impressionem; sicut enim operationem uisus dicitum «uidere», ita et uisorum «uideri», et cetera omnia secundum eundem aspicimus fieri modum. Si igitur nihil eorum quae sunt est omni penitus <naturali> operatione destitutum, Dominusque noster et Deus (propitius esto Domine) nullam habet naturalem voluntatem uel operationem in utrisque ex quibus et in quibus et quae est, quomodo poterimus aut esse aut uocari Dei cultores, secundum nullum modum existere cum voluntate uel operatione dicentes qui adoratur a nobis Deum? Expresse nanque a sanctis patribus edocemur cum dicunt: Quod enim nullam uirtutem habet, neque est neque aliquid est, neque est quaeuis eius omnino positio.»

The <o> dosius: «Quod factum est per dispensacionem, ne accipias ut ratum dogma.»

Maximus: «Si non est ratum eorum dogma qui hunc recipiunt Typus qui sancit et lex nullam dicendam Domini voluntatem uel operationem, quorum detruncatio inexistentialiam indicat eius qui fuerit his priuatus, qua pro causa barbaricis et sine Deo gentibus me absque honore tradidistis? Qua pro causa damnatus sum ad habitandum Biz<y>en, et conservorum meorum alter quidem Perberin, alter uero Mesembriam?»

Theodosius: «Per Deum qui me iudicaturus est, et quando factus est dixi, et nunc idipsum dico, quia male et ad laesionem multorum factus est Typus. Verum occasio facta est ut exponeretur, alterna lis orthodoxorum super operationibus


151 opportunitate cod. 152 enim cod. a. corr. m. sec. 153 apparitionem cod. 158 naturali] suppleui e gr. 168 Theodosius cod. 173 fuerat cod. a. corr. m. sec. 175 Bizyen] restitui ex 15, 22, 593, 595, bizen cod. 177 Theodosius a. corr. cod. 180 horthodoxorum cod. a. corr. m. tert.
activity; if it is able to grow, of a growing and increasing activity; even if it is completely inanimate, and lacks what is called "life", it is not deprived of activity and propensity. And they point to all aids to the senses of sensual beings as being thus, for the activity of such aids is to be subordinated; for example, to sight through its apparition; to hearing through sound; to smell through some perceptible odour; to taste through certain liquids; and to touch through reciprocal impression. For just as we call the activity of sight "to see", so also (we call the activity) of images "to be seen", and we perceive that everything else happens according to the same mode. Therefore if nothing which exists is completely devoid of all [natural] activity, and our Lord and God - be propitious Lord - has no natural will or activity in each (of those natures) from which and in which and which he is, how can we either be or be called worshippers of God, when we say that the God whom we adore exists in no way with a will or an activity? For we are expressly taught by the holy Fathers when they say: 'For what has no power, neither exists, nor is anything, nor has any disposition whatsoever.'

Theodosius: "Do not accept as ratified dogma what was done for the sake of an arrangement."

Maximus: "If the Typus and the law permitting that no will or activity of the Lord should be spoken of, the removal of which entails the non-existence of him who has been deprived of them, is not the ratified dogma of those who accept it, for what reason have you handed me over without honour to barbaric and godless people? For what reason have I been condemned to dwell in Bizya, and one of my fellow-servants in Perberis and the other in Mesembria?"

Theodosius: "By God who is going to judge me, I said when it happened, and now

---

16 The Greek word order gives a different sense: "it is not deprived of a so-called activity and propensity." (PG 90, 141D).

17 The Greek reading is preferable here: διὰ τῆς ἀντανακλασίας "through resistance of a surface" (PG 90, 141D); cf. Latin per reciprocum impressionem.

18 Literally in Latin and Greek "through the dispensation" (PG 90, 144A).

19 Sc. will or activity.

20 Modern Nesebar in Bulgaria. Anastasius had been transferred from Trebizond to Mesembria by the time the dispute between Maximus and Theodosius of Caesarea Bithynia took place in August 656.
et voluntatibus altercantium; et ut omnes pacem mutua fruerentur, considerauerunt quidam huiusmodi uoces silentio comprimendas."

Maximus: «Et quis fidelis suscipit dispensationem taceri facientem uoces quas dici per apostolos et prophetas atque doctores Deus omnium dispensavit? Et inspiciamus domine magne, in quod malum deueniat tractatum capitulum istud. Si enim Deus posuit in ecclesia, primo apostolos, secundo prophetas, terto doctores ad perfectionem sanctorum dicens in Evangelio apostolis et per eos his qui post ipsos sunt: Quod uobis dico, omnibus dico, et iterum: Qui recipit uos, me recipit. Et qui uos spernit, me spernit, manifestum est ac perspicuum quod qui non recipit apostolos et prophetas et doctores, sed spernit uoces eorum, ipsum Christum spernit.

Inispiciamus autem et aliu. Deus eligens excitauit apostolos et prophetas atque doctores ad perfectionem sanctorum. At uero diabolus falsos apostolos et falsos prophetas, et falsos doctores contra pietatem eligens excitauit, quo et utus lex impugnetur et evanglica. Falsos autem apostolos et falsos prophetas et falsos doctores solos hereticos intelligo, quorum sermones et cogitationes peruersae consistunt. Sicut ergo is qui ueros apostolos et prophetas et doctores recipit, Deum recipit, ita et qui falsos apostolos et falsos prophetas et falsos doctores recipit, diabolum recipit. Igitur qui pariter cum scelatis et immundis hereticis sanctos eiecit (suscipite me dicentem veritatem) Deum liquido cum diabolo pariter condemnavit.

Itaque si examinantes nouitatis quae temporibus nostris effectae sunt, eas ad hoc deuenisse inuenierimus summum malum, uidete ne forte pacem praetendentes, apostasia
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again I say the same, that the Typus was evilly contrived, and to the detriment of many. But the need arose to publish it — that is to say, the alteration of the orthodox over activities and wills —, and certain people perceived that such words should be suppressed by silence, so that all may enjoy mutual peace."

Maximus: "And what person of faith takes up an arrangement that silences the words which the God of all arranged to be said through apostles and prophets and teachers? And let us examine, great lord, what evil that point may bring about when it is treated? For if God placed in the church first apostles, second prophets, third teachers, to perfect the saints, saying to the apostles in the Gospel and through them to those who came after them: What I say to you, I say to all, and again, The one who receives you, receives me. And the one who spurns you, spurns me, it is clear and obvious that he who does not receive the apostles and prophets and teachers, but rejects their words, rejects Christ himself.

But let us examine yet another point. God raised by election apostles and prophets and teachers, to perfect the saints. But the devil also raised by election false apostles and false prophets and false teachers against piety, in order that the old law and the Gospel law be attacked. But by false apostles and false prophets and false teachers I understand the heretics alone, whose speech and thoughts are perverted. Therefore, just as he who receives true apostles and prophets and teachers receives God, so also he who receives false apostles and prophets and teachers receives the devil. Therefore, he who has rejected the saints equally with the accursed and impure heretics - accept that I am speaking the truth - has equally condemned God, it is clear, with the devil.

And therefore if, in examining the innovations which have been effected in our times, we find that they have arrived at this utmost evil, beware lest perhaps, under the guise of peace, we are discovered to be listless with apostasy and to preach it, which
repperiamur languere et praedicare, quam praecursuram fore
Antichristi adventum sacratissimus dixit apostolus. Haec
absque subtractione dixi uobis, domini mei, ut parcatis
ubismetipsis et nobis. Iubetis ut haec scripta in libro cordis
mei habens, ingredi et communicem in ecclesia in qua haec
praedicantur, et fiam communicator eorum qui ueraciter
quidem Deum, falsso uero diabolum cum Deo eiciunt? Ne fiat
mihi a Deo qui propter me secundum me factus est, absque
peccato. Et genu flexo dixit: Quicquid iussuritis in seruum
uestrum facere, facite. Ego his qui haec recipiunt nunquam
communicabo.

Et ceu gelidi facti super his quae dicta fuerant, deorsum
capita summii tentes, siluerunt per multam horam; et
annuens atque abbatem Maximum Theodosius intuíitus dixit:
Nos fide dicimus tibi dominum nostrum imperatorem quod te
communicante, tollat Typum.

Maximum: Multum adhuc distamus ab iniucem. Quid
faciemus de confirmata synodice uoce unius uoluntatis in
ejectionem omnis operationis a Sergio, Pyrrho ac Paulo?

Theodosius: Ila charta deposita est et projecta.

Maximum: Deposita est ex lapideis paretibus, non tamen ex
intellectualibus animabus. Suscipiant damnationem horum quae
Rom <a >e synodice prolata est per pia dogmata seu regulas,
et soluitur medius paries, atque hortatione non indigebimus.

Et ait Theodosius episcopus: Non est firmata synodus quae
Rom <a >e celebrata est, quoniam sine iussione facta est
imperatoris.

Maximum: Si synodos quae factae sunt iussiones imperatorum
firmant et non pia fides, recipe synodos quae contra omusion
factae sunt, nam iussione principum sunt
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the most holy apostle said would be a precursor of the advent of the Antichrist. I have said this to you, my lords, without reserve so that you may spare yourselves and us. Do you command that, having this written in the book of my heart, I enter and be in communion with the church in which this is preached, and that I enter into communion with those who truly indeed reject God, but falsely reject the devil along with God? May it not be done to me by God, who on my account, for my sake, was made without sin." And on bended knee he said: "Whatever you order to do to your servant, do. I will never be in communion with those who accept this."

And bowing their heads, they were silent for a long time, as if they had been turned to ice over what had been said. Theodosius, looking and nodding at father Maximus, said: "We tell you in faith that our lord the Emperor would cancel the Typus, if you were in communion."
Maximus: "We are still a long way from a mutual agreement. What will we do about the synodical statement of one will in rejection of any activity, which was agreed upon by Sergius, Pyrrhus and Paul?"22
Theodosius: "That document has been taken down and thrown out."
Maximus: "It has been taken down from the stone walls, not however from rational souls. Let them take up the condemnation of those men23 which was made public at Rome by the synod through righteous teachings and canons, and the barrier is removed, and we will not need encouragement."
And Bishop Theodosius said: "The synod which was held at Rome was not ratified, because it was held without the order of the emperor."
Maximus: "If it is the orders of emperors which confirm synods which were held, and not orthodox faith, accept the synods which were held against the "homoousios"

---

21 Latin subtractione; cf. reverentia previously in translating the same Greek word ὑποστολής (PG 90, 145A).

22 I.e. the Ec thesis (CPG 7607) posted in the narthex of Hagia Sofia and accepted by the decree of the synod in Constantinople in November 638 (see Grumel, no. 292).

23 Or "of those terms" (horum).

24 I.e. the Lateran synod of 649.
patratae, primam uidelicet in Tyro, secundam in Antiochia, tertiam in Seleucia, quartam in Constantinopoli sub Eudoxio Arriano, quintam in Nice quae est in Trace, sextam in Sirmio, et post haec multo post septimam in Epheso secundam cui Dioscorus praefuit. Omnes enim has imperatorum iussio agregauit. Attamen omnes damnatae sunt propter impietatem infidelium dogmatum ab eis confirmatorum. Quare autem non abicitis eam quae deposuit Paulum Samosatenum sub sanctis et beatis Dionysio papa Romano, et Dionysio Alexandrino, atque Gregorio miraculorum patatore qui eidem praefuit synodo quoniam non est iussione facta imperatoris? Qui praeterea canon promulgat solas illas approbandas synodos quae imperatoris iussione sunt congregatae? Verum et si omnino iussione imperatorum synodos aggregetis, illas nouit sanctas et probabiles synodos pius ecclesiae canon, quas rectitudo dogmatum approbuit. Sed et bis, quemadmodum nouit dominus meus et alias docet, fieri synodos in omni provinciâ per singulos annos regula sanctit, iussione imperialis nullam memoriam faciens, ad tuitionem salutaris fidei nostrae, et correctionem omnium capitulorum quae diuinae non conueniunt ecclesiae legi.

Et dixit Theodosius episcopus: «Ita est ut asseris, dogmatum quippe rectitudo synodos roborat. Verum tamen non recipis libellum Mennae in quo unam voluntatem et unam operationem Christi dogmatizavi?»

Maximus: «Ne det Dominus Deus. Vos non recipitis sed eicitis omnes doctores qui post sanctum Chalcedonense concilium decertauerunt aduersum Seueri execrabilem heresim, et ego habeo recipere libellum Mennae, qui post concilium fuit per quem liquido sentire dinoscitur cum Seuero, et Apolinario, et
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for they were carried out by order of the rulers; the first namely in Tyre, 25 the second in Antioch, 26 the third in Seleucia, 27 the fourth in Constantinople under the Arian Eudoxius, 28 the fifth in Nike which is in Thrace, 29 the sixth in Sirmium, 30 and after these, much later, the seventh, being the second in Ephesus, at which Dioscorus presided. 31 For emperors’ orders convened all of these councils. All however were condemned on account of the impiety of the teachings they confirmed which were contrary to the faith. But why don’t you reject the council that deposed Paul of Samosata under the holy and blessed Dionysius, pope of Rome, and Dionysius of Alexandria, and Gregory the Wonder-Worker, who was in charge of the same synod, since it was not held at the emperor’s order? Besides, which canon declares only those synods to be approved which were convened by the emperor’s command? But even if you do in fact convene the synods by the emperor’s order, the upright canon of the church recognises those synods as holy and approvable which the correctness of their teaching approved. But also, as my lord knows and elsewhere

25 In 335 (see M. Simonetti, EEC, p. 855).

26 In 341 (see O. Pasquato, EEC, p. 49).

27 In 359 (see M. Simonetti, EEC, p. 767).

28 This council held in 360, confirmed the Council of Rimini (359) (see M. Simonetti, EEC, p. 195). Eudoxius of Antioch had called a pro-Arian Council in Antioch in 357, which approved the formula of Sirmium (357). He was called in at the Council of Constantinople to replace the homoeousian patriarch of Constantinople, Macedonius.

29 This seems to be the council of 359 (see Mansi, 3, 309-312).

30 This council, held in 357, proscribed the terms "homoousios" and "homoiousios" which had created such division in the church (see M. Simonetti, EEC, p. 783).

31 The so-called "Robber Synod" of 449 (see M. Simonetti, EEC, p. 275).

32 Paul of Samosata, the monarchic bishop of Antioch, was condemned at a number of synods between 264 and 268 for heresy and immorality (M. Simonetti, EEC, p. 663). Dionysius of Alexandria was invited to the first council, but declined on the grounds of ill health, and died soon afterwards, in 264 or 265 (P. Nautin, EEC, p. 238). Gregory the Wonder-Worker took part in the first synod against Paul; when the last one was held, he may have already died (H. Crouzel, EEC, p. 368). According to Eusebius, HE VII, 7, Pope Dionysius (259/260-267/268) never received the letter of the Synod of Antioch in 268 which condemned Paul (B. Studer, EEC, p. 237).

33 Cf. Greek continues from the previous sentence: ἦ δὲ αὐτὸς καλεῖται καυσιλέως πάντως τός συνόδους ἀδροίζεσθαι (PG 90, 148A) "or that, generally speaking, synods are convened at all on the order of an emperor?"
Macedonio, et Arrio, ac omni heresi, et accusat concilium, immo perfecte reicit per ea quae dogmatizavit?

Theodosius: «Quid ergo penitus non recipis unam operationem?»

Maximus: «Et quis dicit unam operationem ex probabilibus magistris ecclesiae?»

Et attulit Theodosius scripta quae falso ab eis ferebantur esse sanctorum Iulii Romani et miraculorum factoris Gregorii atque Athanasii testimonia et legit ea.

Et dixit Maximus: «Timeamus nunc Deum | et ne ulimus irritare illum in hereticorum prolatione testimoniorum. Nullus enim ignorat haec impii esse Apolinarii. Ergo si alia forsas habes, ostende. Nam haec proferentes plus credere cunctis persuadetis quod, secundum ueritatem, impii Apolinarii et nequam cum eo sentientium opinionem renouassetis.»

Et profert idem episcopus Theodosius sub nomine Chrisostomi duo testimonia. Quae agnoscent abba Maximus ait: «Haec Nestorii sunt qui personalem in Christo dualitatem uesane dogmatizavit.»

Et statim fure sce Theodosius dixit: «Domine monache, Satanas locutus est per effrenatum os tuum.»

Maximus: «Ne tristetur dominus meus contra seruam suum,» et mox sumens ostendit ei easdem uoces esse Nestorii, et in quibus sermonibus eius iacerent.

Theodosius: «Deus nouit, frater, haec testimonia patriarcha mihi dedit. Verum ecce alia quidem horum dixisti Apolinarii, alia uero Nestorii.»

Et producto sancti Cyrilli testimonio quod ait, Vnam atque cognatam per utramque demonstrans operationem, dixit: «Quid ad haec dicis?»

---
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teaches, the canon sanctions that synods should be held twice each year in every province, making no mention of imperial command, in order to preserve our saving faith and to correct all points which do not conform to divine ecclesiastical law."

And Bishop Theodosius said: "It is as you assert: indeed the correctness of the teaching confirms synods. However, do you not accept the booklet of Mennas in which he propounds one will and one activity of Christ?"

Maximus: "May the Lord God forbid that. You do not accept, but reject all teachers who struggled against the accursed heresy of Severus after the holy Council of Chalcedon, and I have to accept the booklet of Mennas who lived after the council, through which he is recognised clearly as sympathising with Severus and Apollinaris and Macedonius and Arius and every (other) heresy, and accuses or rather fully rejects, the council, through what he has propounded?"

Theodosius: "What then? Do you completely reject one activity?"

Maximus: "And which of the approved teachers of the church speaks of one activity?"

And Theodosius adduced writings which were falsely said by them to be testimonies of the saints, Julius of Rome, Gregory the Wonder-Worker and Athanasius, and he read them.

And Maximus said: "Let us now fear God and not wish to provoke him in producing the testimonies of heretics. For no-one is ignorant of the fact that these belong to the impious Apollinaris. Therefore if by chance you have others, show them. For by producing these, you persuade the rest to a stronger conviction that you have in truth renewed the unorthodox belief of the impious Apollinaris, and of those agreeing with him."

And the same Bishop Theodosius adduced two testimonies attributed to Chrysostom.

Father Maximus, recognising these, said: "These are from Nestorius who in his madness propounded the duality of persons in Christ."

And immediately Theodosius, boiling with rage, said: "My lord monk, Satan has

---

34 Cf. Greek καὶ διὰ τῶν διδάσκει "and teaches others" (PG 90, 148A). This was first stipulated by Canon 5 at Nicaea in 325, but was frequently repeated. See N. P. Tanner, Decrees of the Ecumenical Councils (London–Washington, 1990), p. 96, n. 1.

35 The Logos dogmatikos attributed to Patriarch Menas written in 552 (see Grumel, no. 243).

36 There is no equivalent of credere in the Greek text (PG 90, 148C).
Maximus: «Sunt quidam ostendentes illud in ueritate per additionem positum in interpretatione Euangeli quae facta est ex hoc sancto patre a Timotheo Helluro. Verum sit secundum uos eius. Scritumur igitur sensum paternarum uocum, et cognoscamus ueritatem.»

305
Theodosius: «Hoc non permitto fieri; simplices enim uoces necessarium habes recipere.»
Maximus: «Dic mihi differentiam, deprecabilis factus, <simplicium> uocum ad uarias.»

310
Theodosius: «Vt sici est recipias uocem, et ne scrutaris sensum ipsius.»
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spoken through your unrestrained mouth."  
Maximus: "May my lord not be upset with his servant," and at once taking them, he showed him that these same words were Nestorius's, and in which of his speeches they occurred.  
Theodosius: "God knows, brother, the patriarch gave me these quotations. But look, you have said that one of them in fact comes from Apollinaris, and the other from Nestorius."

And when the quotation from St Cyril had been produced which says: "Demonstrating a single and cognate activity through each," he said: "What do you say to this?"
Maximus: "There are those who show that this was placed, in fact, as an addition by Timothy Aelurus to that holy father's commentary on the Gospel. But let it be his as you say. Let us then examine the meaning of the father's words, and let us know the truth."
Theodosius: "I shall not allow this to happen, for you ought to accept the plain words."
Maximus: "Tell me, I entreat you, what differentiates (plain) words from those which are complex?"

Theodosius: "That you accept the word as it is, and do not scrutinise its meaning."
And Maximus said: "It is clear that you are introducing new rules foreign to the church even concerning words. If, as you say, it is not fitting to examine words of Scripture and the Fathers, we reject all Scripture, both Old and New (Testaments). For I have heard David say: Blessed are those who examine his testimonies; they seek him with their whole heart, particularly since no-one is able to seek God without examination. And again: Give me understanding and I will examine your law, and I will guard it with my whole heart, as if scrutiny leads to an understanding of the law, and with desire for knowledge persuades the worthy to guard it with their

---

37 Anastasius has elaborated on the basic meaning here of the Greek τοῦ χολικῶν "bridle" (PG 90, 148D), which came by metonymy to mean "that place in the mouth where the horse's bit rests".

38 Sc. Cyril's.

39 Latin tanquam; cf. Greek δὲς "because" (PG 90, 149B).

40 I have followed the Greek punctuation rather than the Latin, which reads: "for an understanding of the law and of knowledge, with longing..." (PG 90, 149B).
dicens? Quid uero Paulus diuinus apostolus dicens: *Si opertum est Evangelium, sed in his qui Pereunt est opertum, in quibus *Deus > saeculi huius excaecavit oculos mentis eorum ut non iucatis eis illuminatio scientia Christi? Vt apparat, similes nos uultis esse Iudaeis, qui simplicibus ut dicitis uocibus, id est sola littera ueluti quadam mole mentem obruentes, euulsi sunt a ueritate, uelamen habentes in cordibus suis, ut non intelligant spiritum qui proprie est et occultatur in littera. Vnde et ait: *Littera quidem occidit, spiritus uero uuiificant.*

Certus efficiatur dominus meus quia ego nullatenus patiar suscipere uocem absque sensu qui reiacet in ipsa, ne fiam manifestus Iudaeus.*

At uero Theodosius hoc audito ait: *Vnam operationem Christi subsistentialem debemus dicere.*

Maximus: *Inspiciamus malum quod ex hoc gignetur, et fugiamus externam hanc uocem; hereticorum enim est tantum qui deorum multitudinem colunt. Si enim subsistentialem Christi dixerimus unam operationem, cum non aptetur aliquid secundum subsistentiam Patri et Spiritui Filio, haud dubium quin nec secundum subsistentialem operationem, cogemur quemadmodum Filio, ita et Patri et Spiritui subsistentiales operationes tribuere, et secundum uos quattuor operationes habebit beata diuinitas, tres segregatius personarum in quibus est, et unam communem significatiam societatis quae est secundum naturam trium subsistentiarum, et secundum patres, si dumtaxat eorum doctrinam recipimus, quadripertita erimus deitate languentes. Naturalem quippe non subsistentialem omnem esse decernunt operationem. Et si hoc uerum est sicut reuera est, quattuor naturas, et quattuor natura deos, differentes ab inuicem subsistentia et natura, dicere*

---
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heart, by fulfilling the holy commandments which are contained in it. And again: *Marvellous are your decrees; therefore my soul has examined them.* But why did the saying from Proverbs want us to examine *parables* and *mysteries* and obscure sayings? Or why did the Lord, speaking in parables, wish his disciples to understand, when he taught them the meaning of the parables? Why did he even command: *Examine the Scriptures*, on the grounds that they revealed testimony of him? And what did Peter, the chief of the apostles, wish to teach, when he said: *The prophets made search and inquiry concerning this salvation?* What indeed of Paul the holy apostle who said: *But if the Gospel message is hidden, it is hidden in the case of those who perish, in whom [the God] of this age blinded the eyes of their minds so that the illumination of the knowledge of Christ would not shine on them?* As it appears, you wish us to be similar to the Jews, who, with plain words as you call them, that is with the letter alone blocking their minds like some obstruction, have been shut out from the truth, having a veil over their hearts, so that they cannot understand the spirit which belongs, and is hidden, in the letter. So he also said: *The letter indeed kills, but the spirit gives life.* My lord may rest assured that to no degree do I allow a word to be accepted divorced from the meaning which lies behind it, lest I become an obvious Jew."

But when he heard this, Theodosius said: "We ought to speak of one hypostatic activity of Christ."

Maximus: "Let us examine the evil which stems from this, and let us avoid this strange expression, for it is the sole property of heretics who worship many gods. For if we have spoken of one hypostatic activity of Christ, although the Son is not ever similar to the Father and the Spirit in respect of hypostasis, there is no doubt that (the Son is not similar) in respect to hypostatic activity. We will be forced to attribute hypostatic activities in the same way to the Son as to the Father and the Spirit. And according to you, the blessed godhead will have four activities, (that is) three distinguishing ones of the persons in which it is, and one common one signifying the group which is of three hypostases according to nature; and according to the Fathers, if indeed we accept their teaching, we will suffer from the sickness

---

41 I have transposed "But" which precedes "it is hidden" in the Latin.

Theodosius: «Quid ergo? Non oportet omnimodis in Christo dicere unam operationem?»

Maximus: «Secundum sanctam Scripturam sanctosque patres nil tale dicitum suscepiuis, sed quemadmodum duas naturas Christum ex quibus et est, ita et naturales eius voluntates et operationes conuenientes sibi cum sit natura Deus, idem ipse simul et homo, credere iussi sumus et confiteri.»

Theodosius: «Vere, domine, et nos confitemur et naturas et

of a fourfold God. For in fact they declare every activity to be natural, not hypostatic. And if this is true, as indeed it is, we will appear to speak of four natures, and four gods by nature, different in hypostasis and in nature from each other. However, who has spoken of or contemplated a separately-held activity of any of those things which are grouped in a certain category, and arranged by nature under a common definition of kind? For it never happens that what is common in nature is proper to any one sole individual. For hypostatic hall-marks such as the length or shortness of the nose, or brightness of the eyes, or baldness, and any such characteristics which are defining, are incidentals which are different from each other in number. For every person in so far as that person is something by nature, but not in so far as he is someone by hypostasis, is recognised to have an activity, according to the rationale of his category, which is both individually and communally understood and spoken of as well; as, for example, a rational and mortal animal, which is characteristic of the generic rationale in us. For we all receive the same life, and the same capacity for reason, and the same ebb and flow and (capacity) to sit and to stand and to speak and to be silent and to see and to hear and to touch, which are characteristic of the rationale commonly understood in us. And thus it is not fitting to invent words which do not have the force either of holy Scripture or of the Fathers or of natural (reason), but (are) foreign and invented by human wiles. However, show me this posited in any of the Fathers, and again we will examine the meaning of the one who said this."

Theodosius: "What then? Is it not fitting to speak in any way of one activity in Christ?"

Maximus: "According to holy Scripture and the holy Fathers we have undertaken to say no such thing, but in the same way as two natures (of) Christ, from which he <also> is, so also we have been ordered to believe and confess his natural wills and activities, which are appropriate to him, since the very same one is by nature

---

42 Source unknown; possibly Cyril or Sophronius.

43 I have translated Latin ratio (Greek λόγος) as "rationale" here. The word has a range of meanings, and sometimes may be better translated by "reason" or "rational principle".

44 There is no equivalent to "also" in the Greek.
operationes diuersas, id est diuinam et humanam, atque ipsius
cum voluntate deitatem, sed et cum voluntate humanitatem,
quoniam sine voluntate nullatenus erat anima eius; duas autem
non dicimus, ne hunc sibimet pugnam inferentem
introducamus."
Maximus: "Ergone duas naturas dicentes, repugnantes eas
infertis propter numerum?"
Theodosius: "Non."
Maximus: "Ergone naturis designatus numerus non diuidit, sed
cum in voluntatibus et operationibus dicitur, diuisionis habet
uirtutem?"
Theodosius: "Vtique in his diuisionem habet, et patres
numerus in voluntatibus et operationibus non dixere,
fugientes diuisionem, sed alteram et alteram, atque diuinam et
humanam, duplam, duplicem, et uti dixerunt dico, et ut fassi
sunt fataeor."
Maximus: "Propter Dominum, si quisquam tibi dixerit alteram
et alteram, quot intelligis? <Vel diuinam et humanam, quot
intelligis?> Vel «duplam» aut «duplicem», quot intelligis?"
Theodosius: "Noui qualityer intelligam, duas autem non dico."
Tunc conversus abba Maximus ad principes dixit: "Propter
Dominum, si audieritis unam et unam, et aliam ac aliam, aut
bis duas, aut bis quinque, quid intelligentes his qui hoc
dicerent respondetis?"
Et dixerunt: "Quoniam adiurasti nos, unam et unam, duas
intelligimus, et alteram et alteram duas intelligimus, et bis
duas, quattuor intelligimus. Similiter et bis quinque decem."
Et quodammodo reueritus Theodosius respsionem eorum ait:
"Quod non est a patribus dictum | non dico."
Et accepto protinus abba Maximus libro gestorum sanctae ac
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God, and also human at the same time."45

Theodosius: "Truly, lord, we also confess both different natures and different activities, that is, the divine and human, and that his divinity has a will but the humanity also has a will, since his soul was by no means without a will; but we do not speak of two, lest we should introduce him as being at war with himself."

Maximus: "What then? When you speak of two natures, do you introduce them as opposed on account of their number?"

Theodosius: "No."

Maximus: "What then? Is it the case that the number assigned to the natures does not divide them, but when it is spoken of with regard to wills and activities, it has the force of a division?"

Theodosius: "Indeed it maintains division in these cases, and the Fathers did not speak of a number in the case of wills and activities, because they avoided division, but they spoke of one and another one, and the divine and the human, double (and) twofold, and as they spoke, I speak, and as they confessed, I confess."

Maximus: "By the Lord, if anyone said to you one and another one, how many do you understand? [Or a divine and a human (will and activity), how many do you understand?] Or double or twofold, how many do you understand?"

Theodosius: "I know how many I would understand, but I do not say that it is two."

Then father Maximus turned to the rulers and said: "By the Lord, if you heard one and one, or one and the other, or twice two, or twice five, from your understanding what would you answer those who said this?"

And they said: "Since you adjure us, we understand by one and one, two, and we understand by one and another one, two, and we understand by twice two, four. Similarly also by twice five, ten."

And Theodosius, made rather afraid by their answer, said: "What is not said by the Fathers, I do not say."

And at once, taking a book of the proceedings of the holy and apostolic Roman

---

45 This paragraph is very similar to a passage from the Testimonia which is repeated twice in the Syllogisms, and provides support for seeing the hands of Maximus and Anastasius the Apocrisiarius in the authorship of both works.
apostolicae synodi Romanae, monstruit sanctos patres duas
voluntates et operationes saluatoris nostri et Dei Iesu Christi
aperte dicentes, quem acceptum ab eo Theodosius consul legit,
sed et omnia sanctorum testimonia patrum.

425 Tuncque respondens Theodosius episcopus dixit: «Deus scit,
nisi quia personaliter anathemata posuit synodus haec, plus
quam omnis homo recepissem illam. Sed ne moras hic
faciamus, quicquid dixerunt patres, dico, et in scriptis
continuo facio duos naturas, et duas voluntates, et duas
operationes, et ingredere, nobiscum communica, et fiat
unitas.»

Maximus: «Domine, non audeo ego suscipere consensum a
ubis in scriptis super huiuscemodi re cum sim monachus
purus, sed postquam Deus ad compunctionem uos excitauit

435 <***> in scriptis transmittite, id est imperator et patriarcha
synodusque ipsorum. Ego enim nec his peractis communico
dum recitantur anathematizati inter sanctam oblationem; timeo
enim commendationem anathematis.»

Theodosius: «Deus nouit, non reprehendo te quia times, nec
alius quisquam; sed da nobis consilium propter Dominum, si
est hoc possibile fieri.»

Maximus: «Quod consilium habeo super hoc dare uobis? Ite,
perscrutamini si tale quid aliquando factum sit et post mortem
solutus sit quispiam a crimine quod in fidei causa contraxit,
atque ab illata contra se qu[a]erela seu damnatione, et
consentiant imperator ac patriarcha imitari Dei
condescensionem faciatque imperator quidem iussionem
rogatoriam, patriarcha uero synodicae deprecationem ad
papam Romanum, et profecto si repertos fuerit mos
ecclesiasticus hoc praecipiens ob rectam confessionem,


434/435 post exciuit occiderunt plura siue in exemplari, siue in
textu Anastasii (side gr.) 445 quaerela cod. e. corr. m. sec.

Scholia 421 synodi] id est Martini papae
447 iussionem] epistolam imperatoris adolatorio iussionem dicunt
father Maximus demonstrated that the holy Fathers openly spoke of two wills and activities of our Saviour and God Jesus Christ. The consul Theodosius accepted the book from him, but also all the testimonies of the holy Fathers, and read them.47

And then in answer Bishop Theodosius said: "God knows that if this synod had not placed (them) personally under anathema, I would have accepted it more (willingly) than anyone else. But lest we delay here, whatever the Fathers said, I say, and I declare directly in writing two natures and two wills and two activities. And come, enter into communion with us and let there be unity."

Maximus: "Lord, I do not dare to accept an agreement from you in writing over an issue of this kind, since I am a mere monk, but after48 God has stirred you to compunction [to accept the words of the holy Fathers, as the canon demanded, you must write to the pope of Rome concerning this]: you, that is, the emperor and the patriarch and their synod. For I will not communicate even when these actions have been taken, while the men under anathema are mentioned in the holy anaphora,49 for I am afraid of being condemned and anathematised."

Theodosius: "God knows that I do not blame you for fearing that, nor does anyone else; but advise us, before God, if this can be done."

Maximus: "What advice do I have to give to you on this? Go and find out if such a thing has ever happened, and anyone was absolved after death from a crime which he committed involving the faith, and from the charge or sentence brought against him. And let the emperor and patriarch imitate the forgiveness of God and let the emperor indeed make an invocatory command,50 but let the patriarch make an entreaty by synodical letter to the pope of Rome. And certainly, if an ecclesiastical

---


47 Cf. PG 90, 153B: Ἰν λοιπον βιβλιον των πεπραγμένων ἐξ αὐτοῦ Θεοδόσιος ὁ ὑπάτος, ἀνέγυς καὶ αὐτὸς πάσος τῶν χρησίων τῶν Πατέρων: "The consul Theodosius, taking from him the book of the proceedings, also read all the testimonies of the holy Fathers."

48 Cf. Greek ἀλλ' ἔτιν "but if" (PG 90, 153C); some manuscripts have ἀλλ' ἔτιν "but since".

49 On the reading of the diptychs after the offering at the eucharistic table, see F. E. Brightman, Liturgies Eastern and Western (Oxford, 1896), p. 538 n. 13.

50 Latin iussionem rogatoriam: a terminus technicus.
conueniet uobiscum procul dubio super hoc."

Theodosius: «Hoc profecto fit. Sed da mihi uerbum quod si
me miserint uenias mecum.»

Maximus: «Domine expedit tibi conseruum meum qui est
Mesembri <a> e accipere tecum magis quam me. Ipsa enim
et linguam nouit, et uerebuntur eum dignius eo quod per tot
annis cruciatus fuerit propter Deum et rectam fidem quae
tenetur in sede ipsorum.»

Theodosius: «Iuriae diverso habuimus ad inuicem modo, et
ideo non gratanter accipio pergere cum illo.»

Maximus: «Domine, iam quia uisum est hoc fieri, exitus fiat
eorum quae putata sunt, et sequor uos quocunque iussitis.»
Et in his surrexerunt omnes cum gaudio et lacrimis, positisque
in terra genibus oratio facta est, et unusquisque ipsorum sancta
Euangelia preciosamque crucem, et imaginem Dei ac
saluatoris nostri Iesu Christi atque dominae nostrae quae illum
peperit sanctissimae Dei genetricis, salutauerunt, | ponentes
nihilominus manus suas ad certificationem eorum quae dicta
sunt.

470

Deindeque cum pusillum confabulati fuissent ad inuicem de
uita quae secundum Deum agitur et diuiniorum observantia
mandatorum, conuersus Theodosius episcopus ad abbatem
Maximum dixit: «En omnia soluta sunt scandala, et facta est
pax per Deum et iet, sed propter Dominum ne c[a]eles me:
non dicis per quemcunque modum unam voluntatem et
operationem in Christo?»

Maximus: «Non mihi possibile est hoc aliquando dicere. Et
dico causam: quoniam extranea uox est sanctis patribus,
duarum duierasarum naturarum unam dicere voluntatem et
operationem. Deinde uero et per omnem modum qui dicit hoc,

III, 131.
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precedent is found instructing this because of a confession of orthodoxy, he will be
reconciled with you over this matter without a doubt."
Theodosius: "Indeed, consider it done. But give me your word that if they send me,
you will come with me."
Maximus: "My lord, it is more expedient for you to take with you my fellow servant
who is in Mesembria than to take me. For he himself also knows the language, and
they will respect him more worthily\textsuperscript{51} for the fact that he was tortured for so many
years on account of God and the orthodox faith which is upheld in their see."
Theodosius: "We had various quarrels\textsuperscript{52} with each other, and for that reason I do
not welcome the idea of going with him."
Maximus: "My lord, because it has now seemed right that this should be done, let
there be an end to the previous imputations, and I (will) follow you wherever you
command."

And at these words everyone arose with tears of joy, and knelt down on the
ground\textsuperscript{53} and prayed, and each of them kissed the holy Gospels and the precious
cross, and the image of God and our Saviour Jesus Christ, and of Our Lady, the most
holy mother of God who bore him, signing with their own hands, no less, as
certification of the proceedings.

And then, when they had discussed with each other for a little while the life
which is led in God and the observance of the divine commandments, Bishop
Theodosius turned to father Maximus and said: "Look, all scandals are resolved, and
peace has been made through God and it will be made, but in the Lord’s name, do
not conceal from me: don’t you say in any way at all that there is one will and
activity in Christ?"
Maximus: "It is not possible for me ever to say this. And I shall tell you the reason:
since it is a saying foreign to the holy Fathers to speak of one will and activity of two
different natures. But furthermore, he who says this will find in every way that

\textsuperscript{51} Cf. Greek δικαστε» "as he deserves" (PG 90, 156A).

\textsuperscript{52} Latin diverso modo, literally meaning "variously".

\textsuperscript{53} The equivalent for "on the ground" is absent from the Greek (PG 90, 156A).
inueniet iure occurrentem sibi prauitatem: primo, quoniam si dixero naturalem, timeo commixtionem; secundo, quia si dixero subsistentalem, divido a Patre ac Spiritu Sancto Filium, et tres uoluntates inducere apparebo mutuo sibimet <non> congregentes, quemadmodum et subsistentias; tertio, quoniam si dixero uelut unius unam uoluntatem et operationem, coger et uelut unius Patris, et uelut unius Spiritus dicere, licet nolim, uoluntatem et operationem, et inueniatur sermo in multitudinem deorum cecidisse; quarto, si dixero affectualém, Nestorii infero personalem divisionem; quinto, si dixero praeter naturam, corrumpo existentiam uoluntatis; corruptio quippe est naturae, id quod praeter naturam est, quemadmodum patres dixerunt."

Theodosius: «Vnam propter unionem salvatoris nostri uoluntatem per omnia et omnino dicere debemus, sicut et Sergius et Pyrrhus bene ut reor intelligentes scripserunt.»

Maximus: «Si iubes domine, suscipe duo super hoc uerba mea: primo, quia si propter unionem una Dei et salvatoris nostri, sicut Sergius, Pyrrhus et Paulus scripserunt, uoluntas effecta est, alterius uoluntatis secundum illos erit Filius Patri propter naturam sed non propter unionem, secundum Filium habenti uoluntatem, si non id ipsum est unitio et natura; secundo, quia si propter unionem una secundum ipsos salvatoris nostri uoluntas effecta est, causam profecto suam, unionem habebit, et non aliam eorum naturam ex quibus existit, et effectus, non naturae, secundum ipsos erit aperte uoluntas; naturam enim non affectum ueritatis ratio non[u]it; tertio, si propter unionem, ut fassi sunt, una salvatoris nostri uoluntas effecta est, qua uoluntate aiunt ipsum fuisse unionem effectam? Non enim ea quae per illam effecta est

distortion\textsuperscript{54} [meets him head on],\textsuperscript{55} first because if I call (the will and activity) natural, I am afraid of confusing them. Second, because if I call (them) hypostatic, I divide the Son from the Father and the Holy Spirit, and I will appear to introduce three wills [in]congruent to each other, and similarly three hypostases. Third, because if I speak of one will and activity as of one (being), I am forced, although I do not wish it, to speak of the will and activity as of one Father and of one Spirit, and the expression will be found to have sunk into a multitude of gods. Fourth, if I say it is dispositional, I infer Nestorius’ division of persons. Fifth, if I say it is beyond nature, I corrupt the existence of the will; for what is beyond nature is a corruption to the nature, as the Fathers said.\textsuperscript{56}

Theodosius: "By reason of the union, we ought to speak of one will of our Saviour, through everything and altogether, as both Sergius and Pyrrhus, in my opinion, wrote with correct understanding."

Maximus: "If you command it, my lord, let me say a couple of words on this point. First, if, because of the union, one will of God and our Saviour was effected, as Sergius, Pyrrhus and Paul wrote, the Son will have a different will, according to them, from the Father,\textsuperscript{57} who has a will in conformity with the Son’s, through nature but not because of the union, if union and nature are not the same thing. Second, if, through the union, one will of our Saviour was effected, according to them, indeed it will have as its cause the union and not either of the natures out of which he exists, and according to them the will clearly will be dispositional, not natural; for the rationale of truth understood [the union] as being natural, but not dispositional.\textsuperscript{58} Third, if what they said is true, that one will of our Saviour was

\textsuperscript{54} Greek reads τὴν ἄρεισκαν "absurdity" (PG 90, 156C).

\textsuperscript{55} Cf. Latin iure occurentem "meeting (him) rightly".

\textsuperscript{56} This resembles certain formulations of the Cappadocians, but none provided a close match to Maximus’ citation. The closest we found was Gregory of Nyssa, \textit{Antirheticus adversus Apollinarium}, vol. 3, 1, ed. F. Mueller (Leiden, 1958), p. 207, 8-9. However, it does closely resemble \textit{Syll}. 399/400.

\textsuperscript{57} On this subject, with reference to the Agony in the Garden, see Maximus, \textit{Opus}. 7, PG 91, 81C-84A, and \textit{Opus}. 3, PG 91, 48A-C, where Maximus cites Gregory of Nazienzen’s \textit{Sermon} 30.12.

\textsuperscript{58} This is the opposite of the Greek (in all but one manuscript) which reads: σχῆσιν γὰρ, ἀλλ’ ἐν φοσσὸν ὁ τῆς ἀληθείας τὴν ἔνωσιν ἐκποτώκος λόγος "as being dispositional, but not natural." (PG 90, 157A).
fatebuntur utique, si dumtaxat uesti operam dederint et quod
est irrationali fugerint. Quarto, si propter unionem una
saluatoris uesti effecta est, liquet profecto quod ante
unionem aut cum multis voluntatibus fuerit, aut penitus
abseque vultate. Et si quidem multarum erat vultatum,
diminutionem multarum pertulit ad unam nimirum vultatatem
contractus, et convertibilitatis perspicue passionem suscepit,
multarum quae sibi naturaliter inerant vultatum
diminutionem. At uero si modis omnibus erat absque
vultate, meliorem natura esse monstrauit unionem, ex qua
acquisuuit vultatem qua natura carebat; et iterum
convertibilis palam profecto fecit, quod natura sibi non inerat,
sed acquisuuit affectu. Quinto, si propter unionem una
saluatoris nostri secundum utraque ex quibus est vultatas
effecta est, recens factus est vultate Deus, idem ipse propter
unionem natura permanens sempiternus, et vultate homo
sine principio, permanens natura recens, quod est impossibile,
ne dixerim impium. Sexto, si propter unionem una naturarum
vultatases effecta est, non est quipiam propter eandem causam
una naturarum effectum natura.»

Et reciso inter haec Theodosius episcopus sermonis super his
habiti impetu dixit: «Quid igitur sit propter unionem, si nihil
horum factum est propter eam?»

Maximus: «Incarnatum sine mendacio factum eum qui sine
carne fuerat demonstrauit, ipsumque natura Deum et omnium
conditorem, natura factum hominem euidenter ostendit, non
conuersione naturae aut diminutione cuiusquam eorum quae
naturae sunt, sed uera suceptione, intellectualiter animata
carne, id est indimincta humanitate, ab omni progenitorio
secundum naturam crimine munda, et quod est secundum

---

515 uolunte cor. m. sec. 518 inerant cor. a. corr. m. sec. 520 unionem cor. a. corr. m. sec.
521/523 translatio Anastasii non est optima 523 unionem an
corrigendum unionem? cf. 498, 503, 510, 514, 520, 526, 529
528/530 Anas. non bene intellexit 529 quipiam] Anas. intellexit
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effected through the union, by which will do they say the union itself was effected? For they will certainly not say (that it was effected) by that will which was effected through the union, if they pay attention to the truth, of course, and avoid what is irrational. Fourth, if, because of the union, one will of the Saviour was effected, it is perfectly clear that before union he either had many wills or was absolutely without will. And if indeed he had many wills, he sustained the diminution of many wills, contracted, to be sure, into a single will, and he clearly undertook the experience of change, (namely) the diminution of the many wills which were in him by nature. But if he was altogether without will, he revealed that the union was stronger than the nature, through which union he acquired a will which the nature lacked; and again, he plainly demonstrated in fact that he was changeable, acquiring by disposition what was not inherent in him by nature. Fifth, if through the union one will of our Saviour was effected, according to both of those out of which he exists, he, God, was made new in will, the same being remaining eternal in nature because of the union, and (he was made) man without a beginning in regard to will, remaining new in nature; which is impossible, not to mention impious. Sixth, if through the union one will was effected in the natures, [why was one nature of the natures not effected by the same cause?]"\(^{59}\)

And with the strength of his arguments on these points depleted amidst this debate, Bishop Theodosius said: "Therefore, what was (achieved) on account of the union, if none of these achievements happened through it?"

Maximus: "It demonstrated that the one who had been without flesh was made incarnate without deception, and clearly showed that he was God by nature and creator of all, made man by nature, not by a change of nature or diminution of anything belonging (to him) by nature, but by true assumption of the rationally ensouled flesh, that is with undiminished humanity, pure from any original sin\(^{60}\)

\(^{59}\) I have followed the Greek rather than the Latin which is corrupt and reads: "not a single thing was effected by one nature of the natures for the same cause" (PG 90, 157B-C).

\(^{60}\) Latin progenitorio...crimine: literally "ancestral sin".
liberationis rationem mirabile reuera et cunctis ingenti stupore habendum, totum in hominibus Deum, eundem integrum manentem intra sua, totum in diuinis hominem, eundem ipsum integre manentem a proprisi non decidentem. Receptio enim in inuicem naturarum, et naturalium quae sibi insunt, iuxta deiloquorum patrum nostrorum doctrinam, et non translatio uel casus propter unionem effecta est, <quod proprium est> eorum qui confusionem maligne faciunt unalitatem, et ideo innovationibus multimode confusionem inducent, et propter defecionem constiantiae rationis suae persequeuntur pios.»

Quibus auditis Theodosius episcopus uisus est cum reliquis qui secum uenerant quod dictum fuerat suscepsisse. Et iterum idem episcopus ad abbatem Maximum: «Fac,» inquit, «karitatem, quid est quod dixisti nobis, quia nullus ut quis subsistentiam, sed ut quid naturam operatur? Asstat enim mihi non intelligenti quod dictum est.»

Maximum: «Nullus ut quis subsistentiam operatur, sed ut quid naturam, utputa, Petrus | et Paulus operantur, sed non Petrice et Paulice sed humane, ambo quippe homines naturaliter iuxta communione et diffinitiam naturae rationem, sed non subsistentialiter secundum id quod proprie facit. Similiter Michaeli uel Gabrihel operantur, uerum non Michaelicel uel Gabrihelice sed angelice, ambo quippe angeli. Et ita in omni natura multa numero praedicante communem sed non annihilatam operationem aspicimus. Ergo qui dicit subsistentialem operationem, ipsam naturam cum una sit infinitam operationibus inducit effectam, secundum multitudinem atomorum quae sub ipsam rediguntur a semet differentem; quod si admiserimus bene se habere, in ipsa omni

547/548 quod - est] suppleui e gr. 562 id quod proprie facit]

Anastasiaus non bene intellexit
according to nature, and what is truly marvellous, and to be regarded in great amazement by all, by reason of the mutual interchange, wholly God in his human (properties), remaining entirely the same within his own (properties), wholly man in his divine (properties), remaining entirely (the same), not lapsing from his own properties. For according to the teaching of our holy Fathers,\(^{61}\) who speak of God, the union brought about the mutual interpenetration of the natures and of the natural properties which are in them, and not the transference or lapse [which is characteristic] of those who maliciously turn the union into a confusion; and on that account they\(^ {62}\) introduce confusion by their innovations in many ways, and because of the lack of consistency in their argument, they persecute the orthodox."

When Bishop Theodosius heard this, it seemed that he and the others who had come with him had accepted what was said. And again the same bishop said to father Maximus: "Do me a favour,\(^ {63}\) what did you say to us, that no-one as far as he is a person acts hypostatically, but as far as he is something, acts naturally? For [it occurs]\(^ {64}\) to me that I cannot understand what was said."

Maximus: "No-one as a person acts hypostatically, but as something acts naturally, as for example Peter and Paul act, but not as Peter and Paul, but as human beings, since both are human beings by nature, according to the [common]\(^ {65}\) and definitive rationale of nature, but not hypostatically according to what each does personally. Similarly Michael and Gabriel act, but not as Michael and Gabriel but as angels, for both are angels. And so in every nature predicated in a great number of persons, we observe a common activity but not an activity reduced to nothing.\(^ {66}\) Therefore he who speaks of a hypostatic activity introduces that very nature, although it is one, as

---

\(^{61}\) This doctrine of "the exchange of properties" is one of Maximus' standard theological arguments.

\(^{62}\) Sc. the heretics.

\(^{63}\) This idiomatic Greek expression Ποιητὴν ἐγκάτασπερ (PG 90, 160A), has been translated literally by Anastasius: Fac karitatem...

\(^{64}\) Cf. Latin asstat.

\(^{65}\) Cf. Latin communionem.

\(^{66}\) The best reading of the Greek is ἀλλ' οὖσιν ἐπωμάζειν τὴν ἐνέργειαν "but not an individualised activity" (PG 90, 160 B2).
natura quoquomodo existendi rationem co<sup>r</sup>rumpimus.»

Et his dictis dum inuicem oscularentur, Theodosius consul dixit: «En facta sunt omnia bene; putasne consensurus est imperator rogatoriam facere iussionem?»

575 Et dicit abba Maximus: «Vtique facit, si ulugerit imitator esse Dei et humiliari cum eo propter communem omnium nostrum salutem, perpendens quia si Deus qui natura saluat non saluavit donec volens humiliaretur, quomodo is qui natura saluandus est homo, aut saluabitur aut saluabit non humiliatus?»

580 Et dixit Theodosius consul: «Spero quia Deo saluante mihi memoriam, hunc eundem ei dicam sermonem; et adquiescet.»

585 Et cum in his se mutuo salutasset, abierunt cum pace, data ab episcopo abbati Maximo quadam pecuniae quantitate et tunica et casula quae fuerant sibi transmissa. Et tunicam quidem statim eademque hora tulit Bizyensis episcopus. Ast in Regio non solum quantitatem sibi pecuniae datae, uerum etiam et aliud quodcunque ex beneficientia quorundam habere uidebatur una cum reliquis eius uilibus rebus ac uestibus abstulerunt.

590 Postquam uero abierunt praedicti uiri, sexto idus Septembrias praesentis quintae decimae indicationis exiuit rursus Paulus consul in Bizyen ad abbatem Maximum, iussionem ferens continentem secundum hanc formam:

595 «Iubemus gloriae tuae ire Bizyen et adducere Maximum monachum cum honore multo atque blanditie tam propter senectam et infirmatatem, quam eo quod sit a progenitoribus noster, fueritque illis honorabilis. Et ponite hunc in ue<sup>n</sup>re<sup>n</sup>rabilis monasterio sancti Theodori quod reiaceit iuxta Regium, et uenire et nuniare nobis, et mittemus ad eum ex

576 cf. Phil. 2, 8

571 corumpimus cod. 599 uerabili cod.
made infinite in its activities, differing from itself according to the number of elements which are combined under it. If we allow that it is so, we corrupt the rationale of the mode of existence in that very nature."

And when this was said, while they were embracing each other, the consul Theodosius said: "Look, everything is arranged well; do you think the emperor is going to consent to make an invocatory command?"67 And father Maximus said: "He (will) indeed do so, if he wishes to be an imitator of God and to be humbled68 with him for the sake of the common salvation of us all, considering that if God who saves by nature did not save until he was humbled willingly, how can man who by nature needs to be saved, either be saved or save when he has not been humbled?"

And the consul Theodosius said: "I hope that, if God prompts my memory, I will say the same to him, and he will agree."69 And after these words, when they had said mutual farewells, they went away in peace, after the bishop had given father Maximus an amount of money and a tunic and cloak which had been sent to him. And the bishop of Bizya in fact at once took away the tunic in the same moment. But in Rhegium they took away not only the sum of money that had been given to him, but also whatever else he was seen to possess as a result of certain people's generosity, together with his remaining meagre possessions and clothing.

But after the men whom I have mentioned departed, on the sixth day before the Ides of September of the current fifteenth indiction,70 the consul Paul went out again to father Maximus in Bizya, bearing an order in this form: "We order your Honour to go to Bizya and to bring back the monk Maximus with great honour and blandishment, both because of his seniority and infirmity, and since he is one of our forebears, and he was honoured among them. And put him in the venerable

---

67 This is a terminus technicus; cf. n.48 above.
68 Some Greek manuscripts add καλ συγκεκριμένα "and to be emptied out" (cf. PG 90, 160B).
69 Cf. Greek πείλητον "he will be persuaded" (PG 90, 160C).
70 I.e. 8 September 656.
persona nostra patricios duos qui debeant illi declarare quae nobis placuerint nos ex animo amantes et a nobis amatos, etuenire nuntiaturi nobis aduentum eius." | Igitur cum idem 
consul adduxisset eum et posuisset in iam nominato 
monasterio, regressus est nuntiare.

605

Et in crastinum ueniunt ad eum Epiphanius et Trohilus patricii cum multo amictu et phantasia, necnon et Theodosius episcopus, et ascendunt ad eum in catechumenium ecclesiae ipsius monasterii, factaque consueta salutatione, sederunt, cogentes et ipsum sedere. Et orsus habitum ad eum sermonem 
Trohilus dixit: «Dominus orbis iussit nos ueni re ad te, et 
dicere uobis quae uisa sunt diuinitus roborato imperio suo, sed 
dic nobis primitus si facias iussionem imperatoris, an non.» 
Maximus dixit: «Domine, audiam quid iusserit pium eius 
imperium, et necessario respondebo. Nam ad id quod ignotum 
est mihi, qualem responsionem datus sum?» 
At uero Trohilus perseverabat asseuerans: «Non potest esse ut 
dicamus aliquid nisi primum dicam utrum facias uel non facias 
iussionem imperatoris.»

620

Et cum uidisset eos insistentes peramplius dilatationi suae et 
amarius intuentes ac asperius respondentes cum omnibus qui 
cum eis erant, et ipsis quoque dignitatiibus saecularibus 
eleutatis, respondens abba Maximus ait: «Quia non patimini 
dicere seruo uestro quae placent domino et imperatori nostro, 
ecce dico audiente Deo ac sanctis angelis et omnibus uobis, 
quoniam quicquid iusserit mihi super quacunque re cum hoc 
saeculo destruenda et corrupienda, prompte faciam.»

625

Et confessim surgens Trohilus dixit: «Orate mihi, ego uadam. 
Hic enim nihil facit.»

630

Et multo uehementique facto tumultu ac multa turbatione et
monastery of St Theodore which is situated near Rhegium, and come and inform us. And we will send to him as our representatives two patricians - two men who love us sincerely and are beloved by us - who must declare to him what pleases us, and come to announce to us his arrival." Therefore when the same consul had brought him and placed him in the said monastery, he went back to announce it.

And on the following day the patricians Epiphanius and Troilus came to him cloaked in great mystery, and also Bishop Theodosius, and they came up to him into the catechumen's place in the church of the monastery itself. And when they had given the customary greeting, they sat down, compelling him to sit too, and Troilus began to converse with him, saying: "The lord of the world ordered us to come to you, and to tell you what seems right to His divinely-established Power, but first tell us if you obey the command of the emperor, or not?"

Maximus said: "Lord, I will hear what his devout power has ordered and I will reply as necessary. For what reply would I give to what I don't know?"

But Troilus persisted, asserting: "It is not possible for us to say anything unless you say first whether or not you will follow the command of the emperor."

And when he saw them being much more insistent at his delay, and glaring at him more unpleasantly and answering more harshly, together with all who were with them, and that they themselves were also important in secular offices, father Maximus said in answer: "Because you refuse to tell your servant what pleases our master the emperor, see, I say in the hearing of God and the holy angels and all of you, that whatever he commands of me concerning any matter whatsoever which will be destroyed and brought to nothing together with this age, I will do readily."

And immediately Troilus rose and said: "Pray for me, I am going, for he is doing

---

71 R. Janin, La géographie ecclésiastique de l'Empire byzantine, Part 1: Le Siège de Constantinople et le Patriarcat Oecuménique, Tom. III: Les Églises et les Monastères, 2nd ed. (Paris, 1969), pp. 150f. identifies this monastery of St Theodore at Rhegium with Procopius' church of St Theodore in Rhesion, and with Anna Comnena's church of the same name at Bathys Rhayx. Janin claims that Rhegium, being located more than twenty kilometres from the capital, could not be reached in a day as described here and in the Vita Maximi, nor would the inhabitants of Constantinople have travelled so far for their Sunday procession. The church St Theodore, he concludes, was instead located at ancient Macrikeuy, or closer, at the aghiasma of St Paraskevi.

72 Cf. PG 90, 161A: ὁ σύντος δικαστός "the consul himself" (PG 90, 161A).

73 This is a very literal translation in Latin of the idiomatic Greek expression μετὰ πολλῆς περιβολῆς καὶ φωνειῶν "enveloped in great pomp" (PG 90, 161A).
confusione, dixit eis Theodosius episcopus: «Dicite illi responsa et cognoscite quid fateatur. Nam sic regredi nihilque dicere et nihil audire, rationabile non est.»

Et tunc Epiphanius patricius ait: «Hoc tibi per nos significat imperator dicens: Quoniam totus occidens et qui in oriente subuersiones operantur ad te spectant, et omnes propter te simultates exagitant nolentes convenire nobiscum in causa fidei, Deus compungi te faciat ut communices nobiscum in Typo qui expositus est a nobis, et exibimus per nos ipsos ad Chal <c> em et osculabimur te, et supponemus uobis manum nostram cumque omni honore ac gloria introducimus uos in magnam ecclesiam, et cum nobis ipsis sistemus ubi ex more imperatores stant, et faciemus pariter synaxin et participabimur intermeratorum et uiiificorum sacramentorum uiiifici corporis et sanguinis Christi, et praedicabimus te denuo patrem nostrum, fietque gaudium non modo amatrici Christi et regiae urbi nostrae, sed et in toto terrarum orbe. Scimus enim certissime quod te communicante sancto huic throno, cuncti uniantur | nobis qui propter te tumque magisterium se a communione nostra sciderunt.»

Et conversus ad episcopum abba Maximus, cum lacrimis ait: «Domine magne, diem iudicii exspectamus omnes. Nostri quae ordinata sunt et diffinita supra sancta Evangelia et uiiificam crucem atque imaginem Dei et salvatoris nostri Iesu Christi et sanctissimae quae illum genuit semper Virginis matris.»

Et summi <s> so deorum uultu episcopus, mitiori uoci dicit ad eum: «Et quid habeo facere, postquam aliu quid placuit <piissimo imperatori> ?»

Et dixit ad eum Maximus abba: «Et quare tetigisti sancta Evangelia et hi qui tecum erant cum non sit in uobis eorum

---


Scholion 643 synaxin] collegium.
nothing."

And when a great and violent disturbance ensued, and great upset and confusion, Bishop Theodosius said to them: "Tell him the answer\textsuperscript{24} and see what he says. For to leave in this way, having said nothing and heard nothing, is not reasonable."

And then Epiphanius the patrician said: "The emperor makes this plain to you through us, saying that: 'The whole of the West and those in the East who are causing subversion look towards you, and they all stir up strife on your account, refusing to be reconciled with us in the cause of faith. May God compel you to enter into communion with us on the terms of the Typus which has been published by us, and we will go out of our own accord to Chalke\textsuperscript{25} and we will kiss you and we will lay our hand on you, and with every honour and glory we will lead you into the Great Church. And together\textsuperscript{26} we will stand where the emperors stand by tradition, and we will celebrate a synaxis together, and we will partake of the pure and life-giving sacraments of the life-giving body and blood of Christ, and we will speak of you again as our father, and there will be joy not only in our royal city which loves Christ, but also in the whole world. For we know most certainly that when you are in communion with this holy throne, all of those who have separated themselves from our communion, on account of you and your teaching, will unite with us.'"

And turning to the bishop, father Maximus said, as he wept: "Great lord, we all await the day of judgement. You know what has been ordained and defined concerning the holy Gospels and the life-giving cross and the image of our God and Saviour the Lord Jesus Christ and of the most holy, ever-virgin mother who bore him."

And lowering his gaze, the bishop said to him in a gentler voice: "And what am I to do, [since]\textsuperscript{77} something else was pleasing [to the most pious emperor]?"

And father Maximus said to him: "And why did you and these men with you swear

\textsuperscript{24} Latin \textit{responsa} "answers".

\textsuperscript{25} The vestibule at the main entrance of the Great Palace of Constantinople (\textit{ODB}, pp. 405f.)

\textsuperscript{26} Latin \textit{cum nobis ipsis} "with us ourselves".

\textsuperscript{77} Latin \textit{postquam} "after".
quae dicta sunt exitus? Vere omnis caeli uirtus hoc mihi facere
minime persuaderet. Quam enim rationem redderem ut non
dicam Deo, conscientiae meae quod [si] propter humanam
gloriam, quae secundum sui rationem nullam habet saluandi
substantiam, fidem abnegarem eius qui fouet eam?"

665

Et in sermone isto surgentes omnes, furore instabiles redditi,
euulsionibus et impulsionibus atque direptionibus
debilitauerunt eum, a capite usque ad ungues sputis certatim
madefacientes. Quorum, usquequo iota sunt vestimenta quibus
circumamictus erat, foeter longius exhalabat.

Et surgens episcopus dixit: «Non oportebat ita fieri sed audire
ab eo tantummodo responsionem, et ingredi et nuntiare
domino nostro bono. Canonicae quippe res alio disponuntur
modo.» Et cum uix eis episcopus ut quiescerent persuasisset,

670

rursus sederunt, et denis milibus iniuriis et maledictionibus
inexcogitabilibus dehonestantibus eum, cum furore multo et
asperitale dixit Epiphanius: «Dic, malorum extreme, uorax
uicium, quasi nos et citatatem nostram sed et imperatorem
hereticos habeas haec prosecutus es uerba? Vere plus quam tu
680

Christianii sumus atque orthodoxi, et Dominum nostrum ac
Deum confitemur habere et diuinam uoluntatem, et humanam
uoluntatem, et animam intellectualem, et quia omnis
intellectualis naturae utique habet ex natura uelle ac operari,
quaniam uitae proprium motus est, et intellectus proprium,
uoluntas; et uoluntatis eius capacitatem nouimus, non
secundum deitatem tantum, sed et secundum humanitatem.
Quin et duas ipsius uoluntates et operationes non abnegamus.»

685

Et respondens abba Maximus dixit: «Si ita creditis
quemadmodum intellectuales naturae ac Dei ecclesia, quomodo
me cogitis communicare in Typo qui solam eorum habet

663 si] supra l. m. sec. cod. humanam] hunam cod. a. corr. m. sec. 664 rationem sui a. corr. cod. 664/665 Anas. non bene intellectit 673 kanonicae cod. a. corr. m. tert. 680 horthodoxy a. corr. cod.
on the holy Gospels, since you had no means of escaping what was said?78 Truly all the power of heaven could not persuade me to do this. For what reason could I give — I do not say to God but to my conscience — if, on account of human glory which has no substance?79 according to its own rationale, I denied the faith [which saves] the person who cherishes it?"

And at these words everyone rose, rendered powerless80 with rage, and they injured him, pulling and pushing and shoving81 (him), drenching him with spit from head to toe in the struggle. Until the garments which he wore were washed, the stench that they gave off spread afar.

And the bishop rose and said: "You shouldn’t have done this, but you should only have heard his answer from him, and gone and announced it to our good lord. For canonical matters are managed in a different manner." And when with difficulty the bishop had persuaded them to be quiet, they sat down again, and, denigrating him82 with countless insults and unthinkable curses, Epiphanius said with great rage and harshness: "Tell us, most evil one, devourer of citizens,83 have you uttered these words, as if you consider us and our city and also the emperor as heretics? Truly we are more Christian and orthodox than you, and we confess that our Lord and God has both a divine will and a human will and a rational soul, and that every rational nature is indeed able to will and have an activity out of (its) nature, since motion is characteristic of life, and will is characteristic of intellect; and we acknowledge his capacity (for operation) of the will, not according to divinity alone but also according to humanity. No indeed, we do not deny that he has two wills and activities."

In answer father Maximus said: "If you believe as rational natures and the

78 Or "since in your case you did not fulfil what was said?".

79 Latin has "for saving" here, not in the next clause as I have placed it, following the Greek (PG 90, 164B).

80 Latin instabiles cf. Greek ἀναστάνεις "out-manouvered", governing ἐπὶ τῷ λόγῳ "at these words" (PG 90, 164C).

81 Latin direptionibus: "with snatching hands".

82 Sc. Maximus.

83 Latin uorax ciuitum, cf. Greek φαγοπόδα "hoary old glutton" (PG 90, 164C). Anastasius mistook the etymology of the second part of the expression.
diuisionem quae uos confitemini?
Et dixit Epiphanius: «Ob dispensationem factum est hoc, ne laedantur populi huiuscemodi subtilioribus uocibus.»
Et respondens abba Maximus dixit: «E contra, omnis homo sanctificatur per districtam fidei confessionem, non autem per diuisionem quae in Typo est posita.»
Et dixit Trohilus: «Et in palatio dixi tibi, quia non interemit, sed taceri iussit, ut pace fruamur omnes.»
Et respondens abba Maximus dixit: «Silentium uerborum, interemtio est uerborum. Per prophetam enim dicit Spiritus Sanctus: Non sunt loquelaes neque sermones, quorum non audientur uoces eorum. Ergo sermo qui locutione non praedicatur, nullatenus est.»
Et dixit Trohilus: «Habe in corde tuo ut uis; nemo te prohibet.»
Et dicit abba Maximus: «Sed non circumclusit Deus corde totam salutem dicens: Qui non confitetur me coram hominibus, nec ego confitebor eum coram Patre meo qui est in caelis. Et sacer apostolus docet dicens: Corde enim creditur ad iustitiam, ore autem confessio fit ad salutem. Si ergo Deus ac Dei prophetae atque apostoli iubent confiteri mysterium sanctorum uocibus, quod est magnum et horrendum, atque totius mundi salutare, non est opus quoquomodo taceri uocem id praedicantem, ut non imminuat urt tacentium salus.»
Et respondens asperiori uerbo Epiphanius dixit: «Subscripsisti in libello?»
Et dixit abba Maximus: «Etiam, subscripsi.»
«Et quomodo,» inquit, «ausus es subscribere et anathematizare confitentes atque credentes sicut intellectuales naturae et ecclesia catholica? Vere judicio meo introducimus te in urbem, et sistemus te in foro uinctum, et mimos ac mimas, et

701/702 Ps. 18,3  707/708 Mt. 10,32  709/710 Rom. 10,10
691 confitemini] profitemini cod. e corr. m. sec.  694 abba Maximus] in mg. cod. m. sec.

Scholion 704 Habes Secundum antiquos paganorum persecutores
church of God do, how is it that you force me to enter into communion on the terms of the Typus which contains only the division\(^{84}\) of what you profess?"

And Epiphanius said: "This was made for the sake of an arrangement, lest people be harmed by rather subtle words of this kind."

And in answer father Maximus said: "On the contrary, every person is sanctified through the strict confession of faith, but not through the division\(^{85}\) which is found in the Typus."

And Troilus said: "I also said to you in the palace that the Typus did not destroy, but ordered silence, so that we all may enjoy peace."

And in answer father Maximus said: "The silencing of words is the destruction of words. For through the prophet the Holy Spirit says: For there is no speech or words of which their voices will not be heard. Therefore a word which is not proclaimed in speech in no way exists."

And Troilus said: "Believe what you want in your heart; no-one forbids you."

And father Maximus said: "But God did not enclose all salvation in the heart when he said: The one who does not confess me before men, neither will I confess him before my Father who is in heaven. And the holy apostle teaches with the words: For one believes in the heart for justification, but confession is made with the mouth for salvation. If therefore God and the prophets and apostles of God command us to confess the mystery of the holy things in words, which is greatly to be feared and is for the salvation of the whole world, there is no need in any way to silence a word which proclaims it, lest the salvation of those who have been silenced be lessened."

And in answer Epiphanius said more harshly: "Have you put your signature to the tract?"\(^{86}\)

\(^{84}\) Latin diuisionem cf. Greek διωσπον "abrogation" (PG 90, 165A). Anastasius possibly read διωσπον.

\(^{85}\) See my note on "division" above.

\(^{86}\) I.e. the Libellus of Anastasius the Disciple adduced at the Lateran Synod, cf. RM, n. 29. It contains a condemnation of the Typus of 648, and was adduced at the Lateran Synod. The subscriptions to a document adduced in the Acts of the Lateran Synod in ACO ser. II, I, p. 57, include the names of Maximus and two Anastasii. This libellus, which also condemns the Typus, is presented to the synod by John, priest of St Sabas, Theodore, a priest of the holy Lavra in Africa, Thalassius, a priest of the Armenian monastery in Rome called Renati, and George, a priest of the monastery of Cilicia on the Aquae Salviae in Rome. See Winkelmann, no. 125 for a brief entry on the Libellus of Anastasius.
prostitutas meritrices et omnem plebem adducemus ut unusquisque ac unaquaque et alapis c <a> edat et conspuat in faciem tuam.

725 Et ad haec respondens abba Maximus ait: «Sicut dixistis fiat si confitentes duas <naturas ex quibus Dominus est, et congruentes ei duas> naturales voluntates et operationes ei qui est Deus natura in veritate simul et homo anathematizauimus. Lege domine gestorum s[a]riem ac libellum, et si ut dixistis inueneritis, facite quod uultis. Ego enim et conserui mei, et quotquot subscripterunt, eos qui secundum Arrium et Apolinarium unam voluntatem et unam operationem dicunt, anathematizauimus, et non qui confitentur Dominum nostrum et Deum in utrisque ex quibus in quibusque et quae est, natura intellectualem, et ideo secundum utranque cum voluntate ac operatione nostrae salutis.»

730 Et dicunt: «Si cum hoc conferimus, neque manducabimus neque bibemus; sed surgamus et prandeamus, et ingrediamur atque dicamus quae audiuius. Iste quippe uenundauit se Satanae.» Et cum surrexissent, pranderunt. Et ingressi sunt cum ira uigilia exaltationis pretiosae ac uiuificae crucis.

740

Et in crastinum diluculo, exiuit Theodosius consul ad praedictum | abbatem Maximum et abstulit ab eo quicquid habebat, dicens ei ex persona imperatoris: «Quia nolui est a te. Et uade ubi dignum temetipsum fore iudicasti, habens quoque iudicium discipulorum tuorum, tam scilicet eius qui est Mesembri <a>e, quam eius qui est Perberis quique fuit notarius beatae memoriae auiae nostrae.» Dixerant autem et patricii, Trohilus uidelicet et Epiphanius, quia «Modis omnibus adducemus etiam ambos discipulos tuos, id est tam
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And father Maximus said: "I have indeed put my signature to it."

"And how," he said, "did you dare to put your signature to it, and anathematise those who confess and believe as rational natures and the catholic church do? Truly in my judgement we (will) bring you into the city, and we will tie you up and stand you in the forum, and we will produce actors and actresses and meretricious prostitutes and the entire crowd, so that each man and woman may deal you blows and spit in your face."

In reply to this father Maximus said: "Let it be done as you have said, if we have anathematised those who confess two [natures out of which the Lord exists, and congruent with him, two] natural wills and activities in him who is God by nature, in truth, and at the same time man. Read, my lord, the series of acts and the tract, and if you find it as you said, do as you wish. For I and my fellow servants, and whoever put their signature to it, anathematised those who speak of one will and one activity, following Arius and Apollinaris, and not those who confess our Lord and God, in both (the natures) out of which and in which and which he is, to be rational in nature, and for that reason to have a will and an activity for our salvation according to each nature."

And they said: "If we debate this, we will neither eat nor drink, but let us arise and have lunch, and let us go in and say what we have heard. For he has sold himself to Satan."

And when they had got up, they had lunch. And it was in a rage that they entered the Vigil of the Exaltation of the precious and life-giving cross.

And on the next day at dawn, the consul Theodosius went out to father Maximus whom I have spoken of, and took away from him whatever he had, saying to him by the authority of the emperor: "Because you refused honour, it has been removed from you; and go where you judged you would be worthy, bearing the sentence of condemnation also passed on your disciples, both the one in Mesembria and the one in Perberis, who was the notary of our grandmother of

---

87 An allusion to the Creed of Chalcedon.

88 I.e. Anastasius the Apocrisiarius and Anastasius the Disciple, respectively. This is the only information we have in these documents as to the disciple's official function in the imperial court.
eum qui est Mesembri <a>e, quam illum qui est Perberis, et probabimus etiam ipsos acuidebimus et ipsorum quoque prouentum. Veruntamen ut scias domine abba quoniam, si saltem modicam requiem sumpserimus a confusione gentium, coniungi ubis habemus, per sanctam Trinitatem, et papam qui nunc est tollemus, et omnes ibidem loquentes et reliquos discipulos tuos et omnes uos conflagimus unumquemque in apto sibi loco, ut conflatus est Martinus.» Et sumptum eum iam dictus Theodosius consul militibus tradidit, et duxerunt eum usque Salambriam.

Et manserunt ibidem per duos dies, quousque perrexit ad castra unus ex militibus et dixit cuncto exercitui quia «Monachus qui blasphemat Dei genitricem huc uenit.» Hoc autem egerunt ut commouerent exercitum aduersus praedictum Maximum abbatem quasi blasphemauerit Dei genitricem. Et post duos dies rediens miles ille, tuit eum in castra, et compunctus diuinitus praetor, immo loci seruator praetoris, misit ad eum primores bandorum, presbyterosque ac diaconos et reuere ndos signorum custodes.

Quos cum intuitus esset iam nominatus abba Maximus aduenisse, surrexit et misit metaneoeam, et miserunt et illi uice reciproca, et sederunt, iubentes et ipsis sedere. Et quidam ualde senex honorabilis dixit ad eum cum reuerentia: «Pater, quoniam scandalizauerunt nos quidam in sanctimoniam tuam quod non dicas Dei genitricem dominam nostram sanctissimam uirginem, adiuro te per sanctam et consubstantialem Trinitatem quo ueritatem dicas nobis, et detergas a corde nostro scandalum hoc, ne laedamus iniuste scandalizati.»

Et missa metaneoea surrexit, et extensis in caelum manibus cum lacrimis dixit: «Qui non dicit dominam nostram

752 mesembrie cod. cf. 748 754 veruntamen a. corr. cod. 768 locis a. corr. cod. 773 reproca a. corr. cod.

Scholion 768 praetoris] Teodorum dicit Coloniae facientem locum comitis ... fratrem imperatoris
blessed memory." But both the patricians, namely Troilus and Epiphanius, had said: "We will certainly produce both your disciples as well, that is the one in Mesembria and the one in Perberis, and we will try them too, and we will see the result in their case as well. But so that you may know, lord father, if we have even a brief respite from the confusion of the people, by the holy Trinity, we will refrain from uniting with you, and we will remove the man who is now pope and all people who speak there, and your remaining disciples, and we will put all of you to the test by fire, each in his own place, as Martin was tested by fire." And the consul Theodosius, whom I just mentioned, took him and handed him over to soldiers, and they led him as far as Selymbria.

And they stayed there for two days until one of the soldiers reached the camp and told the whole army: "The monk who blasphemes against the mother of God is coming here." But they did this to incite the army against father Maximus, whom I have spoken of, as if he had blasphemed against the mother of God. And coming back after two days, that soldier took him to the camp, and the general, spurred on by God, or rather the acting general, sent to him the leaders of the garrison and priests and deacons and revered custodians of the colours. When father Maximus, whom I mentioned, saw them arrive, he arose and prostrated, and they also prostrated in their turn, and they sat down, ordering him to sit down too. And a certain very old and honourable man said to him with reverence: "Father,

---

89 This is Constans II's grandmother, who was properly Eudokia, the first wife of Heraclius. After her death in 612, the emperor's second wife, and niece, Martina was treated as the mother of Heraclius (son of Eudokia) known as Constantine, who was co-emperor for a brief time in 641 with her own son Heraclonas. Constans II succeeded his father Constantine in September 641, and Martina and her son were mutilated and sent into exile (J. Herrin, The Formation of Christendom (London, 1987), pp. 215f.).

90 Latin praetor is the equivalent of Greek στρεμματιώτης (PG 90, 168C).

91 The scholiast identifies the acting general as follows: "He means Theodore of the colony (or perhaps 'of Colonia'), who was taking the place of the comes, and brother of the emperor."

92 A bandon was, in theory, a unit of two or three, but no more than four, hundred horse; see I. Sevcenko, Byzantium and the Slavs in Letters and Culture, Harvard Ukrainian Research Institute (Cambridge, Massachusetts, 1991), p. 486 and n.28. In ODB, p. 250, it is described as a small military detachment, sometimes ethnic.

93 The bearers of ensigns were members of the staff of the excubitores, or select imperial body-guard (ODB, p. 647).
superludabilem, sanctissimam, intemeratam et omni naturae intellectuali venerandam, naturalem ueraciter matrem Dei effectam qui fecit caelum et terram, et mare et omnia quae in eis sunt, sit anathema et catathema a Patre et Filio et Spiritu Sancto, consubstantiali et super substantiali Trinitate, ac omni supercaelesti uirtute, atque a choro sanctorum apostolorum, prophetarum, et infinita plebe sanctorum martyrum, omnique spiritu in istiitia consummato, nunc et semper et in saecula saeculorum, amen.»

Et flentes omnes, orauerunt ei dicentes: «Deus confortet te pater et dignum te faciat absque offensae hunc perficere cursum.»

Et his dictis congregati sunt multi milites auscultaturi multa bona uerba quae mouebantur. Et cum contemptus esset quidam domesticorum preatoris quod multus coacervaretur et aedificaretur exercitus ac repræhenderet quae fiebant, quid suspicatus Deus scit, præcepit eum rapi et emittit extra castra duobus milibus donec collectionem fecissent et ueniissent qui deberent ducere illum Perberis. Verum clericii diuinae moti dilectione pedites duobus illis miliariiis abierunt et uenerunt et salutauerunt eum et orauerunt illi, et manibus suis gestantes imposuerunt eum supra iumentum, et reuersi sunt cum pace ad loca sua; et ipse abductus est Perberis in custodiam qua continuus uexationibus tenebatur.

Et hoc quoque sciendum quia in Regio praetendebat Trohilus ad abbatem Maximum dicens, quod consiliarius Iohannes scripsit sibi de accidentibus quibusdam quae sibi consulerent ac plaserent, «licet hoc fieri interim discipulorum tuorum inordinatio prohibuerit». Aestimo autem quod non scripserit iam dictus consiliarius Iohannes ad Trohilum sed ad
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808 accidentibus] Anas. non bene intellexit gr. συμβάδος

Scholion 808 Iohannes] Hunc sanctus papa Martinus a Chersone anathematizavit in epistola ad sanctum Maximum destinata
since certain people have caused a scandal for us against Your Holiness, (saying) that you do not call Our Lady the most holy virgin, the mother of God, I adjure you through the holy and consubstantial Trinity to speak the truth to us, and remove this scandal from our hearts, lest we are harmed, because we have been wrongfully scandalised."

And after prostrating, Maximus arose and, with his hands stretched to heaven, weeping he said: "Whoever does not say Our Lady (who is) worthy of all praise, most holy, inviolate and venerable to every rational nature, was truly made the natural mother of God who made heaven and earth and the sea, and everything which is in them, may he be anathema and katathema\textsuperscript{94} from the Father and the Son and the Holy Spirit, the consubstantial and supersubstantial Trinity, and every power above heaven, and from the choir of holy apostles and prophets and the innumerable crowd of holy martyrs, and every spirit perfected in justice, now and always, forever and ever, amen."

And they all wept and prayed for him, saying: "May God strengthen you, father, and make you worthy to complete this course without stumbling."

And with these words many soldiers gathered to hear the many good words which were being exchanged. And when one of the general’s officials\textsuperscript{95} observed that a sizeable part of the army had gathered, and was being instructed, and was criticising what was happening, he, suspecting God knows what, ordered Maximus to be taken away and sent two miles from the camp until they had performed the liturgy, and those who had to take him to Perberis had come. But the clergy, moved by divine solicitude, went out two miles on foot, and came and greeted him and prayed for him and, carrying him in their arms, put him on a beast and went back in peace to their own places, and he himself was led off to Perberis into custody, where he was held, enduring constant hardship.\textsuperscript{96}

And this should also be known: that in Rhegium, Troilus claimed to father

\textsuperscript{94} The anathema was a statement of removal from communion; the katathema a curse.

\textsuperscript{95} The term \textit{domesticus} designated a broad range of officials, ecclesiastical, civil and military (\textit{ODB}, p. 646): we see it used here in a provincial military context to designate an official in the general’s administration.

\textsuperscript{96} Cf. Greek ἐν τῇ συνεχόσῃ ὁδόν φρονεῖ "(And he led) him (off to Perberis) under constant guard" (PG 90, 169A).
Mennam monachum, et ille deinceps id dixerit palatinis.


Sola intemerata et sanctissima proprie natura, sine mendacio ac ueraciter Dei mater, et post partum iterum uere uirgo casta, iuua.

\footnotesize
\begin{itemize}
  \item \textit{une} uocatum intellige
  \item kalumniatores \textit{cod. a. corr. m. tert.}
  \item impartibilis \textit{cod.}
  \item hortodoxa \textit{cod. a. corr. m. tert.}
  \item mendatio \textit{cod. a. corr. m. tert.}
\end{itemize}

Scholion 812 Mennam] Hic est qui et genere et mente Aegyptius est et uere ueritatis inimicus.
Maximus\textsuperscript{97} that John the consiliarius\textsuperscript{98} had written to him\textsuperscript{99} [concerning a certain agreement which had been offered and was acceptable to them],\textsuperscript{100} "although the disorder created by your\textsuperscript{101} disciples prevented this from being effected in the meantime." But I think that John the consiliarius, whom I mentioned, did not write to Troilus but to the monk Mennas,\textsuperscript{102} and he reported it in turn to those in the palace.

Glory to you, the only-begotten God, Word of the Father, and one of the consubstantial Trinity, you who comfort in word and deed those who are driven out with you and suffer on your account, and you who make them wise in the Holy Spirit. But you always confound those who are your enemies and (enemies) of your ever-virgin mother, properly and in truth, and who are slanderers of the truth. Glory to you holy Trinity, uncreated, eternal, without beginning, infinite, unchangeable, and our supersubstantial and indivisible God. Glory to you, glory to you, glory to you, the same and only blessed Trinity, hope and salvation of all who worship you in orthodox faith, and who serve you in truth to the end.

Help (us, you who are) alone inviolate and most holy, properly in nature, without deception and in reality, mother of God, and truly chaste virgin again after giving birth.

\textsuperscript{97} Greek reads: "Troilus, referring to father Maximos, said..." (PG 90, 169A).

\textsuperscript{98} The "consiliarius" was an official adviser, a rank that originated in imperial Rome: \textit{Lexikon des Mittelalters} III (Munich-Zurich, 1986), p. 160. The scholiast explains further: "The one whom holy Pope Martin anathematised from Cherson in the letter he sent to holy Maximus." The Greek gloss in A is more specific, and explains the term \textit{conciliarius} as σύμπανος ἡγοῦν σχολαστικός "assistant to the magistrate, that is, an advocate."

\textsuperscript{99} Sc. Troilus.

\textsuperscript{100} Sc. the senate. The Latin reads less correctly: "about certain events which were in his interest and pleasing to him...".

\textsuperscript{101} Sc. Maximus's.

\textsuperscript{102} The scholiast adds: "This is the one who is an Egyptian in race and mentality, and a true enemy of the truth".
EPISTULA ANASTASII AD THEODOSIUM
GANGRENSEM

Anastasii Apocrisiarii epistola ad Theodosium Gangrensem

Exemplar propriae scriptionis epistolae sancti patris nostri ac doctoris Anastasii presbyteri et apocrisiarii magni nominis senioris Romae, novi scilicet confessoris, uel quod magis fatendum est, multum certatoris et martyris ueritatis, scriptae una cum subiacentibus testimoiniis sacris et syllogis mis cum ipsa quae abscisa est eius sancta dextra manu, admirabili prorsus ingenio,
immo diuina uirute et gratia, postquam passus est ipse et patres qui cum eo fuerunt in misero Byzantio propter uerbum tantummodo ueritatis, et quod noluissent uel etiam, ut uerius dicatur, non potuissent eis communicare in tam publica ipsorum perfidia et manifesta impietate secundum sanctum et magnum in theologia Gregorium qui in sermone suo quem in se fecit et adversus Arrianos affatur: «Quasdam dimisimus bestias sanctorum corporibus quod quidam inhumanitatem publicauerint, unum accusantes tantum, ne impietati cederent nec communione polluerentur, quam ut uenenum serpentis fugientes, non corpus laedentem, sed profunda quaeque animae offuscentem.» Missa praeterea est a terto exilio, id est Lazico, ad Theodosium, presbyterum Gangrensem et monachum, in sancta Christi nostri ciuitate constitutum.

Superscriptio. Domino meo per omnia sanctissimo Deo honorabili patri spiritali ac magistro Theodosio presbytero, Anastasius exiguus misericordia Dei presbyter et monachus seruus seruorum Dei. Data uero est cum Deo in sancta Christi Dei nostri ciuitate


tit. non inueniatur in codd. latino uel graeco 3/25 non inueniatur in cod. graeco 4 apocrisiarii] apocrissiarii e corr. cod. 8 syllogismis] syllogismis cod. e corr. m. sec. 9 dextra a. corr. cod. 26 Superscriptio] scripsi, Superscripto cod.
Letter of Anastasius Apocrisiarius to Theodosius of Gangra

Copy of the actual written letter of our holy father and teacher Anastasius, priest and apocrisiarius of great renown of older Rome, indeed a new confessor, or (which is a much greater thing to say) one who strove much, and was a martyr for the truth. He wrote this, together with the attached holy testimonia and syllogisms,\(^1\) with truly admirable skill with his holy right hand which was cut away, or rather by divine power and grace after the suffering he and the fathers who were with him in wretched Byzantium (endured), simply on account of the word of truth, and because they did not want, or even – as may be said more truthfully – were not able to communicate with them in their very public perfidy and obvious impiety. According to the holy Gregory, great in theology, who in the sermon which he wrote about himself and against the Arians, said: "What beasts have we let loose upon the bodies of the saints, in that certain people have revealed their natural inhumanity, accusing them of one thing only: that they would not yield to impiety nor be defiled by communion (with the impious), which we flee as the poison of a serpent, as not wounding the body but injuring the very depths of the soul?"\(^2\) It was sent, moreover, from the third place of exile, that is from Lazica, to Theodosius the priest from Gangra,\(^3\) a monk established in the holy city of our Christ.\(^4\)

Dedication:

To my lord the most holy in all, honourable to God, spiritual father and teacher, Theodosius the priest, the humble Anastasius, by God's mercy priest and monk, servant of the servants of God. [Let it be delivered] with God's help\(^5\) in the holy city of Christ our God to my lord Theodosius, the priest from Gangra.

---

\(^1\) These are translated below.

\(^2\) I have followed the original Greek of Gregory's text. Note that this is a question in the original, but not in the Latin version.

\(^3\) A city in Paphlagonia (modern Çankırı, Turkey), as identified by A. Di Berardino, 'Gangra', EEC, pp. 336f.


\(^5\) Cf. Latin Data uero est cum Deo: "Truly it was given with God".
domino meo Th<e>odosio presbytero a Gangris.

Memoriam iustorum cum laudibus diuinitus inspiratum nobis facere iubet Prouerbium. Ego igitur exiguus memoriam iustorum illorum et praeclae Maximi reuera megisti (hoc enim Maximus nomen insinuat) sermone meo in praesentiarum facere volens, et digne illius uirtuetem atque scientiam sicut et pro Christo Deo gestum martyrium eius laudare minime ualens, hoc solum significare per hanc epistolam Deo honorabilibus uobis considerai, quod et ipsi maxime nosse, prout didici, desiderastis, id est quando beati illi in Domino dormierint.

Notum igitur facio uobis, pluribus ex his quae hic nobis illata sunt malis silentio ob multitudinem eorum et sermonis fastidium, necnon et tempus incongruum traditis, quod cum ueni <s>semus ad amicorum Christi regionem Lazorum sexto idus Iunias quintae indictionis, statim separauerunt nos ab inuicem praecpectione illius qui tunc praecesse his qui illic erant sorte meruerat, diripientes omnia usque ad unam acum et filum, quae necque ad necessarias utilitates tam ex uobis quam ex aliis Christi amicis adquisieramus. Et sacramissimum quidem illum uirum, dominum aic Maximum abbatem, neque in subiugali, neque in uehiculo sedere ualentem pro eo quod in infirmitate positus esset, cum plectentes uirgulas ex eis quasi lectulum texuissent, baiulantes detulerunt, et inclauserunt in castro Schemari uocitato, iuxta gentem eorum qui dicuntur Alani, dominum uero Anastasium abbatem et me peccatorem, super equos impositos, duxerunt et inclauserunt, illum quidem in castro Scotori

32 Prou. 10, 7
The divinely inspired proverb orders us to remember the just with praises. Therefore I, in humility, wish to make a commemoration of those just men, and especially of Maximus, truly "the greatest one" – for the name Maximus [generally] implies this–, in my present discourse. Since I can in no way worthily praise his virtue and knowledge and so too, his witness for Christ God, I decided to inform you, who are honourable to God, through this letter, simply of what you yourselves also longed most of all to know, as I found out: that is, when those blessed men fell asleep in the Lord.

Therefore I make known to you, consigning to silence most of the evils which we endured here on account of their multitude and our aversion to speak (of them), and also the unsuitable time, that when we came to the region of the Lazicans, friends of Christ, on the sixth day before the Ides of June⁶ in the fifth indiction, they immediately separated us from each other by the order of him who was then in authority over those who were there, snatching away everything down to the last needle and thread, whatever we had acquired for our basic wants both from you and from other friends of Christ. And when they had woven from plaited branches a sort of little stretcher, since Maximus was not able to sit on a beast nor in a vehicle on account of his weak condition, they carried off that most holy man – I mean, the lord father Maximus–, with shouts, and shut him up in the fort called Schemaris,⁷ near the people who are called the Alani. But the lord father Anastasius, and me, a sinner, they led off on horses and imprisoned, him in a fort called Scotoris⁸ in Apsilia which is near Abasgia, but me in another camp whose name was Buculus,⁹

---

⁶ I.e. June 8, 662.

⁷ The fortress of Muri (Tsikhe-Muris) in Lechkhumi near Tsageri (Kekelidze, p. 36), where there was a monastery of St Maximus in the eighteenth century (see G. C. Berthold, Maximus the Confessor: Selected Writings, The Classics of Western Spirituality [New York, 1985], p. 31, n. 32).

⁸ Scotori (= Codori) was a fortress on the back of the river of the same name, on the border between Abasgia and Apsilia (Kekelidze, pp. 25-28).

⁹ A fortress in Misimiana, a region of Alania in the north Caucasus (Kekelidze, pp. 25-28). DeVresse, La lettre, p. 11, n. 6, notes that Bouchloon was mentioned by Agathias, Hist. III, 15.
dicto Apsilaeae quae est prope Abasgiam, me autem in
altero castro cuius nomen Buculus erat regionis quae
Mesimiana uocabatur in iam dictorum confinibus
Alanorum, quod uidelicet castrum idem Alani captum
nunc retinere noscuntur. Dein post paucos dies, sumptis
tam me quam beato Anastasio a praedictis castris, illum
quidem miserunt ad castrum nuncupatum Suaniae, cum
iam semiuiuuus esset tam ex multitudine tormentorum ac
uerberum quae in Byzantio sustinuimus, quam ex
necessitatibus atque angustiis quae hic sunt nobis illata.
Vnde et in medio uiae, ut quidam aiunt, ut autem alii
asserunt mox retrusus est in castro Suaniae ad quod
destinatus fuerat, obit. Argumentor igitur quod circa
undecimo uel nono kalendas Augustas dormierit in
Domino. Quinto decimo nanque kalendarum Augustarum
deducti sumus utrique per iussionem tunc principis in id
quod dicebatur Mucurusin praesentandi in medio amici
Christi exercitus, cum ille iam ut praetulimus semiuiuuus
existeret, et ex tunc eum ultra non uidi. Continuo quippe
destinauerunt ipsum quidem, ut dictum est, in castrum
Suaniae, me autem in castrum quod dicturus Thacyria iuxta
Hiberiam. Hinc igitur conicio quod circa undecimo
kalendas uel nono kalendas Augustas quintae indicationis
in Domino, sicut dictum est, obdormierit.

Porro Christi Dei martyr domnus uidelicet abba
Maximus cum esset custodiae mancipatus in castro
superius memorato, diuina sibi facta uisione, aduocauit
quosdam ex his qui erant in castro, et dixit ad eos:
«Tertio decimo die Augusti mensis huius instantis quintae
indicationis, feria septima, assumet me Dominus,» quod et
of the region which is called Mesimiana on the borders of the Alani people, whom I have already mentioned, which is in fact the same fort captured and now held by the Alani. Then after a few days, when both I and the blessed Anastasius had been taken from the forts which I mentioned, they sent him to the fort called Suania,\textsuperscript{10} although he was but half alive, both from the great number of tortures and beatings which we had suffered in Byzantium, and the constraints and straitened circumstances which had been brought upon us here. He died on the road for this reason,\textsuperscript{11} according to some, but others assert that it was soon after he was shut up in the fort of Suania, to which he had been dispatched. Therefore I claim that he fell asleep in the Lord around the eleventh or the ninth day before the Kalends of August.\textsuperscript{12} For on the fifteenth day before the Kalends of August\textsuperscript{13} we were both led by command of the man who was then chief, to that place called Mucuris,\textsuperscript{14} to be presented to the Christ-loving army. Anastasius was already half dead, as we said before, and from that point on I did not see him again. At once they dispatched him to the fort of Suania, as I said, but me they dispatched to the fort which is called Thacyria,\textsuperscript{15} next to Iberia.\textsuperscript{16} From this I conclude, therefore, that on about the eleventh or ninth day before the Kalends of August\textsuperscript{17} of the fifth indication, he fell asleep in the Lord, as has been said.

Furthermore, the martyr of Christ God, namely the lord father Maximus, when he was transferred to the custody of the fort mentioned above, saw a divine

\textsuperscript{10} Or Suaniae; Latin Suaniae.

\textsuperscript{11} I.e. due to the fact that he was half-dead.

\textsuperscript{12} I.e. 22nd or 24th July, 662.

\textsuperscript{13} I.e. 18th July, 662.

\textsuperscript{14} Latin Mucurisin; Mukuris or Mucoris, mentioned in sixth-century sources, was a part of Lazica between the rivers Rioni and Ckhenistqali (Kekelidze, pp. 29f.)

\textsuperscript{15} According to Kekelidze, p. 34, this is the fortress Takveri in the gorge of Lechkhumi.

\textsuperscript{16} Georgian Iberia in the Caucasus corresponds with K'art'li, the eastern part of the medieval Georgian kingdom. The theme of the same name stretching along the eastern Byzantine frontier and into central and northern Armenia was only created in the rule of Basil II in the early eleventh century (\textit{ODB}, p. 971).

\textsuperscript{17} See n. 12 above.
factum est. Igitur terto decimo die praedicti Augusti mensis, praeteritae quintae indictionis, secundum diuinum eius uaticinium, feria septima, praeuentibus derelictis perrexit ad Dominum. Porro et alidum miraculum quod diuinitus in sancto eius monumento efficitur, quodque usque in praeens qui castrum illud et eius circaregionem inhabitant | intuerunt et praeinat, et ad quosdam etiam principum atque magnatum peruenit, dignum est et ubis quoque sanctissimis et per uos omnibus qui ibidem sunt sancti <s>, per litteras fieri manifestum, in gloriain et laudem Dei qui facit mirabilia in sanctis suis et glorificat memoriam eorum qui se orthodoxe ac sincere glorifican. Id est, tres lampades luciferae per singulas noctes sanctum sancti illius martyris Maximi monumentum illustrant. Haec de memorabili hoc uiro, beatoque Anastasio, Deo honorabilibus ubis et per uos omni sanctae Dei quae ilic in recta fide degit ecclesiae breuiter annotau, quatinus et uos, his cognitis, glorificetis Deum qui est mirabilis in sanctis suis.

Interea et quae mihi peccatori et exiguuo post haec contigerunt, et in quibus sim, pari modo perpaucis manifestabo. Cum enim fecissem duos menses in castru praedictae Thacyriae in infirmitate reiacens, et pauxillum quid requiem fuissem adeptus, rursus misit me tunc princeps ad partes Apsiliae et Mesimianaee custodiae mancipandum in castru Phustas, et ut absolute dicam septem mensibus duuxit et circumduxit me per omnes praedictas regiones, nudum et discalciatum et peditem, et frigore ac fame et siti depressum, uolens profecto et me quoque ab hac detergere uita. Sed nescio quid super me

101/102 I Reg. 2, 30 108/109 Ps. 67, 36

vision, (and) summoned some of those who were in the fort, and said\textsuperscript{18} to them: "On the thirteenth day of August of this present fifth\textsuperscript{19} indictment, on the seventh day of the week,\textsuperscript{20} the Lord will take me up." Which is what happened. Thus on the thirteenth day of the said month of August of the fifth indictment which has passed, in accordance with his divine prophecy, on the seventh day of the week, he left behind present things and proceeded to the Lord. Furthermore, it is fitting to make known to you, most holy people, another miracle which is also effected by divine power at his holy tomb, and which those who live in that fort and the area around it see up to the present day and speak about, (and which) has even come to the attention of certain of the chiefs and magnates; and (it is fitting to make it known) through you to all holy people who are there, through letters, for the glory and praise of God who performs miracles in his holy ones, and glorifies the memory of those who glorify him sincerely and according to orthodox belief. That is, three shining lights illuminate the holy tomb of that holy martyr Maximus each night. I have briefly outlined these things concerning that honourable man, and the blessed Anastasius, to you who are honourable to God, and through you to every holy church of God which lives in the right faith there, so that you, when you know these things, may glorify God who is marvellous in his holy ones.

However I will also very briefly make known likewise the things which happened afterwards to me, a humble sinner, and my current condition. For when I had done two months in the fort of Thacyria, which I have mentioned, and I was lying ill, having had very little rest, the man who was then chief again sent me to the regions of Apsilia and Mesimiana to be handed over to custody in the fort of Phusta,\textsuperscript{21} and not to mince words,\textsuperscript{22} he led me for seven months around through all the regions I have described, naked and unshod and on foot, and oppressed by

\textsuperscript{18} Although we may note that Maximus was "speaking" with his tongue cut out.

\textsuperscript{19} In Latin, quintaedecimae before correction; cf. the next sentence.

\textsuperscript{20} I.e. Saturday 13th August, 662.

\textsuperscript{21} There is a tradition among the people of the village of Alexandrovksaia, near Sokhumi, that they live in the region of ancient Phusta (S. Qaukhchishvili, Georgica IV [Tbilisi, 1941], p. 54).

\textsuperscript{22} Latin absolute.
humili praeuidens Deus, qui omnia salubri prouidentia sua producit, usque nunc conservauit me in hac multarum tribulationum et miseriae uita. Post aliquot itaque dies pellitur illinc praedictus princeps. Deindeque succedens alius usus est compati, inter quae duxit me iuxta domum suam receptum a iam memorato castro Pustensium. Et post annum, ex diabola operatione motus, destinat me ad prae dictum castrum. Sed Deus qui remetitur his qui alii remetiantur, eadem die qua me pepulit, pulsus est hinc, et efficitur profugus in Christi amatorum regione Abasgorum, et consilio accepto a Christi amicis qui illic erant principibus magis com patriandi quam me minimum perseguendi, et orationem a me potius quam gemitum percipiendi, ipsi quippe amici Christi principes Abas giae compatiuntur humili mihi quanquam nescierint me, repromisit quidem illis quod si exiret inde et restitueretur in principatu, omnia quae forent ad solacium et refrigerium meum perficeret. Dein post paucos dies nescio unde adiutus egreditur quidem iterum et recipit principatum, nil tamen eorum quae pollicitus est Deo et crebro dictis Dei amicis principibus in opus perduxit. E contrario autem manibus nequam | deductus uiorum, repromi<s>sion quidem oblitus est, tolli autem me a castro Pustensium et maturius in Schemareos castrum mitti praecipit.

Factum interea est, cum ducerent me in iam nominatum castrum, ut ille iterum pelleretur et esset profugus ubi et primum fuerat. Excitauit autem Deus spiritum suum in uiro boni aemulatore qui Dei habeat in se timorem pariter et amorem, et uere pheronime vigilantem secundum

128/129 cf. Matth. 7, 2; Marc. 4, 24; Luc. 6, 38
cold and hunger and thirst, wishing in fact to wipe me too out from this life. But God, foreseeing I know not what concerning my humble self, who supplies everything through his saving providence, has preserved me up until now in this life of misery and many trials. And therefore, after several days, that chief was driven from there. And then he was succeeded by another, who seemed to have compassion, since he led me to near his own home, when I was delivered from the fort of Phusta just mentioned. And after a year, stirred by the activity of the devil, he dispatched me to the fort which I’ve mentioned. But God who gives back in equal quantity to people what they give to others, on the same day on which the chief drove me out, he was driven out\textsuperscript{23} from here, and was made an exile in the region of the Abasgians, who love Christ. Advised by the friends of Christ, who were chiefs there, to have compassion rather than persecute me in my lowliness, and to accept prayers from me rather than groans,\textsuperscript{24} those very Abasgian leaders and friends of Christ had compassion on my humble self although they did not know me. He indeed promised them that if he could leave there and be restored to the leadership, he would carry out everything for my comfort and refreshment. Then after a few days, aided from I know not where, he indeed went out again and regained the leadership, but he carried into action none of those things which he had promised to God and to the leaders and friends of Christ whom I have often mentioned. On the contrary, once delivered from the hands of men, that wretch in fact forgot his promise (and) instead ordered me to be removed from the fort of the people of Phusta and to be sent more quickly to the fort of Schemaris.

However, when they led me to the fort just named, it happened that he again was driven out and was in exile where he had been originally. But God stirred his spirit in a man who was an imitator of good, who was equally possessed of fear and love of God, and truly like his name possessed a mind vigilant with regard to God,

\textsuperscript{23} There is a switch in subject here from "God" to "he", i.e. the chief.

\textsuperscript{24} Literally "to accept prayer from me rather than a groan".
Deum possideat mentem, qui cum Deo nunc praest regioni, et Deum imitante condescensione seu compassione motus, reduxit me a uia crebro dicti Schemareos castri, et constituit me quasi quinque signis longius a diuinitus custodienda domo sua, in loco monachos ueraciter condescente, praebens necessarias largissime corporis utilitates. Pro quibus omnibus Christus uerus Deus, per intercessiones quae illum secundum carmem genuit Dei genitricis semperque uirginis Mariae ac omnium sanctorum, protegat eum una cum amandis filiis suis atque honorabili horum ac prorsus laudabili matre, ab omni caterna malignantium et a multitudine operantium iniquitatem, donans illis honorum refectionem, ut semper omnem sufficientiam habentes, abundant in omne opus bonum, et statione faciat eos quae a[d] dextris futura est dignos, atque diuinam illam et mitem uocem expertos quae dicet: Venite benedicti Patris mei, haereditate percipite praeparatum uobis regnum ab origine mundi, quia <h>ospes fui, et collegistis me et cetera, amen.

Obsecro autem sanctissimos uos eadem pro ipsis postulare in sanctis orationibus uestris, et maxime cum in sanctis et colendis oraeritis. Digni quippe sunt quibus haec pr <a> estetis. Filii enim germani existunt sanctae Christi Dei nostri Anastaseos. Denique Stephanum, qui in sanctis est, filium uidelicet beati Iohannis presbyteri qui cimiliarcha sanctissimae illius ecclesiae fuit, uenientem in hanc regionem, ut asseruit, ad requisitionem humilitatis meae, ipsi cum omni studio et gudio susceperunt et honorauerunt, et omnem subuectionem ad

who with God now governs the region. And imitating God, moved by condescension or compassion, he led me back along the road from the fort of Schemaris, which has been often mentioned, and he settled me at about five miles distance from his house, which was under divine protection, in a place truly fitting for monks, bestowing the necessary provisions for the body most generously. On behalf of all of these, may Christ the true God, through the intercessions of the mother of God and ever-virgin Mary who bore him in the flesh, and of all the saints, protect him together with all his beloved sons and their honourable and entirely praiseworthy mother, from all the malicious crowd and the throng of evil-doers. May God give them the refreshment of good things, so that they, always having every sufficiency, may abound in every good work and may he make them worthy to stand one day at his right hand, and may they experience that divine and gentle voice which will say: Come, blessed of my father, inherit the kingdom prepared for you from the beginning of the world, because I was a guest and you welcomed me, et cetera, amen.

I beg you most holy people, make the same requests for them in your holy prayers, and especially when you pray in the holy and sacred (places). The people for whom (you) offer these (prayers) are worthy indeed. For they are true brothers of (the church of) the Holy Resurrection of Christ our God. Then indeed, they received and honoured with all zeal and joy Stephan, who is among the saints, namely the son of the blessed priest John who was cimiliarch of that most holy church, when he came to this region, as he asserted, to search for my humble self, and

---

25 Latin signis "mile-posts". The author of the Hypomnesticon relates that Gregory's estate was at Zichchoris, and that Anastasius ended his days in the camp of Thousumes, situated above the villa Mochoes, in the border region of Apsilia.

26 Garrigues, op. cit., p. 447, n. 76, seems to understand this sentence as referring to the brothers Theodore and Theodosius, who are also described in Hypomnesticon, p. 90 as "germane brothers", and took it to mean that they belonged to the Church of the Holy Resurrection in Jerusalem. However, syntactically this is impossible, although we must allow for the possibility of error in Anastasius' translation.

27 I.e. Stephan of Dora was the Palestinian sent by Sophronius to Rome c. 640. His father was the treasurer of the Church of the Holy Resurrection in Jerusalem.
requisitionem mei tribuerunt, tanquam homini profecto sanctae Christi Dei nostri Anastaseos. Vnde et subsidium eorum habens, inuenit me sanctus ille Stephanus, cui faciat Dominus Deus misericordiam in illa die iustus iudex, sed et his qui miserunt eum, quoniam reuera opus evangelistae fecit. Sicut enim equus spiritualis ascensorem habens, ipsum scilicet Deum iuxta Scripturam quae ait: Ascendens super equos tuos, et equitatus tuus sanitas, totam Lazicam et Apsiliam et Abasgiam discurrens, sine timore tam quae ueritatis, quam quae subintroductae nouitatis erant, annun[tiauit], ac multorum utilitatis atque salutis et meae ipsius quietis et consolationis causa uiri est facta praeuentia, et nequam nomen, quod ueri apostatae ueritatis nobis imposuerunt, ex tunc dissipatum est, et euidens multis ueritas facta est. His itaque bonis hic proprio aduentu correctis, nobilis ille uiri, kalendis Ianuarii octauae indictionis quae modo praeterit, apud Christi amicum Abasgiæ principem dormiuit in Domino. Cui omnes qui hunc nouerunt, ut sancto requiem exoptarunt.

Quapropter oportebat quosdam ex uestratibus, Dei amatoribus et secundum scientiam zelum Dei habentibus, huc uenire, et quae ueritatis et pro ueritate sunt testificari, ut et orthodoxya magis conualesceret, et introducta nouitas peramplius argueretur, sed et ego humilis consolatione ac refecctione poterit, et uenientes bonam a Christo Deo, pro quo etiam causa est, mercedem perciiperent. Et maxime cum usque ad Hiberiam illinc, ut didici, ueniant, cuiuis rei gratia et huc minime ueniunt?

f. 46°
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they gave him all support in the search, as to a man truly of (the church of) the Holy Resurrection of Christ our God. Whereupon, by their aid, holy Stephan found me. To him may our Lord God the just judge show mercy on that day, but also to those who sent him, since he truly performed the work of an evangelist. For like a spiritual horse, having for its rider God himself, according to the Scripture which says: Mounting on your horses and your riding (is) salvation, he travelled through all of Lazica and Apsilia and Abasgia, (and) he fearlessly proclaimed both what was true and what had been introduced through innovation. And the presence of the man brought profit and salvation to many, and brought me peace and consolation, and the evil reputation which the true apostates of truth had imposed on us was dissipated from that point on, and the truth was made clear to many. And thus when these good people had been set straight by his own arrival here, that noble man, on the Kalends of January of the eighth indiction which has just passed,28 fell asleep in the Lord at the house of the leader of Abasgia, who was a friend of Christ. All who knew him prayed for rest for him, as for a saint.

On account of this it was fitting that certain of those of you who love God and have zeal for God in accordance with wisdom, should come here and give testimony to what is true and on behalf of the truth, so that both the orthodox faith might grow stronger, and the introduced innovation might be exposed more fully; but also so that I, in my lowliness, might grow stronger by consolation and convalescence, and that those who come might receive a good reward from Christ God for whose sake they come.29 And especially since they have come as far as Iberia from there, as I found out, why don’t they come here too?

---

28 I.e. January 1, 665.

29 The Latin pro quo etiam causa est is not clear; the Greek text recommences at this point in the sentence.
Obsecro igitur sanctissimos uos, si possibile fuerit, transmiti mihi, per quenquam fidelem uirum ex his qui ad Hiberniam ueniunt, codicem eorum quae canonice gesta sunt a sancta et apostolica synodo, quae per sacram praeeceptionem sancti martyris et apostolici ac summí papae Martini in seniori Roma est celebrata, quatinus multo magis sacra sanctorum patrum dogmata et quae olim et nunc exortae sunt hereticorum abominationes euidentiores hic positis efficiantur. Hoc enim tantummodo etiam inuiti et nolentes faciunt bonum, qui Deum et nos iniuste persequuntur, quia in diuersa loca et regiones nos exulant, agunt ut et sanitae patrum orthodoxia quam et nos praedicamus peramplius manifestetur, et propria cacodoxia in omni loco et regiune publicetur et arguatur, secundum illum sancti Dionysii Athenarum episcopi et martyris ueritatis affatum, quem ait: «Nouit Deus malum uel bonum,» id est, ut bonum, «et apud eum causae malorum, uirtutes sunt benefacienses.» Bonum enim ueraciter est paternam quidem orthodoxiam, ut dixi, manifestare et confirmare, hereticam uero cacodoxiam publicare ac redarguere, quanquam per exilia id et alias tribulationes gignatur. Sic enim ab initio uerbum quidem dilatatum est ueritatis, porro impietatis minoratum disparuit, persecutionem et exilia seu alia dira patientibus tam sanctis prophetis, quam apostolis ceterisque magistris.

Ergo si, ut flagitaui, a Deo compuncti sacram codicem miseritis, si quidem uoluerint qui hunc portaturi sunt | huc uenire, ad famosissimum et Deo custodiendum patricium et cum Deo magistrum Gregorium sponte

---

226/228 Ps. Dion. Areop., De diu. nom. IV, 30, ed. Suchla, Bd. 1, p. 175, 11-12
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Thus I beseech you, most holy people, if it is possible, to transmit to me, through one of the believers who are coming to Iberia, a codex containing what was passed according to canonical decree by the holy and apostolic synod, which, through the sacred command\textsuperscript{30} of the holy martyr and apostolic and highest pope Martin, was celebrated in older Rome,\textsuperscript{31} in order that the holy teachings of our holy Fathers, and the abominations of the heretics which have arisen in the past and the present, may be made much more more evident to those placed here.\textsuperscript{32} For even unwillingly and inadvertently, those who unjustly persecute God and us, do this good and only this: by banishing us to diverse places and regions, they bring it about that the orthodox faith of the holy Fathers, which we also preach, is revealed further, and the actual heresy is held up to scorn and refuted in every place and region, according to that saying of the holy Dionysius, bishop of Athens and witness to the truth, which says: "God knows [evil and the good in it];"\textsuperscript{33} that is, how good, "and in it the causes of evils, have the power to do good." For it is truly good to reveal and confirm the orthodox faith of the Fathers, as I said, but (also) to make known and refute heretical belief, even though it is achieved through exiles and other hardships. For thus from the beginning the word of truth indeed was disseminated further, and the word of impiety diminished and disappeared, when the holy prophets and the apostles and other teachers suffered persecution and exiles or other dreadful fates.

Therefore if, as I requested, you are compelled by God to send me the sacred codex, if indeed those who are to carry it are willing to come here, let them willingly meet the most famous patrician Gregory, who is protected by God and a \textit{magistros}\textsuperscript{34}

\textsuperscript{30} Latin \textit{praecipionem, a terminus technicus}; cf. \textit{praecipsum}, \textit{Ep. Max. 37}.

\textsuperscript{31} I.e. the Acts of the Lateran Synod of 649.

\textsuperscript{32} In Lazica and especially Thousumes there seem to have been many supporters of the dyothelite cause. The existence of a cult of Maximus in Georgia is evidenced by the existence of two early \textit{Lives} of the saint, from the tenth and twelfth centuries.

\textsuperscript{33} Our Latin and Greek texts both mean "bad or good"; I have followed the Greek of the original text of Dionysius the Areopagite.

\textsuperscript{34} A high-ranking dignity (\textit{ODB}, p. 1267).
occurrens, suscipientes ad eum palam epistolam a laudabili patrio et praetore Hiberiae, at uero si fortassis hucusque uenire noluerint, tribuant eum praedicto laudabili praetori Hiberiae qui debeat illum mittere praelato domino nostro et amplissimo patricio et cum Deo magistro Gregorio, quatinus hoc facientes, perciptatis <***> qui ex ipso profecerint bonam a Christo Deo nostro mercedem.

Praeterea misi ad praesens, cum hac epistola mea, Deo honorabilibus uobis, et per uos sanctissimae ac orthodoxae quae illic est ecclesiae, rotulum habentem testimonia ex dictis sancti Hypoliti episcopi Portus romani ac martyris Christi Dei nostri, quo et per ea nosse habeatis quam concorditer cum aliis omnibus sanctis patribus et arduae duas salvatoris nostri Iesu Christi praedicet naturas et operationes, refellat autem eos qui unam operationem, et naturam unam diuinitatis et humanitatis eius dogmatizant, utpote «convertibilatatem simul et commixtionem, confusionemque» ac diuisionem utriusque ipsius naturae annuntiantes. Quaerite sane diligenter huiuscemodi sacram patris illius librum secundum superscriptionem quae testimonii praeminet. Si enim inueneritis eum, multa et necessaria poteritis ex ipso legere testimonia super eisdem salvatoris nostri naturis et operationibus. Hunc quippe librum Byzantii nobis, antequam passi fuissetemus, delatum, cum hunc totum uellemus transcribere, subito iuxta consuetudinem suam, insistentes adversarii latronum more rapuerunt, et non ualuitus ex ipso plus quam haec octo testimonia tollere.
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with God. (They should) of course take him a letter from the praiseworthy patrician and praetor of Iberia. But if by chance they do not wish to come as far as here, let them give the codex to the praiseworthy general of Iberia, whom I have mentioned, who ought to send it to Gregory whom I’ve spoken of, our lord and most generous patrician and magistros with God, in order that, by doing this, you may receive a good reward from Christ our God, because they will benefit from this (book).\textsuperscript{35}

Moreover, I am now sending, along with this letter of mine to you who are honourable to God, and through you to the most holy and orthodox church which is there, a little scroll containing testimonia from the sayings of the holy Hippolytus, bishop of the Port of Rome and martyr for Christ our God.\textsuperscript{36} I have done this in order that through them also you might know how he preaches two natures and activities of our Saviour Jesus Christ, in agreement with all other holy Fathers and with enthusiasm, but he refutes those who teach one activity and one nature of his divinity and humanity, as advocating "the changeability as well as the commixture, and confusion" and division of each of his natures. Indeed, search carefully for a holy book of this kind belonging to this father, under the dedication which precedes the sayings, for if you find it, you will be able to read many essential pronouncements from it concerning those same natures and activities of our Saviour. This book was in fact passed on to us at Byzantium before we suffered, and although we wished to copy all of it, at once our enemies, entering in the manner of thieves, snatched it, in their usual fashion, and we were not able to copy more than these eight extracts from it.

\textsuperscript{35} There is something omitted in the Latin here, probably because the Greek reads with difficulty.

\textsuperscript{36} I.e. Testimonia of Pseudo Hippolytus, or Contra Beronem et Heliconem haereticos (CPG 1916), which are translated infra. About this author, who wrote under the name of the early third-century Bishop of the Port of Rome, little is known. On the genuine Hippolytus, and a second author of the third century whose works appear under the same name, see P. Nautin, "Hippolytus", EEC, pp. 383-385. The contents of the Testimonia reveal that the author is a contemporary of Maximus (if not Maximus himself).
Quod uero me in medio eorum quae dicta sunt latuit, dicere non pigritabor. Hoc plane est, quia cum euangelizatus fuissem a sanctae memoriae domno Stephano de unitate atque concordia quae ibidem omnium per orthodoxam confessionem ad inuicem et ad Deum effecta est, spirituali, acsi coram Deo dico, laetitia sum repletus, et gratificos hymnos pro tali ac tanto bono, misericordi Deo, licet peccator retuli, et referens non cessabo, petens hanc usque in finem immobilem conseruari ad benignissimae misericordiae suae gloriam et salutem nostram.

Vosque Deo honorabiles et omnes qui uobiscum sunt sanctos, ac per uos totam sanctam quae illic est Dei catholicae et apostolicae saluto ecclesiæ, postulans mei peccatoris scilicet et uincti memoriam fieri in sanctis ad Deum directis orationibus uestris | in sanctis atque colegendi locis, ac pretiosissime desiderandis syllabis uestris fulciendo ac me minimum consolando, atque orando ut dignus efficiar uiusione uilitus uestri, quanuis sit temerarium dictu, priusquam et ipse hanc miseram et multarum tribulationum uitam exceedam.

f. 47v

Sch. cf. Brightman, Liturgies Eastern and Western, p. 538, n. 17


291 Scholion. Obiit autem et ipse sanctus Pater noster et martyr Anastasius, qui hanc scripsit epistolam, die Dominico, hora tertia, quinto idus Octobrias, cum in sancta collecta diceret, «Sancta, sanctis,» indictione decima.
But I will not be slow to tell what has escaped my notice in the course of what has been said. It’s this in fact: when I was informed by lord Stephan of holy memory about the unity and agreement brought about there among everyone, mutually and with God, through orthodox confession, I was filled with spiritual joy as if, I say, before God; and although I am a sinner, I offered to God, who is merciful, hymns of thanksgiving on account of the nature and magnitude of the blessing, and I will not cease to offer them, seeking that this be conserved unchanged to the end, for the glory of his most benevolent compassion and for our salvation. And I greet you who are honourable to God, and all the holy people with you, and through you the entire holy, catholic and apostolic church of God there. I request that I, sinner and prisoner, be mentioned in the holy prayers you direct to God, in the holy and revered places, and that you sustain and comfort me in my humility with your precious letters, 37 which I long for, and pray 38 that I be made worthy of the sight of your face, although it is a bold thing to say, before I too leave this wretched life of many sorrows.

Scholion

But our holy father and martyr Anastasius who wrote this letter himself died too, on Sunday in the third hour on the fifth day before the Ides of October 39 when "Holy things for the holy" was being said in the holy assembly, in the tenth indiction.

37 Latin syllabis from syllaba “syllable, verse” or syllabus “list, syllabus”.

38 Latin orando; Greek omits this verb, and the infinitive ἐξαπατον “to be made worthy” depends on the participle ἔρχομαι “asking” (Devreesse, La lettre, p. 16, ch. 7).

39 I.e. October 11, 666.
SYLLOGISMI ET TESTIMONIA

Prologus subiacentium sacrorum testimoniorum

Testimonia sacra et divinitatis inspirata, per quae liquidius dis[s]cimus, duas per unitatem inconfusam et indiuisam sicut naturas, ita etiam et duas voluntates, ac duas operationes aptas et congruentes naturis, id est diuinam et humanam, non incoetam et incoetam, ut Dei simul et hominis unius et eiusdem Domini nostri Iesu Christi, corde credere ad iustitiam, ore confiteri ad salutem; non autem sicut nothi, qui notha nunc eclesias docentes et perturbantes, unam et nec unam, nec duas, et iterum unam et duas voluntates et operationes in eodem dogmatizant. Hoc enim super instabilitatem et absurditatem sensus eorum qui huiusmodi dogmata exponunt, impium omnino et alienum immaculatae fidei nostrae Christianorum consistit. Eos enim, qui unam voluntatem et operationem, uel etiam naturam unam deitatis et humanitatis eius dogmatizant, inclyti institutores nostri et praeceptores repellunt et detestatur. Hereticorum quipe est huiuscemodi dogma qui in confusione et phantasia et diviisione oberrant. Ergo et hi, qui nunc unam tantum duarum salvatoris nostri Christi natura <ru>m, voluntatem et operationem dogmatizant, nonne cum illis, et secundum illos, supersubstantialis theologiae, ac in carne factae dispensationis subuertunt et diffidentur mysterium, quaternitatem quidem personarum Trinitatem astraentes, ipsum uero unum eiusdem, id est Dominum nostrum Iesum Christum uerum Deum, iuxta quod secundum nos «factus est homo», inanimalem simul et irrationalem atque sine intellectu subscribentes, et coniecturam, et phantasiam, confusionemque ac divisionem utriusque naturae ipsius introducentes. Hi uero qui nec


Prologue to the adjoining holy Testimonia

(These are) the holy and divinely inspired testimonia, through which we learn more clearly to believe in the heart for justice (and) to confess with our mouths for salvation, two natures through an unmixed and undivided union, (and) in the same way also both two wills and two activities fitting and appropriate to the natures, that is the divine and the human, the without-beginning and the begun, as belonging to God and man at the same time, one and the same, our Lord Jesus Christ; but not as those false people confess, who now cause confusion for the churches by their false doctrines, teaching one and not one, nor two, and again one and two wills and activities in the same (person). For this, as well as establishing the unreliability and absurdity of the understanding of the exponents of this kind of teaching, also stands as altogether unholy and foreign to our unstained faith as Christians. For our renowned founders and teachers reject and loathe those who teach one will and activity, or even a single nature of his divinity and his humanity. Clearly this kind of teaching belongs to heretics who stray in confusion and imagining and division. Therefore those people too, who now teach only one will and activity of the two natures of our Saviour Christ, surely suppress and deny – along with them and following them – the mystery of supersubstantial theology and of the dispensation made in flesh. They construe the Trinity as four persons, but claim that that very one of the same, i.e. our Lord Jesus Christ the true God, according to the fact that "he was made man", as we believe, (is) at the same time inanimate and irrational and without intellect, and they introduce conjecture and imaginings and confusion and division of each of his natures. But these people who do not want to
Porro, hi qui unam et duas voluntates et operationes in incarnata eius dispensatione super nouam fabulam et figuramentum huiusmodi dogmatis dogmatizant, non solum orthodoxae ac paternae confessioni hereticam opinione, ueluti aquam unio secundum illud quod dicitur, misconentes simul praedicarem volunt, sed et tres voluntates, et tres operationes, et totidem ex necessitate etiam naturas, id est essentias, habentem eum inducunt, cum nec naturam esse sine operatione, nec rursus operationem sine natura possible sit. Habent enim se praedicta testimonia quemadmodum subinfortum.

Sancti Hyppoliti episcopi Portus Romani et martyris uretatis, ex sermone qui est per elementum de theologia et incarnatione contra Beronem et Heliconem hereticos, cujus initium est, «Ἀγιος, ἀγιος, ἀγιος, Dominus Sabhathos» incessanti uoce clamantes seraphim Deum glorif<ic>ant.

Immensae quippe uirtutis uoluntate Dei, et facta sunt omnia et salvantur quae facta sunt, secundum suas ipsius oportune singula conservata rationes, ei qui est secundum naturam immensae uirtutis Deus et factor uniuersorum, diuina uoluntate, quae omnia fecit ac mouet, suis unaqueque naturalibus producta legibus, immobili permanente. Quod enim immensum est, nulla ratione uel modo recipit motum, non habens quo et circa quod moueat. Vertibilitas enim eius qui est inexpers motionis, motus est. Propter quod secundum nos ueraciter factum homo absque peccato Dei

39 cf. Is. 1, 22 49/50 Is. 6, 3 61 Heb. 4, 15

confess either will or activity in him, pronounce (that he is) without existence or essence according to each of his natures, and show themselves even more unholy than the said heretics through their own teachings.

Furthermore, those who teach one and two wills and activities in his incarnate dispensation, as well as the new version and figment of this kind of teaching, not only wish to teach heretical views at the same time as the orthodox confession of the Fathers, as if mixing water with wine, as it is said, but also represent him as having three wills, and three activities, and even as many natures, i.e. essences, by necessity, since it is not possible for there to be a nature without an activity, nor again an activity without a nature. For the testimonia which I mentioned speak as follows.

From the sermon of the holy Hippolytus, bishop of the Port of Rome and martyr of the truth,1 which concerns theology and incarnation, against the heretics Beron and Helicon,2 which begins according to the verse:3 "Holy, holy, holy, Lord of hosts" the seraphim glorify God with ceaseless voice.

By the will of God which is of unlimited power, all things were made, and all things made are saved, each thing conserved appropriately according to its internal designs,4 while the divine will which made and moves all things, each produced according to its own natural laws, remains unchanged for him who is according to nature God of unlimited power, and the maker of all. For what is unlimited accepts movement by no reason or manner, not having the space in which or that around which it may be

---

1 Or "witness to the truth": the Latin martyr veritatis can mean both.

2 These two opponents are only known from this work. The editor of PL129, 665 notes in (a) that two manuscripts give the latter's name as Πλατώνος. On the claims made by Beron, the heir of Valentinus the Apollinarist, about the single activity of Christ, see Extracts V (p.67), VI (p. 68) and VIII (p. 70).

3 The Latin per elementum does not capture the sense of Greek κατά στοιχεῖον λόγου, which I have translated here.

4 Ἀγων in Greek are the internal designs or rational principles of each intellective being.
uerbum, operatumque ac patiens humanitus quaeunque naturae sunt sine peccato, et naturalis carnis circumscriptio nen propter nos sustinens, nullam omnino propter exinanitionem uicissitudinem pertulit cui id ipsum est Patri, factum id ipsum carni. Sed sicut erat sine carne, omni etiam excepta circumscriptione permansit, et per carnem defice operans quae deitatis sunt, utraque ostendens se per quae dupliciter, diuine scilicet et humane, operatum est secundum eandem, quae ueraciter uera est et naturalis substantia, Deum immensum simul et circumscriptum hominem existentem et intellectum, <substantiam> utriusque perfecte perfectam habentem, cum eadem operatione, id est naturali proprietate, ex quibus manentem semper secundum naturam sine convertibilitate earum differentiam scimus, sed non (sicut quidam aiunt) secundum comparationem, ne eundem sibi secundum ipsum praeter quod oportet maiorem ac minorem dicamus. |

Connaturalium quippe, et non eorum quae alterius sunt naturae, comparationes existunt. Deo enim factori omnium fact[or]um, infinitoque finitium, et infinitati finis, secundum nullam comparatur rationem, cum semper et per omnì naturaliter abinuiecem, sed non comparativue differantur, quanquam ineffabilis quaedam et indirrumpibilis in unam subsistensiam utriusque facta sit unitas, omnem penitus omnis facti scientiam fugiens. Diunitas enim, ut erat ante incarnationem, est et post incarnationem, secundum naturam infinita, incomprehensibilis, impa<s>sibilis, incomparabilis, inconvertibilis, per se potens, et, ut totum dicamus, subsistens substantialis solum infinitae uirtutis bonum.


64
II Eiusdem ex eodem sermone

Factus ergo ueraciter secundum Scripturas, non conuersus uniuersorum Deus homo sine peccato, ut nouit ipse solus, cum sit artifex naturalis eorum quae sunt supra sensum, in ipsa simul salutari incarnatione deitatis suae coaptans carni operationem, non circumscriptam ea propter euacuationem, nec sicut ex deitate sua, ita et ex ipsa naturaliter cognatam, sed in quibuscunque incarnatus sit deifice operatus est per ipsam declaratam. Non enim caro facta est per naturam deitas, translata natura, facta uidelicet secundum naturam deitatis caro, sed quod erat etiam deitati coaptata mansit, id est caro infirma et passibilis natura et operatione, quemadmodum saluator ait: Spiritus quidem promptus, caro autem infirma. In qua operatus et passus quae erant carnis absque peccato, exinanitionem pro nobis indicauit diuinitatis, miraculis et carnis passionibus naturaliter roboratam. Propter hoc enim factus est homo uniuersorum Deus, ut carne quidem passibili patiens, totum nostrum morti uenditum redimeret genus, impassibili uero deitate per carmem mirabiliter operans, ad immortalem illud et beatam reduceret uitam, de qua occiderat diabolo parens, atque sanctos intellectualium substantiarum caeli ordines ad inconuentibilitatem mysterio suae stabiliret incorporationis, cuius opus omnium est in eum recapitulatio. Mansit ergo etiam incarnatus secundum naturam Deus superimmensus, sibi cognatam et convenientem habens operationem, ex deitate quidem substantialiter natam, per sanctissimam uero carmem in miraculis dispensatorie declaratam, ut credatur Deus esse, per infirmam natura carmem per se operans uniuersitatis salutem.

94 cf. Heb. 4, 15 103/105 Matth. 26, 41; Marc. 14, 38 105/107
cf. Ep. Leonis ad Flavianum, ACO i, i, pp. 14, 28 - 15, 1 106
Heb. 4, 15 115 cf. Eph. 1, 10

96 coaptans] e corr. manu sec. 98 cognatam] corred e gr.
ἀφοσιωμένην, cognitam cod.
Extract II from the same sermon

Therefore according to Scripture, the God of the universe truly became man without sin, not through conversion, as he himself alone knows, since he is the natural fashioner of those things which are above understanding, fitting the activity of his divinity to the flesh simultaneously in the saving incarnation, (an activity) which was not limited by it\(^8\) because of the emptying, and not springing from the flesh naturally as it did from his divinity, but manifested through it in whatever he performed divinely as the incarnate one. For the flesh was not made deity through nature, with the nature changed over, that is, it was (not) made flesh according to the nature of deity, but what it was, the flesh remained even when fitted to the deity, that is, weak and possible in nature and activity, as the Saviour said: *For the spirit is willing but the flesh is weak*. Acting and suffering in the flesh those things of the flesh *without sin*, he revealed the emptying of the divinity on our account, confirmed according to its nature by miracles and in the sufferings of the flesh. For on this account the God of all was made man, so that by suffering indeed in possible flesh, he might ransom all our race which had been sold to death; but by his impassible divinity working miracles through the flesh, (so that) he might lead it\(^9\) back to the immortal and blessed life, from which it had fallen by obeying the devil; and so that he might establish the holy heavenly orders of intellectual substances in unchangeability by the mystery of his enfleshment, whose task is the recapitulation of all to him. Therefore even when he was incarnate, he remained the supremely unlimited God by nature, possessing an activity related and appropriate to himself, which in fact was produced from the deity in substance, but which was revealed through (his) most holy flesh in miracles through the economy, so that he might be believed to be God, bringing about through his agency the salvation of all through the flesh which is by nature weak.

Extract III from the same sermon

For if I may explain what was said about the Saviour by an example, my natural speech is related and appropriate to me, since I am a rational and intellectual soul.

---

\(^8\) Sc. the flesh.

\(^9\) Sc. human kind.
III Eiusdem ex eodem sermone

Etenim et mihi, ut paradigmate quod de salutare dictum est exprimam, naturalis sermo meus cognatus est et competens, cum sim rationalis | et intellectualis anima. Cuius secundum naturam est a se mobilis operatio ac prima uirtus, semper mobilis sermo naturaliter ex ea profluens, quem uerbis prolatum et lineis exaratum lingua quidem organice cum oportet produco, et litteris artificiosē + per indissimilia non existentem, et dissimilibus non fugientem + ostendens eum subauditum. Non enim linguae ac litterarum naturalis sermo meus est, licet per eas ipsius faciamus pronuntiationem, sed meus, qui secundum naturam loquor, et per utrasque illum ut meum pronuntio, ab intellectuali quidem anima mea semper naturaliter diriuatum, per corporalem uero linguam meam organice, ut dixi, cum oportet productum. Sicut ergo in nobis, quantum aestimare possimus quod modis omnibus est inaestimabile, per corporalem linguam nostram inconvertibiliter, quae secundum naturam est animae rationabilis producitur uirtus, ita et in gloriosa Dei incarnatione, per sanctissimam carnem suam, in quibuscunque divinae operaretur, sine convertibilitate omnipotentia et cunctorum factiua totius deitatis operatio monstrabatur, absque omni secundum naturam circumscriptione permanens, licet per carnem fulget natura circumfinita <m>. Non enim circumscribitur facticia natura, quod secundum naturam factum non est, licet cooriatur ei per conceptionem omnem sensum circumscribentem; nec etiam in eodem ipso sibi natura differetur aliquando et naturalis operatio, donec utrunque intra

128 lingua cod. a. corr. manu sec. 132 ipsius] supra l. manu sec.
149/151 Anastasius non bene intellexit
My soul has, according to nature, a self-moving activity and primary power, the ever-moving speech flowing forth from it naturally, which I produce when necessary, and is carried forth in words and inscribed in lines\textsuperscript{10} by the tongue indeed as an organ, and skilfully by letters. I show that it has been understood, since it does not exist\textsuperscript{11} through (media) which are not unlike, and does not escape because of the differing (media). For my natural speech does not belong to the tongue and letters, although through them we articulate it, but belongs to me. I speak according to nature, and through both of them I articulate it as mine, always indeed by nature arising from the understanding of my mind, but produced through my bodily tongue as an organ, as I said, when it is fitting. Therefore, just as what is a rational power of the soul according to nature is produced in us through our physical tongue without change – as far as we can guess at what is altogether unable to be guessed –, in the same way also in the glorious incarnation of God, in the things he performed divinely through his most holy flesh, the activity of the whole deity – omnipotent and creative of all – was revealed, without the capacity for change, remaining without any limitation according to nature, although it shone through the flesh which was encompassed by nature. For what is according to nature without generation is not limited by a generated nature, although it arises in it through conception which limits it in every sense; nor indeed does the nature and natural activity at any stage differ from itself in the very same one,\textsuperscript{12} as long as each\textsuperscript{13} remains within its own natural unchangeability. For the movement of beings of the same nature alone is self-moving, revealing the substance of which it is the natural power, which is not in any way able to be or to become of the substance of a different-natured property without

\textsuperscript{10} Cf. Diekamp, p. 323, 10: ἰδαίων τε καὶ γραμματείας ἐφ' ἀρχάζως "both speaking and writing well in lines".

\textsuperscript{11} Cf. Diekamp, p. 323, 12: μὴ προτέρους "not changed" for Latin non existentem. The next clause "and does not escape because of the differing (media)" would seem to be a scholiast’s comment on the text of this clause, which may itself be corrupt.

\textsuperscript{12} Latin in eodem ipso sibi...differtur is a poor translation of εἰς τὸν τὸν ἑνὸς σεφορίζω (I have adopted Diekamp’s emendation of εἰς τὸν, p. 323, 26). The Greek means: "nor indeed can it (sc. what is according to nature not created) ever be reduced to this (sc. what is a created nature) in itself, in terms of nature or natural activity."

\textsuperscript{13} Latin utrunque is neuter singular, and presumably refers to each of "the created and the uncreated."
propriam manet naturalem inconvertibilitatem. Connaturalium enim tantum per se operans est motus, manifestans substantiam cuius naturalem constat esse uirtutem, diuersae naturae proprietatis substantia <e> nulla ratione esse uel fieri sine convertibilitate ualente <m>.

III Eiusdem ex eodem sermone
Mysterium nanque diuinæ incarnationis apostolis et prophetis atque doctoribus duplum ac diuersam in omnibus habere naturalem theoriam dinoscitur, cum sit perfectæ deitätis et plenæ demonstratiuum humanitatis. Quarum donec unum secundum substantiam non cognitum fuerit uerbum, unius operationis, cum utriusque sit, nunquam ali quando cognoscetur motus. Cum enim semper secundum naturam existat Deus, superinfinita[m] uirtute[m] factus, sicut uoluit, homo sine peccato, quod erat est, cum quantis cognoscitur Deus; et quod factus est, est cum quantis esse cognoscitur homo, secundum utunque suum semper permanens sine casu, quibus diuine pariter et humane operatus est, per[fectionem per omnem utriusque rationem sibi naturaliter incommutabilem saluans.

V Eiusdem ex eodem sermone
Bero enim quidam nuper, et alii quidam, Valentinii phantasia deserta, deteriori irretiti sunt prauitati, dicentes assumptam a uerbo carnef fuisse eadem quae diuinitas operata est operatam <propter assumptionem>, diuinitatem vero compassibilem carnis propter exinanitionem, convertibilitatem simul et commixtionem, seu co <n> fusionem, atque utriusque in inuicem mutationem dogmatizantes. Si enim assumpta caro facta est cooperatrix diuinitati, liquet quod et natura Deus cum quotquot est

---

165 cf. Heb. 4, 15 168/170 cf. Deusdedit, Conc. Lateranense, ACO ser. II., i, p. 59, 21-23

changeability.\textsuperscript{14}

Extract IV from the same sermon

For the mystery of the divine incarnation is recognised by the apostles and prophets and teachers to have a double and diverse natural basis for consideration in all respects, since it demonstrates perfect deity and full humanity. The movement of these\textsuperscript{15} will never be understood, since it belongs to both, until the Word is recognised as not being one according to substance, having one activity. For since God always exists according to nature, and was made man, as he wished, without sin by superinfinitely power, what he was he is, with whatever makes him recognised as God; and what he was made, he is, with whatever makes him recognised as man.\textsuperscript{16} He remains always without fail according to each of his (natures), in which he acted equally as God and as a human being, preserving in himself the naturally incommutable perfection through the whole internal design\textsuperscript{17} of each (nature).

Extract V from the same sermon

For a certain Beron lately, and certain others who had abandoned the notion of Valentinus,\textsuperscript{18} have been entangled in a worse depravity, in saying that the flesh assumed by the Word performed the same things which the divinity performed [on account of the assumption],\textsuperscript{19} but that the divinity suffered with the flesh on account of the emptying; and in teaching at the same time changeability and the mixing together, or confusion, and the changing of each into the other. For if the assumed

\textsuperscript{14} I have translated the emended text. The original Latin looks like an ablative-absolute phrase qualifying \textit{substantiam} but omits the second occurrence of the noun \textit{substantiae} (οὐσίας). Cf. the citation of this passage at 316/318.

\textsuperscript{15} Sc. deity and humanity.

\textsuperscript{16} For "man", the Greek, in Diekamp, p. 324, 6 reads: Θεὸς καὶ γνωρίζωσα πάντων ἄνθρωπος: "God, and is able to be known as man".

\textsuperscript{17} On the meaning of ratio, (Greek λόγος), see n.2 above.


\textsuperscript{19} This is supplied from the Greek, Diekamp, p. 324, 13-14: διὰ τὴν πρὸσολήψιν.
<naturaliter> intelligatur Deus, et si facta est exinanita compa<s>sibilis carnis diuinitas, liquet quod et natura caro cum quotquot est naturaliter esse intelligitur caro. Ea quippe quae mutuo sunt cooperantia et eadem operantia et eiusdem originis, profecto et compassibilia naturae non suscipientia differentiam, et naturis sibi confusis erit dualitas Christus, et, personis separatis, fiet quaternitas, quod est nimium fugiendum. Et quomodo illis unus et idem ipse erit Deus natura simul et homo Christus? Quam etiam secundum ipsos habebit essentiam mutatione diuinitatis factus homo, et carnis translatione Deus? Casus enim in alterutras, omnimoda est utrarumque peremptio. Inspiciatur itaque a nobis aliter sermo.

VI Eiusdem ex eodem sermone

Pium Christianis constitutum est dogma credentibus, secundum eandem naturam ac operationem, et omne alid sibi conueniens, aequalis sibi et eundem ipsum esse Deum, nihil omnino eorum quae sua sunt inaequale habentem et inconueniens. Si igitur secundum Beronem assumpta sibi caro eiusdem operationis effecta est, haud dubium quin et eiusdem facta est sibi naturae, cum quotquot est natura, id est inprincipalitate, infactione, infinitate, sempiternitate, incom praee hensibilitate, et quaeacunque horum secundum magnitudinem theologica amplissime in deitate ratio contemplatur, et uicissiduddinem utraque passa sunt, neutro naturae suae substantalem rationem ultra salvandam habente. Qui enim ea quae alterius sunt naturae sentit eandem operationem, [non] confusionem simul naturalem, et divisionem eius personalem introducit, incognita prorsus idiomatum commutatione naturali eorum facta existentia.
flesh was made a co-operator with the divinity, it is clear also that God is God in nature with however many (properties) he is understood to have [by nature], and if the emptied divinity was made able to suffer with the flesh, it is clear also that the flesh is flesh by nature with however many (properties) it is understood to have by nature. In fact those things which work together, and have the same scope of activity, and are of the same origin, and of course are able to suffer together, do not accept a difference of nature, and Christ will be a duality if his natures are confused with each other, and he will become a quaternity if the persons are separated, which must be utterly avoided. And how will there be one and the very same Christ from these, at the same time God and man by nature? And what essence will he have, according to them, when he is made man by mutation of the divinity, and God by change of the flesh? For [a change] into each other entails the total destruction of each one. Therefore let us examine the argument in another way.

Extract VI from the same sermon

The right teaching is established among Christians who believe that God is equal to himself and the very same, according to the same nature and activity, and everything else belonging to him, and that he has nothing at all unequal or unfitting in his characteristics. If, therefore, as Beron claims, the flesh assumed by him has been made to have the same activity, there is no doubt that his flesh has been made to have the same nature as he, with whatever the nature has, i.e. being without beginning, without being made, without end, everlasting, incomprehensible, and whatever attributes of magnitude theological reasoning contemplates most fully in the deity, and each has undergone change, with neither having the substantial internal design of its nature still intact. For whoever thinks that those things of another nature (have) the same activity, introduces at the same time a confusion of natures, and a division with respect to his person, with their natural existence made altogether recognisable by the exchange of the personal properties.

---

20 This is supplied from the Greek, Diekamp, p. 324, 18: φορτωμένος.

21 Greek μετάφυσις can mean "a grammatical inflexion", like the Latin casus which Anastasius has used in his translation, but which fails to give the right sense.

22 A verb needs to be supplied to the Latin noun phrase (eandem operationem), to render the sense of the Greek noun τοιούτουργίαν. The negative (non), missing from the Greek, has not been translated.
VII Eiusdem ex eodem sermone

Si uero eiusdem sibi non fuit naturae, nec eiusdem sibi aliquando fiuet naturalis operationis, ne appareat secundum naturam operationem inae qualem habere et inconuenientem, et suae ipsius, per omnia eorum quae sua sunt, naturalis extraneus factus aequalitatis et identitatis, quod est penitus impium.

VIII Eiusdem ex eodem sermone

In hunc autem errorem illati sunt male credentes propriam carnis effectam diuinam operationem, quae per ipsum in miraculis manifestata est, qua totum Christus substantians secundum quod intelligitur Deus, tenet retentum. Non enim cognoverunt, impo sibile[m] esse diuinae operationem naturae, alterius naturae substantiae idioma fieri absque convertibilitate; neque intellexerunt, quod non utique proprium sit carnis, quod per eam quidem ostensum est, non ex ea naturaliter ortum, praesertim cum clarae sit eis et manifestae probationis. Ego enim lingua loquens et manu scribens, unam et eandem per utramque intellectualis animae meae profero cogitationem, operationem eius existentem naturallem, nulla ratione ostendens eam lingua uel manu naturaliter ortam, sed nec effectam earum uel dictam cogitationem propter eius ex utraque manifestationem. Linguam enim uel manum cogitatiuam sapientes noulit nemo; sicut nec sanctissimam Dei carnis, pro eo quod assumpta sit, et per eam diunita sit operatio clara effecta, secundum <***> natura conditricem. Sed pie confitetur credens, qua «propter salutem nostram», et ut ad inco <n> ursibilitatem ligaret universitatem, uniuersorum conditor ex sanctissima semper uirigne Maria per

Ps. 81, 5 238 ex definitione Nicaena, in Conc. Lateranense, ACO ser. II, i, p. 219, 9-10

Extract VII from the same sermon
But if he\textsuperscript{23} was not of the same nature as himself, nor will he ever become of the same natural activity as himself, lest he should appear to have an activity which is unequal and unfitting to his nature, and to have become estranged from his own natural equality and identity through all the properties which belong to him: this is completely impious.

Extract VIII from the same sermon
But into this error have been drawn those who wrongly believe that the divine activity, which has been revealed through (the flesh) itself in miracles, was made proper to the flesh, by which (activity) Christ, who gave the universe substance, in so far as he is understood as God, holds it together in his power. For they did not know that it is impossible for an activity\textsuperscript{24} of the divine nature to become a property of a substance of another nature without changeability; nor did they understand that what has indeed been shown through it, but has not arisen from it by nature, is not indeed proper to the flesh, especially since it is a clear and obvious proof to them. For I, by speaking with my tongue and writing with my hand, bring forth one and the same thought from the understanding of my mind through each, (a thought) which exists as its natural activity, in no way indicating that it has arisen from the tongue or the hand by nature, nor that it is a deliberation which they have brought about by speaking,\textsuperscript{25} simply because it is manifested through both. For no-one who reasons sensibly thinks that the tongue or the hand is capable of thought; so too neither (does anyone reason) that the most holy flesh of God is according to (him)\textsuperscript{26} by nature capable of creation, by virtue of the fact that it has been assumed, and the divine activity has been made clear through it. But he confesses correctly, believing that the

\textsuperscript{23} Sc. Christ.

\textsuperscript{24} Cf. Greek ἐνεργεῖας "activities".

\textsuperscript{25} Sc. the tongue's and the hand's.

\textsuperscript{26} There is a problem with the Latin (secundum natura conditricem) and the Greek text here. I have translated my suggested emendation (eum), following the Greek, but it is not really clear to whom or what this pronoun (οὗτος) refers: perhaps it should be neutral rather than masculine, referring to the neutral accusative verbal noun clause "through the assumption", in which case the Latin should read secundum id natura conditricem.
conceptionem inuiolabiilem sine conversibilitate substantians sibimet animam intellectuallem cum sensu corpore, natura «factus est homo» malitiae alienus, totus Deus ipse, totus homo idem ipse, deitate quidem diuina per suam ipsius sanctissimam carmen, non existentia natura carnis, operans, humanitate uero humana, non existentia natura deitatis, nil diuinum nudum corpore operatur, nil humanum idem ipse priuatum diuinitate gerens, seruans sibimet modum secundum utrunque immutabilem, per quem operatus est utraque
decenti more, ad approbationem perfectae ac uerae nihilque habentis pravitas inhumanationis suae. Itaque Bero quidem
cic se habens, ut dixi, operationis monade deitatem Christi
et humanitatem naturaliter simil confundens, et partiens
personaliter, dissoluit utiam, ignorans solius
con[tra]naturalium personarum connaturalis identitatis
eandem ipsum operationem esse significativum.

Syllogismi de suppositis diuinitus sapientibus testimoniis,
| et alii, eiusdem Sancti Anastasii
Ecce nunc et sacratissimus hic et magnus doctor,
eresistatique testis fidelis, concorditer cum alii omnibus
sanctis catholicae Dei ac apostolicae institutoribus ecclesiae,
‘duas secundum unionem inconfusam et impartibilem
quemadmodum naturas, ita etiam duas voluntates et duas
operationes congruentes et conuenientes naturis, diuinam ut
dictum est et humanam, increatam et creatam, non incoeptam
et coeptam, tanquam Dei simul et hominis unius et eiusdem
Domini nostri Iesu Christi,’ magna uoce confitetur ac
praedicat, et confiteri nobis sine praeuaricatone iubet.

Difficillimum autem esse, ac modis omnibus impossibile
diffinit, ut unam volutatem et operationem aut naturam

243 ex definitione Nicaena, in Conc. Lateranense, ACO ser. II, i,
p. 219, 10 243/244 cf. Max. Disp. cum Pyrr., PG 91, 305 C 10-
12 262/267 cf. super, 3/7

246 post deitatis an ceciderunt aliqua? Vide gr. ἄνωθεν πάσην
θέοτος 250 decenti more] an corrigendum recenti more? cf. gr.
κατανοηθεν] 255 connaturalium] correci nisi 354, contranaturalum
cod. 262 inconfusam cod. a. corr. manu sec.

Scholion 244 ipse] totus Deus pariter natura, et homo idem ipse
founder of everything, "for our salvation", and so that he might bind everything to unchangeability, established in himself – from the most holy, ever-virgin Mary through the inviolable conception –, without changeability, an intellectual mind with a sentient body (and) "became man" by nature, a stranger to wrongdoing, wholly God and the very same one wholly man, (equally by nature wholly God and the very same one wholly man); with the deity, indeed, performing divine acts through his most holy flesh, not existing by nature in the flesh, but with the humanity accomplishing human acts, not existing by nature in the divinity, [enduring (human things) by suspension of divinity], and that he performed nothing divine stripped of the body, and the very same one accomplished nothing human that was deprived of divinity, (and) kept in himself an immutable mode (of existence) according to each, through which he performed both (kinds of act) in a fitting way, to prove his perfect and true incarnation, which contained no wickedness. And so Beron, who believes thus, as I said, in the monad of activity, confused together the deity and humanity of Christ in respect of nature; and by dividing him in respect of person, destroyed (his) life, not knowing that the very same activity indicates the single connatural identity of persons of the same nature.

Syllogisms on the attached divinely wise decrees and others, of the same holy Anastasius

Look now, this most holy and great teacher and faithful witness to the truth, in agreement with all other holy founders of the catholic and apostolic church of God, confesses and preaches in a loud voice, and orders us to confess without equivocation, "in the same way as two natures according to the unmixed and indivisible union, so also two wills and two activities which are appropriate and fitting to the natures, the divine – as has been said – and human, uncreated and created, without beginning and begun, as of God and man at the same time, and of one and the same, our Lord Jesus Christ."

But he describes it as most difficult, and in every way impossible, for those

---

27 This is supplied from the marginal gloss.

28 This is supplied from the Greek, Diekamp, p. 326, 5: ἀναχαίνε 

70
unam deitatis et humanitatis eius confiteantur hi qui pie
uiuere volunt. Propter quod et tale quid in eo dogmatizantes,
tanquam impios et alienos immaculatae nostrae
Christianorum fidei abicit et condemnat, nosque hoc facere
protestatur.

De duabus enim salvatoris nostri Christi naturis et
operationibus, ut breuiter paucu ex sacris illius eloquiis
expediem, haec euidenter affatur: 'Vtraque ostendens se per
quae dupliciter, divina scilicet et humane, operatum est
secundum eandem, quae ueraciter uera est et naturalis
substantia, Deum immensum simul et circumscripturn
hominem existentem et intellectum, substantiam utriusque
perfect[i]e perfectam habentem cum operatione sua, id est
naturali proprietate.'

Et rursus: 'Non enim facta est natura deitas, transmutata
natura, caro, facta natura diuinitatis caro, sed quod erat
etiam deitati coaptata mansit, caro infirma et passibilis natura
et operatione, sicut ait saluator: Spiritus quidem promptus,
caro autem infirma.'

Et iterum: 'Per quam operatus et patiens quae erant carnis
sine peccato, pro nobis indicauit exinanitionem deitatis,
miraculis et carnis passionibus naturaliter roboratam,'

Et iterum: 'Mysterium diuinæ incarnationis apostolis et
prophetis atque doctoribus duplum et diuersam habere
dinoscitur naturalem in omnibus theoriam, indimutae
deitatis existens et plenæ demonstratium humanitatis.'

Et iterum: 'Quibus diviine pariter et humane operatus est,
perfectionem per omnem utriusque rationem sibi naturaliter
incommutabilem saluans.'
who wish to live piously to confess one will and activity, or one nature of his divinity and humanity. On account of this and of similar (doctrines) that they are teaching in his\textsuperscript{29} regard, he rejects and condemns (them) as impious and foreign to our unstained faith as Christians, and calls us to do the same.

For concerning the two natures and activities of our Saviour Christ, to relate briefly a few passages from his holy sayings, he states this clearly: "...Showing himself to be both, through (the actions) which he performed in a twofold manner – that is, as God and as a human being –, according to the same substance which is truly real and natural, at once being and understood to be the unlimited God and the limited human being, and having the perfected substance of each perfectly, with its own activity, i.e. natural property."

And again, "For flesh was not made deity in nature, with the nature changed over, (i.e.) flesh made with the nature of divinity, but what it was the flesh remained even after it was fitted to the deity, weak and passible in nature and activity, as the Saviour said: \textit{For the spirit is willing but the flesh is weak}."

And again, "Through (the flesh), by acting and suffering the things of the flesh without sin, he revealed the emptying of the divinity for our sake, confirmed according to its natures in miracles and sufferings of the flesh."

And again, "The mystery of the divine incarnation is recognised by the apostles and prophets and teachers to have a double and different natural basis for consideration in all respects, since it existed as undiminished deity and demonstrated full humanity."

And again, "In which (sc. natures) he acted equally as God and as a human being, preserving in himself the naturally incommutable perfection through the whole internal design of each (nature)."

\textsuperscript{29} Sc. Christ's.
Et iterum: 'Nil diuinum nudum corpore operatus, nil humanum | idem ipse priuatum diuinitate gerens, seruans sibimet modum secundum utrunque immutabilem, per quem operatus est utraque decenti more, ad approbationem perfectae ac ueræ nihilque habentis prauritatis inhumanitionis suae.'

De his uero qui unam deitatis et humanitatis eius operationem et naturam unam dogmatizant, dicit: 'Non enim circumscribitur facticia natura, id quod per naturam factum non est, licet cooriatur ei per conceptionem omnem circumscribentem sensum; nec etiam in eodem ipso sibi natura differtur aliquando et naturalis operatio, donec utrunque intra propria manet naturalem inconuersibilitatem.'

Et item: 'Connaturalium quippe tantum est eadem ipsa operans motus, essentiam indicans cuius naturalem constat esse uirtutem, alterius naturae proprietate substantiae secundum nullam rationem esse uel fieri sine conversibilitate ualentem <m>.'

Item: 'Ea quippe quae mutuo sunt cooperantia et eadem operantia et eiusdem originis, profecto et compassibilia naturae non suscipieniia differentiam, et naturis sibi confusis erit dualitas Christus, et personis separatis, fiet quaternitas, quod est nimium fugiendum.'

Et iterum: 'Si igitur secundum Beronem assumpta sibi caro eiusdem operationis effecta est, haud dubium quin et eiusdem facta est sibi naturae, cum quotquot est natura, id est inprincipalitate, infactione, infinitate, sempiternitate, incompraehensibilitate, et quaecunque horum secundum magnitudinem theologica amplissime in deitate ratio contemplatur, et uicissitudinem utraque passa sunt, neutro
And again, "He performed nothing divine stripped of the body, and the very same one achieved nothing human that was deprived of divinity, (and) kept in himself an immutable mode (of existence) according to each, through which he performed both (kinds of act) in a fitting way, to prove his perfect and true human incarnation, which contained no wickedness."

But concerning those who teach one activity and one nature of his divinity and humanity, he says: "For what is according to nature without generation, is not limited by a generated nature, although it arises in it through conception which limits it in every sense, nor indeed does the nature and natural activity at any stage differ from itself in the very same one, as long as each remains within its own natural unchangeability."

And likewise, "In fact only the movement of beings of the same nature is self-moving, revealing the essence of which it is the natural power, which is in no way able to be, or to become, <with> the property of a substance of another nature,\textsuperscript{30} without changeability."

Similarly, "In fact those things which work together and have the same scope of activity, and are of the same origin, and of course are able to suffer together, do not accept a difference of nature, and Christ will be a duality if his natures are confused with each other, and he will become a quaternity if the persons are separated, which must be utterly avoided."

And again, "If therefore, as Beron claims, the flesh assumed by him has been made to have the same activity, there is no doubt that his flesh has been made to have the same nature as he, with whatever the nature has, that is, being without beginning, without being made, without end, everlasting, incomprehensible, and whatever attributes of magnitude theological reasoning contemplates most fully in the deity, and each has undergone change, with neither having the substantial internal design of

\textsuperscript{30} Cf. Extract 3: "of the substance of a property of a different nature..."
naturae suae substantialem rationem ultra salvandum habente.'

Et rursus: 'Qui enim eorum quae alterius sunt naturae eandem ipsam sentit operationem, confusionem pariter naturalem et diuisionem eorum inducit personalem, incognita prorsus idiomatum translatione naturali eorum facta essentia.'

Item: 'Si uero eiusdem sibi non fuit naturae, neque eiusdem sibi fiet naturalis operationis.'

Et iterum: 'In eundem autem errorem illati sunt, male credentes propriam factam carnis diuinam operationem, quae in miraculis per ipsam apparuit, qua totum Christus substantians secundum quod intelligitur Deus, continet retentum.'

Et iterum: 'Non enim cognoverunt impossibile esse diuinæ operationem naturæ <alterius naturæ> idioma fieri sine co <n>uer|tibilitea.'

f. 51r

Et iterum: 'Quarum donec unum secundum substantiam cognoscatur uerbum, unius operationis, nunquam aliquando, eo quod utriusque sit, cognoscetur motus.'

Et iterum: 'Itaque Bero quidem sic se habens, ut dixi, operationis unalitate deitatem Christi et humanitatem simul confundens naturaliter, et partiens personaliter, dissoluit utiam, ignorans solius connaturalium personarum connaturalis identitatis eandem ipsam operationem esse significati[u]um.'

His igitur ita et ab hoc quoque sacratissimo et magno doctore ac martyre ueritatis, (id ipsum autem est si dicamus a sanctissimo, qui in eo loquitur, Spiritu) manifestius dictis, diligenter intendant qui volunt, et maxime qui communicant


its nature still intact."
And again, "For whoever thinks that those things of another nature (have) the same activity, introduces at the same time a confusion of natures, and a division of their persons, with their natural existence made altogether unrecognisable by the exchange of the personal properties."
Likewise, "But if he was not of the same nature as himself, nor will he become of the same natural activity as himself."
And again, "But they have been drawn into the same error, believing wrongly that the divine activity, which was revealed through (the flesh) itself in miracles, was made proper to the flesh, by which (activity) Christ, who gave the universe substance, in so far as he is understood as God, holds it together in his power."
And again, "For they did not know that it is impossible for an activity of the divine nature to become the property of another nature without changeability."
And again, "While the Word is understood as being one according to substance of these,31 having one activity, movement will never be understood, since it belongs to both."
And again, "And so Beron, who believes thus, as I said, in the single activity, confused together the divinity and humanity of Christ in respect of nature; and by dividing him in respect of person, destroyed (his) life, not knowing that the very same activity indicates the single connatural identity of persons of the same nature."

So, therefore, let those who wish to do so attend diligently to these words, and to the clearer words spoken by this most holy and great teacher and martyr for the truth – but it is the same as if we should say "by the most Holy Spirit who speaks in him" – and especially those who enter into communion with the people who have

---

31 Sc. deity and humanity.
his, qui nouitates nunc operati sunt, et sciant certissime quia qui duas salvatoris nostri Christi voluntates naturales, et operationes denegant et abiciunt, et impiam ac alienam Christianici dogmatis tam sacram et orthodoxam confessionem appellant, unamque deitatis et humanitatis eius voluntatem et operationem dogmatizant, eos qui taliter sibi consone non confitentur anathematizantes, liquido, et absqueullo tegente uelamine sanctos prophetas et apostolos atque doctores; uel etiam ut uerius dicatur sanctissimum Spiritum qui in illis locutus est, quin immo et loquitur, anathematizant, et ab eo per illos traditam nobis sacram et orthodoxam confessionem abnegant et abiciunt, atque impiam et alienam a Christianico dogmate esse asseuerant; et aequaeut praedictus hereticus, quin potius ut omnes simul profaniheretic, qui in confusione ac phantasia et diuisione deceptisunt, solum supersubstantialis theologiae ac incarnatae dispensationis non abnegant et subuertunt mysterium, quaternitatem quidem personarum sanctam confitentes Trinitatem, at uero unum huius, id est Dominum nostrumIesum Christum, inanimatum et sine intellectu ac sine ratione, secundum quod propter nos «factus est homo», introducentes, et convertibilitatem simul et conspersionem ac mutabilitatem, confusionemque ac phantasiam et diisionem utriusque naturae ipsius pronuntiantes, et puri per hoc hominis uel prodigii cuiusdam matrem sanctam sempervirginem ac Dei genetricem Mariam scribentes.

Deinde uero hanc, quae uidelicet in eo ab illis dogmatizataest, unam uoluntatem et unam operationem respuentes, et neque unam, neque duas, id est diuinam et humanamvoluntatem uel operationem in eo, uel quandam ex omnibus
now brought about innovations. Let them know with the utmost certitude that those who reject and deny two natural wills and activities of our Saviour Christ, and those who call such a holy and orthodox confession "impious" and "foreign to Christian teaching", and teach one will and activity of his divinity and his humanity, anathematising those who do not confess in like manner in agreement with them, clearly and without any covering veil (anathematising) the holy prophets and apostles and teachers; or even, as may be said more truly, they anathematis the most Holy Spirit who spoke in them, or rather who speaks in them, and they reject and deny the holy and orthodox confession handed down to us by the Spirit through them, and maintain that it is impious and foreign to Christian dogma. And just like the heretic whom I mentioned, or rather like all wicked heretics together, who have been deceived in confusion and fantasy and division, they not only deny and subvert the mystery of supersubstantial theology and the incarnate dispensation, by actually confessing the holy Trinity as four persons, but they (also) introduce one of the Trinity, that is our Lord Jesus Christ, as inanimate and without intellect and without reason, according to the fact that "he was made man" on our account; and they profess at the same time the changeability and fragmentation and mutability, and confusion and fantasy and division of each of his natures, and through this (reasoning) they write that the holy ever-virgin and bearer of God, Mary, is the mother of a mere man or a kind of monster.

But then, by rejecting this one will and one activity which they in fact teach in him, and refusing to confess either one, or two, that is a divine and human will or activity in him, or any (will and activity) at all, they not only reveal themselves as

32 Sc. the holy prophets, apostles and teachers.

33 Sc. Beron.
confiteri volentes, non solum instabiles | et tergiuersatores, sed et hereticis qui in confusione ac phantasia et divusione errauerunt, magis impios ipsi seipsos propriis uerbis et dogmatibus monstrant. Nam illi quidem uel unam, isti uero nec unam uoluntatem uel operationem eum habere uolunt, ac per hoc insubstantialem illum et inessentialem, minus enim <non > est dicere sine uoluntate ac impotem, secundum utrasque naturas pronuntiant, cum iuxta sacras diffinitiones et rationes corruption, id est interemptio et inexistetia naturae, naturalium habitudinum et operationum atque uirtutum inffirmitas et defectus existat, et quod uniuersaliter uoluntate naturali ac substantiali operatione privatur, neque est, neque alicuam est, neque est quaeuis eius essentia.

Et non ipsum tantum, sed et Patrem et Spiritum Sanctum insubstantialium astruunt et inexistetem. Eiusdem enim utrisque illis substantiae, id est deitatis, et uoluntatis ac operationis salvator existit, secundum quod est et dicitur natura Deus, ita ut subseuenter et Dominam nostram uere sanctissimam super omnes sanctos uenerandum scilicet et laudandam, ut proprie ac non fallaciter, sed ueraciter Dei genitricem semperque uirginem, non proprie ac ueraciter matrem Dei describant, sed eius qui nullomodo secundum ipsos existit. Et isti quidem talibus ac tantis impietatibus capti, per sua ipsius dogmata propalantur. Hi uero qui simul cum duabus uoluntatibus et operationibus, quae a sanctis catholicae institutoribus ecclesiae pie in salvatore nostro Christo dicuntur, aliam unam nescio unde fingentes confiteri volunt, et anathematizant eos, qui non consone sibi unam et duas, id est tres uoluntates et operationes in eo confitentur, nihilominus et isti sanctos prophetas et apostolos ac doctores,


inconstant turncoats, but by their own words and teachings, they also show themselves more impious than heretics who have strayed in confusion and fantasy and division. For the latter indeed at least wish him to have at one (will and activity), but the former wish him to have not even one will or activity, and through this they profess him to be without substance and without essence. For this is tantamount to saying\(^{34}\) without will and without power, according to both natures, since according to the holy definitions and principles, corruption — that is, death and non-existence of nature — is a failing and defect of natural states and activities and powers, and what is entirely deprived of natural will and substantial activity neither is, nor is anything, nor has any essence whatsoever.

And they declare that not only he, but also the Father and the Holy Spirit, lack substance and existence. For the Saviour is of the same substance as each of them, that is, of divinity, and of (the same) will and activity, according to which he is in nature, and is called, God, in such a way that as a result they also describe our Lady not properly and truly as the mother of God, — that is, as truly most holy above all the saints, worthy of veneration and praise as the bearer of God, properly and without any deception and in truth, and ever-virgin —, but as the mother of him who, according to them, in no way exists. And these who have been seized by impieties of such a nature and magnitude are revealed through their own teachings about him. But those who wish to confess, together with the two wills and activities which are piously said to be in our Saviour Christ by the holy founders of the catholic church, another one dreamed up from who-knows-where, and anathematise those who do not confess in agreement with them one and two, that is, three wills and activities in him, no less do these people anathematise also the holy prophets and apostles and teachers, and over and above them, the most

\(^{34}\) I have translated the emended text.
quin et super hos, qui in ipsis locutus est, immo et nunc per
eos affatur sanctissimum Spiritum anathematizant, et traditam
per eos nobis ab illo sanctam et immaculatam fidem nouis
adulterantes adinuentionibus abnegant, et aliam in salvatore
Christo naturam praeter diuinam et humanam, extraneam
quandam et omnium alienam existentium fingunt, cuius esse
volunt a se dictam in illo unam voluntatem et operationem,
quoniam omnis voluntas naturalis et substantialis operatio,
nature profecto voluntatiue ac operatuiue idiomata sunt. Et
omnis operatio naturalis substantiam indicat, ex qua procedit
et inest, et indicatium uniuscuiusque naturae operatio, et
est, et cognoscitur naturalis; et omnis natura propriae
operationis | substantiali ratione cognoscitur, et omnis natura
conuenientem sibi seque significantem habet operationem
hanc ab aliis discernentem, diffinitioneque substantiarum,
naturales earum operationes uera ratio nouit. Et ut
compendiose dicatur, nec naturam sine operatione, quae
illum substantialiter charactrizet, nec rursus voluntatem uel
operationem constat esse sine quadam substantia, id est
possibile, quemadmodum diuina concionantur eloquia, et ipsa
rerum natura clamat.

Igitur voluntatem et operationem unam praeter duas circa
saluatorem Christum fingentes, ex necessitate etiam aliam
naturam praeter diuinam, ut dictum est, et humanam,
extraneam quandam existentium omnium alienam plasmantes
applicant ei, cuius esse iam dictam a se unam voluntatem,
quae inane figmentum fictae cogitationis est, et germen quod
ab idolatria nil penitus differt. Deus enim simul et homo
saluator existens, duas tantum co <n> gruentes sibi naturas
et voluntates et operationes, id est diuinam et humanam
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Holy Spirit who spoke in them, or rather, who even now speaks through them. And they reject the holy and immaculate faith handed down by him through them to us, polluting it with new innovations, and they dream up another nature in Christ the Saviour, apart from the divine and the human, an extra one which is foreign to all existing ones. They wish there to be one will and activity of this (nature) in him, dreamed up by themselves, since every natural will and substantial activity are in fact the characteristics of a voluntary and active nature. And every natural activity reveals substance, from which it proceeds and in which it dwells, and the activity which is an indicator of any one nature both is, and is recognised as, natural. And every nature is recognised by the internal design of its own activity according to its substance, and every nature has an activity which suits it and signifies it (and) distinguishes this (nature) from others, and true reason knows the definitions of substances, their natural activities. But to put it briefly, it is neither possible for a nature to be without activity, which characterises it according to its substance, nor again is it accepted for a will or activity to be without a certain substance, as the divine teachings make known and the very nature of things proclaims.

Therefore, in dreaming up one will and activity in respect to Christ the Saviour above the two (he has), by necessity they even attach to him another nature apart from the divine and human ones, as has been said: by fashioning a certain extra one, foreign to all existing beings, whom they claim, as I have mentioned, to have one will, which is an empty figment of a dreamed-up speculation, and a seed which is not at all different from idolatry. For the Saviour exists as God and man at the same time, having only two natures and wills and activities fitting to himself, that is
habet, quemadmodum incliti praeceptores nostri ac doctores affirmant, non unam ac duas, id est tres, ut aduersarii
dogmatizant, quo illud evidentissime gerant quod olim a Deo
per Aesaiam prophetam in calumniam dicitur, id est:
*Cauones tui unum aqua mixcent*. Vt enim apparet, et isti
uerbum ueritatis cauponum more adulterando, naturalem
dualitatem uoluntatum et operationum saluatoris nostri
Christi una uoluntate ac operatione, quae in ipso ab hereticis,
qui in confusione ac diuisione seu phantasia decepti sunt,
impie dogmatizata est, ueluti *unum aqua mixcentes*, utraque
sectas pariter confiteri compellunt, quod impium ueraciter est
et alienum immaculatae fidei nostrae Christianorum, qui ex
diametro, similiter ut praecessores sui, etiam per hunc a
ueritate decidunt modum. Aequale quippe ex diametro et
simile malum est cum heretica opinione, paternam proicere
ac reprobare orthodoxiam, et e diuerso cum hac pariter et
illam confiteri et approbare. *Quae enim partitio iustitiae
et iniuitati? Aut quae societas luci ad tenebras? Aut quae
conuentio Christi ad Belial? Aut quae pars fideli cum
infidele? Qui autem consensus templi Dei cum idolis?
diuinus ait apostolus. Inquam uero et ipse: *Quae partitio,
uel communicatio, aut conuentio, aut pars, aut consensus
paternae orthodoxiae ad nequam hereticorum opinionem, ut
cum altera | altera praedicetur uel etiam respuatur?*

Et hoc quoque diligenter intendant, quia si quemadmodum
magnus ab immortalitate cognominatus, immo uero cunctus
sanctorum chorus affirmat quod pene fides saluatoris nostri
non admitat, cum hoc instabile quiddam secundum suam
ipsius rationem existat. Quod si hoc fuerit passa, et quod
huic est contrarium procul dubio sustinebit, additamentum

---
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the divine and the human, just as our renowned instructors and teachers affirm; not one and two, that is, three, as the opponents teach, by which they perform most clearly what God once said through the prophet Isaiah as a calumny, namely: *Your innkeepers mix wine with water.* For as it appears, these people too, by adulterating the word of truth in the manner of innkeepers and *mixing wine with water*, compel their sects to confess equally both, (i.e.) the natural duality of wills and activities of our Saviour Christ, along with one will and operation, which was impiously taught in him by heretics who were deceived in confusion and division or fantasy. This is truly impious and foreign to our immaculate Christian faith. They, like their predecessors, fall in the opposite direction\(^{35}\) from the truth even through this measure. It is obviously a similar evil – diametrically-opposed\(^{36}\) and equal – to abandon and condemn the orthodoxy of the Fathers, along with heretical views, and on the other hand to confess and approve orthodoxy equally with heresy. *For what partnership is there between righteousness and lawlessness? Or what fellowship is there between light and darkness? Or what agreement does Christ have with Belial? Or what does a believer share with an unbeliever? But what agreement has the temple of God with idols?* asks the divine apostle. But for my part I say: *What partnership or fellowship or agreement or commonality or consensus* does the Fathers’ orthodoxy have with the wicked thinking of heretics, so that one should be preached with the other, or even rejected?

And let them also attend carefully to this, because if, as a great man whose name is synonymous with "immortality",\(^{37}\) or rather the whole company of saints, affirms: something that the faith of our Saviour would hardly allow, since this is something unreliable according to its own rationale. But if the faith allows this, it will beyond doubt sustain what is contrary to it, that is, the addition, and how will the faith remain unchanged by further defects and innovations?

\(^{35}\) Latin *ex diametro*.

\(^{36}\) Again, *ex diametro* in the Latin.

\(^{37}\) I.e. Athanasius, archbishop of Alexandria, as noted by the Latin scholiast.
scilicet, et quomodo manebit ulterius fides defectibus et profectibus immutata? Dicant, inquit, nobis qui per singulos dies fides creant, immo deos sibi diversos fingunt, quoniam cum fidei uerbo mutatur atque multiplicatur a talibus id quod creditur.

Ergo et aduersarii fides sibi condentes diversas, absque omni contradictione secundum qualitatem et quantitatem atque immutationem dogmatum suorum, immutant simul et multiplicant id quod creditur, et quinque Christos eatenus plasmasse monstrantur, hunc quidem unam operationem, illum uero nec unam operationem, et alium unam voluntatem, et alterum nec unam voluntatem, porro quintum unam et duas, atque unam et duas, id est tres operationes et tres voluntates, ut aiunt, habentem.

Et dicant, si ulunt, illi ipsi qui talia exponunt dogmata et qui communicant eis, in quem talium ac tot Christorum a se fectorum credentes baptizati sunt uel baptizantur, aut cuius eorum corpus et sanguinem sumunt atque distribuunt, utrum eius qui unam, an qui nec unam operationem; eius qui unam voluntatem, an eius qui unam et duas, et unam et duas, id est tres operationes et tres voluntates, et propterea iam ex necessitate tres etiam naturas habet? Sed Non erat uox et non erat auditio, quemadmodum ait propheta magnus Helias scelestos sacerdotes et pseudoprophetas confusionis redarguens. Nam quicquid horum dixerint, illinc cum impietate etiam redargutionem sermo eorum circumferet, quoniam non in uerum et ueraciter existentem Christum credunt atque baptizant, nec illius corpus et sanguinem accipiunt et distribuunt.
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"Let them tell us," he says, "those who invent faiths every day, or rather dream up various gods for themselves, since what is believed is changed and multiplied by such people, along with the word of faith."

Therefore also our opponents establish various faiths for themselves, without any (notion of) contradiction according to the quality and quantity and alteration of their teachings, at once changing and multiplying what is believed. And they are shown to have fashioned five Christs so far: this one has one activity, but that one does not even have one activity, and one has one will, and another does not even have one will, and in addition the fifth has one and two activities, and one and two wills, that is three activities and three wills, as they say.

And let those who expound such teachings, and those who are in communion with them, state, if they are willing, in which one of the Christs of this kind and number that have been invented by themselves, they believed when they were baptised or are baptised; or (let them say) which one's body and blood they take and give out, whether it belongs to the one who has one activity or to the one who does not even have one activity; to the one who has one will, or to the one who has one and two activities, and one and two wills, that is three activities and three wills, and therefore now also has by necessity three natures? But there was no voice and there was no hearing, just as the great prophet Elias said, in accusing the wicked priests and the false prophets of (causing) confusion. For whichever of these they say, their words will proclaim thereby the reproof along with impiety, since they do not believe in, and baptise into, the true and truly existing Christ, nor do they take and give out his body and blood.
Illum enim uestum scilicet, et qui uere consistit, Christum Deum simul et hominem, incliti magistri nostri ac praecipuiores scientes, duas et tantum quemadmodum naturas, sic etiam et duas uoluntates, et totidem operationes congruentes sibi, diuinam scilicet ut iam dictum et comprobatum est, et humanam, increatam et creatam, sine incoptione et cum incoptione, in ipso confitentur et confiteri nobis praecipiunt. Non autem ut hi nunc nuditates fecerunt, | unam et nec unam, nec duas, et rursus unam et duas, id est tres uoluntates et operationes habere illum fatentur. Super haec autem omnia quae dicta sunt, et illud quoque certissime nouerint, quoniam unam nec unam, neque duas, et iterum unam et duas uoluntates et operationes, et omnia cum anathematibus et depositionibus ac excommunicacione dogmatizantes, aperte sibi et alterutris repugnare probantur, et ipsi per seipso et inuiicem subuerunt ac destruunt, alterna uerba et dogmata, seque ipsos et alterutros, et eos qui sibi communicant, anathematizant, et ab omni sacra dignitate ac ministerio pellunt atque deponunt. Necnon et a perceptione illibatae communionis uiuiisci corporis et sanguinis magni Dei et saluatoris nostri Iesu Christi sequestrant. Et haec liquido nos et nullo intuentes et scientes obstante ulcerine, non solum propter multiformem errorem, uestum etiam et propter instabilitatem et absurditatem ac reciprocationem talium uiorum et dogmum, omni custodia nosmetipsov ab illorum impietate et communione seruemus, quotquot in ueritate esse ac dici Christiani uolumus. Alienum quippe a Christianis est, cum orthodoxy etiam impietatem suscipere, aut confiteri quidem orthodoxam fidem, communicare uero his, qui hanc per nouas adinuentiones abnegant et adulterant.
For our renowned teachers and instructors, knowing him (to be) the true and truly existing Christ, God and man at the same time, confess in him, and teach us to confess, just as (we confess) two natures — and only that many —, so also two wills, and the same number of activities which are fitting to himself, (which are) divine and human, as has been said and proven already; uncreated and created; without beginning and with beginning. But they do not confess a Christ that has one and not one, nor two, and again one and two, that is three wills and activities, like those who have now made innovations. But over and above all these points that I have made, let them know this too with utmost certainty: that (by teaching) one and not one, nor two, and again one and two wills and activities, and teaching everything with anathemas and depositions and excommunication, they are plainly proven to fight against themselves and each other, and they subvert and destroy each other’s words and teachings by their own agency, and they anathematise themselves and each other, and those who are in communion with them, and they drive them out and depose them from every holy office and service. And they also separate themselves from receiving the pure communion of the life-giving body and blood of our great God and Saviour Jesus Christ. And since we see and know these things clearly, without any obscuring veil, let all of us who wish in truth to be, and to be called, Christians, keep ourselves completely safeguarded against their impiety and communion (with them): not only on account of their manifold error, but also too because of the inconstancy and absurdity and alternation of such men and their teachings. Indeed it is foreign to Christians to accept impiety with orthodoxy, or even to confess the orthodox faith, but to be in communion with those who deny it and pollute it through new inventions.

38 Sc. our teachers and Fathers.
Propter quod, divina nobis lex simul et apostolica iubet, eos qui alius praeter quod a Christiferis uiris accepimus, docere ac introducere conati fuerint, auertere et anathematizare, non tantum si homines fuerint, sed et licet angeli fortassis e caelo descendentes extiterint. Et si hoc fecerimus, et diuinam sine praevericatione adimpleuerimus praeeceptionem, sacramque ac orthodoxam fidem absque adulteratione simul et innovatione possiderimus et confessi fuerimus, ad uiam salui efficiemur aeternam in Christo Iesu Domino nostro, cum quo Deo et Patri, una cum sanctissimo et bono ac uiiifico Spiritu, gloria, honor, imperium et adoratio nunc et semper, et in omnia nunquamque finienda saecula saeculorum, amen.
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On account of this, the divine and apostolic law simultaneously admonishes us to avoid and anathematise those who attempt to teach and introduce anything other than what we have received from Christ-bearing men, not only if they are men, but even if they are perhaps angels descending from heaven. And if we do this, and fulfil the divine command without equivocation, and if we adhere to and confess the holy and orthodox faith without adulteration and also without innovation, we will be saved for eternal life in our Lord Christ Jesus, with whom also to God the Father, together with the most holy and good and life-giving Spirit, be glory, honour, power and worship now and forever, and for all the never-ending ages of ages, amen.
HYPOMNESTICON

Scholion siue Ypomnesticum his qui desiderio ac zelo diuino legere uoluerint breuiter declarans, quae paucis sunt agnita, id est una cum athleticis certaminibus quot exilia et in quibus locis ac tempore pertulerint martyrium, diemque fidae ad Deum professionis et exhibitionis sanctorum et deiferorum patrum nostrorum | ac magistorum, nouorum reuera confessorum et magnorum martyrum, praecipue illius qui positam hic epistolam digito Dei scriptis, eo quod ipse quidem eorum qui ante se defuncti sunt, Maximi scilicet et Anastasii discipuli eius significauerit diem ut prelatum est, de se autem et germanis fratribus eius, Theodoro scilicet ac Euprepio, nemo, insuper et Martini sanctissimi et summii apostolicus papa ac martyr, qui omni qua sub sole est praecellit hieratica dignitati, atque quorundam aliorum, quorum praesens epistola mentionem non facit, nec quaequunque ut reor aliqua charta uel homo.

Oportet eos qui haec legerint exemplaria praesentis sacrae illius sacri epistolae, Deo parentibus qui scrutatur renes et corda firmissime credere, quia in ea, Deo teste ueritatis, ex ipsa epistola quae propria manu eius, immo ut uerius propter miraculi dicamus insigne, digito Dei scripta est, sancti uidelicet patris et magistri nostri domni abbatis Anastasii presbyteri et apocrissiarii senioris et opinatissimae urbis Romae, multumque certantis magni et noui reuera martyr in ueritatis, transcripta sunt, scripta ab eo (postquam passus est quemadmodum dictum est in Byzantio una cum concertatore suo et uere philosopho, immo deosopho magnoque commartyre Christi ueri Dei et salvatoris nostri Maximo, id est cum abintus abs cisae fuerint praetiosae ipsorum ac sacrae diuinitusque ueraciter mouiles linguae ac manus cum
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Hypomnesticon

The scholion or hypomnesticon for those who wished with longing and godly zeal to read a brief narration of things known to few, that is how many exiles, together with rigorous trials, and where and when our holy and God-bearing Fathers and teachers, that is, the new confessors and great martyrs, achieved martyrdom, and the day of their sure departure to God and of their being revealed; especially (the trials) of him\(^1\) who wrote, by the finger of God, the letter attached here, where he indicated the day of those who died before him, that is Maximus and his disciple Anastasius, as it was predicted, but concerning himself and his brothers Theodore and Euprepius, blood brothers, no-one (has written). And above all (the trials) of Martin, the most holy and highest apostolic pope and martyr, who has precedence to every priestly rank under the sun, and of certain others not mentioned by the present letter, nor any other document or person, as far as I know.

It befits those who have read copies of the attached holy letter of that holy man, to trust with utmost certainty those obeying God who examines minds and hearts, because those things were transcribed in it,\(^2\) with God as witness to the truth, from the very letter which was written by his own hand (or rather, as we may say more truly, was written through an amazing miracle by the finger of God). I mean, by our holy father and teacher, our lord father Anastasius, the priest and apocrisiarius of the older and most esteemed city of Rome, a great striver, and in fact a great new martyr for the truth. It was written by him\(^3\) (after he suffered, as was said, in Byzantium together with his fellow striver Maximus, truly a philosopher or rather a theosopher, and great fellow martyr for Christ our true God and Saviour, that is, when their precious and holy tongues, divinely and truly eloquent, were cut away from the inside, and their hands were cut off and they were beaten and tortured most cruelly, from which they endured the flow of their blood during a procession through

\(^1\) Sc. Anastasius Apocrisiarius.

\(^2\) Sc. the letter. There is a problem with the syntax of this sentence in the Latin, which is lacking a subject, as in the Greek: Devreesse, Hypomnesticon, p. 67, 23.

\(^3\) The following long parenthesis is signalled by a marginal gloss which notes the hyperbaton from the words "written by him" to "with his holy right hand".
uerberibus et tormentis amarissimis, ex quibus sanguinis fluorem et pompam per totam urbem perpessi sunt, quod nec malae unquam uitae reuera quisquam sustinuit; et nisi solus Deus, qui ex nihilo ut essent cuncta produxit et mortuos suscitat, ex huiuscemodi crudelitate ipsorum et tanto sanguinis fluxu, cauterio nullomodo illis induto uel constipatorio aliquo abscisionibus manuum atque linguarum ad cessationem sanguinis iuxta morem apposito, hos conservasset ad uerecundiam adversariorum, tradissent extunc desiderato a se Deo suas ipsius sanctas reuera et beatas procudubio animas; haec autem omnia ob nihil alius in eos gesserunt uere profanissimi et miserrimi apostatae ureitatis, nisi propter pessimam ueraciter et solam inuidiam quam antiquus hostis daemon in eis seminavit quemadmodum et in similibus suis Iudaieis, cum non potuissent saltem ad commodum quid resistere sapientiae quae illis merito fuerat a Deo donata pro uera sibilicet ureitate, et solum pro eo quod noluissent illi communicare | cum his in tam publica et sine Deo impietate ipsorum) cum ipsa sancta dextera manu sua quae abscisa fuerat, cuiusque truncus tantum remanserat, id est sine planta et digitis, inopinato argumento, cum uidelicet duo sibimet paruissima ligna et tenua colligauerit, immo ut uerius dicatur uirtute ac gratia diuina, quemadmodum et lingua reuera diuina et inuisibili expedite penitus et sine prohibitione loquebatur quamquam abintus ex ipso fuerit fundo recisa, sicut Lebarnicius patriicus Lazicae cum iuramentis terribilibus enarravit nobis, dispensatione Dei in hoc ipso per semet inspector effectus, diffidens super hoc glorioso et ingenti miraculo. Quin et Theodorus, protosecretarius praetorii praefecti Constantinopolitani, ante
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the whole city, which in fact not even any miscreant ever sustained. And unless God alone, who created everything as it is from nothing, and who raises the dead, had not saved them for the shame of their enemies, from such cruelty at their hand and from such a flow of blood, with no kind of cautery allowed to them or any bandaging applied to the place where their hands and tongues had been severed in order to stop the blood, as is usually done, they would at that moment have handed over their holy and certainly blessed souls to God whom they longed for. But those most profane and wretched apostates of the truth did all this to them for no other reason than out of envy alone, truly most wicked, which the old enemy the Devil sowed in them as in the Jews whom they resemble, since they could not to the slightest degree resist the wisdom which had been given to them deservedly by God on behalf of the truth, and only because they did not want to be in communion with them in their so public and godless impiety.) (It was written) by him with unforeseen ingenuity, with his holy right hand which had been cut off, only its stump remaining, that is without palm and fingers, when he had fastened to the stump two very small and slender twigs, or rather, as we may say more truly by divine power and grace, just as he also spoke with a divine and invisible tongue quite without hindrance or constraint, although it had been cut off from the very root from inside, as Lebarnicius the patrician of Lazica recounted to us with terrible oaths, who had been a witness to this very activity by God's arrangement, and who had been distrustful of this glorious and mighty miracle. Moreover Theodore, protosecretary of the praetorian

---

4 This refers to the trial of Maximus, Anastasius the Disciple and Anastasius the Monk in Constantinople in 662, at which they were condemned to exile. The amputation of the right hand and tongue of Maximus and the Apocrisiarius is also described in a passage called the "Third Sentence" which is found at the end of the Disputatio in the Greek version.

5 Latin constipatorio.

6 This is a misunderstanding of the Greek ἀγάματος "author of evil" (Devreesse, Hypomnestic, p. 68, 12).

7 Sc. the martyrs.

8 Literally "to himself".
hunc enarravit mihi et ipse cum horribilibus iuramentis, cum
conscius fuisse sanctarum passionum ipsorum tanquam
dominus et magister huisci modi rerum, glorificans et
laudans ac gratias agens Deo super tali miraculo et tam
fiduciali uirtute ipsorum, quoniam sicut canis uel ceruus ex
cursu multo et siti uel caumate, ita laxauerunt et tradiderunt
linguas suas ut etiam manus, quamquam breui ualde statura
sanctus et infirmus esset corpore Maximus, sicuti cunctis est
manifestum; quocirca et abundantiis aduersarii sauciantes
sensus suos super tanta et tali alacritate sanctorum,
intrinsecus nequissimi et ueraciter inhumani, ut reuera ferae
agrestes has absceedebant.

Non solum ista sic ab eo epistola scripta, sed et aliiis multis
libris ac tomis studiorum ipsius, quorum ipsi non solum
inspectores divina prouidentia facti sumus, sed et partim in
sortem gratia Dei ex eis accipere illius praecessione
meruimus, et ipsis quoque simili argumento et manu, immo
ut uerius dictum est digito scriptis Dei sicut magni Moysi
tempore legitur factum, prouidentia uidelicet et cooperatione
solius omnipotentis Dei, qui cum sit amator bonitatis et
hominum facit mirabilia magna in sanctis suis, et glorificat
uere glorificantes se tam indeclinabili opere quam uerbo et
ueritate, cum adhuc degeret in ultimo, id est tertio, exilio
suo Lazicae in castro Thusumes nuncupato sito supra ullam
Mochoes climatis Apsiliae termini ad Orientem Pontici maris
apud ipsum pedem Caucasorum montium, iuxta Christi
amicorum regionem Abasgorum et gentem Alanorum, quasi
signis quinque a praedio Zichachorio, id est prima domo
Gregorii ueri amici Christi | patricii et magistratus eiusdem
regionis Alanorum, cuius et optimam memoriam merito facit
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prefect of Constantinople,⁹ told me this earlier, and he also swore terrible oaths since he was aware of the holy sufferings of those men, as he was the director and superintendent of such matters. He was glorifying and praising and thanking God for such a miracle and for their confident courage, since, like a dog or a hind as a result of running a distance, or from thirst or the heat, so they gave in and handed over their tongues, as also their hands, although the holy Maximus was very small in stature and weak in body, as is obvious to everyone. On this account the enemies, being intrinsically most evil and truly inhuman like wild beasts, mutilated them, even more amazed by the extent and nature of the readiness of the holy men.

As well as that letter written by him in this way, we ourselves not only became eye-witnesses, by divine providence, of many others of his books and tomes containing his own [works]¹⁰ but we were also honoured to receive a share of them in accordance with his instructions by the grace of God, and those written by the same manual method. Rather, they were written, as is said more truly, by the finger of God, as is said to have happened in the time of the great Moses, with the providence and facilitation of the sole omnipotent God, who, out of his love for goodness and human beings, does great miracles among his saints, and glorifies those truly glorifying him with unwavering effort and with word and truth. (He wrote them) when he was still living in the last, that is the third, exile in Lazica. He was in the fort called Thusmes, sited above the estate Mochoes in the border region of Apsilia, to the east of the Pontic sea, at the very foot of the Caucasus mountains, next to the region of the Abasgi, friends of Christ, and the Alani people, almost five mileposts from the Zichachorian estate, that is the first home of Gregory the true friend of Christ, the patrician and magistros of the same region of the Alani. Anastasius makes a very positive mention of Gregory deservedly in the letter on this subject,¹¹ having been moved against his will by the order of the wretched leaders who were

---

⁹ The protosecretary was the head secretary of the praetorian prefect, or eparch of Constantinople. The eparch of the city was the supreme judge in Constantinople and its vicinity, and chief of police, with jurisdiction over prisons (ODB, p. 705.) The praetorian prefect's importance declined in the seventh century and the last known by name, Alexander, dates to 626 (ODB, p. 1710).

¹⁰ Cf. Latin studiorum, i.e. the Testimonia and Syllogisms translated supra.

¹¹ Literally "of this kind", i.e. the letter of Anastasius to Theodosius of Gangra, translated supra.
in huiusmodi epistola, translati uidelicet ui et praeceptione miserorum principum qui illic ante se usque ad se praehuerunt, in eodem tertio exilio septies, in difficilioribus locis et tribulatione multa, in praecipito castro Thusumes dormiuit in Domino, cum et ipse certamine bono certasset, orthodoxam reuera fidem seruasset, et cursum martyrii consummasset, mensis Octimbri die undecima, feria prima, hora tertia, cum diceretur inter sancta officia «Sancta sanctis», indiczione decima, cum praedixisset et ipse diem sanctae depositionis suae quibusdam qui sibi aderant ante menses tres, et aliis quoque pluribus miraculis, sanctissimi et omnia efficientis Spiritus cooperatione, tam ibidem quam in duobus exiliis suis Trapezunti uidelicet et Mesembria patratis, plurimisque conversis ad ueritatem et illuminatis.

Qui cum conuersati fuissent et perdurassent in hoc sancto et beatissimo et multorum sudorum certamine, id est coronam ferente confessione ac testimonio, praedictus quidem sanctus Anastasius presbyter et apocrisiarius Romanus a sexta indiczione praeteriti cyclo usque ad decimam indicionem in omnibus praecipitibus tribus exiliis suis, traductionibus diversis affectus tribulationibusque ac necessitatibus et angustiis non mediocribus nec modicis, permansit annis ulginti. Discipulis uero eius Theodoro et Eurepio, germanis et sanctis fratribus, filii Plutini beatissimi imperatorii pistoris (id est qui super omnes pistores publici est, eorum uidelicet qui annonas scholarum omnium soluunt, quod appellatur tetransiton), diuitiis pretiosis et dignitatis diversis, diuinisque uirtutibus et uirginitate quae his omnibus maior est adornatis, per quam scilicet ut opinor etiam tantis pro Christo agonis et coronis

95/97 II Tim. 4,7 98/99 uide Brightman, Liturgies Eastern and Western, p. 538, n. 17; cf. Ep. Anas. Scholio; et Relatio Motions 180

96 orthodoxam cod. a. corr. m. sec. 103 Mesembria} an corr. sit. Mesembriae? 109 ad] a cod. a. corr. m. sec. 116 eorum]\ expectaueris eos
in charge there before him up to his time, seven times in the same third exile, in more difficult places and in great tribulation. In the fort Thusumenes, which I have mentioned, he went to rest in the Lord, since he himself had fought in the good fight, and preserved the truly orthodox faith, and completed the course of martyrdom, on the eleventh day of October, on the first day of the week, in the third hour, when "Holy things for the holy" was being said during the holy office, in the tenth indiction, when he himself had predicted the day of his own holy passing to certain people who had been with him three months earlier. With the cooperation of the most holy and efficacious Holy Spirit in many other miracles also, both there and in his two exiles spent in Trebizond and Mesembria, very many were turned to the truth and illuminated.

[They continued] and endured in this holy and most blessed struggle of many exertions, that is, the crown-bearing confession and witness. The holy Anastasius, priest and Roman apocrisarius, whom I mentioned, survived twenty years, from the sixth indiction of the past cycle up to the tenth indiction in all his three exiles, as I said, (and was) affected by various removals, and by tribulations and neediness and deprivations which were neither moderate nor few. But his disciples Theodore and Euprepius, true and holy brothers, sons of Plutinus, the most blessed miller of the emperor -- that is, the one who is placed above all the millers of the public treasury who distribute the grain supplies of all the schools, which is called Tetransiton --, who were adorned with precious riches and various offices, and divine virtues and virginity which is greater than all these -- for which I believe they deserved to be honoured with so many trials and crowns on behalf of Christ, as they were chaste and pure of heart, since they themselves will see God --, wanted to flee to Rome after the first exile of their teacher and ours in Trebizond, having made

---

12 I.e. Sunday 11 October, 666.

13 Latin conuersati fuissent. Anastasius, attempting to rescue something syntactically from the hanging participles in Greek, has put this verb and the following (perdurassent) into a cum clause. The translation of ἐνδυσαρεύωνας by conuersati seems to have been influenced by ἐναρεύων in the previous line (Devreesse, Hypomnesticon, p. 70, 17).

14 I.e. from 647/648, the time of the publication of the Typus, to 666.

15 I.e. imperial guards and civil bureaux (Lampe, p. 1361).
honorari meruerunt ut casti et mundo corde, quoniam ipsi Deum uidebunt, post primum magistri sui et nostri apud Trapezunti exilium, multis elemosynis et oblationibus factis, uolentibus Romam confugere, protinus et ipsis in eadem persecutione prope Abydum compræhensis, propter eandem et solam causam, et pro eo quod noluissent cum eis contaminari tam euidente impiete in profano et penitus sine Deo imperatorio Typo, qui ex summissione factus est eorum qui erant ecclesiae Constantinopolos, et publicatis, id est denudatus omni substantia quae inerat sibi et dignitatis quas habebant, flagellaque mortalix a praefecto suscipiantibus et Chersonem in exilium missis, et illic uiæpius ab inuicem separatis, et in castris gentium ibidem adiacentium deputatis, iunior quidem frater, qui ut uere in cunctis pheronymus E <u>prepes nominatus est, completo in huicsemodi Dei amico agone anno nono, ad Dominum abit mense Octobri die uicesima sexta, indictione quarta decima, alter uero, qui et prior frater quique Dei donum merito a Domino est uocatus, perdurans ab eadem sexta indictione usque ad iam dictam decimam inductam in instantis cycli, id est usque ad sanctissimi patris et magistri eorum ac nostri Anastasi presbyteri (qui rueret miserrimi et orphani propter ta nta > m raritatem et inopiam uerbi ueritatis et omnis spiritualis escaes, ita ut nunc etiam adimpeatum sit quod a Domino de malis nouissimorum temporum dicitur, non famem panis mittendam, neque sitim aquae, sed famem audiendi uerbum Domini) sicuti dictum est sanctam in Domino requietionem, annum uicesimum agit adhuc persecutiones in athleticis sudoribus et agonibus in eodem Chersonis exilio, iam memoratus uidelicet frater Theodorus,

121/122 Matth. 5,8  145 cf. II Tim. 3,1; Iac. 5,3 etc.  145/147 Am. 8,11


Scholia 135 pheronymus] Pheronymum una est ex speciebus appellatiuorun nominum apud Grecos ut est omonymum uel synonimum; est autem pheronymus cui cum nomine res concordat, sicut hic: Eurepesis enim bene decorus interpretatur; pheronymus autem dictur quasi ferens nomen boni decoris, propter morum scilicet ornamenta.
138 Dei donum] Id est Theodorus, qui uidelicet Dei donum interpretatur
many alms and offerings. They too were immediately seized in the same persecution near Abydos,\textsuperscript{16} on account of the same sole reason, that is, because they did not want to be contaminated with them by such obvious impiety in the profane and absolutely godless imperial \textit{Typus}, which was made by the submission of those who belonged to the Constantinopolitan church. And when their property had been confiscated, that is, when they were stripped of every resource that they had, and of the offices which they used to hold, they received a deadly whipping from the prefect and were sent into exile in Cherson.\textsuperscript{17} There, more often (than not) separated from each other by force, they were put in the forts of neighbouring peoples. The younger brother who was fittingly named\textsuperscript{18} Euprepius\textsuperscript{19}—how truly, in all respects—when he had completed the ninth year of such a trial out of love for God, went to the Lord in the month of October, on the twenty-sixth day, in the fourteenth indiction.\textsuperscript{20} But the other brother who was older and who was rightly called "a gift of God" by the Lord, persevering from the same sixth indiction up to the tenth indiction of the present cycle which I have already mentioned, that is up to the holy rest in the Lord of their most holy father and teacher and our priest Anastasius—they\textsuperscript{21} were most wretched and deprived, on account of the considerable rarity and lack of the word of truth, and of all spiritual food, in such a way that even now, that which was said by our Lord is fulfilled, concerning the evils of the last days, \textit{not sending hunger for bread, or thirst for water, but hunger for hearing the word of the Lord}—, as was

\textsuperscript{16} Abydos, the ancient town of Mysia, on the Hellespont, the site of the town north-east of modern Çanakkale, and a toll station until late Byzantine times (\textit{Webster’s New Geographical Dictionary} [Springfield, MA, 1988], p. 4).

\textsuperscript{17} A Greek colony in the Chersonese near mod. Sebastopol (\textit{ODB}, p. 418).

\textsuperscript{18} See the marginal gloss on \textit{pheronymous}: "A pheronym is one of the types of names used by the Greeks, like a homonym or synonym; but it is a pheronym when the fact concurs with the name, as here: for Euprepius means ‘well-adorned’, but it is called a pheronym as if he bore the name of ‘adorned with goodness’, on account of the decency of his mores."

\textsuperscript{19} So in Greek, εὐπρεπὴς (Devresse, \textit{Hypomnesticon}, p. 71, 21); cf. Latin \textit{Euprepes}.

\textsuperscript{20} 26 October, 655.

\textsuperscript{21} Sc. Theodore and Euprepius. This anacoluthon is the start of another parenthesis.

\textsuperscript{22} The equivalent for \textit{mittendam} is not in the Greek (Devresse, \textit{Hypomnesticon}, p. 71, 32).
qui et propria manu multa sanctorum opuscula dignatus est
exhibere nobis qui pergebamus illuc ad usitacionem et
adorationem eius et pretiosae memoriae Martini summi et
uere uniuersalis papae et magni martyris ueritatis.

Cuius et miracula nobis copiosa quae ibidem facta sunt cum
illatis quoque illis importabilibus tribulationibus retulit,
donata etiam particula sancti orarii, id est facialis quae sibi
fuerat ab eo dimissa, et uno ex campagis eius, id est caligis
(quos nullus alius inter homines portat, nisi sanctus papa
Romanus), eo quod et ipse illic fuerit exilio religatus
postquam omnia dira passus est cum abducetur ab urbe
Roma; qui se ipsum tradiderat, gestiens atque desiderans
admodum pro Christo subire martyrium, ut imitator et
successor sancti et apostolorum principis Petri, tam in
naugio, quam in ipso Byzantio, ita ut palam alapis
c<\a>ederetur ab inimicis Dei, dignum autem patre suo
diabolo perpetrantes opus in eum. Tam ueste illum sua
exuerunt, quam ferreorum grauamina uinculorum et
catenarum sancto eius collo et pretiosis reliquis membris
imposuerunt. Deinde cum eisdem ferreis compedibus
pompantes, per totam plateam traxerunt a palatio usque ad
praetorium praefecti, cum uigiliae magistro, id est primo
carnificum, colligatum; et cum gladio praecedebat eum
quidam ut membrum conduceret, deliberante ac
praecipiente Bucoleonte, detestabili sacellario et digne
sanguinem deuorantis bestiae cognomento, tanquam qui et
opera bestiali furare referta possideret, scientia et consilio
Constantini imperatoris, qui et praedictum obscenum et
pessimum Typum condidit, Gregorio eunucho et praefecto
miserae illius urbis. Quod utique iam et factum fuisset
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said, his brother Theodore, whom I have just mentioned, is spending his twentieth year still persevering in the rigorous labours and trials in the same exile in Cherson. He was kind enough to show us with his own hand many small written works of the saints, when we went there to visit and venerate him and Martin of precious memory, the highest and truly universal pope and great martyr for truth.

Theodore recounted to us the abundant miracles of Martin which happened there, as well as the unbearable tribulations that they suffered, and also gave us as a gift a piece of a holy handkerchief, that is a face cloth, which had been left to him by Martin, and one of his boots, that is, the half-boots which no other man wears except the holy Roman pope, because he himself had been sent into exile there after he suffered all manner of dreadful things when he was conveyed from Rome, and had handed himself over, eagerly desiring and longing passionately to undergo martyrdom for Christ, as an imitator and successor of the holy Peter, chief of the apostles, both in the sea voyage and in Byzantium itself, in such a way that he was publicly beaten with blows by the enemies of God, performing a deed worthy of their father the devil against him. They stripped him of his clothes, and burdened his holy neck and the rest of his precious limbs with iron bonds and chains. Then leading him in procession bound in the same iron fetters, they dragged him along the whole road from the palace to the praetorian prefecture, chained to the officer of the guard, that is to say, the chief executioner, and a man walked in front of him with a sword to cut him up limb from limb. The detestable sacellarius Bucoleo – (who was) worthily named after a beast devouring blood – decided and directed it, as one who also was the author of works filled with bestial fury, all with the knowledge and advice of the emperor Constantine, who established the aforesaid offensive and wicked Typus, with Gregory the Eunuch and prefect of that wretched city. Indeed, this would already have happened as far as his bold readiness and purpose was concerned, if

23 Sc. Pope Martin.

24 This is clear evidence that the duties of the sacellarius had passed beyond those of imperial treasurer, cf. RM n. 5.

25 The Greek adds: "on the advice of Paul, the wretched former president of Constantinople..." (Devreesse, Hypomnesticon, p. 72, 30/31).

26 This possessive pronoun refers to Martin.
quantum ad temerariam eius alacritatem et propositum pertineret, nisi misericordissimi et benignissimi Dei praesidium hos in <hi>buisset, et non huius robusti <ssi> mam fortitudinem hostes erubuisset (nourunt enim hoc pati frequenter etiam tyranni truces et inhumani, licet nimis immisericordes sint et crudescescunt eum qui operatur in illis Satan, martyrio eius forsitant inuentientes secundum similium sibi apostatam et idolorum usanias deditum Iulianum illum famosum et uere sapientem in malis), aut certe Deo meliori quadam et sibi soli nota qui omnia nimiram ad utilitatem dispensat, immensa hunc et ineffectibili prouidentia conservante. Cum fecisset in duobus carceribus, in excubitu scilicet et custodia praefecti, in tribulatione multa et infirmitate grauisima dies centum octoginta, omnem uero tribulationis sui agenem in annis tribus et ultra, sicuti ex his quae de ipso conscripta sunt, et a Romanis militibus et propriis eius hominibus qui cum eo multis tormentis affecti per diversa loca exilium pertulere scire potuimus, porro dormiuit et ipse in Domino (cum unam semper et solam sanctam catholicam et apostolicam gloriosam Dei nostri ecclesiam sacratissimis et ueracibus dogmatibus synodice illustrasset, et tam sanctarum ac universalium quinque synodorum, Nicaenae uidelicet, Constantinopolitanae, Ephesinae prioris, Chalcedonensis, et rursus Constantinopolitanae sub Iustiniano imperatore, quam omnium sanctorum diuinitus sapientium et probabiliblum patrum nostrorum ac ueracium magistrorum sacra et piissima dogmata roborasset, quemadmodum hi qui amore pio legere uolerint, in sacris gestis sanctae ac apostolicae piissimaeque synodi quae ab eo Rom <a>e celebrata est inuenient, cum
the protection of the most merciful and kindly God had not prevented them, and the enemies had not grown ashamed of Martin’s stalwart bravery. For even savage and inhuman tyrants are sometimes able to experience this, even though they are excessively merciless and cruel, following the example of Satan who operates in them. Perhaps they begrudged his martyrdom, according to one similar to themselves, an apostate, devoted to the madness of idols: that infamous Julian,²⁷ truly wise in evil things; or at least, preserved by a certain great and ineffable providence, (which is) something better and known to God alone, who arranges all things for the good. He himself²⁸ went to rest in the Lord when he had spent 180 days in great suffering and most severe weakness in confinement in two prisons, that is, in the watch-house and in the prison of the prefect,²⁹ although every agony of his tribulation (lasted) for three years and more,³⁰ as we are able to know, both from those things which were written about him, and also from the Roman soldiers and his own men who were affected by many torments with him, and endured exile in various places. (He died) after he had brought illumination to the one and only, always holy, apostolic and glorious catholic church of our God, by most sacred and truthful synodic teachings, and he had confirmed the holy and most pious teachings of the five holy and universal synods - namely Nicaea, Constantinople, Ephesus I, Chalcedon and Constantinople II under Emperor Justinian³¹ - and equally those of all our holy, divinely wise and most approved Fathers and truthful teachers. He had made plain and preached the truth with great effort, and revealed the crimes of the enemy, and made them known more clearly. This will be found, by those wishing with pious love to read (about it), in the sacred acts of the holy and apostolic and most righteous

²⁷ A suggestion that Julian the Apostle (361-363) also begrudged saints the martyrdom they longed for. The author of the *Parastaseis Syntomoi Chronikai*, ch. 42, ed. A. Cameron and J. Herrin (Leiden, 1984), p. 117, noted that "Julian, hated of God, burned many Christians (in a furnace in the Hippodrome) on the pretext of their being criminals."

²⁸ Sc. Martin.

²⁹ Martin spent 178 days in two prisons in Constantinople, according to the author of the *Commemoratio* (PL 129, 598C): 93 days in the Prandiaria (PL 129, 593A), and 85 days in the Diomedes prison (PL 129, 596A).

³⁰ His tribulation only lasted for three years if we count the years 653-655 inclusively.

³¹ The Ecumenical Councils of 325, 381, 431, 451 and 553 respectively.
in omnem locum et omnem regionem transmissa sint, et ardue uestatem manifestasset ac praedicasset, et flagitia hostium reuelasset atque liquidius publicasset), bono multumque sibi amabili agone agonizans, et ad desideratum Dominum, pro quo et proprium sanguinem quantum ipse fuit effudit, in laetitia copiosa profectus | mense Septembrio die sexta decima, indictione quarta decima, qua et custodientis pietatem copiosaeque certatricis et castae uirginis ac martyriris Euphemiae honoranda memoria per annos singulos celebratur, reconditus inter tumulos sanctorum, in domo percolenda sanctissimae intermeratae ac semper laudandae gratiosae uereque supergloriosae dominae nostrae utpote quae proprie natura et absque mendacio ac ueraciter est Dei genitrix et semper uirgo Maria quae appellatur Blachernes, extra muros a stadio uno ipsius de cetero benedictae urbis Chersonis. In qua sancta domo etiam iam memoratus sanctus Euprepius requiescit iuxta eundem perornatum <pastorem > ac uere magistrum, qui euangelicam uocem opere adimpleuit qua dicitur: Pastor bonus animam suam ponit pro ouibus suis.

Porro sanctus et memorabilis ac optimus et per omnia sapiens, immo diuinitus sapiens, magnusque uestitatis propugnator et commnartyr eorum megistus qui et Maximus (hoc enim ut antea indicauimus dictione Latina maximi nomen insinuat), cuius et sanctum monumentum per singulas noctes lampades exhibit a die qua dormisse dinoiscitur usque in praesens et in perpetuum omnibus illucescens et patefaciens confidentiam suam quam optinet apud Deum, sicuti praeposita commendat epistola, et nos ipsi per nosmet auditores a multis illius loci principibus et habitatoribus, qui

216 septembrio cod. e corr. m. sec. 218 pietatim cod. a. corr. m. sec. 222 supergloriosae] semper gloriosae cod. a. corr. m. sec. 227 pastorem] restitut el gr., om. cod.
synod which was celebrated by him at Rome,\textsuperscript{32} since the acts have been transmitted to every place and each region. He \textit{fought the good fight} much loved by him, and was carried forth in abundant happiness, to the Lord he longed for, for whom he poured out so much of his own blood, on the sixteenth of September, in the fourteenth induction,\textsuperscript{33} on which day the honourable memory of Euphemia,\textsuperscript{34} guardian of orthodoxy and valiant striver and chaste virgin and martyr, is celebrated every year. He was buried among the tombs of the saints in the venerable house of Our Lady, the all-holy, inviolate and ever to be praised, gracious and truly superglorious, who is properly by nature and without deception and truly the bearer of God, and the ever-virgin Mary. (The church), which is called Blachernes,\textsuperscript{35} (is) one stadium outside the walls of that city of Cherson, blessed as to the rest.\textsuperscript{36} In this sacred house, holy Euprepius whom I have just mentioned, also is laid to rest near the same much-adorned\textsuperscript{37} [shepherd] and true teacher, who by his work fulfilled the gospel saying: \textit{The good shepherd lays down his life for his sheep}.

Moreover the holy and memorable and most excellent and wise in everything, or rather divinely wise, and great fighter for truth and fellow martyr of those, Megistus who is also Maximus – for this name means "greatest" in Latin, as we indicated earlier –, whose holy tomb displays lights each night, from the day when he is known to have gone to rest, up to the present and perpetually, giving light to all and making clear the confidence which he enjoys with God, just as the preceding letter commends – and we ourselves have been in a position to hear (of those things)

\textsuperscript{32} I.e. the Acts of the Lateran Synod of 649.

\textsuperscript{33} I.e. 16 September 655; cf. the Greek \textit{Vita Martini} (BH G 2259), ed. P. Peeters, \textit{AB} 51 (1933), p. 261 (chap. 12), dates Martin’s death to 13 April 656. Peeters, in the same article, p. 249, states that it is impossible to choose between the two dates.

\textsuperscript{34} The Council of Chalcedon was held in the Church of St Euphemia, who was hence venerated as the protector of orthodoxy by the pro-Chalcedonians.

\textsuperscript{35} The Greek \textit{Vita Martini, op. cit.}, pp. 261-262, also mentions Martin’s burial in the church of St Maria of Blachernes, named after the Blachernae in Constantinople.

\textsuperscript{36} The Latin \textit{de cetero} is an inadequate translation of Greek τὸ λατρεύω "as a result" (Devreesse, \textit{Hypomnemata}, p. 74, 20).

\textsuperscript{37} The Latin \textit{perornatum} is an inadequate rendition of the Greek παρκηνθηκόν "common to the world" (Devreesse, \textit{Hypomnemata}, p. 74, 22).
cum iuramentis huiusmodi mirabile uere miraculum fiducialiter praedicabant, effecti sumus, eorum uero qui obtutu proprio uiderant has (unus etiam ipse comes eiusdem <S>chemareos castri nomine Mistrianus existit, qui et uigilans cum militibus has non semel nec bis, sed et multotiens contemplatus est, et primus patenter de his omnibus praedicavit), nobis illuc pergere non ualentibus propter montis illius ascensus, id est uerticus Caucasiorum, quo excelsior Mons super terram non est, difficultatem, et tempus hiemis, insuper et confusionem gentium quae fit in partibus illis, pariter et Anastasius discipulus eius, ab undecima indictione praeteriti cycli, per tria exilia, Bizyes scilicet et Perberei Thracensium regionis atque praedictum Lazicum, in multis contritionibus et intolerabilibus necessitatibus atque huiuscemodi athleticis certaminibus annis decem peractis, ad regnum migrare supernum, sanctus quidem Maximus, sicut dictum est, mense Augusto die tertia decima, indictione quinta, cum praedixisset ex diuina revelacione | suam in Domino ante dies quindecim dormitionem futuram sicuti iam praemissum est, sanctum uero suum pro uritate in Christo Deo nostro martyrium ante non paucos annos, discipulus uero eius Anastasius mense Iulio die uicesima quarta indictionis eiusdem.

Igitur missa nobis est huiusmodi sacratissima et praeposita propriae manus, immo diuinitus exarata epistola una cum suppositis sibi deiloquis testimoniiis et syllogismis, ab eodem ipsorum exilio, id est Lazico; quam et habemus et conseruamus cum eodem quo scribent tradito sibi diuinitus argumento, id est praedictis duobus exilibus fusticulis, et aliis benedictionibus ac muneribus eius sanctisque ac

243 ipse[ supra l. m. sec. 244 Schemareos] restitui e gr., chemareos cod. existit cod. a. corr. m. sec. 248 ascensus] correti, ascensum cod. 263 die] iterait a. corr. cod. 266 syllogismis cod. e corr. m. sec.
from many leaders and inhabitants of that place, who were telling confidently with oaths of such a truly incredible miracle, and who had seen these (lights) with their own eyes. There is one, Mistrianus by name, a comes\textsuperscript{38} in the same fort of Schemaris, who saw them not once or twice but many times on night-watch with the soldiers, and first talked about all these things openly to us; although we were not able to go there because of the difficulty of the steep ascent of that mountain - that is, the peak of the Caucasus, than which there is no loftier mountain on earth - and the winter season, and above all the confusion of people which exists in those parts.\textsuperscript{39} (Maximus) departed\textsuperscript{40} to the heavenly kingdom at the same time as Anastasius his disciple, who spent ten years in three periods of exile, from the eleventh indiction of the past cycle through three exiles in great grief and under intolerable deprivation and strenuous struggles of this kind, namely in Bizya and Perberis in the region of Thrace, and Lazica, which I have already mentioned; indeed, holy Maximus, as was said, (departed) on the thirteenth of August, in the fifth indiction, when he had foretold his future rest in the Lord by divine revelation fifteen days earlier, as can be found in the previous account, whereas (he foretold) his holy martyrdom for the truth in Christ our God, some years before; and his disciple Anastasius (departed) on the twenty-fourth of July in the same indiction.\textsuperscript{41}

Therefore the most holy letter on this subject,\textsuperscript{42} set forth (here) by his own hand, or rather, divinely issued, was sent to us from the same exile, that is in Lazica, together with the attached testimonies and syllogisms which speak of God. We possess and keep it, together with the same device with which he used to write, handed down to him by divine inspiration, that is the aforesaid two slender twigs, [and similarly his other hand-written books and tomes from after the suffering, but

\textsuperscript{38} The Greek form of this term (comes) was used in later times to refer to subaltern officers of the army (as here) and navy units (\textit{ODB}, p. 485); later, in the eighth and ninth centuries, the κόμης τῆς κόρης was an official on the staff of a strategos, probably with judicial and police duties (\textit{ODB}, p. 1139).

\textsuperscript{39} Note the anacoluthon: the sentence resumes here from the point "just as the preceding letter commends" on the previous page.

\textsuperscript{40} The plural verb migrauerē has as its subject both Maximus and Anastasius his disciple.

\textsuperscript{41} On the date of Anastasius the Disciple's death, see \textit{Ep. Anas.}, p. 54, n. 12.

\textsuperscript{42} Literally "of this kind".
uenerabilibus, necnon et omnibus post Deum bonis librorm
uidelicet eius studiis, et propriae manus compositionibus
tanquam reurea sacrosanctis laudibus et reliquis. Data uester
est nobis uere minimis, Theodosio scilicet et Theodoro
germanis et sine dolo fratibus, humilius et peccatoribus
monachis, per Gregorium monachum et abbatem monasterii
sancti Iohannis Baptistae regionis Albanorum quod appellatur
Batararu, mensis Augusti die uicesima indictionis undecimae;
quae praeteriit nos qui reuertebamur a regione saepe dicta
Lazorum. Illuc enim profecti fueramus, licet ualde infirmi et
pauperes et indigni essemus, secundum consuetudinem ad
uisitationem eorum, non solum propter iam dictum creditum
nobis pondus conscriptum, id est praecessionem saepe
memorati sancti ac summi apostolici papa Romani Martini,
personaliter ad eum in eadem magni nominis urbe
aduentibus, et certitudinem propriae manus de his quae ab
eo synodice confirmata sunt ex ipso sumentibus et
audientibus papa et alio ex his qui simul aderant, sed et
quoniam ore proprio mandauerat nobis de hoc postquam
passi sunt cum adhuc essent Byzantii in custodia praetorii
praefecti quae appellatur Diomedis, ex qua et praemissimus
eos in iam saepe dictum tertium eorum exilium Lazicae,
merentes illis et in reliquis eorum exilii et custodiis,
laboribus et sollicitudinibus angustissque non mediocribus,
secundum quod nobis possibile fuit (per Deo acceptas eorum
precias nobis cooperante ipso qui eripuit nos saepius de
iniquis manibus impiorum, marisque periculis ac diuersis
stempestibus) ministrare de paupercula quae inerat nobis ex
parentum benedictione sicut in Domino, ut autem uerius
dicamus, Dei munere et non ex alienis, sed et reliquis nil
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286 aduentibus cod. a. corr. m. sec. 287 sunt] cod. a. corr. inc.
sa 291 praefecti] supra l. m. sec.
also many works from before his suffering, and his hand-written compositions, in that they are both treasures and relics that are truly holy and sacred as well.\textsuperscript{43} But [the sacred letter on this subject\textsuperscript{44} was given to us, the truly lowly germane\textsuperscript{45} and genuine brothers, namely Theodosius and Theodore, humble monks and sinners, through Gregory, monk and abbot\textsuperscript{46} of the monastery of Saint John the Baptist, of the Albanian region which is called Batararu,\textsuperscript{47} on the twentieth of August of the eleventh indiction, which passed\textsuperscript{48} when we were returning from the region of Lazica, which I have often mentioned. For we had set out there, although we were very weak and poor and unworthy, to visit them according to custom, not only on account of the burden\textsuperscript{49} entrusted to us in writing, which has already been mentioned, that is, the command of the often-remembered, holy and highest apostolic Roman pope, Martin, to those coming to him personally in the same city of great name,\textsuperscript{50} and taking from him [an assurance in his own hand concerning those truly pious teachings, synodically ratified by him, first conveyed by us];\textsuperscript{51} but also because he had given us an order concerning this with his own mouth,\textsuperscript{52} after they

\textsuperscript{43} Latin reads less clearly than the Greek: "with his other blessings and holy and venerable gifts, and with all his good studies after God, namely of his books, and compositions of his own hand as truly sacrosanct praises and relics." (Devreess, \textit{Hypomnematon}, p. 76, 2-5).

\textsuperscript{44} The subject of the verb is omitted in the Latin.

\textsuperscript{45} Latin \textit{germanis} may be a deliberate pun, meaning both "brothers" and "true" i.e. without guile.

\textsuperscript{46} Here Anastasius has preserved the distinction between \textit{ἀββᾶ} and \textit{ἡγουμένου} (Devreess, \textit{Hypomnematon}, p. 76, 8).

\textsuperscript{47} The Greek adds: "in the holy church of the Resurrection of Christ our God" (Devreess, \textit{Hypomnematon}, p. 76, 10).

\textsuperscript{48} Latin \textit{praeterit nos} "passed by us".

\textsuperscript{49} The Greek adds: "of the service of the Word" (Devreess, \textit{Hypomnematon}, p. 76, 15).

\textsuperscript{50} I.e. Rome.

\textsuperscript{51} Latin reads less clearly than the Greek: "an assurance in his own hand concerning those matters which were confirmed by him at the synod, and hearing from the pope and another of those who were there at the same time." (Devreess, \textit{Hypomnematon}, p. 7, 19-21). The reference is to the Acts of the Lateran Synod.

\textsuperscript{52} Cf. Greek \textit{αὐτὰς δῷςιν} "face to face" (Devreess, \textit{Hypomnematon}, p. 76, 21).
minus eorum concertatoribus | et commartyribus, et ut
fieremus inspectores stigmatum ipsorum et passionum, quae
propter Christum uerum Deum nostrum pertulerunt, quin
immo et auditores per nos effecti, diuinitus quoque sapientis
atque saluantis expertes eorum constitueremur doctrinae, et
Deo persuadibilibus et bene acceptis ipsorum orationibus
frueremur, et quaedam uestimentorum quae in passione sibi
scissa sunt, propriis manibus ab eis accepta, deferremus, una
cum sanctificatis pannis pretiosoque sanguine rubricatis qui
circumpositi fuerant sanctis eorum quae abscisae fuerant
manibus, causa sanguinem medicinaliter restringendi.
Vtrosque autem complecti ac memorari non sine
consideratione, ut reor, perpendimus, pro eo quod unum et
idem ipsum in certamine sanctae reuera et orthodoxae fidei
et in unculo pacis et caritatis dinoecantur effecti. De cetero
inftita multitudo eorum qui in praedicta non ferenda et
intolerabili persecutione, diuersis uerberibus et
tribulationibus palam et occulte martyrium inferebant, astuto
ac uersuto molimine has ill[u]s aliter atque aliter, quasi non
pro fide sed sub praetextu aliarum ingerebant occasionum
atque dannorum, adeo ut haec simplicioribus quibusque qui
facile decipientur ignorantibus, soli Deo quem occulorum est
cognitor et his qui studiosiores erant, hos et quamobrem
passi sint, proculdubio deserentes.

Pro quibus omnibus <uos> uniuersos qui in ueritate quae
reuera sunt ueritatis relegitis, ac si praesentes et procidentes,
tam cordis genu cum corporalibus genibus, quam cordis
sensu cum lacrimiris inclinati et ante uestigia omnium uestrum
prouoluti, deprecamur et exoramus quo pr i m u m quidem
ueniam in omnibus tribuatibus exiguitati ac indisciplinati
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had suffered, while they were still in Byzantium, in the prison of the praetorian prefect which is called Diomedes, from which we set out before them to their third place of exile in Lazica, which I have often mentioned. We were considered worthy to minister to them in their remaining exiles and confinements, labours and troubles and considerable deprivations, to the best of our ability — because their prayers were received by God, who helped us, snatching us on many occasions from the wicked hands of the impious, and from dangerous seas and various storms —, as it were, in the Lord, from the modest gift which came to us from our parents, or as we may say more truly, by the gift of God and not of strangers. But (we were considered worthy to minister) no less also to their remaining fellow strugglers and martyrs, both so that we might become observers of their stigmata and sufferings which they endured on account of Christ our true God; but also that we too, having become hearers with our own ears, might be strengthened by the experience of their divinely wise and saving teaching; and that we might benefit from their welcome prayers which are able to prevail upon God, and so that we might bring back certain items of their clothing which were torn in their suffering, received with our own hands from them, together with the bandages which were sanctified and reddened by (their) precious blood, which were wrapped around their holy hands after the amputation, to stem the flow of blood for medical purposes. But we have considered (it right) to commemorate jointly and remember both Maximus and Anastasius Apocrisiarius, not without deliberation, in my opinion, because they are recognised as having been made one and the same in the struggle of the truly holy and orthodox faith and in the bond of peace and love. As for the rest, the infinite number of those who in the unbearable and intolerable persecution, which I’ve mentioned, were

53 I.e. in 653/654.

54 The Greek reads "we escorted them".

55 Latin merentes; cf. Greek ἔξωθέναι (Devreesse, Hypomnesticon, p. 77, 2).

56 Or "from their own hands".

57 The Greek reads τὸ λοιπὸν ἀπέρευν πλῆθος "the remaining infinite number" (Devreesse, Hypomnesticon, p. 77, 23).
nostrae qui ad certitudinem et satisfactionem tanquam uere fideles fideliter talia prorsus recipimus, et ne obliuo uelet tantos et tales sacros agones eo quod ulde a paucis et raris haec cum diligentia cognoscantur (nos autem, ut dictum est, cum voluuntate Dei horum ipsisuisibus consciex parte maxima facti fuissesmus, et discrimen quod ex desidia generatur metui <s> semus, et non ob aliud, ut coram Deo dico, nisi propter hoc quoquomodo haec scribere praesumpsii <s> semus, et uitam uel laudes depromere minime ualuisseus talium et tot pro pietate certaminum ac sudorum uere mirabilium et magnorum illorum in Domino sacratissimorum uirorum, | propter collectaneam scilicet et rudem rusticitatem nostram et omnimodam indisciplinacionem, per quas nobis et sermonis inest inopia super omnes, quibus sufficere arbitramur pro magnae uitae actibus et praecoonis, si qui, ueritatis et studii amore, legere uoluerint diuina illorum et ueraciter sine fastudio contra impietatem et pro p[r]ietate laboris plurimos et conscripta, quae et cum omni sollertia et diligentia una cum his etiam quae sunt ex aduersariorum execrabilibus scriptis, licet humiles et ueraciter uiles super omnes et in omnibus simus, iuxta uirtutem tamen quae inest nobis, in diuersis libris ac tomis conscriptisimus, et amatoribus ueritatis tradidimus, in gloriam et indesinentem laudem et gratiarum actionem omnipotentis Dei et uere mirabilis in sanctis suis, ac zelum et alacritatem eorum qui pro pietate certare uoluerint, confusio nemque ac ineptabile opprobrium inimicorum ueritatis et ipsius Dei uniuersorum, instantiasque ac oppositiones illatarum sibi falsarum calumniarum et decretorum inaniu ac instabilium, et absolute omnes eorum
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publicly and privately bearing witness,\textsuperscript{58} in various beatings and torments, [inflicted upon them] with shrewdness and cunning in one way or another, as if not for the faith but under the guise of other pretexts for condemnation, for this purpose, that those who are simpler and more ignorant are easily deceived,\textsuperscript{59} we have without a doubt left to God who alone knows secret things and to those who were more diligent, (who know) who suffered and for what reason.

On behalf of these, we pray and entreat all [you] who read through, in the truth, all things which are truly of the truth – as if we were present and prostrate, so much bending with the knee of the heart together with our physical knees, as much as with the feeling of our hearts, in tears and prostrated before the feet\textsuperscript{60} of all of you. \textbf{First,} indeed, (we pray and entreat)\textsuperscript{61} that you grant a comprehensive pardon for our lowliness and our lack of instruction, [in order to confirm and reassure those who are really faithful and who]\textsuperscript{62} faithfully receive such things exactly, and (we pray) that oblivion should not veil the magnitude and nature of the sacred struggles, because these things are recognised with diligence by a very rare few. But since we, as has been said, by the will of God, have been made sharers of most of these things with our own eyes, and because we feared the danger which is generated by idleness, and not for any other (reason), as I say before God, except this, have we somehow dared to record these things in writing. We have barely been able to draw forth the life and praises of such numerous struggles on behalf of orthodoxy, and of the truly marvellous exertions of those great men, most holy in the Lord, on account of our unpolished and boorish lack of refinement and complete lack of instruction, which has

\textsuperscript{58} Latin \textit{martyrium inferebant}. The Greek construction is in active voice here but changes to the passive in \textit{προςφερομένων} (Devecesse, \textit{Hypomnesticon}, p. 77, 25-27). Anastasius has misunderstood, and maintained an active construction with \textit{ingerebant}.

\textsuperscript{59} The Greek is less cumbersome: \textit{διὰ τῶν ἀσκοῦσθέντων εὐλογοῦν} "because simpler-minded people are easy to deceive..." (Devecesse, \textit{Hypomnesticon}, p. 77, 27-28).

\textsuperscript{60} Latin \textit{vestigia}, literally "footprints".

\textsuperscript{61} These two verbs (\textit{deprecamur et exoramus}) must be understood with each of the adverbs introducing each of his three requests: "we pray and entreat first that..., second... and third...". I have created a new paragraph for each point, although this is one continual sentence in the Latin.

\textsuperscript{62} Anastasius Bibliothecarius has made several mistakes in the Latin, which translates as: "we who, for the certainty and satisfaction, as though truly faithful, (faithfully receive such things exactly)..."
sacratissimos ac pios agones atque suidores qui ab eis qui ex aduerso erant diuero modo sunt acti, id est a subintroducta noua et heretica omnia recipiente adinuentione Heraclianokyrosergioppyrrhopaulopetriatarum et inooluntatiuinoperatistarum, uel ut uerius dicamus nouorum Epicuriorum, id est penitus carentium Deo, ut ipsa rerum experientia et ipsa contrariorum impia conscripta demonstrant his qui huiuscemodi discernere norunt, quatinus hi qui post nos studiosi et in uerbo potentes fuerint, et his inuentis ex his occasionem acceperint, Deo ac sanctis eius gratiarum actiones debitas reddant; da enim sapienti occasionem et sapientior, inquit, erit; secund o uero indesinentibus orationibus et supplicationibus cum operibus bonis ac lacrimis benignissimum natura et misericordissimum placetis Deum, ut compatiatur infirmitatibus nostris, sedet[ae] de cetero instantem adhuc dolosam et uersutam et penitus argumentosam atque grauisissam super omnes praecedentes paganas et hereticas persecutiones, quippe cum sciat pulueris nostri fragilitatem et facilem lapsum propter nimiam fraudem eorum atque nequitiam, et finis seditionis fiat, et terminus huiusmodi atrocissimi mali pretiosum scilicet illorum sanguinem effundentium, ueluti sub impii et Dei exsortibus Arrianis profuso sanguine sancti Petri Alexandrini patriarchae ac martyris | gestum est (propter quod et praedicti sancti patres nostri et ueraciter pietatis doctores, praecipueque apostolicus et uerticialis papa noster Martinus similiter semetipsum in sacrificium pro fidei populo tradidit, in omnibus agonithetam Christum Deum nostrum et uericem apostolorum Petrum imitatus et in cunctis secutus, cuius et successor ut reuera dignus effectus
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left us, more than others, with a poverty of expression. If anyone with a love of truth and learning wishes (to do so), we think it is sufficient, instead of the acts of a great life and eulogies, to read their very many divine works and writings, truly unrestrained against impiety and on behalf of piety. Although we are humble and truly and in all respects more base than anyone, we have however written these down, according to the strength which we possess, with all care and diligence in various books and tomes, together with even the accursed writings of their enemies. And we have passed down to those who love the truth, for the glory and unceasing praise and thanksgiving of the omnipotent God, truly wonderful in his saints, and for the zeal and enthusiasm of those who wish to struggle for piety, and the confusion and inevitable condemnation of the enemies of the truth and of the God of all himself, both the threats and oppositions of the false slanders brought against them, and of the meaningless and wavering decrees, and absolutely all their most holy and pious trials and labours, which were inflicted on them in various ways by those who were against them. (They were inflicted), that is, by the newly introduced and heretical all-embracing innovation of the Heraclius-Cyrus-Sergius-Pyrrhus-Paul-Petrines and the no-will no-operationists, 63 or as we may say more truly, the new Epicureans, 64 that is of those altogether lacking God, as the very [proof] of the matter and the [impious] writings themselves of the opposition demonstrate to those who know how to discern matters of this kind. (We have passed them down) in order that those coming after us, who are studious and skilled in words, and can take the opportunity from these when they are discovered, may render to God and to his saints the thanksgiving that is owed; for give an opportunity to the wise man and he will be wiser, it is said.

But second, (we pray and entreat) that you please God who is most kind and merciful in nature, with (your) unceasing prayers and supplications, with good works and tears, so that he may have compassion on our weaknesses, and he may, for the

---

63 These two strings of names have been invented to describe those of the monothelite party, the first being followers of the patriarchs Cyrus, Sergius, Pyrrhus, Paul and Peter; the second group being those who forbade the mention of will or activity with respect to Christ.

64 The Epicureans were much maligned by Christians, as they did not believe in a providential God or in human immortality. It is not clear why they have been singled out for particular opprobrium here.
est), pacemque firmam et indissolubilem unitatem ubique sanctis suis donet ecclesiis, nec permittat de reliquo usque in finem haeresim quamlibet suscipiari, tam propter multitudinem miseratationum suarum, quam ob infirmitatem et mobilitatem naturae nostrae, quae super omnes praeteritas generationes excreuit;  

395  
terito autem ut immobiles usque in finem conservemur, non solum nos, sed et omnes pii in sancta reuera et orthodoxa atque immaculata nostra Christianorum sola catholica et uera fide, remi <s> sionemque peccatorum et salutem percipiamus, qui ueraciter peccatores sumus et serui omnium qui uere orthodoxi et proprie adoratores sunt Christi ueri Dei et salvatoris nostri, qui reuera glorificantes se magnifice in ueritate glorificat, cuique decora est omnis gloria, honor, imperium, magnificentia in caelo et in terra, adoratio et gratiarum actio in sensu cordis et ipsa ueritate, timoreque ac tremore pariter et exultatione secundum propheticum eloquium, una cum immortalis et miserationum amatore compatientissimoque ac misericordissimo super naturam Patre, atque sanctissimo et consubstantiali uniuferoque ac omnipotente diuino Spiritu, nunc et semper et in uniuersa et infinita saecula saeculorum, amen.

393/394 Ps. 50,3 et 68,17  402/403 I Reg. 2,30  406/407 cf. Ps. 2,11; cf. etiam I Cor. 2,3; II Cor. 7,15; Eph. 6,5 etc.

398 orthodoxa cod. a. corr. m. sec.  399 remissionemque scripsi, remissionemque cod.  401 orthodoxi cod. a. corr. m. sec.
rest,\textsuperscript{65} stop the persecution which still threatens, cunning and crafty, completely (devious)\textsuperscript{66} and more serious than all preceding pagan and heretical persecutions, since he surely knows that we are fragile dust, and how easy it is to lapse because of their exceeding deception and wickedness. And (we pray and entreat) that there be an end to sedition, and a close to the most atrocious evil of this kind, that is of those pouring out precious blood, as was done under the impious Arians,\textsuperscript{67} deprived of God, with the outpouring of the blood of holy Peter of Alexandria, patriarch and martyr. On account of this, our aforesaid holy Fathers, the true teachers of piety, and especially our apostolic and highest Pope Martin, similarly handed himself over as a sacrifice on behalf of the faithful, imitating the arranger of combat, Christ our God and the head of apostles Peter, and following them in all ways, whose successor he also became, as indeed he was worthy. May God give lasting peace and indissoluble unity everywhere to his holy churches, and may he not permit any heresy to rise up as for what remains\textsuperscript{68} to the end of time, as much because of the great number of his mercies, as because of the weakness and fickleness of our nature, which surpasses all past generations.

But third, (we pray and entreat) that we may be preserved unwavering up to the end, not only us, but also all the pious in our truly holy and orthodox and unstained faith of Christians, the sole catholic and true faith, and that we may attain the remission of sins and salvation, we who are truly sinners and servants of all, who are truly orthodox and proper worshippers of Christ the true God and our Saviour, who truly glorifies those glorifying him magnificently in truth, and who is worthy of

\textsuperscript{65} The sense of ἀληθῶν "therefore" (Devreesse, Hypomnemata, p. 79, 14) was missed here, as elsewhere, by Anastasius, who translated it as de cetero.

\textsuperscript{66} Cf. Latin pentius argumentosam "very rich in proof".

\textsuperscript{67} Peter II of Alexandria was nominated by Athanasius as his successor in 373, but was usurped by an Arian candidate, by the command of the emperor Valens. Peter found refuge with Pope Damasus in Rome, and returned to Alexandria c. 379. He died before the Council of Constantinople opened in 381 (M. Simonetti, EEC, p. 678). There seems to be some confusion in the author's mind between this Peter, and Peter I, Patriarch of Alexandria in the early fourth century, who was martyred in 311 (M. Simonetti, EEC, p. 677). Peter II was not a patriarch or a martyr, as he is described in our text, but Peter I was not persecuted by Arians.

\textsuperscript{68} The Greek τοῦ λοιποῦ "in the future" (Devreesse, Hypomnemata, p. 79, 29) would have been better translated by in reliquum, rather than de reliquo.
all glory, honour, power, magnificence in heaven and on earth, adoration, and thanksgiving in the feeling of the heart and in truth itself, and with equal fear and trembling and rejoicing according to the prophetic saying, together with the Father - (who is) immortal and loving of mercies and most compassionate and most merciful in nature -, and with the most holy and consubstantial and life-giving and omnipotent divine Spirit, now and forever until the entire and never-ending ages of ages. Amen.

Here end the commemorations of the saints Pope Martin, and Maximus the monk, and his disciples Anastasius and Anastasius, and the brothers Euprepius and Theodore.  

---

69 The following is added here in the Greek, and is probably original: "moreover with a perfect faith, too, which exceeds all things, in as much as it is the chief and perfecter of all virtues, and the only guide to salvation…" (Devreesse, Hypomnemata, p. 80, 8-10).

70 This scholion is not found in the Greek.
Expliciunt commemorationes de sanctis papa Martino et Maximo monacho, seu Anastasio itemque Anastasio discipulis eius, atque Euprepio et Theodoro germanis.

INDEX OF BIBLICAL QUOTATIONS
AND ALLUSIONS

Old Testament

Exodus
31, 18 Hypo. 78
20, 11 Disp. 784/785

I Kings
2, 30 Hypo. 81/82, 402/403,
   Ep.A. 101/102

III Kings
18, 26 Syll. 502/503

Psalms
2, 11 Hypo. 406/407
7, 10 Hypo. 18/19
18, 3 Disp. 701/702
18, 4 RM 138/139
50, 3 Hypo. 393/394
63, 3 Ep. Anas. 160/163
67, 36 Hypo. 81, 355; Ep. Anas.
   108/109
68, 17 Hypo. 393/394
81, 5 Syll. 222/225
108, 17 Disp. 744/745
118, 2 Disp. 316/317
118, 34 Disp. 318/320
118, 129 Disp. 323/324
134, 6 RM 155/157
135, 4 Hypo. 81
145, 6 Disp. 784/785

Proverbs
1, 6 Disp. 324/325
9, 9 Hypo. 371/372
10, 17 Ep. Anas. 32

Sirach
10, 10 RM 68

Isaiah
1, 22 Syll. 39, 455, 460
6, 3 Syll. 49/50
40, 4 Disp. 108/109
62, 10 Disp. 107/108

Daniel
3, 18 RM 259/260
6, 16 RM 262/263

Amos
8, 11 Hypo. 145/147

Habakuk
3, 8 Ep. Anas. 188/189

I Macabees
2, 63 RM 68

New Testament

Matthew
5, 8 Hypo. 121/122
6, 30 RM 68
7, 2 RM 47/49; Ep. Anas.
   128/129
7, 13 RM 486/487
8, 25 RM 483
10, 16 RM 486
10, 32 Disp. 707/708; Ep. Cal.
   108/109
10, 40 Disp. 191/192, 202/203
13, 18 Disp. 326/327
16, 18 Ep. Max. 56/58; Ep. Cal.
   99
18, 7 RM 64/65
25, 33-34 Ep. Anas. 165/166
26, 41 Syll. 103/105, 287/289

Mark
9, 37 Disp. 202/203
4, 24 Ep. Anas. 128/129
13, 37 Disp. 190/191
14, 38 Syll. 103/105, 287/289
15, 1 RM 466

Luke
1, 28 Hypo. 222
6, 27 RM 438/439
6, 38 Ep. Anas. 128/129
8, 11 Disp. 326/327
10, 16 Disp. 192
10, 19 Disp. 66/67
12, 8 Ep. Cal. 108/109
22, 32 Ep. Max. 56/58

John
5, 39 Disp. 328
10, 11 Hypo. 229/230
8, 44 Hypo. 166/167
Acts
4, 24 Disp. 784/785
20, 30 Disp. 200/201

Romans
4, 17 Hypo. 34/35
5, 3-4 Disp. 56/57
5, 4 Disp. 67/68
8, 29 Disp. 29/31
10, 2 Ep. Anas. 202
10, 10 Disp. 709/710, Syll. 7/8

I Corinthians
2, 3 Hypo. 406/407
12, 28 RM 309/310, Disp.
188/189, 195/196
13, 12 Syll. 531/532

II Corinthians
4, 3-4 Disp. 331/334
3, 6 Disp. 339
5, 11-16 Syll. 467/470, 471/472
7, 15 Hypo. 406/407
9, 8 Ep. Anas. 164/165

Galatians
1, 8 RM 270/271
1, 8-9 Syll. 542/545

Ephesians
1, 21 RM 496/498
1, 10 Syll. 115
2, 14 Disp. 234
4, 3 Hypo. 315
4, 11 RM 309/310, Disp.
185/186
4, 12 Disp. 189
4, 11-12 Disp. 195/196
6, 5 Hypo. 406/407
6, 19 Disp. 9/10

Philippians
2, 8 Disp. 576

II Thessalonians
2, 3-4 Disp. 210/212

II Timothy
3, 1 Hypo. 145
4, 5 Ep. Anas. 185/186
4, 7 Disp. 792/793; Hypo.
95/97, 213/214
4, 8 Ep. Anas. 184/185

I Peter
1, 10 Disp. 330

II John
8 Ep. Cal. 102

Jude
25 Syll. 551/553

Hebrews
4, 15 RM 317, Disp. 218/219,
Syll. 61, 63, 94, 106, 165, 291
5, 6 RM 188, 193
7, 3 RM 190/191
9, 28 Disp. 218/219

James
5, 3 Hypo. 145
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