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INTRODUCTION

The Byzantine empire in the seventh century was overtaken by successive waves of radical change, in respect of its internal structures, both imperial and social, and its religious groupings as defined by the Council of Chalcedon (451). In the midst of agitated Christological controversies, Arab and Persian attacks rocked the empire’s physical foundations and exploited existing weaknesses based on divisions between Chalcedonian and non-Chalcedonian communities.\(^1\) Several centuries of controversy over what it meant to say that Christ was ‘God made man’ culminated in two disputes, over the number of activities in Christ and the number of wills. The doctrines of *monenergism* (one ‘energy’ or activity in Christ) and *monothelitism* (one will which subsumed both human and divine aspects) were instigated by theologians close to the court, particularly the patriarch of Constantinople, as a way of shoring up ecclesiastical unity in a time of political turmoil. With Avar–Slav enemies to the north and Persians and Arabs to the east, the last thing Emperor Heraclius needed was a recalcitrant monk stirring up dissent in Africa and Italy. This was Maximus the Confessor, whose theological obstinacy had a quite unprecedented impact on Heraclius’ precarious hold on imperial rule in the declining capital of Constantinople. Even the patriarch Pyrrhus was at one stage persuaded by Maximus’ powers of rhetoric to defect to the dyothelite (two-will) camp, albeit temporarily. The monastic resistance led by Maximus gained the support of popes John IV, Theodore, and Martin I, and found many other followers in the West. The strength of western opposition to the imperial doctrine can be judged by the convocation of 150 bishops at the Lateran Synod in Rome in 649. Their opposition eventually led to Martin, Maximus, and his disciple Anastasius being brought

\(^1\) In general, we have preferred to use throughout this introduction the term ‘non-Chalcedonian’ for the churches which have traditionally been labelled by their opponents as ‘monophysite’, given the religious prejudice the latter term connotes.
to trial on trumped-up charges in Constantinople, where they were condemned to torture and eventual death in exile, under appalling physical conditions.

The seven documents translated in this volume constitute a unique contemporary witness to Maximus' and Martin's stalwart opposition to imperial edicts enforcing adherence to monenergism and monothelitism. They cover events from the time of Maximus' arrival in Constantinople for his first trial in 655; the futile attempts to persuade him to accept the imperial compromise; to his final trial in the capital in 662; and his death in Lazica, on the coast of the Black Sea. They provide a rare insight into the difficult period of transition from the decentralized provincial system of government that characterized Late Antiquity, to a more hierarchical structure centred on the power of the emperor in Constantinople. They also shed light on some lesser-known but significant participants in the monothelite controversy, several of whom followed their master into exile in Lazica: Maximus' two disciples Anastasius the monk and Anastasius the Apocrisiarius, and their friends Theodore Spoudaeus, Theodosius of Gangra, and the brothers Theodore and Euprepius.

These documents were translated into Latin in the late ninth century by Anastasius Bibliothecarius, papal librarian and diplomat of the Frankish Emperor Louis II. Anastasius' interest in the monothelite dispute was political rather than theological, and his choice of works for translation reflects his collaboration with Pope Nicholas I to promote papal primacy, both in relation to the Franks and the emperor of the East. Anastasius' translation is particularly important because it pre-dates any of the existing Greek manuscripts, thus providing the earliest and most complete witness to the tradition. For one of the seven texts presented here, the Latin version is our sole witness, and for another it supplies a lacuna in the single Greek witness.

I. THE MONOTHELITE CONTROVERSY AND ITS CHRISTOLOGY

In this brief introduction we seek to place the documents in their historical context by giving an account of the origins, both internal and external, of the monenergist and monothelite doctrines, and
the role that these played in the imperial struggle for religious authority and ecclesiastical unity in the seventh century. The theological implications of the heterodox teaching will be examined, together with the scriptural and patristic sources cited by those who resisted it. Although dyothelite orthodoxy was ultimately vindicated by the Sixth Ecumenical Council held in Constantinople in 680/1, where both the human will and the divine will of Christ were affirmed, this decision came several decades too late to save the lives of several martyrs for the cause.

The late 620s saw a renewed attempt by the imperial church to establish religious unity in the Byzantine empire, and to heal the schism between those who accepted the Council of Chalcedon (451) and those who felt it had betrayed Cyril of Alexandria. The monenergist compromise was the shrewd design of Sergius, patriarch of Constantinople, under the auspices of Emperor Heraclius; it was crystallized in the Alexandrian Pact of Union welcomed by Cyrus, patriarch of Alexandria and imperial flunky, in 633. By this agreement, Cyrus claimed to have effected union of the non-Chalcedonian party with the imperial 'orthodoxy', that is, supporters of monenergism in Egypt. Sergius and Heraclius hoped that the rest of the empire would follow suit, and certainly there was a deafening silence on the theological front until Sophronius spoke out against it in 633. The doctrinal edifice of monenergism was built upon three pillars: first, the recognition of the Cyrilline doctrine of 'one incarnate nature of God the Word'; second, an acceptance of the theopaschite formula, that is, the statement that 'one of the Trinity suffered in the flesh'; and finally, the ps.-Dionysian affirmation of 'a new (or 'single') theandric activity' in Christ after the union. Both the statements of Cyril and ps.-Dionysius the Areopagite seemed, on a superficial reading, to endorse the existence of a single activity in Christ.

II. CONCILIAR BACKGROUND TO MONENERGISM

The doctrine of monenergism was the perhaps inevitable outcome of centuries of conflict between the churches over the orthodox definition of the nature or natures of Christ, which had prompted

2 κοινή τε και διαθεσμή ἐνέργεια: on the textual variation of this phrase see n. 33 below. See also Louh, Maximus, 11–13 for further explication of these three doctrines.
the convocation of three Ecumenical Councils. Emperor Justin I (518–27) gave imperial support to Chalcedon, bringing the Acacian schism—caused by the non-Chalcedonian leanings of a previous patriarch of Constantinople, Acacius (472–89)—to an end in 518. Under his successor, Justinian, there was an attempt, known as Neo-Chalcedonianism or Cyrillic Chalcedonianism, to show that the findings of Chalcedon were consonant with the teaching of Cyril. In particular they sought to endorse the Cyrillic doctrine of 'one incarnate nature of God the Word'.

Emperor Justinian initiated discussions in Constantinople in 532 to test a new strain of Cyrillic Chalcedonianism, based on the theopaschite formula promulgated by a group of Scythian monks in Rome during Justin I's rule, that is, the affirmation that 'one of the Trinity suffered in the flesh'. Theopaschism had become associated with the non-Chalcedonians after Peter the Fuller, patriarch of Antioch (d. 488), added the phrase 'who was crucified for us' to the Trisagion in the liturgy, as a reminder that it was God the Word who suffered in the flesh, and not just the human Christ. This addition was at first resisted in Constantinople where the Trisagion was thought to address the Trinity rather than Christ, as in the Antiochene usage. By accepting the monks' formula, the emperor hoped to show that the Chalcedonian church embraced theopaschism, thus removing one of the obstacles to unity with the church of Antioch.

3 i.e. the Third Ecumenical Council of Ephesus (431), the Fourth Ecumenical Council of Chalcedon (451), and the Fifth Ecumenical Council of Constantinople (553), as well as the 'Robber Synod' at Ephesus (449).

4 Acacius composed the Henoticon under Emperor Zeno's authority in 482. This was a compromise statement endorsing monophysitism and was designed to achieve unity in the eastern provinces. Acacius re-established the non-Chalcedonian Peter Mongus ('the hoarse'), whom he had previously deposed, as patriarch of Alexandria, thus prompting the bishop of Rome, Felix III, to convene a synod in Rome condemning the Henoticon and anathematizing Acacius and Peter Mongus. This led to schism, which lasted until Justin's acceptance of Chalcedonianism in 518.


6 The Trisagion or 'Thrice-Holy' is the chant: 'Holy God, holy Mighty, holy Immortal, have mercy upon us.'
Justinian continued persecution of the Nestorian church in 542 with the renewed condemnation of the *Three Chapters*, which were composed of the writings of Theodore of Mopsuestia, and the works against Cyril by Theodoret of Cyrillus and Ibas of Edessa. The emperor had been persuaded by the Origenist Theodore Askidas that this was the only way to end the separation of the non-Chalcedonians. The development of a rival Jacobite clergy in Syria and Asia Minor under the charismatic leadership of Jacob Baradaeus from the time of his consecration as bishop of Edessa in 543 defeated Justinian’s efforts towards reconciliation, and he turned instead to persecution of the non-Chalcedonian churches of Syria, Egypt, and Armenia. When this achieved no significant progress towards ecclesiastical unity, he convoked the Fifth Ecumenical Council in 553 in an effort to achieve universal condemnation of the three Syrian fathers, and acceptance of the theopaschite formula, and to clarify that the intention of Chalcedon was to embrace the teaching that the divine Logos was the hypostasis of the incarnate Christ. Thus the Cyrilline position was declared acceptable as long as it was interpreted in accordance with the Holy Fathers’ teaching. Followers of Severus—the Jacobites in Syria, and the Theodosians in Egypt—were unimpressed by the condemnation of the *Three Chapters*, and chose not to re-enter into communion with Constantinople. Likewise, the Syriac church in Persia remained staunchly Nestorian, holding a council in 554 to reaffirm their commitment to the teaching of two natures in the Incarnate Word. The bishop of Rome, Vigilius (537–55), whose patrons were Belisarius, defender of the city against the Goths, and the empress Theodora, initially took the imperial position on the question of natures. However, in 540 he was forced to make a statement confessing a strictly two-nature doctrine to the emperor which was more representative of the faith of the western churches. Under his leadership, the Roman and African Catholic churches also initially opposed Justinian’s condemnation of the *Three Chapters*, published between 543 and 546. The Fifth Ecumenical Council was convened in 553 to

---


condemn the *Three Chapters* and yet uphold the Definition of the
Faith of Chalcedon. The hapless Vigilius, taken by force to
Constantinople in November 545, was imprisoned and subjected
to such ill-treatment that he finally capitulated, and gave his sub-
scription to the canons of the Fifth Ecumenical Council in
December 553. He died in Sicily on his way back to Rome in 555,
thus avoiding what would certainly have been a cold welcome
home. The bishops of Dalmatia, Milan, and Aquileia, and certain
African bishops, refused to give their signatures to the proceed-
ing of the council, however. The bishops of Grado, Aquileia, and of
Milan refused to enter into communion with Vigilius’ successor
Pelagius, who had been a staunch ‘defender of the *Three Chapters*’
until he was persuaded to change his mind by Justinian. The
western church’s antagonism to imperial interference in ecclesias-
tical affairs was greatly increased by these events.

*External Causes of Unrest within the Empire*

Thus when Heraclius took the imperial throne in 610, after oust-
ing the usurper Phocas, he inherited a deeply fragmented empire,
in both religious and political terms. The ‘everlasting’ peace treaty
with the Persians of 591 had been broken in 602 by Chosroes II,
intent on avenging the death of Maurice at the hands of the
usurper Phocas. Avar–Slav invasions of the European provinces
had been continual throughout Phocas’ reign (602–10). The
Persian king Chosroes refused to sign a peace treaty with
Heraclius, and the advance of Persian forces in the East from 613
to 619 led to the loss of Caesarea, Antioch, Damascus, and
Jérusalem (614), and the subsequent removal of the True Cross
from the shrine of the Holy Sepulchre by the Persians, followed by
the loss of Egypt in 619. Thessalonica was held under siege from
617 to 619, and the Avar threat to the Balkans could only be con-
tained by the purchase of peace of 620. Heraclius thus turned his
attention to the reorganization of the Byzantine military forces,
and led his own forces into battle in Asia Minor in 622, defeating
the Persians in Armenia in 622/3. Heraclius remained in the East

9 Murphy–Sherwood, 154ff.
10 Victor of Tunnuna, *Chronicon* (a. 558), *MGH Auctores antiquissimi* 11, *Chronica Minor* ii,
ed. T. Mommsen (Berlin: Weidmann, 1894), 205 = PL 68. 961a. Pelagius had previously
been a determined opponent of Justinian’s condemnation of the Nestorians; see
Murphy–Sherwood, 153ff.
COnci liar BaCkgound to Monenergism

for the next five years, and won a decisive victory near Nineveh in 627. Chosroes, utterly defeated, was killed in a coup, and Byzantium reclaimed all the territory it had lost since 613. Meanwhile in Constantinople, the combined Avar–Slav forces had arrived within the region of the capital in 625–6, while the Persian army waited in Chalcedon for a chance to cross the Bosporus and take the Royal City. Patriarch Sergius played a large part in the defence, mobilizing the people in a procession of icons through the city. The Avar–Slav forces were defeated, and the Slav fleet destroyed. The Persians, left with no means to cross the Bosporus, eventually withdrew in late 626. Heraclius returned to Constantinople, having recovered the relic of the True Cross from the Persian capital, Ctesiphon (628). Sergius, as defender of the city in the emperor's absence, shared his triumph, thus strengthening the alliance between church and state which was to manifest itself clearly throughout the monenergistic and monothelite controversies.

The need for unity among the churches continued to be a pressing concern under the subsequent Arab threat. Just as the monenergistic formula was being accepted at Alexandria in 633, Muslim forces began to invade Byzantine territories, after the death of their spiritual leader Muhammad in 632. Damascus fell to the Muslim forces in 635; Jerusalem was surrendered by the patriarch Sophronius in 638; the Muslims advanced into the Persian empire in the 640s, and in 642 took Alexandria, which was only briefly recovered by the Byzantine empire in 645. Thus three of the five patriarchates passed out of the emperor's jurisdiction, leaving only his own capital and the unruly see of St Peter. The exarch of Carthage, Gregory, staged an unsuccessful rebellion in 645, and Olympius, exarch of Ravenna, followed suit in 649. Maximus and Martin respectively were accused of involvement in these uprisings.

Three decades of wars had led to huge numbers of displaced people within the bounds of empire. Many Greeks fled from

---

11 According to Theophanes (trans. C. Mango and R. Scott, The Chronicle of Theophanes the Confessor. Byzantine and Near Eastern History AD 284–615 (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1997), AM 619, 457), Heraclius returned to the capital in 626/7, but this date is uncertain (ibid. 458 n. 3). Nikephoros' claim that Heraclius' triumphal return took place after the True Cross was restored to Jerusalem on Thursday 21 March 630: see B. Flusin, Saint Anastase de Pise et l'histoire de la Palistin au debut du VIIe siecle, vol. 2 (Paris: Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique, 1999), 293–303; cf. V. Grumel, 'La réposition de la Vraie Croix à Jérusalem par Herculeus, le jour et l'année', Byzantinische Forschungen 1 (1936), 199–249.
the eastern provinces to the western territories of the empire, especially Carthage, Sicily, South Italy, and Rome. Many of these refugees were monks, who founded new monasteries in the West, both non-Chalcedonian and Chalcedonian. Maximus the Confessor was among this number, and used this forced sojourn abroad (ξένωρα) to his advantage in his campaign against imperial heresy. It seemed clear to Maximus, as to others, that the Byzantine military defeats were a direct consequence of the emperor’s diversion from orthodoxy. In defiance, he turned to the only remaining patriarch for support: the bishop of Rome.

*Genesis of the Monenergist and Monothelite Doctrines*

In 616, in an attempt to shore up imperial authority in the wake of the Persian invasions of Syria, and with an invasion of Egypt imminent, Heraclius’ cousin Nicetas achieved a tentative union between the Jacobite and Coptic churches of Syria and Egypt respectively. From around 616 or 617, Heraclius and the patriarch Sergius saw monenergism as a way to restore ecclesiastical unity throughout what was left of the empire: the assertion of a unique activity in Christ should appeal to the non-Chalcedonians, while the preservation of the affirmation of two natures would appease the Chalcedonians. The assertion of ‘one will’ seemed to be a natural corollary to the assertion of a single activity. Our evidence for the early phase of the doctrines comes from Maximus’ *Dispute with Pyrrhus*, which took place in Carthage in July 645, the *Proceedings* of the Lateran Council (649) and Constantinople III (680/1), and the *Vita Maximii*. In 616–18 Sergius presented the monenergist doctrine in a letter to the non-Chalcedonian monk George Arsas of Alexandria, to the outrage of George’s bishop John the Almsgiver, a fierce supporter of Chalcedon. Sergius asked George to supply him with texts supporting the doctrine.

12 Murphy-Sherwood, 188.
13 See D. Olster, ‘Chalcedonian and Monophysite: the Union of 616’, *Bulletin de la Société d’Archéologie Copte* 27 (1983), 99–108, on the factors which motivated the various factions involved in the reconciliation. This union had nothing to do with the development of the monenergist doctrine at the same time by Heraclius.
14 *Dispute with Pyrrhus, PG* 91. 332811–33398.
15 Murphy-Sherwood, 172, also mention Maximus’ letter to Marinus of Cyprus, of 645–6, on which see Sherwood, *Dat-List*, 53–5, nos. 79–85.
17 Murphy-Sherwood, 173.
The author of the *Vita Maximi* places the weight of blame on Athanasius, patriarch of the Jacobites in Antioch (593–631), claiming that he persuaded Heraclius that he would receive the Council of Chalcedon, if the emperor agreed to the doctrine of monenergism. Theodore of Pharan, a Chalcedonian, was consulted by Sergius and persuaded to approve the doctrine. In his letter to Theodore, Sergius cited a forged letter of Menas, patriarch of Constantinople (536–52) to Pope Vigilius. This *Libellus*, now lost, affirmed ‘one activity and one will’ of the incarnate Word. Some of Theodore’s subsequent writings on the subject have survived, including his *Letter to Sergius of Arsinoë on the single activity*, and a work called *The interpretation of patristic texts*, which boldly asserts that ‘Christ’s will in effect is one and it is divine’. Sergius also wrote to Paul the Blind, leader of the non-Chalcedonians in Cyprus. Paul had met with Heraclius in Armenia (622–3) where the emperor made an unsuccessful attempt to convert him to monenergism. Paul was sent back to his archbishop Arcadius in Cyprus, with a decree forbidding talk of two activities after the union.

The compromise doctrine eventually found its most ready adherent in Cyrus of Phasis, in Lazica, who was contacted during Heraclius’ campaign there against Persia in 626. Sergius wrote to Cyrus on the subject of a single activity in Christ in the same year, in answer to his objections to the doctrine on the grounds that it was irreconcilable with Pope Leo’s formula: ‘Each form (i.e. nature) performs what is proper to it, in communion with the other’ (*agit enim utraque forma cum alterius communione quod proprium est*). In his reply, Sergius cited the spurious *Libellus of Menas*, ‘in which, in a similar way, he taught the doctrine of one will and one life-giving operation of the great God and Saviour our Lord Jesus Christ’ (Tit. 2: 13). In regard to Leo’s statement Sergius turned the usual...

---

18 *Vita Maximii*, *PG* 90. 76c14–77b2.
19 Grumel, *Requets*, no. 281. See Murphy-Sherwood, 175f. for descriptions of Sergius’ first four letters on the subject; a brief account of Cyrus’ letter to Theodore of Pharan is given in *Vita Maximii*, *PG* 90. 72c7–d3.
20 As mentioned by Maximus in the *Dispute with Prymas*, *PG* 91. 33c8–c.
21 Extracts of both these texts are translated in Murphy-Sherwood, 390–2.
22 Murphy-Sherwood, 175f.
23 *ACO* ser. 2, 2/2. 528. 4–10 (= *Mansi* 11. 52d9) in the *Letter of Sergius to Cyrus*, quoted in the twelfth session of the Sixth Ecumenical Council (*CPF* 7604).
25 Leo made this statement in his *Epist. 11. 4 ad Flavianum*, *ACO* 2. 1. 1, p. 14, lines 27–9.
26 *CPF* 7604. *ACO* ser. 2, 2/2. 528. 17–19.
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interpretation around, by taking the nominative subject as an ablative: ‘(Christ) performs what is proper to him with each form, in communion with the other.” By this cunning manoeuvre Sergius made the pope’s statement sound like an affirmation of monenergism. He continues: ‘One ought to recognize it, because various teachers of the catholic church rose to the defence of this letter, and we know none of these to have said that the most holy Leo asserted two activities in this book.” Cyrus was impressed and duly converted. He was rewarded with election to the patriarchate of Alexandria in 631.

Theological Implications of Monenergism

Drawing on the Cyrilline Chalcedonian tradition, the doctrine of monenergism affirmed that Christ was ‘one of the Holy Trinity, the Word God’, from two natures, that is from both Godhead and humanity, and discerned in two natures. This single person ‘performed activities fitting for God and for a human being by one theandric activity’, according to a quotation (or misquotation) from ps.-Dionysius the Areopagite’s letter to Gaius. The authority of this text was made dubious by the existence of two variant readings: the non-Chalcedonian version, cited by the Severans at the Council of Constantinople in 532, was that of ‘one theandric activity’, although some manuscripts supplied ‘a certain new theandric activity’. The problem of identifying the correct reading is compounded by the fact that the ps.-Dionysian text only exists in the edition of John of Scythopolis, who may have revised the text in line with his own dyophysite leanings. As we shall see,

27 That this is not what Leo intended is clear from the following words in his Tome: Verbo saeculi operatus quod Verbi est, et caro occupante quod carnis est.
28 He does the same in his second letter to Cyrus (PG 7605), ACO ser. 2, i. 134–8, after the union in Alexandria, as E. Bellini notes in ‘Maxime interprete de Pseudo-Denys l’Areopagite’, in Heinzer-Schönborn, Maximus Confessor, 40 and n. 15.
29 oportet esse scire, quod . . . diversae probabilitatibus ecclesiis dictorum ad hanc et verum adversariam praeceptae ostentis ad tum seum ad inconvenientem praeceptae ostentis diversa, quod et presens libro duas operationes Leo sanctissimus assersuit. ACO ser. 2, 21/2, 531, i–6. It should be noted, however, that the Greek edition does not mark τερτόν μονον as dative, either in this letter (528, 25) or in Sergius’ second letter to Cyrus, ACO ser. 2, i. 158. It is, however, in the dative case in Maximus’ citation of the phrase in the Dispute with Pyrrhus, PG 91. 35285–6.
30 Past of Union, chaps. 6 and 7, trans. by P. Allen, forthcoming.
31 Ep. 4 ad Gaium, PG 3. 107261.
Maximus the Confessor rejected the monenergistic version on the grounds that it was impossible. In his *Synodical Letter*, Sophronius interpreted the phrase to mean 'not existing as one (activity) but existing in different kinds.' The assertion made in the theopaschite formula that 'one of the Trinity, God the Word, suffered in the flesh' also seemed to imply a single divine activity of the Incarnate Word. Severus was claimed to have supported monenergism implicitly, by both its supporters and its enemies, since he objected to the distinction made between acts of Christ as God and acts of Christ as human. Maximus Confessor writes that the Severan bishops on Crete confessed neither two activities in Christ, nor one activity, but in accordance with Severus they affirmed that 'one will, and every divine and human activity proceed from one and the same God the Word incarnate'.

*Reception of the Monenergist Compromise*

The monenergist compromise succeeded in uniting the Armenian church with imperial 'orthodoxy' in 690, and also had limited success in the churches of Syria and Mesopotamia. It enjoyed greatest success in Egypt under the monenergist convert Cyrus who, as patriarch of Alexandria, promulgated the Alexandrian *Pact of Union or Nine Chapters* (*CPG* 7613) in June 693. The last chapter anathematizes anyone who accepts the writings of Theodoret, the letter of Ibas, and the person and writings of Theodore of Mopsuestia. It affirms the use of the Marian title 'Theotokos' (ch. 5); the theopaschite formula derived from Cyril (ch. 2) and Cyril's own theopaschite statement (ch. 3); his statement of 'one incarnate nature of God the Word'; and a single theandric activity in Christ, citing the monenergist version of the words of ps.-Dionysius the Areopagite (ch. 7). It makes no mention

---

53 There is variation in the citation of this phrase in Sophronius' *Synodical Letter*, *ACO* ser. 2, 2/1. 456. 14 where four manuscripts read κοινή ('common') rather than καινή ('new'). Bellini, 'Maximus', in Heinze–Schönborn, *Maximus Confessor*, 41 n. 18, notes this divergence in the manuscript tradition. The latter reading is accepted by C. von Schönborn in *Sophronie de Jerusalem. Vie monastique et confession dogmatique*, *Théologie Historique* 20 (Paris: Beauchene, 1972), 208, in his translation of extracts of Sophronius' *Synodical Letter*.

54 *Opus.* 3. 496.

55 This is preserved under the title *Salutatio* in the proceedings of the Lateran Synod (ch. 7 only), *ACO* ser. 2, 1. 134. 4–29, and in full in the proceedings of the Sixth Ecumenical Council, *ACO* ser. 2, 2/2. 594. 14–601. 20.
of a single will in Christ. The Theodosian party of Alexandria agreed to its terms and was reconciled, to the great satisfaction of Cyrus and Sergius.

Their relief was to be short-lived, however. Sophronius immediately objected to the Pact of Union and appealed to Patriarch Sergius of Constantinople. Sergius thereupon issued the Psephos (639) forbidding any mention of one or two activities in Christ, and excluding the possibility of two contrary wills. Soon after his consecration as patriarch of Jerusalem in 634, Sophronius declared his support for the Chalcedonian position in his Synodical Letter, which technically observes the Psephos by not counting the activities, but rejects monenergism on the grounds that it entails monophysitism. Sophronius was clear in his insistence on the two-nature formula as affirmed at Chalcedon, and sought to explain the phrase from Leo's Tome to Flavian: 'Each form (that is, nature) effects that which is proper to it, in union with the other.' Curiously, the Psephos was approved by Maximus the Confessor, who had been a close friend of Sophronius since the occasion of their meeting in North Africa, although he sought

---

36 They were named after their influential patriarch Theodosius, who, despite protection from Empress Theodora, had been condemned to exile by Justinian. Even in exile, however, he remained significant both politically and dogmatically. See Grillmeier 2/2, 347–8, and A. Van Rooij and P. Allen, Monophysite Texts of the Sixth Century, Orientalia Lovaniensia Analecta 56 (Leuven: Peeters, 1994), 126–43.


39 ACO ser. 2, 2/1. 442. 15–16. See n. 27 above.

40 διὰ τῶν εἰδότων κενούσας πατρικῷ καὶ οἰκείῳ θεοίσματι: ACO ser. 2, 2/1. 432. 4–5.

41 ACO ser. 2, 2/1. 432. 7.

42 Maximus' letter to Pyrrhus, Letter 19, PG 91, 386c1–387a3.

43 According to the Syriac Life, Maximus arrived in Africa after Constant II's accession in 641. Brock, 'Syriac Life', 324–5, in his commentary on chs. 17–18 gives a summary of the discrepancies in the sources concerning Maximus' movements in the 630s and 640s. The Syriac Life is of considerably greater value for this part of Maximus' life than for his early years, of which its vitriolic account is most likely of as little value as the encomastic version given in the Greek Life. For more information on Maximus' later years we await the edition of Maximus' Letters and Opuscula, which is currently being prepared by Dr Basil Marko for the CCEG. The end of Maximus' Letter 5, published by R. Devrouexe, 'La fin inédite d'une lettre de saint Maxime', Revue des Sciences religieuses 17 (1937), 25–35, gives an exact date of 632 for the letter. On account of this, Sherwood, Date-List, 6, suggests that Maximus came to Africa around 629/30. Sherwood conjectures that Maximus may have been in Alexandria with Sophronius in 633 (Date-List, 28–9). According to the Syriac Life (ch. 18),
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clarification of certain terms used in the edict. Sergius reported these developments to the bishop of Rome, Honorius (625–38) (CPG 7606). Demonstrating a spectacular lack of awareness of the theological issues at stake, Honorius replied with a letter of congratulations (CPG 9375) for obtaining theological agreement in the eastern churches. This letter contained the infamous statement of what was to become the heretical doctrine of monothelitism: a confession of 'the one will of our Lord Jesus Christ.' Thus the pope was later credited as the inventor of the heretical doctrine.

In a second letter to Sergius, Honorius seems to retreat from his former position, perhaps as a result of receiving Sophronius’ Synodical Letter. At Sophronius’ instigation, Arcadius of Cyprus convened a synod in the mid-630s. According to the author of the Syriac Vita Maximi, Anastasius, whom the author claims was of African origin, was there to defend Maximus’ ‘pernicious’ doctrine. He met with little success, the bishops being unable to reach a conclusion, and finally appealing to the judgement of the emperor. Sophronius then sent his envoy Stephen of Dora to Rome. At this point, Maximus began to make his objections to the monenergist compromise known in writing, in Ambigua 5, where he argues against Cyrus of Alexandria’s citation of the

he returned to Syria-Palestine at some time before 641, ‘where he was active shortly after the Arab invasions.’ (Brock, ‘Syriac Life’, 325). If the Syriac Vita is accurate, it might be necessary, as Brock suggests (325), to posit two sojourns of the Confessor in Africa, one before 633 and the second after the latter part of 641.

44 unde et unam voluntatem feletam domini Jesu Christi: Letter of Pope Honorius to Sergius (CPG 9375), preserved in ACO ser. 2, 2/2. 55. Hefele–Leclercq, Histoire des Conciles 3/1, 350 claim that the first of the two old Latin versions, which were made from the Greek translation and are printed in Mansi vol. 11, cols. 338 ff., must have been prepared by the Roman librarian Anastasius. The involvement of Anastasius, the ninth-century translator, is not possible; however, since the letter is an integral part of the acts of the twelfth session, as composed in 661.

45 CPG 9377, surviving only in fragments in the 19th session of the proceedings of the Sixth Ecumenical Council, ACO ser. 2, 2/2. 620. 622. 10; 622. 12–624. 10.

46 The Syriac Vita Maximi, chs. 10–14. Brock, ‘Syriac Life’, 316 f., is the only witness to this synod. See M. Albert and C. von Schönborn (eds.), La Lettre de Sophron de Jerusalem à Arcadius de Cypre, Patrologie Orientale 39 (2), n. 173 (Turin: Brepolis, 1978), 172–6. The late Arcadius is mentioned as a stalwart opponent of monothelitism in Maximus’ letter to Peter (PG 91. 14388), and he is probably the subject of Maximus’ praise of the bishop of Cyprus, in his Letter to Marinos (PG 91. 245314 and n. 32); see Sherwood, Date List, 42.

47 Brock, ‘Syriac Life’, chs. 10–14, c. 19, 316–18. This could not refer to two wills at this early stage, as Maximus’ works on the subject only appeared in the 640s; cf. ch. 9, 316: ‘And he wrote four books, acknowledging in them two wills and two activities and two minds’.
monenergist version of ps.-Dionysius the Areopagite’s expression: ‘one theandric activity’.  

Development of Monothelitism

The monothelite position was enshrined in the Ekthesis (CPG 7607) drafted by Sergius in 638 with the help of the future Patriarch Pyrrhus, abbot of the monastery of Chrysopolis, who succeeded Sergius in that same year. Both the Ekthesis and the later Typos (647/8) stand in a tradition of imperial statements on faith questions. The Ekthesis, signed by the Emperor Heraclius, was drafted in very similar wording to the Pact of Union of 633, up to the point where it rejected the teaching of one or two activities in the divine incarnation:

The expression ‘one activity’, even if it was uttered by certain Fathers, nevertheless alienated and confused some who heard it, who supposed that it would lead to the destruction of the two natures which were hypostatically united in Christ our God. In a similar way the expression ‘two activities’ scandalised many, on the grounds that it had been uttered by none of the holy and approved spiritual leaders of the church, but to follow it was to profess two wills at variance with one another, such that God the Word wished to fulfil the salutary suffering but his humanity resisted his will and was opposed to it, and as a result two persons with conflicting wills were introduced, which is impious and foreign to Christian teaching.

Honorius did not live to make any response to this document, as he died in 638, before he received it—perhaps fortunately enough for Rome’s future reputation as the upholder of orthodoxy. His successor Severinus refused to accept it, and was brutalised by the exarch. The following popes, John IV (640–2), Theodore I (642–9), and Martin (649–53), all rejected the Ekthesis. In 641, Emperor Heraclius died and left the crown to Constantine III and Heraclonas, his two sons by different wives. Constantine died in mysterious circumstances soon afterwards, and power was seized by Heraclius’ wife and niece, Martina, mother of Heraclonas. She

---

48 Ambigus 5. 1057a–b, trans. by Louth, Maximus, 177. Maximus deals with the subject again in 642 in Opus 7. 843–854, ibid. 188.
49 Brandes, 143.
was deposed in November 641 and replaced by Heraclius’ grandson Constans II. Pyrrhus, a supporter of Martina, was also deposed and replaced by Paul II as patriarch in the same year.

Maximus the Confessor went to Africa with his disciple Anastasius after the accession of Constans II, according to the Greek *Vita*. He had come out openly against monotheletism in c.640. A comprehensive account of his Christology has been offered by Bausenhart, and we will attempt but a brief summary of Maximus’ principal arguments against the doctrine of one will. While Maximus was concerned to defend Honorius against charges of personal heresy, he criticized the Constantinopolitan interpretation of the pope’s formulation of ‘one will in Christ’ as diminishing the Incarnate Word and limiting his saving activity: Honorius’ definition referred only to the humanity of Christ, he argued. Maximus’ early arguments, which draw on the Aristotelian tradition in which will is defined as ‘rational desire’, are summarized in *Opus. 7* (642) and *Opus. 3* (c.645), both addressed to the deacon Marinus of Cyprus. In the first of these, Maximus casts around for patristic authorities to refute the *Ekthesis*. He quotes from a work that was attributed, possibly spuriously, to Athanasius, on the Agony in the Garden:

> And when he says, ‘Father, if it be possible let this cup pass,’ as the great Athanasius says in his treatise on the Incarnation and the Trinity, ‘nevertheless not my will be done, but yours. For the spirit is eager but the flesh is weak,’ we understand that two wills are manifest here: the human which belongs to the flesh, and the divine. For the human will, because of the weakness of the flesh, seeks to avoid the passion; the divine will is eager.”


52 Louth, *Maximus*, 16; Sherwood, *Date-List*, no. 60a, 43 notes that Maximus’ earliest attack on the *Ekthesis* was made in his letter of 640 to Abbot Thenasius concerning the affair of Pope Severinus’ apocracies in 638.


55 *Opus. 7*, 81c, Louth, *Maximus*, 187. Maximus is quoting pr.-Athanasius, *On the Incarnation and Against the Arians* 21, PG 26. 1021b–c. The work is attributed to Marcellus of
Maximus adduces further support from Gregory Nazianzen's statement: 'For the willing of that one is not opposed [to God] but completely deified.' The quotation is deliberately taken completely out of context, as Louth notes. To explain this citation, Maximus introduces the distinction between gnomic and natural wills, an important one for the orthodox position, and expanded upon in Opus. 3. All human beings since the Fall have a 'gnomic' or deliberative will, because they are uncertain in their attempt to follow the will of God, since they cannot correctly identify the good, having been blinded by sin. Christ, on the other hand, according to Maximus, did not have a deliberative will since he did not need to deliberate about the right course of action, but rather his natural human will conformed perfectly to the divine will.

The Fathers openly confessed two natural, but not gnomic, wills in Christ, lest they proclaim him double-minded and double-willed, and fighting against himself, so to speak, in the discord of his thoughts, and therefore double-personed.

This view presumes the existence of two natures in Christ, a human and a divine one, and two activities. Maximus' doctrine of the 'exchange of properties' (ἀντιτίθεντα/communicatio idiomatum) affirms that in Christ there is a fully human nature with its own properties, and a fully divine nature with its own properties, neither of which is diminished in any way by the union. On the question of two activities, he cites two patristic passages that refer to the unity of activities: ps.-Dionysius' 'theandric activity' and Cyril of Alexandria's statement that 'the activity is shown to have kinship with both (natures)'. These are not to be understood as indicating numerical unity after the union, however, but a kind of 'double activity of the double nature'. Activities are natural, proceeding from natures, and cannot be understood as hypostatic, for

Ancyr by M. Gerhard in CPG 2866. This passage was also quoted in extenso at the Sixth Ecumenical Council, ACO ser. 5, 2/1. 998. 9-18.

36 Opus. 7. 81c, ibid., citing Gregory Nazianzen, Sermon 30. 12.
37 Ibid. 217 a. 33: Gregory was arguing against the Eunomians' claim that the distinction between the will of the Son and the will of the Father contradicted the doctrine of their consubstantiality. The citation is given a fairer treatment in Opus. 3. 49a–b.
38 Opus. 3. 56b in Louth, Maximus, 197.
39 As expressed in Opus. 7. 84d. See Murphy–Sherwood, 229.
40 Ep. ad Galiam 4, PG 52. 1072C1.
41 Commentary on John, 4. 2.
42 Opus. 7. 85a. 186.
in that case Christ would have a different activity from that of the Father, since he is a separate person.\textsuperscript{63}

In July 643, Pyrrhus agreed to a public debate with Maximus in Carthage over the orthodoxy of monothelitism.\textsuperscript{64} The debate was held in the presence of the exarch Gregory.\textsuperscript{65} Murphy and Sherwood explain the difficulty for the monothelites in this way: the will is a \textit{particular} human activity, which is primarily known in actions and interactions. Thus the will can easily appear to characterise the person, and agent and action seem impossible to distinguish.\textsuperscript{66} Since the unity of agent in the incarnate Word had been insisted upon by all who accepted the teachings of Cyril, this orthodox belief seemed to imply the non-orthodox doctrines of monenergism and monothelitism; as the confused Pyrrhus protested, 'But one person who will presupposes one will of that person, not two.'\textsuperscript{67} If activity and will are assigned to the person, the divine person who is the second of the Trinity will have only a divine will and a divine activity, and the work of salvation will be rendered meaningless, as the actions of a mere puppet. Maximus insisted, however, that will (like activity) was natural, not hypostatic, although it emanated from the person. Our capacity to will is natural; how we will, the process of willing, is personal. According to this distinction, natural will is an essential property of the unalterable natural definition (\textit{λόγος ὑπακοής}) of each being.\textsuperscript{68}

Pyrrhus, reluctant to accept that will is characteristic of the nature rather than the person, objected that the human will of Christ, if it were natural, would therefore be necessary, thus excluding all free human movement.\textsuperscript{69} Maximus' answer is that Christ is, like all human beings, self-determining (\textit{αὐτοκράτειος}).\textsuperscript{70} Christ's was the only human will that was truly free, that is, free to conform to the divine will of God. Human beings can gradually return to this state, as the result of Christ assuming a human will in the incarnation, according to the principle that only that which was

\textsuperscript{63} Opus. 7. 85b. 189.
\textsuperscript{65} Gregory was later accused of conspiracy against the emperor and was killed fighting the Arab incursions in 647.
\textsuperscript{66} Murphy–Sherwood, 227.
\textsuperscript{68} Murphy–Sherwood, 276–8.
\textsuperscript{69} \textit{Dispute with Pyrrhus}, PG 91. 293B5–8.
\textsuperscript{70} ibid. 324A–9; see Murphy–Sherwood, 276, and 278–81.
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assumed by Christ in the flesh could be saved.\textsuperscript{71} This is seen most clearly in the events of the Garden of Gethsemane and the passion of the crucifixion. While the incarnate Word suffered the natural movements of the rational soul he was endowed with, in accordance with its logos, such as fear of death, hunger, and thirst, he submitted these movements, by an act of his human will, to the will of the Father.\textsuperscript{72} Thus he was able to overcome his natural repulsion to death, and to say to the Father, ‘Not my will but yours be done’ (Matt. 26: 39). The main point of Maximus’ arguments is presented in the \textit{Dispute with Pyrrhus} in the simple expression: ‘Thus Christ in his two natures, wills and operates our salvation.’\textsuperscript{73} From the question of two wills, they proceed to two activities, whereupon Maximus again expounds ps.-Dionysius’ ‘new theandric activity’ as referring to a qualitative change in the activities after the union, not a quantitative one.\textsuperscript{74}

Pyrrhus suffered a resounding defeat, and declared himself persuaded to abandon the heresy, after presenting himself in Rome with a statement of his orthodoxy to Pope Theodore. Maximus seems to have followed him to Rome at his request in 645 or 646. As soon as Pyrrhus reached Ravenna in 647, he recanted and returned to the monothelite fold, perhaps yielding to pressure from the exarch. Maximus continued to oppose the heretical doctrine, unperturbed by the \textit{Typos}, issued by Patriarch Paul in 647 or 648 in the name of Emperor Constans II, which banned any mention of either one or two activities or wills in Christ. This edict met with widespread resistance, both eastern and western. Theodore and Euprepius, who were sons of the imperial miller, were arrested in Italy and banished to exile in the Chersonese for their opposition. Their friend Anastasius the Apocrisarius, a papal representative to the emperor, was sentenced to exile in Trebizond at this time. Pope Martin, also an \textit{apocrisarius} in the imperial capital before his election to the pontificate, refused to seek confirmation of his election in 649 from either the emperor or from the imperial exarch, in direct defiance of the heretical rule.

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{71} \textit{Dispute with Pyrrhus}, PG 91. 326a14; trans. by Hefele–Leclercq, \textit{Histoire des Conciles}, 3/1. 415. The principle is affirmed by Gregory Nazianzen, \textit{Ep}. 101.32.
\item \textsuperscript{72} Murphy–Sherwood, 265.
\item \textsuperscript{73} \textit{Dispute with Pyrrhus}, PG 91. 320c12–14; cf. \textit{Record} 77.
\item \textsuperscript{74} \textit{Dispute with Pyrrhus}, PG 91. 345b5–346a7; trans. by Hefele–Leclercq, \textit{Histoire des Conciles}, 3/1. 420.
\end{itemize}
\end{footnotesize}
Lateran Synod of 649

Preparations for the Lateran Synod must have been already under way during the pontificate of Theodore, given the speed with which it was convened after Martin's accession. Just three months after his election, Martin opened the Synod in October 649 to condemn the ekthesis and the typos, a council attended by many Greek monks as well as those from Italy (mostly from suburbicarian Rome), Africa, and Libya. Maximus' name appears in the subscriptions to the libellus included in the proceedings of the council, as well as the names of two monks called Anastasius.  

Although we have no conclusive proof that he was in attendance, it is likely that he would have wished to keep a low profile, given the hostility that had been engendered against him in the Byzantine court since his vocal protest against the typos of 647/8. Riedinger has pointed to significant evidence that the proceedings of the council were composed in Greek before the council and were then translated into Latin.  

He suggests that the 'council' was no more than a meeting convoked by Martin to hear and approve the Latin version of the 'proceedings' which had been formulated in the Roman archive. These had been written in Greek by Maximus Confessor during the pontificate of Theodore, who spoke Greek himself, but who had died before the 'council' could be staged. There was in fact no real discussion or debate at the council. He further suggests that the Latin translation was made by the Byzantine monks who came to Rome with Maximus.  

Pierres, who earlier identified canons 10 and 11 of the Lateran Council as the work of Maximus, and proved that they had been written in Greek originally, also pointed out that twenty-seven of the orthodox and heretical quotations cited during the fifth session of the council had already appeared in Maximus' Tomus Spiritualis. It should be remembered, as Alexakis points

---

75 ACO ser. 2, t. 57, nos. 27, 34, and 35.
76 R. Riedinger, 'Die Lateransynode von 649 und Maximus Confessor', in Heinzer-Schönborn, Maximus Confessor, 111–21. The proceedings were designed to appear as if they had been originally conceived in Latin: see ACO ser. 2, t. 54. 35–7 where the Greek monks and presbyters request a Greek translation to be made of the Latin acts.
78 Riedinger, 'Die Lateransynode', 119.
79 J. Pierres, Sanctus Maximus Confessor, princiæ episcoporum synodi Lateranensis anni 649 (Part historica), Diss. Pontificia Universitas Gregoriana (Rome, 1940), 12–14.
out,\textsuperscript{80} that Martin was not accused by the imperial authorities in Constantinople of staging the Lateran Synod of 649. He was charged rather with treason, for conspiring with the exarch Olympius against the emperor in 649. It seems unlikely, however, that the Byzantines would have had the means to find out whether the council had been a genuine synod, given that the only Greek representatives to attend were supporters of Maximus and Martin. Insofar as the council was attended by its signatories and issued twenty canons, it matters little for the validity of its conclusions who wrote the speeches that were presented.

One of the most interesting aspects of the proceedings of the Lateran Synod is its preservation of the largest florilegium of scriptural and patristic authorities ever to be documented at a council.\textsuperscript{81} This consisted of 123 quotations supporting the dyothelete position, and forty-two monothelite citations, which were condemned in the canons issued at the close of the council.\textsuperscript{82} The compilation of these largely Greek sources was probably also the work of Maximus,\textsuperscript{83} although the Latin monks may have contributed the few Latin citations included,\textsuperscript{84} from Augustine and Ambrose, Leo I, and Hilary. The authenticity of Cyrus’ citation of ps.-Dionysius the Areopagite as speaking of ‘one theandric activity’\textsuperscript{85} was brought into question after Sergius’ letter of approval for the Nine Chapters was read aloud. Sergius had misquoted Cyrus’ citation by omitting the word ‘theandric’.\textsuperscript{86} Both ‘heretics’ were taken to task for this at the council, and the ‘true’ reading, that is, ‘a new theandric activity’ was affirmed, after comparison with the original Letter to Gaius.\textsuperscript{87} Theodore of Pharan, Cyrus of Alexandria, and the three patriarchs of Constantinople Sergius, Pyrrhus, and Paul were anathematized together with their writings, and all who followed them.\textsuperscript{88} The council was to

\textsuperscript{80} Alexakis, 20 ff.
\textsuperscript{81} Alexakis, 18.
\textsuperscript{82} ACO ser. 2, i. 258–314 (dyothelete citations); 390–34 (monothelite citations). See also the Florilegium Dyotheleism, Ibid. 425–36.
\textsuperscript{83} Riedinger, ‘Die Lateranamnode’, 118.
\textsuperscript{84} Twenty-seven out of 103 quotations: Alexakis, 18 n. 75 and 20. See also Santerre, Les Moines, 119 and n. 55.
\textsuperscript{85} μηδ θεοθέτου ἄνεγερμα in the seventh chapter of the Paul of Union, read aloud at the Council, ACO ser. 2, i. 134. 19.
\textsuperscript{86} Letter of Sergius to Cyrus (CPO 7600), ACO ser. 2, i. 136. 37.
\textsuperscript{87} ACO ser. 2, i. 140. 34–5; 142. 59–144. 3.
\textsuperscript{88} Ch. 18, Session 5, ACO ser. 2, i. 382. 30–384. 27.
spark an angry reaction from Constantinople, which culminated in the arrest and exile of Martin, Maximus, and his disciples.

III. BIOGRAPHICAL DOCUMENTS

Very few theological treatises survive from Maximus’ pen after his departure to Rome in 646. However, seven largely biographical documents in Greek and in a Latin translation shed light on the imperial reaction against those who resisted monothelitism. In chronological order, these are:

1. Record of the Trial, an eyewitness account of the events of the trial of Maximus and his disciple Anastasius in Constantinople in 655, largely consisting of reported dialogue between Maximus and his various accusers and calumniators.

2. Dispute between Maximus and Theodosius, Bishop of Caesarea Bithynia, a word-for-word account of the debate between Maximus and Bishop Theodosius, which took place during Maximus’ exile in Bizya in August 656, and was written within a year of the events described.

3. Letter of Maximus to Anastasius the monk, his disciple: Maximus’ letter dates to 19 April 658, while both he and Anastasius the monk were in exile in Perberis.

4. Letter of Anastasius to the monks of Cagliari: Anastasius (either the disciple or the Apocrisarius) seeks the monks’ help in Rome, and offers them encouragement in their continued resistance to the monothelite party.

5. Letter of Anastasius the Apocrisarius to Theodosius of Gangra, written not long before his death in exile in Lazica on 11 October 666, and accompanied by testimonia (lit. ‘witnesses’) falsely attributed to Hippolytus, bishop of Portus Romanus, and syllogisms, probably from the hand of Anastasius himself.

6. Commemoration, a record of the terrible trials in exile of Pope Martin I, Maximus the Confessor, Anastasius the Disciple, Anastasius Apocrisarius, Theodore, and Euprepius, all martyrs for the dyothelite cause. This was written in late 668 or early 669 by the fervent but poorly educated Theodore Spoudaeus, who, together with his brother Theodosius of Gangra, made the long trek to the Caucasus to visit the exiled

Louth, Maximus, 192.
pontiff, only to find that he had arrived too late: the pope was already dead.

7. Against the people of Constantinople, a later piece of colourful invective ‘short on facts but long on rhetoric’, as it has been described by Pauline Allen, written against the imperial monothelite party by an anonymous monk who was a vehement supporter of Maximus.

Events of AD 653–69 Described in the Documents

The trials of Pope Martin and Maximus before the senate in Constantinople can only be understood, as Brandes recently noted in his magisterial study on the subject, against the background of the crisis facing Byzantium in the form of Arab invasions. The hagiographical sources for the Life of Maximus offer little concrete information on these trials. Fortunately the seven documents under consideration here have a great deal to say about these proceedings. They were what we might call ‘show trials’, designed by the senate to shift blame for the general crisis onto their monothelite opponents, and to present them as criminals. The weighty role of the senate can be seen in the high official status of the main protagonists. In 653, Martin was taken under imperial arrest to Constantinople, arriving on 17 September, where he was tried in 654 on charges of conspiring against the emperor Constans II with Olympius, exarch of Ravenna. Martin tried to bring up the matter of the Lateran Synod and was told that it was not relevant to the case. He received the death sentence but this was commuted to exile in the Chersonese, where he arrived in May of the same year (Comm. §§ 3 and 8). He died soon afterwards, either on 16 September 655 or 13 April 656.

90 Henceforth these seven documents will be referred to in abbreviated form as: Rec, Dnys, Ep. Max., Ep. Cal., Ep. Anas., Comm., and CP.
92 Brandes, 153.
93 Brandes, 212.
94 Also described in the Narrationes de exilio santi Papae Martini (BHL 5592), PL 129, 585–605.
95 P. Peeters, in Une Vie greeque du Pape S. Martin I, AB 51 (1933), 232 ff., points out several discrepancies of detail between the Narrationes de exilio santi Papae Martini and the Greek Vita Martini, including the dates given for Martin's death. Here he declared it
Maximus and Anastasius his disciple were arrested soon after Martin's arrest, in Rome according to the *Life of Maximus*, 96 and were escorted to Constantinople for trial in 655. Maximus was charged with having betrayed Egypt, Alexandria, and Africa to the Saracens (*Record §1*), of complicity with the conspirator exarch Gregory in Carthage (*Record §2*), and of opposition to the *Typos* (*Record §9*). No firm evidence of Maximus' involvement in the conspiracy of Gregory could be brought to bear—the accusation rested on a dream that Maximus was purported to have had. Brandes has brought to attention the political/ideological dimensions of this dream, based on Constantine the Great's famous vision on the Milvian Bridge, as it is found in the writings of Rufinus of Aquileia (d. 410). 97 A direct relationship between the dream and the propaganda of Constans II seems possible, according to Brandes. 98 Maximus was also accused of Origenism, to which he reacted vehemently with an anathema of Origen and his works (*Record §5*). The author in *Record §7* notes the appearance in Constantinople of the legates of Pope Eugenius, elected in August 654, seeking union with the patriarch. 99 Their imminent communion with the newly elected patriarch of Constantinople, Peter, 100 indicated papal support for the *Typos* and perhaps also for a statement of monothelitism issued by Pyrrhus upon his election. This approval does not square with Eugenius' actions, soon after his consecration on 10 August, when he apparently rejected the *Synodical Letter* of Peter, elected as Pyrrhus' successor in June 654. 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 not explicit about the wills and activities of Christ. 101 There is no independent impossible to choose between the two dates. The *Narrations*, which include four letters from the hand of Pope Martin, are soon to be published in a critical edition by B. Neil.

96 The author of the *Life of Maximus*, Recension II (PG 90. 837–884a), declares that Maximus and both Anastasii were arrested at the same time as Martin, but is not a reliable witness for this or other chronological details.

97 Brandes, 186f.

98 Brandes, 189.

99 Larchet, 163 n. 134, followed Devreesse in suggesting that these emissaries sought approval for the election of Eugenius, but this was based on an incorrect dating of the trial described in the *Record to May-June 654*.

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

101 The pope was not allowed to celebrate Mass until he promised to reject the *Synodical Letter*, according to the author of the *Life of Eugenius* in the *Liber Pontificalis*, Duchesne, LP
evidence for the content of Peter's synodal letter. At the conclusion of this trial, Maximus was sentenced to exile in Thracian Bizya, and his disciple to Perberis.

In Bizya in August 656, Maximus held a dispute with Theodosius, who was convinced by the force of his arguments against the doctrine of one will in Christ, and promised to write to Rome to recant, asking Maximus to accompany him there if he were sent by the emperor and the patriarch (DB §4). Maximus initially refused, but suggested he take Anastasius the Apocrisiarius in his stead. Anastasius had been transferred to Mesembria some time before this suggestion was made in August 656 (DB §13). Theodosius would not accept the substitute, so Maximus reluctantly agreed to accompany him to Rome, if he was sent. This exchange may owe something to a similar account from the earlier dispute between Maximus and Pyrrhus in 645. Maximus was next transferred to Rhegium, near Constantinople, where Theodosius returned to him, again asking him to re-enter into communion with the church of Constantinople (DB §10). The pope, it seems, had fallen out of favour with the imperial party by September 656, when the representatives of the patriarch Peter and the emperor threatened that they would dispose of the pope and those who spoke like him in Rome (DB §13). This Maximus refused to do, and he was transferred to Selymbria for two days, and then to Perberis in separate confinement from his disciple Anastasius. Here the legates of the patriarch Peter (654–66) visited him in April 658, in a renewed attempt at reconciliation. They referred to the union which had been effected among the churches of Constantinople, Rome, Alexandria, and Jerusalem. Maximus was threatened with death by order of the emperor and the bishops of Constantinople and Rome, if he refused to obey the emperor's command to enter into communion with the church of Constantinople. The letter of Anastasius to the monks in Cagliari rejects the compromise formula of the patriarch Peter, as defined in his letter to Pope Vitalian (657–72) on the subject of wills and operations in late 657 or early 658, in which Peter professed both one and two wills, and


103 See Winklemann, no. 133, for references to the secondary literature on this letter, for which a date of 653 has been suggested.

104 Dispute with Pyrrhus, PG 91: 339.
one and two activities in the economy of salvation, and excommunicated anyone who asserted otherwise.\textsuperscript{104} Anastasius asks the monks to go to Rome to plead with the pope on their behalf.\textsuperscript{105} The anxiety evident in his letter was due to uncertainty about the position of Vitalian, elected in June 657. Vitalian did not condemn the \textit{Typas} in his synodical letter, and entered into communion with the church of Constantinople without apparent hesitation. 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 evidence that the bishop of Rome had not in fact represented the ‘true catholic and apostolic church’ after Martin was condemned to exile in 654.

The second trial of Maximus and his followers was convened in 662 by the imperial court, at which Maximus and the two Anastasii were sentenced to exile in Lazica (\textit{DB}§17, \textit{Comm.} §9). Anastasius the Apocrisiarius and Maximus suffered mutilation, according to the \textit{Vita Maximi} (PG 90. 1040–1056), \textit{DB}§17, \textit{Comm.} §4 and \textit{Ep. Anas.} §1. Maximus died at Schemaris on 13 August 662, Anastasius the Disciple in the previous month, on 22 or 24 July, at or in transit to Souania, and Anastasius the Apocrisiarius on 11 October 666, two years before Theodore Spoudaeus and Theodosius of Gangra arrived there with the purpose of bringing him material and spiritual comfort (\textit{Ep. Anas.} §§4–5 and Scholion). Within the year before his death, the Apocrisiarius wrote a letter to Theodosius of Gangra containing a plea for help, in which he outlined the vicissitudes of his final years: from Bouculus he was transferred to Thacyria for two months, then from September 663 he was moved again several times, spending a year in Phusta. In the spring of 664 he was on his way to Schemaris when he was unexpectedly freed by the patrician Gregory. He lived under Gregory’s protection at Thousoumes

\textsuperscript{104} Reported in the \textit{Letter of Pope Agatho} (\textit{CPG} 9437), \textit{ACO} ser. 2, 2/1. 108. 18–110. 17 (= Mansi, XI. 2760–2773). ‘\textit{Patriae eius successor ad sanctae memoriae Vitalianum papam accipit, et unum duas voluntates, et unum duas operationes in dispensatione incarnacionis magis Dei et salvatoris sapientem se profittere Petrus quoque, et unam, et duas voluntates et operationes in dispensatione incarnacionis salvatoris nostri Iesu Christi sapere se protestatus.’ See Winkelmann, no. 147.

\textsuperscript{105} This letter is supposed by Larchet, 166, probably to have been written in June 654, i.e. before the first trial of Maximus, and before the newly elected Pope Eugenius rejected the \textit{Synodical Letter} of Patriarch Peter. Thus Larchet explains Anastasius’ sense of urgency as being occasioned by Eugenius’ failure to have taken a stand against monothelitism at that point.
until his death in 666 (Ep. Anas. §7). He mentions a visit from Stephen, possibly Stephen of Dora, Sophronius' emissary to Rome in c.640. Stephen died during the return journey, on 1 January 665. In his letter Anastasius requested a copy of the Acta of the Lateran Synod to be sent to him. The brothers only received the letter in August 668, from the hands of Gregory, abbot of the Church of John the Baptist in Betararous. Theodore Spoudaeus' Commemoration records the sufferings of the martyrs for the dyothelete cause. It also suggests the presence in Lazica of Stephen of Dora from the Church of the Holy Resurrection in Jerusalem. The burial of Martin in the church of St Maria of Blachernes, a mile out of the city of Cherson (Comm. §8), and miracles at Maximus' tomb at the monastery of St Arsenius in Lazica are recounted (Ep. Anas. §5, Comm. §9), possibly providing evidence of an early cult in Lazica. These accounts are given in the hope of the continued prayers and support of their readers.

Theological Arguments Presented in the Documents

Only in the Record and the Dispute are theological arguments against monothelitism presented in any detail. Although most of the charges brought against Maximus at his first trial are of a political nature, there is some discussion there of his reasons for rejecting the Typos. Maximus argues that the Typos is contrary to the Creed of Nicaea, as it deprives the creator God of a natural will and activity by silencing all talk of one or two wills or operations, for the sake of arranging peace. Since the Typos was issued under imperial authority, the question of the emperor's right to interfere in matters of doctrine is raised. Maximus argues against the exercise of a sacerdotal role by the emperor. He is asked to recount the dispute with Pyrrhus, and accused of persuading him to anathematize his own teaching, and to accept Maximus' personal doctrine. Maximus insists that he is not committed to his own teaching but to the common teaching of the catholic church. He refuses to enter into communion with the church of Constantinople while those who were condemned by the Lateran Synod still preside. He accuses the heretics of inconsistency; they overturned four holy councils by the Nine Chapters, and by the Ekthesis of Sergius, and by the Typos; what they taught in the Chapters, they condemned in the Ekthesis, and what they taught in
the *Ekthesis*, they annulled in the *Typos*. He suggests that Constans should dissociate himself from the *Typos*, just as Heraclius disowned the *Ekthesis* written in his name by Sergius. When asked why it is necessary to speak of wills and activities in Christ, he answers that nothing which exists can exist without a natural activity, for the holy Fathers say that there is not, nor can there be known, any nature without an essential activity which characterizes it. If this is so, how can Christ either be, or be known as, truly both God and a human being by nature? Referring again to the doctrine of the ‘exchange of properties’, Maximus continues by saying that, according to holy Scripture and to the holy teachers and councils, we are taught that the incarnate God is capable of will and of activity both in his divinity and his humanity. For in respect of nothing by which he is known as God, or by which he is known as a human being by nature, is he imperfect. And if he is perfect in each, so that he is diminished in neither, one must confess him to be what he is, with all the natural properties existing in him, out of which and in which and which he is proved to be. This last threefold expression is a favourite with Maximus, incorporating both the Syrian/Leonine phrase (‘in two natures’) and Cyrilline formula (‘out of two natures’).

In the *Dispute*, Maximus informs Theodosius that in saying there is one activity of the divinity and of the humanity of Christ he confuses the language of theology and economy, that is, language appropriate for speaking of the Trinity, and appropriate to Christ’s work of salvation. For, if ‘one activity implies one hypostasis’, then the holy Trinity is made a quaternity, as if Christ’s flesh were made one being with the Word, and an extra person were added to the three persons of the Trinity. And by destroying the two activities, and asserting a single will of his divinity and humanity, the heretics remove the possibility of Christ bestowing blessings upon us, since, even though he wants to, he cannot without an activity according to nature. Not only do they insist on one will, but that a divine one, which has no beginning or end. Thus Christ the flesh with a divine will becomes co-creator of the world with the Father, Son, and the Holy Spirit, which is ridiculous as well as impious. As in the *Record*, Maximus condemns the *Typos* for removing the will and activity of Christ, without which he cannot exist, citing ps.-Dionysius as his authority: ‘For what has no

---

power, neither exists nor is anything, nor has any disposition whatsoever.\textsuperscript{107}

After all the patristic passages adduced by Theodosius have been shown to be spurious and refuted,\textsuperscript{108} Theodosius is persuaded to admit that he too confesses different human and divine natures, wills, and activities, but will not speak of two wills or activities, lest they be seen to be contrary to each other. Maximus forces him to admit that when he speaks of two natures, the number does not introduce division. Theodosius, however, refuses to do the same in the case of wills and activities, but prefers to speak as the Fathers did, of one and another, or double and twofold. Maximus reduces his opponent to ridicule by demanding of the onlookers, "How many does one and one make?", as if Theodosius were merely refusing to do his sums. Maximus then uses the proceedings of the Lateran Synod to demonstrate that the Fathers openly spoke of two wills and activities. Theodosius seems to be persuaded and declares his acceptance of two wills and two activities, but then opens his questioning again, asking Maximus if there is no way at all in which he will speak of one will and activity in Christ. Maximus replies in the negative, since one cannot say that the single will and activity is natural, or hypostatic, or of one being, or dispositional, or beyond nature. He insists that activity is not hypostatic, that is, according to what each person does, but rather is natural, according to the common rationale of nature. This is a development of the same point made earlier in the Dispute with Pyrhus. Theodosius declares himself convinced, but fails to persuade the emperor and the patriarch to abandon the official doctrine, and Maximus' fate is sealed when he is summoned within a few weeks to Rhegium, near Constantinople, and given an imperial ultimatum which he refuses to obey.

The Italo-Greek contribution to dyothelite resistance at the time of the controversy is evident in several written sources: Maximus' letters to monks in Sicily whom he visited on his way to Rome, and Anastasius' Letter to the Monks of Cagliari. It is corroborated by the prominent role of Bishop Deusdedit of Cagliari at the

\textsuperscript{107} Fr. Dionysius the Areopagite, De Dianois Nomimis 8. 5, ed. B. Suchla, Corpus Dionysianum 1. 203. 2–4.

\textsuperscript{108} Writings of Apollinarius attributed to Julius of Rome, Gregory Thaumaturgus, and Athanasius; two testimonies of Nestorius attributed to John Chrysostom; an expression from Cyril's Commentary on John 4. 2, which was said by Maximus to be an addition by Timothy Aelurus to Cyril's work.
Lateran Synod. When Pope Agatho convened a council of 125 bishops in Rome in c.679 at the request of the Emperor Constantine IV to discuss the monothelite question, there was a significant number from Calabria and Sicily in attendance: thirteen in all subscribed to the proceedings of the Council.

Sixth Ecumenical Council in Constantinople 680/1

The Council of Rome was followed by the Sixth Ecumenical Council in Constantinople. In response to Constantine IV’s request for representatives, as well as for texts which dealt with the monothelite issue, Agatho sent a delegation of seven representatives. The florilegium they brought was basically the same as that of the Lateran Synod of 649, containing both orthodox and heretical quotations. The citations in the Roman florilegium 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 Vigilius, were rejected. Macarius of Antioch, who had presented the monothelite case with the monk Stephen, was accused of producing false texts and anathematised, along with his followers. The council concluded this highly original exercise in literary criticism with the condemnation of Cyrus of Alexandria, Sergius, Pyrrhus, Paul, and Peter of Constantinople, Theodore of

---

109 Deusdedit’s successor Justin also signed the Acta after the Synod, ACO ser. 2, 1. 409. 16
110 The imperial Sacra addressed to Agatho’s predecessor Donus were dated 12 Aug. 678.
111 Letter of Pope Agatho to Constantine IV (CPG 9418), ACO ser. 2, 2/1. 122–39; subscriptions: 112
112 Sacra Constantini IV imperatoris ad Dominum popum (CPG 9416), a. 679: ACO ser. 2, 2/1. 6.
113 The Letter of Pope Agatho to Constantine IV (CPG 9417) at the time of the Sixth Ecumenical Council names several Greeks among the theologians chosen by him to expound the Western position on the monothelite question (ACO ser. 2, 2/1. 57. 6–16). Agatho presents as his legates Abundantius (bishop of Paterno, i.e. Tempa), John (bishop of Reggio), and John (bishop of Pavia), the priests Theodore and George of Rome, with the deacon John and the subdeacon Constantine of Rome (as well as Theodore, legate of the church of Ravenna). On this, see C. Mazzucchi, ‘Attività scrittoria calabrese dal VI al IX secolo’, in Autori Vari, Calabria Bizantina: Tradizione di pieta e tradizione scrittoria nella Calabria greco medievale (Rome: Casa del Libro, 1983), 88.
114 Alexakis, 26–31, gives a thorough analysis of the florilegium used at the Sixth Ecumenical Council.
Pharan, and Honorius of Rome, on the basis of their works. Even the Roman legates concurred with the anathema pronounced upon the former pope.

Maximus was not mentioned at the Sixth Ecumenical Council, probably to spare imperial embarrassment over his recent condemnation and martyrdom. Nevertheless, the doctrine which he and Pope Martin had worked tirelessly to promote, ultimately at the cost of their lives, was finally vindicated. In their reliance on texts of Scripture, the Fathers, and the church councils, Maximus and his disciples showed their concern to adhere to orthodox tradition, and to avoid any charge of innovation. Particularly in the case of ps.-Dionysius the Areopagite, however, their authorities were not always unambiguous, and required careful exegesis. The compilation of florilegia from mainly Greek sources has provided a lasting witness to the intellectual strength of their resistance. The monothelitic doctrine had a brief revival under the emperor Philippikos Bardanes (711–13) who removed the image of the Council of Constantinople III from the Church of Hagia Sophia, but it was quickly suppressed, and the image restored, by the following emperor, Anastasius II. The orthodox doctrine of two wills in the one person of the incarnate Christ, that is, one human will and one divine, distinct but not contrary to each other (the doctrine upheld by both the Lateran Synod in Rome, and the Sixth Ecumenical Council in the imperial capital), thus became a pillar of union rather than a source of division between the churches of East and West.

IV. THE TEXT TRADITION

Greek Manuscript Tradition

Almost all of the early witnesses to the above texts come from Southern Italy, where they were copied up until the thirteenth century. Calabria, and particularly its mountainous areas, was the

---

113 Maximus' role as an interpreter of ps.-Dionysius the Areopagite was one of his most significant contributions to the history of Christian thought, according to J. Pelikan, 'Maximus in the History of Christian Thought', in Heinzer–Schönborn, Maximus Confessor, 398.


115 Much of the following material on the Greek and Latin manuscript traditions has appeared in the introduction to the edition of Allen–Neil, pp. xxii–xxx.
refuge of many Greek monks from Sicily in the tenth and eleventh centuries, fleeing the first wave of invasions by the Arabs, and subsequently the Norman invasions.\textsuperscript{118} These monks sought to preserve Byzantine culture by the transcription of Greek manuscripts, many of which have survived. The monastic centres of Reggio di Calabria and Grottoferrata were especially active in the preservation of the Maximian tradition. Early copies of the \textit{DB} are found in codices \textit{Vaticanus graecus 1912} (10th c.), of Calabrian provenance (A); \textit{Venantius Marcianus graecus 137} (10th c.) of Italo-Greek provenance (M); \textit{Vaticanus graecus 1646} (a. 1118) copied by Nicholas of Reggio (V); \textit{Parisinus Coislinianus 267} (12th c.) from Southern Italy (C); \textit{Venantius Marcianus graecus 135} (13th c.), from Southern Italy (R); \textit{Scorialensis graecus 273} (12th c.) from Southern Italy (S); \textit{Vaticanus graecus 2064} (12th c.) from Reggio di Calabria (W); and \textit{Vatopedius 475} (late 13th or early 14th c.) from Mt Athos (X). The earliest witnesses to the \textit{Ep. Max.} are A, C, M, R, S, V, and X. The \textit{Record} is also found in these same seven early manuscripts. The \textit{Ep. Anas.} survives in only one Greek manuscript (A) which also contains an excerpt of the proceedings of the Lateran Synod. The \textit{Comm.} survives in two codices, \textit{Vaticanus graecus 1671} 10th c., which seems to have been copied in the monastery of Grottoferrata (F), and in X. \textit{CP}, found only in Greek, likewise survives in two manuscripts, S and its copy, C.

These manuscripts may be divided into two families, the first of which contains two manuscripts (R and X) deriving from a Constantinopolitan model, and copied in the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries. All the others belong in the second family of Italo-Greek stock, from the tenth to the twelfth centuries. One of these, however, 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 X.

\textit{Relationship between the Greek and Latin Texts}

The Athonite manuscript X seems to approximate most closely to Anastasius' Latin version, and to the model for the corrections of A, and may represent the original tradition, before it split onto the

\textsuperscript{118} E. Follieri, 'Attività scrittoria calabrese nei secoli X-XI', in \textit{Calabria Bizantina}, 109–32.
South Italian and Constantinopolitan branches. \( R \) contains a reworked and hagiographicized text, containing numerous gratuitous additions, and changes of word order for no apparent reason. However, a close examination of the text of \( R \) reveals that, despite the somewhat degenerate copy it represents, it is descended from the same text-type as that from which Anastasius made his translation. The corrector of \( A \) has not extended his efforts to the Record, and thus \( A \) does not demonstrate the same affinities with Anastasius’ Latin as do \( RX \) in this particular document. The close connection between the Latin and the corrected version of Val. grec. 1912 (\( A \)) has allowed the reconstruction of the Greek text at certain points. Where the corrector of \( A \) and/or \( X \) have given a reading that is unique, this has been adopted in the Greek text.

Two of the documents, DB and the Record, are included verbatim in the third recension of the Vita Maximi, of which an edition is currently in preparation. The third recension of the Vita Maximi has seventeen witnesses, the earliest dating to the eleventh century.

Latin Manuscript Tradition

Our sole surviving copy of Anastasius’ translation of these documents appears in a codex now held in the Bibliothèque Nationale, Paris. Parisinus Latinus 5095, fos. 27v–58r (\( p \)) is a copy made before 895, in or near Laon, of the original of c.874. It belonged originally to the collection of the Cathedral School of Laon. The manuscript is described as follows: Parchment, 292 mm. \( \times \) 230 mm.; 35 ll.; 1 col.; 138 fos. (fo. 2 is blank).

The sources tell us little with regard to the early literary formation of the translator, Anastasius Bibliothecarius. It is clear that he was brought up in Rome with Latin as his mother tongue, but acquired Greek at an early age. He received an exceptional education, probably within a monastery, as public education had disappeared in Rome by the end of the sixth century. Anastasius’

119 MGH 7, Ep. 9, 423, 11–12: ut nec ipsius linguae meae, in qua natus sum, ne disserim alienae, vim penetravit sufficiens ut per hoc nonquam interpres, et quasque rationes consueus arripere praesumpsisset.

120 MGH 7, Ep. 17, 440, 8–9, where Anastasius speaks of the Greek Passion of P.-Dionysius the Areopagite: quas Romanis legi, quam puer esse.

contact with the brothers Constantine-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 ps.-Dionysius the Areopagite, he mentions that Constantine-Cyril had committed to memory the codex of ps.-Dionysius’ works, and had recounted it to his listeners at the time of his visit to Rome.  

Anastasius’ career in the Roman curia began when he was created cardinal of S Marcello by Pope Leo IV in 847.  

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, emperor of 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 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

---

122 MGH 7, Ep. 13, 433, 18–21.
123 The best accounts of Anastasius’ chequered career are those of Arnaldi, Dizionario, 25–37, and Davis, LP, Introduction to the Life of Leo IV, 104–5, 256–260 and passim.
125 Davis’s translation in LP, Introduction to the Life of Leo IV, 105, of Annales Bertiniani, 95.
126 Arsenius, bishop of Orte (855–68), Anastasius’ uncle and the father of Eleutherius, held the office of Roman aponomatus, established by Louis II, from 848 or 849. Arsenius persuaded Nicholas bishop of Anagni and Mercurius the master of the soldiers to assist him in his scheme to install Anastasius in the pontificate, according to Duschesne LP 2, 141 = Davis, LP, Life of Benedict, 106, chs. 5–7, 160 f.
Trastevere\textsuperscript{129} 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,\textsuperscript{130} and soon after was elevated to the official position of \textit{bibliothecarius sanctae romanae ecclesiae}.

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 Stephanie 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{132} The anathema of 653 was renewed and Anastasius was again deprived of the priesthood on 12 October 868.\textsuperscript{133} He seems to have been exonerated from this charge within two years, because we find him addressing his translation of the proceedings of the Eighth Ecumenical Council (869–70)\textsuperscript{134} to Pope Hadrian II in 871, under the title of \textit{abbas et summae ac apostolicae vestrae sedis bibliothecarius}.\textsuperscript{135} 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. He had been sent by Emperor Louis II to arrange a marriage contract between Louis' daughter Ermengarde and Emperor Basil's son Constantine. He 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.

\textsuperscript{129} Ep. 2, \textit{MGH} 7, 399. 7–8.
\textsuperscript{130} Duchesne, \textit{LP} 2: 175 = \textit{Davis, LP, Life of Hadrian}, ch. 10. 264. Anastasius was restored at the same time as Zacharias of Aragon, deposed and excommunicated in 863 for trespassing on his assignment at the Council of Constantinople, at which the patriarch Ignatius was condemned by Photius (on the Council of 869, see Duchesne, \textit{LP} 2: 158–5 = \textit{Davis, LP, Life of Nicholas}, ch. 40, 222 and 212 n. 37).
\textsuperscript{131} \textit{Annales Bertiniani}, a. 868, 92: \textit{Iadem vero Eleutherius, consilio, ut fereunt, fratris sui Anastasii, quem bibliothecarium Romanae ecclesiae in eundo ordinationis suae Adrianus constituerat.}
\textsuperscript{132} As recorded by Hincmar, \textit{Annales Bertiniani}, 92; Nelson, 145.
\textsuperscript{133} \textit{Annales Bertiniani}, 94–6; Nelson, 148–50; testimony against Anastasius was given by his relative Ado (149).
\textsuperscript{134} So called in the West, but not recognized as ecumenical by the eastern church because it resulted in the deposition of Photius, Patriarch of Constantinople. On Anastasius' translations of the Acts of the Seventh and Eighth Ecumenical Councils, see B. Neal, "The Western Reaction to the Council of Nicaea II", \textit{Journal of Theological Studies} 58 (2000), 535–52.
\textsuperscript{135} \textit{MGH} 7, 493. 23–4.
On his return, he was sent to Naples on a double diplomatic mission, with a papal and imperial mandate along with Bertarius, abbot of Montecassino. He continued to hold the position of *bibliothecarius* under the following pope, John VIII, presumably up until his death, which occurred probably between 877 and 880.

**Description of the Documents**

1. Record of the Trial

A record of the first trial of Maximus and his disciple Anastasius in Constantinople in 655, at which Maximus is sentenced to exile in Bizya, and Anastasius to Perberis.

*Date and Authorship:* It is not possible to give a more precise dating for this trial than the year 655. More specific dates offered by Devreese and van Dieten have relied on the incorrectly dated *Ep. Max.* The text merely says that the trial began ‘several days’ after their arrival in Constantinople, for which no precise date is given. The first day of the trial was a Saturday: ‘For behold, Roman emissaries arrived yesterday, and tomorrow on Sunday they will communicate with the patriarch.’ This seems to refer to the emissaries of Pope Eugenius, who presented themselves to the see of Constantinople soon after the pope’s election in August 654. The second day of the trial took place on ‘the next Saturday’ and the sentence of exile was given by the emperor on the following Sunday. At the end of the *Record*, the author states that, at the time of writing, Maximus and his disciple are still in exile, in Bizya and Perberis respectively, indicating that the text was written before 8 September 856, when Maximus was transferred...
to Rhegium. The existence of two disciples of Maximus, both called Anastasius, accounts for two of the claims made for the authorship of this document, on account of a phrase from the Life of Maximus where the author attributes the Record to the disciple of the holy man. Devreese attributed the Record to Anastasius the Disciple. Lampe, on the other hand, attributed the Record and DB of the Acta Maximi to Maximus' supporter and fellow-sufferer, Anastasius the Apocrisarius. The attribution made in the Life of Maximus must be treated with caution, until the dating of the second recension and its relationship to the third has been established. Theodore Spoudaeus and Theodosius of Gangra, who are connected with the documents Ep. Anas. and Comm. (nos. 5 and 6 below), were suggested as joint authors of these documents by Garrigues, since they theoretically could have been eye-witnesses to the trial. Bracke rejected all these attributions in favour of the joint authorship of the two documents by Maximus and Anastasius his disciple.

2. Dispute between Maximus and Theodosius of Caesarea Bithynia

An account of the debate between Maximus and Bishop Theodosius, which took place in Bizya in August 656, and a brief account of further discussions held in Rhegium and Selymbria in the following month.

Date and Authorship: The DB was written in 656 or 657, that is, shortly after the events took place in August and September 656, while Anastasius Apocrisarius was in exile in Mesembria, and Maximus and Anastasius his disciple were in Perberis. Two dates given in the text support this dating: 24 August 'of the now-passed fourteenth indiction' and 8 September 'of the current fifteenth indiction'. The last part of the DB, the Third Sentence, is not included in the Latin, and is also omitted from one of the Greek manuscripts which is closest to the Latin, Athomensis Vatopedius 475. It must be considered as a later addition. Like the Record, the DB was attributed first to Anastasius the Disciple by Devreese.

---

142 Recension II, PG 90: 8805-10.  
143 Garrigues, 'Maxime', 474.  
144 Bracke, Vita, 136 f.  
145 Devreese, 'La Vie', 8.  
146 Devreese, 'La Vie', 8.  
147 Bracke, Vita, 132 f., and 136.  
148 Disputes §2 and §9 respectively.
probably on the basis of the *Life of Maximus, Recension II*; then to Anastasius Apocrisiarius by Lampe; and thirdly, to Theodore Spoudaeus and Theodosius of Gangra by Garrigues. Bracke rejects all of these in favour of joint authorship by Maximus and Anastasius the Disciple. The redactor of the third recension of the *Life of Maximus* attributes the *DB* to 'the disciple of the holy man'.

3. Letter of Maximus to Anastasius his Disciple

Maximus’ letter to Anastasius of 19 April 658 while they were both in exile in Perberis, giving a verbatim account of a discussion between Maximus and representatives of the patriarch, unnamed here but identified as Peter in two recensions of the *Life*. This letter was traditionally dated to May 655 on the basis of Migne’s corrupt version of the text, but the date has been correctly established by our edition, which reads μηδεπεντηκοστῇ instead of the corrupt πεντηκοστῇ. The correct Greek reading agrees with Anastasius Bibliothecarius’ Latin version, allowing us to date the letter to 19 April 658, since Mid-Pentecost fell on 18 April in that year. Bracke claimed that the addressee of the letter was more likely to have been Anastasius Apocrisiarius, then in exile in Mesembria, than Anastasius the Disciple, who was in the same place of exile as Maximus, namely

151 Bracke, *Pâme*, 144.
152 Bracke, *Pâme*, 66; Peter was patriarch of Constantinople from June 654 until October 666. This letter is incorporated into *Recensio II* as part of the dispute between Maximus and Theodosius bishop of Caesarea Bithynia, and in *Recensio I* as following shortly after the first trial recounted in the *Record*.
153 e.g. Devreese, *La Vie*, 30: ‘Maxime raconte que le 18 du mois, hier écrit-il, jour de la Pentecôte [18 Mai 655] le patriarche Pierre vint vers lui’; cf. Winkelmann, no. 136, 543, dates the interrogation to 15 May. Van Dieten, *Patriarchen*, 107, also adopts the date of 18 May 655 for the interrogation described in the letter. Pentecost, however, fell on 17 May in 655, leaving these calculations one day out.
154 See, however, the editorial comment in the Migne edition at PG 90. 151–2, n. (a): μηδεπεντηκοστῇ legit Anastasius (Bibliothecarius) quem et sequer. (The editor, F. Combeuf, has followed the correct reading of Anastasius Bibliothecarius.)
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Perberis, at the time of writing. However, we have no reason to believe that Maximus was in communication with the Apocrisiarius at this time. The incorrect dating of the letter has also caused some confusion over the dating of the documents to which the letter makes reference. The compromise formula of the patriarch Peter of Constantinople does not survive, but is reported in Ep. Max. by the legates of the patriarch: ‘We say there are two operations on account of diversity, and one on account of the union.’ Given the revised dating of the letter of Maximus, the letter of the patriarch should rather be dated to some time shortly before 19 April 658. The meaning of the Latin coda at the end of Ep. Max. is obscured by its layout in Parisinus latinus 5095, where it appears on the next line after the name ‘Anastasius’ as follows:

Haec iussit mihi transcribere et nota facere sanctissimis uobis, quo et ex his motione comperta, communem .. afferais Domino precem.

Bracke, Garrigues, and Winkelmann have nominated Maximus Confessor as the subject of this sentence, translating it as: ‘He [Maximus] ordered me [Anastasius the Disciple] to transcribe this and send it to you,’ and have claimed that the addressees (sanctissimis uobis) were the monks of Cagliari, the addressees of the following letter of Anastasius. However, we think it more likely that the subject is the Anastasius from the previous line, who ordered the compiler of these documents to make a copy of Maximus’ letter to Anastasius for the edification of others. There is some similarity of phrasing in the epilogue of the Commemoratio which is part of the Acts of Pope Marin, pointing to the possible authorship of Theodore Spoudaeus.

157 Bracke, Vita, 159.
159 Bracke, Vita, 159, suggests that the recipient is more likely to be Anastasius Apocrisiarius, but admits that this cannot be proven from the manuscripts. Anastasius is described as Ἀναστάσιος μονάχος τὸν Κατοῦν τούτῳ μαθητὴν in the title to the Ep. Max. monachum discipulum inn in Anastasius Bibliothecarius’ Latin version.
4. Letter of Anastasius to the Monks of Cagliari

A letter of Anastasius (the disciple or Apocrisiarius?) to the monks of Cagliari, seeking their help and offering encouragement in their continued resistance to the monothelite party.

_Date and Authorship:_ This letter, written by Anastasius the monk and disciple of Maximus, and addressed to the monks of Cagliari, exists only in the Latin version of _Parisinus latinus 5095_, fos. 34–5. The identity of its author has not been established with certainty, given that ‘Anastasius the monk and disciple’ (_Anastasius monachus et discipulus_) could refer to either of the two disciples of Maximus who bore that name. However, authorship is traditionally ascribed to Anastasius the Monk, rather than the other Anastasius, who elsewhere always bears the epithet ‘Apocrisiarius’.\(^{161}\)

In the _Collectanea_ of Anastasius Bibliotecarius, this letter is found immediately following the letter of Maximus to his disciple Anastasius the Monk (_CPG 7701_). The coda of that letter, which likewise exists only in Latin, seemed to the editor of the _PL_ to introduce this letter to the monks of Cagliari, whereas Sirmond placed it, correctly as it seems, adjoining the previous letter. A reference to Maximus’ trial (_ex his motione comperta_) identifies this coda with the account in Maximus’ letter of his examination by the patriarchal emissaries on 18 April 658. Although the syntax gives rise to ambiguity, Winkelmann and Bracke\(^{162}\) interpreted the coda to mean that Maximus had ordered Anastasius to transcribe his letter (_Haec iussit mihi transcribere_) for others to read. Thus they concluded that Anastasius attached a copy of Maximus’ letter (in Greek) to his own letter to the monks of Cagliari.\(^{163}\) While this explanation is possible, it seems more likely that Anastasius is the subject of the exhortation, and the compiler of the documents pertaining to Maximus’ life is the object (_mihi_), as we have argued in a recent article.\(^{164}\)

Little is known of the existence of Greek monks in Cagliari in the period to which this letter dates (that is, after 19 April 658, the date of Maximus’ letter to his disciple Anastasius),\(^{165}\) with the

---

\(^{161}\) Cf. Bracke, _Vita_, 79–85, in support of the argument for attribution to Anastasius Apocrisiarius.

\(^{162}\) Winkelmann, no. 137, 543; Bracke, _Vita_, 79 ff.

\(^{163}\) See van Dieten, _Patriarchen_, 108–9.

\(^{164}\) Neil, _‘Liber’_, 97.

\(^{165}\) Cf. Winkelmann, no. 137, 543.
exception of Deusdedit, bishop of Cagliari, who was, in spite of his Latinate name, a prominent Greek figure at the Lateran Synod of 649 in Rome.  

Of the two Migne editions, PL 129. 623–6 more closely resembles Sirmond’s edition which is quite faithful to the original, and contains fewer innovations than the “improved” text of Combeis (PG 90. 133–6).

5. Letter of Anastasius the Apocrisarius to Theodosius of Gangra
A letter by Anastasius Apocrisarius, accompanied by Testimonia attributed to Hippolytus, bishop of Portus Romanus, and Syllogisms, probably from the hand of Anastasius.

Date and Authorship: The prologue, which survives only in the Latin version, has been added by an unknown party, possibly the recipient of the letter, Theodosius of Gangra, or his brother, Theodore Spoudaeus.  
Anastasius composed this letter during his last year of exile in Lazica, before his death on 11 October 666, but it did not reach its addressee Theodosius until August 668. Both the Latin translation and the Greek text date the death of Anastasius the Disciple to 22 or 24 July 662 (cf. the Comm. which only gives the latter date). The Latin supplies a description of Maximus’ death on 13 August 662, which has not survived in the Greek, as well as an account of Anastasius the Apocrisarius’ trials in exile in Lazica and Abasgia from 662, and of the visit he received from Stephen, son of the priest John the cimiliarch of the Church of the Holy Anastasis. Anastasius records Stephen’s death as occurring on 1 January 665 ‘of the eighth indiction which had passed’, thus providing the terminus post quem of his own letter, that is, September 665. The scholion recording the death of Anastasius the Apocrisarius on 11 October 666 survives in both the Greek and its Latin translation.

The Testimonia and Syllogisms which are appended to the letter in the Parisinus Latinus 5095 (Ios. 48–51*) bear the linguistic stamp of Anastasius the Apocrisarius, although he himself attributed the Testimonia to Hippolytus, the bishop of Portus Romanus in the late second and early third centuries. Anastasius’ account of their

---

166 See P. Conte, Il Sinodo Lateranense dell’ottobre 649, Collezione Teologica 3 (Vatican: Libreria Editrice Vaticana, 1980), 162 and passim.
167 As suggested in Neil, ‘Lives’, 100
168 See Devreese, ‘La lettre’, 8 n. 1, and 9.
origins should be treated with caution: he informed Theodosius of
Gangra (Ep. Anas. 264/8) that these eight extracts from the Sermon
of Hippolytus against the heretics Beron and Helicon (CPG 1916) were all
that he managed to copy before the whole work was snatched
from him by imperial officers in Constantinople. Winkelmann's
 attribution of the so-called 'extracts' to the Apocrisarius himself
seems most likely, given their anti-monothelite content and convo-
luted style. The Testimonia and Syllogismi have not been included in
this volume because their content is syllogistic rather than bio-
graphical. The Greek version of the text does not appear in any of
the manuscripts containing the other documents translated in this
volume. These two texts will be edited at a later date.

6. Commemoration

A commemoration of the trials in exile of Pope Martin I, Maximus
the Confessor, Anastasius the Disciple, Anastasius the Apocrisia-
rus, Theodore, and Euprepius, all martyrs for the dyothelite
cause.

Date and Authorship: The Comm. was written soon after the Ep. Anas.
was received in August 668. The author refers to 'us, the truly
lowly Theodosius [of Gangra] and Theodore [Spoudaeus].

Devreesse has established that Theodore was the more likely
author, following the attribution in the Greek prologue of the
work to a certain Theodore, who made a record of events for 'this
holy assembly'. Devreesse suggests that this 'holy assembly' may
refer to the association of Spoudaei in Constantinople, who were
probably descendants of the fifth-century association of the same
name first established in Constantinople by John Chrysostom to

168 See Dickamp, Doctrina Patrum, Intro., p. xcvii n. 3; Winkelmann, no. 125, 541.
170 The eight extracts of the Testimonia have survived in at least two Greek codices,
Boleianus Miscell. 184 (12th c.) and Parisinius graccus 1144 (15th c.), which have been edited by
Dickamp, Doctrina Patrum, ch. 44, 321-6; see also his Introduction, p. xlviii, on their spurious
attribution to Hippolytus, the late second-/early third-century bishop of Portus Romanus.
Another manuscript, now lost, from the collection of Franciscus Turrianus, was edited by
Simond together with Anastasius Bibliothecarius' Latin translation in his edition of the
Collectanea, as noted in its introduction, p. vi.
171 'The sacred letter on this subject was handed over to us, the truly lowly Theodosius
and Theodore, legitimate and genuine brothers, both humble and sinful monks' (Comm.
§10).
172 ὁ Θεοδώρος τις μαθητεύοις τῇ θείᾳ δραμὴν ταύτην συγγραφὴν ἐποιήσατο ἐκ τοὺς ὀφθαλμοὺς
οὗτος (Comm. §5), cited by Devreesse, 'Hypomnesticon', 50, as the reason for rejecting his
original suggestion of Theodosius of Gangra as its author.
combat the Arian threat. The brothers have also been associated, on the basis of less convincing evidence, with the church of the Holy Anastasis, in either Jerusalem or Constantinople. The Greek version has a different title from the Latin, and its prologue is drawn largely from Theophanes. It describes the death of Constans in Sicily, followed by a few lines introducing the death in exile of Maximus, the two Anastasii and Martin. The Latin introduction is quite different, and Devreese claims it must be the invention of Anastasius Bibliothecarius. Since we have no other examples of Anastasius adding significantly to the works he is translating, and because the Latin bears all the signs of being a translation from Greek, we do not believe this to be the case. Theodore (or a compiler) seems to be the most likely candidate for authorship of this prologue, and also for the Latin coda, not edited by Sirmond:

The commemorations give an account of the holy ones: Pope Martin, Maximus the monk, his disciples Anastasius and Anastasius, and the brothers Euprepius and Theodore.

The author of the Latin prologue refers to ‘the letter of Anastasius

174 J.-M. Garrigues, ‘Le sens de la primauté romaine chez saint Maxime le Confesseur’, Liturgia 21 (1976), 6–24 (here, 15) expresses the opinion that Theodore Spoudaeus and Theodore of Gangra were inhabitants of Jerusalem, on the basis of a reference to ‘the holy city of our Christ’ in the Latin prologue to Anastasius’ letter to Theodotius: ad Theodotium presbyterum Gangrenum, et monastium sancte Chrisii nostre etatis constitutum (Ep. Anas. 5). Garrigues goes further in ‘Maxime’, 447 n. 76, where he claims that the numerous allusions to (the church of) the Anastasia that we find in the writings of the brothers Theodore and Theodotius show that the congregation of Spoudai to which they belong is that of Jerusalem, attached to the Anastasia. J. Noret, in his recent article ‘A qui était destinée la lettre BBG 1339 d’Anastase Apocrisaire?’, AB 116 (2000), 37–43, examines the evidence for locating the community of the Anastasia in Jerusalem rather than in Constantinople, as Devreese assumed to be the case in ‘La lettre’, 7 n. 4. However, the allusions to which Garrigues and Noret refer do not personally connect the brothers with that church. Theodore at least must belong to the congregation of Hagia Sophia, if the title of the Narrationes de exilio sancti Pappae Martini is accurate: Ex his quae a Theodoro Studes sanctae Sophieae scripta sunt... (PL 199, 585 D1–2).
176 Devreese, ‘Hypomnemation’, 59, n.3.
177 Paurium latum 5055, fo. 58r: Explicit commemorations de sanctis papa Martinus et Maximo monachos seu Anastasio illeque Anastasio discipulis suis, atque Euprepius et Theodoro Germanus (Comm. §11).
NOTE ON THE TRANSLATIONS

attached here', indicating that the Comm. was appended to the Ep. Anas.

7. Against the People of Constantinople
A later piece of invective against the imperial monothelite party, written by an anonymous supporter of Maximus.

Date and Authorship: This vitriolic document was written after the trial of Maximus and the two Anastasii in 662, and contains a number of hapaxlegomena and rare words. If it was not composed by Anastasius Apocrisiarius, it could stem from the same circle of monks engaged in compiling anti-monothelite material, who were possibly also the authors of the Doctrina Patrum.

V. NOTE ON THE TRANSLATIONS

In translating these documents, we 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 can only offer, for one and a half documents, a translation of the Latin translation, and that the original Greek itself was often less than clear in its expression. However, the Greek, with all its faults, often makes better sense than Anastasius' Latin, and for this reason, we have relied upon the Greek text wherever it is available. Our primary objective 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 we ask for the reader's forbearance. The Letter of Anastasius to Theodosius of Gangra presented a particular challenge, with its turgid style and frequent anacolutha.

178 Winkelman, no. 152, gives no suggestion as to the date of the piece.
179 The earliest form of the work has been dated by its edit Drikamp, Doctrina Patrum, p. 1xxix, to some time between 662 (the year of Maximus' death) and the opening of the Sixth Ecumenical Council in 680.
180 G. Théry, 'Socr Étienne, traducteur de Denys', Archivum Latinu Medii Aevi 6 (1931), 185.
which have resulted in long sentences that run on for up to half a page. We have attempted to break these up where possible, but have often had to retain the unwieldy syntactic structures of the original in order to preserve the sense. The convoluted theological phrases of the Letter of Anastasius to the Monks of Cagliari also proved very difficult to render idiomatically, and with no Greek to which to refer, we have had to make the best of a text full of lacunae and opaque expressions. The author of the Commemoration himself apologises for the roughness of his language, and the 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.' Devreesse rightly notes that these faults have been aggravated by the manuscript tradition, and that Anastasius has not tried to remedy them in his translation. The final document, Against the Constantinopolitans, was perhaps the most difficult of the Greek texts to translate, containing so many hapaxlegomena piled one upon the other, with the result that the intensity of the author’s contempt for his adversaries makes far greater impact than his rhetorical style.

The Greek and Latin texts are reproduced from our own edition: square brackets mark a word or letter that should be deleted, e.g. [poeta]; pointed brackets signal an insertion, e.g. ⟨poeta⟩; obelisks mark passages where Latin or Greek is unclear and cannot be restored, e.g. ↑poeta↑.

In the English translation words that have been added for the sake of clarity are marked with square brackets as usual; pointed brackets mark the translation of a word that has been supplied in the Greek or Latin text, e.g. ⟨poet⟩.

101 Devreesse, ‘Hypomnemata’, 65. 102 Ibid.
Map 1. Byzantine empire at the death of Heraclius in 641
(Reprinted with alterations, from R. Browning, The Byzantine Empire (London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 1980), 16 by kind permission of the publisher.)
Map 2. Lazica and surrounds in the seventh century
(Revised version of P. Allen and B. Neil (eds.) with J. Noret, CCSC 39 (Turnhout-Leuven: Brepols, 1999), Introduction,
RELATIO MOTIONIS
(CPG 7736)

Εξήγησις τῆς γεννομένης κυνήσεως μεταξὺ τοῦ κυρίου Δῆβα Μαξίμου καὶ τῶν σὺν αὐτῷ, καὶ τῶν ἄρχόντων ἐπὶ σεκρέτου.

§1. Τῇ ἡμέρᾳ δὲ προσωρμισθησθαν παύτη τῇ βασιλευούσῃ πόλει ὁ τε κύριος Μάξιμος καὶ οἱ σὺν αὐτῷ, περὶ δύσμας ἡλίου ἐλθόντες δύο μανδάτους μετὰ δέκα ἐκκοκουμιτόρων, ἐπήραν αὐτούς ἐκ τοῦ πλαίου γυμνούς καὶ ἀνυποδέτους· καὶ μερίσαστες αὐτοὺς ἄπτε ἄλληλων, ἐφύλαξαν εἰς διάφορα ἐκκοκούβιτα. Καὶ μεθ’ ἡμέρας τυχὸς ἀναφέρουσαν αὐτοὺς ἐν τῷ παλατίῳ, καὶ εἰσάγονοι τὸν γέροντα, ἐν ᾨ ἄφνῃ συνήχθη ἡ σύγκλητος καὶ πολὺς ἄλλος ἤχος· καὶ παριστάνας αὐτὸν μέσον τῶν ἄρχόντων καθημένον, καὶ λέγει αὐτῷ ὁ σακελλάριος: Ἰησοῦς Ε',' μετ’ ἄργης πολλῆς καὶ μανίας.

Καὶ λέγει: “Χάριτι Χριστοῦ τοῦ Θεοῦ τῶν ὁλίγων, Χριστιανὸς εἰμὶ.”

Καὶ λέγει ἔκεινος: “Οὐκ ἐστιν ἄρχεις.”

Ἀπεκρίθη ὁ τοῦ Θεοῦ δούλος: “Σὺ λέγεις νῦν εἰμί· ἄλλ’, ὁ Θεὸς λέγει εἰμὶ καὶ διαμένειν Ἰησοῦς.”

“Καὶ πῶς,” φησίν, “ἐπερ Χριστιανὸς εἰ, μισεῖς τὸν βασιλέα;”

Ἀποκριθεὶς ὁ τοῦ Θεοῦ δούλος ἔφη: “Καὶ πόθεν δῆλον; τὸ γὰρ μίος φιλίας ἐστὶν κεκρυμμένη διάθεσις, ἀσπερ οὖν καὶ ἡ ἀγάπη.”

Καὶ λέγει αὐτῷ: “Σὺ ἐν ἑποίησας, πάσην ἐγένετο ἀνεμός ὡς μισεῖς τὸν βασιλέα καὶ τὴν πολιτείαν αὐτοῦ· σὺ γὰρ μίος Ἀγίου τοῦ Λεοπόλδου καὶ Λεοπόλδου καὶ Πετάπολον καὶ Πύρσον καὶ Αἰφρίνης Σαρακηνοῦς παραδόχως.”

“Καὶ τίς η τούτων ἀπόδειξές;” ἐφη.

Καὶ παραφέρουσαν Ἰωάννην τὸν γεννομένον σακελλάριον Πέτρου τοῦ γεννομένος στρατηγοῦ Νομιχίδας τῆς Αφρικῆς λέγοντα ὅτι “Πρὸ εἰκοσιδύο ἄνω ὁ πάππος τοῦ δεσπότου ἐκέλευσεν τῷ μακαρίῳ Πέτρῳ λαβεῖν στρατόν καὶ ἀπελθεῖν εἰς Ἀγίουτον κατὰ
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RECORD OF THE TRIAL

(CPG 7736)

An account of the process which took place between lord Father Maximus and his companions, and the officials in the privy chamber.¹

§1. On the day when both lord Maximus and his companions anchored at this royal city, around sunset two commissioners² came with ten palace guards,³ and took them off the ship without clothing or shoes. And after separating them from one another they put them under guard in different guard-houses. And after some days they brought them up to the palace, and led in the old man to the place where the senate had assembled and a great crowd besides. And they made him stand in the midst of the officials, who were seated, and the finance minister⁴ said to him with great anger and frenzy: ‘Are you a Christian?’

And he said: ‘By the grace of Christ, God of all, I am a Christian.’

And the finance minister said: ‘That’s not true.’

The servant of God answered: ‘You say I’m not, but God says that I am, and will remain a Christian.’

‘And how,’ he said, ‘if you are a Christian, can you hate the emperor?’

And the servant of God said in reply: ‘And what’s the evidence for that? After all, hatred is a hidden disposition of the soul, just as love is too.’

And he said to him: ‘From what you have done it has become clear to everyone that you hate the emperor and his empire. I say this because single-handedly you betrayed Egypt, Alexandria, Pentapolis, Tripolis and Africa to the Saracens.’

‘And what’s the proof of those charges?’ he said.

And they produced John, the former finance minister of Peter, the former general of Numidia in Africa,⁵ who said: ‘Twenty-two years ago the emperor’s grandfather⁶ ordered blessed Peter to take an army and go off to Egypt against the Saracens, and he wrote to you, as if he were speaking to a servant of God, having confidence in you as a holy
τῶν Σαρακηνών, καὶ ἐγραψέν οὗι ός πρὸς δούλου τοῦ Θεοῦ λαλῶν, πληροφοροῦν ἔχον εἰς ὦς ἐς ἡγόν ἀνθρώπων, εἰ συμβουλεύεις αὐτῷ ἀπελθεῖν. Καὶ ἀντέγραψας αὐτῷ λέγων μηδὲν τοιούτο ποιήσας, ἐπειδή οὐκ εὐδοκεῖ ὁ Θεός, ἐπὶ τῆς βασιλείας Ἡρακλείου καὶ τοῦ γένους αὐτοῦ συμπραχθήναι τῆς πολιτείας τῶν Ῥωμαιῶν."

Λέγει ὁ δοῦλος τοῦ Θεοῦ: "Ἐὰν ἀληθεύει, πάντως ἔχει καὶ τὴν πρὸς ἑμεῖς ἑμῖν πρὸς αὐτῶν ἐπιστολήν παρενεχθόσι, καὶ ὑπόκειμαι ταῖς δοκοῦσαι τῷ νόμῳ τουναί." 

Καὶ λέγει: "Ἐγὼ οὖν ἔχω ἐπιστολὴν, ἀλλ’ οὔτε ὥδε, εἰ ὅλως ἐγραφέν σοι. Ἀλλ’ ἐν τῷ φοσσάτῳ ταῦτα καθ’ ἑκέινον ἐλάλουν πάντες τοῖς καιροῖς." 

Λέγει πρὸς αὐτὸν ὁ τοῦ Θεοῦ δοῦλος: "Εἰ τὸ φοσσάτον ὅλον τοῦτο διελάλει, πῶς σὺ μόνος τούτο συκοφάντεις με; Ἐδεώρησάς με ποτὲ ἡ ἐγὼ σε;"

Καὶ λέγει: "Οὐδέποτε." 

Τότε στραφεὶς πρὸς τὴν σύγκλητον ὁ τοῦ Θεοῦ δοῦλος εἶπεν: "Εἰ δικαίων ἐστιν τοιούτους παρακομίζοντι κατηγόρως ἡ μάρτυρα, κρίνατε ἑν ὦ γὰρ κρίματι κρίνετε, κρηθήσεσθε καὶ ἐν ὧν μέτρῳ μετρεῖτε, μετρηθήσεσθε," φησάνι ὁ τῶν ὅλων Θεός."

§ 2. Καὶ μετὰ τοῦτον φέρουσιν Σέργιον τὸν Μαγουδανέων λέγοντα: "Πρὸ ἐννέα ἐτῶν ὁ μακάριος Ἀββᾶς Θωμᾶς ἐθύμων ἀπὸ Ρώμης εἶπεν μιᾷ τοῖς Θεοδώρους ἐπιμενεῖ με πρὸς τὸν πατρίκιον Γεωργίου, ἢν εἶτα αὐτῷ μὴ φοβηθήναι τινα. Ὁ γὰρ δοῦλος τοῦ Θεοῦ ὁ Ἀββᾶς Μάξιμος ἐθεώρησεν ὄναρ, ἢν καὶ οὐρανοίς εἰς ἀνατολαὶ καὶ δυσμάς ἦσαν δῆμοι ἀγγέλων καὶ οἱ μὲν εἰς ἀνατολάς ἐκραθήσαν, Κωνσταντίνον Ἀγνουστοτς, τοῦ βίγκας, οὗ δὲ εἰς δυσμάς ἐβόωσεν. Γεωργίῳ Ἀγνουστος, τοῦ βίγκας καὶ ὑπερήχησεν ἡ φωνὴ εἰς δυσμᾶς, τὴν τῶν εἰς ἀνατολήν φωνήν." 

Καὶ τότε κράζει ὁ σακελλάριος: "Ἐπεμψέν σε ὁ Θεὸς καθήναι εἰς τὴν πόλιν ταύτην." 

Λέγει ὁ τοῦ Θεοῦ δοῦλος: "Ἐξαριστῶ τῷ Θεῷ καθαίροντι με τῶν ἐκουσίων μοι κακῶν δὲ ἀκουσάντων κολάσεως πλήρη. Οὐδὲ τῷ κόσμῳ ἁπλῶν τῶν πασχαλῶν. Ἀνάξις γὰρ ἔχειν τὰ σκάνδαλα, ὅσιοι δὲ δὲ οὗ τὰ σκάνδαλα ἔρχεται. Οὕτως οὖν ἐδει τω μὴν λαλεῖναι παροικία Χριστιανῶν, οὐδὲ ἀτιμωρήτους μείνειν τού τó του τούτο πάλιντα πρὸς τὸ ἀρέσαι ἀνθρώποις, σήμερον οὖν, καὶ αὐριον οὐκ οὖν, Τάυτα ζῴωντο Γεωργίου ἐδει τούτον
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person, [to enquire] if you counselled him to set off. And you wrote back to him saying he should do nothing of the sort, because God did not approve lending aid to the Roman empire during the reign of Heraclius and his kin."

The servant of God said: ‘If you’re speaking the truth, of course you have both Peter’s letter to me, and mine to him. Let them be produced, and I’ll submit to the punishments decreed by the law.’

And he said: ‘I don’t have the letter, nor do I know if he wrote to you at all. But everyone in the camp at that time was speaking of these matters.’

The servant of God said to him: ‘If the entire camp was discussing that matter, how is it that you’re the only one to caluminate me? Have you ever seen me, or I you?’

And he said: ‘Never.’

Then, turning to the senate, the servant of God said: ‘You must judge whether it’s just to have such accusers or witnesses brought forward. “For by the judgement you judge, you shall be judged, and by the measure that you measure, it shall be measured unto you,” said the Lord of all.’

§2. And after him they brought in Sergius Magoudas, who said: ‘Nine years ago the blessed Father Thomas, who had come from Rome, said to me: “Pope Theodore sent me to the patrician Gregory to tell him not to be afraid of anybody. I mean that the servant of God, Father Maximus, had a vision in his sleep that in the heavens to the East and West there were crowds of angels. And the angels in the East shouted: ‘Constantine Augustus, you shall conquer,’ whereas the angels in the West exclaimed: ‘Gregory Augustus, you shall conquer.’ And the voices of those in the West prevailed over those in the East.”’

And at that point the finance minister shouted: ‘God has sent you to this city to be burnt.’

The servant of God said: ‘I give thanks to God who cleanses me of my voluntary sins by means of involuntary chastisement. But woe to the world because of scandals. For it is necessary that scandals come, but woe to the man through whom scandal comes. Such matters should really not have been spoken about in the presence of Christians, nor should those people go unpunished who fabricate such matters to gratify human beings, who are here today and gone tomorrow. He should have made these accusations while Gregory was alive, and made known to the emperor his good will towards him. The just thing to do, if it commends itself to you as well, is to make my former calumniator go out
εἰπεῖν, καὶ γνωρίσας τῷ βασιλεὶ τὴν εἰς αὐτὸν εὔνοιαν. Δίκαιον δὲ ἔστω, εἰ καὶ ὅμως παρίσταται, τὸ πρὸ τοῦτο συκοφάντην ἐκβιασθῆναι ἀπελθὼν ενέγκα τὸν πατρίκιον Πέτρου, καὶ τούτῳ τὸν ἀββᾶν Ἰωάνναν, κάκευνον τὸν μακάριον πάπαν Θεόδωρον· καὶ τότε παρουσία πάντων, ἔλεγεν τῷ πατρίκιῳ Πέτρῳ· Ἐστι, κύρι ὁ πατρίκιος, ἐγραψάς μοι ποτὲ περὶ ὧν ἐπίνεν ὁ σῶς σακκάλαριος ἢ ἐγὼ σοι; Καὶ ὅταν κατέθετο, ὑπὸ κόλασιν ἐγκαύη. Ὄμοιος δὲ καὶ τῷ μακάριῳ πάπα· Ἐστι, δέσποτα, ἐγὼ σοι ποτὲ ὄναρ ἀφηγησάμην; Καὶ ὅταν ἠλεγξέν με, ἔκεινον ἥν τῷ ἐγκλήμα, οὐκ ἐμοὶ τοῦ ἑωρακότος. Ἀπροαίρετον γὰρ πράγμα τὸ ὄναρ· μόνα δὲ τὰ προαιρετικὰ κολάξες ὁ νόμος, εἰπερ αὐτῷ ἐναντίον τοῦτον ἐπεστάληκεν." Τότε λέγει πρὸς αὐτὸν ὁ Τρούλος· "Παῖζεις, αὐθανά, οὐκ οἴδας ποῦ εἶ;"

Ὁ δὲ· "Οὖ παίζω, ἀλλὰ πενθῷ τὴν ζωὴν μου συντηρηθεῖσαν μέχρι τοῦ νῦν, ἵνα τοίοτον λάβω πείραν φασμάτων."

Καὶ λέγει ὁ κύρις Επιφάνιος· "Ὁ Θεός γεωσκεῖ, καλῶς ποιεῖ παίζων αὐτά, ἦν οὐκ εἰσίν ἀληθῆ." Μεθ’ δὲ ὁ σακκάλαριος πάλιν μετ’ ὀργῆς εἴπεν πρὸς αὐτόν· "Ἄπλω πάντες ψεύδοται, καὶ οὐ μόνον ἁληθεύεις;"

Καὶ ἀποκριθεὶς εἶπεν ὁ τοῦ Θεοῦ δούλος, συνδικότας τῷ λόγῳ· "Ἄξοισαν ἔχετε συγχωροῦντος τοῦ Θεοῦ, καὶ ζωσάσας καὶ βαπτάσαις πλην οὓς οὖν ἠλθεύομεν, καὶ ὁ Σατάνας φίλει Θεός ἐστιν. Εἰ δὲ οὐκ ἔστω, ὡσπερ οὖν οὐδὲ ἔστω, οὐδὲ οὗτο θλήθωμαι. Μήτε γὰρ ἄξωθον μετὰ Χριστιανῶν θεωρήσει τὴν ἐπιθέσειν τοῦ ἀπεριουσίου Θεοῦ, ποιητοῦ τε καὶ δημιουργοῦ, καὶ κτίστου, καὶ προοιμοῦτο, καὶ κριτοῦ, καὶ Σωτῆρος τῶν ἁλῶν, εἰ ποτὲ ὄναρ τοιοῦτον ἠθεοῦμαι, ἢ ἄλλου ἀφηγηθοῦν ήκουσα, εἰ μὴ τῇ ὧρᾳ ταύτῃ παρὰ τοῦ κυρίου Σερχίου τοῦ εὐνοίου τῆς βασιλείας."

§3: Ἐστα τρίτον συκοφάντην προβάλλοντα, Θεόδωρον τὸν ιώνιον ᾿Ιωάννου τοῦ κανδιδάτου γενομένου, τὸ ἐπίκλην Χιλα, τὸν νῦν γαμήρων τοῦ κυρίου Πλάτωνος τοῦ πατρικίου, λέγωντα ὅτι "Συντυχίας μεταξὺ ἡμῶν ἐν Ρώμῃ γενομένης περὶ τοῦ βασιλέως, διέσυρεν τὸ λαλούμενον, μυττία ποιεῖν καὶ λαμία." Πρὸς ὁν εἴπεν ὁ τοῦ Θεοῦ δούλος· "Οὐδέποτε διελέχθην σοι, εἰ μὴ ἁπαξ μετὰ τοῦ ὁσιωτάτου πρεσβυτέρου κυρίου Θεοχαρίστου, τοῦ ἀδελφοῦ τοῦ ἐξάρχου, διὰ τῶν πρεμικήριου, προτραπεῖς διὰ γραμμάτων περὶ τοῦτον. Καὶ εἰ δὲ εὐρεθῶ, ψευδόμενος, ἀπολάβω."
and bring in Peter the patrician, and Peter should bring in Father
Thomas, and Thomas should bring in blessed Pope Theodore. And
then, in the presence of everyone, I would say to Peter the patrician:
"Tell me, lord patrician, did you ever write to me on the matters your
finance minister alleges, or I to you?" And if he should say yes,
I would submit to chastisement. Similarly too with the blessed pope:
"Tell me, master, did I ever recount to you a dream of mine?" And
if he should prove me guilty, his would be the crime, not mine who
[am supposed] to have seen it. After all, a dream is something which
is not under the control of the will. The law punishes only actions
which are under the control of the will, if, that is, they are done in
defiance of it.'

Then Troilus said to him: 'You're teasing us, Father. Don't you
know where you are?'

He said: 'I'm not teasing you; rather, I am regretting that my life
should have been spared up to the present, so that I experience
monstrosities like these.'

And the lord Epiphanius said: 'God knows, he is doing the right
thing in teasing us about these matters if they aren't true.'

After him the finance minister said with great anger to Maximus
again: 'Is it really the case that everyone's telling lies and you're the
only one telling the truth?'

And the servant of God said to him in reply, weeping as he spoke:
'With God's permission, you have the power over both life and death.
However, if these people are telling the truth, then it's Satan who's
really God. But if he isn't, as indeed he's not, these people haven't
told the truth either. Nor may I be worthy to see in the company of
Christians the manifestation of the supersubstantial God, who is both
maker and demiurge, creator, provider, judge, and Saviour of all, if
I ever had a dream of this kind or heard another person recount it,
except at this present time by lord Sergius, who is well disposed to the
empire.'

§3. Then they produced a third accuser, Theodore, the son of John
the former subaltern, whose surname was Chila, who is now the
son-in-law of the lord patrician Plato, who said: 'In a conversation
that took place between us in Rome on the subject of the emperor, he
ridiculed what was said, making sounds of contempt and derision.'

The servant of God said to him: 'I have never conversed with you
except once, with the most holy lord presbyter Theocharistos, the
brother of the exarch, through the primicerius, when I was
§4. Καὶ μετὰ τοῦτον, τέταρτον ἄγουσαν Γρηγόριον τῶν εἰνόν Φωτείνον λέγοντα ὅτι "Ἀπεθάνων εἰς τὸ κελλίον τοῦ ἁββά Μαξίμου ἐν Ρώμη, κάμον εἴπόντος, ὅτι καὶ ἱερεύς ἐστιν ὁ βασιλεύς, εἶπεν ὁ ἁββάς Ἀναστάσιος ὁ μαθητής αὐτοῦ. Μὴ ἀξιωθῇ εἶναι ἱερεὺς.

Καὶ εἴθεος λέγει πρὸς αὐτὸν ὁ τοῦ Θεοῦ δοῦλος: "Φοβήθητι τοῦ Θεοῦ, κύριε Γρηγόρε, οὐδὲν παντελῶς ἐν τῇ περὶ τῶν τοιούτων διαλέγεται λελάληκέν ὁ σύνδοολός μου." Καὶ ἔπειτα ἐστών εἰς τὴν γῆν, λέγων τῇ συγκλήτῳ: "Ἀνάσχεσθε τοῦ ὁδοῦ ἡμῶν, καὶ πάντα λέγω ὅσον ἐλαλήθη, καὶ ἐλάληξε με έαν ψέψομαι. Οὐ κύριός μου οὗτος Γρηγόριος ἐλθὼν εἰς Ρώμην, ἦζώσαν εἰδέν εἰς τὸ κελλίον τοῦ δοῦλον ἡμῶν· ὅν ἦδον, ὡς ἔθος μοι ἐστιν, ἐρρήμωσε ἐμαντόν εἰς τὴν γῆν, καὶ προσκύνησα αὐτῷ, καὶ ἡσασάμενον αὐτόν, καὶ εἶπον αὐτῷ μετὰ τὸ καθίσαι: Τίς ἡ αἰτία τῆς ποθήτης παρουσίας τοῦ δεσπότου μου; Καὶ εἶπεν: ὁ ἀγαθὸς καὶ θεοστήρικτος ἡμῶν δεσπότης, φροντίζων τῆς εἰρήνης τῶν ἁγίων τοῦ Θεοῦ ἐκκλησίας, ἐπαύσαν κέλευσαι πρὸς τὸν θεοτύμητον πάσαν, πέμψας καὶ προσφορὰν εἰς τὸν ἄγιον Πέτρον, προτερπόμενος αὐτὸν ἐνωθῆναι τῷ προέδρῳ Κωνσταντινουπόλεως· ἀπερ πεμφθῆς διὰ τῆς ἐρήμης μετάρρυθμος κατηχοῦσαν τὸ εὐσεβές αὐτοῦ κράτος. Καὶ εἶπον: Δόξα τῷ Θεῷ τῶν ποιησάντων σέ αὐτό τῆς τοιαύτης διακονίας. Πλὴν ἔτι ποιῶ τρόπῳ γενάθηται τὴν ἐνωσιν ἡ αὐτοῦ θεοστήρικτος ἐκκλησίας γιάλήνη εἰπερ οἰδας. Καὶ εἶπας: Ἐπὶ τῷ Τύπῳ. Καὶ ἐφήν Αὐτὸντον, ὡς οἶμαι, τούτῳ καθέστηκεν· οὗ γὰρ ἀνέχοντα οἱ Ῥωμαῖοι συναναρρηθήται παῖς τῶν ἁκάβρων αἰρετικῶν φωνῶν τῶν ἁγίων πατέρων φουτοφόρους φωνάς, ἢ τῷ ψεύδει συναποβεβηκάρεθα τῇ ἀλήθειας, ἢ τῷ σκότει συναφανθήθη τὸ φῶς. Οἴδαν γὰρ ἡμῖν έσται τὸ προκυπνούμενον, εἰ γένηται τῶν θεοδιδάκτων λόγων ἀνάρεισι. Καὶ εἶπας: Οὐκ ἀνάρεισαν τῶν ἱερῶν τοῦ Τύπου ποιείται φωνῶν, ἀλλὰ σωτήρ, ἢ πρὸ τὴν εἰρήνην οἰκονομίσασθε. Καὶ εἶπον: Έστι παρὰ τῇ θείᾳ Γραφῆς σωτήρ καὶ ἀνάρεις. Ὁ Θεὸς γὰρ εἶπε διὰ τοῦ Δαυίδ: Οὐκ εἰσίν λαλαί· οὐδὲ λόγοι, ἄν οὐκε ἀκούονται αἱ φωναί αὐτῶν. Οὐκοῦν εἰ μὴ λαλοῦνται καὶ ἀκοῦονται οἱ περὶ Θεοῦ λόγοι, οὐδὲ ἄλογα εἰσίν κατὰ τὴν Γραφήν. Καὶ εἶπας: Μὴ βάλης με εἰς φλας· ἢ γὼ ἀρκοῦμαι τῷ ἁγίῳ συμβολῷ. Καὶ πῶς δύνασαι τῷ ἁγίῳ ἀρκεῖσθαι συμβολῷ, ἐφην, δεχόμενον τὸν Τύπον; καὶ τί βλάπτει τὸ δέχεσθαι τὸν Τύπον, καὶ λέγειν τὸ συμβολόν; ἐφης. Λέγω: Ὁτι προβασινός ἀναρεῖ τὸ συμβολόν ὁ Τύπος. Καὶ εἶπας: Πῶς διὰ τὸν Κύριον;
enjoined by letter to do this. And if I'm found to be lying, I'll take
what's coming.'

§ 4. And after him, they brought a fourth person, Gregory the son of
Photinus,\(^{17}\) who said: 'I went to Father Maximus' cell in Rome, and,
when I said that the emperor was a priest too, Father Anastasius, his
disciple, said: "He shouldn't be considered a priest."'

And straight away the servant of God said to him: 'Fear God, lord
Gregory, my fellow servant said nothing at all during the discussion
on matters like these.' And he threw himself on the ground, saying to
the senate: 'Bear with your servant and I'll tell you everything as it
was said, and he will convict me if I lie. When my lord Gregory came
to Rome, he deigned to come to your servant's cell. When I saw him,
as is my custom, I threw myself down on the ground and welcomed
him respectfully. And I kissed him and said to him after we had sat
down: "What is the reason for the welcome arrival of my master?"

And he said: "Our good master, who is established in God, in his care
for the peace of God's holy churches, has issued an order to the pope,
who is honoured by God, sending an offering as well to St Peter,
urging him to be united with the president of Constantinople.\(^{18}\)
His orthodox Majesty deigned that this order be sent through my
mediocrity." And I said: "Glory to God who made you worthy to per-
form such a service. Only [tell me] if you know, on what terms His
divinely crowned Serenity has ordered the union to come about." And
you said: "On the terms of the Typos."\(^{19}\) And I said: "This, in my
opinion, is an impossible situation, for the Romans won't allow the
illuminating statements of the holy Fathers to be annulled simulta-
neously with the expressions of impure heretics, or the truth to be
snuffed out simultaneously with falsehood, or the light to perish
simultaneously with darkness. I mean that there will be nothing for us
to worship if the sayings taught by God are annulled." And you said:
"The Typos won't cause the annulment of the sacred expressions, but
silence, so that we may arrange peace." And I said: "According to
divine Scripture, silence is also annulment. For God said through
David: "There is no speech, nor are there words, whose sounds are not heard.'
Therefore, unless the words concerning God are spoken and heard,
they don't exist at all, according to Scripture." And you said: "Don't
make matters more difficult for me\(^{20}\)—I'm satisfied with the holy
creed." "And how," I said, "can you be satisfied with the holy creed if
you have accepted the Typos?" "And what harm is there in accepting
the Typos and saying the creed?" you asked. I said: "Obviously the
Εἴπομεν ἐφην, τὸ σύμβολον, καὶ γνώθι πῶς ἀναιρεῖται ὑπὸ τοῦ Τύπου. Καὶ ἤρεχ τοῦ λέγειν. Πιστεύω ἐις ἕνα Θεόν Πατέρα παντοκράτορα, ποιητὴν οὐρανοῦ καὶ γῆς· ὀρατῶν τε πάντων καὶ ἀοράτων. Επίσης, ἐποίησεν, μικρόν, καὶ μᾶθε πῶς ὃς τῶν ἐν Νυκτὶ ποτέ ἤρηται. Ποιητὴς γὰρ οὐκ ἤπει Ἰησοῦ, θελήσως καὶ ἐνεργείας φυσικής ἐστήσημεν, ἐπίσης καὶ ἑσπέρας, ἀλλ' οὐκ ἀναγκαζόμενος ἐποίησεν τὸν οὐράνιον καὶ τὴν γῆν, εἰτέρα ἀλληλείπεις λέγων ἐν Πνεύματι Δανίης. Πάντα ὅσα ἤθελήσειν ὁ Κύριος, ἐποίησεν ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ καὶ ἐν τῇ γῇ, ἐν ταῖς βασιλείαις καὶ ἐν πάσαις ταῖς ἀβύσσοις. Ἐν ὧν ὀικονομίας χάριν συναναφέρεται ἡ κακοπατία ἡ σωτηρία ποτές, χορημοῦ Θεοῦ παντελῆς, ἀλλ' οὐ' ἐγώ. ἔστι τὸ τοιοῦτον εἰδὸς τῆς λεγομένης οἰκονομίας. Ἀεί δὲ καὶ οἱ δυσόνομοι Του διάοι οἱ λέγουσιν· Οἰκονομήσωμεν τὴν πρὸς ἀλλήλους εἰρήνην, καὶ ἐνοικώμεθα, καὶ περίελθομεν ἡμεῖς μὲν τὴν περιστοχείαν, καὶ ἤμεισι τὸ βάπτισμα, καὶ μηκέτι ἀλλήλους πολεμήσωμεν. Τούτῳ καὶ Αρέανοι ποτὲ προέτειναν ἐγγράφως ἐπὶ τοῦ μεγάλου Κοσμουστίου λέγοντες· Περίελθομεν τὸ ὄμοιούσιον καὶ τὸ ἐτεροοούσιον, καὶ ἐνοικώμεθα αἱ ἐκκλησίαι. Καὶ οὐ κατεδεξάντο οἱ θεοφόροι πατέρες ἡμῶν· ἀλλ' εἴλαντο μᾶλλον διακεκριθαὶ καὶ ἀποθεανεὶ, ἢ ἀιμοπής φωνὴν παραστατικὴν τῆς μᾶς τοῦ Πατρὸς καὶ τοῦ Υἱοῦ καὶ τοῦ Ἰδρύμος Πνεύματος ὑπερονυμοῦ θεότητος, καὶ ταῦτα συνεπιτίθεμεν τοῖς ταῦτα προετέινον τοῦ μεγάλου Κοσμουστίου, καθὼς πολλοὶ ἀστράχηται τοῖς πηλοῖς τὰ τότε γενόμενα γράψαι. Καὶ οὐδέδε τῶν βασιλέων ἄνθροποι φῶνας πειθαὶ τοὺς θεογόνους πατέρας συμβασισθήναι τοῖς ἐπὶ αὐτῶν αἱρέτιζοντο· ἀλλὰ ταῖς τραυμαῖς καὶ κυριαῖς, καὶ καταλήψει τοῦ ἐχθρομένου δόγματι έκχρηστο, λέγοντες προφανῶς ὅτι ἱερεῖς ἐστὶ τὸ ἐχθρεύς καὶ ὁρίζονται καὶ ἐτεροοούσιον τοῖς νοστηριών δόγματι τῆς καθολικῆς ἐκκλησίας. Καὶ ἐπίστα· Τί οὖν; Ὁικ οὔτε πάς βασιλεῖς Χριστιάνοι καὶ ἱερεῖς; Καὶ εἴποι· Ὁικ ἐστιν; οὐκ γὰρ ἀρκεῖ τὰ παρέστατα θυσιαστήρως, καὶ μετὰ τὸν ἀγιασμὸν τοῦ ἁρτοῦ υἱοῦ αὐτῶν λέγον· Τὰ ἄγια τοῖς ἁγίοις. Οὕτω βατιζές, οὔτε μίρῳ τελετήν ἐπιτελεῖς, οὔτε χειροθετεῖς, καὶ ποιεῖς ἐπισκόπους καὶ πρεσβυτέρους καὶ διακόνους· οὔτε χρίες ναούς, οὔτε τὸ σύμβολο τῆς ἱεροσύνης ἐπισφέτεται, τὸ ὄμοιούσιον καὶ τὸ εισαγγελίων, ὡσπερ τῆς βασιλείας, τὸν στέφανον καὶ τὴν ἀλουργία. Καὶ ἐπίστα· Ποις ἡ Γραφή βασιλέα καὶ ἱερεὰ λέγει εἶναι τὸν Μελχισεδέκ; Καὶ εἴποι· Ἐνοί τοῦ φύσει βασιλεῖς τῶν δῶν Θεοῦ γενομένου φύσει διὰ τήν ἡμῶν σωτηρίαν ἀρχιερεῖς, εἰς

"Ps. 134:6"
Typos annuls the creed.” And you said: “By the Lord, how?” “Let us recite the creed,” I said, “and you must know how it is annulled by the Typos.” And you began to recite it: “I believe in one God, Father almighty, maker of heaven and earth, of all things both seen and unseen.” “Wait a moment,” I said, “and learn how the faith of those in Nicaea is repudiated. I mean that God wouldn’t be a maker were he deprived of a natural will and activity, if he made heaven and earth by an act of will and not through compulsion, if what David says in the Spirit is true: ‘Whatever the Lord willed, he did in heaven and on earth, in the seas and in all the deeps.’ But if the saving faith should be annulled simultaneously with erroneous belief for the sake of an arrangement, this kind of so-called arrangement is a complete separation from God and not a union. I mean that tomorrow the hateful Jews will also begin to say: ‘Let’s arrange a peace with one another, and unite, and let us remove circumcision and you baptism, and we won’t fight with each other any more.’ This is what the Arians too once proposed in writing at the time of Constantine the Great, when they said: ‘Let’s remove the words “homoeousion” and “heteroousion” and let the churches unite.’ Our God-bearing Fathers didn’t accept this; instead they chose to be persecuted and to die rather than pass over in silence an expression which indicated the one supersubstantial godhead of the Father and the Son and the Holy Spirit. And Constantine the Great concurred with those who had made these proposals, as has been recorded by many who diligently wrote about the events of that time. No emperor was able to persuade the Fathers who speak of God to be reconciled with the heretics of their times by means of equivocal expressions. Instead they employed clear and authoritative expressions, and ones that corresponded to the teaching that was being inquired into, saying plainly that it is the mark of priests to make an inquiry and to define on the subject of the saving teachings of the catholic church.” And you said: “Well then, isn’t every Christian emperor also a priest?” And I said: “No, he isn’t, because he neither stands beside the altar, and after the consecration of the bread elevates it with the words: ‘Holy things for the holy’; nor does he baptize, nor perform the rite of anointing, nor does he ordain and make bishops and presbyters and deacons; nor does he anoint churches; nor does he wear the symbols of the priesthood, the pallium and the Gospel book, as [he wears the symbols] of imperial office, the crown and purple.” And you said: “How is it that Scripture says that Melchisedek was king and priest?” And I said: “Melchisedek was a single type of the one who was king by nature, God of all
υπήρξεν τόπος ὁ Μελχισεδέκ. Ὅσο εἶ ὑπάρχει κατὰ τὴν ἀεί 
Μελχισεδέκ ἐτερον λέγεις εἶναι βασιλέα καὶ ιερέα, καὶ τὰ λουτ 
τόλμησον εἶπεν, τῷ ἀπάτωρα, ἀμήτωρα, ἀγενεαλόγητον, μή 
άρχην ἥμερων, μήτε τέλος ζωῆς ἔχοντα, καὶ σκόπει τὸ ἑκ 
τότου ἀναφώμενον κακῶν ἄλος γὰρ εὐρεθήσεται Θεὸς ὁ τοιοῦτος ἐν 
ἀνθρωπίας, κατὰ τὴν τάξεων Μελχισεδέκ, ἀλλ’ ὁ κατὰ τὴν τάξε 
Χριστός τῆς ἡμῶν ἱερουργῶν σωτηρίαν. Πλὴν, τὲ θέλουμε διὰ 
πολλῶν ἑλθείς: Εἰς τὴν ἁγίαν ἀναφορὰν ἐπὶ τῆς ἁγίας τραπέζης, 
μετὰ τοῦ ἀρχιερείας καὶ ιερείας καὶ διακόνων καὶ πᾶν τὸ ἱερατικὸ 
τάγμα, μετὰ τῶν λαϊκῶν ὁ βασιλεύς μνημονεύονται, λέγοντος τοῦ 
διακόνου. Καὶ τῶν ἐν πίστει κεκοιμημένων λαϊκῶν, Κωνσταντίνου, 
Κωνσταντος, καὶ τῶν λουτρῶν. Οὕτως δὲ καὶ τῶν ζῶντων 
μνημονεῦει βασιλέως, μετὰ τοὺς ἱερωμένους πάντας.”

Ταῦτα αὐτοῦ λέγοντος, κράζει ὁ Μηνᾶς: “Ταῦτα λέγων ἔσχε 

σα τὴν ἐκκλησίαν.”

Καὶ λέγει πρὸς αὐτὸν: “Εἰ ὁ λέγων τὰ τῶν ἁγίων Γραφῶν καὶ 
τὰ τῶν ἁγίων πατέρων σχίζει τὴν ἐκκλησίαν, ὁ ἀνατρικὸς τῶν 
ἀγίων δόγματα, τί δειχθήσεται τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ ποιών, ἄν χωρίς οὐ 
ἀυτὸ τοῦτο ἐκκλησίαν εἶναι δυνατόν;”

Καὶ στραφεὶς ὁ σακελλάριος εἰπὼν τοῖς ἀνθρώποις τοῦ ἐξάρχου 

μετὰ κραυγῆς: “Εἴπατε τῷ ἐξάρχῳ· Τοιοῦτον ἀνθρωπόν ὄφειλες 

καθαρίζεις ὃ ὅτι ἔχεις.”

§5. Καὶ λαβὼν αὐτὸν ἔξω, εἰσάγουσι τὸν μαθητὴν, καὶ 
ἀπαίτουσι αὐτὸν κατειπεῖ τοῦ ἐπιστάτου ὑπὸ θλίψεως Πύρρου, 
ἀπεκρίνατο ἤρεμα τῇ φωνῇ τῇ τῆς ἀληθείας ὑπὸ ὁδὸς ἐτίμησι 
Πύρρου ὢς ἐτίμησον ὁ ἐπιστάτης μου.” Καὶ κελεύεται 
κράζει. Καὶ ἐπεθεὶ οὐ κατεδέχατο τῆς προσοψίας μοναχοῦ 
εὐλογηθεὶς φωνῆς ζευγάροις κατερήθηκε αὐτὸν ὑπὸ τῶν 
παρεπτομένων καὶ πιγμαῖς αὐτὸν βαλόντως, ἡμιθανέα πεποικάσαι. 
Καὶ ἀπολυθῶν αὐτὸν ἐπὶ τὰ δεσμωτήρια, καταλαμβάνει τὸν 
γέροντα ὁ Μηνᾶς, λέγων παρασυριὰς τῶν ἀρχώντων “Ἐβαδέν σε ὁ 
Θεὸς, καὶ ἔγαγεν σε ὁδόν, ὃ καὶ ἀπολάβης ὁσα εἰς ἄλλους ἐποίησας, 
πλαυνὸν πάντας εἰς τὰ Ποιγῶνος δόγματα.”

Πρὸς ὅπως εἰπὼν ὁ τοῦ Θεοῦ δοῦλος παρασυρία πάντων “Ἀνάθεμα 
Ὡριγένει καὶ τοῖς δόγμασι αὐτοῦ, καὶ παρὰ σύμφορον αὐτοῦ.”

Καὶ λέγει ὁ πατρικὸς Ἐπιφάνιος: “Εἴπατε, κυρί ἀββᾶ Μηνᾶ, ὁ 
κατ’ αὐτοῦ παρὰ σοι ἐπαγόμενος ψύχος; οὐ καὶ ἤ τὴν Ὠριγνωστὴς, 
ἐπάν ἀναθημάτους, τῆς τοιαύτης ἑαυτῶν ἠλευθέρωσε μέμψεως.
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things, who became by nature a high-priest on account of our salvation. Since you say that there is another person who is king and priest according to the order of Melchisedek, you must also be bold enough to say the rest—that he is without father, without mother, without genealogy, without beginning to his days, nor end to his life. And observe the evil that grows out of this idea—another such person will be found who is God incarnate according to the order of Melchisedek, but not according to the order of Aaron, to work out our salvation. But why do we want to enumerate many points: during the holy anaphora at the holy table, after the high-priests and priests and deacons and the whole clerical rank, the emperors are remembered with the laity when the deacon says: 'And the lay-people who have fallen asleep in faith, Constantine, Constans, and the others.' Thus he remembers the living emperors as well, after all the clergy.

While he was saying this, Menas28 shouted: 'By making these statements you have split the church.'

And he said to him: 'If the one who states what is in Scripture and the holy Fathers splits the church, what will the person who annuls the teachings of saints be shown to do to the church, without which [sc. teachings] the church's very existence is impossible?'

And turning around, the finance minister shouted to the exarch's people: 'Say to the exarch: ‘Should you have allowed a person like this to live where you rule?’”

§5. And when they had taken him outside, they brought in his disciple, and when they demanded that he denounce his superior on the grounds that he had distressed Pyrrhus, he answered in a soft voice what was true: 'Nobody honoured Pyrrhus as my superior did.' And he was ordered to speak up. And because he didn't consent to be deprived of the respectful way of talking that is fitting for monks, he ordered him to be beaten by those standing by; and by punching him they rendered him half-dead. And when they had been dismissed to the prisons, Menas laid hold of the old man, saying in the presence of the officials: 'God has struck you and brought you here so that you might accept the consequences of what you did to others, when you led everyone into the error of the teachings of Origen.'

The servant of God said to him in the presence of everyone: 'Anathema on Origen and his teachings, and on everyone of the same mind as himself.'

And the patrician Epiphanius said: 'The censure adduced by you against him, lord Father Menas, has come to an end, such that, even
§6. Καὶ τῇ αὐτῇ ἡμέρᾳ περὶ τῆς ἁφῆς τοῦ λόχου, Τρώιλος οἱ πατρίκες καὶ Σέργιος οἱ Εὐκρατάς ο ἐπὶ τῆς τραπεζῆς τῆς βασιλικῆς παρεγένοιτο πρὸς τὸν δούλον τοῦ θεοῦ τῶν γέροντα, καὶ καθίσαντες ἐκέλευσαν καὶ αὐτῶν καθίσασθαι, καὶ εἶπον πρὸς αὐτούς: "Εἰπὲ ἢμῖν, κύριε ἄββα, τὴν μεταξὺ σοῦ καὶ Πιέρου γενομένην ἐν Ἀφρικῇ καὶ Ρώμῃ περὶ τῶν δογμάτων κίνησις· καὶ ποιοῖς αὐτῶν ἐπεισάς λόγοις ἀναθεματίσασθαι τὸ δόγμα τὸ ἴδιον, καὶ τῷ αὐτῷ συνυπάθης;"

Καὶ ἀφηγήσατο αὐτοῖς πάντα καθεξῆς, ὡς ἡ μημή ἀνέσωσεν. Καὶ τούτῳ εἶπεν ὅτι "Ἐγὼ δόγμα ἴδιον οὐκ ἔχω, ἀλλὰ τὸ κοινὸν τῆς ἐκκλησίας τῆς καθολικῆς. Ὁ γὰρ ἐκκίνησα φωνὴν τὴν οἰκίαν, ἵνα ἴδιον μου λέγεται δόγμα."  

Καὶ μετὰ πᾶσαν τὴν ἀφήγησιν λέγουσιν αὐτῷ: "Οὗ κοινωνεῖς τῷ θράόν ᾧ Κωνσταντινούπολεως;"

Καὶ εἶπεν: "Οὐ κοινωνῶ."  

"Διὰ ποιὰν οὐ κοινωνεῖς αἰτίαν," εἶπον.  

Απεκρίθη: "Ὅτι τὸν ἀγῶνα τῶν συμμαχών ἔξεβαλον διὰ τῶν ἐν Ἀλεξανδρείᾳ γεγομένων ἐννέα κεφαλαίων· καὶ διὰ τῆς ἐν ταύτῃ τῆς πόλεως γεγομένης παρὰ Σεργίου Εὐχέσεως, καὶ διὰ τοῦ προσεγχοῦς ἐπὶ τῆς ἐκκλησίας ἰσόκτισσος ἐκτεθείσος Τύσου καὶ ὅτι ἀπερ ἐδοξομάτικα διὰ τῶν κεφαλαίων, διὰ τῆς ἐκκλησίας κατέκρινα καὶ ἀπερ ἐδοξομάτισα διὰ τῆς ἐκκλησίας, διὰ τοῦ Τύσου ἡκύρωσαν· καὶ καθέλθαν ἐκατούρως ἐστιαικῶς. Οἱ τοῖς ὑπ᾿ ἐαυτῶσιν κατακριβέντες καὶ ὑπὸ τῶν Ρωμαίων καὶ τῆς μετὰ ταύτῃ ἐπὶ τῆς ἑγδόνης ἱσόκτισσος γεγομένης συνόδου καθαρηθέντες, καὶ τῆς ἱεροσοφίας γεγομένης, ποιῶν ἐπιτελείσα μυστικωμίαν ἢ ποιῶν πνεύμα τοῦ παρὰ τῶν τοιούτων ἐπιτελουμένους ἐπιφορτίζει."  

Καὶ λέγουσιν αὐτῷ: "Τί οὖν; Σὺ μόνος σοὶ καὶ πάντες ἀπολλήνυμι;"

Καὶ εἶπεν: "Οὐδένα κατέκριναν οἱ τρεῖς παιδεῖς μὴ προσκυνήσαντες τῇ εἰκόνῃ, πάντων ἀβραμών προσκυνοῦστων. Οὐ γὰρ ἐσκότωσαν τὰ τῶν ἄλλων, ἀλλ᾿ ἐσκότωσαν ὅσαν ἂν αὐτοῖς μὴ ἐκπέσασιν τῆς ἀδιάθοδος εὐσεβείας.  

1 Cf. Dan. 3:18  

Οὔτω καὶ Δανὴλ βλήθεις εἰς τῶν λάκκων τῶν λεόντων, οὐ κατέκρινε τινὰ τῶν μὴ προσευχαμένων τῷ Θεῷ κατὰ τὸ ἱερό τοῦ Δαρείου, ἀλλὰ τὸ ἴδιον ἐσκότησαν· καὶ εἴπατο ἀποδανεῖν, καὶ μὴ παραπεσεῖν τῷ θεῷ, καὶ ὑπὸ τῆς ἰδίας
if he were an Origenist, he freed himself from a charge like that when he pronounced the anathema. From now on I won’t have a charge of that nature made about him any longer.’ And each one of them was led away to the place where they were kept under guard.

§6. And on the same day about nightfall, Troilus the patrician and Sergius Eucratas,\(^{30}\) the one in charge of the royal table,\(^{31}\) came to the old man, the servant of God, and when they had sat down they ordered him, too, to sit, and said to him: ‘Tell us, lord Father, about the doctrinal dispute which took place between you and Pyrrhus in Africa and Rome, and what words you used to convince him to anathematise his own teaching and to agree to yours.’

And he recounted to them in order everything that his memory had stored up. And he said this: ‘I don’t have a teaching of my own, but the common one of the catholic church. I mean that I haven’t initiated any expression at all that could be called my own teaching.’

And at the end of his entire account they said to him: ‘Aren’t you in communion with the throne of Constantinople?’\(^{32}\)

And he said: ‘No, I’m not.’

‘What’s the reason that you’re not in communion?’ they asked.

He answered: ‘They rejected the four holy synods through the \textit{Nine Chapters} which came into being in Alexandria,\(^ {33}\) and through the \textit{Ekthesis} which came into being in this city by Sergius,\(^ {34}\) and through the \textit{Types} which was published recently in the sixth indiction.\(^ {35}\) What they proclaimed as teaching through the \textit{Chapters}, they condemned through the \textit{Ekthesis}; and what they proclaimed as teaching through the \textit{Ekthesis}, they cancelled through the \textit{Types}; and they condemned themselves as many times.\(^ {36}\) Those, therefore, who passed judgement on themselves and the Romans and were condemned subsequently at the synod which took place in the eighth indiction,\(^ {37}\) and were stripped of the priesthood—what kind of liturgy can they celebrate, or what kind of Spirit can come upon \textit{liturgies} celebrated by such people?’

And they said to him: ‘How can you say that? Is it the case that you’re the only one who’ll be saved, and everyone [else] will be lost?’

And he said: ‘The three boys didn’t pass judgement on anyone when they didn’t adore the idol, while all [other] people did. I mean that they didn’t examine the affairs of others, but they examined the question how they personally shouldn’t lapse from true religious observance. Similarly, too, when Daniel was thrown into the lions’ den he didn’t pass judgement on anyone who hadn’t prayed to God
§7. Λέγουσιν αὐτῷ: "Καὶ τί ἔχεις ποιῆσαι, τῶν Ρωμαίων ἐνυμένου τοις Βοιαντίοις; Ἰδοὺ γὰρ χρῆς ἔλθεν οἱ ἀποκρισαίραι τὸς Ῥώμης, καὶ ἄριστα τῷ Κυριακῷ κοινωνοῦσι τῷ πατριαρχῷ καὶ πάσι δήλω γίνεται ὅτι οὐ διέστρεψε τὸς Ρωμαίον ἰμέλεις σοῦ ἐπαρθένος ἐκεῖθεν, συνέθεντο τοις ἐνταύθα.

Καὶ εἶπεν πρὸς αὐτούς: "Οἱ ἐλθόντες, οἰονίσθητε πρόκριμα τῶν θρόνων Ῥώμης, καὶ κοινωνήσασθαι, ἐπάν οὐκ ἦγαγον πρὸς τὸν πατριαρχὴν ἑπιστολήν, οὐ τοιοῦτον καὶ οὐ πειθοῦσι ποτὲ ὅτι οἱ Ρωμαίοι ἐνυμένοι τοῖς ἐνταύθα, εἰ μὴ ἰμολογήσουσι τὸν Κύριον ἵματον καὶ Θεὸν καθ' ἐκατέρα τῶν ἐὰν, ἐν οἷς τε καὶ ἀπέρ ἐστιν, εἶναι φύσει θελητικῶν τε καὶ ἐνεργητικῶν τῆς ἱμών σωτηρίας."

Καὶ λέγουσιν: "Εἰ δὲ σωματικῶς ἐνυμένοι τοῖς ἐνταύθα οἱ Ρωμαίοι, τί ποιήσεις;"

Καὶ εἶπεν: "Τὸ Πνεῦμα τὸ ἁγιόν διὰ τοῦ ἀποστόλου, καὶ ἀγγέλου ἀναθεματίζει παρά τῷ κύριῳ τοὺς καινότους."

Καὶ λέγουσιν: "Πάντως ἀνάγκη ἐστὶν, θελησίς λέγεσθαι ἐπὶ Χριστοῦ καὶ ἐνεργείας;"

Ἄπεκρίθη: "Πᾶσα ἀνάγκη, εἴπερ ενεσθεῖν κατὰ ἄλλης ἡμῶν ἀληθείας. Οὐδὲν γὰρ τῶν ὑπὸν χωρίς ἐνεργείας φυσικῆς ὑφέστηκεν. Οἱ γὰρ ἁγιοὶ πατέρες φανερῶς λέγουσιν μήτε εἰναὶ μήτε γνώσικεθαι χωρίς τῆς ὑποστολῆς αὐτῆς ἐνεργείας τῇ οἰανθήποτε φύσις. Εἰ δὲ οὕτως ἐστὶν, οὔτε γνώσικεθαι φύσις ἢ ἢ βάσεως χαρακτηρισμός ἐνεργείας, ποίε εἰναι τὸν Χριστὸν τῇ γνωρίζεσθαι Θεὸν ἀλλήθος φύσις καὶ ἀνθρώπου ἐστὶν ὑπαπτὸν. Ἀπολέσας γὰρ, κατὰ τοὺς πατέρας, τὸ βρυγικὸν ὁ λέων, οὐκ ἐτί λέων καὶ τὁ ὑλικτικὸν ὁ κύων, οὐκ ἐτί κύων. Καὶ ἄλλο τὸ ὑπονούν τὸ φυσικὸν αὐτοῦ συστητικὸν ἀπολέσας, οὐκ ἐτί ἐστίν ὑπερ ἤν."
in accordance with the decree of Darius, but he examined his own conduct. And he chose to die and not to backslide from God, and to be flayed by his own conscience in the matter of the transgression of the natural law. May God then grant me too not to pass judgment on anyone or to declare that I'm the only one who's saved. To the best of my ability I'll choose to die rather than have on my conscience the worry that in some way or other I have suffered a lapse with regard to belief in God.

§7. They said to him: 'And what will you be in a position to do, should the Romans be united with the Byzantines? Look, after all, the apocrisiarii came from Rome yesterday, and they will communicate with the patriarch tomorrow, Sunday—it will become clear to everyone that it was you who turned the Romans away. Doubtless with you removed from here, they will agree with the Byzantines.'

And he said to them: 'Those who have come won't prejudice the see of Rome in any way, even if they do communicate, because they haven't brought a letter to the patriarch. And I'll never be convinced that the Romans will be united with the Byzantines, unless they confess that our Lord and God by nature wills and works our salvation according to each [of the natures] from which he is, and in which he is, as well as which he is.'

And they said: 'But if the Romans should come to terms with the Byzantines, what will you do?'

And he said: 'The Holy Spirit, through the apostle, condemns even angels who innovate in some way contrary to what is preached.'

And they said: 'Is it altogether necessary to speak of wills and activities on the subject of Christ?'

He replied: 'Altogether necessary, if we want to worship in truth, for no being exists without natural activity. I mean that the holy Fathers say plainly that it is impossible for any nature at all to exist or be recognised apart from its essential activity. And if a nature can neither exist nor be known apart from the activity which characterizes it according to substance, how is it possible for Christ to exist or be known as truly God and human being by nature? After all, according to the Fathers, the lion that loses its roar is no longer a lion, and if the dog loses its bark, it's no longer a dog. And anything else that loses what is naturally constitutive of it is no longer what it was.'

And they said to him: 'We actually know that this is so. But don't distress the emperor, who issued the Typos for the sake of peace and that alone, not because he wanted to destroy any of those things
ἐπὶ εἰρήνη τὴν σωτηρίαν τῶν ποιούσιν τὴν διάστασιν φωνῶν ὁμονομούντα·”

Καὶ ῥίφας ἐκατὸν ὁ τοῦ Θεοῦ δούλος εἰς τὴν γῆν μετὰ δακρύων εἶπεν: “Ὅδε ὦφειλεν λυπηθῆναι ὁ ἀγαθὸς καὶ εὐσεβὴς δεσπότης κατὰ τῆς ἐμῆς ταπεινώσεως. Ὁ γὰρ δύναμιν λυπήσαι τὸν Θεόν σωτηρίαν ἀπερ αὐτοῦ λαλεῖσθαι καὶ ὁμολογεῖσθαι προσέλθειν. Εἰ γὰρ κατὰ τὸν θεῖον ἀπόστολον αὐτὸς ἔστω ὁ θέμενος ἐν τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ, πρῶτον ἀποστόλου, δεύτερον προφήτου, τρίτου διδασκάλου· δήλου ἐστὶν ὅτι αὐτὸς ἔστω ὅ διὰ τούτων λαλήσας. Διὰ πάσης οὖν τῆς ἁγίας Γραφῆς, τῆς τε παλαιᾶς καὶ νεῶς διαθήκης, καὶ τῶν ἁγίων διδασκάλων καὶ σωφρόνων διδασκαλόμεθα, θελητικῶν τε καὶ ἐνεργητικῶν θεοτητῆς τε καὶ ἀνθρωπότητι, τὸν ασκουθέντα Θεόν. Οὐδενὸς γὰρ τῶν οἷς ὁ θεός γενόσκεται, ἢ τῶν οἷς ἀνθρώπου φύσει γνωρίζεται χωρίς ἁμαρτίας ἐστὶν ἐλληπής. Εἰ δὲ τέλειός ἐστι καθ’ ἐκάτερον, ὡς οὐδεὶς καθ’ ἐκάτερον ἐλληπής, προβαλόν τὸ κατ’ αὐτὸν ὅλον νυστέψας μνηστήριον ὁ μὴ ὁμολογῶν αὐτὸν εἶναι ὅπερ ἔστω, μετὰ τῶν προσώπων αὐτῷ καθ’ ἐκάτερον, τῶν ἐξ ἀυτὸς τε καὶ ἀπερ ἔστω, πάντων φυσικῶν ἰδιωμάτων.”

§8. Καὶ μικρὸν σωτήρας, καὶ ἀλλότριος προσωπεύεις λέγοντας: “Πόθεν δύνασαι δείξαι, ὅτι τὰς συνόδους ἐκβάλλουσαν οἱ τοῦ βρόντος Κωνσταντινουπόλεως;”

Καὶ λέγει αὐτοῖς: “Ἡ δεδεικται μερικῶς, διὰ τῶν εἰς Ρώμην λαληθέντων παρ’ ἐμοῦ πρὸς τὸν κύριον Γρηγόριον τὸν ἀσηχρητέας καὶ νῦν εἰ παρετέρωσε τὴν δεσπότητα τοῦ δεσποτῆς, καὶ κελεύει δοθῆναι ἄδειαν τῷ ἀναζύω ὅμων δοῦλῳ, καὶ ποιῶ γνῶσιν βιβλίων, ὅτι τὰ ἐμα ἀφηρήθησαν, καὶ πᾶσα φανερὸν ποιῶ τοῦτο, χωρίς οἰκοδομής τοῦροσ λόγων.”

Καὶ λόσι σὲ ἀλλότριος πολλῶν λαληθέντων, εἰς γραφικοῖς καὶ φυσικοῖς ἐτράπησε γνωμασίας τε καὶ θεωρίας, ἑδ’ αἰς ἡμινηθέντες, ἐξαιρέτως διετήθησαν καὶ ἐξαντλεῖ δέγην: “Οὗτος ὁ Κύριος ὄψετε τῇ ἐκ τοῦ νῦν ὁχλεῖν ὑμῖν ἔχομεν.”

§9. Ο δὲ κύριε Σέρχιος εἶπεν αὐτῷ ὅτι “Πολλάκις ἔλθων εἰς τὸ κελλίου σου εἰς Βεββαῖα, καὶ ἤκρισαμένην τής διδασκαλίας σου καὶ ὁ Θεὸς ἔχει βοηθήσας σοι καὶ μὴ ἀγωνίας. Εἰς ὅ ὅ μόνον

1 Cor. 12:28
2 Heb. 4:15
apprehended spiritually on the subject of Christ, but because, with an eye to peace, he was arranging for the silencing of the expressions which were causing the dissension.'

And throwing himself on the ground, the servant of God said tearfully: 'The good and orthodox master shouldn’t be distressed by my lowliness. I say this because I cannot distress God by keeping silent about what he himself ordered to be said and confessed. For if, according to the divine apostle, he is the one who founded the church first apostles, second prophets, third teachers, it’s clear that he is the one who spoke through them. Throughout all of holy Scripture, therefore, both the Old and the New Testaments, and also throughout the holy teachers and synods, we are taught that the incarnate God both wills and works in both his divinity and his humanity. For he lacks none of those things in which he is recognised as God, or of those things in which he is known by nature as a human being, except sin. If he is complete according to each, in that he is not lacking in anything with respect to either, obviously the person who doesn’t confess him to be what he is, with all the natural properties which belong to him according to each (both those from which, in which, and which he is), is adulterating the whole mystery concerning Christ.'

§8. And after being silent for a while, they said while nodding to each other: 'How are you able to show that those in charge of the see of Constantinople rejected the synods?'

And he said to them: 'It’s already been shown in part from what I said in Rome to the lord Gregory the secretary. And now if it pleases the master for it to be shown, he will give an order that permission be given to your unworthy servant, and I shall make a list of books (because mine have been confiscated), and I’ll make this plain to everyone without any verbal riddles.'

And subsequently, when many other matters had been discussed, they turned both arguments and thoughts to Scripture, nature, and grammar. They enjoyed these discussions, and their attitude became more cheerful. And they began to say: 'The Lord knows that we have obtained spiritual profit, and from now on we won’t importune you.'

§9. Lord Sergius said to him: 'Often I went to your cell in Bebbas and listened to your teaching. God will come to your aid. Don’t be anxious. There’s only one point on which you distress everyone, namely that you’re causing many people to be separated from the communion of the church here.'
λυτείς πάντας, ὅτι πολλοὶ ποιεῖς χωρισθήναι τῆς κοινωνίας τῆς ἐνταῦθα ἐκκλησίας.

“Εστί τίς ο λέγων,” εἶπεν ὁ δοῦλος τοῦ Θεοῦ, “ὅτι εἶπον ‘Μὴ κοινωνήσῃ τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ τῶν Βυζαντίων’,”

Απεκρίθη ὁ κύριος Σέργιος: “Αὐτὸ τοῦτό τὸ σὲ μὴ κοινωνεῖν, μεγάλη πρὸς πάντας ἐστὶ φωνὴ μὴ κοινωνηθεῖσα.”

Καὶ εἶπεν ὁ τοῦ Θεοῦ δοῦλος: “Οὐδὲν βιαστέρου συνειδότος καθηγοροῦντος, καὶ οὐδὲν τούτῳ συνηγοροῦντος παρρησιαστικώτερον.”

Ακούσας δὲ ὁ κύριος Τρωίλος ὁ τῷ Τύπῳ ἀναθεματίζεται εἰς πᾶσαν τὴν δύσαν, λέγει πρὸς τὸν δοῦλον τοῦ Θεοῦ: “Καλὸν ἔστω, ὅτι τοῦ εὐσεβοῦς ἡμῶν δεσπότου ἡ ὑπόληψις ὑβρίζεται.”

Απεκρίθη ὁ τοῦ Θεοῦ δοῦλος: “Ὁ Θεὸς συγχωρήσει τοῖς ἐκβιβάζοις τῶν δεσπότην ποιήσαι τῶν Τύπων καὶ τοῖς συγχωρήσαι.”

Καὶ λέγει: “Τίνες εἰσὶν οἱ ἐκβιβάζοις, καὶ τίνες οἱ συγχωρόμενοι.”

Απεκρίθη: “Οἱ τῆς ἐκκλησίας ἐξεβιβαζον, καὶ οἱ ἀρχινότες συνεχόμενοι καὶ δοῦο ο ὑσπὸς ἐκ τῶν ὑπενθύμων εἰς τὸν ἄθων καὶ καθαρῶν πάσης αἱρέσεως ἐξετινάχθη. Ἀλλὰ συμβουλεύσατε ποιῆσαι ὁ ἐσόφησα ὁ ἐν εὐσεβείᾳ τῇ μνήμῃ γενόμενος αὐτοῦ πάππος. Ἐκεῖνος γὰρ αἰσθάνεσθαι ὅτι ὄψιν αὐτοῦ των κατὰ τὴν δύσαν καταχέουσιν, διὸ κελεύσας ἐλευθεροί εὐπάθος ἐσοφησάς τῆς ἐστὶν ἐκκλησίας μέμφειν, γράφας ὅτι ‘Ἡ Ἐκκλησίας οὐκ ἐστὶν ἐμ᾽ ὅστε γὰρ ἐν γῇ ὑπηρέτειν, ἡ ἐκκλησία γενόται ἀλλὰ Σέργιος αὐτὴν ἐν πατριαρχίᾳ συντάξας πρὸ πέντε ἔτων τοῦ ἀνέλθειν με ἀπὸ τῆς ἀναπτολῆς, ἐδείξας μοι κατὰ ταύτῃ γενόμενα τὴν πανευρίμασα πάλιν, συνιομένη μοι προτεθήκαν αὐτὴν μεθ᾽ ὑπογραφῆς καὶ κατεδέξαμεν τὴν ἑκείνου παράκλησιν. Νῦν δὲ γινόμενος ὅτι τωφ᾽ αὐτὴν διαμαζόμεναι πάσιν ἔχοντο ποιώ, ὅτι οὐκ ἐστὶν ἐμ᾽ ὅστε ταύτῃ ἐποιήσατο τὴν κέλεσαι πρὸς τὸν μακάριον Ἰωάννην τὸν πάπαν, κατακρίνοντα τὴν Ἐκκλησίαν ἐν τοῖς πρὸς Πύρρων τότε γραφείοιν. Καὶ ἐκτοτε Σέργιος χρηματίζει πανταχοῦ εἶναι ἡ Ἐκκλησίας. Τοῦτο ποιήσαι καὶ ὁ νῦν εὐσεβῶς βασιλεύων ἡμῶν, καὶ μένει παντελῶς ἀχάρτος πάσης μέμφεως ἡ πρόληψις αὐτοῦ.”

Τότε σεισάμενας τὰς κεφαλὰς, ἐσοίότισαν, τοῦτο μόνον εἰρηκότες: “Ολα δυσαρέσκη καὶ ἀνέκβατα.”

Τούτων καὶ ἐτέρων διαφόρων λαλήθετεν, προσκυνηθεῖσαν καὶ προσκυνήσαντες, μετὰ πάσης ἡλιοτητῆς ἀνέκβατον.
'Is there anyone,' said the servant of God, 'who claims that I said: 'Don’t communicate with the church of the Byzantines’?'

Lord Sergius answered: 'The very fact that you’re not in communion is a great argument for everyone not to be in communion.'

And the servant of God said: 'There’s nothing more compelling than an accusing conscience, and nothing more outspoken than a supporting one.'

Lord Troilus, on hearing that the Typos was anathematized throughout the entire West, said to the servant of God: 'Is it a good thing that the reputation of our orthodox master suffer outrage?'

The servant of God answered: 'May God forgive those who caused the master to issue the Typos and those who allowed it.'

And he said: 'Who are the ones who caused [him to issue it] and who are the ones who allowed it?'

He answered: 'The ecclesiastical officials caused [him to do it] and the state officials allowed it. Look at how the filth from those responsible has spread out over the one who is innocent and pure of any heresy. But advise him to do what his late grandfather did, [who is kept] in orthodox memory: on becoming aware that some people in the West were heaping blame on him, he freed himself of any censure from the church through a decree which he composed:43 "The Ekthesis is not mine, for I neither dictated it nor ordered its composition. But the patriarch Sergius, who composed it five years before my return from the East,46 requested me on my return to that all-fortunate city that it be published in my name with my signature. And I acceded to his demand. Now, however, knowing that some people are in dispute over it, I am making it clear to everyone that it is not mine." He issued this decree to the blessed Pope John, who had condemned the Ekthesis at the time when he wrote to Pyrrhus.47 And from that time on the Ekthesis was called everywhere the work of Sergius. Let the one who now rules over us in an orthodox manner do this too, and his reputation will remain completely undefiled by any censure.'

Then, shaking their heads, they became silent, saying only this: 'The whole problem is difficult and insoluble.'

After these and other different matters had been discussed, they exchange obeisances and left very cheerfully.
§10. Καὶ πάλιν τῷ ἄλλῳ αὐξβάτηρι, ἀνήγαγον αὐτοὺς ἐν τῷ παλαιῷ· καὶ εἰσέφερον τῷ πρῶτῳ τὸν μαθητή τοῦ γέροντος, συνελθόντων τότε καὶ τῶν δύο πατριαρχῶν· καὶ ἀγούσων Κωνσταντίνον καὶ Μηνᾶν κατηγόρους τοῦ γέροντος, καὶ ἀπαιτοῦσα τοὺς μαθητὴν συγκαταθέσατο τοῖς παρ᾽ αὐτῶν λεγομένοις. Μετά δὲ πάσης τῆς παρηγορίας εἶπεν ὁ μαθητὴς ἀφόβας πρὸ τῆς σύγκλητος: Ἑκατοντάτου εἰσάγετε ἐν σεκρέτῳ παλαιόν; Οὕτως οὐκ ἔστω ὅστε πρεσβύτερος, οὔτε μοναχὸς, ἀλλὰ τριβοῦνες θυμέλησις. Ἑγκυρίσθη Ἀφρος καὶ Ρωμαίως, ποίᾳ γόναις βούκαις ἤλθεν ἐκείνος. Πάντες ἔμαθον τὰς παυρογιαίας αὐτοῦ, ἃς ἐποίησεν πρὸς τὸ λαβεῖν, ποτὲ μὲν λέγων ὅτι ἀδελφαὶ αὐτοῦ εἰσίν, ποτὲ δὲ ὅτι Διὰ τὸ μὴ κοινωνήσας τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ Κωνσταντινουπόλεως ἐπήρα αὐτὸς, ἵνα μὴ χρανθᾶσιν τῇ αἱρετικῇ κοινωνίᾳ. Ἀλλὰ καὶ πάλιν ἐὰν λείψῃ αὐτῷ σπαστάλη, καὶ εὐρή χώραν μὴ γνωρίζουσαν αὐτῶν, τὰ αὐτὰ ποιεῖ, αἰλεροῖ κέρδους χάριν, καὶ μισάμην ήδονής. Καὶ μεγάλη ἀλαχῦς ἔστω ὅ τι καὶ συντριγχάνεις αὐτῷ, τοῖς σεμνῶς βιοίναι βέλους."

Εἶτα μετὰ ταῦτα, ἐρωτηθεῖς εἰ τῶν Τύπων ἀνεθεμάτισαν, ἀφόβων εἶπεν ὁ θέσης ἀνεθεμάτισα, ἀλλὰ καὶ λυβέλλων ἐποίησα." "Τί οὖν; Ὄχι ἡμολογεῖς πεποιηκέναι κακός;" λέγουσιν αὐτῷ οἱ ἄρχοντες.

Καὶ λέγει: "Μὴ δοῦ ὁ Θεὸς ἵνα ὅπερ ἐποίησα καλῶς κατὰ θεσμῶν ἐκκλησιαστικῶν, εἴπω γεγενηθαί κακῶς."


Ἀπεκρίθη ὁ τοῦ Θεοῦ διδάσκω: "Εγὼ βασιλέα οὐκ ἀνεθεμάτισα, ἀλλὰ χάρτην ἀλλότριον τῆς ἐκκλησιαστικῆς πίστεως."
§10. And again, on the next Saturday, they brought them into the palace. And they brought in first the old man’s disciple, the two patriarchs also being present at the time. And they brought Constantine and Menas, the old man’s accusers, and these demanded that the disciple agree entirely with what they had said. With great outspokenness the disciple said fearlessly to the senate: ‘Are you bringing Constantine into the privy chamber of the palace? He’s neither a priest nor a monk, but a pander. It was known to the Africans and Romans what kind of females he kept when he went there. Everyone knew the tricks he used to hide the fact: sometimes he said that they were his sisters, sometimes he said: “I took them so that they wouldn’t be in communion with the church of Constantinople, in case they be stained by communion with heretics.” And again, if the opportunity for wantonness failed him, and he found a region where he was unknown, he would do the same things for the sake of disgusting profit and dirty pleasure. And for those who want to lead a decent life it’s a great shame ever to come in contact with him.’ Then after that, when he was asked if he had anathematized the Typos, he answered fearlessly: ‘Not only have I anathematized it, but I’ve also composed a small document [against it].’

“How can you say that? Don’t you confess that you’ve acted wrongly?” the officials said to him.

And he said: ‘May God not grant that I should say that what I did correctly according to the law of the church was done wrongly.’

§11. And when he had been asked many other questions and had answered as God provided, he was led out of the privy chamber, and they brought in the old man, and lord Troilus said to him: ‘Speak, Father. Look, speak the truth, and the master will have pity on you; because if we go through a legal enquiry and if even one of the accusations against you is true, the law will take your life.’

And he said: ‘I’ve already said, and I say it again, that if one single thing is said to be true, Satan too is God. But if he’s not God but an apostate, the accusations made against me are also false and without substance. Still, if you order something to be done, so be it. If I worship God I won’t come to harm.’

And he said to him: ‘Didn’t you anathematize the Typos?’

He answered: ‘I’ve said many times that I did.’

He said to him: ‘You’ve anathematized the Typos—you’ve anathematized the emperor.’
Καὶ λέγει αὐτῷ: “Ποῦ ἀνθεμαστίσθη;”

“Υπὸ τῆς συνόδου Ῥώμης” ἀπεκρίθη, “εἰς τὴν ἐκκλησίαν τοῦ" Σωτήρος καὶ εἰς τὴν Θεοτόκον.”

Τότε λέγει πρὸς αὐτὸν ὁ ἑπαρχός: “Κοινωνεῖς τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ τῶν ἰδέων, ἢ ὡς κοινωνεῖς;”

Ἀπεκρίθη, καὶ ἔπειν “Οὐ κοινωνῶ.”

Λέγει αὐτῷ: “Διὰ τί;”

Ἀπεκρίθη “Ὄσι ἐξ ἐμέ έναλέω τὸς συνόδου;”

Καὶ ἔπειν “Ἐάν ἐξω ἐμαθεί τὸς συνόδου, πῶς εἰς τὰ δίπτυχα ἀναφέρονται;”

Καὶ λέγει: “Καὶ τίς ἄνησις ὀνομάτων, τῶν δοχείων ἐκμαθη-μένων;”

“Καὶ δύνασαι,” ἔφη, “τούτο δείξαι;”

Καὶ ἔπειν “Ἐάν λάβω ἀδειαν, καὶ κελεύετε, δειξθήται ἔχει τούτο πάνω εὐχέρως;”

Καὶ οἰκοτικῶν πάντων λέγει αὐτῷ ὁ σακελλάριος: “Διὰ τί ἀγαπᾶς τοὺς Ρωμαίους, καὶ τοὺς Γαλατίους μισεῖς;”

Ἀποκριθεὶς ὁ τοῦ Θεοῦ δοῦλος ἔπειν “Παραγγελιὰν ἐχομεν τοῦ μῆ μεσίσα τινα.” Ἀγαπῶ τοὺς Ρωμαίους ὡς ὁμοστόους, τοὺς δὲ Γαλατίους ὡς ὁμογλόους;”

Καὶ πάλιν λέγει αὐτῷ ὁ σακελλάριος: “Πάσων ἐτῶν λέγεσαι σεαυτόν;”

Ἀπεκρίθη “οὐ.”

Καὶ λέγει αὐτῷ: “Πάσος ἅρις ἔχει μετὰ σοῦ ὁ μαθητής σου;”

Ἀπεκρίθη “λῦ;”

Τότε ἀνέκραξεν εἰς κληρικόν: “Ἀπέβαλκε σοι ὁ Θεός ὃς ἐποίησε τῷ μακαρίῳ Πύρρῳ.”

Πρὸς ὁν οἴδει ἀπεκρίθη ὅλως.

§12. Τοσοῦτον δὲ λαληθέντων ἐν τῷ σκέτῳ, οὐδεὶς οἴδει δόλως τῶν πατριαρχῶν ἐβδέλυσατο. Ἐν δὲ τῷ κυνείθαι περὶ τῆς συνόδου Ῥώμης λόγων, κράζει ὁ Δημοσθένης: “Οὐ κεκύρωται ή σύνοδος, τοῦ συγκρότησαντος αὐτὴν καθαρεύνετος.”

Καὶ λέγει ὁ τοῦ Θεοῦ δοῦλος: “Ὁ καθηρέθη, ἀλλ’ ἐδιώκθη. Ποια γέγονεν ἐπὶ τοῖς πατραγμένοις συνοδίῳ καὶ κανονικῇ ἀσφαλείᾳ ἐχόμενον αὐτῷ τὴν καθαρεύσιν; Πλὴν ἦν καὶ κανονικῶς καθηρέθη, οὐ ποιεῖ τούτῳ πρόκριμα τοῖς ὀρθοδόξως κατὰ τοὺς

* Cf. Matt. 5: 38-48, Lk. 6: 27
The servant of God answered: 'I haven’t anathematized the emperor, but a document alien to the faith of the church.'

And he said to him: 'Where was it anathematized?'

'During the synod of Rome,' he answered, 'in the Church of the Saviour and in that of the Mother of God.'

Then the eparch said to him: 'Are you in communion with the church of the people in this city, or are you not?'

He answered and said: 'I'm not.'

He said to him: 'Why?'

He answered: 'Because it has rejected the synods.'

And he said: 'If it has rejected the synods, how is it that they are referred to in the diptychs?'

And he said: 'What’s the use of names, if the teachings have been rejected?'

'And can you,' he said, 'prove this?'

And he said: 'If I have permission, and you give the order, it will be very easy for this to be proven.'

And when everyone had stopped speaking the finance minister said to him: 'Why do you love the Romans, and hate the Greeks?'

The servant of God said in reply: 'We have a commandment not to hate anybody. I love the Romans because we share the same faith, whereas I love the Greeks because we share the same language.'

And again the finance minister 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 clerics called out: 'God has paid you back for what you did to blessed Pyrrhus.'

To this man he made no reply at all.

§12. During the lengthy discussions in the privy chamber, not one of the patriarchs said anything at all. But when mention was made of the synod of Rome, Demosthenes called out: 'The synod has not been ratified, because the person who convened it has been deposed.'

And the servant of God said: 'Not deposed but banished. What synodical and canonical act is there in the proceedings which firmly supports his deposition? Still, even if he were canonically deposed, this does not prejudice what was ratified in an orthodox manner through
§13. Ταύτα δει ἡ μνήμη κατέχει τὰ κεκινμένα καὶ λειλαμβάνει· καὶ εἰς τοῦτον τὰ κατ᾽ αὐτοῦ κατέληξε τέλος, ἀπολυθήνας καὶ τοῦ ἄγιον γέροντος ἐν τῇ φρουρᾷ ἀπὸ τοῦ σεκρέτου. Καὶ τῇ ἐπαύριον, ἢτις ἦν κυριακή, συμβούλιον ποιήσαντες οἱ τῆς ἐκκλησίας, ἐπεισοῦν τὸν βασιλέα, ταύτῃ αὐτοῦ κατακρινών τὴν πικρὰν καὶ ἀπάνθρωπον ἐξορίαν, δημημένους ἀληθῶν τῶν μὲν ἄγιων γέροντας εἰς Βίζυμη κάστρον τῆς Θράκης· τὸν δὲ μαθητὴν αὐτοῦ εἰς Πέρβεριν, ὥστε ἐχει ἐξαπέστει ἡμᾶς ποδός ή Ῥωμαίων βασιλέα· ἀπρονοήτους, γυμνοὺς, ἀτρόφους, πάσης τῆς πρὸς τὸ ξύλον ἀφορίσῃς ἐστερημένους· ἡ ἐγνίωσας θαλάσση, ἃ μὴ ἐγνωσάς ἐκ τῶν ἑλεομάνων ἐπίσκεψιν. Καὶ αὕτως εἰσὶν γνωμοί καὶ ἀτροφοί, μόνην ἔχοντες τῆς ἑλπίδα τοῦ Θεοῦ· παρακαλοῦντες πάντας Χριστιανούς καὶ τούτο βοώντες· „Εἴσασθε διὰ τὸν Κύριον, ἵνα τελειώσῃ ὁ Θεός τὸ ἔλεος αὐτοῦ μετὰ τῆς ταπεινότατος ἡμῶν, καὶ διδάξῃ ἡμᾶς ὅτι οἱ συμπλήντες αὐτοῦ· ἡρωμένης πείρας λαμβάνον διάθεσιν, ἀνέμους καὶ κύμασιν δοξολογεῖν τοῦ τοιαύτου, ἀκατοστείλατο διὰ διαμένωντος.“ Σὺγχωρεῖ γὰρ κλάδωνς μεγάλου αὐτοῦ περιτριθήναι, δοκιμῶν αὐτῶν τὴν περὶ αὐτῶν διάθεσιν, ἢ μεγάλη φωνῆ κράζουσι· Κύριε, σιώπη ἡμᾶς, ἀπολλύμεθα ἢ καὶ μάθωσι πάντα μόνω αὑτῷ ἐπιγράφει, τὰ τῆς αὐτῶν σωτηρίας· καὶ μὴ πεποιθῆτε ὅσιν ἐπὶ ἑαυτοῖς, καὶ τύχων γαλήνης μεγάλης, τοῦ ἀνέμου καὶ τῶν κυμάτων κατ- εναισθέντων. Καὶ εἰς μέσον λύκων αὐτοῦς εκδίκασε, καὶ διὰ τῆς σταυροῦ πίλης ἐξελθεῖν, καὶ διὰ τῆς παρακλήσεως ἔδεικνυτο τῷ παρακλητῷ· καὶ λυμῶν, καὶ δώρων, καὶ γύμνων, καὶ δέσμων, καὶ φυλάκων, καὶ ἀπαγωγών, καὶ κατηγορίας, καὶ σταυρῶν, καὶ ἄλλων, καὶ ἄλλων, καὶ χολής, καὶ ἐμπτύσματα, καὶ ἐπιτυγχάνει, καὶ κολοφύσιμα, καὶ ἔπαιγμον καταπληκτοῖς, καὶ πάθος καὶ διαδόθης πολυτρόπους· ἐν τέλεσι, ἡ παμφοῖς ἀνάστασις, φέρουσα μεθ' ἑαυτῆς εἰρήνην τοῖς δι' αὐτὸν διωκομένων, καὶ χαράν τοῖς δι' αὐτὸν θλιβομένων, καὶ ἄναληψιν εἰς ὀφθαλμοὺς, καὶ προσωπογράφης τῷ πατρικῷ καὶ ὑπερούσῳ θρόνῳ, καὶ ληξιὰ ὑπεράμως πάσης ἐρχόμενης ὑπεράμως καὶ ἐξουσίας καὶ δυνάμεως καὶ κυριότητος· καὶ παντὸς
the sacred canon, with which the writings of the late Pope Theodore concur as well.'

And lord Troilus said when he heard this: 'You don't know what you're saying, Father. What's happened has happened.'

§13. This was what was done and said, as much as can be remembered. And the process against them came to an end like this, when the holy old man was dismissed from the privy chamber into prison. And on the next day, which was Sunday, the ecclesiastical officials took counsel and persuaded the emperor to sentence them to this cruel and inhuman exile, separating them from each other, the holy old man to Bizya, a fort in Thrace, his disciple to Perberis, which is the furthest outpost of the Roman empire, without provisions, without clothing, without nourishment, deprived of all resources for living. They were not close to the sea, so that they did not have visits from those who took pity on them. And so they are, without clothing and without nourishment, having only hope in God. They exhort all Christians with the cry: 'Pray through the Lord that God may perfect his mercy by the aid of our dejection, and may teach us that those who sail along with him experience a savage sea, as the ship is tossed by wind and wave, but remains unshakeable.' Their point is that he allowed them to be tried by rough surf, testing their disposition towards him, so that they might call out loudly: 'Lord, save us—we're perishing'; and so that they might learn to attribute to him everything that pertained to their salvation; and so that by not relying on themselves they might attain great calm when the wind and the waves had been lulled. And he delivers them into the midst of wolves and encourages them to go in through the narrow gate, and to travel along the straight path. And he offers them hunger, thirst, nakedness, bonds, prisons, guards, captivity, scourging, a cross, nails, vinegar, bile, spitting, slapping, buffeting, and mockery. And suffering and different types of death. The end of these [tribulations] is a radiant resurrection, bringing peace with it for those who have been persecuted on his account, and joy to those who have been afflicted on his account, and ascent into heaven, and access to the Father's super-essential throne, and an appointed place above every rule and authority and power and domination, and above every name that is named, whether in the present age or in the age to come. May we all obtain it, through the prayers and intercessions of the ever-virgin Mary, who is truly by nature Mother of God, all-praiseworthy and all-revered and supremely glorious, and of the holy apostles, prophets, and martyrs, amen.
RELATIO MOTIONIS

ἀνόματος ὅνομαζομένου, εἰτε ἐν τῷ αἰῶνι τούτῳ, εἰτε ἐν τῷ μέλλοντι ὃς τύχομεν ἀπαντεῖ, εὐχαῖς καὶ προσβείαις τῆς παν-

υμνήτου καὶ πανσέπτου καὶ ὑπερενδόξου κυρίως φύσει Θεοτόκου καὶ ἀειπαρθένου Μαρίας, καὶ τῶν ἁγίων ἀποστόλων, προφητῶν καὶ μάρτυρων ἁμήν.

1 Eph. 1: 21
DISPUTATIO INTER MAXIMUM
ET THEODOSIUM
DISPUTATIO INTER MAXIMUM ET THEODOSIUM, EPISCOPUM CAESAREAEE BITHYNIAE
(CPG 7735)

Τόμος περιέχον τα κινηθέντα δόγματα μεταξύ του ἐν ἁγίωσ Μαξίμου καὶ Θεοδοσίου ἐπισκόπου Καισαρείας τῆς Βιθνίας, καὶ τῶν σὺν αὐτῷ ἀρχόντων τοῦ παλαιτίου.

§1. Τὰ κεκινημένα περὶ τῆς ἀμωμῆς ἦμῶν τῶν Χριστιανῶν πίστεως καὶ τῆς τῶν δι᾽ ἐναντίας παρεισάκτου καινοτομίας μεταξύ τοῦ τε ἅββᾶ Μαξίμου καὶ Θεοδοσίου ἐπισκόπου Καισαρείας Βιθνίας ἀναγκαίων ἡγεσάμην κατάδηλα ποιήσαι πάσην ὑμᾶς τοῖς ἐν ὀρθοδοξίᾳ διατελούσιν, ἵνα ἀκριβέστερον τὰ περὶ τούτων εἴδεναι ἔχοντες, δοξάζητε μᾶλλον τὸν φιλάθρωπον Θεόν, τὸν διδάσκοντα λόγον ἐν ἀνοίγει τοῦ στόματος τῶν φοβουμένων αὐτῶν μήπως συνήθως οἱ ἔχοντες τῆς ἀληθείας, τάναντα ταύτης διαφημίζοντες, ἐκταράζωμε νῦμοι τὰς καρδίας.

§2. Τοιγαροῦν τῇ εἰκάδι τετάρτῃ τοῦ Ἀναγόμοντος μηνὸς τῆς νῦν παρελθοῦσης τεσσαρακοσίων ἐπιμελήσεως, ἐξῆλθε πρὸς αὐτὸν ἐν ἢ παρεφυλαττετό εξορία, τούτεστιν ἐν τῷ τάκτῳ Ἰεῖμησ, ὁ ῥήτεις ἐπισκόπου Θεοδόσιος ὡς ἐπεν ἐκ προσώπου Πέτρου τοῦ προεδροῦ Καυσαρείας τοῦκελεούντος λόγων πεμφθεῖς, καὶ Παῦλος καὶ Θεοδόσιος οἱ ὑποτικοὶ, ὡς ἐπεῖν καὶ αὐτοὶ ἐκ προσώπου τοῦ βασιλέως πεμφθέντες καὶ ἀνελθόντες πρὸς τὸν ἐθιμόνον μοναχὸν Μαξίμου, ἐν ὡ τόπῳ ἀπεκκελείσθη, ἐκάθισαν, καὶ ἐπέτρεψαν καὶ αὐτὸν καθίσασθαι, συνάντος αὐτοὺς δηλούσι καὶ τοῦ ἐπισκόπου Βιθνίας.

§3. Καὶ λέγει πρὸς αὐτῶν Θεοδόσιος ὁ ἐπίσκοπος: “Πῶς ἔχεις, κύρι ἅββᾶ;”

Witnesses: RXL, AM, SW, ND

* Eph. 6:19
A book containing the teachings which were discussed between holy Maximus and Theodosius, bishop of Caesarea in Bithynia,\(^1\) and the rulers of the palace [who were] with them.

§1. I have thought it necessary to make evident to all of you who persevere in right belief the discussions between Father Maximus and Theodosius, bishop of Caesarea Bithynia, concerning our blameless Christian faith and the innovation which was introduced by those outside it. My purpose is that when you have more accurate knowledge of these matters you will glorify the more God who loves human beings, who gives a word in the opening of the mouth of those who fear him, so that the enemies of the truth, in their usual way, do not spread abroad the opposite of what happened, and trouble your hearts.

§2. It was, then, on the twenty-fourth day of August in the fourteenth indiction just passed that Bishop Theodosius, whom I have mentioned, went out to Maximus in the place of exile where he was held (that is, in the fort of Bizya), being sent, as he claimed, as the representative of Peter, patriarch of Constantinople. The consuls Paul and Theodosius,\(^2\) too, were sent, as they too claimed, as the emperor's representatives. And when they reached the monk Maximus, whom I have mentioned, in the place where he was imprisoned, they sat down, and ordered him too to sit. The bishop of Bizya was with them as well, of course.

§3. And Bishop Theodosius said to Maximus: 'How are you, my lord Father?'

Maximus said to him: 'As God preordained before all ages a way of life for me in his providence, that's how I am.'
Máximus prós autón: "Ως προωρίσεν ὁ Θεός πρὸ πάντων τῶν αἰῶνων τὴν περὶ ἐμὲ προνοητικὴν διεξαγωγήν, οὕτως ἔχω.

Θεοδόσιος: "Τί οὖν; Πρὸ παντὸς αἰῶνος τὰ περὶ ἐκαστὸν ἡμῶν προῳρισεν ὁ Θεός?"

Máximos: "Εἰπὲ προῄνυν, πάντως καὶ προωρίσε.

Θεοδόσιος: "Τί ἐστιν αὐτὸ τοῦτο τὸ ἑνδυνάμως καὶ ὁμοῖο ἡμῖν;"

Máximos: "Ἡ πρόγνωσις τῶν ἐφ’ ἡμῖν ἐννοιῶν καὶ λόγων καὶ ἐργῶν ἑστιν ὁ δὲ προῳρισμὸς τῶν οὐκ ἐφ’ ἡμῖν συμβαίνοντων ἑστι.

Θεοδόσιος: "Ποιὰ εἰσὶ τὰ ἐφ’ ἡμῖν, καὶ ποιὰ τὰ οὐκ ἐφ’ ἡμῖν;"

Máximos: "Ὡς ἐόκει, πάντα γινώσκων ὁ ἰσοπάτης μου, δοκιμαστικὸς διαλέγεται πρὸς τὸν δούλον αὐτοῦ.

Θεοδόσιος: "Μᾶ τὴν ἀλήθειαν τοῦ Θεοῦ, ἀγνοῶν ἥρωτησα, καὶ μαθεῖν θέλων τὴν διαφορὰν τῶν ἐφ’ ἡμῖν, καὶ οὐκ ἐφ’ ἡμῖν καὶ πῶς τὰ μὲν ὑπὸ τὴν πρόγνωσιν τοῦ Θεοῦ, τὰ δὲ ὑπὸ τὸν προῳρισμὸν ὑπάρχουσιν."

Máximos: "Εφ’ ἡμῖν ἑστε τὰ ἐκούσαι πάντα, ἡγοῦν ἁρεταί καὶ κακίαι οὐκ ἐφ’ ἡμῖν δεῖ αἱ ἐπιφορὰι τῶν συμβαίνοντιν ἡμῶν κολαστικῶν τρόπων, ἢ τῶν ἐναντίων. Οὔτε γὰρ ἐφ’ ἡμῖν ἑστιν ἡ κολασιώσαν νόσος, οὔτε ἡ εὐφραίνουσα χάρις καὶ ποιητικὰ τοῦτον αἰτία. Οἶον αἰτία νόσου ἀταξία, ὡσπερ καὶ ἡγείας ἑταξίας καὶ βασιλείας οὐρανῶν αἰτία ἢ τῶν ἐντολῶν φυλακῆς, ὡσπερ καὶ πυρὸς αἰωνίου ἢ τοῦτον παράβασις.

Θεοδόσιος: "Τί οὖν; Διατυπὸ θλῖψῃ ἐν τῇ ἐξορίᾳ ταύτη, ἐπειδὴ ἔξει ταῦτα ἐποίησας ταύτης τῆς θλίψεως;"

Máximos: "Παρακαλῶ ὅταν ὁ Θεὸς ταύτη τῇ θλίψῃ περιορίσῃ τὰς ἐκτίσεις ὅπως ἠμαρτον αὐτῶν ἐν τῇ παραβασί τῶν αὐτῶν δικαιώματος εντολῶν.

Θεοδόσιος: "Οὐκ ἑστι καὶ δοκιμὴς ἐνεκεῖ ἐπεγομένης πολλοῖς θλίψεις;"

Máximos: "Ἡ δοκιμὴ τῶν ἁγίων ἑστιν, ὧν φανεροθεία διὰ τῆς θλίψεως τῷ βίῳ τῶν ἀνθρώπων, αἱ περὶ τὸ φύειν καλῶ διαθέσεις αὐτῶν, ἐσταῖται συνεκφονοῦσα τὰς ἁγιομένας πάσιν αὐτῶν ἀρεταῖς, ὡς ἐπὶ τοῦ Ἰσραήλ καὶ Ἰωσήφ. Ὁ μὲν γὰρ ἐπὶ φανεροῦσα τῆς ἐγκεκριμένης ἀνδρείας ἐπειράζετο ὁ δὲ ἐπὶ ἐκφάνει τῆς ἁγιαστικῆς σωφροσύνης ἐδοκιμαζότο καὶ πάσας τῶν ἁγίων ἀκούσισι ἐν τῷ αἰώνι τούτῳ θλίβεις ἐπὶ ταῖς τιμωταῖς οἰκονομίαις ἐθλιβέτο, ὡς δὲ τῆς ἀθεθείας τῆς συγχωρουμένης αὐτῶς ἐπαρχῆναι, τῶν ὑπερήφανον καὶ ἀποστάτην πατήσωσι

b Cf. Rom. 8:29 c Cf. Rom. 5:3-4
Theodosius: ‘How can you say that? Did God preordain our individual destinies before all time?’

Maximus: ‘If he had foreknowledge assuredly he preordained as well.’

Theodosius: ‘What is the exact meaning of the words “had foreknowledge” and “preordained”?’

Maximus: ‘Foreknowledge pertains to thoughts and words and actions which come from us. Predestination pertains to those accidents which do not come from us.’

Theodosius: ‘What is the nature of those matters which are from us, and what is the nature of those which are not from us?’

Maximus: ‘It seems that although my master knows everything he is discussing questions to test his servant.’

Theodosius: ‘By God’s truth, I asked in ignorance, and because I wished to know the difference between those matters which are from us and those which are not from us, as well as how some were subjected to God’s foreknowledge, and others to predestination.’

Maximus: ‘The matters which are from us are all acts of volition, that is to say, virtues and vices. Those which are not from us are inflictions of kinds of punishments which happen to us, or their opposites. I mean that neither the punishment of illness is from us, nor the gladness of good health, although the operating causes of these states [do originate from within us]. For example, the cause of illness is intemperance, just as the cause of good health is temperance, and the cause of the kingdom of heaven is the keeping of the commandments, just as the cause of eternal fire, too, is transgressing them.’

Theodosius: ‘How can you say that? Is that why you suffer in this place of exile, because you’ve committed some deeds worthy of this suffering?’

Maximus: ‘I pray that, by this suffering, God may limit the punishments of which I was guilty in sinning against him by transgressing his commandments, which bring justification.’

Theodosius: ‘Isn’t suffering endured by many also for the sake of being tested?’

Maximus: ‘Being tested is proper to the saints, so that through the suffering in people’s lives may be shown their dispositions, which concern what is naturally good, [and] may show them at the same time their virtues, which are unknown to everyone, as in the case of Job and Joseph. For the former was tried in order to demonstrate his hidden fortitude, the latter was tested in order to exhibit the chastity which made him a saint. And every one of the saints who suffered
δράκοντα, τουτέστοι τῶν διάβολου. Ἡ γὰρ ὑπομονή, δοκιμής ἔργων ἔστιν ἐφ’ ἐκάστῳ τῶν ἁγίων.”

Θεοδόσιος: “Μὰ τὴν ἀλήθειάν τοῦ Θεοῦ, καλῶς εἶπας· καὶ ἰμαλογῶ τὴν ὁμήλειαν καὶ ἔξηγον ἐν τοῖς τοιούτοις ἀδιαλείγεσθαι ὡμίν’ ἀλλ’ ἐπειδή ἐπ’, ἄλλω κεφαλαίῳ κἀγὼ καὶ οἱ δεσπόται μου οἱ μελλοπατρίκοι πρὸς σὲ γεγονόμεν, καὶ τοσοῦτο διαστήματα ἦλθομεν, παρακαλούμενε σε τὰ παρ’ ἡμῶν προτείνόμενα δέξασθαι καὶ χαροποιήσατε πάσαν τὴν οἰκουμένην.”

Μάξιμος: “Ποιὰ ταῦτα εἰσί, δέσποτα, καὶ τὸς ἐγὼ καὶ πόθεν εἰμί, ἢ ἐπὶ τοῖς προτεινόμενοι μοι συγκατάθεσις χαροποιήσατε πάσαν τὴν οἰκουμένην;”

Θεοδόσιος: “Μὰ τὴν ἀλήθειαν τοῦ Κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, ἀπερ λέγω σοι ἐγὼ τε καὶ οἱ δεσπόται μου οἱ μελλοπατρίκοι, ἐκ τοῦ στόματος τοῦ δεσπότου ἡμῶν τοῦ πατριάρχου καὶ τοῦ εὐερετοῦ δεσπότου τῆς οἰκουμένης ἠκούσαμεν.”

Μάξιμος: “Κελεύσατε οἱ δεσπόται μου εἰσέπε ἀπερ βούλεαθε καὶ ἀπερ ἠκούσατε.”

Θεοδόσιος: “Παρακαλεῖ ὁ βασιλεύς καὶ ὁ πατριάρχης δι’ ἡμῶν μαθεῖν παρὰ σοῦ, διὰ ποτέν αἰτίαν οὐ κουπινεῖς τῷ θρόνῳ Κωνσταντινούπολεως.”

Μάξιμος: “Ἐχεῖτε περὶ τούτου ἐπιτροπὴν ἐγγραφὸν παρὰ τὸν εὐερετοῦ δεσπότου βασιλέως η παρὰ τοῦ πατριάρχου;”

Θεοδόσιος: “Οὐκ ὁφειλεῖς δέσποτα ἀπίστησά ἡμῖν. Κἂν γὰρ ταπεινός εἰμί, ἀλλ’ ἐπίπλοκος ἀκούω καὶ οἱ δεσπόται μου, τῆς συγκλήτου μέρος ὑπάρχουσι καὶ οὐκ ἦλθομεν περάσατε σὲ μὴ διό ὁ Θεὸς.”

Μάξιμος: “Ολοκληρώσε ἐγὼ ἠθέτει πρὸς τὸν δοῦλον ἡμῶν, ἐγὼ χωρὶς πᾶσης υποστολῆς λέγω τὴν αἰτίαν ὑμνοχνοικων τῷ θρόνῳ Κωνσταντινούπολεως. Πλὴν εἰ καὶ ἄλλως ἦν τὸ ἑρωτάν με διὰ ποτέν αἰτίαν, ἡμῶν οὐκ ἔστι, τῶν γυναικῶν ἀσφαλῶν πλείον ἐμοὶ τὴν αἰτίαν.

Γνώσατε τάς γενομένας καινοτομίας ἀπὸ τῆς ἐκτῆς ἐπιεμφάνειας τοῦ διεθνοῦς κύκλου, ἀρξαμένας ἀπὸ Ἀλεξανδρείας διὰ τῶν ἐκτεθέντων ἐννέα κεφαλαίων παρὰ Κύρου, τοῦ ὁμοίων ἡμῶν ἔκεισε προεδροῦ, τῶν βεβαιωθέντων ὑπὸ τοῦ θρόνου Κωνσταντινούπολεως, καὶ τῶς ἄλλως ἀλλωσεις, προσθήκας τε καὶ μειώσεις, τάς γενομένας συνόδικας ὑπὸ τῶν προεδρευόντων τῆς τῶν Βυζαντίων ἐκκλησίας, Σεργίου λέγω καὶ Πολύβου καὶ Παύλου ἀστίνας καινοτομίας πάσα γνώσκει ἡ καθ’

---

4 Cf. Lk. 10:39  
5 Cf. Rom. 5:4; Jam. 1:3
involuntarily in this life suffered in accordance with such arrange-
ments, so that through the weakness which allows them to be
burdened they might trample on the proud and apostate serpent, that
is the devil. I mean that endurance in the case of 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
the usefulness [of what you have said]. I always wanted to converse
with you on matters like these. But because both I and my masters,
the patricians elect,³ have come to you on another subject, and we
have travelled such great distances, please accept our offer and make
the whole world happy.'

Maximus: 'What sort of offer is this, master, and who am I and
from what stock, that my assent to your offer to me would make the
whole world happy?'

Theodosius: 'By the truth of our Lord Jesus Christ, what I am
telling you, I and my masters the patricians elect, we heard from the
mouth of our lord the patriarch and the orthodox master of the
world.'

Maximus: 'My masters, please say what you wish and what you
heard.'

Theodosius: 'The emperor and the patriarch ask through us to
ascertain from you the reason for which you are not in communion
with the see of Constantinople.'

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

Theodosius: 'Master, you shouldn't doubt us, for even if I am lowly
I am a bishop, and my lords are part of the senate. And we haven't
come to try you—God forbid!'

Maximus: 'In whatever manner you have come to your servant,
I will tell you without any reserve the reason that I am not in com-
munion with the see of Constantinople. However, even if it was the
task of others to ask me the reason, it is not your task, because you
know the reason with more certainty than I.

You know the innovations which came into being from the sixth
indiction of the past cycle,⁴ which were begun in Alexandria by
means of the Nine Chapters published by Cyrus, who—I don't know
how—had been made president⁵ there. They were ratified by the see
of Constantinople, as well as the other changes, both additions and
deletions, which were made in synodical letters by those presiding
over the church of Byzantium—I mean Sergius and Pyrrhus and
Paul.⁶ Our whole world recognizes these as innovations. It is for this
ἡμᾶς οἰκουμένην. Διὰ ταύτην τὴν αἰτίαν οὐ κοινωνώ, οὐ δούλος ὑμῶν, τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ Κωνσταντινουπόλεως. Ἀρθόω τα προσκόμματα τὰ τεθέντα ὑπὸ τῶν εἰρημένων ἀνδρῶν, μετ’ αὐτῶν ἔκεινων τῶν θεμέων αὐτὰ, καθὼς εἶπεν ὁ Θεός. Καὶ τοὺς λίθους ἐκ τῆς ὁδοῦ διαρρίθμησε· καὶ τὴν λείαν καὶ τετραμένην, καὶ πάσης ἀκανθώδους αἱρετικῆς ἐλευθέραν ὅδον τοῦ Ἐναγγέλου βαδίσατε, καὶ καθάπερ ἦν εὐρέσκων, ὁδεῖν πάσης δίχα προτροπῆς ἀνθρώπινης. Ἐνώ ἂν δὲ τοῦ τεθέσαι προσκόμμασιν, καὶ τοῖς τεθείσαις αὐτὰ σεμνόνωνται οἱ πρόεδροι Κωνσταντινουπόλεως, οὔτε ἐστιν ὁ πείθω με λόγον ἡ τρόπος κοινωνίας αὐτοῖς.

Θεοδόσιος: "Τι γαρ κακῶν ὁμολογούμεν, ἢν χαρισθῆτε τῆς κοινωνίας ἡμῶν;"

Μάξιμος: "Ὅτι μίαν ἐνέργειαν λέγοντες θεότητος καὶ ἀνθρωπότητος τοῦ Θεοῦ καὶ Σωτῆρος ἡμῶν Ιησοῦ Χριστοῦ, συγχέετε τὸ τε τῆς θεολογίας καὶ τῆς οἰκουμείας λόγον. Εἴ γὰρ πειθήσαντες δεῖ τοὺς ἁγίους πατέρας, λέγουσιν ὅτι ἡ ἐνέργεια μία, τοῖς δὲ καὶ ὁ σῶς μία, τετράδα ποιεῖ τὴν ἁγίαν Τριάδα, ὡς ὁμοφύοις τῷ Δόξῳ γενομένης τῆς αὐτοῦ σαρκὸς, καὶ ἐκθέταις τῆς πρὸς ἡμᾶς καὶ τῆς πρὸς τὴν αὐτοῦ τεκούσαν συγγενεύς κατὰ τὴν φύσιν ταυτότητος.

Καὶ πάλιν ἀναφεύγετε τὰς ἐνέργειας, καὶ μίαν κυριοῦντες θέλησιν θεότητος αὐτοῦ καὶ ἀνθρωπότητος, ἁφαιρείσθε αὐτῷ τῆς τῶν ἁγαθὸν διανομήν. Εἴνα γὰρ ἐνέργειαν οὐδεμίαν ἔχει, κατὰ τοὺς τοῦτον θεσπίζοντας, δήλον ὅτι, κἂν θέλῃ, ἐλεηθήσαι οὐ δύναται, ἁφαιρεθείσης αὐτοῦ τῆς τῶν ἁγαθῶν ἐνέργειας, εἴπερ ἐνέργειας φύσεις χαρίς, οὐδὲν τῶν ὁντῶν ἐνέργειαν ἔχει πράττειν πέφυκεν.

Ἀλλὰς τε δὲ, καὶ τὴν σάρκα ποιεῖ τῷ μὲν θελήματι συνδημιουργόν πάντων τῶν αἰώνων, καὶ τῶν ἐν αὐτοῖς, Πατρὶ τε καὶ Υἱῷ καὶ Πνευματικῇ, τῇ δὲ φύσει κτιστῇ· ἢ τό ἀληθετερόν εἶπεν, ἀναρχόν τὴν θελήσαι, εἴπερ η θεία θελήσῃς ἀναρχός ἐστιν, ὡς ἀνάρχου θεότητος· τῇ δὲ φύσει πρόσφατον, ὅπερ πάσαιν οὐκ άνοικαν ὑπερβαίνει μόνον ἀλλὰ καὶ ἀσέβειαν. Οὐ γὰρ λέγετε ἁπλῶς μόνον ἐν θέλημα ἀλλὰ καὶ τοῦτο θείκας. Θείας δὲ θελήσιας οὐδεὶς δύναται ἄρχον ἐπινοεῖσθαι κροτείνην ἢ τέλος, ἐπεὶ μὴ δὲ τῆς θείας φύσεως, ἢ ἐναντίων ἢ θέλησις.

Πάλιν δὲ ἔτεραν εἰσάγοντες κανονομίαν, ἁφαιρείσθε παντάπασι πάντα τὰ γνωριστικὰ καὶ συστατικὰ τῆς θεότητος καὶ τῆς ἀνθρωπότητος τοῦ Χριστοῦ, νόμους καὶ τύπους θεσπίζοντες μὴ τίς μίαν, μὴ δὲ ἐν αὐτοῦ θελήσεις ἡ ἐνέργειας λέγεσθαι· ὅπερ ἐστὶ
reason that I, your servant, am not in communion with the church of Constantinople. Let the offending innovations proposed by the men I have mentioned be removed, together with those same men who proposed them, as God said: "And throw the stones from the path, and walk the level and smooth path of the Gospel", which is free from every thorn of heresy. Similarly I, on finding it so, shall walk without any human encouragement. But as long as the presidents of Constantinople take pride in the offending articles which have been proposed, and in those who have proposed them, there is no word or means to persuade me to enter into communion with them.'

Theodosius: 'So, what evil do we confess that makes you separate yourself from communion with us?'

Maximus: 'It is because, in saying that there is one activity of the divinity and humanity of our God and Saviour Jesus Christ, you confuse both the language of theology and of the economy. The point is that, if you are to believe the holy Fathers, who say: "Those who have one activity have also one essence," you are making a quaternity of the holy Trinity, in that Christ's flesh becomes one being with the Word, and stands aside from the cognate identity which by nature he has with us and with the woman who bore him.

And again, by destroying the activities and asserting one will of the divinity of the same one and of the humanity, you remove the blessings which he has bestowed [on us]. For if he has no activity, according to those who ratified this, it is clear that, even if he wants to, he cannot show mercy, because the activity of his blessings has been removed, if indeed without natural activity nothing which exists remains to have an activity or to perform.

Let me put it another way. You make the flesh, with regard to the will, a co-creator with Father, Son, and Spirit, of all ages and of those in them; with regard to nature [you make the flesh] a creator, or to speak more truthfully, not having a beginning with respect to its will, in as much as the divine will is without beginning, since the divinity is without beginning; with regard to the nature [you make the flesh] recent, which exceeds not only all sense but also all impiety. I mean that you do not simply speak only of one will, but you say also that it is divine. But nobody can think up a temporal beginning or end of divine will because [it cannot be done] even of the divine nature, to the essence of which the will is proper.

Again, introducing another innovation, you completely remove everything which signifies and confirms the divinity and humanity of Christ, sanctioning by laws and decrees that neither one nor two wills
πράγματος ἀνυπάρκτου. Οὐδὲν γὰρ τῶν ὄντων, εἰτε νοερόν ἐστιν ἀφάρητα βεληντικῆς δυνάμεως καὶ ἐνεργείας, εἰτε αἰσθητικοῦ, τῆς αἰσθητικῆς ἐνεργείας, εἰτε φυτικοῦ, αἰξητικῆς καὶ ἔρευνης ἐνεργείας· εἰτε παντελῶς ἄμυχον καὶ πάσης ἀμοιρὸν ζωῆς, τῆς καθ’ ἐξαν λεγομένης ἐνεργείας καὶ ἐπιτηδειότητος, καὶ δηλούσι πάντα τὰ ὀφέλεια ὃντα, ἀντιληπτικὰ τυχόνου ταῖς τῶν αἰσθητικῶν αἰσθήσεων ἐνεργεία γὰρ τῶν τοιοῦτων, τὸ ὑποτευθεῖ πάντως ὀρᾶει διὰ τῆς ἰδίας ἐπιφανείας, ἀκών διὰ κτύπου, ὄσφηρες δι’ ἀτόμου τῶν προσφηνῶν, γενόεσθαι τοιαὶ χιμαῖροι, καὶ ἀφέν διὰ τῆς ἀντιτυπίας. Υπὲρ γὰρ ἐνεργείαν λέγομεν τῆς ὀράσεως τὸ ὀρῶν, ὀφέγη καὶ τῶν ὀρωμένων τὸ ὀρᾶθαι· καὶ τὰ λοιπὰ πάντα κατὰ τῶν αὐτῶν θεωροῦμεν γενόμενα τρόπον. Εἰ τῶν ὀφέγμα τῶν ὀφέγμας ἐστὶ πάσης ἐρημοῦ παντελῶς φυσικῆς ἐνεργείας, ὁ δὲ Κύριος ἠμῶν καὶ Θεός (Ἀλαθητὶ Κύριε) ὀφέγμα μεῖχεν ψυχικὴν βέλησιν ἢ ἐνεργείαν καθ’ ἐκάτερον τῶν ἢ ἐν, ἐν ὁι τε καὶ ἀπερ ἐστὶ, πῶς δυνάμεθα ἢ εἶναι ἡ καλεῖσθαι θεοσεβεῖς, κατ’ ὀφέγμα τρόπον ὑπάρχοντα βεληντικῶν ἢ ἐνεργειακῶν τῶν παρ’ ἠμῶν προσκυνούμενοι λέγοντες θεόν; Ῥανοῦ γὰρ ὅτι τῶν ἁγίων πατέρων διδασκόμεθα, λέγοντος: Τὸ γὰρ μηδεμίαν ὄνομαν ἔχων, οὔτε ἐστιν, οὔτε τι ἐστιν, οὔτε ἐστι τοῖς αὐτῶν παντελῶς θείας."  

Θεόδοσις: "Τὸ δὲ οἰκονομίαν γινόμενον, μὴ λάβῃς ὡς κύριον δόγμα."  

Μάξιμος: "Εἰ μὴ ἐστι κύριον δόγμα τῶν δεχόμενων, ὁ Θεοπάτων Τύπος καὶ νόμος μηδεμίαν λέγεσθαι τοῦ Κυρίου βέλησιν ἢ ἐνεργείαν, ὃν ἢ ἀφάρητος τῆς ἀνυπαρξίας δηλοὶ τοῦ ταύτας ἀφήφημεν, διὰ ποιῶν αἰτίων βαρβάρως έθεει καὶ άθεος ἀπέδεικτο με ἀνευ τιμῆς; Διὰ ποιῶν αἰτίων κατερκθῆναι αὐθείως Βιβλίον, καὶ ὁ σῶφοιλοι μου, ὁ μὲν Πέρτερον, ὁ δὲ Μεσμιμβριαν."  

Θεόδοσις: "Μᾶ τὸν Θεόν τὸν μέλλωντα με ἐπάσας, καὶ ὄτε γέγονεν εἰσείν, καὶ νῦν τὸ αὐτὸ λέγω, ὅτι κακῶς γέγονεν ὁ Τύπος, καὶ ἐπὶ βλάβη πτολίαν. Πρόμαθεος δέ γέγονε τοῦ ἐκτεθνής αὐτῶν, ἢ πρὸς ἀλλήλους τῶν ὀρθοδόξων περὶ θελητών καὶ ἐνεργειῶν ζητημαχίας καὶ διὰ τὸ πρὸς ἀλλήλους εἰρηνεύεσθαι τάντας, συνειδὼν τινὲς τοῖς τοιάστατα κατασχυσάθηναι φωνᾶς:"

Μάξιμος: "Καὶ ποιοὶ πιστῶς δέχεται οἰκονομίαν κατασχισάσθουσαν φωνᾶς, ἀπερ αἰείσθησθαι δ’ ἀποστόλων καὶ προφητῶν καὶ προκατάλθου τῶν ὀλίγων Θεοῦ οἰκονομίας.  

Καὶ σκοπήσωμεν, κύριο ἡ μέγας, εἰς ποιον κατανά τῆς ἰδήνομον τὸ ἐπικάλεσμα πρῶτον τοῦτο. Εἰ γὰρ ὁ μὲν Θεός ἔθετο ἐν τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ πρῶτον

---

b Cf. Eph. 4:11
or activities are to be spoken about in him, which is characteristic of something without an individual existence. I say this because nothing which exists, if it is rational, is deprived of power and activity having will; if it is sensual, of a sensual activity; if it is able to grow, of a growing and increasing activity; if it is completely inanimate, and devoid of all life, it is not deprived of a so-called activity and propensity appropriate to its state; and they indicate that everything exists in this way, being aids to the senses of sensual beings. After all, the activity of such aids is to be completely subordinate: to sight through its own manifestation; to hearing through sound; to smell through some attendant odour; to taste through certain liquids; and to touch through resistance of a surface. For just as we say that the activity of sight is to see, so too [do we say that the activity] of images is being seen. And we perceive that everything else happens in the same way. If, then, nothing that exists is completely devoid of all natural activity, our Lord and God—be propitious, Lord—has no natural will or activity in either of those [natures] from which and in which and which he is, how can we either be or be called pious if we maintain that the God who is adored by us 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: ‘Don’t accept as ratified teaching what happened on account of an arrangement.’

Maximus: ‘If the Typos and the law permitting nobody to speak of the will or activity of the Lord, the removal of which indicates the non-existence of him who has been deprived of them, is not the ratified teaching of those who accept them, for what reason have you handed me over without dignity to barbaric and godless people? For what reason have I been condemned to live in Bizya, and one of my fellow-servants in Perberis and the other in Mesembria?’

Theodosius: ‘By God who is going to examine me, I said both when it happened and I say the same now too, that the Typos was an evil event, and to the detriment of many. But an occasion occurred for publishing it—the altercation between orthodox parties over the wills and activities, and so that all might be at peace with each other, certain people were privy to the silencing of words such as these.’

Maximus: ‘And what believer accepts an arrangement which silences words that the God of all arranged to be spoken through apostles and prophets and teachers? And let us examine, great lord, what great evil that issue may result in when it is handled. For if God
Disputatio inter Maximum et Theodosium

apostólyous, deúteron profothas, tríton didaskalous1 prós tón katórtismon tón ágion,2 eirhikós en tó Eisagégélw tōs apostólous, kai di autón tois mei autois: "O umían léga, pási léga,3 kai pálion 'O dekhamenos umías émè déxetai4 kai o dèthetón umás émè áthetai," déthi ék en profothes, óws o mía dekhamenos tois apostólous kai tois profothas kai tois didaskalous, álì dèthetón autôn tás phosías, autôn dèthetai tôn Xristóin.

Kai to állo dé skophésimw: 'O Theós ékplexámenos, éxhgeirven apostólous kai profothas kai didaskalous prós tón katórtismon tón ágion:n o dé diábolos fésudapostólous kai féudoprouthas kai fesudididaskalos katá tis éusfeiías ékplexámenos éxhgeirven, óste kai tois palaión polémhaini nómon, kai tois éusgapélikos. Fesudapostólous dé kai fesudoprouthas kai fesudididaskalos múnos tois aíretikous, ón ois lógoi kai ois lóghmoi diestxarménous eisón.6 Soter oin o tois álthetais apostólous kai profothas kai didaskalous dekhamenos, Theón déxetai, óútos kai o tois fesudapostólous kai fesudoprouthas kai fesudididaskalos dekhamenos, tois diábolon déxetai. 'O toinw synexbállos tōs ágion tois énaexai kai akatártous aíretikos (dexeíbash mé légonnta tis álthetai), tò diábolon tòn Theón profothan sóygkatékren.

Eî toinw ymnnályontes tás geýneména kainoutomá ev tois hmeteirous chrónon, eîs to toto katanówos autás eúrískomen tò akróptaton kaków, órapté mhípsis eiríthin profothasiaímenoi, tìn apostrapoii épherámenon noéiaqontes kai kerqítontes, òn pródromos eîpèn éesaih tís tois Anthérístous parousias o theós ápóntolos.7 Tauta chorís ypoostròs eîpèn umías, deútpota mou, òna feísghthei eautónta kai kai umíon. Kelleútete òna taúta geýraména òçón ev tì biblìa tís umíos karbías, eisdhli koumí̔somen ev òta taúta kerqítetai ekklíasia, kai geýnamai koumías tôn álbetai món tòn Theón, dèthèn de tò diábolon tò Thèw synexbállethoi: Mhp geýnoiò moi parà tò Thèw, to di' émè kai' émè geýnamon, chorís ámartyías."8 Kai baîllos metávouno eîpèn: "Eî to kelleútete eîs tòu dòuon umíos poíhse, poíhstote: éñw tois taúta dekhaménois oûdeitéte ýnòmîs koumías.9

1 1 Cor. 12: 28 2 Eph. 4: 12 3 Lk. 10: 16 4 2 Thess. 2: 3-4 5 Mk. 13: 37 6 Eph. 4: 11-12 7 Heb. 4: 15, 19: 28
placed in the church first apostles, second prophets, third teachers, to perfect the saints, saying in the Gospel to the apostles, and through them to those after them: "What I say to you, I say to everyone", and again: "The one who receives you, receives me", "and the one who rejects you, rejects me", it is clear and obvious that the one who does not receive the apostles and the prophets and the 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 raised by election false apostles and false prophets and false teachers against piety, in order that the old law, and the Gospel, might be attached. False apostles and false prophets and false teachers I understand to be the heretics alone, whose words and thoughts are perverted. Therefore, just as the one who receives the true apostles and prophets and teachers receives God, so too the one who receives the false apostles and the false prophets and the false teachers receives the devil. The one, then, who has cast out the saints together with the foul and impure heretics—accept that I am speaking the truth—has obviously condemned God together with the devil.

If, therefore, in discussing the innovations which have happened in our times, we find that they have resulted in this utmost evil, beware lest under the guise of peace we are found to be sick with apostasy, and preaching it, which the divine apostle said would come before the advent of the Antichrist. I have said this to you, my masters, without reserve, so that you may spare both yourselves and us. Do you command that, when I have this written in the book of my heart, I come into communion with the church in which this is preached, and be in communion with those who in truth cast out God, but in fact cast out the devil together 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 be done to your servant, do. I will never be in communion with those who accept this.'
§4. Καὶ ἁπταμέντες ἐπὶ τοῖς λαβηθείσι, κἀτῳ βαλόντες τὰς κεφαλὰς ἐξαίγασαν ἐπὶ ἑκατὸν ὄβραν· καὶ ἀνακύψας καὶ τῷ ἄββα Μαξίμῳ ἀτενίσας Θεοδόσιος ὁ ἐπίσκοπος εἶπεν: "Ἡμεῖς ἀντι-φωνοῦμεν σοι τὸν δεσπότην ἡμῶν τὸν βασιλέα, ὅτι σοῦ κοινωνοῦντος κοινβίζει τὸν Τύτον."

Μάξιμος: "Πολὺ ἀκόμη ἀπέχομεν ἀλλήλων· τὶ ποιοῦμεν περὶ τῆς συνοδικοῦς βεβαιωθείσης φωνῆς τοῦ ἕνος θελήματος, ἐπ’ ἐκβολὴ πάσης ἐνεργείας, ὑπὸ Σεργίου καὶ Πάρρου καὶ Παύλου;"

Θεοδόσιος: "Ἐκείνος ὁ χάρτης κυριεύχη καὶ ἀπεβλήθη.

Μάξιμος: "Κατηχεύθη ἐκ τῶν λιθών τοίχων, οὐ μὴν ἐκ τῶν νοερῶν ψυχῶν. Δὲξονται τὴν κατάκρισιν τούτων τῆς ἐν Ρώμῃ συνοδικοῦς ἐκτεθείσαν δι’ εὐσεβῶν δογμάτων τε καὶ κανόνων, καὶ λέλυται τὸ μεσάτοιχον; καὶ προτροπῆς οὐ δέομεθα."

Καὶ εἶπε Θεοδόσιος ὁ ἐπίσκοπος: "Ὅτι ἔρρωται ἡ σύνοδος ἡ ἐν Ρώμῃ, ἐπειδὴ χωρὶς κελεύσεως γέγονε βασιλέως."

Μάξιμος: "Εἰ τὰς γινομένας συνόδους αἱ κελεύσεις τῶν βασιλέων κυριοποίας, ἀλλ’ οὐχὶ εὐσεβῆς πίστις, δέξαι τὰς κατὰ τοῦ ὕμνουσιον γενομένα συνόδους, ἐπειδὴ κελεύει βασιλέως γεγόνας· φυμα δὴ πρῶτη τὴν ἐν Τύρῳ, δευτέραν τὴν ἐν Ἀντιοχείᾳ, τρίτην τὴν ἐν Σέλευκείᾳ, τετάρτην τὴν ἐν Κορονατύνουσαν ἐπὶ Εὐθοδίου τοῦ Ἀρειανοῦ, πέμπτην τὴν ἐν Νίκη τῆς Θράκης, ἐκτὸς τὴν ἐν τῷ Κερμίῳ, καὶ μετὰ ταῦτα πολλοῖς ὀστεροῖς χρόνοις, ἕξδεμιν τὴν ἐν Εφέσῳ δεύτεραν, ὡς ἐξήρχη Διούσκορος· ὅλος γὰρ ταῦτα κελεύει βασιλέως ἡθορεῖ, καὶ ὁμοῦ πᾶσιν κατεκρήθησαν διὰ τὴν ἀθέαν τῶν ὑπ’ αὐτῶν κυριοδίνης ἄστιγμῶν δογμάτων. Διὰ τὸ δὲ οὕτως ἐκβάλλετε τὴν καθελαί αὐτοὺς Παύλου τοῦ Σαμοσαταί ἐπὶ τῶν αἰγίων καὶ μακάριων Διονυσίου τοῦ πάσα Ρώμης καὶ Διονυσίου τοῦ Ἀλεξανδρείας καὶ Γρηγορίου τοῦ θαυματουργοῦ, τοῦ τῆς ἁστῆς ἐξάραντος συνόδου, ἐπειδὴ μὴ κελεύει γέγονε βασιλέως; Ποίος δὲ κανόνων διαγγέλετε, μόνας ἐκείναις ἐγραφοῦνται τὰς συνόδους, τὰς κελεύει βασιλέως ἀθροισθεῖσας, ἢ ὅλους κελεύει βασιλέως πάντως τὰς συνόδους ἀθροισθέως; Ἐκεῖνος οἴδας ἁγίας καὶ ἐγκρίτων συνόδους τῆς ἐνεργείας κανόνων, ἢ ὁράσας δογμάτων ἐνέκρινεν. Ἀλλὰ καὶ καθὼς οἴδας ὁ δεσπότης μου καὶ ἄλλος διδάσκει, δεύτερον γίνεσθαι συνόδου κατὰ πᾶσαν ἐπαρχίαν τοῦ ἑτού τοῦ κανόνων διηγόρευες, κελεύεσθαι βασιλικῆς μηδεμίᾳ μηδῆςς πεποιημένον, ἐπ’ ἀσφαλείᾳ τῆς σωτηρίωδος ἡμῶν πίστεως, καὶ

* Eph. 2:14
§4. And frozen by what had been said, they bowed their heads and remained silent for a considerable time. And on looking up and nodding at Father Maximus, Bishop Theodosius said: 'We give you a guarantee that, if you communicate, our master the emperor will cancel the Typos.'

Maximus: 'We are still a long way from mutual agreement. What will we do about the statement of one will in rejection of any activity, which was agreed on by Sergius and Pyrrhus and Paul in their synodical letters?\footnote{12}

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 accept the condemnation of those men\footnote{13} which was made public in Rome by the synod\footnote{14} by means of both orthodox teachings and canons, and the dividing-wall is removed, and we will not need encouraging.'

And Bishop Theodosius said: 'The synod at Rome was not ratified, because it was held without the order of the emperor.'

Maximus: 'If it is the orders of emperors, but not orthodox faith, that confirm synods which have been held, accept the synods which were held against the “homoousios”, because they were held at the order of emperors. I mean the first one in Tyre,\footnote{15} the second in Antioch,\footnote{16} the third in Seleucia,\footnote{17} the fourth in Constantinople under the Arian Eudoxius;\footnote{18} the fifth in Nicaea in Thrace;\footnote{19} the sixth in Sirmium;\footnote{20} and after these many years later, the seventh, the second one in Ephesus, at which Dioscorus presided.\footnote{21} For the order of emperors convened all of these synods, and nevertheless all of them were condemned on account of the godlessness of the impious teachings that were confirmed by them. Why don't you reject the one which deposed Paul of Samosata under the holy and blessed Dionysius, pope of Rome, and Dionysius of Alexandria, and Gregory the Wonder-Worker, who presided over the same synod,\footnote{22} because it was not held on the order of an emperor? What kind of canon declares that only those synods are approved which are convened on the order of emperors, or that generally speaking synods are convened at all on the order of an emperor? The devout canon of the church recognizes those synods as holy and approved which the correctness of their teaching approved. But also, as my master knows and teaches others, the canon\footnote{23} declares that synods be held twice each year in every province, making no mention of imperial order, with the purpose of preserving our saving faith and
διορθώσει πάντων τῶν ἀνήκοντων τῷ θείῳ τῆς ἐκκλησίας νόμων κεφαλαίων.

Καὶ εἴπε Θεοδόσιος ὁ ἐπίσκοπος: "Ὡς λέγεις ἐστὶν· ἡ τῶν δομιμῶν ὀρθότης ἐγκρίνει τὰς συνόδους· πλὴν ὦ δέχοντας τὸν ἄββαλλον Μηνᾶ, ἐν ὧ μίαν θέλησαν καὶ μίαν ἐνέργειαν τοῦ Χριστοῦ ἐδογμάτισε·"

Μάξιμος: "Μὴ δῷ Κύριος ὁ Θεός. Ὑμεῖς οὐ δέχεσθε, ἀλλ’ ἐκβάλλετε πάντας τοὺς διαδακαλούς, τοὺς μετὰ τὴν ἁγίαν ἐν Χαλκηδώνι σύνοδον, τοὺς ἀγωνισμένους κατὰ τὴν Σεβήρου μιαρᾶς αἵρεσιν· κἀγὼ ἔχω δέχασθαι τὸν ἄββαλλον Μηνᾶ, τὸν γενναμένον μετὰ τὴν σύνοδον, δι’ οὗ συνήγορε προφανῶς Σεβήρῳ καὶ Ἀπολλονίῳ καὶ Μακεδονίῳ καὶ Ἀρείῳ καὶ πάσῃ αἵρεσι, καὶ κατηγορεῖ τῆς συνόδου, μᾶλλον δὲ τελείως ἐκβάλλει, δι’ ὧν ἐδογμάτισε;"

Θεοδόσιος: "Τί οὖν ὅλως οὐ δέχη μίαν ἐνέργειαν;"

Μάξιμος: "Καὶ τίς λέγεις μίαν ἐνέργειαν τῶν ἐγκρίτων διαδακαλούς;"

Καὶ ἤγαγε Θεοδόσιος τὸς φευδωνίμους παρ’ αὐτῶν φερομένας Ἰουλίου τοῦ Τράχημα τός τὸν θαυματουργόν Γρηγορίον καὶ Ἀθανασίου τῶν ἁγίων χρήσεων, καὶ ἀνέγυρα αὐτάς.

Καὶ εἴπε Μάξιμος: "Φοβηθῶμεν δὴ τὸν Θεόν, καὶ μὴ βελησσοῦμεν παροργίασαι αὐτὸν ἐπὶ τῇ παραγωγῇ τῶν αἱρετικῶν χρήσεων. Οὐ δεικνύει ταύτας εἰναι τοῦ δυσσεβοῦς Ἀπολλονίου. Ἐπὶ μὲν ἄλλας ἔχεις, δεῖξον ἐπὶ ταύτας προφέροντες, πλεῖον πείθετε πάντας, ὅτι κατὰ ἀλήθειαν Ἀπολλονίου τοῦ δυσσεβοῦς καὶ τῶν ὀμοφρῶν αὐτῶς κακοδοξίαν ἀνακούσατε;"

Καὶ προφέρει ὁ αὐτὸς ἐπίσκοπος Θεοδόσιος ἐπί ὅνομα τοῦ Χρυσοστόμου δύο χρήσεως, ἀς ἀναγνώρισεν ὁ ἄββας Μάξιμος ἐφ’ ἂν τοῦ Νεστορίου εἰσὶ τοῦ νοσήσαντος ἐπὶ Χριστῷ τὴν προσωπικὴν δυνάμειν.+"

Καὶ εἴθεως θυμῶν ἔξας Θεοδόσιος εἶπε: "Κύριε μοναχέ, ὁ Σωτήρας ἐλάλησε διὰ τοῦ χαλινοῦ σου."

Μάξιμος: "Μὴ λυπηθῇ ὁ δεσπότης μου πρὸς τὸν δουλὸν αὐτοῦ."

Καὶ λαβὼν εἴθεως ἔδειξεν αὐτῷ πᾶσας τὰς δικαιοσύνες τοῦ Νεστορίου, καὶ ἐν ποιίων λόγοις αὐτοῦ κειμένως.

Θεοδόσιος: "Ὁ Θεός οἶδεν, ἀδελφε, τὰς χρήσεις ταύτας τὸ πατριαρχῆς μου δεδωκε· πλὴν ίδιον τὰς μὲν εἰπὼς Ἀπολλονίῳ, τὰς δὲ Νεστορίῳ." Καὶ παραγωγὴν τὴν τοῦ ἁγίου Κυρίλλου χρήσαν τὴν λέγοντος Μίαν τε καὶ συγγενῆ, δι’ ἂμφοτ’ ἐπιδεικνύσις τῇ ἐνέργειας, εἶπε: "Τί πρὸς ταῦτα λέγεις;"
correcting all points which do not conform to the divine law of the church.'

And Bishop Theodosius said: 'It is as you say: it is the correctness of the teachings which approves synods. However, don’t you accept the document of Menas, in which he propounds one will and one activity of Christ?'

Maximus: 'Lord God forbid! You do not accept, but reject, all teachers after the holy synod at Chalcedon who struggled against the abominable heresy of Severus, and do I have to accept the document of Menas, who lived after the synod, by which he obviously supports Severus and Apollinaris and Macedonius and Arius and every heresy, and accuses the synod—I should say, he rejects it completely—by what he has propounded?'

Theodosius: 'How is it, then, that you don’t accept one activity at all?'

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

And Theodosius adduced quotations which were falsely put forward by them as belonging to the saints, Julius of Rome and Gregory the Wonder-Worker and Athanasius, and he read them out.

And Maximus said: 'Let us now fear God, and not wish to provoke him in producing quotations from heretics. There is nobody who doesn’t know that these come from the impious Apollinaris. But if you have others, show them, because by putting these ones forward you will persuade everyone the more that you have really suffered from the false opinion of the impious Apollinaris and those who are of like mind with him.'

And the same Bishop Theodosius put forward under the name of Chrysostom two quotations which Father Maximus recognized and said: 'These are from Nestorius who suffered from the duality of persons in Christ.'

And immediately, boiling with rage, Theodosius said: 'My lord monk, Satan has spoken through your mouth.'

Maximus: 'My master must not be upset with his servant.' And taking them he showed him immediately that the same words were of Nestorius, and in which of his speeches they occurred.

Theodosius: 'God knows, brother, that the patriarch gave me these quotations. But look, you said that some come from Apollinaris, others from Nestorius.' And producing the quotation from St Cyril which says: 'Demonstrating a single and cognate activity through each,' he said: ‘What do you say to this?’
Μάξιμος: "Εἰς τινὲς δείξαντες αὐτὴν κατὰ ἄλλην κατὰ προσθήκην τεθείαν ἐν τῇ ἐμφανείᾳ τοῦ Ἐυαγγελίου τῆς γενεμῆς ἐὰν τοῦ ἁγίου τοῦ πατρὸς, ὑπὸ Τιμοθέου τοῦ Ἀλλοῦ. Ἐστώ δὲ καθ’ ὑμᾶς αὐτοῦ. Εξετάσωμεν τοῖν τὴν διάσωσιν τῶν πατρικῶν φωνῶν, καὶ γνωσόμεθα τὴν ἄλλην.

Θεόδωρος: "Τούτῳ οὐ συνχωροὶ γενέεσθαι ἀπλὰς γὰρ τὰς φωνὰς ἀνάγκην ἔχεις δεῖξαται.

Μάξιμος: "Εἰπέ μοι τὴν διαφοράν, παρακλῆσέ με, τῶν ἀπλῶν φωνῶν πρὸς τὰς ποικίλας.

Θεόδωρος: "Ἰνα ὡς ἔστι δέξη τὴν φωνήν, καὶ μὴ ἐρευνήσῃς τὴν ἐννοιαν αὐτῆς.

Καὶ εἴπε Μάξιμος: "Προφανῶς καὶ ξένους τῆς ἐκκλησίας καὶ τοῖν τῶν φωνῶν εἰσάγετε νομικὸν. Εἰ καθ’ ὑμᾶς οὐ δεὶ ἐρευνάν τὰς φωνὰς τῶν Γράφων καὶ τῶν πατέρων, ἐκβάλλομεν πάσαν τὴν Γραφήν τὴν ἐπὶ παλαιάν καὶ τὴν καλύτερα. Ἡκουσά γὰρ λέγουσα τοῦ Δαβίδ Μακάριοι οἱ ἐξερευνώντες τὰ μαρτυρία αὐτοῦ, ἐν ὅλῃ καρδίᾳ ἐκζητήσουσαν αὐτῶν ὡς μηδενὸς χωρίς ἐρευνής δυναμένου ἐκζητήσαι τὸν Θεόν. Καὶ πάλιν Ἑυτετέσσον με, καὶ ἐξερευνήσας τὸν νόμον σου, καὶ φυλάξω αὐτὸν ἐν ὅλῃ καρδίᾳ μου ὡς τῆς ἐρευνής ἀγούσης ἐπὶ τὴν γνώσιν τοῦ νόμου, καὶ τῆς γνώσιν πόθῳ πειθοῦσας τοῦ ἀνίμους ἐκ καρδίας αὐτοῦ φυλάξαι, διὰ τῆς πληρώσεως τῶν ἐν αὐτῷ κειμένων ἀγίων ἐντολῶν. Καὶ πάλιν Θαυμάστα τὰ μαρτυρία σου, διὰ τοῦτο ἐξερευνήσας αὐτὰ ἢ ψυχή μου. Ὑπὸ τοῦ παραβολῆς καὶ αὐθάναμα καὶ αὐθομονοῦντος λόγου σου ἐρευνὰς ἡμᾶς βούλεται ὁ παρομοιαζός λόγος; Ὑπὸ τοῦ Κύριος ἐν παραβολαῖς λαλῶν βούλεται νοεῖν τοὺς ἑαυτοῦ μαθητὰς, διδάσκοντος τῶν παραβολῶν τὴν διάσωσιν; Ὑπὸ τοῦ προστάσσον ἐρευνάτας τὰς Γραφὰς, ὡς μαρτυροῦσας περὶ αὐτοῦ; Ὑπὸ τοῦ ἀποστόλου χριστιανοῦ Πέτρου διδάσκει βούλεται. Περὶ ἡς σωτηρίας εὐκαταγγέλλας καὶ ἐξερευνήσας προφητῶν λέγων; Ὑπὸ τοῦ Παύλου ὁ Θεὸς ἀπότολος λέγων. Ἐκ κεκαλυμμένων ἐστὶ τὸ Ἐυαγγέλιον, ἀλλ’ ἐν τοῖς ἀπολλυμένοις ἐστὶ κεκαλυμμένον ἐν οἷς ὁ Θεὸς τοῦ αἰῶνα τούτου ἑρμηνευάς τοῦ ἀποδίδοσιν τῆς διανοίας αὐτῶν, εἰς τὸ μὴ διανυσματίζεις αὐτοῖς τὸν φωτισμὸν τῆς γνώσεως τοῦ Χριστοῦ; Ὑπὸ ἑαυτοῦ, ἐξομοιοθητίζει μηδὲν βοûλευεῖ τοῖς Ἰουδαϊκοῖς, ὡς ἄλλας ταῖς φωναῖς, ὡς λέγετε, τούτῳ μόνῳ τὸ γράμματά ἀσπέρ τινι φορτίῳ ἐγκύψαιτε τοῦ νοῦν, ἐξέπεσαν τὴν ἄλλην.
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Maximus: 'There are those who show that this was placed, in fact, by Timothy Aelurus as an addition to the exegesis of the Gospel made by this holy Father.26 But let it be Cyril's as you say. Let us, then, examine the meaning of the Father's words, and know the truth.'

Theodosius: 'I do not consent to this happening, for you have to accept the words as they are.'

Maximus: 'Please tell me the difference between the words as they are and the words as they are embellished.'

Theodosius: 'That you accept the word as it is, and do not scrutinize its meaning.'

And Maximus said: 'Obviously in the case of words too you are introducing rules which are new and foreign to the church. If, according to you, one ought not scrutinize the words of Scripture and of the Fathers, we are rejecting all Scripture, both the old and the new. For I have heard David say: “Blessed are those who scrutinize his testimonies; they seek him out with all their heart”, because nobody is able to seek out God without scrutiny. And again: “Make me understand, and I will scrutinise your law, and I will guard it with all my heart”, because scrutiny leads to knowledge of the law, and through desire for knowledge persuades the just to guard it with their heart, by fulfilling the holy commandments which are contained in it. And again: “Marvelous are your testimonies; this is why my soul has scrutinised them”. But why does the saying from Proverbs want us to scrutinize parables and riddles and obscure sayings? What did the Lord, speaking in parables, want his disciples to understand, when he taught them the meaning of the parables? Why did he give the order: “Scrutinize the Scriptures”, on the grounds that they were testifying about him? What did Peter, the chief of the apostles, want to teach when he said: “The prophets scrutinized and searched out concerning this salvation”? Why did Paul, the divine apostle, say: “If the Gospel is hidden, still it is hidden in those who perish, in whom the God of this age blinded the eyes of their understanding, so that the illumination of the knowledge of Christ would not shine on them”? As it appears, you want us to be similar to the Jews who, with simple words, as you call them—that is, with the letter alone blocking their mind like rubbish—have lapsed from the truth, having a veil over their hearts so that they cannot understand the spirit which belongs, and is hidden, in the letter. About this spirit Paul says: “The letter kills, but the spirit gives life”. May my master rest assured that I do not consent to accepting a word without the meaning which is contained in it, lest I become an obvious Jew.'


τὸ κάλυμμα ἐχοντες ἐν ταῖς καρδιαῖς αὐτῶν, τοῦ μὴ νοησαι τὸ κύριον πνεύμα, τὸ ἐγκεκριμένον τὸ γράμματι περὶ οὗ φησί: Τὸ μὲν γράμμα ἀποκτέναι τὸ δὲ πνεύμα ζωοποιεῖ.2 Πληροφορθῆ ὁ δεσπότης μου, ὅτι ἐγώ οὐκ ἀνέχομαι δέξασθαι φωνὴν χωρὶς τῆς ἐγκεκρίμενης αὐτῆς διανοίας, ἵνα μὴ γένομαι προφανὴς Ἰουδαίος.3

Θεοδόσιος τούτων ἀκοῦσας εἶπε: "Μίαν ἐνέργειαν τοῦ Χριστοῦ ὑποστατικὴν οφείλομεν λέγειν."

Μάξιμος: "Σκοπήσαμεν τὸ τυχόμενον ἐκ τούτου κακῶν, καὶ φόνομεν τὴν ἐξενήσυ ταύτην φωνήν μόνων γὰρ αἰρετικῶν πολυθεοῦντος ἑστὼν. Εἰ γὰρ ὑποστατικὴ τοῦ Χριστοῦ λέγομεν τὴν μίαν ἐνέργειαν, οὐ συμβαίνει δὲ ποτέ κατὰ τὴν ὑπόστασαν τῷ Πατρὶ καὶ τῷ Πνεύματι ὁ Υἱὸς, δὴ λοιπὸν ὅτι οὐδὲ κατὰ τὴν ὑποστατικὴν ἐνέργειαν ἀναγκαζόμεθα δὲ ὁσπέρ τῷ Υἱῷ, οὔτως καὶ τῷ Πατρὶ καὶ τῷ Πνεύματι ὑποστατικὰς ἐνέργειας ἀπονεῖμαι καὶ καθ’ υἱὸς τέσσαρας ἐνέργειας ἐξεῖ ἡ μακαρία θέσεως τρεῖς ἀφοριστικὰς τῶν ἐν ὅς ἐστι προσώπων, καὶ μίαν καὶν σημαντικὴν τῆς κατὰ φύσιν τῶν τριῶν ὑποστάσεως κοινότητος καὶ κατὰ τούς πατέρας, εἰπερ αὐτῶν δεχόμεθα τὴν διδακταίαν, τετρασαίνομεν νοσήσουμεν. Φυσικὴν γὰρ ἀλλ’ οὐχ’ ὑποστατικὴν πάσαν εἶναι διαγορεύοντοι ἐνέργειαι. Καὶ εἰ τούτῳ ἔστων αὐτῶν, ὡσπέρ οὐκ καὶ ἐστών, τέσσαρας φύσεως καὶ τέσσαρας φύσεις θεοῦ, διαφέρονται ἀλλήλων ὑποστάσει τὰ καὶ φύσει διεχθηκόμεθα λέγοντες. Πλὴν τῆς εἰπέν τὴ θεωρηθήκεν ἰδιάξουσαν ἐνέργειαν οἰκυσθῆτο τῶν ὑπὸ τί εἶδος ἀναγιγμένων, καὶ ὑπὸ τῶν κοινῶν ὄρισμὸν τοῦ ἐξῆς φύσει ταπτομένων; Οὐδέποτε γὰρ γίνεται τὸ φύσει κοινῶν, ἐνὸς καὶ μόνω τοῖς ἰδίοις. Τὰ γὰρ ὑποστατικὰ σήμαιντα, οἶνον γρυπότητας, ἡ γλαυκότητας, ἡ συμτότης, ἡ ἕφεσιν, καὶ ὁσα τοιαύτα, ἀφοριστικὰ εἰσὶ συμβεβηκότα τῶν ἀρχὸμ ἀλλήλων διαφερόντων. Πάσα γὰρ ἀνθρωπός, νόει τὶ τὴν φύσιν ὅποιʼ ἡλικίαν, ἀλλ’ οὐχʼ ὡς τὶς τὴν ὑπόστασαν, πέφυκεν ἐνέργειαν, κατὰ τὸν ἰδιαίτερα καὶ κοινῶς νοούμενον τε καὶ λεγόμενον καταγραφικὸν λόγον, οἰνὸν τὸ ζωὸν τὸ λογικὸ τὸ ἤθνῃ, ὑπέρ ἐστι τοῦ καθ’ ἡμᾶς γενικοῦ λόγου. Πάντες γὰρ τῆς αὐτῆς μετέχουμεν ζωῆς καὶ τῆς αὐτῆς λογικότητος, καὶ τῆς αὐτῆς ῥοῆς καὶ ἀπορροῆς καὶ τοῦ καθέξοδου καὶ ἵστασας, καὶ λαλεῖν καὶ σιγάν, καὶ ὅραν καὶ ἀκούειν καὶ ὀπτεῖπεν, ὑπέρ εἰς τοῦ κοινῶς ἐδʼ ἡμῶν νοούμενον λόγου. Οὐ δεί οὖν κανονομεῖν φωνὰς μὴ ἔχουσας ἑσχῆν ἢ γραφικὴν ἢ παρακλήσιμον ἢ φωσικήν, ἀλλὰ ἔξενη καὶ διαστροφαῖς ἀνθρώπων ἐξηκρημένην. Πλὴν δείξομεν μοι ταύτην κειμένην
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On hearing this, Theodosius said: 'We ought to speak of one hypostatic activity in Christ.'

Maximus: 'Let us consider the evil which is engendered by this, and let us avoid this strange expression, for it is the property solely of heretics who worship many gods. I mean that if we call the one activity in Christ hypostatic, although the Son is not ever similar to the Father and the Spirit with regard to hypostasis, it is clear that [the Son is not similar] either with regard to the hypostatic activity. We will be forced to attribute hypostatic activities both to the Father and the Spirit in the same way as to the Son, and, according to you, the blessed godhead will have four activities, three distinguishing ones of the persons in which it is, and one common one signifying the community which is of three hypostases according to nature; and according to the Fathers, if indeed we accept their teaching, we will be suffering from the sickness of a fourfold God. I say this because they declare every activity to be natural, not hypostatic. And if this is true, as indeed it is, we will be shown to be speaking of four natures and four gods by nature, different from each other in both hypostasis and nature. However, who has spoken of or contemplated a peculiar activity of any object at all among those that are grouped in a certain category, and arranged by nature under a common definition of the category? For it never happens that what is common by nature is proper to any one sole individual. I mean that hypostatic indicators, such as a beaked nose, or dull eyes, or a snub nose, or baldness, and all such characteristics, are defining incidentals of things which differ from each other in number. I mean that every person, in so far as he is something by nature, but not in so far as he is someone by hypostasis, is disposed to have an activity, according to the categorical rationale which is both individually and communally understood and spoken of as well, like the rational, mortal living being which is characteristic of the generic rationale in us. I mean that we all share the same life and the same capacity for reason, and the same ebb and flow, and [the 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. Therefore we should not coin words which do not have the force either of Scripture or of the Fathers or of nature, but are foreign and invented by human wiles. However, show me that this is found in any one Father, and again we shall seek out what the one who used this expression intended.'

Theodosius: 'How can you say that? Shouldn’t one speak at all of one activity in Christ?'
οἴκωδίπτησεν πατρί, καὶ πάλιν τὸν νοῦν τοῦ ταύτην εἰρηκότας ἐπι-
χετοῦμεν."

Θεοδόσιος: "Τι οὖν; ὃ δὲ παντελῶς ἐπὶ Χριστοῦ λέγεις μίαν
ἐνεργείαν;"

Μάξιμος: "κατὰ τὴν ἄγιαν Γραφὴν καὶ τοὺς ἁγίους πατέρας
αὐτῶν τοιούτοι λέγεις παρελάβομεν: ἀλλ' ὑπὲρ δύο φύσεις τοῦ
Χριστοῦ τὰς ἐὰν ἄν ἔστω, ὡστός καὶ τὰς φυσικὰς αὐτοῦ θελήσεις καὶ
ἐνεργείας καταλλήλους αὐτῷ, ὧμοιο τε φύσει Θεός καὶ
ἀνθρώπος ὑπὸ τῷ αὐτῷ πιστεύει καὶ ὦμολογεῖ ἐπετράπημεν."

Θεοδόσιος: "Ὅτις, δέσποτα, καὶ ἱμεῖς ὦμολογούμεν καὶ τὰς
φύσεις καὶ διαφόρους ἐνεργείας, πορεύσωμεν γε τοῖς καὶ
ἀνθρώπων καὶ θελητικῶν αὐτῷ τὴν θεότητα καὶ θηλητικῶν
αὐτοῦ τὴν ἀνθρωπότητα, ἐπειδὴ οὖν ἄνευ θελήσεως ἢ ἡ ψυχὴ
αὐτοῦ. Διὸ δὲ οὖ λέγομεν, ἣν μὴ μαχάμεθα αὐτὸν ἀποτρ
ἐσαγάγωμεν."

Μάξιμος: "Τι οὖν; Δύο φύσεις λέγομεν, μαχαμένοις αὐτῶς
εἰσάγαγετε διὰ τὸν ἁρμόνιον;"

Θεοδόσιος: "Οὖν."

Μάξιμος: "Τι οὖν; Φύσεων ἐπισήμανον ὁ ἁρμόνιος οὐ
diakrīνεται ἀλλ' ἐπὶ θελήσεως καὶ ἐνεργειῶν λεγόμενος,
diairēσεως ἔχει δύο μορίαν;"

Θεοδόσιος: "Πάντως ἐπὶ τούτων διαίρεσιν ἐχεί καὶ οἱ πατέρες
ἁρμόνιον ἐπὶ θελήσεως καὶ ἐνεργειῶν οὐκ ἐποτίζονται, φεύγοντες τῇ
διαίρεσιν, ἀλλὰ ἄλλην καὶ ἄλλην, καὶ θείαν καὶ ἀνθρωπίνην,
ὀπιλῆν, διήτηται καὶ ὡς εἴπαν λέγων, καὶ ὡς εἰρήκασι λέγων."

Μάξιμος: "Διὰ τὸν Κύριον, ἐὰν τις σοι ἐπή ἄλλην καὶ ἄλλην,
pósas noeis; ἡ 'θείαν καὶ ἀνθρωπίνην', póssas noeis; ἡ 'ὀπιλῆν'
ἢ 'διήτητα', póssas noeis."

Θεοδόσιος: "Οἶδα πόσο νοοῦ, δύο δὲ οὐ λέγων.
Τότε στραφεύτε ὁ ἀββᾶς Μάξιμος πρὸς τοὺς ἄρχοντας εἶπε: "Διὰ τὸν Κύριον, ἐὰν ἀκούσητε μίαν καὶ μίαν, καὶ ἄλλην καὶ ἄλλην, ἡ
dis δύο, ἡ δῆ πέντε, τί νοοῦντες τοὺς λέγουσαν ἀποκρίνεσθε;"
Καὶ εἶπαν: "Εἴπετε ἄρθρισας ἡμᾶς, τὸ μίαν καὶ μίαν, δύο
νοοῦμεν καὶ τὸ ἄλλην καὶ ἄλλην, δύο νοοῦμεν καὶ τὸ διὸ δύο,
tέσσαρα νοοῦμεν ὁμοίως καὶ τὸ δίς πέντε, δέκα."
Καὶ ὑπὲρ αἰσθανοῦσας Θεοδόσιος τὴν ἀπόκρισιν ἔκεινον εἶπε:
"Τὸ μὴ εἰρήκασιν τοῦ πατράσαν, οὐ λέγων."
Καὶ λαβὼν εἰδέως ὁ ἀββᾶς Μάξιμος τὴν βίβλον τῶν πεπραγ-
μένων τῆς ἁγίας καὶ ἀποστολικῆς συνόδου Ῥώμης, ἔδειξε τοῖς
ἀγίοις πατέρας τὰς δύο θελήσεις καὶ ἐνεργείας τοῦ Σωτήρος
Maximus: 'In accordance with holy Scripture and with the holy Fathers we have undertaken to say nothing like that, but just as we have been ordered to believe and confess Christ as two natures from which he is, so too [have we been ordered to confess] his natural wills and activities which are appropriate to him, because the same one is by nature both God and human at the same time.'

Theodosius: 'Truly, master, we too confess both the natures and different activities, that is to say, both the divine and the human, and we confess that his divinity has a will, and his humanity has a will, because his soul was not without a will. But we do not speak of two, lest we introduce him as being at war with himself.'

Maximus: 'How can you say that? When you speak of two natures, do you introduce them as being at war on account of their number?'

Theodosius: 'I don’t.'

Maximus: 'How can you say that? Is it the case that the number assigned to the natures doesn’t divide them, but, when it is spoken of with regard to wills and activities, it has the force of division?'

Theodosius: 'Assuredly it maintains division in these cases, and the Fathers did not speak of number in the case of wills and activities, because they avoided division, but they spoke of one and another one, and divine and human, double, twofold; and as they spoke, I speak, and as they said, I speak.'

Maximus: 'By the Lord, if someone says to you “one and another one”, how many do you understand? Or “divine and human”, how many do you understand? Or “double or twofold”, how many do you understand?'

Theodosius: 'I know how I understand, but I don’t say that it’s two.'

Then turning to the rulers, Father Maximus said: 'By the Lord, if you hear one and one, and one and another one, or twice two, or twice five, from your understanding what answer would you give to those who said this?'

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

And Theodosius, made afraid as it were by their answer, said: 'What was not said by the Fathers, I do not say.'

And at once, taking the book of the Acts of the holy and apostolic synod of Rome, Father Maximus showed that the holy
heimer καὶ Θεού Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ διαρρήκθην λέγοντας· ἢν λαβὼν ἐξ αὐτοῦ Θεοδόσιος ὁ ὑπάτος, ἀνέγνω πάσας τὰς χρήσεις τῶν ἁγίων πατέρων.

Καὶ τότε ἀποκριθεὶς Θεοδόσιος ὁ ἐπίσκοπος εἶπεν· "Ὁ Θεὸς οἶδαν, εἰ μὴ ὅτι προσωπικός τὰ ἁνάβημα τεθεικεν ἢ σύνοδος αὐτῆς, πλεῖον παντὸς ἀνθρώπου ἐδεχόμην αὐτήν. Αλλ’ ἵνα μὴ χρονοτριβοῦμεν ἐνταῦθα, εἰ τι εἶπαν οἱ πατέρες, λέγω, καὶ ἐγγράφως εὐθέως ποιῶ, δύο φύσεις, καὶ δύο θελήσεις, καὶ δύο ἐνέργειας· καὶ εἰδεχθεὶς μεθ’ ἡμῶν κοινωνήσομαι, καὶ γένηται ἔνωσις."

Μάξιμος· "Δέσποτα, ἐγώ οὖς τολμῶ δέξασθαι συγκατάθεσιν παρ’ ὑμῶν ἐγγράφον περὶ τοιοῦτον πράγματος, φιλῶν ὑπάρχων μοναχός· ἀλλ’ ἐπών κατένυξεν ἡμᾶς ὁ Θεὸς, τὰς τῶν ἁγίων πατέρων δέξασθαι φωνᾶς, καθὼς ἀπαίτεῖ ὁ κανόν, πρὸς τὸν Ρώμης περὶ τούτων ἐγγράφως ἀποστειλάτε, ἡγοῦν ὁ βασιλεὺς καὶ ὁ πατριάρχης καὶ ἡ κατ’ αὐτὸν σύνοδος. Ἁγώ γὰρ οὐδὲ τούτων γνωμονὸν κοινωνοῦν, ἀναφερομένων τῶν ἁναθεματισθέντων ἐπὶ τῆς ἁγίας ἀναφορᾶς. Φοβοῦμαι γὰρ τὸ κατάκριμα τοῦ ἁναθέματος."

Θεοδόσιος· "Ὁ Θεὸς οἶδαν, ὁ καταγινώσκω συν φοβομένου, ἀλλ’ οὕτω ἄλλος τις. Ἀλλὰ δός ἡμῖν βουλὴν διὰ τῶν Κύριων, ἕως τούτῳ δυνατόν γενέσθαι."

Μάξιμος· "Ποιὰν βουλῆν ἔχω ὑμῖν περὶ τούτου δούναι; Ῥάγετε, ψῆφαφθαστε ἐὰν τι τοιοῦτον γέγονεν ποτε, καὶ μετὰ βάςατον ἀπελθῆ τίς τοῦ περὶ τὴν πόσην ἐγκήματος, καὶ τοῦ ἐξενεχθέντος κατ’ αὐτοῦ ἐγνήματος τε καὶ κατακρίματος· καὶ καταδέξηται ὁ βασιλεὺς καὶ ὁ πατριάρχης μιμηθασθαι τοῦ Θεοῦ τὴν συγκατάβασιν· καὶ ποιήσουμεν, ὁ μὲν κλέεσαι παρακλητικῆς, ὁ δὲ συνδικὴν δέχασθαι πρὸς τὸν πάσαν Ρώμης· καὶ πάντως εἴπερ εὑρίσκετε τρόπος ἐκκλησιαστικὸς τοῦτο ἐπιτρέπων, διὰ τὴν ὑγθὴν ὁμολογίαν τῆς πίστεως συμπαθάνεται ὑμῖν περὶ τούτου."

Θεοδόσιος· "Τοῦτο πάντων γίνεται· ἀλλὰ δός μοι λόγον ὅτι, εὰν ἔμε πέμπωσιν, ἔρχῃ μετ’ ἔμοι."

Μάξιμος· "Δέσποτα, συμφέρει σοι τὸν σύνδοιλον μοῦ τὸν ἐν Μεσημβρίᾳ λαβέων μεθ’ ἐαυτοῦ, ἣς ἐμὲ ἐκεῖνος γὰρ καὶ τὴν γλώσσαν οἶδε, καὶ αἴδοιόν αὐτὸν ἄξιος, τοσοῦτος χρόνους κοιλαζόμενον διὰ τὸν Θεόν καὶ τὴν κρατοῦσαν ὑγθήν πόσην ἐν τῷ κατ’ αὐτοῦ θρόνων."

Θεοδόσιος· "Ἀμαμαχάσι διαφόρως πρὸς ἀλλήλους ἐσχομεν, καὶ οὐχ’ ἡδέως ἔχω μετ’ ἐκείνου ἀπελθεῖν."

Μάξιμος· "Δέσποτα, ἐπάνω ἐδοξεῖ τοῦτο γενέσθαι, ἐκβασις γένηται τῶν δοξάντων· καὶ ὅπως κελεύετε, ἀκολουθῶ ὑμῖν."
Fathers spoke openly of the two wills and activities in our Saviour and God Jesus Christ. Taking the book from him, the consul Theodosius read out all the quotations from the holy Fathers.

And then in answer Bishop Theodosius said: ‘God knows that, if this synod had not put anathemata on their persons, I would have accepted it more than anyone. But so that we don’t waste time on this point, whatever the Fathers said, I say, and I will immediately declare in writing two natures and two wills and two activities. And enter into communion with us and let there be unity.’

Maximus: ‘Master, I do not dare to receive a written agreement from you on a matter of this kind, being a mere monk. But seeing that God has stirred you to accept the expressions of the holy Fathers, as the canon demands, you must make a written dispatch on this matter to the see of Rome, that is to say, the emperor and the patriarch and his synod. I say this because I will not communicate even when these measures have been taken, so long as the men who have been anathematized are mentioned in the holy anaphora, because I am afraid of being condemned by anathema.’

Theodosius: ‘God knows, I don’t blame you for being afraid, and nor does anyone else. But advise us by the Lord whether this can be done.’

Maximus: ‘What kind of advice do I have to give to you on this? Go, find out if anything of this kind has ever happened, and after death anyone was absolved of a crime involving the faith, and if both the crime and the punishment were lifted from him. And let the emperor and the patriarch be willing to imitate God’s condescension, and let the former make a supplicatory rescript and the latter an entreaty by synodical letter to the pope of Rome. And of course, if an ecclesiastical precedent is found which enjoins this because of the correct profession of the faith, the conclusion will be drawn for you on this point.’

Theodosius: ‘Of course this will be done. But give me your word that, if they send me, you’ll come with me.’

Maximus: ‘Master, [if] it is expedient for you, take with you my fellow-servant who is in Mesembria, rather than me: he knows the language too, and they will respect him as he deserves for the fact that he was tortured for so many years both on account of God and the right faith, which is upheld in their see.’

Theodosius: ‘We have quarrelled in various ways with each other, and I don’t like the idea of going with him.’

Maximus: ‘Master, seeing that a decision has been made to do this,
Καὶ ἐπὶ τούτοις ἀνέστησαν πάντες μετὰ χαρᾶς καὶ διακρώνη καὶ ἐβαλον μετάνοιον, καὶ εὐχὴ γέγονε· καὶ ἐκατοστὸς αὐτῶν τὰ ἄγια Εὐαγγέλια, καὶ τὸν τίμιον σταυρὸν, καὶ τὴν εἰκόνα τοῦ Θεοῦ καὶ Σωτήρος ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, καὶ τῆς Δεσποινῆς ἡμῶν, τῆς αὐτῶν τεκούσης παναγίας θεοτόκου ἁπάσαντο, τεθεικοτές καὶ τὰς ἱδίας χειρὰς ἐπὶ βεβαιώσει τῶν λαληθέντων.

§5. Εἰτα μικρὰν ὄμηλάνσαντες πρὸς ἅλλης περὶ τοῦ κατὰ Θεὸν βίου, καὶ τῆς τῶν θείων ἐντολῶν τηρήσεως, στραφεὶς Θεοδόσιος ὁ ἐπίσκοπος πρὸς τὸν ἄββαν Μάξιμον εἶπεν: "Ἰδοὺ πάντα διαλέγω τὰ σκάνδαλα, καὶ γέγονεν εἰρήνη διὰ τοῦ Θεοῦ, καὶ γενήθησαν ἀλλὰ διὰ τὸν Κύριον μὴ κρύψης με· οὐ λέγεις καθ’ οἰονόμοστο τρόπον μίαν βέλησιν καὶ μίαν ἐνέργειαν ἐπὶ Χριστῷ;"

Μάξιμος: "Οὐκ ἐνδέχεται τῷ τοῦτο ποτὲ εἶπεν. Καὶ λέγω τῷ αὐτῶν ἐπειδὴ ζητήσης ἠντίκης ἤ θεον τούς ἀγίους πατράσεως, δύο φύσεως διαιφρότες μίαν λέγεις βέλησιν καὶ ἐνέργειαν. Εἰτα δὲ καὶ διὰ παντὸς τρόπου τοῦ τοῦτο λέγων εὑρίσκει εὐθυβόλως ὑπαντώσων αὐτῶ τῆν ἀποκλίναν. Εἰπ ή τοῦ τούς φωναί, φοβοῦμαι τὴν σύνχυσιν· εἰπεν δὲ ὑποστητικὴν, διανοώ τοῦ Πατρὸς καὶ τοῦ Πνεύματος τοῦ Υἱοῦ, καί τρεῖς θελήσεις εἰσάγων φανερωμεν, μη συγκαλλοῦσαι ἀλλήλαις, ὅπερ καὶ τὰς ὑποστάσεις· εἰπεν δὲ τὴν ὦν ἔνος μίαν βέλησιν καὶ ἐνέργειαν, ἀναγκάζω καὶ τὴν ὦν ἔνος τοῦ Πατρὸς, καὶ τὴν ὄνος τοῦ Πνεύματος εἴπειν, καί μὴ θέλω, βέλησιν καὶ ἐνέργειαν, καὶ εὑρεθήσεται εἰς πολυεύθεια ἐκκείπον ὁ λόγος· εἰπ εἰς σχετικὴν, τῆς Νεατορίου εἰσάγων προσωπικὴν διαφέρεσαι· εἰπ εἰς παρά φύσιν, φύεραι τὴν ὑπαρξιν τοῦ κοινού ἀρδο γὰρ τῇ φύσει, τὸ παρά φύσιν ἑστι, καθὼς οἱ πατέρες εἰρήκας.

Θεοδόσιος: "Μιὰ διὰ τὴν ἐνσωσιν τοῦ Σωτήρος ἡμῶν βέλησιν, πάντη τε καὶ πάντως ὀφείλον λέγειν, καθάπερ καὶ Σέργιος καὶ Πύρρος, ὡς οὕτω, καὶ λοίφηστες γεγράφασι." 

Μάξιμος: "Ἐκ κελευσι δέσποτα, δέξαι μου περὶ τοῦτον διὸ ῥητά. Ἐπὶ διὰ τὴν ἐνσωσιν μιὰ τοῦ Θεοῦ καὶ Σωτήρος ἡμῶν, καθάπερ Σέργιος καὶ Πύρρος καὶ Πάυλος γεγράφασι, γέγονε βέλησις, ἐπερευθένς κατ’ αὐτοὺς ὁ Υἱὸς ἐστιν τῶν Πατρὶ διὰ τὴν φύσιν, ἀλλ’ ὃς διὰ τὴν ἐνσωσιν, κατὰ τὸν Υἱὸν ἔχοντι βέλησιν, εἰπεν ὃς ταυτόν ἐστιν ἐνσωες καὶ φύσις. Ἐπὶ διὰ τὴν ἐνσωσιν μιὰ κατ’ αὐτοὺς τοῦ Σωτήρος ἡμῶν γέγονε βέλησις, αὐτῶν αὐτῆς ἐξει πάντως τὴν ἐνσωσιν, ἀλλ’ ὃς ῥετέρας τῶν ἔως ἔστι φύσιν καὶ σχέσεως κατ’ αὐτοὺς ἐστιν προοδήλως ἡ βέλησις, ἀλλ’ ὃς φύσεως..."
let there be an end to imputations. And I will follow you wherever you command.'

And at these words they all stood up with tears of joy, and knelt down and prayed; and each of them kissed the holy Gospels and the precious cross, and the icon of our God and Saviour Jesus Christ, and of Our Lady, the most holy Mother of God who bore him, signing with their own hands, no less, in ratification of the discussions.

§5. Then, when they had engaged briefly in mutual discussion regarding the life which is led according to God, and the observance of the divine commandments, Bishop Theodosius turned to Father Maximus and said: 'Look, all the scandals are resolved, and peace has been made through God, and it will continue. But by the Lord, don’t keep me in the dark: don’t you say in any way at all that there is one will, one activity in Christ?'

Maximus: 'It is impossible for me ever to say this. And I’ll tell you the reason: because it is a saying foreign to the holy Fathers to speak of one will and activity of two different natures. But then too in every way the person who makes this statement will find that absurdity meets him head on. For if I say that [the will and activity] are natural, I am afraid of confusing them. If I say that they are hypostatic, I divide the Son from the Father and the Spirit, and I will appear to be introducing three wills which are incongruent with each other, as is the case too with the hypostases. If I say that the one will and activity are as of one being, I am forced, even though I do not wish it, to speak of the will and activity as of one Father and as of one Spirit, and the expression will be found to have slipped into a multitude of gods. If I say that they are dispositional, I introduce Nestorius’ division of persons. If I say that they are beyond nature, I corrupt the existence of the will; for what is beyond nature is a corruption to the nature, as the Fathers said.'

Theodosius: 'On account of the union, in every way and in all ways we ought to speak of the will of our Saviour as one, as both Sergius and Pyrrhus, in my opinion, wrote with correct understanding.'

Maximus: 'If you command it, master, let me say a couple of words on this point. If, because of the union, one will of God and our Saviour was effected, as Sergius and Pyrrhus and Paul wrote, the Son will be of a different will, according to them, from the Father, who has a will in conformity with the Son, because of nature but not because of the union, if indeed union and nature are not the same
σχέσιν γάρ, ἀλλ’ οὐ φύσιν ὁ τῆς ἀληθείας τῆς ἔνωσιν ἐπίσταται λόγος. Εἰ διὰ τὴν ἔνωσιν ὡς ἐφασαν, μία τοῦ Σωτῆρος ἡμῶν γεγένηται θέλησις, ποία θελήσει φασίν αὐτὴν γεγενήθηκα τῇ τῆς ἔνωσιν; Οὐ γάρ δὴ τῇ δι’ αὐτὴν γενομένη φαίνει ἀληθείας φροντίζοντες, καὶ τὸ παράλογον φεύγοντες. Εἰ διὰ τὴν ἔνωσιν μία τοῦ Σωτῆρος γεγένηται θέλησις, δῆλον ὅτι πρὸ τῆς ἔνωσεως, ἠ πολυθέλης ἢ εἰ παντελῶς αὐθεντής. Καὶ εἰ μὲν πολυθέλης ἢ, μειώσει τῶν πολλῶν, πρὸς μίαν πισταλεῖς ὑπέμεενεν θέλησιν, καὶ τροπῆς προφανῶς ἐδέξατο πάθος, τὴν τῶν προσοψον αὐτῷ φυσικῶς πολλῶν θελήσεως μεῖώσαν. Εἰ δὲ παντάπασαν ἢ αὐθεντής, κρείττονα τῆς φύσεως ἀπέφηνεν ὡσοι τὴν ἔνωσιν, εἶ ἄτροπα ἀναπέφηνε, τῇ τῇ τῇ πρόσῳ αὐτῷ, ἀχέει κτησάμενος. Εἰ διὰ τὴν ἔνωσιν μία τοῦ Σωτῆρος ἡμῶν καθ’ ἐκατερον τῶν εἰ δὲν ἔστι γέγονεν θέλησις, πρόσφατος γέγονεν τῇ θελήσει Θεός, ἢ αὐτῶς διὰ τὴν ἔνωσιν τῇ φύσει μένων ἄδικος, καὶ ἀναρχὸς ἀνθρώπος τῇ θελήσει, μένων τῇ φύσει πρόσφατος, ὅπερ ἀδύνατον, ἢν μὴ λέγω ὑποθέσει. Εἰ διὰ τὴν ἔνωσιν μία τῶν φύσεων γέγονεν θέλησις, τί ἀρθεί διὰ τὴν αὐτὴν αἰτίαν μία τῶν φύσεων οὐ γεγένηται φύσις;’’

§ 6. Καὶ διακόφας ἐπὶ τούτως τὴν ἐν τούτως τοῦ λόγου φοράν Θεοδώσιος ὁ ἐπίσκοπος ἐπήθη: “Τί τοιῶν διὰ τὴν ἔνωσιν γέγονεν, εἰ μὴν τούτων γεγένηται δι’ αὐτήν;”

Μάξιμος: “Ἐνωρίκον ἐδείξατε ἀφευδώς γεγονότα τῶν ἀσαρκῶν αὐτῶν τῶν φύσεων. Θεόν καὶ τῶν ὅλων δημιουργῶν, φύσει γενόμενον ἀνθρώπων ἁμαρτίας παρεσπενήνει, ὡς τροπή φύσεως, ἡ μειώσει τῶν τῆς φύσεως, ἀλλ’ ἀληθεὶς προσφέρῃ νοερός ἐνυπογέιος σκοτεινός, ἡγοῦν ἀνελλοπούτος ἀνθρωπότητος, παντὸς προστατικοῦ καθαρᾶς κατὰ φύσιν ἐγκλήματος, καὶ τῷ κατ’ ἐπαλλαγὴν λόγῳ, τῷ βαθμῶς ὅστε καὶ πάση καταπληκτών, ὅλως ἐν τοῖς ἀνθρώποις Θεὸν τοῦ αὐτῶν ἄλοκληρον μένοντα τῶν ἀδικῶν εἶναι, ὅλως ἐν τοῖς θεοῖς ἀνθρώπων τοῦ αὐτῶν ἀλοκληρίως μένοντα τῶν ἀδικῶν ἀνέκπτυσιν. Περικύριος γὰρ εἰς ἀλλήλας τῶν φύσεων καὶ τῶν αὐτῶν προσώπων φυσικῶν, κατὰ τὴν τῶν θεογονῶν ἡμῶν πατέρων διάδοσιν, ἀλλ’ ὁ μεταφοράς ἢ μεταπτώσις διὰ τὴν ἔνωσιν γέγονεν, ὅπερ ἔδα τῶν σύγχρων κακούργου ἐποιεμένος τὴν ἔνωσιν, καὶ διὰ τοῦτο τοὺς κανόνας πολυτρότως ἐμφυρομένως, καὶ δι’ ἀπορίαν τὴς τοῦ κατ’ αὐτῶς λόγου σταθερότητος διωκόντων τοὺς εὐσεβεῖς.”
thing. If, because of the union, one will, according to them, of our Saviour was effected, indeed it will have as its cause the union and not either nature of those out of which he exists, and the will will clearly be dispositional, according to them, but not natural; for the rationale of truth understands the union as being dispositional, but not natural. If, because of the union, as they said, one will of our Saviour was effected, by which will do they say the union was effected? For they will certainly not say by that will which was effected through the union, if they pay attention to truth and avoid what is irrational. If, because of the union, one will of the Saviour was effected, it is clear that before the union he either had many wills or was completely without will. And if indeed he had many wills, he sustained the diminution of many wills, contracting them into one will, and he obviously accepted the experience of change, [namely] the diminution of the many wills which belonged to 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 showed plainly that he was changeable, acquiring by disposition what did not belong to him by nature. If, because of the union, one will of our Saviour was effected according to each of those out of which he exists, he was made God, new in will, the same being remaining eternal in nature on account of the union, and [he] was made] a human being without a beginning in will, remaining new in nature, which is impossible, not to mention impious. If, because of the union, one will was effected in the natures, why do you suppose that one nature was not effected of the natures by the same cause?

§6. And having exhausted the force of his argument in this debate on these points, Bishop Theodosius said: ‘What, then, was effected because of the union, if none of these possibilities came about through it?’

Maximus: ‘It demonstrated that the one who had been without flesh was enfleshed without deception; it proved distinctly that he was God by nature and creator of all, having become a human being by nature, not by a change of nature or by a diminution of any of what belongs to nature, but by the true assumption of rationally ensouled flesh, that is to say, not lacking in humanity, pure from all charge of original sin according to nature, and, by reason of the mutual interchange—which is truly marvellous and astonishing to everyone—wholly God in his human [properties], remaining entirely the same
§7. Ὡν ἀκούσας Θεοδόσιος ὁ ἐπίσκοπος ἔδωκε μετὰ τῶν λοιπῶν τῶν σὺν αὐτῷ παραγενομένων, τὸ λεχθὲν ἀποδέχεσθαι. Καὶ πάλιν ὁ αὐτὸς ἐπίσκοπος πρὸς τὸν ἀββᾶν Μάζιμων φησὶ: “Ποίησον ἀγάπην τί ἐστιν ὅπερ ἐπιστεύεις ἢμῖν, ὅτι οὐδεὶς ὡς τίς τὴν ὑπόστασαν, ἀλλ’ ὡς τί τὴν φύσιν ἐνεργεῖ; προσιταίαι γὰρ μοι μὴ νοῦσαν τὸ λεχθὲν.”

Μάζιμων: “Οἰδεῖς ὡς τίς τὴν ὑπόστασαν ἐνεργεῖ, ἀλλ’ ὡς τί τὴν φύσιν; οἷον Πέτρος καὶ Παύλος ἐνεργοῦσαν, ἀλλ’ οἱ Ἡρῴδεις καὶ Παύλοι καὶ Ἡρῴδεις, ἀλλ’ ἄνθρωποις ἁμφοῖς γὰρ ἀνθρώποι φυσικῶς κατὰ τὸν κοινὸν καὶ ὁριστικόν τῆς φύσεως λόγου, ἀλλ’ οὐχ’ ὑποστατικῶς κατὰ τὸ ἱδίον ποιοῦ. Ὁμοάλλος Μιχαὴλ καὶ Γαβριήλ ἐνεργοῦσαν, ἀλλ’ οὐχ’ Μιχαηλιτικῶς η Ζαβριηλιτικῶς, ἀλλ’ ἄγγελικώς: ἁμφοῖς γὰρ ἄγγελοι. Καὶ οὕτως ἐπὶ πάσης φύσεως, πολλῶν τῷ ἀρμοδίῳ κατηγορομένης, κατηγορομένης, ἀλλ’ οὐκ ἦτομοι μέγεν τὴν ἐνεργείαν θεωροῦμεν. Οὐκοῦν ὁ λέγων ὑποστατικῆς ἐνεργείας, αὐτὴν τὴν φύσιν μέναν οὕσεις, ἀπειρον τοῖς ἐνεργείαις εἰςάγει γεγενημένην, κατὰ τὸ πλῆθος τῶν ὑπ’ αὐτὴν ἀναγομένων ἀτόμων έαυτῆς διαφέρουσαν: ὅτε εἰ δεξιόμεθα καλὸς ἔχεις, πάσῃ φύσει τῶν ἐπ’ αὐτή τοῦ πῶς εἶμαι λόγον συνδιαφθείρουμεν.”

§8. Καὶ τούτων εἰρημένων, ἐν τῷ ἀσπάζεσθαι ἀλλήλους, εἶπε Θεοδόσιος ὁ ὅπατος: “Ἰδοὺ γέγονε τὰ πάντα καλῶς; ἅρα καταδέχεται ὁ βασιλεὺς παρακλητικῆς ποιήσας κέλευσαι.”

Καὶ λέγει ὁ ἀββᾶς Μάζιμων: “Πάντως ποιεῖ, εἰ μὲν θῆλη μοιχηθῆναι εἰναι τῷ Θεῷ, καὶ συνταπευνωθῆναι καὶ συγκεκουρήσαι αὐτῷ, διὰ τὴν κουφὴν πάντων ἢμῶν σωτηρίαν, λογιζόμενος ως ἐπερ ὁ φύσαι κύριοι Θεοὶ οὐκ ἔσωσιν ἐως ἐταπευμοθῆθαι θέλων, πῶς ὁ φύσαι σωζόμενος ἀνθρώπος, ἡ σωθῆσαι ἡ σώσει μὴ ταπευνοῦμεν.”

Καὶ εἶπε Θεοδόσιος ὁ ὅπατος ὅτι “Ἐλπίζω τοῦ Θεοῦ σωζόντος μοι τὴν μνήμην, τούτοις αὐτῶν τὸν λόγον λέγω, καὶ πείθεται.” Καὶ ἐπὶ τούτως ἀσπάσομαι ἀλλήλους, ἀπῆλθον μετ’ εἰρήνης, δεδοκιμάσα τῷ ἐπισκόπῳ τῷ ἀββᾶ Μάζιμων τῷ πεμφθὲν αὐτῷ ποινῶν οἰκτρῶν, καὶ στιχάριν καὶ καμάσαν καὶ τὸ μὲν στιχάριν εὐθέως καὶ κατ’ αὐτὴν τὴν ὄραν ἔπηρεν ὁ Βιζῳς ἐπίσκοπος. Ἔν δὲ τῷ Ρηγίῳ οὐ τὸ δοθὲν αὐτῷ ποινῶν μόνον, ἀλλὰ καὶ ἄλλο εἰ τῇ δήποτε έξε εὐτυχίας εἶχε, μετὰ τῶν λοιπῶν οἰκτρῶν αὐτῶν πραγμάτων καὶ ἐσθημάτων, ἀφειλάται.

b Cf. Phil. 2:8, 7
within his own [properties], wholly human in his divine [properties], remaining entirely [the same], not lapping from his own [properties]. For according to the teaching of our holy Fathers, who speak of God, through the union there occurred a mutual interpenetration of the natures and of the natural properties in them, but not a transfer or a lapse, which is characteristic of those who maliciously make the union a confusion,30 and on that account they mix it up with innovations in many ways, and because of the difficulty they have in remaining steadfast in their argument, they persecute the orthodox."

§7. When Bishop Theodosius heard this, it seemed that he and the rest of those who had come with him accepted what had been said. And again the same bishop said to Father Maximus: ‘Do me a favour! What is it you said to us—nobody as far as he is a person acts hypostatically, but as far as he is something acts naturally? For it occurs to me that I didn’t understand what was said.’

Maximus: ‘Nobody as a person acts hypostatically, but as something acts naturally. For example, Peter and Paul act, but not in a Peter-like and Paul-like manner, but in a human manner: they are both human beings by nature according to the common and definitive principle of nature, but not hypostatically according to what each does personally. Similarly, Michael and Gabriel act, but not in a Michael-like and Gabriel-like manner, but in an angelic manner: they are both angels. And so in every nature predicated in a great number of persons we observe activity that is common, but not individualized. So the one who speaks of a hypostatic activity introduces that very nature, although it is one, as made infinite in its activities, differing from itself according to the number of elements which are brought under it. If we accept that this is alright, we corrupt at the same time the principle of how every nature exists in itself.’

§8. And when this was said, while they were embracing each other the consul Theodosius said: ‘Look, everything has turned out well. Is the emperor then expected to make a supplicatory rescript?’337

And Father Maximus said: ‘Of course he will do so, if he wishes to be an imitator of God and to be humbled and emptied with him for the sake of the common salvation of us all, considering that if the God who saves by nature did not save until he was humbled willingly, how can the human being, who by nature needs to be saved, either be saved or save when he has not been humbled?’

And Theodosius the consul said: ‘I hope that, if God prompts my
§ 9. Μετὰ γὰρ τὸ ἀπελθὲν τοὺς εὑρημένους ἄνδρας, τῇ ὁγδόῃ τοῦ Σεπτεμβρίου μηνός τῆς παρούσης πεντεκαδεκάτης ἵδικτιών ἐξῆλθεν αὐτὸς Παύλος ὁ ὅποτος ἐν Βιζήν πρὸς τὸν ἀββᾶν Μάξιμον, κέλευσαν ἐπιφερόμενοι περιέχοσαν κατὰ τόν τῶν τόπων: "Κελεύσαμεν τῇ σῇ ἑνδοξότητι ἀπελθὲν ἐν Βιζήν, καὶ ἀγαγεῖν Μάξιμον τὸν μοναχὸν μετὰ πολλῆς τιμῆς καὶ κολακείας, διὰ τὸ τῆς γῆς καὶ τὴν ἀπέθαναν καὶ τὸ εἶναι αὐτὸν προγονικὸν ἴμων, καὶ γενομένου αὐτοῖς τίμιων· καὶ θέσθαι τούτων ἐν τῷ εὐαγείρων μοναστηρίῳ τοῦ ἁγίου Θεοδώρου, τῷ διακεκομένῳ πλησίον τοῦ Ρηγίου· καὶ ἐλθεῖν, καὶ μηνύειν ἰμών, καὶ πέμπομεν πρὸς αὐτὸν ἐκ προσώπου ἴμων δύο πατρικίου, ἐφείλοντας αὐτῷ διαλεχθῆναι τὰ παραστάντα ἢμῖν, φιλοῦντας ἢμᾶς ψυχικῶς, καὶ παρ᾽ ἴμων φιλομενῶς· καὶ ἐλθεῖν καὶ ἀναγειρέλῃ ἢμῖν τὴν παρουσίαν αὐτοῦ." Ἀγαγεῖν τοῖνος αὐτὸν καὶ ἀποθέμενος ὁ αὐτὸς ὅποτος ἐν τῷ ἑρθέντι μοναστηρίῳ, εἰσῆλθε μηνύσαι.

§10. Καὶ τῇ ἑξῆς ἡμέρᾳ ἐξέρχονται πρὸς αὐτὸν Ἑπιφάνιος καὶ Τρωίλος οἱ πατρικίου μετὰ πολλῆς περιβολῆς καὶ φαντασίας, καὶ Θεόδοσιος ὁ ἐπίσκοπος, καὶ ἀνέρχονται πρὸς αὐτὸν ἐν τῷ κατοικούμενῳ τῆς ἐκκλησίας τῆς αὐτῆς μονῆς· καὶ τοῦ συνήθους ἁστατοῦ γενομένου, ἐκάθισαν, βιασάμενοι καὶ αὐτὸν καθίσας. Καὶ ἀπαράμενοι τοῦ πρὸς αὐτὸν λόγου Τρωίλος εἶπεν: "Ὁ δεσπότης τῆς οἰκουμένης ἐκέλευσε τήμα πρὸς σὲ γενέσθαι, καὶ λαβάσαι ὑμᾶς τὰ δόξαντα τῷ αὐτοῦ θεοστηρίκτῳ κράτει. Ἄλλ᾽ εἰπεὶ ἵμων πρῶτον: ποιεῖς τὴν κέλευσιν τοῦ βασιλέως, ἦ σὺ ποιεῖς;"

Μάξιμος εἶπε: "Δέσποτα, ἀκούσω τί ἐκέλευσε τὸ εὐσεβές αὐτοῦ κράτος, καὶ δεάντων ἀποκρίνεσθαι ἐπεὶ πρὸς τὸ ἄγνοιαμένου μοί, ποιαν ἀπόκρισιν ἔχω δοθήναι;"

Τρωίλος δὴ εἶπεν δέλων λέγων: "Οὐκ ἐνδέχεται ὃτι λέγομεν τί ποτε, ἐὰν μὴ πρῶτον εἶπης ἐν ποιεῖς, ἦ σὺ ποιεῖς τὴν κέλευσιν τοῦ βασιλέως."

Καὶ ὁς εἶδεν αὐτοὺς ἑνσταμένους ἐπὶ πλείον, καὶ ἐπὶ τῇ ἁπαλῇ ἀυτοῦ πικρότερον βλέποντος, καὶ τραγύτερον ἀποκριμα-μένους μετὰ πάνω τῶν συνόντων αὐτοῖς, καὶ αὐτῶν ἀξίωμας κούμους ἐπηρεάσεως, ἀποκρίθηκε ὁ ἀββᾶς Μάξιμος εἶπεν: "Εἰπάν οὖν ἀνέχομαι εἰπεῖν τῷ δούλῳ ἴμων τὰ παραστάντα τῷ δεσπότῃ ἴμων καὶ βασιλεί, ἵνα λέγων, ἀκούοντος τοῦ Θεοῦ καὶ τῶν ἁγίων ἄγγελων καὶ πάνω ἴμων, ὅτε εἰτὶ τῇ δήποτε κέλευσοι μοι περὶ οἰονοθετεῖς πράγματος τῷ αὐτῶν τούτω συγκαταλογομένου καὶ συμφθειρομένου, προθυμίους ποιῶ."
memory, I will say the same to him and he will be persuaded.' And when after these words they had embraced each other, they departed in peace, after the bishop had given Father Maximus a pitiful amount of money which had been sent to him, and a tunic and a cloak. And the bishop of Bizya took away the tunic immediately and at the same moment. While in Rhegium they took away not only the money which had been given him, but also anything else at all he possessed as a result of receiving alms, together with his remaining pitiable effects and clothing.

§9. After the men I have mentioned departed, on eighth day of September in the current fifteenth indiction, the consul Paul went out again to Father Maximus in Bizya, taking with him an order comprising the following formula: 'We order Your Gloriousness to go to Bizya, and to bring back Maximus the monk with much honour and coaxing, both because of his age and infirmity, and the fact that he is our ancestor, and was honoured among them. And put him in the holy monastery of St Theodore, which is situated near Rhegium. And come and inform us, and we shall send to him as our representatives two patricians who must declare to him what we commend, because they love us sincerely and are beloved by us. And they must come and announce to us his arrival.' When, then, the consul himself had brought him and put him in the said monastery, he went back to announce it.

§10. And on the following day the patricians Epiphanius and Troilus went out to him enveloped in great ostentation, and also Bishop Theodosius, and they came up to him in the catechumens' place in the church of the same monastery. And when they had given the customary greeting they sat down, forcing him to sit too.

And opening the discussion with him, Troilus said: 'The master of the world has ordered us to come to you and to tell you what His divinely established Power has decided. But tell us first—will you do what the emperor orders, or not?'

Maximus said: 'Master, I will hear what His pious Power has ordered, and I will reply as necessary, because what kind of reply can I give to what I don’t know?'

But Troilus persisted, saying: 'It’s not possible for us to say anything at all, unless you say first whether you will or won’t do what the emperor orders.'

And when he saw them more insistent, and glaring at him more
Καὶ εὐθέως ἀναστάς Τρῳδὸς εἶπεν: “Εὐξασθεί μοι, ἐγὼ ὑπάγω· οὔτος γὰρ ὑώθεν ποιεῖ.”

Καὶ πολλοῦ πάνω γενομένου θορύβου, καὶ πολλῆς ταραχῆς καὶ συχχοῦσεως, εἶπεν αὐτὸς Θεοδώσιος ὁ ἐπίσκοπος: “Εἰπατε αὕτῳ τὴν ἀπόκρισιν, καὶ γνώσε τι λαλεῖ· ἔπει τὸ οὐτὸς εἰσελθεῖν μηδὲν εἰρήκοστας καὶ μηδὲν ἀκούσαντας, οὐκ ἔστων εὐδογον.”

Καὶ τότε Ἐσπάνιος ὁ πατρίκιος εἶπε: “Τούτῳ σοι δῆλοι δι’ ἡμῶν ὁ βασιλεὺς λέγω: Ἑσειδῆ πάσα ή δύσις, καὶ οἱ ἐν τῇ ἀνα\-τολῇ διαστρέφοντες εἰς σὲ θεωροῦσι, καὶ πάντες διὰ σὲ στασάμουσι, μὴ θέλοντες συμβιβασθῆναι ἡμῖν περὶ τὴν πίστιν κατανυξίζει σέ ὁ Θεὸς κοινωνήσαι ἡμῖν ἐπὶ τῷ παρ’ ἡμῶν ἐκτεθέντι Τύπῳ, καὶ ἐξερχόμεθα ἡμεῖς δι’ ἑαυτῶν εἰς τὴν Χαλκῆν, καὶ ἀσπαζόμεθα σὲ, καὶ ὑποτιθέμεθα ἡμῖν τὴν χείρα ἡμῶν, καὶ μετὰ πάσης τιμῆς καὶ δόξης εἰσάγομεν ἡμᾶς εἰς τὴν μεγάλην ἐκκλησίαν, καὶ μεθ’ ἑαυτῶν ἑστῶμεν ἐν ὧν κατὰ συνέβαινε τοι βασιλεῖς ἑστάνται, καὶ ποιοῦμεν ἀμα τὴν σύναξιν, καὶ κοινωνοῦμεν ἀμα τῶν ἀχράντων καὶ ζωοποιοῖν μυστηρίων τοῦ ζωοποιοῦ αὐτοῦ καὶ αἴματος τοῦ Χριστοῦ, καὶ ἀνακηρύττομεν σε πατέρα ἡμῶν, καὶ γίνεται χαρά ὦ μόνον τῇ φιλοχριστῷ καὶ βασιλείᾳ ἡμῶν πόλει, ἀλλὰ καὶ πάση τῇ ὁκουμένῃ. Ὅδαμεν γὰρ ἀσφαλῶς ὅτι σου κοινωνοῦντος τῷ ἁγίῳ τῶν ἐναπαθῆ θρόνῳ, πάντες ἐνοίκισατε ἡμῖν, οἱ διὰ σε καὶ τὴν σὴν διδασκαλίαν ἀποσχίζαντες τῆς κοινωνίας ἡμῶν.”

§11. Καὶ στραφεὶς πρὸς τὸν ἐπίσκοπον ὁ ἀββᾶς Μάξιμος μετὰ διακρίσεως εἶπεν αὐτῷ: “Κύριε ὁ μέγας, ἡμέραν κρίσεως ἐκδηλώθη σαντερεῖ.” Ὅδε λέγω ταῦτα καὶ ἔδωκαν ἐπὶ τῶν ἁγίων Ἀγγελιῶν καὶ τοῦ ζωοποιοῦ σταυροῦ, καὶ τῆς εἰκόνος τοῦ Θεοῦ καὶ Σωτῆρος ἡμῶν, καὶ τῆς αὐτοῦ τεκνογονίας παναγίας ἀπειραθέν-νου δητρός.”

Καὶ βαλὼν κάτω τὸ πρόσωπον ὁ ἐπίσκοπος ἔστασε ἐπὶ τὸ καθήμενον καὶ λέγει πρὸς αὐτὸν: “Καὶ τί ἐγὼ ἐγὼ μοι ὑπάρχω, ἐπὶ τοὺς τῆς ἐνεσθενατοῦ βασιλείας.”

Καὶ φησὶ πρὸς αὐτὸν ὁ ἀββᾶς Μάξιμος: “Καὶ διὰ τί ἢμα τῶν ἁγίων Ἀγγελιῶν, καὶ οἱ μετ’ αὐτῶν, οὐκ ὁμοίως ἐπὶ τῶν λαβαθέντων ἐκβάσεως; Ὁσανός πάσα ὅ δυναμιν πάντων τούτων ὑπηκοοῦσα τις πρὸς αὐτὸν. Τί γὰρ ἀπολογήσωμαι, αὐτὸ λέγω τῷ Θεῷ, ἀλλὰ τῷ ἐμῷ συνειδῆται, ότι διὰ τῶν ἀνθρώπων, τῷ καὶ αὐτὴν λόγων μυθηθοῦσα ἐχουσαν ὑπαρξήν, τὴν αὐξησαν τουσ στάργοντας αὐτὴν πίστιν ἐξωμοσάμην.”
vindictively because of his delay, and answering more harshly, together with all those who were with them, and [when he saw] that they themselves were distinguished in public offices, Father Maximus said in reply: ‘Seeing that you refuse to tell your servant what commends itself to our master the emperor, look, I say in the hearing of God and the holy angels, and all of you, that whatever he orders of me concerning any matter whatsoever which will be destroyed and brought to nothing with this age, I will do readily.’

And Troilius got up immediately and said: ‘Pray for me, I am going—he’s doing nothing.’

And when an exceedingly great tumult ensued, and great disturbance and confusion, Bishop Theodosius said to them: ‘Tell him the answer and see what he says, for to leave like this, having said nothing and heard nothing, is not reasonable.’

And then Epiphanius the patrician said: ‘It is this that the emperor makes clear to you through us, with the words: “Since all the West and those in the East who are causing subversion look to you, and they all stir up strife because of you, 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 Typas which was published by us, and we will go out of our own accord to the Chalke, and we will embrace you, and we will lay our hands on you, and with every mark of honour and glory we will lead you into the Great Church. And together we will stand where the emperors stand by custom, and together we will celebrate the synaxis, and together we will partake of the pure and life-giving mysteries of the life-giving body and blood of Christ, and we will proclaim you 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 with certainty that when you are in communion with the holy see of those here, all those who, on account of you and your teaching, were separated from our communion will be united with us.”’

§ 11. And turning to the bishop, Father Maximus said to him tearfully: ‘Great lord, we all await the day of judgement. You know what has been prescribed and decided with reference to the holy Gospels and the life-giving cross, and the image of our God and Saviour, and of the most holy ever-virgin mother who bore him.’

And bending down the bishop said to him in a gentler voice: ‘And what am I able to do, seeing that something else occurred to the most orthodox emperor?’
Καὶ ἐπὶ τῷ λόγῳ τούτῳ ἀναστάτες, θυμοῦ στρατηγήσαντος πάντας αὐτοὺς, τιμωσὶ καὶ ὀθοιμοὶ καὶ σφαεροὶ παρέδοον αὐτὸν, ἀπὸ κεφαλῆς ἕως ὀνύχων κατακλύσασες αὐτὸν πτύσμασιν· ὄντες, μέχρις ὡς ἐπιλύθησαν ἀπερ περιμέβλητο ἑμάτια, διεπνέετο ὁ βρόμος.

Καὶ ἀναστὰς ὁ ἐπίσκοπος εἶπεν: "Ὅτε ὦκ ἐζει γενέσθαι, ἀλλ’ ἀκούσαι μόνον παρ’ αὐτοῦ τὴν ἁπάκρισιν, καὶ εἰσελθεῖν καὶ ἀναγεννᾶ τῷ δεσπότῃ ἡμῶν τῷ ἁγαθῷ. Τὰ γὰρ κανονικὰ πράγματα ἐτέρω διοικοῦσι τρόπῳ."

§12. Καὶ μόλις πεῖσας αὐτούς ὁ ἐπίσκοπος ἰσχύσαι, πάλιν ἐκθάσαι, καὶ μυρίαις ὦβρεσι καὶ ἀραῖς ἀνεπνοητοῖς μιμώσαντες αὐτὸν, μετὰ θυμοῦ πάλλου καὶ πραξάττετος εἶπεν Ἑσπάνιος: "Εἰπε, κακέσχητε φαγοπόλιε, ὡς ἀἱρετικοὺς ἔχων ἡμᾶς καὶ τὴν πόλιν ἡμῶν καὶ τὸν βασιλεία, τούτοις εἶπας τοὺς λόγους; Ὁστος πλεῖον σου Χριστιανοὶ ἐσμέν καὶ ὀρθόδοξοι καὶ τὸν Κύριον ἡμῶν καὶ Θεόν ὀμολογοῦμεν ἐχεῖν καὶ θείκη ἁθλησθω καὶ ἀνθρωπότηκ θελήσαι, καὶ νοεράν ψυχήν καὶ ὅτι πάσα νοερὰ φύσις πάντως ἔχει τὸ ἔθελεν ἐκ φύσεως καὶ τὸ ἐνεργεῖ, ἐπειδὴ ἔσωξ ἢδον ἡ κύριος, καὶ νοῦ ἢδον ἡ κάθηκας. Καὶ νεκρικοῖν αὐτῶν οἴδας, οὐ θεότητι μοῦν, ἀλλὰ καὶ ἀνθρωπότητι. Ἀλλὰ καὶ τὰς δυο θελήσεις αὐτοῦ καὶ ἐνεργείας οὐκ ἀρνοῦμεθα."

Καὶ ἀποκριθεὶς ὁ ἄββας Μάξιμος εἶπεν: "Εἰαν οὖτω πιστεύετε, καθὼς αἱ νοερεῖ φύσει καὶ ἡ τοῦ Θεοῦ ἐκκλησία, πῶς με καταναγκάζετε κοινωνῆσαι ἐπὶ τῷ Τύπῳ, τῷ μόνῃ τὴν τούτων ἔχοντι ἀναρέσει τῶν παρ’ ὑμῶν ὀμολογηθέντων;"

Καὶ ἐπεν Ἑσπάνιος: "Δι’ ὅσιοιμϊν τοῦτο γέγονεν, ἵνα μὴ βλαβοῦσιν οἱ λοιπὶ τῶν τυπάσεις λεπτοτέραις φωναίς."

Καὶ ἀποκριθεὶς ὁ ἄββας Μάξιμος εἶπε: "Τουρανίου πᾶς ἀνθρω- πός ἀγιάζεται διὰ τῆς ἀκριβοῦ ὀμολογίας τῆς πίστεως, οὐ μὴν διὰ τῆς ἁμαρτείως τῆς ἐν τῷ Τύπῳ κειμενῆς."

Καὶ ἐπεν Τριώλος: "Καὶ ἐν τῷ παλατίῳ εἴπον οὖν, ὅτι οὐκ ἁμαρτεί, ἀλλὰ κατασταθήσεται ἐκέλευσον, ἵνα εἴρητομεν πάντες."

Καὶ ἀποκριθεὶς ὁ ἄββας Μάξιμος εἶπεν: "Ἡ σαρή τῶν λόγων, ἀναίρεσις τῶν λόγων ἐστί. Διὰ γὰρ τοῦ προφητών λέγει τὸ Πνεύμα τὸ ἁγιον. Ὁμιλεῖ λαλοῖ ὄνεοι λόγοι, οὐ μὴν ἀκούσωνται αἱ φωναὶ αὐτῶν. Ὁδεικνύον ὁ μὴ λαλούμενος λόγος, οὐδ’ ὅλως ἐστί."
And Father Maximus said to him: 'And why did you and those with you swear on the holy Gospels, when in your case you did not fulfil what was said? Truly, all the power in heaven could not persuade me to do this. For what reason should I give—I don't say to God, but to my conscience—for having denied the faith which saves those who cherish it, on account of human glory which has no substance according to its rationale?'

And at these words, when rage had overpowered them all, they got up, and disabled him by repeatedly pulling and shoving and hustling him, saturating him from head to toe by their spitting. Until the garments which he wore were washed, the stench that they gave off was pervasive.

And the bishop got up and said: 'You shouldn't have done this, but only heard his answer from him and gone and announced it to our good master: canonical matters are settled in another way.'

§12. And when with difficulty the bishop had persuaded them to be quiet, they sat down again, and, disparaging Maximus with countless outrageous remarks and unthinkable curses, Epiphanius said with great rage and harshness: 'Tell us, you utter villain, you hoary old glutton—did you say these words because you consider us and our city and the emperor as heretics? In reality 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 certainly able to will and to have an activity out of its nature, because motion is characteristic of life, and will is characteristic of intellect. And we are acquainted with the fact that he possessed a will, not only with respect to divinity but also with respect to humanity. In fact we don't deny that he has two wills and activities.'

And in reply Father Maximus said: 'If you believe as rational natures and the church of God do, how is it that you are forcing me to enter into communion on the terms of the Typos which contains only the abrogation of what you profess?'

And Epiphanius said: 'It was on account of an arrangement that this happened, lest the laity be harmed by too subtle words of this kind.'

And in reply Father Maximus said: 'On the contrary, each person is sanctified by the scrupulous confession of the faith, not through the abrogation of it, which is found in the Typos.'

And Troilus said: 'I said to you in the palace as well that it did not
Καὶ εἰπεῖ Τρωίλος· "Ἐχε ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ σου ὡς θέλεις· οδδεὶς σε κωλεῖ." 

Καὶ λέγει ὁ ἄββας Μάξιμος· "Αλλ’ οὐ περιώρισεν ὁ Θεὸς τῇ καρδίᾳ τὴν ὅλην σωτηρίαν εἰπὼν· ὁ μὴ ὁμολογῶν με ἐμπροσθεν τῶν ἀνθρώπων, οὔτε ἔγω ὁμολόγησον αὐτὸν ἐμπροσθεν τῷ Πατρός μοι τοῦ ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς. Καὶ ὁ θείος ἀπόστολος διδάσκει λέγουν· Καρδίᾳ μὲν πιστεύεται εἰς δικαιοσύνην στόματι, δέ όμολογεῖται εἰς σωτηρίαν." Εἰ ὁ Θεός καὶ οἱ τοῦ Θεοῦ προφῆται καὶ ἀπόστολοι κελεύουσιν ὁμολογεῖται τὸ μιντήριον φωναῖς ἀγίων, τὸ μέγα καὶ φρικτόν καὶ παντός τοῦ κόσμου σωτήριον, οὐκ ἔστε χρεία οἰκεῖοτητος τρόπων καταπαγούσης τὴν τοῦτο κηρύσσουσαν φωνήν, ἵνα μὴ μειωθῇ τῶν αἰγών τῆς σωτηρίας." 

Καὶ ἀποκριθεὶς τραχυτάτῳ λόγῳ Τιθάνιος ἐπείπ· "Ὑπογράφας ἐν τῷ λιβέλλῳ," 

Καὶ εἶπεν ὁ ἄββας Μάξιμος· "Ναι, ὑπέγραφα." 

"Καὶ πῶς ἐτόλμησος," ἐπείπ, "ὑπογράφαι, καὶ ἀναθηματίας τοὺς ὁμολογούντας καὶ πιστεύοντας ὡς αἱ νοεραί φύσεις καὶ ἡ καθολικὴ ἐκκλησία; Ὅτι τῇ ἑμῷ κρίσει εἰςαγόμενοι σε εἰς τὴν πόλιν, καὶ ἱστόμεν εἰς τὸν φόρον δεδεμένον, καὶ τοὺς μίμους καὶ τὰς μμαδᾶς καὶ τὰς προεστάμενας πόρους καὶ πάντα τὸν λαὸν φέρομεν, ἵνα ἐκατοπτεῖ καὶ ἐκάστη ταῖς ἐκπυρώση ἐις τὸ πρώποτον σου." 

Καὶ πρὸς ταῦτα ἀποκριθεὶς ἐφῆ ὁ ἄββας Μάξιμος· "Ὡς εἰπατε γένηται, ἐὰν τοὺς ὁμολογοῦντας τὰς δίοις φύσεις ἐξ ὃν ὁ Κύριος ἔστι, καὶ τὰς καταλήπτους αὐτῶν δύο φυσικὰς θελήσεις καὶ ἐνεργεῖας Θεῷ φύσει κατὰ ἀλλήλους ὠντι καὶ ἀνθρώπων, ἀνθεμπε- 

τάσαμεν. Ἀνάγωγοι, δέσποτα, τὰ πετραγμέα καὶ τὸν λιβέλλον, καὶ ἔαν ὡς εἰπατε εὕρητε, ποιῆσατε ὅπερ βούλεσθε. Ἔγω γὰρ καὶ οἱ σῶμαλοι μου καὶ ὡσι ὑπέγραφαν, τοὺς κατὰ τὸν Ἀρείον καὶ Ἀπολλώριον μίαν θελήσαν καὶ μίαν ἐνέργειαν λέγοντας, ἀνθεμπε- 

τάσαμεν, καὶ μὴ ὁμολογούντας τὸν Κύριον ἵμαρ καὶ Θεὸν καθ’ ἐκατέρω τῶν ἐξ ὃν, ἐν οἷς τε καὶ ἄπερ ἔστι, φύσει γιορτῶν, καὶ διὰ τοῦτο κατ’ ἀμφοὶ θελητικοῦ καὶ ἐνεργητικοῦ τῆς ἱμαρ τοῦτο θελημα." 

Καὶ λέγουσι· "Εὰν τοῦτο συναπαχθῶμεν, οὐτε τρώγωμεν, οὔτε πίνουμεν ἄλλα ἀναστώμεν, καὶ ἀριστήσωμεν, καὶ εἰδέλθωμεν καὶ εἰπόμεν ἀπερ ἡκούσαμεν. Ὑδίος γὰρ πέπρακεν εαυτόν τῷ Σατανᾷ." 

6 Matt. 10:32 6 Rom. 10:10
abrogate but ordered silence, in order that we might all enjoy peace.’

And in reply Father Maximus said: ‘The silencing of words is the
abrogation of words: through the prophet the Holy Spirit says: “There
are no speeches nor words of which their voices will not be heard.” Therefore the
word which is not uttered, in no way exists.’

And Troilus said: ‘Believe in your heart as you wish—nobody is
preventing 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 human
beings, neither shall I confess him before my Father who is in heaven.” And the
divine apostle teaches with the words: “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 order the verbal confes-
sion of the mystery of holy things, which is great and fearful, and for
the salvation of the whole world there is no need in any way to silence
a word which proclaims this, lest the salvation of those who are silent
be diminished.’

And in reply Epiphanius said in very harsh terms: ‘Have you put
your signature to the document?’

And Father Maximus said: ‘Yes, I have put my signature to it.’

‘And how’, he said, ‘did you dare to put your signature to it, and to
anathematize 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 bring actors and actresses and prostitutes who stand in public,
and the entire populace, so that every man and every woman may
slap you and spit in your face.’

And to this Father Maximus said in reply: ‘Let it be done as you
have said, if we have anathematized those who confess the two
natures from which the Lord is, and congruent with him, who is God
by nature in truth, and human, the two natural wills and activities.
Read out, master, the acts and the document, and if you find it as you
said, do what you like. After all, I and my fellow-servants and every-
one who put their signature to it anathematized those who speak of
one will and one activity, following Arius and Apollinaris, and not
those who confess our Lord and God according to each of the natures
out of which, and in which, and which he is, to be rational in nature,
and for that reason according to both [natures] to will and work for
our salvation.’

And they said: ‘If we get carried away on this point we will
neither eat nor drink. Instead, let’s get up and have lunch, and go in
Καὶ ἀναστάντες ἡρῴασαν καὶ εἰσήλθον μετ’ ὀργὴς, τῇ παρα-
μοιᾷ τῆς ὁψώσεως τοῦ τιμίου καὶ ζωοποίου σταυροῦ.

§13. Καὶ τῇ ἐξής ἐωθεὶ ἐξήλθε Θεοδώρος ὁ ὑπάτος πρὸς τὸν
eἰρημένον ἄββαν Μάξιμον, καὶ ἀφείλατο πάντα ὅσα εἶχεν, εἰτῶν
ἀυτῷ ἐκ προσωποῦ τοῦ βασιλέως ὅτι “Ὅτι ἡθέλησας τιμῆν, καὶ
ἐμακρύνθη ἀπ’ σοῦ. Καὶ ὑπάγε ὡς ἄγει ἥρκεις εἶναι,
ἐχὼν τὸ κράμα τῶν μαθητῶν σου, τοῦ τε ἐν Μεσημβρίᾳ καὶ τοῦ ἐν
Περβέροις, τοῦ γενομένου νοταρίου τῆς μακαρίας ἡμᾶς μάμιμης.”
Ἡσαν δὲ καὶ οἱ πατρίκιοι, τούτεστι Τροχλός καὶ Ἐπιφάνιος
eἰρηκότες ὅτι “Πάντως φέρομεν καὶ τοὺς δύο σου μαθητάς, τὸν τε
ἐν Μεσημβρίᾳ καὶ τὸν ἐν Περβέροις, καὶ δοκιμάζομεν καὶ αὐτούς,
καὶ βλέπομεν καὶ τὴν ἐπ’ αὐτοῖς ἐκβασιν.” Πλὴν ἦν οἶδα, καὶ
ἀββά, ὅτι μικρὰν ἁνέαν ἄνα βάζωμεν ἐκ τῆς συγχώσεως τῶν
ἐθνῶν, ἀρμόσασθαι ὡς ἔχομεν, μά τὴν ἀγίαν Τριάδα, καὶ τὸν
πάπα τὸν ὑπ’ ἐσάραμεν, καὶ πάντας τοὺς ἀκείσαν λαλοῦντας,
καὶ τοὺς λυποὺς σου μαθητάς, καὶ πάντας ἡμᾶς χωνεύομεν, ἐκατῶν
ἐν τῷ ἐπιπτέειμι αὐτοῦ τόπῳ, ὅσ’ ἐχωνεύθη Μαρτύνος.” Καὶ λαβών
αὐτῶν ὁ ἄρηθεις ὑπάτος Θεοδώρος παρέδωκεν αὐτοῖς στρατιώτας,
καὶ ἤγαγεν αὐτῶν ἑως Σαλαμβρίας.

§14. Καὶ ἔμειναν ἐκεῖ δύο ἡμέρας, ἐσὼ ὡς ἀπῆλθεν εἰς τὸ
φοσσάτον ὁ εἰς τῶν στρατιωτῶν, καὶ εἶπεν ὅλῳ τῷ στρατῷ ὅτι “Ὁ
μοναχὸς ὁ βλασφημῶν τὴν Θεότοκον ἄδει ἔρχεται.” Τοῦτο δὲ
πεποίηκασιν ἵνα κινήσασι τὸν στράτον κατὰ τὸν ῥήθητος ἄββα
Μάξιμον, ὅσ’ βλασφημοῦντος τὴν Θεότοκον. Καὶ μετὰ δύο ἡμέρας
ἐπανελθὼν ὁ στρατιώτης, ἐλαβὲν αὐτῶν ἐν τῷ φοσσάτῳ, καὶ
κατανυγεῖς ὑπὸ τοῦ Θεοῦ ὁ στρατηγὸς, ἦγου τὸν τοποτηρῆτος τοῦ
στρατηγοῦ, ἐπεμβὰν ἐγγύς αὐτῶν πρὸς βάλλων, πρεσβυτέρους καὶ διακόνους καὶ τοὺς ἐκλάβους συνοφυλάκας.
Οὐς ἰδὼν παραγεγομένοις ὁ βριθεὶς ἄββας Μάξιμος, ἐγέρθης
ἐβαλεν μετάνασαν καὶ ἀντέβαλον κάκεινοι, καὶ ἐκάθησαν, κελέσα-
νες καὶ αὐτῷ καθίσασι. Καὶ τοὺς πάντας γέρων τίμιοι εἶπε πρὸς αὐτῶν
μετὰ πολλῆς τῆς εὐδαίμονας: “Πάτερ, ἐπειδὴ ἔσκανδαλίσαν ἡμᾶς
τινὲς εἰς τὴν σὴν ἀγιωσάνθην, ὥς οὐ λέγεις Θεότοκον τὴν ἐσπονὴν
ἡμῶν τὴν παναγίαν παρθένου, ὁρκίζω σε κατὰ τὴν ἁγίας καὶ
ὁμοουσίου Τριάδος εἴπειν ἡμῖν τὴν ἄληθειαν, καὶ ἀποτύφωσαι
κατὰ τῶν καρδιῶν ἡμῶν τοῦτο τὸ σκάνδαλον, ἵνα μὴ βλαπτώμεθα
ἀδίκως σκανδαλιζόμενοι.”

⁷ Pσ. 108: 17
and say what we have heard. For this fellow has sold himself to Satan.’

And they got up and had lunch. And they went in angrily to the vigil of the exaltation of the precious and life-giving cross.  

§13. And on the next day at dawn, the consul Theodosius went out to Father Maximus whom I have spoken of, and took away all his possessions, saying to him as the emperor’s representative: ‘You refused honour, and it has been removed from you. And go where you judged you would be worthy, bearing the sentence of condemnation passed on your disciples, both the one in Mesembria and the one in Perberis, who was the notary of our blessed grandmother.  

But there were also the patricians, namely Troilus and Epiphanius, who said: ‘We will of course produce your two disciples as well, both the one in Mesembria and the one in Perberis, and we will try them too, and we will see the result in their case also. But so that you may know, lord Father, that if we have a short respite from the confusion of the people, by the holy Trinity, we will refrain from accommodating ourselves to you, and we will remove the present pope and all people who speak there, and the rest of your disciples, and we will put all of you to the test by fire, each in his own place, as Martin was put to the test by fire.’ And the consul Theodosius, whom I have mentioned, took him and handed him over to the soldiers, and they led him as far as Scymbria.  

§14. And they stayed there for two days, until one of the soldiers reached the camp and told the entire army: ‘The monk who blasphemes against the Mother of God is on his way here.’ But they did this to incite the army against Father Maximus, whom I have spoken of, on the grounds that he blasphemed against the Mother of God. And after two days the soldier came back and took him to the camp, and the general, stirred by God, that is to say, the acting general, sent to him the leaders of the garrison, priests and deacons and devout keepers of the colours.  

When Father Maximus, whom I have mentioned, saw them arrive, he stirred himself and knelt, and they too knelt in their turn, and they sat down, ordering him to sit down as well. And a certain exceedingly old, honourable man said to him with great reverence: ‘Father, because 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
Καὶ βαλὼν μετάνοιαν ἀνέστη, καὶ ἐκτείνας τὰς χεῖρας εἰς τῶν οὐρανῶν μετὰ δικρών εἶπεν ὡς μὴ λέγων τὴν δέσποιναν ἡμῶν τὴν παντόμοιον καὶ παναγίαν ἀχραντον, καὶ πάση τῇ φύσει τῇ νοερᾷ σεπτήν, φυσικὴν ἀληθῶς μητέρα τοῦ Θεοῦ γενομενήν, τοῦ πατήραν τὸν οὐρανον καὶ τὴν γῆν καὶ τὴν θάλασσαν καὶ πάντα τὰ ἐν αὐτοῖς, ἔστω ἀνάθεμα καὶ κατάθεμα ἀπὸ τοῦ Πατρὸς καὶ τοῦ Υἱοῦ καὶ τοῦ Ἁγίου Πνεύματος, τῆς ἕμουσιν καὶ ἐπερουσίων Τριάδος, καὶ πάσης ἐπουρανίου δυνάμεως, καὶ τοῦ χριστοῦ τῶν ἁγίων ἀποστόλων καὶ προφητῶν, καὶ τοῦ ἀπείρου δήμου τῶν ἁγίων μαρτύρων, καὶ παντός πνεύματος ἐν δικαιοσύνῃ τελεῖομένου, τῶν καὶ ἐκκαὶ ἐκ τῶν αἰώνων αἰμήν.

Καὶ κλαίαντες πάντες, ἤδηστον αὐτῷ λέγοντες ὡς ὁ Θεὸς ἐνδυναμώσεις σε, πάτερ, καὶ ἄξιοις σε ἀπρόσκοπον τελείωσί σε τὸν θρόμον τοῦτον.

Καὶ τούτων εἰρήμενων ἤθροισθησαν πολλοὶ στρατιώται, πολλῶν καλῶν κυνηγόντων λόγων ἀκρομένων: καὶ θεωρήσας τῶν δομετίκων τοῦ στρατηγοῦ ὅτι πολὺς ἐπισωρεύεται στρατός καὶ οἰκοδομέεται, καὶ καταγωγὸς τῶν εἰς αὐτὸν γενομένων, τί υπονόησας ο Θεὸς οἶδεν, ἐπέστρεψεν ἀνάρπαστον αὐτὸν γενέσθαι καὶ βιβληθῆναι ἀπὸ δύο μιλίων τοῦ φοισάτου, εἰς ἂν τὴν συναγερμῷ ποιήσαι, καὶ ἐλθὼν οἱ ἄφεντοι ἀπαγαγεῖν αὐτόν ἐν Περπέρωις. Πλὴν ὅτι θεία κινοῦμενοι ἁγάρη οἱ κληρικοὶ ἐπέζηνεν τὰ δύο μίλια, καὶ ἦλθον, καὶ ἰστάσαντο αὐτὸν, καὶ γέφυραν αὐτὸς καὶ χεῖριν ἑδάς βαστάζοντες ἐπέθηκαν αὐτὸν ἐπὶ τὸ κτῆμα, καὶ ὑπέστρεψαν μετ’ εἰρήνης εἰς τοὺς τόπους αὐτῶν. Καί αὐτός ἀπερίθηκεν ἐν Περπέρωις ἐν τῇ συνεχούσῃ αὐτὸν φονείᾳ.

§15. Καὶ τούτῳ δὲ ἵστεον, ὅτι ἐν τῷ Πηγάρῳ ἀποτενόμενον Ἰωάννη τοῦ Ἀβίλα Μάχιμον εἶπεν, ὡς ὁ κοσμιλαίρος Ἰωάννης ἔγραψεν αὐτῷ περί αυτοῦ λόγως προσβαθείσης αὐτοῦ καὶ ἀρεσάςας αὐτοῖς: "Καὶ τούτῳ γενέσθαι τέως, ἤ τῶν σῶν μαθητῶν αὐτῶ θαλάνθητεν." Ὅμως δὲ ὅτι οὐκ ἔγραψεν ὁ εἰρημένος κοσμιλαίρος Ἰωάννης τὸν Τρωίλον, ἀλλὰ πρὸς Μηνᾶν τὸν μοναχὸν, κάκειον λοίπον εἶπε τοῖς τοῦ παλατίου.

§16. Καὶ μετὰ ταῦτα ἔγγαγεν αὐτοῖς ἐν Κωνσταντινοπόλει, καὶ ἔποιχαν κατ’ αὐτῶν πράξεις, καὶ μετα τὸ ἀναθεματίας καὶ ἀνασκάψας αὐτοῖς, τὸν ἐν ἁγίοις Μάχιμον καὶ τὸν μακάριον Ἀναστίσαν τῶν μαθητῶν αὐτοῦ, τὸν τῆς ἁγίωτος πάπαν Μαρτινόν, καὶ τὸν ἁγίον

2 Ex. 20: 11, Ps. 145: 6, Acts 4: 24, etc. 3 2 Tim. 4: 7
Trinity to tell us the truth, and to turn away this scandal from our hearts, so that we don’t suffer harm because we have been wrongfully scandalized.’

And after kneeling, he stood up, and stretching out his hands to heaven he said tearfully: ‘The one that does not say that Our Lady, who is worthy of all praise and most holy, inviolate, and venerable to every rational creature, was truly made the natural Mother of God who made heaven and earth and the sea, and everything which is in them, let him be anathema and katakathema from the Father and the Son and the Holy Spirit, the consubstantial and supra-essential Trinity, and from every power in heaven, and from the choir of the holy apostles and prophets, and the innumerable crowd of the holy martyrs, and from every spirit perfected in justice, now and always and 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 when this had been said, many soldiers gathered to hear the many positive words which were exchanged. And when one of the general’s body-guards observed that much of the army was crowding up and being edified, and criticizing what was happening to Maximus, he, suspecting God knows what, commanded Maximus to be taken off and put two miles away from the camp until they had celebrated the synaxis, and those who were to take him away to Perberis had come. Except that the clerics were moved by divine love and went the two miles on foot, and came and greeted him and prayed for him, and carrying him in their arms, they put him on a beast and returned in peace to their own places. And Maximus was led off to Perberis under constant guard.

§15. And this should be known: that in Rhegium Troilus said with reference to Father Maximus that John the consiliarius had written to him concerning an agreement which had been offered to them and was acceptable to them, ‘although in the meantime the disorder among your disciples prevented this from happening.’ But I think that John the consiliarius, whom I have mentioned, did not write to Troilus but to the monk Menas, and it was he who reported it in turn to those in the palace.

§16. And after this they took them to Constantinople and took action against them, and after anathematising and cursing them, St
Σωφρόνων τὸν πατριάρχην Ἱεροσολύμων, καὶ πάντας τοὺς ἀρθροδόξους καὶ σύμφωνας αὐτῶν, ἤνεγκαί καὶ τὸν ἄλλον μακάριον Ἀναστάσιον, καὶ τοὺς αὐτούς ἀναθέματι καὶ ἰδίᾳ χρησάμενοι καὶ ἐπὶ αὐτῷ, παρέθυκαν τοῖς ἄρχοντες εἰπόντες αὐτῶς: "Σὺ μὲν οὖν Ἀναστάσιε, τὸ φαίνει τῆς πανθῆμον τῶν ἀναθεμάτων τῆς ἀράς ἐνδυσάμενος περιβόλαιον, ἀπολλάσσω τῆς κανονικῆς ἀκροάσεως, πρὸς ἥν ἤρετών στὰς τῆς γεέννης ἀποφεύγομεν, συνούσης ἡμῖν τῆς εὐκλείας καὶ πάντα συν-
διατηρήσας τιμίας τε καὶ ἵππος συγκλήτου, παραχρῆμα τὸν μεθ’ ἡμᾶς παραληφθέντος κρίσιν, καὶ τὰ τοῖς πολιτικοῖς δοκοῦσα νόμῳ ἐπὶ τοῖς διαταξεμένοις, ὡς αὐτοὶ δοκιμάσει, τῶν τηλικοῦτων συν βλασφημῶν ἐνεκα καὶ τυραννίδων." 

§17. Ψῆφος γ’ κατ’ αὐτῶν. 

Τὴς παρούσης συνόδου, καὶ συνεργία τοῦ παντοδυνάμου Χριστοῦ τοῦ ἀληθοῦς ἡμῶν Θεοῦ, κανονικῶς ψηφισαμένης τὰ δέοντα καθ’ ὑμῶν, Μάξιμος Ἀναστάσιος καὶ Ἀναστάσιος, ἔπει τὸ λείπον ύπήρχε ἀπὸ τὰ παρ’ ὑμῶν λεγόμενα τὰ δυσσεβῶς καὶ πρακτέντα, ταῖς αὐτοτροφεῖς τῶν νόμων καθυποβληθῆναι ποιναῖς, εἰ καὶ δέξοι ποιή τῶν τοιούτων ὑμῶν πλή-
μελημάτων καὶ βλασφημίων οὐχ’ ὑπετεί, τῷ δικαίῳ ὑμᾶς περί τῆς μείναις καταλιπθέντες κρίσις, τῶν νόμων κεφαλῆς ἀκρίβειας, κεφαλαιών ὑμῶν τὸ ζῆν, ψηφισμένα, τὸν παρόντα ἡμῶν πανεῖδον ἐπαρχούσαν, αὐτίκα παραλαμβάνοντα ὑμᾶς ἐν τῷ κατ’ αὐτὸν πολιάρχοις πραιτωρίᾳ, νεώτεροι τὰ μετέφεραν τύποντα Ἀναστάσιον καὶ Ἀναστάσιον, τὸ ὄργανον τῆς ὑμῶν Μάξιμος καὶ Ἀναστάσιος ἀκολούθας, τούτα τῇ τῆς παρούσης ὑμῶν γλώσσαν, ἐνδόθεν ἐκτεμένω ἐπὶ δὲ καὶ τὴν διακοσμήσαντα τὸν ἑαυτὸς ὑμῶν λογισμῷ σκαιροῦ τὴς ἐξουσίας διαστέματι, περι-
οικισμένους ὑμᾶς στερήσῃ τῶν αὐτῶν βιβλιακῶν μελῶν, τὰ δυσκαλεῖκα 
μιμούσα ταύτης τῆς κυρίας τῶν πόλεων περινοστέασαι, ἀδειφύγω τε καὶ 
φυλακὴ προσπενθοῦτοι διηρκεῖ διαρκήν ὑμᾶς, πρὸς τὸ μετεύχει ὑμᾶς καὶ εἰς τὸν ἔρωτα τῆς ζωῆς ὑμῶν χρόνον τὰ οἰκεῖα οἰμαίους ἑπικράτησα, τῆς ἐπισυνοδεύσεως καθ’ ὑμῶν ἀράς περιπετεῖσθαι τῆς ὑμῶν κεφαλῆς. 

Παραλαβόν μον ἀυτοῖς ὁ ἐπαρχὸς καὶ κολάσας ἐτέρω τὰ μέλη 
αὐτῶν καὶ περιγαγών ὄλην τὴν πάλιν ἔξωρισεν αὐτοῦ ἐν Λαξικῇ.

1 Cf. 2 Tim. 4:8
Maximus and blessed Anastasius his disciple, and the most holy Pope Martin, and holy Sophronius the patriarch of Jerusalem, and all the orthodox and those who shared their opinion, they brought the other blessed Anastasius as well, and employing the same anathemata and insults against him too, they handed him over to the rulers with these words: 'Therefore you, Anastasius, because you have put on the grey shroud of the anathemata and curse of the entire populace, depart from the canonical hearing, in whose eyes you have been carried off and have chosen the sedition of hell. The honourable senate which is esteemed and holy acts with us and decides with us in every matter; it will immediately accept our verdict and will carry out in your regard what is decided by the laws of the city, as they themselves approve, because of the enormity of your acts of blasphemy and rebellion.'

The Third Sentence against them

§17. 'The present synod, with the assistance of the all-powerful Christ and true God, has passed the appropriate canonical sentence on you, Maximus, Anastasius, and Anastasius. It was already in store for you, in view of what had been said and done impiously by you, that you would be subjected to the harsh penalties of the law in the present life—even though a just penalty does not exist for the kinds of trespasses and blasphemies you have committed; we leave you to the just judge with regard to the greater penalty—and on the question of penalty we have exhausted the precision of the law, [and] are sparing your life. We have passed sentence that the all-praiseworthy eparch who is with you is to take you immediately to the praetorium where he rules over many. And when he has flogged Anastasius and Anastasius he is to cut out from inside your mouth the organ of your licentiousness, Maximus and Anastasius, that is your blaspheming tongue. Then he is to sever with his sword your sinister right hand because it ministered to your blasphemous argument. When you have been led around after the amputation of your abominable limbs, he is to walk around the twelve sections of this sovereign city, and to hand you over to lifelong exile and, what is more, permanent custody, so that afterwards and for every year of your lives you will bewail your own blasphemous errors, and the curse which you contrived against us is turned upside down on your head.'

The eparch took them, then, and punished them by cutting their limbs. And after leading them around the entire city, he sent them out into exile in Lazica.
EP. MAXIMI AD ANASTASIUM
MONACHUM DISCIPULUM

(CPG 7701)

Τοῦ αὐτοῦ ἐν ἀγίοις ἀββᾶ Μαξίμου πρὸς Ἀναστάσιον μονάζοντα τὸν ἑαυτοῦ μαθητὴν.

Χθες ὁκτωκαιδεκάτη τοῦ μηνός, ἕτερην ἐν ἀγία μεσοπεντηκοστῇ, ὁ πατριάρχης ἐθήλωσεί μοι λέγων· "Ποιας ἐκκλησίας εἰ, Βυζαντίων; Ρώμης; Ἀντιοχείας; Ἀλεξανδρείας; Ιερουσαλήμων; Τὸν πάσαν μετὰ τῶν ὑπ’ αὐτὰς ἑπαρχίων ἠνώθησαν. Εἴ τοῖς εἰ τὴς καθολικῆς ἐκκλησίας, ἐνώθητι, μήπως ξένην ὁδὸν τῷ βίῳ καυστομοῖς, πάθης ὅπερ ὁ προσδοκῶς."

Πρὸς οὖς εἶπον· "Καθολικὴν ἐκκλησίαν, τὴν ὠρθὴν καὶ σωτηρίαν τῆς εἰς αὐτὸν πίστεως ὁμολογίαν, Πέτρων μακαρίαις ἐφ’ οἷς αὐτὸν καλὼς ὁμολογήσας, τὸν ὁλὸν εἶναι Θεὸς ἀπεφήνασ. Πλὴν μάθω τὴν ὁμολογίαν ἐφ’ ἢ πασῶν τῶν ἐκκλησιῶν γέγονεν ἡ ἐννίες, καὶ τὸ γενομένου καλὼς οὐκ ἀλλοτροῖμαι."

Καὶ ἔφασιν· "Κἂν οὐκ ἕχωμεν περὶ τοῦτον κέλευσιν, λέγομεν, διὰ τὸ γενέσθαι σε παντελῶς ἀπροφάσιστον. Δύο λέγομεν ἐνεργείας διὰ τὴν διαφορὰν, καὶ μίαν διὰ τὴν ἐννίεν."

"Τὰς δυὸ διὰ τὴν ἐννίειν μίαν φατέ γενομένας ἡ παρὰ ταῦτας", εἶπον, "ἐτέραν."

"Οὐ" ἔφασιν, "ἀλλὰ τὰς δύο μίαν διὰ τὴν ἐννίεν."

"Ἀπελλάγμημεν πραγμάτων" ἔφην, "ἐκαθορίστηκαν πιστῶς καὶ Θεὸν ἀνύπαρκτον πλάσαντες· εἰ γὰρ εἰς μιᾶν συγχέομεν τὰς δυὸ διὰ τὴν ἐννίεν καὶ πάλιν εἰς δύο διαφοράν, εἰς τὸν καθολικὸν, μίαν διὰ τὴν διαφοράν, οὐκ ἔσται μιᾶς οὕτως διὰς ἐνεργείας, ἀλλὰς ἀναρμομένων αἰώνας καὶ ποιούσιν ἀνενεργήτων τὸν ὁ προστέθηκαν καὶ παντελῶς ἀνύπαρκτον· τὸ γὰρ μηδεμίαν ἔχον ἐκ φύσεως ἀναφαίρετον καὶ μηδενείς λόγῳ τρεῖς ἀλλοιομένην καὶ μεταπέπτουσαν κίνησιν, πάσης ὁμοίας ἐστιν κατὰ τούς πατέρας.

Witnesses: A MS RXG p

* Cf. Matt. 16: 17
LETTER OF MAXIMUS TO
ANASTASIIUS, HIS DISCIPLE

(CPG 7701)

The same Father St Maximus, to the monk Anastasius, his disciple.

Yesterday, the eighteenth of the month, which was holy Mid-
Pentecost, the patriarch sent me a message, saying: 'What church
Jerusalem? See, all of them are united, together with the provinces
subject to them.' If, therefore, you belong to the catholic church, be
united, lest perhaps you devise a strange path by your way of life and
you suffer what you don't expect.'

I said to them: 'The God of all pronounced that the catholic
church was the correct and saving confession of the faith in him when
he called Peter blessed because of the terms in which he had made
proper confession of him. But let me learn the confession on which
the unity of all the churches was effected, and if it was effected
properly I shall not be estranged from it.'

And they said: 'Although we don't have an order concerning this
matter, we will speak, because you have become completely inexcus-
able. We say two activities because of the difference, and one because
of the union.'

'Do you say that the two became one because of the union, or is
there another activity besides these?' I asked.

'No,' they said, 'Rather the two became one because of the union'.

'We have departed from the facts,' I said, 'by inventing for our-
selves a faith without substance and a God without existence. For if
we confuse the two into one because of the union, and again we
separate the one into two because of the difference, there will not be a
unity nor a duality of activities, because they are forever separated
from each other and render him, to whom they belong, incapable of
activity and completely non-existent. I say this because what by
nature has no movement which cannot be taken away, or change its
οὐκ ἔχον ἐνέργειαν οὕσωδὼς αὐτῷ χαρακτηρίζουσαν τοῦτο λέγειν ός δύναι, οὔτε ἐδιδάχθην ἐκ τῶν ἁγίων πατέρων ὁμολογεῖν τὸ δοκοῦν ὑμῖν οὖν ἐξουσιαστικὸς ποιήσατε.

"Ὅφικοιν ἄκουσον" ἔφησαν: "ἔδοξε τῷ δεσπότῃ καὶ τῷ πατριάρχῃ διὰ πρακτικόν του πάπα Ῥώμης ἀναθεματισθήναι σε μὴ πειθόμενον, καὶ τὸν ὀψιόμενον αὐτοῖς ἀπενέγκασθαι βάνατον."

"Τὸ τῷ Θεῷ πρὸ παντὸς αἰώνος ὀρισθέν ἐν ἐμοί δέχοιτο πέρας, φέρον αὐτῷ δόξαν πρὸ παντὸς ἐγνωσμένην αἰώνος", αὐτοῖς τούτων ἀκούσας ἀπεκρίνατον.

Καὶ πρὸς τὸ γνώσασθαι, καὶ προσβήκην εὐχῆς τῷ Θεῷ ποιήσασθαι καὶ δεῖχες, ἐμφανὴ οὐ τα ὑδαθεῖνα πεποίηκα, παρακαλῶ τῷ Κυρίῳ Θεῷ, καὶ τοῖς ἑκεί σὺν αὐτῷ πατράσων ἡμῶν ἁγίοις γνώριμα καταστήσας ταῦτα, τῆς αὐτῆς χάριν αἰτίας.

Anastasius. Haece iussit mihi transcribere et nota facere sanctissimis uobis, quo et ex his motione comperta, communem omnes pro communem matre nostra, catholica uidelicet ecclesia, et nobis indignis seruis uestrís afferatis Domino precem, ad robosrandm omnes et nos quoque, in illa uobiscum perseuerantes secundum pie in ipsa praedicatam a sanctis patribus [I]h[o]domoxam fidem. Magnus enim in toto mundo timor habetur, cum haec persecutionem consonanter ab omnibus patiatur, nisi sua gratia consuete pr(a)estet auxilium is qui semper auxiliatur, semem pietatis saltem seniori Romae reliquens, nobis non mentientem ad apostolorum habitam principem repromissionem suam confirmans.

b Cf. Lk. 22: 32, Matt. 16: 18
position in any way, or decay, is devoid of all substance, according to the Fathers, because it does not have an activity essentially characterizing it. I cannot say this, nor have I been taught to confess it by the holy Fathers. Do what you think fit, because you are invested with authority."

"Listen, then," they said. "The master and the patriarch have decided, following an instruction from the pope of Rome, that you will be anathematized if you do not obey, and that you will be sentenced to the death they have determined."

"May what has been determined by God before every age receive its end, bringing to him glory which has been known before every age," I answered when I heard this.

And so that you might know [this], and increase your prayer and petition to God, I have made plain to you the messages that were sent, beseeching that you make these matters known to the divine Lord and to our holy Fathers who are there with him, for the same reason."

Anastasius 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 everyone at the same time, 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.
EPISTULA ANASTASII
AD MONACHOS CALARITANOS
(CPG 7725)

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

§1. Multa scribere nos etiam praeter uotum tempus prohibuit,
omnia uero in uno nota facimus uerbo sanctissimis uobis. Hi qui
alterius sunt partis, diffinitione immobili ut est, et propriae
maxime professionis constitui paternam non malunt doctrinam,
sed alternis impelluntur opinionibus quas et numerare
operosum de cetero duco. Modo ergo ab inexistential ad in-
conuenientiam translati sunt, id est ex eo quod neque unam neque
duas dicunt, ad praedicandum duas et unam, id est tres in uno
eodemque Christo voluntates et operationes traducti, quod
neque patrius, neque synodicus, neque physicus sermo decreuit,
sed neque priscorum et deinceps hereticorum furor eatenus ad-
minuit, sciens inanem tanquam uitio proprio corruptam eandem
opinionem.

§2. Si enim diuersae ex diuersis compositum substantiis
charactrizant naturaliter proprietates, utpote nullatenus adempta
naturarum diversitate propter unionem, sed salua potius
proprietate utrisque naturae et in unam personam et unam sub-
sistentiam concurrente, quemadmodum sancta Chalcedonensis
synodus ait, et is Deus ex Deo Patre, et homo ex homine semper
uirgine matre, idem ipse existens cognoscitur, iuxta naturam
natus, quamquam incorporaliter et sine causa, corporaliter autem
ex hac propter causam, salutem uidelicet nostram, quomodo
possibile est unam eandemque personam, id est unum eundem-
que Christum Dominum nostrum et Deum, super duas etiam alia

Witness: p
A LETTER OF ANASTASIUS TO THE
MONKS OF CAGLIARI

(CPG 7725)

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, even 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.

§2. For let us suppose that diverse properties characterize a thing composed of diverse substances according to nature, inasmuch as the diversity of natures is in no way removed by union, but rather the saving property of each nature concurs both in one person and in 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, 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?
secundum ipsos proprietate naturaliter figurari, ad certitudinem eorum ex quibus et in quibus et quae est?

§3. 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 duabus una, id est alterutris, ( ) tres, siue naturales, siue substantiales; uerum naturales quidem non, sed secundum illos subsistentiales, aggregentque ob hoc aduersus eum iam aut tres substantias, aut totidem subsistentias, et secundum ipsum aequi numeri proprietates, increatam uidelicet et creatam et neutram, id est inexistenter. Inexistens 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 uero si non eadem sed alia, exceptis his ex quibus est credendus, in eo per tertiam aiunt, Æendum secundum candum; rursus proferunt in inexistenter, uelut is qui medius inter (utramque) neutra[m] harum existat, increatam scilicet natura sua et creatam substantiam atque uirtutem: aut enim subsistentiam volunt hanc esse, aut compositam, aut deuiriilem, aut unitoria propin aduationem. Nam non solum, ut dictum est, hanc non existenter 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 perhibent eum etiam a congenita proprietate quam habet ad interemerat matrem et uirginem alienum, quasi secundum neutrum horum habeat compositam aut subsistentiam, aut deuiriilem, aut unitoria propria voluntatem et operationem. Verum Patris quidem incompositam sine principio habet, et substantiam atque diuinam, matris uero creatam natura et humanam.

§4. Deinde etiam diuisas naturas ex quibus ipse est inferunt, quasi per operationem et non per subsistentiam sibi unitas innotescat, si propter unitatem uniam operationem dogmatizent, quod hi qui in divisione corrupti sunt dicunt, affectuosam hanc esse operationem fabulose fingentes. Sic autem et confusioni locum tribuentes, et deuiriilem secundum Seuerum male interpretantur, unam hanc sed non duas secundum unionem, diuinam
§3. 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\(^1\) 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]\(^4\), 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 power uncreated by its own nature, and created; for they want these\(^5\) to be either hypostatic, or composite, or 'theandric', or unitary on account of the union.\(^6\) For not only do they introduce, as I have said, this non-existent [property] which characterizes him according to none of those from which he is by nature, but they even render him a stranger from the natural relationship which he has with his God and Father. For it is less correct that they present him a stranger 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\(^7\) not composite, without beginning, and substantial and divine, but from his mother he has a will and activity which are by nature created and human.

§4. 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 [they are] both allowing room for confusion, and they wrongly interpret 'theandric' as Severus does,\(^8\) contending that this signifies one but not two, according to the union, divine by nature and human, and they introduce for them-
natura et uirilem, significare contendentes, et hac Deiuiiri quan-
dam naturam, sed non uirum factum Deum sibimet subinducunt,
praesertim cum hoc praevidentis etiam uere deiphantor Dionysius,
non unam uocauerit hanc, sed noua quadam deiuirili nobis eum
dixerit operatione conversatum, ostendens non alteram ab altera
disjunctum, sed ambas per alterutras et alterutris connaturaliter
adunatas, in eorum ex quibus et in quibus et quae erat certi-
tudinem preferendas et, ut paterne dicamus, cum alterius communione
horum utrumque, ita ut mirabiles quidem passiones, compas-
sepsibilia vero proculubio miracula cognoscantur, per omni-
modam 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 corrigere
noentes sermonem, adhuc et senioris Romae propriae consentire
sectae coegerunt apocrisiarios, unam super duas, id est tres secum
praedicandi in eodem Domino nostro Iesu Christo voluntates et
operationes, similis scientiae ligno gustum commiscientes, quem-
admodum et isti fidem ex bono et malo conferunt affectantibus.
Vnde et talibus circumuenientes litteris, ei qui miserat, mittunt.

§5. Quia ergo in magno propter hæc periculo sunt res pene
totius catholicæ et apostolicae Dei ecclesiae constitutæ, pro ea
deprecamur et obsecramus sanctissimos us, ne hanc despiciat
periclitantem, sed adiuuetis tempestatibus laborantem, scientes in
tempore tribulationis dilationem quae in Spiritu sancto est nasci,
et si possibile est usos transire cius, quasi alia pro causa, ad
senioris Romae pios et firmos ut petram uiros, a qui uidelicit uobis-
cum tutores nostri sunt semper et propugnatores feruentissimi
uertatis, obsecare hos supplicatoris uocibus et lacrimis pro
omnibus Christianis, quatus mercedem a Domino sortiantur, b
omnibus similiter et si(bi)met absque nouitate recens inuentu
seruantes orthodoxam fidem, et nihil super ea minus plussue
suscipientes uel approbantes praeter quae diffinita sunt a sanctis
patribus ac syndibus, ut boni studii sui aemulatione, hoc maximu-
num cum Dei auxilio directe prosequentes opus, cum illis siue
nunc, siue in die iudicii Dominum habeant debitorem; c quem
nimirum habuerunt in talibus creditorem, non aliud quid praeter
se, sed se ipsum totum, totis uobis atque illis in aeternas delicias et

a Cæ. Matt. 16: 18  b Cæ. 2 Jn. 8  c Cæ. Matt. 10: 32, Lk. 16: 8
SELVES 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\(^9\) AS 'CHANGED BY A CERTAIN NEW THEANDRIC ACTIVITY FOR US',\(^{10}\) 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',\(^{11}\) INDEED IN SUCH A WAY THAT MARVELLOUS SUFFERINGS AND COMPASSIONATE MIRACLES ARE RECOGNIZED AS BEYOND DOUBT, THROUGH THE COMPLETE ADAPTION 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 AND 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.\(^{12}\)

§5. 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 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 AS YOU DO, AND ARE MOST SERVANT 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. THE UPHOlitv WILL BE 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
refectionem donantem; quem et nos habere adversus Arrianos, qui continuantur hic, supplice Deo, beatī et nostrae ad Deum deductionis praeuii, cum simus egeni pauperes et indigni serui uestri.
both now and on the day of judgement. He 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 Arians \(^1\) who are united here, since we are needy paupers and your unworthy servants.
§1. Exemplar propriae scriptionis epistolae sancti patris nostri ac doctoris Anastasii presbyteri et apocrisiarii magni nominis senioris Romae, noui scilicet confessoris, uel quod magis fatendum est, multum certatoris et martyris ueritatis, scriptae una cum subiacentibus testimoniiis sacris et syllogismis cum ipsa quae abscisa est eius sancta dextra manu, admirabili prorsus ingenio, immo diuina uirtute et gratia, postquam passus est ipse et patres qui cum eo fuerunt in misero Byzantio propter uerbum tantummodo ueritatis, et quod noluisent 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 aduersus Arrianos affatur: “Quasdam dimisimus bestias sanctorum corporibus quod quidam inhumanitatem publicauerint, unum accusantes tantum, ne impietati cederent nec communione polluerentur, quam ut uenenum serpentes fugientes, non corpus laedentem, sed profunda quaee animae offuscantem.” Missa praeterea est a tertio exilio, id est Lazico, ad Theodosium, presbyterum Gangrenem et monachum, in sancta Christi nostri ciuitate constitutum.

§2. Ἡ ἐπιγραφή. Δεσπότη μου τὰ πάντα ἀγωνίας θεοτική βασιλείας και διδασκάλω Θεοδοσίω πρεσβυτέρῳ Αναστάσιος (ὁ ἕλαχιστος) ἐλέει Θεοῦ πρεσβυτέρος καὶ μοναχὸς δούλος τῶν δούλων τοῦ Θεοῦ. Ἀποδοθῇ σὺν Θεῷ ἐν τῇ ἀγίᾳ Χριστῷ τοῦ Θεοῦ ἡμῶν πόλει τῷ δεσπότῃ μου Θεοδοσίῳ πρεσβυτέρῳ τῷ ἀπὸ Γάγγρων.
LETTER OF ANASTASIIUS
APOCRIARIUS TO THEODOSIIUS
OF GANGRA

(CPG 7733)

§1. Copy¹ 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—
who strove much, and was a martyr for the truth. He wrote this,
together with the attached holy testimonia and syllogisms, 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 pollute themselves with 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?' It was
sent, moreover, from the third place of exile, that is from Lazica, to
Theodosius the priest from Gangra, a monk established in the holy
city of our Christ.³

§2. 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 in the holy city of Christ
our God to my lord Theodosius, priest from Gangra.
§3. Ἡμᾶς δικαιῶν μετ’ ἐγκυμόνων ποιεῖσθαι ἡ θεότητος ἡμῶν διακελεύεται Παροιμίᾳ. ἔγιν τοὺς οἱ ἐξέλχοντο, μνήμην τῶν δικαιῶν ἐκείνοις καὶ μάλιστα Μαξίμου τοῦ ὅπως μεγάλου (τούτο γὰρ ὡς ἐπὶ τοῦ πλείστον τῷ Μάξιμῳ ὅνομα ἡλικία) τῷ λόγῳ ποιήσασθαι ἐπὶ τοῦ παρώντος βουλόμενος καὶ ἄξιος τῆς ἐκείνου ἀρετῆς καὶ γνώσει, ὡσπερ οὖν καὶ τὸ ὑπὲρ Χριστοῦ τοῦ Θεοῦ μαρτύριον αὐτοῦ, ἐγκυμοσύνης μη ἐγκυμοσύνης τούτο καὶ μόνον σημαίνει διὰ τούτο τοῦ γράμματος τοῦ θεοτουμητοῦ ὑμῶν συνειδόν, ὡσπερ καὶ μάλιστα γνώσις, ὡς ἠμαθῶς, ἐπιστεύετε, τούτοις τὸ πότε οἱ μακάριοι ἐκείνοι ἐν Κυρίῳ κεκαίρηται.

§4. Γνωρίζω τούς ἡμᾶς, τὰ πλείστα τῶν ἐπαυχόντων ἡμῖν ἐνταῦθα δεινών σιωπῆ παρατείνεις διὰ τὸ πλῆθος καὶ τὸ τὸ στόχον ἦγορομοιοί, καὶ μὴν καὶ τὸ τοῦ καρποῦ ἀνεπιτήθειοι, ὡσπερ καταλαβόντων ἡμῶν τὴν τῶν φιλοχριστῶν Λαζών χώραν τῇ ὑγική τοῦ ιουλίου μηνὸς τῆς πέμπτης ἐπεμνῆσες τῆς ἐνσώφας πεπεκαλεδαικατηρίδος, εἰθέως διειλεῖ ήμᾶς ἀπ’ ἀλλήλων κατ’ ἐπιτροπήν τοῦ τηρικαῦτα τὸ ἄρχει τῶν ἐνταῦθα λαχάντος, διαρρίσσεις πάντα, μέχρι καὶ ἔνοις βελόνιοι καὶ ράμματος, ὡσά πρὸς τὰς ἀναγκαίας χρειὰς ἐκ τῶν χήρων καὶ τῶν καθ’ ὑμᾶς φιλοχριστῶν ἐκκεκτήμεθα. Καὶ τῶν μὲν δειον ἐκεῖνον ἄνδρα, φημί δὴ τὸν κύριον ἄββαν Μάξιμου, μὴτε εἰς ὑποζήγην, μήτε εἰς φορεῖον καθεσθήνῃ δυνάμενων διὰ τὸ ἐν ἀσθενείᾳ κατα-κείσθαι, πλέξαντες ἀπὸ βεργίων ὡσπερ χαλάδρων, βαστάζοντες ἀπήγαγον καὶ ἐνέκλεισαν εἰς κάστρον λεγόμενον Σχήμαρν πλησίον τοῦ θέου τῶν λεγομένων Ἀλανών, τὸν δὲ κύριον ἄββαν Ἀναστάσιον καμὲ τὸν ἅμαρτουλὰν ἐφιππίστευς ἀπήγαγον καὶ ἐνέκλεισαν, ἐκεῖνον μὲν εἰς κάστρον λεγόμενον Σκοτόριν τῆς Αὐλίας πλησίον τῆς Αθηναίας, ἐμὲ δὲ εἰς ἑτερον κάστρον, ὃν ὁμοῖα Βοσκάλου τῆς λεγομένης Μητρίου ἐχειράς ἐν τοῖς μεθορίων τῶν λεγομένων Ἀλανῶν, ὡσπερ κάστρον παραλαβόντες οἱ αὐτοὶ Ἁλανοὶ νῦν κατέχομεν. Εἶτα μὲτ’ ἄλλες ἡμέρας λαβόντες ἐμὲ τε καὶ τὸν μακάριον Ἀναστάσιον ἐν τῷ εἰρήμενον κάστρῳ, ἐκεῖνον μὲν παρέσκεψαν εἰς κάστρον τῆς λεγομένης Σοφοκλῆς ἡ δ’ λοιπῶν ἡμιδιάν δυνα εκ τοῦ πλῆθος τῶν βασάνων καὶ τῶν αἰκίασιων ὅπως ἐκ τῷ Βοκαστίῳ ὑπεμείναμεν, οὐ μὴν ἄλλα καὶ τῶν ἀναγκῶν καὶ περιστάσεως τῶν ἐνταῦθα ἐπενεχθέντων ἡμῖν. Ωθειν ἐν μέσῳ τῆς ὁδοῦ, ὡς τείχες φασίν, ἄλλοι δὲ ὡς λέγουσιν, ἀμα τῷ ἐγκλείσθηναι αὐτὸν εἰς δ’ παρεπέμβαθεν κάστρον τῆς Σοφοκλῆς

* Prov. 10:7
§3. The divinely inspired Proverb orders us to *remember the just with praises*. Therefore I, in humility, wish to compose in the present discourse a commemoration of those just men, and especially of Maximus, truly 'the greatest one': the name Maximus in general implies this. Since I can in no way succeed in worthily praising his virtue and knowledge, nor his witness on behalf of Christ God either, I decided to inform you, who are honourable to God, through this writing, simply of what you yourselves also long most of all to know, as I have found out: that is, when those blessed men fell asleep in the Lord.

§4. I am therefore making known (to you)—consigning to silence most of the evil events suffered by us on account of their number and the beginning of the narrative, in fact also because of the inappropriateness of the occasion—that, when we reached the land of the Lazicans, friends of Christ, on the eighth day of the month of the month of June in the fifth indiction of the fifteen-year period now upon us, they immediately separated us from each other, on the order of the one who then had authority over those who were there, snatch- ing away everything, down to a single needle and thread, whatever we had acquired for our basic wants both from you and the friends of Christ in your company. And since they could place that saindy man—I mean the lord Father Maximus—neither on a beast nor on a litter because of his weak condition, after they had plaited from sticks a sort of little stretcher, they carried him off and shut him up in the fort called Schemaris, near the tribe of the people called the Alani. But the lord Father Anastasius, and me, a sinner, they took off on horses and imprisoned, him in a fort called Scotoris in Apsilia near Abasgia, and me in another fort whose name is Boucolous, in the land called Mesimiana on the borders of the Alani, whom I have mentioned, which is the fort which the same Alani captured and now hold. Then after a few days, they took both me and the blessed Anastasius from the forts I have mentioned, and sent him to a fort called Souania, although he was already by that time half-dead, as a result of the multitude of tortures and suffering which we had undergone in Byzantium, not to mention both the constraints and the distressing circumstances into which we were brought here. For this reason, halfway during the journey, as some say, but, as others say, immediately on being imprisoned in the fort of Souania to which he had been dispatched, he died. Consequently I judge that he fell asleep in the Lord about the twenty-second or twenty-fourth day of the
Hinc igitur conicio quod circa undecimo kalendas uel nono kalendas Augustas quintae indicationis in Domino, sicut dictum est, obdormierit.

§5. 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 factum est. Igitur tertio decimo die praedicti Augusti mensis, praeteritae quintae indicationis, secundum diuinum eius uaticinium, feria septima, praeentibus derelictis perrexit ad Dominum. Porro et aliiud miraculum quod diuinitus in sancto eius monumento effectur, quodque usque in praesens qui castrum illud et eius circumregionem inhabitant intuentur et praeindicant, et ad quosdam etiam principum atque magnatum peruenit, dignum est et ubiis quoque sanctissimis et per uos omnibus qui ibidem sunt sancti, per litteras fieri manifestum, in gloriam et laudem Dei qui facit miracula in sanctis suis et glorificat memoriam eorum quae orthodoxe ac sincere glorificant.
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month of July. I say this because on the eighteenth day of the same month of July we were both brought to the place called Moucourisis on the order of the man who was then chief, prisoners in the midst of the army who are friends of Christ. Anastasius was already half-dead, as I have said, and from that point on I did not lay eyes on him anymore. I mean that while they dispatched him immediately, as has been said, to the fort of Souania, [they dispatched] me to the fort called Thacyria, near Iberia.

From this, then, I assume that, on about the twenty-sixth or twenty-fourth day of the month of July in the fifth indiction, he fell asleep in the Lord, as has been said.

§5. Furthermore, the martyr of Christ God, namely the lord Father Maximus, on being transferred to the custody of the fort mentioned above, saw a divine vision, [and] summoned some of those who were in the fort, and said to them: 'On the thirteenth day of August of this present fifth indiction, on the seventh day of the week, God will take me up.' Which is what happened. Thus on the thirteenth day of the said month of August in the fifth indiction 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 too which is effected by divine power at his holy tomb, and which those who live in that fort and the area around it observe 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 to say, three shining lamps illuminate the holy tomb of that holy martyr Maximus on individual nights. I have briefly outlined these things concerning that remarkable 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.
§6. Interea et quae mihi peccatori et exiguo post haec con-
tigerunt, et in quibus sim, pari modo perpaucis manifestabo. Cum
enim fecisset duos menses in castro praedictae Thacyriae in
infirmitate reliicens, et pauxillum quid requiem fuisse ad easy
rursus misit me tunc princeps ad partes Apsiliae et Mesimianae
custodiae mancipandum in castro Phustas, et ut absolute dicam
septem mensibus duxit et circumduxit me per omnes praedictas
regiones, nudum et discalciatum et peditem, et frigore ac fame et
siti depressum, volens profecto et me quoque ab hac detergere
uita. Sed nescio quid super me humili praеvidens Deus, qui omnia
salubri proudentia sua producit, usque nunc conservauit me in
hac multarum tribulationum et miseriae uita. Post aliquot itaque
dies pellitur illinc praedictus princeps. Deindeque succedens alius
uisus est compati, inter quae duxit me iuxta domum suam recep-
tum a iam memorato castro Phustensium. Et post annum, ex dia-
bolica operatione motus, destinat me ad praedictum castrum. Sed
Deus qui remetitur his qui alieni remitiuntur, eadem die qua me
pepulit, pulsus est hinc, et efficitur profugus in Christi amatorum
regione Abasgorum, et consilio accepto a Christi amici qui illic
erant principibus magis compatiendi quam me minimum per-
sequendi, et orationem a me potius quam gemitum percipiendi,
ipsi quippe amici Christi principes Abasgiae compatiuntur humili
mihi quamquam nescierint me, repromisit quidem illis quod si
exiret inde et restituenderetur in principatu, omnia quae forent ad
solacium et refugium meum perfereret. Dein post paucos dies
nescio unde adiutus egreditur quidem iterum et recipit principat-
tum, nil tamen eorum quae pollicitus est Deo et crebro dictis Dei
amici principibus in opus perduxit. E contrario autem manibus
nequam deductus uirom, repromisit quidem oblitus est,
tollit autem me a castro Phustensium et maturius in Schemareos
castrum miti praecipit.

§7. Factum interea est, cum ducerent me in iam nominatum
castrum, ut ille iterum pelleretur et esset profugus ubi et primum
fuaret. Excitavit autem Deus spiritum suum in uiro boni aemula-
tore qui Dei habeat in se timorem pariter et amorem, et uere
phoromine vigilantem secundum Deum possideat mentem, qui
cum Deo nunc praeest regioni, et Deum imitante condescensione
seu compassionem motus, reduxit me a uiro crebro dicti Schemareos

6 Cf. Matt. 7: 2, Mark 4: 24, Lk. 6: 38
§6. 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,¹⁰ and not to mince words, he led me for seven months around through all the regions I have described, naked and unshod and on foot, and oppressed by cold and hunger and thirst, wishing in fact to wipe me too out from this life. But God, foreseeing I do not know 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 thus, after several days, that chief was driven from there. And then he was succeeded by another, who seemed to have compassion, since he brought me near to 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 have 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 out²⁰ from here, and was made an exile in the region of the Abasgians, who love Christ. Advised by the friends of Christ, who had been chiefs there, to have compassion rather than persecute me in my lowliness, and to accept prayers from me rather than groans, ¹¹ 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 do not know 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, the wretch in fact forgot his promise [and] instead ordered me to be removed from the fort of the people of Phusta, and later to be sent to the fort of Schemaros.

§7. However, when they were bringing me to the fort just named, it happened that he was driven out again and was in exile where he had been originally. But God stirred his spirit in a man who was an imitator of good, who possessed equally fear and love of God, and truly like his name possessed a mind vigilant with regard to God, who with
castri, et constituit me quasi quinque signis longius a diuinitus custodienda domo sua, in loco monachos ueraciter condecente, praebens necessariis largissime corporis utilitates. Pro quibus omnibus Christus uerus Deus, per intercessiones quae illum secundum carmem genuit Dei genitrices semperque virginis Mariae ac omnium sanctorum, protegit eum una cum amandis filiis suis atque honorabili horum ac prorsus laudabili matre, ab omni ceteris malignantibus et a multiundine operantium iniuriam.

Donans illis bonorum reflectionem, ut semper omnem sufficientiam habentes, abundant in omne opus bonum, et statione facit eos quae a[d] dextris futura est dignos, atque duinam illam et mitem uocem expertos quae dicet: Venite benedicti Patris mei, haereditate percipite praeparatorum nobis regnum ab origine mundi, quia (h)ospes fui, et collegistis me et cetera, amen.

§8. Obsecro autem sanctissimos usos eadem pro ipsis postulare in sanctis orationibus uestrís, et maxime cum in sanctis et colendis oraueritis. 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 cimilarcha sanctissimae illius ecclesiae fuit, uenientem in hanc regionem, ut asseruit, ad requisitionem humilitatis meae, ipsi cum omni studio et gaudio susceperunt et honorauerunt, et omnem subuectionem ad 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 index, sed et his qui miserunt eum, quoniam reuera opus evangelistae fecit? Sicut enim equus spirituālis ascensoris habens, ipsum scilicet Deum iuxta Scripturam quae ait: Ascendens super equos suis, et equitatus suis sanctus, totam Lazicam et Apsiliam et Abasgiam discurrens, sine timore tam quae ueritatis, quam quae subintroductae nouitatis erant, annuntiaut, ac multorum utilitatis atque salutis et meae ipsius quietis et consolationis causa uiri est facta praesentia, 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 rectitis, nobilis ille uir, kalendis Ianuariis octauae inductionis quae modo praeteriit, apud Christi amicum

---

Ps. 69: 3
Mat. 25: 34-5
Hab. 3: 8
2 Cor. 9: 8
2 Tim. 4: 8
Gf. Matt. 25: 33-4
2 Tim. 4: 5
God now governs the region. And imitating God, moved by condescension or compassion, he brought 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 children 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 he may make them worthy of the position which will be at his right hand, and they may 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.

§8. 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 revered [places]. The people for whom you offer these [prayers] are worthy indeed. I mean that 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 Stephen, who is among the saints, namely the son of the blessed priest John who was cimilarch of that most holy church, when he came to this region, as he asserted, to search for me in my humility, and 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 Stephen 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 Apsila and Abasia, [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, on the
Abasagiae principem dormiuit in Domino. Cui omnes qui hunc noverunt, ut sancto requiem exoptaretur.

§9. Quapropter oportebat quosdam ex uestratibus, Dei amatibus et secundum scientiam zelum Dei habentibus; huc uenire, et quae urritatis et pro urritate sunt testificari, ut et orthodoxy magis conualesceret, et introducta nouitas peramplius argueretur, sed et ego humilis consolatione ac reflexione poterim, et uenientes bonam a Christo Deo, pro quo etiam causa est, mercedem perципerent. Et maxime cum usque ad Hiberiam illinc, ut didici, ueniant, cuius rei gratia et huc minime ueniant?

... ὑπὲρ οὗ καὶ ἡ ὑπόθεσις ἐστὶν, ἐκομιζοντος καὶ μάλιστα ἔως Ἰβερίας ἐκ τῶν αὐτοῦ, ὡς μανθάνω, παραγινόμενοι, τίνος χάρων καὶ ἐνταύθα οὗ φοιτῶσι;

§10. Δυσωπῶ τοιγαροῦν τοὺς ἀγιωτάτους ὑμᾶς, εἰ τῶν ἐνδεχομένων ὑπάρχει, πεμφθῆναι μοι διὰ τούς πιστούς τῶν ἐς Ἰβερίαν ἐρχομένων τὴν βίβλου τῶν κανονικῶν ὑπὸ τῆς ἁγίας καὶ ἀποστολικῆς συνόδου, τῆς κατὰ πρόστασιν ἱερὰ τοῦ ἁγίου μάρτυρος καὶ ἀποστολικοῦ καὶ κορυφαίου πάπα Μαρτίνου ἐν τῇ πρεσβυτέρᾳ Ῥώμη ἀδροισθήσεσθαι, πραχθήσων, ὡς ἂν πολλῷ πλέον τὰ τῶν ἁγίων πατέρων ἱερὰ δόγματα καὶ τὰ τῶν πάλαι καὶ νῦν ἀναφημένων αἰρετικῶν βεβελέγματα κατάδηλα τοῖς ἐνταύθα γένονται. Τούτω γὰρ καὶ μόνον ἀκοντες καὶ μη βουλόμενοι ποιοῦσι καλὸν οἱ τῶν Θεόν καὶ ἡμᾶς ἀδίκως ἐκδικώκοντες, ὡς ὅσπερ εἰς διαφόρους τόπους καὶ χώρας ἐξαρίστως ἡμᾶς, τὴν μὲν τῶν ἁγίων πατέρων ὁρθοδοξίαν, ἦν καὶ ἡμεῖς προσβείομεν, ἐπὶ πλέον φανερώθησαν παρασκενάζουσι, τὴν δὲ οἰκείαν κακοδοξίαν ἐν πανί τόπῳ καὶ πάσῃ χώρᾳ στηλετέυεσθαι καὶ διελέγχεσθαι, κατὰ τὸ εἰρημένον τῷ ἁγίῳ Διονυσίῳ τῷ ἐπισκόπῳ Αθηνῶν καὶ μάρτυρι τῆς ἁληθείας, ὅτι Ὕδεν ὁ Θεός τὸ κακὸν ἢ ἁγαθὸν, τούτοις ὡς ἁγαθῶν, καὶ παρ᾿ αὐτῷ αἱ αἰτίαι τῶν κακῶν δυνάμεις εἰσὶν ἁγαθοτοι. Ἀγαθῶν γὰρ ὡς ἁληθῶς ὑπάρχει τὸ τὴν μὲν πατρικὴν ὁρθοδοξίαν, ἦσθιν, φανερώθηκεν καὶ κρατύνθηκε, τὴν δὲ αἰρετικὴν κακοδοξίαν στηλετύθηκε καὶ διελέγχηκε, εἰ καὶ δι᾿ ἐξαιρέών καὶ τῶν ἄλλων ἡλίθεων τοῦτο γίνεται· οὕτως γὰρ ἐξ ἀρχῆς ὁ μὲν λόγος τῆς ἁληθείας ἐπλατύνθη καὶ ἐκρατύνθη, ὁ δὲ τῆς ἁσθείας ἐσμερώθη καὶ ἐξηγαγίσθη, διωκομένων δηλονότι

1 Cf. Rom. 10:2
Kalends of January of the eighth indiction which has just passed,\textsuperscript{25}
that noble man 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.

§9. On account of this it was fitting that certain 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 innovation
which has been introduced might be made known more fully; but
also so that I, in my lowliness, might grow stronger by consolation
and convalescence, and that those who came might receive a good
reward from Christ God for whose sake they came.\textsuperscript{26} And especially
since they have come as far as Iberia from there, as I have found out;
why don’t they come here too?

§10. Therefore I beseech you most holy people, if the possibility
exists, to send me by one of the believers who come to Iberia the book
containing what was passed by canonical decree by the holy and
apostolic synod, which, through the sacred command of the holy
martyr and apostolic and most high Pope Martin, was convened in
older Rome, in order that the sacred teachings of the holy Fathers,
and the abominations of the heretics which have sprung up both in
the past and in the present, may be made much more obvious to
those [who live] here. My point is that those who persecute God and
us unjustly perform this and only this favour inadvertently and
against their will: while banishing us to different places and regions,
they contrive to have the orthodox faith of the holy Fathers, which we
too preach, revealed further, while their own heresies is held up to
scorn and refuted in every place and in every region, according to the
saying of the holy Dionysius, bishop of Athens and witness to the
truth: “God knows evil [and] in it, good”—that is, how good “and in it the
causes of evils have the power to do good”\textsuperscript{27} I mean that it is truly good to
cause the orthodox faith of the Fathers to be revealed and strength-
ened, as I have said, and to have the unorthodox faith of the heretics
held up to scorn and refuted, even though this is achieved through
exiles and other hardships. For thus from the beginning the word of
truth was spread abroad and disappeared, when of course both the
holy prophets and apostles and teachers suffered persecution and
exile and other dreadful fates.
καὶ ἐξοριζομένων καὶ τὰ ἄλλα δεινὰ πασχόντων τῶν τε ἁγίων 
προφητῶν καὶ ἀποστόλων καὶ διασκαλῶν.

§11. Ἐὰν οὖν, ὡς ἐδοξοῦσα, ὑπὸ Θεοῦ κατανυγόμενοι ἀποστέλ-
λετε τὴν ἱερὰν βίβλον, εἰ μὲν βούλονται οἱ ταύτην ἐπιφερόμενοι 
ἐνταῦθα ἐλθεῖν, πρὸς τὸν πανευφήμιον καὶ θεοφάνεικον πατρίκιον 
καὶ σὺν Θεῷ μάγιστρον Γρηγόριον αὐτομαθήσατε, λαμβάνοντες 
προδήλους ἐπιστολήν πρὸς αὐτὸν ἐκ τοῦ πανευφήμιου πατρικίου 
καὶ στρατηγοῦ Ιβερίας, εἰ δὲ τυχόν οὐ βούλονται ἔστω ὑδὲν 
παραγενόμενα, παράσχουσιν αὐτὴν τῷ εἰρημένῳ πανευφήμιῳ στρατηγῷ 
Ιβερίας ὡς ὀφείλοντος αὐτὴν στείλαι τῷ λεηφθείς δεσπότῃ ἡμῶν 
καὶ ὑπερφυεστάτῳ πατρικίῳ καὶ σὺν Θεῷ μάγιστρῳ Γρηγόριῳ, 
ὡς αὐτὸ τούτο ποιοῦντες κοιμᾶσθε τῶν ἀπ' αὐτῆς μελλόντων 
ἀφελθῆναι τὸν ἀγαθὸν μισθὸν παρά τοῦ Θεοῦ ἡμῶν.

§12. Ἡ στιν δὲ ἐπὶ τοῦ παρόντος σὺν ταύτῃ μου τῇ ἐπιστολῇ τοῖς 
θεοτιμήτοις ὑμῖν καὶ δι' ὑμῶν τῇ αὐτὸθα ἁγιωτάτῃ ὀρθοδόξῳ 
ἐκκλησίᾳ κοινάκιοι ἔχουν χρήσεις η' τοῦ ἁγίου Τιτπολόπου 
ἐπισκόπου τοῦ λεύνου Ρώμης καὶ μάρτυρος Χριστοῦ τοῦ Θεοῦ, 
ὥστε καὶ δι' αὐτῶν εἰδέναι ἔχοντες ὅτι συμφωνῶς τοῖς ἄλλοις 
ἀπαντῶν ἁγίοις παρατάσει διασυνοπίως τὰς δύο τοῦ ἱερᾶς ἡμῶν 
Ἱστοῦ Χριστοῦ ἀνακηρύκτηθε φύσει τε καὶ ἐνεργείας, ἀποκρυπτεῖ 
δὲ τοὺς μίαν ἐνεργείαν καὶ φῶς μίαν τῆς θεότητος καὶ τῆς 
ἀνθρωπότητος αὐτοῦ δογματίζοντας, οὐ τροπῇ ὑμοὶ καὶ φίλοι, 
σύγχροι τε καὶ διαφέρεις ἀμφότεροι αὐτῶν τῶν φύσεων 
καταχρησίμες. Ζητήσατε δὲ τὴν τοιαύτην ἱερὰν τοῦ πατρός 
βίβλον ἐπιμελείας κατὰ τὴν ἐμφερομένην ἐν τοῖς χρήσεις 
ἐπιγραφήν. Ἐὰν γὰρ εἰρθεί αὐτήν, πολλὰς καὶ ἀναγκαίας 
δυνήσεσθε εξ αὐτῆς μαρτυρίας ἀναλέξασθαι περὶ τῶν αὐτῶν δύο 
τοῦ σωτῆρος ἡμῶν Χριστοῦ φύσεων καὶ ἐνεργείως. Ταῦτα γὰρ 
προσενεχθέντα τίμην ἐν Βυζαντίῳ τὴν βίβλον πρὸς τοῦ ἡμᾶς 
παθέων, καὶ βουλομένων ἡμῶν ἀλήθεια μεταγράψαι, αἰνηθίδιοι κατὰ 
τὸ εὐθὸς αὐτοῦ ἐπιστάντες οἱ δι' ἑναντίας λεγομένων ἀφελοῦντο 
καὶ οὐκ ἵπποι εἰρέομαι πλὴρος τῆς τούτων χρήσεως εξ αὐτῆς ἐπάρασιν.

§13. Ἡ δὲ με διὰ μέσον τῶν ἐλπιμένων διέλαβεν, εἰσπέραν οὐκ 
ὄκνησαν. Τούτῳ δὲ ἔστων ὑποτελεῖς ἐναγγελιάθεις ὑπὸ τοῦ ἐν ἁγίως 
κυριοῦ Στεφάνου τὴν αὐτόθι γεγονυῖαν τῶν πάντων δι' ὀρθο-
δόξου ὁμολογίας πρὸς τῇ ἁλλήλους καὶ τὸν Θεόν ἐνοικεὶ τε καὶ 
ὁμόνοιαν, συνεματικής ὡς ἐπὶ Κυρίῳ ἐνεπλήθησθην εὐφροσύνης, καὶ
§11. Let us suppose, then, that, as I have besought, you are compelled by God to send the sacred book. If those who bring it are willing to come here, let them come of their own accord to the all-famous patrician, guarded by God, and the magistros who is in the company of God, Gregory. They should of course take him a letter from the all-praiseworthy patrician and general of Iberia. If, on the other hand, it happens that they are not willing to come as far as here, let them give the book to the all-praiseworthy general of Iberia, whom I have mentioned, who should send it to Gregory, who has been mentioned, our master and most magnificent patrician and magistros in the Lord, such that, in so doing, you may receive from those who are going to benefit from the [book] the good reward from our God.

§12. For the present may you find with this letter of mine to you who are honoured by God, and through you to the most holy orthodox church there, a scroll containing eight extracts from the holy Hippolytus, bishop of the port of Rome and a witness to Christ God. My purpose was that also through them you would be in a position to know that, in agreement with the other holy Fathers, he preaches ardently both two natures and activities in our Saviour Jesus Christ, while he renounces those who teach one activity and one nature in his divinity and humanity, on the grounds that they advocate both *the changeability together with the mingling, confusion*, and the division of both of his natures.30 Search carefully for a holy book like this belonging to the Father under the dedication preceding the extracts. For if you find it you will be able to read many essential witnesses in it to the two natures and activities of Christ our Saviour. I say this because this book was delivered to us in Byzantium before we suffered, and when we wanted to copy it in its entirety, our enemies insisted immediately in their usual fashion on snatching it away like thieves, and we were unable to copy it with the exception of these eight extracts.

§13. What has escaped my notice in the course of what I have related, I won’t be slow to tell. It’s this: when I was informed by the holy lord Stephen about the unity and agreement which had come about there between everyone, mutually and with God, through orthodox confession, I was filled with spiritual joy as if before the Lord. And even if I am a sinner, on account of the nature and magnitude of the blessing I offered up and will not cease to offer up hymns of thanksgiving to God who loves human beings, requesting that this
εὐχαριστηρίους ὑμνοὺς ὑπὲρ τοῦ τοιοῦτον καὶ τηλικοῦτον ἁγάθου τῷ φιλανθρώπῳ Θεῷ, εἰ καὶ ἀμαρτωλός τυχόναν, ἀνέπαυσα καὶ ἀναπέμπων οὐ παύομαι, αἰτούμενος ταύτην μέχρι τέλους ἀσάλευτον διαφυλαχθῆναι πρὸς δόξαν μὲν τῆς αὐτοῦ ἀπεραγάθου φιλανθρωπίας, ἡμῶν δὲ σωτηρίαν.

§14. Ὑμᾶς τε τοὺς θεοτιμήτους καὶ πάντας τοὺς σὺν ὑμῶν ἁγίους καὶ δι' ὑμῶν πάσαν τὴν αὐτάθι ἁγίαν τοῦ Θεοῦ καθολικὴν καὶ ἀποστολικὴν ἐκκλησίαν ἀσπάζομαι, αἰτούμενος μημονεῦειν μου τοῦ ἀμαρτωλοῦ καὶ δεσμοῦ ἐν ταῖς ἁγίαις ὑμῶν πρὸς Θεόν εὐχαῖς ἐν τοῖς ἁγίοις καὶ σεβασμίῳ τῶν, καὶ τιμίαις ἕμοι καὶ πολυποθήτοις συλλαβαῖς ὑμῶν ὑποστηρίζων με καὶ παραμυθεῖσθαι τὸν ἐλάχιστον καὶ τῆς κατὰ πρόσωπον ὑμῶν θέου, εἰ καὶ τολμήσων εἴπειν, ἀξιωθῆναι πρὸ τοῦ καὶ τὸν δύστηρον τοιοῦτον καὶ πολύβλεπτον ὑπεξελθεῖν βίον.

Scholion. Τετελείωται δὲ καὶ αὐτὸς ὁ γράφας τὴν ἐπιστολὴν ἁγίου πατήρ ἡμῶν καὶ μάρτυρ Αναστάσιος, μην ὃκτωβρίῳ ἀ', ἡμέραν ἀ', ὡρα γ', ῥηγαζόμενον ἐν τῇ ἁγίᾳ συνάξει “Τὰ ἁγία τοῖς ἁγίοις”, ἰδικτιώνος δεκάτης.
be preserved up to the end unshaken, for the glory of his most benevolent love of humankind, and for our salvation.

§14. I greet both you who are honourable to God and all the holy people with you, and through you the whole holy catholic and apostolic church of God there. I request that you remember me, a prisoner of sin, in your holy prayers to God, and in the holy and revered places, and that you sustain and comfort me in my humility with your precious letters, which I long for greatly, and grant me the sight of your face—even if it is a bold request—before I too depart from this miserable life of many sorrows.

Scholion. Our holy Father and martyr Anastasius, the author of the letter, himself died too on the eleventh day of the month of October, on Sunday at the third hour while 'Holy things for the holy' was being said in the holy synaxis, in the tenth indiction.
THEODORI SPUDAEI
HYPOMNESTICON
(CPG 7968)

Ἰστορία σύντομος. Τὰ κατὰ τὸν μακάριον Μαρτίνον γεγονότα τάκτικα Ῥώμης καὶ τὸν ὅσιον Μάξιμον καὶ τῶν σὺν αὐτῷ.

§1. Scholion siue Ypomnesticum his qui desiderio ac zelo diuinō legere voluerint breuiter declarans, quae paucis sunt agnīta, id est una cum athletics certaminibus quot exilia et in quibus locis ac tempore pertulerint martyrium, diemque fidae ad Deum profecitionis et exhibitionis sancctorum et deiferorum patrum nostrorum ac magistrorum, nouorum reuera confessorum et magnorum martyrum, praecipue illius qui positam hic epistolam digito Dei scriptit, eo quod ipse quidem corum qui ante se defuncti sunt, Maximī scilicet et Anastasii discipuli eius significaverit diem ut praelatum est, de se autem et germanis fratribus eius, Theodoro scilicet ac Euprepio, nemo, insuper et Martini sanctissimi et summī apostolici papae ac martyrīs, qui omni quae sub sole est praecellīt hieraticae dignitati, atque quorundam aliorum, quorum præsens epistola mentionem non facit, nec quacunque ut reor alia charta uel homo.

§2. Εν ἑτεὶ ἐξαικηλιστῷ ἐκατοστῷ ὀκτωκαιδεκάτῳ ἡ καὶ μικρῶν τι πλέον τῆς τοῦ κόσμου κτισμως, τοῦ Ἡρακλείου κατὰ αὐγχώρησιν Θεοῦ βασιλεῦσαντος (γραφομαι γαρ ἐν τῷ Ιαββ. Διόσῳ βασιλεᾷ ὑποκριντῷ ἀπὸ δυσκολίας λαοῦ) καὶ Σεργίου κατὰ τὸν αὐτὸν χρόνον τοῦ βρόντος τῶν ἑραικῶν Κωνταντουσόλεως ἐφιζόντως, ἔλαβεν χάραν αἴρεσις εἰσαχθήναι τῶν μονοθείτων, ήτις καὶ παρεξετάθη ἀωί χρόνους ἐγγὺς ἐξήκοντα κατὰ διαδοχάς γαρ ἀτε χάγγραμα τομῆς λαβόντες οἱ αὐτοῖν

Witnesses: F X ὁ

* Job 34: 30
* 2 Tim. 2: 17
COMMEMORATION
(CPG 7968)

An abbreviated account. What was done against blessed Martin, Pope of Rome, and holy Maximus and of those with them.¹

§1. The scholion or commemoration 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 revelation; especially [the trials] of him² 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.³

§2. In the year 6118, or even a little later, after the creation of the world, when with God’s consent Heracles was emperor (it is written in the Book of Job, ‘I will give a king who is an interpreter of the people’s discontent’), and Sergius was settled on the patriarchal throne of Constantinople, the heresy of the monoethelites began to be introduced into the country, which endured for something close on sixty years. I say this because his descendants received the empire and held sway over it in succession like a gangrenous sore. From them descended an emperor by the name of Constantin. They say he was called Constos,⁴ whom some also call Pogonatus because he had a long beard. When he too became possessed by this heresy [and] published
§3. Μαρτύρος οὖν ὁ ἐν ὕσια τῇ μνήμῃ γεγονός πρόεδρος τῆς πρεσβυτέρας Ρώμης, συνόντων αὐτῷ καὶ τοῦ ἐν εὐλαβείᾳ τῇ μνήμῃ Μαξίμου καὶ Ἀναστασίου τοῦ αὐτοῦ μαθητοῦ, σύνοδον ποιήσας ἐν Ρώμῃ ἱερῶν καὶ ὑβριδίων ἄδρων, ἀνεθεμάτισεν τὸν προειρήμενον ἀσκηθή Τύπον. Ως ἡ ἐπέμενεν ὁ τοιοῦτος τοῖς γεγονόις, ἀλλὰ πρῶτο μὲν τὸν διακόνιον Μαξίμου μετὰ καὶ τοῦ μαθητοῦ αὐτοῦ κατέκλεισαν ἐν φρουρᾷ, καὶ μετὰ πολλὰς ἀνακρίσεις ὅρων αὐτοῦ τῇ ὑβριδώδεις ὁμέρους, ἔσοροτος γεγονέναι προσώπαζεν εἰς τῇ Ὁράκῃ, ἐν φύλεις Βιζή καὶ Περιθῆ. Ἀδεις δὲ ὡς δρᾶκὸς ὁ αὐτὸς Κωνστάντιος τοῦτος πρὸς ἐαυτὸν ἐπισωπέρε. Οἱ δὲ ἀνακρίνοντες πλέον μᾶλλον ἠλεγξαν αὐτοῦ τὸν καὶ τῶν μετ' αὐτοῦ. Μετὰ δὲ ἁρματικοῦ σκόπου εἰσέκει τὰς χεῖρας καὶ τὸς γλώσσας καὶ παραπεπέμβαν αὐτοῦ ἐν Λατινῇ εἰς ἐξορίαν. Ἐξόμενος δὲ τῆς κακίας, γράφει τῇ ἔξαρχῳ Ραβέννῳ, καὶ αὐτὸς ἀσπέττετο στρατιώτον ἐν Ρώμῃ καὶ χειρίστατα τὸν ἁδικόν Μαρτύριον καὶ ἄγει αὐτὸν ἐν Κωνσταντινουπόλει. Καὶ κατάκλειστον τοῦτον ποιησάμενος καὶ πολλὰς θλίψεις αὐτῷ ἐσπευσίως, κατακρίνει αὐτόν ἐν Χερσονήσω παραπεμφθέρῃ, ὡς Θεοδόρῳς τῇ καθετείᾳ τῇ θείᾳ ομηρύγῃ τιτῇ συγγραφη ἐποιήσατο ἔχουσαν οὕτως.

§4. Χρῆ τούς ἐντευξομένους τοίνυν τοῖς ἔσως τῆς προκειμένης ἱερᾶς τοῦ ἱεροῦ ἐπιστολῆς Θεοῦ πεποθομένους τῷ ἐπάνωτε καθαρίας καὶ νεφροῖς ἀσφαλοῖς πιστεύσας, ὅτι ἐν αὐτῇ, ὡς ἐπὶ μάρτυρι τῷ Κυρίῳ ἀληθείας, ἐξ αὐτῆς τῆς ἰδιογράφου αὐτοῦ, μᾶλλον δὲ ταξιθέτερον εἰπέν διὰ τὸ τοῦ θαυμάτου παράδοξον, δικτύλῳ Θεοῦ γραφείσης ἐπιστολῆς, ἑγουν τοῦ ἁγίου πατρὸς ἦμων καὶ
the Typos, which is full of blasphemy, he posted it in the exo-narthex of the holy Great Church of God in Constantinople in ratification of the blasphemous heresy of the monotheitles. But he paid a just penalty: when he set out from Constantinople, intending to travel to Rome, he got as far as Sicily, and there, while he was relaxing in the baths, he received a fatal blow from the attendant, and was carried off. These events happened later. Let us return to the subject.

§3. So when Martin of holy memory became president of older Rome, Maximus of pious memory and his disciple Anastasius also being with him, after convening in Rome a synod of priests and orthodox men, he anathematized the impious Typos, which I have already mentioned. Constantine really could not abide the fact that this had happened, but firstly imprisoned holy Maximus in a camp together with his disciple, and seeing after many inquiries that they remained true to the orthodox faith, he gave the order for them to be banished to Thrace, to the cities Bizya and Perberis. But in turn, like a serpent the same Constos dragged them back to himself. When subjected to an inquiry it was much rather the case that they got the better of him and those with him. So in the grip of passion he cut off their hands and tongues, and sent them into banishment in Lazica. Clinging to evil, he wrote to the exarch of Ravenna, and [the exarch] dispatched an army to Rome, and it took captive the famous Martin and took him to Constantinople. And making him a prisoner and inflicting him with many sufferings, they condemned him to be sent to Cherson, as a certain Theodore instructs [us] in the writing which he composed for this divine assembly, which runs as follows.

§4. Those who have read these copies of the attached holy letter of the holy man are obliged to trust with certainty those obeying God who examines the inner hearts, because in it as God is a witness to the truth, was transcribed from the very letter which was written by his own hand—rather, to speak more truly, was written through an amazing miracle by the finger of God. That is to say, by our holy Father and teacher, the lord Father Anastasius, the presbyter and apocrisarius of the city of older Rome, which has a great name, who both was a great contender and was truly a great new confessor and martyr for the truth. It was written by him—after he suffered, as was said, in Byzantium together with his fellow contender, Maximus, truly a philosopher, or rather a theosopher, and his great fellow
διδασκάλου κυρίου Ἄββα Αναστασίου, τοῦ πρεσβυτέρου καὶ ἀποκρισιαρίου τῆς πρεσβυτερίας καὶ μεγαλονύμου πόλεως Ρώμης, πολύθλου τε καὶ μεγάλου νέου ὅντως ὀμολογητοῦ καὶ μάρτυρος τῆς ἀληθείας μετεγράφη, γραφείας σαρ' αὐτοῦ (μετά τὸ πάθειν αὐτῶν, ὡς εἰρηταὶ, ἐν Βυζαντίῳ ἀμέτακτον ἀναφορὰν αὐτῶν καὶ ὅντως φιλοσοφίαν, μᾶλλον δὲ θεοσκόπῳ καὶ μεγάλῳ αὐτοῦ συμμάρτυρι Χριστοῦ τοῦ ἀληθινοῦ Θεοῦ καὶ Σωτῆρος ἡμῶν Μαξίμων, τούτου τινὶ ἀποκαθηθῇ τὰς τιμὰς αὐτῶν ἱερὰς τε καὶ θεοκτιστικῶς ἀληθῶς γλώσσας τε καὶ χείρας σάν αἰκίσμοις καὶ βασάνοις πυκνάταις, αἰμορραγίας τε καὶ πομπῆς πάσης τῆς πόλεως, ὥστε δάκρυσσι τοῖς ἀληθινοῖς ὑπεράττῃ ποτὲ\ ὡς εἰ μὴ ἦν μόνος ἐκ τοῦ μόνος εἰς τὸ εἶναι τὰ πάντα παραγγειλαμένα Ἰησοῦ καὶ νεκροὺς ἀνάστασιν, ἐκ τῆς ταυτότητος αὐτῶν ἀπήνως καὶ τοιαύτης αἰμορραγίας, κανονίζεται ὡς πρὸς συνήθειαν μὴ συγχωρηθέντος αὐτοῦ τῇ συντρικοῖς τοὺς προσεκεχθέναι ταῖς τοιαῖς τῶν χειρῶν τε καὶ γλώσσαν πρὸς πάνω τοῦ αἵματος, τούτως διεξάλεξεν πρὸς ἐντροπὴν πάνω ἐναντίων, ἀπέδωκαν ἄν ἐκείνη τῷ ποθομένῳ Θεοῦ τὰς ἑαυτῶν ἁγίας ὅντως καὶ μακαρίας ψυχὰς· τάτα δὲ πάντα δὲ ὡδήν ἑτέρων ἔδρασαν εἰς αὐτοῖς οἱ ὅντως παμμάχοι καὶ πανάθλιοι ἀποκάλυπται τῆς ἀληθείας, ἀλλ' ἡ διὰ τοῦ κάκιστον ἀληθειῶς καὶ μόνων φθόνων, ὃ ἐκ ἀρχάκεικος δαιμόνιος αὐτῶν ἐνέπεσεν, καθά καὶ τοῖς ὑμεῖς αὐτῶν Ἰουδαίοις, ἐν τῷ μὴ δύνασθαι καὶ πρὸς βραχύ ἀντιστάσθηναι τῇ ἐκ Θεοῦ ἀξίως διωρθήθησθαι αὐτοῖς σοφία ὑπὲρ τῆς ὅντως ἀληθείας, καὶ τοῦ μὴ ἠλέειν αὐτοῖς συγκοινωνήσαι αὐτοῖς καὶ μόνον τῇ ὅτι ποθοῦ ποιηθῇ καὶ ἀθεία αὐτῶν met' αὐτῆς τῆς κοπείσης αὐτοῦ δεξιὰς ἁγίας χειρὸς, ἢτοι τοῦ καρποῦ καὶ μόνου, τούτουσιν ἀνένευ τοινοῦ καὶ δακτύλων, παραδόξως μηχανή, ήτοι δύο ἕξαλοι πτερον ἐπιδεξιομένους ἐναστὶ, μᾶλλον δὲ ταλήθεστερον εἰπεῖν δυνάμει καὶ χάριτι θεία, καθαὶ γλώσσῃ ἄλλῳ δείχθαι, τῇ καὶ ἄρατον ἄνευ πολυπλοκότος πάντῃ καὶ ἀκωλύτιον φθεγγομένου, καὶ αὐτῶν ἀπὸ ἐναῦ εὐδοκία τοῦ πνευμόνου τιμηθείσης αὐτῆς, ὡς Ἀλεξάνδρας ἡ πατρίκιας Λαδέκης μετ' ὅρκων φρικτῶν ἢλθησάτο ἡμῖν, ἐκνημονία Θεοῦ αὐτόπτης ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτὸ γενόμενον, δυσπιστῶν ἐπὶ τὸ παράδοξον τοῦ μεγάλου τοῦτον δαιμόνιον. Ἐπὶ μὴ καὶ Θεόδωρος ὁ πρωτοσκεπτήρας τοῦ πραιτωρίου τοῦ ὑπάρχου Κωνσταντινούπολεως πρὸ τοῦτον ἢλθησάτο ἡμῖν καὶ αὐτὸς μεθ' ὅρκων φρικτῶν, αὐτόπτωρ γεγονοῦς τῶν ἱερῶν πανθημάτων αὐτῶν, ὡς κύριος καὶ ἐπιστάτης τῶν τοιούτων, διαζάτων καὶ εὐχαριστικῶν τῷ Θεῷ ἐπὶ τῶν τοιούτων
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witness to Christ, our true God and Saviour, that is, when both their precious tongues, holy and truly divinely eloquent, were cut off from the inside, and their hands were cut off and they were beaten and tortured most cruelly, from which they bled while being paraded through the whole city, which in fact not even any foul criminal has ever undergone. And unless God, who alone brings everything from nothingness into existence and raises the dead, had not protected them in order to shame their enemies, from this kind of roughness at their hands and from a considerable loss of blood, there being no cautery allowed them as it is usually, and no astringent applied to where both their hands and tongues had been severed in order to stop the blood, they would then and there have given up their truly holy and blessed souls to God whom they longed for. But the truly most foul and most wretched apostates of the truth did all this to them for no reason other than through envy alone, truly most evil, which the demon, the author of evil, sowed in them, just as he did in the Jews who are like them. They were unable to resist even for a short time the wisdom which had been deservedly bestowed on them by God on behalf of what is really the truth, and the only thing they did not want was to communicate with them in their impiety and godlessness, which were so public—[it was written by him] with his holy right hand which had been cut off, in other words, with the stump and that alone, that is, without palm and fingers, with amazing ingenuity, in other words by fastening two slender twigs to the stump,7 or rather, to speak more truly, by divine power and grace, just as he also spoke with a truly divine and invisible tongue completely without hindrance and restraint, although it had been cut off from the very root from the inside. Lebarnikios, the patrician of Lazica, recounted this to us with terrible oaths, who by God’s plan had personally seen this very activity, although he had been distrustful about the amazing nature of this great miracle. Moreover, Theodore too, the protosecretary of the praetorian prefect of Constantinople,8 recounted this to us earlier, and he also swore terrible oaths, since he was aware of their holy sufferings, being the director and superintendent of matters like these. He glorified and gave thanks to God for such a miracle and for their courageous bravery, because, like a dog or a deer as a result of running a great distance, or from thirst and the heat, so they yielded and gave up their tongues, and similarly their hands, although holy Maximus was exceedingly short in stature and infirm of body, as is obvious to everyone. This is why the enemies, who were intrinsically
θαύματι καὶ εὐθάρσει ἄνδρεὶς αὐτῶν, ὅτι ὦσπερ κύων ἡ ἔλαφος ἐκ ὄρμου πολλοῦ καὶ δύσης ἡ καύματος οὐτοῦ ἑξάλασαν καὶ προ- ἔδωκαν τὰς γλώσσας αὐτῶν καθὰ καὶ τὰς χεῖρας, καὶ καὶ μικρο- φυοῦς πάνω καὶ ἄσθενοις ὄντος τῷ σώματι τοῦ ἄγιου Μαξίμου, ὡς πᾶσιν εὑρήσαν. Διὸ καὶ περισσός ὁ δι' ἐναντίας πληγέντες τὴν 
φρένιν ἐπὶ τῇ τοσαύτῃ καὶ τηλικάνῃ προβομίῳ τῶν ἁγίων, ἐνδοθεὶ 
οἱ παμπάνηροι καὶ ἀληθῶς ἀπάνθρωποι, ὡς ὄντως ἄγριοι θήρες, 
ἐξέτεροι ταύτας.

§5. Οὗ μόνον δὲ ταύτης τῆς ἐπιστολῆς οὐτὸς παρ' αὐτοῦ 
γραφεῖτος, ἀλλὰ καὶ ἑτέρων πλεῖστῶν βιβλίων τε καὶ τῶν ἱδίω 
αὐτοῦ ποιημάτων καὶ συγγραμμάτων ἱερῶν, ὅν ὦ μόνον 
aυτόπται προνοια Θεοῦ γεγόναμεν, ἀλλὰ καὶ μερικῶς ἐν κλήρῳ 
χάριτος Θεοῦ λαβεῖν ἐξ αὐτῶν κατ' ἐπιτροπὴν αὐτοῦ ἡμῖν θύμημα, 
καὶ αὐτῶν ὁμοίως ὡς τῇ αὐτῇ μεθύδῳ τε καὶ χειρὶ (μάλλον δὲ 
ἀληθῶς, ὡς εἰρήται, δικτύλω Θεοῦ ὡς ἐπὶ τοῦ μεγάλου Μωισέως) 
γραφέντων, προνοια καὶ συνεργεία τοῦ μόνου παντοδυνάμου καὶ 
φιλαγάδου τούτοις καὶ φιλανθρώπου Θεοῦ τοῦ ποιότος εὐαγγελία 
μεγάλα ἐν τοῖς ἁγίοις αὐτοῦ καὶ δοξάζοντος ἀληθῶς τοὺς 
dοξάζοντας αὐτὸν ἄκλινος ἔργον τε καὶ λόγον καὶ ἀλήθειαν, ἐτ 
διάχωντος ἐν τῇ ἐπιτυγχαίᾳ ἢγου τρίτη αὐτοῦ ἐξ ὁμοίᾳ Λαξιθ, 
in κάστρῳ ἐπίπληγες Θεοῦ ἡμῖν κειμένοι ἀπάνω χωρίον Μάχης, 
κλίμασις Ἀσπίλας τέλους, κατ' ἀνατολάς τῆς Ποιγκῆς ἀλασάς, 
pαρ' αὐτὸν τῶν πόλεων τῶν Καυκασίων ἱηρῶν, πληγάζω τῶν τῶν 
φιλοχρίστων Ἡβαγγέλων χώρας καὶ τοῦ ἑθους τῶν Ἡβαγγέλων, ὡς 
ἀπὸ σημείων πέντε τοῦ χωρίου Ζυγαϊώσωμεν, ἢγου τοῦ πρώτου 
ἀπὸν Γρηγορίου τοῦ ὅστως φιλανθρώπου πατρίκων καὶ μαγιστρῶν 
tῆς αὐτῆς τῶν Λαξίων χώρας, οὗ καὶ μνήμην ἁγάθην ἀξίως 
παραγίηται ἐν τῇ τοιαύτῃ ἐπιστολῇ, μετασάντως αὐτοῦ, βια καὶ 
ἐπιτροπὴ τῶν ἐκείνων πρὸ αὐτοῦ ἄθλων ἀρχιτέκτονα ἐὼς αὐτοῦ, ἐν 
tῇ αὐτῇ τρίτῃ ἐξορίᾳ ἐπάκει ἐν δυσχερέσει τόπως καὶ θλίψει 
πολλής, ἐν (τῇ ἐτερμένῃ καταθή του Θουσοθμῆς) ἐν Κυριω 
κεκοιμητε αὐτὸς, τῶν ἁγίων τοῦ καλὸν ἀγωνισάμενος, τῆς ὅντως 
ἀρθροδοξοῦ πίστευτον τηρήσας καὶ τὸν ὄρμον τοῦ μαρτυρίου τελέσας 
μὲν Ὀκτωβρίῳ ἐκκεκάθη, ἡμέρα πρώτη, ὕφα τρίτη, ἔκκεκάθη 
in τῇ ἁγίᾳ συνάξει Τὰ ἁγία τοῖς ἁγίοις, ἰδικτοίς δεκάτης, 
προετοῖς καὶ αὐτὸς τὴν ἡμέραν τῆς αὐτοῦ ἁγίας ἀναπαύσεως ταῖ 
tῶν ὄντως μετ' αὐτοῦ πρὸ μνημῶν τριῶν, καὶ ἔτερα δὲ πλείονα.
thoroughly wicked and truly inhuman like really wild animals, mutilated them, being extraordinarily struck by the extent and nature of the saints' readiness.

§5. As well as that letter written by him in this way, we personally not only saw by God's providence both very many of his other books and tomes containing his sacred compositions and writings, but we were also honoured to inherit parts of them, by the grace of God, in accordance with Anastasius' instructions, and at the same time some of those written by the same manual method—more truly, as is said, by the finger of God, as [happened] in the case of the great Moses. [This happened] through the providence and co-operation of the one, all-powerful God, who both loves good and loves human beings, who alone performs great wonders in his saints and truly glorifies those who glorify him unwaveringly in both deed and word and truth. [He wrote them] when he was still living in the last, that is to say the third, exile in Lazica, in a fort called Thousoumes which is situated above the district of Mochoes, in the border-region of Apulia, to the east of the Pontic sea, right at the foot of the Caucasus mountains, near the land of the Abasgi, who love Christ, and the Alani people, about five miles from the district of Zichachoris, that is to say the first home of Gregory, the true friend of Christ, the patrician and magistros of the same land of the Lazicans. Anastasius deservedly makes a positive mention of Gregory in the letter on this subject, when he was moved, forcefully and at the order of the miserable officials there before him up to his time, seven times in the same third exile, in difficult places and in a great deal of suffering. In the fort called Thousoumes, which I have mentioned, he went to sleep in the Lord, having fought the good fight and kept the truly orthodox faith and completed the course of a martyr, in the month of October on the eleventh day, on the first day [of the week], at the third hour, when 'Holy things for the holy' was being said in the holy synaxis, in the tenth indiction, when he himself had predicted the day of his holy passing to certain people who had been with him three months earlier. And by most of the various miracles which, with the co-operation of the all-holy and all-efficacious Spirit, he performed both there and in his two other places of exile, I mean in Trebizond and Mesembria, he converted a great many people and illuminated them by the truth.
θαύματα (τῇ) τοῦ παναγίου καὶ παντενεργοῦς Πνεύματος συνεργεία πονήσας εκείνη τε καὶ ἐν ταῖς ἄλλαις αὐτοῦ δυσὶν ἐξορίαις, Τραπεζοῦντι φιμί καὶ Μεσημβρία, παμπόλλους ἐπιστρέφας καὶ φωτίσας τῇ ἁληθείᾳ.

§ 6. Ἐνδιατρίψαντες δὲ καὶ πληρώσαντες ἐν τῇ τοιαύτῃ αὐτῶν ἀγία καὶ παμμακαριστῶν, πολυδρότων, (στε)φανηφόρων ὁμολογία τε καὶ μαρτυρία, ὡς μὲν εἰρημένοι ἄγιοι Αναστάσιος ὁ πρεμύθερος καὶ ἀποκρισιάριος Ρώμης ἀπὸ ἐκτῆς ἐπενεμήσεως τοῦ παρωχηκότος κύκλου μέχρι τῆς λεχθείσης δεκάτης ὑδικτιών τῆς ἐνστώσης πεντεκαδεκατηστηρίου ἐν διαὶ ταις προδελεγμέναις τριάν αὐτῶν ἐξορίαις, μεταστάσεσι διαφόροις, διάφοροι τε καὶ ἀνάγκαις καὶ περιστάσεσιν οὐ μετρίας οὔτε ὁλίγας έτη εἰκοσι, οἱ δὲ αὐτοῦ μαθηταί, Θεόδωρος καὶ Εὐστέρπος, γνώσοντες ὄντως καὶ ἄγιοι ἀδελφοὶ, ισός Πλουτίνου τοῦ μακαριστάτου βασιλικοῦ μάγκειστος (ἡτο ἐπάνω ὅλων τῶν τοῦ δημοσίου μαγκίτων τῶν τάς ἀνάνας πασῶν τῶν σχολῶν ἀπολύσων, ὡς ἐπιλέγεται, τετράναστον), πλούτων πολυτελείας καὶ δεξίωμασι διαφόρως, τείχως τε ἁρταῖς καὶ τῇ μείζονι πασῶν παρθενία κεκοσιμημένοι, δι᾽ ἂς, ὡς οἶμαι, καὶ τῶν τηλικούτων ὑπέρ Χριστοῦ ἀγώνων τοῦ καὶ στεφάνους κατηχιζόμενοι τιμηθῆναι ὡς ἄγιοι καὶ καθαροὶ τῇ καρδίᾳ, ὥστε αὐτοὶ τῶν Θεοῦ ὄμφανται; μετὰ τὴν πρώτην τοῦ ἐπιστάτου αὐτῶν τε καὶ ἱμὼν ἐν Τραπεζοῦντι ἐξορίαι, οἱ πλείσταις δεξιοσιμίωσι καὶ καρποφορίας ποιήσαντες, ὑποληθέντες ἐπὶ Ρώμην καταφυγεῖν, παρανταύτας σχεθέντες καὶ αὐτοὶ ἐν τῷ αὐτῶ διωγμῷ πληθύναν Μβόδου, διὰ τὴν αὐτὴν καὶ μόνην ὑπόθεσιν τοῦ μή δὲ αὐτοῖς θελήσας αὐτοῖς συμμανθήση τῇ προσφύγῳ ἀσβεία ἐπὶ τῷ γινομένῳ ἐξ ὑποβολῆς τῶν τῆς ἐκκλησίας Ἐκκλησιαστικούτων συνβεβήλαις καὶ πάντη ἄθεω βασιλικής ὑπάρξῃ, καὶ δημιουργήσῃς πάσης τῆς προσώπου αὐτοῖς περιποιήσεως καὶ τῶν ἐπικείμενων αὐτοῖς δεξιομάτων, ἐπινώσια τε βανάσσαμα παρὰ τῶν ἑπάρχων λαβόντες καὶ ἐξορισθέντες ἐν Χερσονήσῳ κακεῖσθι βίᾳ πολλάκις χωροθέντες ἀπ’ ἀλλήλων καὶ ἐν κάστροις τῶν ἐκείνη παρακείμενοι ἐθνῶν ἀφερενθέντες· ὃ μὲν νέωτερος ἀδελφός, ὡς τοῦ ᾗ ὄντως φερομένως ἐν πάσιν Εὐστέρποις ὁμοοιοθέτης, πληρώσας ἐν τῷ τοιούτῳ φιλοκόμω ἄγων ἔτος ἑπτάντων πρὸς Κύριον ἐπορεύθη μην Ὀκτωβρίου χι’ ἤδεικτιών εἰς τὸν οἴκον ὁ δὲ ἐτερος, ὃ καὶ πρώτος ἀδελφός, ὃ καὶ Θεοῦ δωρον ἀξίω· ὅτι Κύριον κεκλημένους, διαρκέας ἀπὸ τῆς αὐτῆς ἐκτῆς ὑδικτιών
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§6. While continuing to complete this holy and all-blessed confession and witness as well, which was full of exertion and brought them crowns, the said holy Anastasius, presbyter and apocrisiarius of Rome, [survived] twenty years, from the sixth indiction of the past cycle up to the tenth indiction, as I have said, of the present fifteen-year [cycle],\(^v\) in all of his three exiles, which I have spoken about before, and in different removals and in both sufferings and straitened circumstances and in misfortunes that were neither moderate nor few. His disciples Theodore and Euprepius, truly genuine and holy brothers, sons of Plutinus, the most blessed miller of the emperor—that is to say, the one who is above all the millers of the public treasury who distribute the grain supplies of all the schools,\(^v\) which is called \textit{tetrasitan}—who were equipped with extravagant 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 both so many trials and crowns on behalf of Christ, because they were chaste and \textit{pure of heart, since they will see God}—wanted to flee to Rome after the first exile of their teacher and ours as well in Trebizond, when they had donated very considerable amounts of alms and offerings. They too were stopped immediately in the same persecution near Abydos,\(^vi\) for the same reason and that alone—because they did not wish to be contaminated with them by their manifest impiety in the all-profane and completely godless imperial \textit{Typos}, which came about at the suggestion of those from the church in Constantinople. And when they had all the property belonging to them confiscated, and the offices they used to hold, they received a deadly whipping from the eparch and were sent into exile in Cherson.\(^vii\) There, for the most part separated from each other by force, they were assigned to the forts of neighbouring peoples there. The younger brother, that is to say the one who was truly in all respects fittingly named Euprepius, when he had completed the ninth year of suffering like this out of love of God, went to the Lord in the month of October, on the twenty-sixth day, in the fourteenth indiction.\(^viii\) The other brother, who was older and who was deservedly called 'a gift of God' by the Lord, having persevered from the same sixth indiction up to the tenth indiction of the present cycle, which I have mentioned—that is to say up to the holy rest in the Lord of their all-holy Father and the superior of them and us, the priest Anastasius [sc. the Apocrisiarius], as was said—when they\(^ix\) were truly pitiable and deprived, on account of the considerable rarity and lack of a
μέχρι τῆς εἰρημένης δεκάτης ἐπιευμήθησες τοῦ ἑνεστῶτος κῶλου, ἤτοι τῆς τοῦ παναγίου πατρὸς καὶ ἐπιστάτου αὐτῶν τε καὶ ἡμῶν Ἀναστασίαν πρεσβυτέρου, ὡς πρόκειται (τῶν ὄντων ἐλεεινῶν καὶ ὀρφανῶν διὰ τὴν τοσαύτην σπάνην καὶ ἀπορίαν τοῦ τῆς ἀληθείας λόγου καὶ πάσης πνευματικῆς τροφῆς, ὡς νῦν καὶ οὐκ ἀλλοτε πληροῦσθαι τὸ ὑπὸ τοῦ Κυρίου εἰρημένον περὶ τῶν ἐν ἑσχάταις ἡμέραις1 δεινῶν· οὐ λιμῶν ἁρτοῦ, οὐδὲ δόξαν ὑδάτων, ἀλλὰ λιμῶν τοῦ ἁκούας λόγον Κυρίου), καθὼς εὗρηται, ἐν Κυρίῳ ἀγίας ἀναπαύσεως ἦτος εἰκοστοῦ ἀγεῖ ἐτὶ ἐναρκτερῶν τοῖς ἀθλητικῶς ἱδρύσας καὶ σκάμμασιν ἐν τῇ αὐτῇ ἑξορίᾳ Χερουβίνος.

§7. Ὅσι, ἦγουν ὁ εἰρημένος πρῶτος ἄδελφος Θεόδωρος, καὶ οἰκεία χειρὶ πλείστα πονηράτα τῶν ἁγίων ἠξώσεις παρασχεῖν ἡμῖν ἀπελθοῦν ἐκεῖσε εἰς ἐπίσκεψιν καὶ προσκύνησιν αὐτοῦ τε καὶ τοῦ παντίμου μυχάματος Μαρτύνου τοῦ κορυφαίου καὶ ἄνωθεν ὀἰκουμενικοῦ πάπα καὶ μεγάλου μάρτυρος τῆς ἀληθείας.

§8. Οὗ καὶ θαύματα πλείστα ἐκεῖσε γνώμενα μετὰ καὶ τῶν ἐπενεχθείσιν αὐτοῖς ἀφορήτων τῆς ἡμέρας ἐνεχθήσατο ἡμῖν, χαρισάμενος καὶ μέρος τοῦ εὐθείου αὐτοῦ παρὰ τοῦ ἁγίου(ου) ὠραρίου ἦτοι φακιολοί, καὶ τὸ ἐν τῶν καπαγίων αὐτοῦ ἦγουν καλείγιον (οίον οὔδεις ἐτερος ἐν ἀνθρώπωσι φορεῖ ἀλλ’ ἡ μόνος ὁ Ρώμης ἁγίος πάπας), διὰ τὸ καὶ αὐτὸν ἐκεῖσε εξώρισεν γενέσθαι μετὰ τὸ πάνω εἰς αὐτῶν ἐν τῷ παραπεμπέσθαι ἀπὸ Ρώμης, ἐάν χαρισάμενος καὶ ἐπισκεπτόντα πάνω τὸ ὑπὲρ Χριστοῦ μαρτύρων, ὡς μεμητής τε καὶ διάδοχος τοῦ ἁγίου καὶ κορυφαίου τῶν ἀποστόλων Πέτρου, κατὰ τὸ πλούς τε καὶ ἐν αὐτῷ τῷ Βυζαντίῳ, ὡστε καὶ κατὰ πεδίων κοσμηθήσεται αὐτοῦ παρὰ τῶν ἐθνῶν τοῦ Θεοῦ, ἀξίων δὲ τοῦ πατρὸς αὐτῶν τοῦ διαβόλου, τῆς το εὐθύςτοι αὐτοῦ γυμνοθέντος, καὶ βαρβατοθείρις καὶ ἀλισσεός περιτεθέντων τῇ το ἁγίον αὐτοῦ τραχύλῳ καὶ τοῖς λοιποῖς αὐτοῦ τμίοις μέλεσιν, εἴτε τοις αὐτοῖς τὸ σῶμα ὑποπέσαντος πᾶσαν τὴν μέσην ἀπὸ τοῦ παλαιότοι ἐως τοῦ πρωτοῦ τοῦ ἐπάρχον, τοῦ βεγγαλογιστοροῦ ἦγουν τοῦ αὐτοῦ τῶν δημῶν συνδεδεμένου καὶ μετὰ τοῦ ξίφους προϊόντος διὰ τὸ μελῆμα αὐτοῦ κατακοπήνα, ὀρίσαντος τε καὶ ἐπί[σ]τρεφοντος Βου[κ]κολεόντος τοῦ δυσμενοῦς σακαλαρίου καὶ ἀξίως ὠνόμα αἰμομόρδου θηρῶς ἐπικληθόντος, ὡς καὶ ἐργα θηριώδιας με(σ)τὰ κεκτημένου, εἰσῆλθε καὶ γνώμη Κωνσταντίνου τοῦ βασιλέως, τοῦ
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truthful word, and of all spiritual food, such that now and at no other time the Lord's words are fulfilled, concerning the evils of the last days, no hunger for bread, nor thirst for water, but a hunger for hearing the word of the Lord—as was said, [his brother Theodore] is spending his twentieth year holding out in the rigorous labours and crises in the same place of exile in Cherson.

§7. He, that is to say the older brother Theodore, whom I have mentioned, was kind enough to show us with his very own hand a great many written works of the saints, when we went there to visit him and venerated both him and Martin of all-precious memory, the head and truly ecumenical pope and great martyr for the truth.

§8. Theodore recounted to us also the very many miracles of Martin which happened there, as well as the unbearable tribulations which bore down on them, and he gave us as a gift a piece of a kerchief or towel, which had been left to them by the holy man [sc. Martin], and one of his boots or half-boots which no other person wears except the holy pope of Rome alone. This was because Martin too had been exiled there after terrible sufferings while he was being conveyed from Rome. He handed himself over, eagerly desiring and longing passionately to be martyred for Christ's sake, as both an imitator and successor of holy Peter, chief of the apostles, both during the sea voyage and in Byzantium itself. The upshot was that he was hit publicly by the enemies of God, who are worthy of their father the devil, and he was stripped of his clothes, and, too, heavy irons and chains were put around both his holy neck and the rest of his precious limbs. Then they led him with the same irons in procession along the whole road from the palace up to the praetorian prefecture, chained to the officer of the guard,20 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 wretched finance minister Boukoleon21 decided and permitted [this], he who was deservedly called by the name of a blood-devouring beast, as one who had also brought upon himself deeds full of bestial savagery, with the knowledge and consent of the Emperor Constantine, who produced the totally foul and totally evil Typos, which I have spoken about, on the advice of Paul, the wretched former president of Constantinople, with Gregory the Eunuch and eparch of the city rightly described as pitiable.22 In fact, this would already have happened as far as both his [sc. Martin's] bold readiness
καὶ τὸν εἰρημένον παμμάριον καὶ παγκάκιστον Τύπον ἐξ εἰσιτήριας Παύλου τοῦ δυστήρου προέδρου γενομένου Κωνσταντινουπόλεως δημιουργήσαντος, Γρηγόριω τῷ εὐφυικῷ καὶ ἐπάρχῳ τῆς ἀθλίας ἀντων εἰρημένης πόλεως. Ὁ καὶ ἤδη γέγονεν ἀν ὡς τῇ εὐθαρσίᾳ αὐτοῦ προθυμίᾳ τε καὶ προθεσίᾳ, εἰ μὴ ἡ τοῦ φιλανθρώπου καὶ ὑπεραγάθου Θεοῦ ῥοπὴ τούτων ἀνέστειλεν, ἡ τῇ τούτων πολυ[α]θενέτειν ἄνθρωπον καὶ ἀντιπόλων (οἰκεῖοι γὰρ καὶ τούτῳ πάσχειν πολλάκις καὶ τὴν τάξιν ἄρρητος τε ἀπανθρωπητεύσει εἰς καὶ ἀπανθρωπητεύσει, εἰ καὶ οὐκ ἀπανθρωπητεύσεις καὶ ὁμοίως κατὰ τὸν ἐν αὐτοῖς ἐνεργοῦτα Σατάν), ἡ τῷ μαρτυρῶν φθονησάντων κατὰ τὸν ὅμοιον αὐτοῦ ἀποστάτην καὶ εἰδωλομανή Σουλιανάκτων ἔκειν τὸν περιβόητον καὶ ἀντωνομᾶς συμμετέχον τῷ κακῷ, ἦ καὶ αὐτῷ μόνῳ ἔγκριμαινεν Θεοῦ τῷ πάντῃ πρὸς τὸ συμφέρον ὁ ὅκουνωσιν, ἀπείρῳ τε καὶ ἀφράτῳ προνοίᾳ τούτων διεφύλαξεν. Ποιόστος αὐτῷ ὁ ἐν μεν ταῖς διάφοροι, τῷ τῇ ἐξευδότει καὶ τῇ φιλακῇ τοῦ ἐπάρχου, ἐν θλίψει πολλῇ καὶ ἁσθενεῖα βαρυτάτη ἰμέρας ἐκατον ὁγδοῦνεκταν, τὸν ὑπὸ πάντα τῆς ἀθλίας ἀνεκδοτος αὐτοῦ ἀγώνα ἐν ἔρευντι τρισίν ἢ καὶ πρός, καθὼς ἐκ τῶν περὶ αὐτοῦ συγγεγείρειν καὶ τῶν ὄντων αὐτῷ μετὰ πλεῖστων βασιλέων ἐν διαφόρωσ τόπων ἔποιερες τραγωδίας τῶν Ῥωμαίων καὶ οἰκείων αὐτοῦ ἀνθρώπων, ἠδυναμεῖ τὸν θάνατον, κεκοιμηθεῖ τε καὶ αὐτὸς ἐν Κυρίῳ, τὴν μίαν καὶ μόνην ἀγίαν καθολικήν καὶ ἀποστολικήν ἐνδοξον τοῦ Θεοῦ ἡμῶν ἐκκλησίαν πανεύροις καὶ ἀληθεῖς δόμισιν αὐτοκεφαλίσιον καθαφαίρεσιν, τὰ τῶν ἀγίων καὶ οἰκουμενικῶν πάντες αὐτούς, τὸ ἐν Νικαιᾳ φημὶ, καὶ Κωνσταντινουπόλει, Ἐφέσῳ τῷ τῷ πρότερον καὶ Χαλκηδονι, καὶ ἄδικα ἐν Κωνσταντινουπόλει ἐπὶ Ἰουστινιανοῦ τοῦ βασιλέως, καὶ πάνω τῶν ἁγίων θεοφάνους τε καὶ ἐγκρίτων πατέρων καὶ ἡμῶν ἀληθῶν διδάσκαλων ἵκα καὶ πανευφανείς δόγματα βεβαιώσασα, καθὼς οἱ φιλευθερισμοῦ ἐντυπώσαντες ἐθέλοντες εὑρήσωμεν ἐν τοῖς ἔρεισι πεπαγμένοις τῆς παρ' αὐτοῦ ἐν Ῥώμῃ συγκροτηθείσης ἀγίας καὶ ἀποστολικῆς πανευραυσώσαν, ἐν παντὶ τόπω καὶ πάσῃ χώρᾳ ταῖς ἐκπέμπει, καὶ ἀπανθρωπεύσει τὴν ἐλληθείαν φανερώσας τοι καὶ κηρύξας, τὸ δὲ αἰσχρὸ τῶν ἐναντίων ἀνακάλυψαι καὶ τὴν στηθεῖσας πάνω σαφὸς, τῶν καὶ πολυεράστων αὐτῷ ἀγώνια ἐγκυκλισάμενος· καὶ πρὸς τὸν ποθούμον Κύριον, ύπερ οὗ καὶ τὸ οἰκείον αἷμα τοσ' αὐτοῦ ἦμενεν, ἐν εὐφράσει μεγίστη πανευθείᾳ μηνὶ Σεπτεμβρίου ἰσ', ἰδιοκτείνως ἤδ' ἐν ἔ καὶ τῆς φιλακῆς τῆς εὐσεβείας πολυάθλου τε καὶ ἀγνης παρθένου καὶ

---
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and his purpose [were concerned], if the decisive intervention of
God, who loves human beings and is supremely good, had not
checked them, or the adversaries had not become ashamed by
Martin’s almighty bravery. I say this because even hard and inhuman
tyants are perhaps capable of experiencing even this, although
they are excessively merciless and cruel in the manner of Satan who
operated in them. Or they begrudged [him] martyrdom, in the
manner of one similar to themselves, the apostate Julian, who was
crazy about idols: that infamous man, truly wise in evil matters; or
God preserved him in his providence, which is both without limit and
unspoken, which is something better and known only to God himself,
who arranges everything for our advantage. Martin himself fell asleep
in the Lord when he had done 180 days in the two prisons, both in the
watch-house and in the eparch’s prison, in great tribulation and most
grievous ill-health, although every suffering in his struggle [lasted] for
three years or even more,24 as we are able to ascertain both from what
was written about him, and also both from the Roman soldiers and
his own people who with him were exiled to various places and
endured a great many torments. [He fell asleep] after he had brought
illumination to the one and only holy catholic and apostolic, glorious
church of our God, by the all-holy and the true teachings of the
synods, I mean the one in Nicaea, and Constantinople, both Ephesus
I and Chalcedon, and again in Constantinople at the time of the
emperor Justinian,25 and the sacred and all-pious teachings of all the
holy Fathers who are both full of divine wisdom and approved, and
our true teachers, as those who wish to read reverently will find in the
sacred acts of the holy and apostolic and all-pious synod which was
convened by him in Rome.26 He dispatched these [acts] to every
place and to every region, and both showed and proclaimed the truth
intensely, both revealing and publicising the sordid deeds of the
enemy very clearly. He fought the good fight much loved by him, and
got with the greatest joy to the Lord whom he desired, on whose
behalf he poured out his own blood as far as he could, in the month of
September on the sixteenth day in the fourteenth indiction,27 on the
day on which every year is celebrated the all-precious memory of
Euphemia,28 guardian of orthodoxy, who is both a great contender
and a pure virgin and martyr. He was buried among the tombs of
saints in the all-venerable house of Our Lady, the all-holy, inviolate,
all-praiseworthy, gracious one, who is properly speaking by nature
both really and truly the Mother of God and ever-virgin Mary, which
μάρτυρος Ἐδφημίας ἡ πάντως μνήμη κατ’ έτος τελείται, κατατεθείς εν ουροίς ἁγίων, οίκων δὲ πανομοσχαμίω τῆς παναγίας ἀχράντου καὶ πανυμνήστου κεχαριτωμένης δεσποινής ἡμῶν ὡς κυρίως φόρει ἄμετον τε καὶ ἀληθῶς Θεοτόκου καὶ ἀειπαρθένου Μαρίας ἐπηλεγμένων βλαχέρναι, ἐξω τεχθῶν ὡς ἀπὸ σταδίου ἐνος τῆς αὐτῆς εὐλογημένης τὸ λοίπον πόλεως Χερσονήσου. Ἐν φ’ ἁγίω οίκω καὶ ὁ μεμονωθῆς ἁγίος Ἐσπερίας ἀναπέσταυται πλησίον αὐτοῦ τοῦ παγκοσμίου ποιμένος τε καὶ ἀληθῶς διδασκάλον τοῦ τής εὐαγγελικῆς φωνῆς ἔργῳ πληρόσωσαν, ἢ φησὶν. ὁ ποιμήν ὁ καλὸς τῆς ψυχῆς αὐτοῦ τίθησιν ὑπὲρ τῶν προβάτων.

§9. ὁ δὲ ἁγίος καὶ ἄσιμος, πανάριστος τε καὶ πάνωσος μέγας τῆς ἁλθείας συνυπέρμαχος καὶ συνμάρτυς αὐτῶν μέγιστος, ὁ καὶ Μάξιμος (τοῦτο γάρ, ὡς προκαθήλωτα, τῇ Ρωμαίᾳ λέξει τὸ Μάξιμος ὄνομα δηλοῖ), οὔ καὶ τὸ ἁγίων μνήμη κατὰ νῖκα λαμπάδας ἀναβιβασάνει, ἄφ’ ἣ ἡμέρας κηκομίεροι μέχρι νῦν καὶ εἰς ἀεὶ πάσας καταφωτισόοναι καὶ φαινοῦνσας τὴν αὐτοῦ πρὸς Θεόν παρηγάζειν, ὁ ἡ προκειμένη παράστασιν ἑσιστέλλει καὶ ἤμει νικήκησεν αὐτήν κατὰ πάλλων τῶν ἐκείσε ἀρχόντων τε καὶ οἰκητῶν μὲθ’ ὁρῶν τῷ τοιούτῳ παράδειξεν ἀντὶς θοίμα παρηγάζια κηρυττόντων γεγόναμεν, τῶν δὲ καὶ αὐτοῦθεν θεσαμενών (ὅν ἐν ὑψαρχεῖ καὶ ποιμήν τοῦ αὐτοῦ κάστρου Σχημάρεως καύμας Μιστράνων, ὁ καὶ βυθεῖνες μετὰ τῶν ἑαυτοῦ στρατιωτῶν τάντας αὐτῷ ἅπαξ διὸς ἀλλὰ καὶ πολλάκις θεσάμενος καὶ πάσιν πρῶτος φαινότως κηρύξας), ἡμῶν δὲ μὴ δυνανόντων ἐκείσε παραγενέσθαι διὰ τὴν τούτο ὅρος ἐκείνων ἤτοι τῆς κορώβης τῶν Καυκάσιων, οὗ ψφηλότερον ὄρος ἑπὶ γῆς οὐκ ἔστιν, δυσχέρειαν καὶ τὴν ἀραν περί τοῦ χειμῶνος, ἐπὶ μὴ καὶ τὴν γενομένην σύγχυσιν τότε τῶν ἐθνῶν ἐν τοῖς μέρεσιν ἐκεῖνων, αἰαν ανασταίρων τῷ αὐτοῦ μαθητή, ἀπὸ ἐνοκάτη ἐπυμβέβηκεν τοῦ παρελπισθός κύκλου, καὶ αὐτοῖ θαμαίνειν τῇ τρισὶ ξεροίᾳ, λέγω δε Βιζήν τε καὶ Περβρέρει τῆς τῶν Ὀρακῶν χώρας καὶ τῇ ἐψημενῇ Δαβίδ, ἐν πολλαῖς χρηματαῖσι καὶ αὐτοὶ ἀνετόντως αἰθητικοὶ ἁγίων ἐν τῇ δεκα, πρὸς τὴν ἀνω βασιλεύων μετουκάθησαν ὁ μὲν ἁγίος Μάξιμος, καθὼς εἴρηται, μηρὶ Αὐγουστρωγία ἐν τοῖς ἀστερομένωι εἰ, προειρήμων ἐν Θείας ἀποκάλυψισι τὴν ἀυτοῦ κοίμησαν πρὸ τοῦ ἡμερῶν εἰ, καθα πρόκειται, τὴν δὲ ἁγίαν αὐτοῦ ὑπὲρ τῆς ἀλθείας ἐν Χριστῷ τῷ Θείῳ ἡμῶν μαρτυριῶν πρὸ
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is called Blachernai, by about one stadium outside the walls of that city of Cherson, blessed as a result. In this holy house holy Euprepius too, whom I have mentioned, is laid to rest near the same shepherd who is both shared by the world and a true teacher, who fulfilled by his work the words of the Gospel which say: ‘The good shepherd lays down his life for his sheep.’

§9. The holy and famous, all-excellent as well as all-wise, their great fellow-contender and fellow-martyr Megistos, who is also Maximus—as has been indicated earlier, the name Maximus means this in the Latin language—whose holy tomb also displays an abundance of lights each night, from the day when he fell asleep up to now and forever, giving illumination to all and showing the trust [which he enjoys] with God, as the preceding letter commends. And we personally heard [this] from both many of the officials there and the local people, who told us confidently with oaths about the truly amazing nature of this miracle, and who had seen [the lights] with their own eyes. There is one of these, a comes, Mistrianus, himself from the same fort of Schemaris, who saw these [lights] not once or twice but many times while on night-watch with his soldiers, and was the first to tell everyone openly. But we were unable to get there because of the difficulty of that mountain, that is to say the summit of the Caucasus, than which there is no loftier mountain on earth and the winter season, not to mention the confusion which occurred there among the people in those parts. Together with Anastasius his disciple, he departed for the heavenly kingdom. From the eleventh indiction of the previous cycle they had similarly spent ten years in three places of exile—I mean both Bizya and Perberis in the region of Thrace, and Lazica, which I have mentioned—in numerous afflictions and desperately straitened circumstances, and in strenuous struggles of this kind. Holy Maximus, as was said, [died] in the month of August, on the thirteenth day in the fifth indiction, having foretold his death by divine revelation fifteen days earlier, as can be found in the preceding [account], whereas [he had foretold] his holy martyrdom for the truth in Christ our God a considerable number of years before; and his disciple Anastasius [died] in the month of July on the twenty-fourth day in the same indiction.
Ικανών ἤτων, ὁ δὲ αὐτοῦ μαθητής Αναστάσιος μητὶ Ἰουλίω καὶ ἱδρυτών τῆς αὐτῆς.

§ 10. Ἑστάλη γοῦν ἡμῖν ἢ τοιαύτη πανέρος καὶ προκειμένῃ ἰδιάχειρος, μᾶλλον δὲ θεοχάρακτος ἐπιστολή μετὰ τῶν ὑποκειμένων αὐτῇ θεογόνων χρήσεων καὶ συλλογισμῶν, ἀπὸ τῆς αὐτῆς τρίτης αὐτῶν ἔξοριας, ἦγουν Δαλικῆς· ἦν καὶ κατέχομεν μετ’ αὐτῆς ἢ ἔγραφε θεοπαραδότου μηχανής, ἤτοι τῶν εἰρημένων δύο ἀγίων ἔξωλων, καὶ τῶν ἄλλων αὐτοῦ ὑσαύτου ἰδιογράφων βιβλίων τε καὶ τόμων τῶν μετὰ τὸ πάθος, οὐ μὴν ἄλλα καὶ πρὸ τοῦ πάθους πλείστων ποιημάτων αὐτοῦ καὶ ἰδιοχείρων συγγραμμάτων, ὡς ὄντως ἦρα καὶ ἄγια τε κειμήλια τε καὶ λείψανα. Ἀπεδόθη δὲ ἢμῖν τοῖς ὄντως ἐλαχίστοις Θεοδώρῳ καὶ Θεοδώρῳ γνησίοις καὶ ἀναθέτοις ἀδελφοῖς, ταπεινοῖς τε καὶ ἀμαρτωλοῖς μοναχοῖς, διὰ τοῦ ἀββᾶ Γρηγορίου τοῦ ἡγουμένου μονῆς τοῦ ἀγίου Ἰωάννου τοῦ Βαπτιστοῦ τῆς τῶν Ἀλβανῶν χώρας ἐπιλεγομένης Βεταραμώνων, ἐν τῇ ἁγίᾳ Χριστοῦ τοῦ Θεοῦ ἡμῶν Αναστάσει, ἡ τοιαύτη ἢερα ἐπιστολή μηῆν Αὐγοῦστῳ εἰκάζει ἱδικτιῶν ὑγίας, ἀντιπαρεδόθουσας ἡμᾶς, ὑποστρέφον μὲς τῆς πολλάκις λεγομένης τῶν Δαλικῶν χώρας, ἀπελθοῦσαν ἐκείσης, εἰ γὰρ καὶ λιῶν ἀσθενεῖς πτωχοὶ τε καὶ ἀνάξιοι κατὰ τὸ εἰσθήσει ἤμεν εἰς ἐπίσκεψιν αὐτῶν, οὐ μόνον διὰ τὸ ἐπιτεθεὶ ἢμῖν τῆς διακοινίας τοῦ λόγου δοὺς καὶ ἐγγράφον προϊκετον ἤτοι πρόστασιν τοῦ μνημονευ-θέντος ἢγίου καὶ κοινότοις ἀγοροτοικοῖς πάπα Ρώμης Μαρτίνου, αὐτοπροσώπους πρὸς αὐτὸν ἐν τῇ αὐτῇ μεγαλούνῳ πόλει παραγεγρομένων, καὶ πληροφορίαν ἰδιάχειρον περὶ τῶν ὅτι αὐτοῦ συνοδικῶς κυριαθέντων ἐυθείως ἀληθοῦς δογμάτων πρότερον παρ’ ἡμῶν κοιμασμένων, ἀλλὰ καὶ διὰ [του]τὸ αὐταίς ὄψεως ἐν- τελεῖσθαι ἢμῖν αὐτοῖς περὶ τοῦτο, μετὰ τὸ παθεῖν αὐτοῖς αἰτίας ἐν Βυζαντίῳ ἐν φρουρῷ τοῦ πραιτορίῳ τοῦ ἐπάρχου ἐπι- λεγομένης[5] Διομήδους, ἢ ἢς καὶ προσέπιψαμεν αὐτοὺς ἐπὶ τὴν διαφοράς λεγομένης τρίτης αὐτῶν ἔξοριας Δαλικῆς, ἀξιωθεντες καὶ ἐν ταῖς λοιπαῖς αὐτῶν ἔξοριας καὶ παραφυλακαῖς, κόσιοι καὶ μόθους καὶ περιστάσεις οὐ μετραῖς, κατὰ τὸ ἢμῖν δυνατῶν (Θεοῦ συνεργοῦντος καὶ διὰ τῶν θεοδέκτων αὐτῶν δεησόμενος ἐξελοῦμεν ήμᾶς πολλάκις ἐκ τῶν παρανόμων χειρῶν τῶν ἁσβείων, θαλάσσης τε κυνοῦν καὶ πειρατῶν διαφόρων) διακονόσας αὐτοῖς ἢ τῆς ὑπαρχοῦσης ἢμῖν πειθράς εὐλογίας γονικῆς, ὡς ἐπὶ Κυρίω, ταλθέουσαν δὲ εἰπεῖν Θεοῦ δώρεας καὶ
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§10. So there was sent to us from their same third place of exile, that is to say Lazica, the all-holy letter on this subject, and it is set forth in his own hand, or rather (it was) written by God, with both the attached testimonies and syllogisms which speak of God. And we have it [sc. the letter] in our possession, together with the same device he used to write it, which was delivered by God, that is to say the said two holy twigs, and similarly both his other handwritten books and tomes from after the suffering, not to mention a great number of his works and his handwritten compositions from before the suffering as well, in that they are both treasures and relics (that are) truly sacred and holy as well. The sacred letter on this subject was handed over to us, the truly lowly Theodosius and Theodore, legitimate and genuine brothers, both humble and sinful monks, through Father Gregory, abbot of the monastery of St. John the Baptist, of the region in Albania which is called Betararous, in the holy Church of the Resurrection of Christ our God, in the month of August on the twentieth day of the eleventh indiction, which passed by us as we were returning from the region of Lazica, which I have often mentioned. We had gone there, even if we were very weak and both poor and unworthy, to visit them according to our custom, not only because of the burden of the service of the word which was imposed on us according to the written instruction, that is to say the order of the holy and chief apostolic pope of Rome, Martin, who has been mentioned, when we came to him personally in the same city of great name, and an assurance in his own hand concerning the truly orthodox teachings ratified by the synod, which we were the first to transmit; but also because in our presence he had given us a command [to visit] them on their account, after they were found guilty (and) suffered in Byzantium in the prison of the praetorian prefect, which is called Diomedes. From the prison we also escorted them to their third place of exile in Lazica, which I have mentioned at various times. We were considered worthy to minister to them in their remaining exiles and places of detention, in their toils and troubles and considerable crises, to the best of our ability—because their prayers were received by God, God helped [us], snatching us on many occasions from the wicked hands of violent people and from dangerous seas and various trials—from the modest gift which we had from our parents, as it were in the Lord, or to speak more truly, from a gift from God and not from strangers. Moreover, [we were considered worthy] to minister also to the rest of their fellow-contenders and fellow-martyrs,
οὐκ ἔξ ἄλλων ἐνομφάνουσαν, οὐ μὴν ἄλλα καὶ τοῖς λοιποῖς αὐτῶν συν-
αγωγοῦσαν καὶ συμμάρτησαν, καὶ αὐτόπται γενέσθαι τῶν διὰ
Χριστοῦ τῶν ἀληθῶν ἡμῶν Θεοῦ στιγμάτων αὐτῶν καὶ
παθημάτων, ἐτί μὴ καὶ αὐτήκοις τῆς ἄνωθεν χειροτέκου καὶ
σωματικῶς αὑτῶν διδασκαλίας ἐν πείρα καταστήμαται, καὶ τῶν
θεοπειθῶν αὐτῶν καὶ ἀληθῶς εὐπροσδόκητων εὐχῶν ἐν ἄπολαύσει
gενέσθαι, καὶ τινῶν τῶν ἐν τῷ πάθει περισχαθῶν αὐτῶν ἐνομφα-
νόματων αἰκίαις χειρῶν παρ’ αὐτῶν κομίσασθαι ἀμα τοῖς τῶν
περιπεθεμένων ἐν ταῖς ἱπτρείαις ταῖς ἀποκοπεῖσαι αὐτῶν ἅγιαις
χειρῶν ἡγιασμένων τε καὶ πεφωνημένων τοῖς αὐτῶν τιμίως
αιμασὶ πανιών. Ἀμφότεροι δὲ συνάψαντο καὶ μυημονεύοντα οὐκ
ἀσκόπσαν, ὡς ὁμίλαν, συνειδομένη, ἀλλ’ ἦ διὰ τὸ ἐν καὶ ταῦτα
αὐτοῦ ἐν τῇ ἀθόριστῃ τῆς ἁγίας ἄνωθει καὶ ἀρθρόδαξιν πίστεως καὶ
τῷ συνδέσμῳ τῷ τῇ εἰρήνῃ φ καὶ ἀγάπῃς θείας γενέσθαι, τὸ
λοιπὸν ἅπερον πλήθος τῶν ἐν τῷ εἰρημένῳ ἀνυπόστατῳ καὶ
ἀφορτήσαν διωγμῆς διαφάνεις αἰκίαις καὶ διάβασαν φανερῶς τε καὶ
κρυπτῶς μαρτυροῦσαν, εὑρηκὼς ταῖς πανοῦργοις ταῖς
αὐτοῦ ἀληθοῦς ὡς ὁ πέρι πίστεως δῆθεν ἀλλ’ ἐτέρων χάριν
προφάσεως καὶ ζημιῶν προσφερόμενων διὰ τῶν ἀπλουστέρων
ἐνυπόλοτον, τῷ τῶν κρυψτῶν γνώστης καὶ μόνῳ τούτοις καὶ δι’ ἦν
αἰτιῶν πᾶσαν ἀκριβῶς ἐπισταμένης Θεῷ καὶ τοῖς φιλο-
ποντωτέροις καταλελοιπότες.

§11. Ὑπέρ ὧν ἀπαντῶν καὶ ὡμᾶς πάντως τοὺς ἐν ἀληθείᾳ τα τῆς
ἀντιτις ἀληθείας ἐνεπνευμένους, ὡς παροίκες καὶ προσπίπτοντες,
tὸ τε ἐναν τῆς κοινὸς συν τοῖς σωματικοῖς γόνατοι ἐν αἰσθήσει
κεριάς καὶ δάκρυσα κλίνοντες καὶ πρὸ τῶν ἤχων πάντων ὡμῶν
προκυλλομένων, δεόμεθα καὶ παρακαλοῦμεν, πρῶτον μὲν
συγκυρώμην ἐν πάσιν εἴναι τῇ τῆς ἡμῶν ὄθενει καὶ αἰμαθεὶς
πρὸς πίστις καὶ πληροφοριὰς τῶν ἄνωθεσι πιστῶν καὶ πιστῶς τοῖς
τοιαύται δεχομένων, καὶ τοῦ μὴ λήθῃ τῷ χρόνῳ καλύφαι
τοιοῦτος καὶ τηλευταῖος ἰεροὺς ἀγώνας διὰ τὸ πάνω ὄλγοις καὶ
σπανίους σὺν ἀκριβεία ταῦτα ἐπισταμένους ἡμῶν δὲ, ὡς εἰρήται,
βουλήση τοῦ αὐτῶς ὡς συνοιτών εἰς τοῖς πλεῖσι
γεγονότων καὶ τοῦ ἐκ βαθμίας κίνδυνον ψυφρομένων, ἀλλ’ οὐ δι’
ἐτέρων ὡς ἐπὶ Κυρίῳ καθ’ οἰονοδύτη τρόπον τάστα γράφαμα
τολμησάσαντο, μὴ εὐπροσόντων βίον τῇ ἐγκομίου ἐφικέσθαι
τοιοῦτος καὶ τοσοῦτος ὑπὸ εὐσεβείας ἄγανων τε καὶ ἐκείνων
tῶν ἄνω θαυμασίων καὶ μεγάλῶν ἐκείνων ἐν Κυρίῳ θείων
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and to witness the stigmata and the sufferings [which they endured] through Christ our true God; furthermore, to hear for ourselves their teaching, which was full of divine wisdom and saving during their period of testing; and to benefit from their prayers, which trust in God and are truly acceptable; and to receive from them, from their own hands, some of their clothes that had been torn during their suffering, together with bandages which, after the amputation, had been wrapped around their holy hands for medical purposes, which were both sanctified and reddened by their precious blood. We have resolved to commemorate jointly both Maximus and Anastasius, not in an ill-considered way, in my opinion, but because they have become one and the same in the struggle for the truly holy and orthodox faith and in the bond of both peace and divine love. The remainder of the infinite number of those who both publicly and privately bore witness in the said intolerable and unendurable persecution, through various beatings and afflictions, and punishments inflicted on them both by skilful devising and cunning in one way or another, as if not on behalf of the faith at all, but on other pretexts, because simpler-minded people are easy to deceive, we have left to God, who knows secret things, and to the more diligent. God alone knows accurately the people and the reason for which they suffer. On behalf of all these, we ask and entreat all of you who read in truth matters which are really of the truth—as if we were present and prostrate, both bending the knee of our heart with our bodily knees with heart-felt tears, and prostrating ourselves before the feet of all of you. 38

§11. First [we ask and entreat] that there be a comprehensive pardon for our worthlessness and our lack of knowledge for the confirmation and assurance of those who are truly faithful and faithfully receive matters of this kind, and that in the course of time oblivion may not veil the nature and magnitude of the sacred struggles, because they are understood accurately by a very rare few. Because, as was said, by the will of God we became privy to most of these events with our own eyes, and we distrusted the danger which comes from idleness, for no other reason of any kind—[I say] by the Lord—have we dared to record these events in writing. We were unable to attain to [writing] the life and praise of such numerous strenuous struggles on behalf of orthodoxy by those truly admirable and great men, holy in the Lord, on account of the boorishness of our upbringing, and both our lack of education and of knowledge, as a result of which, more than everyone
ἀνδρῶν, διὰ τὴν σύντροφον ἡμῶν ἀγροικών, ἰδιωτείαν τε καὶ πάντη ἀμάθειαν, δι’ ὅν καὶ τὸ τοῦ λόγου ἀπορον ἡμῖν πρόσεστον ὑπὲρ ἀπαντας, οἷς ἀρκεῖν ἥγουμεθα ἀντὶ μεγάλων βιῶν τε καὶ ἐγκωμίων τοῖς φιλαθλοῦσι καὶ φιλοσόφοις ἐνυγχάνειν ἐθέλοντκα τὸ ἐκεῖνων ἑνθεὶς καὶ ὄντως ἀκόρεστα κατὰ τῆς ἀσβεστίας καὶ ὑπὲρ τῆς ἐσβεστίας πλείοστα πονημάτα καὶ συγγράμματα, ἀ καὶ μετὰ πάσης σπουδῆς καὶ ἀκριβείας, μετά καὶ τῶν ἐκ τῶν ἐναντίων βδε[λ]λορῶν συγγραμμάτων, εἰ καὶ μέτριοι καὶ εὐτελεῖς ἄληθος ὑπὲρ ἀπαντάς καὶ ἐν πάσιν τυγχάνοντες, κατὰ τὴν ἐνοδίαν δύναμιν ἐν διαφόροις βίβλοις τε καὶ τόμοις συνεγραφάμεθα, καὶ τοῖς τῆς ἀληθείας ἐρασταὶ ἐκδεδώκαμεν, εἰς δόξαν καὶ ἀληθῶν αὐτῶν τε καὶ εὐγιαρίσατον τοῦ παντοδύναμου Θεοῦ καὶ ὄντως βαθμοῦτο εὐ τοῖς ἀγίοις αὐτῶν, ἐξήλθε τε καὶ προβημία τῶν ὑπὲρ ἐσβεστίας ἀθλεῖν ἐθελόντων, ἀσχύνην καὶ ὀνείδους ἀναπόδραστων τῶν τῆς ἀληθείας καὶ αὐτοῦ τοῦ Θεοῦ ἐχθρῶν, τάς τε ἐνοπάσεις καὶ ἀντιθέσεις τῶν προσευχηθείσων αὐτοῖς ἰσευθηροῖς καὶ ἐχθροῖς ἐώλων τε καὶ ἀσυμμέτρων, καὶ ἀπλῶς ἀπαντάς τοὺς αὐτῶν εὐθείας καὶ ὄντως εὐσβείας[ας] ἀγώνας τε καὶ ἱρώτας τοῖς ἐν τοῖς κατ’ αὐτῶν παρὰ τῶν δι’ ἐναντία διαφόροις πραξθείσων, ἦτοι τῆς παρασκάκτου νέας ἀνετικοπανδέκτου καινοτομίας τῶν Ἐρακλειανοκυροσεργο(λοσεροσερενοτεροτο)ν καὶ ἁθελθονενεγηγήτων, ἡ τελθεστερον εἰσεπτέ νέων Ἔικουρειν ἦγουν πάντη ἀθλείως, ὡς αὐτὴ τῶν πραγμάτων ἡ πείρα καὶ αὐτῆς τῶν ἐναντίων τὰ ἀσβή συγγράμματα δεικνύουν τοῖς τά τοιαύτα Διακρίνει εἰδότους, ὡς οἱ μεθ’ ἡμᾶς σπουδαίοι καὶ ἐν λόγῳ δυνατοί τοιαῦτα ηὐρίσκοντες καὶ ἀφορμὴν ἐκ τούτων λαμβάνοντες τὸ τῷ Θεῷ καὶ τοῖς ἀγίοις ὀφειλόμενον ἀποκείμενον γίνου γάρ φησιν σοφῷ ἀφορμήν καὶ σοφότερος ἐστιν; ἡ δε’ ἐντετεί ἐξερευναὶ τε καὶ ἱκανης τῶν ἔργων ἀγαθοῖς καὶ διάκρις τῶν ὑπεράγαθον φύσει καὶ φιλάνθρωπον ἐκκενισθήναι Θεοῦ τοῦ συμπαθήσας τοῖς ἀθελείαις ἡμῶν καὶ κατασπάσαι λοιπὸν τὸν ἐπὶ ἑστάτων δόλων καὶ πανούργων, παμμηχανοῦν τε καὶ βαρύτατον ὑπὲρ ἀπαντάς τοὺς προλαβόντας Εὐληθρούς τε καὶ αἰρετικοὺς διακριτοὺς, ὡς γινώσκοντα τοῦ χῶς ἡμῶν τό σαθρόν τε καὶ εὐθυλόθων διὰ τὸ ὑπέραγαν ὑπολογὸν αὐτῶν καὶ παμπόθων, καὶ τέλος γενέθησθε στάσιν τε καὶ λής τοῦ τοιοῦτον παντείου κακοῦ τὴν δι’ αὐτῶν ἔχειν τῶν τιμῶν αἰνήματος αὐτῶν, ἀσπέρ ἐπὶ τῶν δυσομήνων καὶ ἀθέων Αρειάναν τὴν τοῦ ἄγιου Πέτρου τοῦ πατριάρχου Αλεξανδρείας καὶ μάρτυρος [δι’ ὅτι καὶ οἱ εἰρημένοι ἄγιοι πατέρες ἡμῶν καὶ
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[else], we are unable to express ourselves. For those who wish to read with a love of truth and of industry we think that, instead of both great lives and praises, their very many works and writings, [which are] godly and truly insatiable against (impiety and on behalf of) piety, will suffice. Although we are truly in all respects both of modest ability and of no account, more than everyone [else], according to the means we have we have written these down both with every care and with accuracy, both in various books and in tomes, together with the accursed writings of their enemies as well. And we have given these out to the lovers of truth, for the glory and both unceasing praise and thanksgiving of the omnipotent God and him [who is] truly wonderful in his saints, both for the zeal and readiness of those who wish to struggle for piety, and the shame and inevitable censure of the enemies of the truth and of God himself, the acts of both hostility and oppression contained in the lies and judgements both stale and unformed which were adduced against them, and absolutely all their godly and truly pious strenuous struggles, which consisted in afflictions brought on them in various ways by those who were against them. I mean the newly introduced, heretical all-embracing innovation of the (Heraclean)-Cyro-Sergio-Pyrho-Paulo-Petrines and the no-will-no-activists, or, to speak more truly, the new Epicureans, that is to say, of the completely godless, as the very proof of the matters and the impious writings of the enemies demonstrate to those who know how to discern matters of this kind. Our purpose [sc. in giving these out] is that when those who come after us, who are studious and skilled in words, find these [writings] and seize the opportunity from them, they may render to God and the saints what is owed. For 'give an opportunity to the wise and he will be wiser', it says.

Second, [we ask and entreat you to] appease God, who is supremely good by nature and generous, by both assiduous prayers and supplications, with good works and tears, so that he may have compassion on our weaknesses and therefore put a stop to [the persecution] which still threatens, cunning and crafty, both completely devious and more serious than all preceding persecutions, both those of the pagans and those of the heretics; he knows that our dust is both feeble and unsteady, because of their deceitfulness, which is beyond measure and depraved. And let there be both an end to the sedition and a close to such a completely atrocious evil, by which their precious blood has been poured out, just as happened under the hateful and godless Arians with the [pouring out of the blood] of holy
ἀληθῶς τῆς εὐσεβείας διδάσκαλοι, ἡσαύρετος ὁ ἀποστολικὸς καὶ κορυφαῖος ἦμων πάπας Ρώμης Μαρτίνος ὁμοίως εἰσὶν ἄνθρωποι ὑπὲρ τοῦ πιστοῦ λαοῦ παρέδωκεν, ἐν πᾶσιν τῷ ἁγιονομήτῳ Χριστῷ τῷ Θεῷ ἢμῶν καὶ τῷ κορυφαίῳ τῶν ἀποστόλων Πέτρῳ μμησάμενος τε καὶ ἀκολουθήσας ἐν πᾶσιν, οὐ καὶ διάδοχος ως ἄληθος ἄξιος γέγονεν, εἰρήνην τε βεβαιάν καὶ ἀλατίον ἐνώπιον ταῖς ἀπανταχοῖς ἁγίαις αὐτοῦ ἐκκλησίαις δωρήσας καὶ μὴ συγχωρήσας τοῦ λοιποῦ μέχρι τέλους αἴρεσιν τὴν οἰκινοῦ ἀναφικνήσαι, διὰ τὸ πλῆθος τῶν αὐτοῦ ὁλοκληρῶν ἐν τῷ ὑπὲρ πάσαν γενέων ἀδελφεῖς τε καὶ εὐρύπιστον τῆς ἡμετέρας φύσεως· τρίτον δὲ τοῦ ἀρέτοις μέχρι παντὸς φιλαξίθηναι ἡμᾶς καὶ πάντας τοὺς εὐσεβείς ἐν τῇ ὑπόσκω ἁγία ὀρθοδόξω τε καὶ ἀμοιβήτῳ ἢμῶν τῶν Χριστιανῶν μόνη καθολική καὶ ἀποστολική πίστει, ἀθεσείς τε ἀμαρτίων (τυχεῖν) καὶ σωτηρίας ἢμῶν τῶν ἠλθός ἀμαρτιών, δοῦλων πάντων ὅτε ὀρθοδόξων καὶ γνησίων προσκυνητῶν Χριστοῦ τοῦ ἅλθεν αὐτοῦ καὶ Σωτήρος ἢμῶν, τοῦ ὑπὸ ὅτως δοξάζωμεν αὐτὸν μεγάλος ἐν ἄληθείᾳ δοξάζωτον.  Oi πρέπει πάσα δόξα, τιμή, κράτος, μεγαλυτική, μεγαλοπρέπεια ἐν οὐρανῶ καὶ ἐπὶ γῆς, προσκύνησις τε καὶ εὐχαριστία ἐν αἰώνιοι καρδίας καὶ αυτὴ ἐν ἀληθείᾳ, φόβῳ τε καὶ τρόμῳ καὶ ἀγαλλίασε κατὰ τὸ προφητικὸν δόγμαν, ἐπὶ μὴν ὑπὲρ πάντα καὶ πίστει τελεία ἡ κορυφή καὶ τελειωτικὴ πασῶν ἀρετῶν καὶ μόνη ὁδηγήσει σωτηρίας, σὺν τῷ ἀθανάτῳ καὶ φιλοκτέρων συμπαραστάτῳ τε καὶ εὐπλήρωτος ὑπὸ φῶν Πατρὸς καὶ τῷ παναγίῳ καὶ ὁμοουσίῳ ξωοτικῷ τε καὶ παντοδύναμῳ θείῳ Πνεύματι νῦν καὶ ἄεί καὶ εἰς τοὺς ἀπελευθήσασας αἰώνας τῶν αἰώνων ἁμήν.
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Peter, patriarch of Alexandria and martyr. It was on this account that our said holy Fathers too, [who are] also in truth the teachers of piety, especially our apostolic and chief pope of Rome, Martin, similarly gave himself up as a sacrifice on behalf of the faithful, both imitating in all respects and following in all respects Christ our God, who presides over the contest, and Peter the chief of the apostles, whose successor he also became because he was (truly) worthy. May [God] grant both lasting peace and indissoluble unity to his holy churches everywhere, and not allow heresy of any kind to grow again in the future until the end of time, because of both the number of his mercies, and both the weakness and fickleness of our nature, which surpasses that of every generation.

Third, [we ask and entreat] that we be kept unmoved forever, and all those who are pious in our truly holy and blameless Christian faith, which alone is catholic and apostolic; and that we may obtain both the forgiveness of sins and salvation, we who are truly sinners, servants of all who are really orthodox and genuine worshippers of Christ the true God and our saviour, who really glorifies those who glorify him magnificently and in truth. To him belong all glory, honour, might, greatness, majesty in heaven and on earth, both adoration and thanksgiving in the feeling of the heart and in truth itself, with both fear and trembling and rejoicing, according to the saying of the prophet; 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 sole guide to salvation. Together with the Father, who is immortal and prone to pity, both compassionate and tender-hearted beyond nature, and the divine Spirit, who is all-holy and consubstantial, both life-giving and omnipotent, now and always and until the never-ending age of ages, amen.

Scholion. The commemorations give information about the saints Pope Martin, and Maximus the monk, and his disciples Anastasius and Anastasius, and the brothers Euprepius and Theodore.
CONTRA
CONSTANTINOPOLITANOS
(CPG 7740)

Κατὰ Κωνσταντινοπολίτων ὑπὲρ τοῦ ἀγίου πατρὸς ἡμῶν Μαξίμου, στηλιτευτικὸν ὑπὸ τῖνος μοναχοῦ, ἐκ δρμύζεως καρδίας αὐγγραφεῖν.

§1. Οἱ μὴ τὴν ἀλήθειαν συνέντες ὡς θέμις, τὸ ψεύδος δὴπουθεν ἄντι τῆς εἰρημένης ἀσπαζόμεθα. Ὅταν γὰρ ψυχή ἀναζηκέντο ἡ τῆς τοῦ Θεοῦ διὰ τὴν οἰκεῖαν μαθηματίκαν ἀδώμητος, ἀγνωσίας πληροῦται καὶ σκότους· καὶ βλέπει τὸ φῶς σκότος, καὶ τὸ σκῦλος φῶς. Καὶ ὃν τρόπον τοξότητας ἄσκοπος, καὶ πρὸς τοῦτο καὶ νεωρὰν τεῖνον εὐεκτον, τὴν βολὴν ἀστόχοις βάλλει καὶ ἀτέχνως· οὕτως καὶ αὐτὴ λόγους καὶ ἔργα προβαλλομένη, καματύλη καὶ λοξώδη καὶ ἀσωφάρτηται ταῦτα προτείνεται, καὶ μᾶλλον τοῦς σταγόνα συράνινον κατασώκειαν ὑποδέξασθαι. Ὅτερ δὲ πέποθεν ὁ ἀλογώστατος καὶ ἀσωφάρτατος καὶ εὐθείαττος βασιλεὺς, καὶ οἴ περὶ Ἐσπάνον, μᾶλλον δὲ Ἀποφάνον, τὸν πυρίκειαν ἄλλῃ οὐ πατρίκιαν, καὶ Θεοδόσιον τὸν ὑπόσκοπον ἄλλῃ οὐκ ἐπίσκοπον, τῶν τῶν ἄγιων Μάξιμου καὶ τρίτων θεολόγων γλυκοπληξίαν ἀληθεύσαντων, καὶ τοῦ δυὸ Ἀναστασίου τῶν αὐτοῦ ἀνθών φοιτητῶν τῷ αὐτῷ κήρυμα ψηφισάντων.

§2. Τῷ γὰρ, ὃς οὗτος, ἦν μικρὰ πρὸς ὑμᾶς διαλέξωμαι ἐξ ἀνίας καὶ ἄλλης ὑπὸ τῆς τυχοῦσης, ἀσημένε ἐν τοῖς ἐγκρίτοις καὶ θεολογικοῖς καὶ ψυχοφοβείς αὐτοῦ δόγμασι, καὶ ἐν τοῖς ἠθικοῖς καὶ γνωστικοῖς καὶ θεοπρεπεῖς νοήμασι ἐξηράντε ὡς γραφῆς ἀτοπον, ἦν τοιαύτη ἀπανθώμῃ τιμωρίᾳ τῶν δίκαιων ὡς δυσχρήστῳ ἀποκρυφῆς; Ἐπέρματα πονηρά, ἀμβλυθρίδια ἀτελεστα, πτηνά νυκτοπορινά, γῆς ἄνερα, κοιλίαν ἄργα, τραπεζογίγαντες.

Witnesses: SC

* Cf. Is. 3: 10, Wis. 2: 12
* Is. 1: 4
AGAINST THE PEOPLE OF
CONSTANTINOPLE
(CPG 7740)

A work of invective in defence of our holy Father Maximus, written out of
bitterness of heart by a monk.

§1. Those who don’t understand the truth as they should will,
I assume, embrace falsehood instead of the truth that has been told.
For when a soul is unworthy of God’s illumination because of its own
indifference, it is filled with ignorance and darkness, and perceives
light as darkness and darkness as light. Just as an aimless archer
shoots the arrow without aim and without skill, even though he has
tensed the yielding bowstring for his purpose, so too when the soul
shoots forth words and deeds, it puts them forward as crooked and
oblique and disconnected, and in particular with regard to those who
have been deemed worthy to receive a piece of heaven.1 Indeed this
is what befell the most irrational, most unintelligent, and most
silly emperor,2 and the companions of Epiphanius—I should say
Apophanius—3 the arsonist but not a patrician4 and Theodosius the
underseer but not the overseer,5 who cut off at the root the tongue of
holy Maximus, the third theologian,6 and those of the two Anastasii,
his disciples from the beginning, [and] condemned them to the same
punishment.

§2. My purpose is to address a few words to you [people of Constan-
tinople], out of a grief and a greater-than-usual distress. What impiety
did you find in his approved theological and spiritual teachings, or in
his moral, mystical, or exegetical ideas, that was foreign to Scripture,
such that you cut off7 the just man with such an inhuman punish-
ment, as if he were a troublemaker? You seeds of wickedness, incomplete
abortions, birds that travel by night, intestines of the earth, idle
bellies, giants of the table, and hunters of women.8 Look, take up his
book Difficulties, which every creature has admired and continues to
admire, and it will be admired still.9 Consider his two Centuries, in
καὶ γυναικοίρακες. Ἡ δὲ μετὰ χειρὰς τῶν Ἀπόρων ἡ βιβλίος αὐτοῦ, ἢν πάσα φύσις ἠθικοὶ ραγίζεται καὶ θαυμάζει, καὶ ἔτει αὐθαυστικήσαται. Ἡ δὲ δύο πρὸς ταῖς τέσσαρις ἐκατοντάδες, ὡς οὐ λέγω τοὺς ἀναξίους ὑμᾶς, ἀλλὰ καὶ τοὺς ἀγαν ἐγκρίτους ἐφάνησαν τίμια. Ὁ δὲ τῶν ψυχῶν κώδικας αὐτής τιμᾶς πρὸς τὴν ἐνοῦσαν τῇ φύσει δύναμιν καθιστάμενα, ὃν ὑπομένει καὶ ἐπαινοῦμεν.

§3. Ἡ ὑμῶν ὁφείλειν τιμηθῆναι δεξιά, ὡς ἄφη λυσσώσα, ὡς ἀγεῖ ὑπὲρ μὴ λέγω διὰ τὸ δυσφήμον παρὰ μεμολυμένη, ὡς ὑποδόχος τῆς δευτέρας εἰδωλολατρίας. Ἐχρῆν τοὺς ὑμῶν ἐξορίζει ὀφθαλμοῖς, ὡς προχειρότατον τοῦ διαβόλου ὄργανον, ὡς ἀσελγείας πρόδρομον, ὡς λυσσώδους λαγνείας διάνεμα. Τὴν ὑμῶν καθήκεν ἐνδοθεν γλώττας τεμείν, ὡς ἐν ὑδάτων ἀναχείσαν, κακεῖθεν ἀποροφθείσα, ὡς τρέφουσα πόνον καὶ κόπον, καὶ ἱδρυτὴν ἐν λάρναγε διωβοῦσαν, καὶ βλασφημαν ἐγκαταύσας, καὶ ἀργά καὶ πτωχοκτόνα διαλακώσας. Τὸν νόσον ὑμῶν ἐχρῆν διασπαραγθῆναι, καὶ τὸ ἁμα κέμον στιθόνον, ὡς ἄχμα διαμόνων, ὡς ὅφεις ἐρυθυστήρου, ὡς δαιμόνων σκρυπηθήρων, ὡς ἀσέβειας χαρτοφυλάκειν.

§4. Τοιαῦτα σου, ἐπτάλοφε Βαβυλών, τὰ αὖχεματα τηλικάτα ἀνάσια καὶ κοσμοβόρα θηλάξεις ἐγγονα. Αἰμασοι ἄγιοι κομβας, τῷ λύθρῳ τῶν ὄσιων ἀνακρήσθης. Πάν αἷμα δίκαιων δίκαιως ἐκένωσας, καὶ ὡς καταπτήσεις; πᾶς δόσι δίκαιο παρὰ σοῦ ἐδιωθέ, καὶ ὡς ἐρυθρας, ἀλαζονείς, καὶ ὡς ἐπιγυμνοκής σκάξεις, καὶ χειροκομής λυχνίς, καὶ ἰχθεφθείς σφάξεις, καὶ σκευοφορείς γλυπτοτεκνείς, καὶ κουνομείς δεξιάν, Θεοῦ ἀληθειαν λέγω, ἐκτείνεις, καὶ Ἀδύνα τοῖς ἄγιοις ἀνεπαισκότας κράζεις. Ἀλλὰ σὲ μὲν καὶ τοὺς σους ἢ τοῦ Θεοῦ ἀδιάδραστος δίκαιη δίκη; τοὺς δὲ ἐμολογητάς καὶ ὡς ἐλαττον μάρτυρας ἡ αἰώνιος Χριστός ὑποδέχητας βασιλείας ἤς καὶ ἡμεῖς, εἰ καὶ τολμήσων εἰπεῖς, ἐπιτύχοις διὰ τῶν εὐπροδέκτων αὐτῶν παρακλήσεω καὶ.
§3. It’s your right hand that should have been cut off because it’s rabid when it touches, because, being totally defiled, it leads to (I can’t say it because it’s shameful), because it accommodates a second act of idolatry. It’s your eyes that should have been gouged out, because they are the most accessible tool of the devil, because they are the forerunner of licentiousness, because they are an incitemment to rabid lechery. It would have been fitting for your tongue to be cut off from the root, because it was raised to heaven and rejected from there, because it nourished toil and trouble, and forced pleasure through your throat, and gave birth to blasphemy, and brought forth words that are idle and murderous for the poor. It’s your back that should have been torn to pieces, and your breast, full of anger, because it is the vehicle of demons, because it is the creeping place of the serpent, because it is the registry of demons, because it is the archive of impiety.

§4. Such, O seven-hilled Babylon, are your boasts. Such are the unhallowed offspring that you suckle, which are gluttonous for the world. You preen yourself on the blood of saints, you skip for joy at the gore of holy people. You empty all the blood of the just in an unjust manner, and you don’t cover in fright? Every person who is just has been persecuted by you, and you don’t blush? You make false claims, and you don’t acknowledge it; you stumble, and you use your hands for support; you prepare traps, and you practise oratory; you slaughter, and you philosophize; you cut out tongues, and you share communion; you cut off the right hand (I mean God’s truth) and you call out ‘Holy things for the holy’ without perceiving what you’re doing. But God’s inevitable judgement will judge you and your companions, whereas Christ’s eternal kingdom will welcome the confessors, who are no less than martyrs. May we too—if I may dare to say it—attain that kingdom through their prayers of intercession which are acceptable [to God], amen.
NOTES

RECORD OF THE TRIAL

1. Probably the domed hall in the imperial palace later called the Trullanum, where the Quinisext Council was held in 691/2 (Brandes, 180).
2. These were mandatores or subaltern officials employed for special missions. Imperial mandatores appear on seals from the seventh to the ninth centuries (ODB 1281).
3. Excubatores were the imperial guards, a select corps created by Leo I under the command of a comes excubitorum, later identified as the ὅμβολως τῶν Ἑξκουβίων, first recorded in 765 (ODB 636).
4. The sacellarius' role had by this time passed from the role of imperial treasurer to general controller of imperial affairs: see J. Darrouzès, Recherches sur les ОФФИКИ de l'Eglise byzantine, Archives de l'Orient chrétien 11 (Paris: Institut Français d'Etudes Byzantines, 1970), 310. Brandes, 162, suggests that this official is to be identified with the sacellarius Boukoleon, who conducted Pope Martin's trial in 654; cf. Comm. 88.
5. On Peter, patrician and dux Numidiae, see PLRE 3, 1913, no. 70. Before his death in 637, he again ascended to the exarchate (Brandes, 183 n. 268). John, as sacellarius of Peter, possibly had financial responsibilities as well as administrative ones: see Brandes, 184 n. 273, on this provincial office, as distinct from the imperial finance-minister.
6. i.e. Emperor Heraclius (610–41).
7. This refers to events of 633 ('if from a false accusation one may adduce evidence'; Sherwood, Date-List, 40).
8. These letters do not survive, if they ever existed. However, there are two other extant letters of Maximus (Ep. 12 and Ep. 13) to Peter the Illustrious, who seems to be the same character as Peter the Patrician, mentioned in n. 5 above. See Sherwood, Date-List, nos. 30 and 40.
10. This refers to events of 646 when Gregory, the exarch of Africa, rose in rebellion against the Emperor Constans II. Gregory was killed in the Arab incursions in the following year. In July 645, Gregory presided over the debate between Maximus and Pyrrhus in Carthage, in which Pyrrhus was
persuaded to abandon his monothelite position. Pope Theodore (642–9) received Pyrrhus' written renunciation of his former error, and wrote on his behalf to the emperor. Two of the pope’s letters on the subject of Pyrrhus, one to Paul, his successor as patriarch of Constantinople, and the other to the bishops who consecrated Paul, survive in the Latin Collectanea translated by Anastasius Bibliothecarius, PL 129, 577–82; 581–4.

11. 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 1100). A. H. M. Jones, *The Later Roman Empire 284–602: A Social, Economic and Administrative Survey i* (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1964; repr. 1979), 613 describes the original forty white-robed kandidati as the emperor’s personal bodyguard. John the kandidatos does not figure in the entries up to the year 641 covered by *PLRE*3.

12. This can also mean ‘brother-in-law’.

13. Theodore Chila is only mentioned here. Brandes, 192 n. 316, notes that Plato was exarch of Ravenna (645–9?), and his presence in Constantinople is recorded in 649 (according to Duchesne, *LP* 1, 337, l. 11) and 653, during the trial of Pope Martin (Commemoration of Pope Martin (*BHL* 5592–4), in PL 129, 598b1–2). Plato occasionally functioned as the Emperor Constans II’s consultant on Italian affairs.

14. μεταίκη and λαμβια are *kathaxigomena* and are not found in the lexica, although alternative readings *baria* and *lambia* are cited from this text in Lampe, 306 and 790. Anastasius Bibliothecarius’ Latin translation (muttianis et sub-sassanatones) is little help in determining the sense.

15. 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 the term exarch here means 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 (ODB 767) and probably refers to the patriarch of Constantinople in this instance, although it has been suggested that the title was abandoned by the sixth century in favour of ‘patriarch’ (ibid.).

16. The primicerius was the head of a government department (Lampe, 1131). By the end of the seventh century the primicerius notariorum was the head of the notaries and the chancellery (Darrouzés, *Recherches*, 335 f.). No record of the letter mentioned here survives. See ODB 1719 f. on the various types of primicerius.

17. On Gregory’s office as secretary (*ascretio*), see §§. Brandes, 194 n. 329, makes the plausible suggestion that he brought the *Typos* with him on his visit to Rome.

18. i.e. the patriarch.

19. The *Typos* of Emperor Constans II (*CPG* 7621), *ACO* ser. 2, 1, 208, 1–210, 15, was written in 647/8 under the direction of Patriarch Paul II and enjoined silence on the issue of the number of wills and activities in Christ.

20. Lit. ‘Don’t throw me into the woods.’


24. Brightman, Liturgies Eastern and Western, 538 n. 17, cites this text as evidence of 7th-cent. use of this formula in the Byzantine liturgy.

25. See Lampe, 1534, s.v. πρεσβύτης 5b.vii, for this practice.

26. I.e. foreshadowing or symbol.


28. On the role of Menas, described elsewhere in these documents as ‘monk’ or ‘Father’, Brandes, 181, remarks that as a cleric he could hardly have been a member of the senate, but he was present during the trial of 655, and spoke briefly against Maximus and his disciple Anastasius (see §10). His theological objections to Maximus were raised outside the actual trial. He seems to have been a consultant to the senate on theological matters. See also Dispute §15 for his role in informing those in the palace about the terms of an agreement offered by John the Consularius to Maximus.

29. 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, 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 (ibid. 66–8). His corrections to Origenism can be found in the Centuries on Theology and the Incarnate Dispensation of the Son of God (CPG 7694) in PG 90. 1084–1173; Ambiguis (CPG 7705), in PG 91. 1092–1417, and the study of P. Sherwood, The Earlier Ambigua of Saint Maximus the Confessor and His Refutation of Origenism, Studia Anselmitana 36 (Rome: Herder, 1955); for discussion of his views on Origenist eschatology, see B. Daley, ‘Apokatastasis and “Honorable Silence” in the Eschatology of Maximus the Confessor’, in Heinzer–Schönborn, Maximus Confessor, 309–33; and more generally, J. M. Garrigues, ‘La personne composée du Christ d’après saint Maxime le Confesseur’, Revue Théologique 74 (1974), 181–204, esp. 181–4.

30. The name ‘Eucratas’ is indicative of a strong attachment to the Council of Chalcedon, and was also used of John Moschus and Sophronius of Jerusalem. See H. Chadwick, John Moschus and his friend Sophronius the
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31. This office had obviously exceeded its previous limit of imperial steward. Sergius is the earliest-known holder of this office, which was reserved for eunuchs: Brandes, 201 n. 386.

32. The Greek word ἰπέων has been translated here and elsewhere as 'see'.

33. I.e. *Sufficio or Assurance* (*CPG* 7613), *ACO* ser. 2, 2/2, 594. 17–600. 20. The *Nine Chapters* declared the basis for the Alexandrian *Pact of Union* in June 623, a monoenergist compromise which provided the basis for reconciliation between the imperial church, represented by Patriarch Cyrus, and the Theodosian party.

34. The *Eutychis of Sergius* (*CPG* 7607), *ACO* ser. 2, 1. 156. 20–162. 13, issued in 638.

35. I.e. in 647/8. See Winkelmann, no. 106. On the *Typos*, see n. 19 above.


37. I.e. the Lateran synod of 649.

38. The apocrisaries (i.e., representatives of the pope in Constantinople) of Eugenius I, who had been elected bishop of Rome in August 654, although his predecessor Martin I had not yet been deposed from office.

39. These papal emissaries did not have vicarious powers, serving merely as messengers between the pope and the imperial court.


42. In cases where εὐσεβὴς and εὐσεβέστατο mean respectively 'pious' and 'piety' in a narrow and technical sense, we have translated them as 'orthodox' and 'orthodoxy'.

43. The *ascretis* of the court replaced the *referendarii* (or imperial secretaries, an office created by Julian and generally thought to have disappeared after 600; see *ODB* 1778), and 'formed the upper echelon of imperial secretaries positioned higher than imperial notaries' (*ODB* 204). The term first appears in the sixth century, and there is mention of an *ascretis* at the Third Council of Constantinople (680/1). See §4, on Maximus' discussion with Gregory in Rome.

44. The location of this place (cf. Latin *Bellus*) has not yet been identified. It may possibly be the monastery of St Sabbas (if the Greek is more accurate than the Latin translation) in Rome, as Garrigues suggested in 'Maxime', 411 n. 9 and 421. See the explanations of Santerre, *Les moines grecs et orientaux à Rome aux époques byzantine et carolingienne* (Brussels: Académie Royale de Belgique, 1980), 86 n. 195, and Brandes, 202 n. 392.
45. This is the only extant fragment of the purported Letter of Emperor Heracleius to Pope John IV, dated 640/1 (CPG 9382). See the bibliography on the alleged letter in Brandes, 203 n. 399.

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

47. Cf. Letter of Pope John IV to Emperor Constantine III (CPG 9383) = PL 80, 602–7 and PL 129, 561–6), in a retroversion from Greek by Anastasius Bibliothecarius. The letter makes an apology for Pope Honorius and makes a protest against the Patriarch Pyrrhus.

48. Or ‘on another Saturday’.

49. i.e. Peter, patriarch of Constantinople (654–66), and another unidentified patriarch, probably Macedonius, the monothelite patriarch of Antioch, who was in permanent residence in Constantinople from after 639 until after 662: Brandes, 182 n. 261, and van Dieten, Patriarchen, 108 and n. 8.

50. On Menas see §5 and Dispute §15. Constantine is not mentioned elsewhere.

51. On the Libellus of Anastasius the Disciple, see Dispute §12 and n. 42; cf. Winkelmann, no. 125.

52. i.e. the great Roman basilicas of John Lateran and Mary Major, respectively.

53. Demosthenes, whom Brandes, 175 and 181 n. 251, has identified as in all likelihood the same ὁμοιογέφαος as had appeared in Martin’s trial, described in the record of that trial as rescriptor et collaborator ecelarii (Commemoration of Pope Martin, PL 129, 597v3–14.)


**DISPUTE AT BIZYA**

1. The lesser-known Caesarea, south-west of Nicaea.

2. The honorific title of consul (consular) was granted to two men each year by the emperor. The consuls were responsible for the fulfilment of public duties such as presenting banquets, distribution of the consular diptychs (until 541), and organization of public games (ODT 525, s.v. ‘Consul’).

3. i.e. the consuls Paul and Theodosius mentioned in §2.

4. i.e. in 647/8.

5. i.e. patriarch.

7. That is to say, the terminology appropriate for the Trinity, and for the saving work of Christ in his Incarnation.


11. Sc. will or activity.

12. These endorsed the Ekthesis of Sergius, issued in 638. Only a fragment of Pyrrhus’ synodal decree survives (PG 7615), Mansi 10. 1001c11–1004b4, on which see Grumel, no. 294.

13. Or ‘of those points’.

14. i.e. the Lateran Synod convened by Pope Martin I in 649.

15. In 335 (see M. Simonetti, EEC 655).

16. In 341 (see O. Pasquato, EEC 439).

17. In 355 (see M. Simonetti, EEC 767).

18. This council held in 356, confirmed the Council of Rimini (356) (see M. Simonetti, EEC 193). 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 homoiousian patriarch of Constantinople, Macedonius.

19. A council held in Thrace between 357 and 360.

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

21. The so-called ‘Robber Synod’ of 449 (see M. Simonetti, EEC 273).

22. 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 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 239). Gregory the Wonder-Worker took part in the first synod against Paul; when the last one was held, he may have already died (H. Grousset, EEC 366). According to Eusebius, HE 7. 7, Pope Dionysius (259/60–267/8) never received the letter of the Synod of Antioch in 268 which condemned Paul (B. Studer, EEC 237).

23. This was first stipulated by canon 5 at Nicaea in 325, but it was frequently repeated. See Tanner, 96* n. 1.

24. This is the Logoi dogmatikoi falsely attributed to Patriarch Menas (385–52).


26. Any exegesis of Timothy Aelurus (d. 477), one of the most vociferous and active proponents of the one-nature christology, would have been unaccept-
able to Maximus and those who opposed the doctrine of one activity in Christ.

27. Here and in what follows it is a question of distinguishing between literal and allegorical exegesis.

28. The source is unknown, but is possibly Cyril of Alexandria.

29. i.e. the proceedings of the Lateran Council of 649.

30. In 381 the First Council of Constantinople referred to the 'gospel faith established by the 318 fathers at Nicaea' (Tanner, 204). The Council of Ephesus in 431 endorsed this view (Tanner, 65). More generally canon 1 of the Council of Chalcedon decreed that 'the canons hitherto issued by the saintly fathers at each and every synod should remain in force' (Tanner, 87).

31. On the reading of the diptych after the offering at the eucharistic table see Brightman, *Counsels Eastern and Western*, 538 n. 13.

32. A technical term for an imperial dispatch or rescript; παρακλητικός carries the sense of 'supplicatory' when used in this phrase, rather than the more usual 'hortatory'. Cf. Lampe, 1018, s.v. παρακλητικός; and cf. n. 37 in §8.

33. This resembles certain formulations of the Cappadocian Fathers, e.g. Gregory of Nyssa, *Antirrheticus adversus Apollinarium*, ed. P. Mueller, *Gregori Nysson Opera Dogmatica Minora 3/1* (Leiden: Brill, 1938), 207. 8–9. However, the best match we found was a passage from the *Syllogismi* of Anastasius the Aposcissarius: *PL* 129, 677a3–4.


35. While this is the majority reading in the Greek tradition, a single Greek manuscript (A) bears the right reading, which agrees with the Latin: 'understands the union as being natural, but not dispositional.'

36. This is a reference to Eutyches, the alleged founder of monophysitism, and his adherents.

37. Cf. n. 32 in §4 for another instance of this technical term.

38. R. Janin, *La Géographie ecclésiastique de l'empire byzantin*, Part I: *Le Siège de Constantinople et le Patriarcat Oecuménique*, vol. 3: *Les Églises et les monastères*, Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique, 2nd edn. (Paris: Institut Français d'Etudes Byzantines, 1965), 130 f., identifies the monastery of St Theodore which is situated near Rhégium with Procopius' church of St Theodore in Rhesion, also called St Theodore of Bathys Rhayx by Anna Comnena. The church of St Theodore was located near Bakirköy (ancient Macrikeny) or closer, at the aghiasma of St Paraskevi, called Çobanagiasmas. Janin rejected the reading of 'Rhégium', which was located more than twenty kilometres from the capital, and could not, he claimed, be reached in a day as described here, nor would the inhabitants of Constantinople have travelled so far for their procession on a Sunday. See *ODB* 1788.

39. These two officials of high rank played an important role in Maximus' first trial, as indicated in *Record* §8 and passim.
40. The vestibule at the main entrance of the Great Palace of Constantinople (ODB 405f.)
41. Sc. in Constantinople.
42. i.e. the *Libellus* of Anastasius the Disciple; cf. Record §10. 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. 2, 1, 57; include the names of Maximus and two Anastasii. This *Libellus* is presented to the synod by John, priest of St Sabbas, 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.
43. i.e. 15 Sept. 656.
45. Constans II's grandmother was actually Eudocia, the first wife of Heraclius, but here the reference may be to Martina, who was treated as the mother of the younger Heraclius, known as Constantine (son of Eudocia), as well as of her own son Heraclonas. Both the younger Heraclius and Heraclonas were emperors for a brief time in 641. Constans II succeeded his father Constantine in September 641.
46. i.e. Eugenius and his supporters in Rome.
47. On Selymbria (*Σελυμπρία* in the text), mod. Silvri in Turkey, see ODB 1867f.
48. This bears the gloss: 'He means Theodore who took the place of the *consus* of the colony (or "of Colonia"), that is to say the emperor's brother.' Heraclius' brother Theodore, a military commander, died on 20 Aug. 656. It is unclear whether the scholiast refers to an unspecified colony (Latin *colonia*) or the Greek proper name *Koloneia*, the name of both a town on the river Lykos in interior Pontus, and subsequently (by 869) a military district commanded by a strategos; see ODB 115f.
49. A small military detachment, sometimes of ethnic composition (ODB 29f).
50. The keepers of the colours or bearers of ensigns were members of the staff of the *exsultions*, or select imperial body-guard (ODB 647).
51. On the term *domestikos*, which designated a range of ecclesiastical, civil, and military officials, see ODB 646.
52. The scholion reads: 'This person is a *symphonos* or *scholastikos*. Holy Martin the pope anathematized him from Cherson in the letter to the holy Maximus.' This scholion confirms that the role of the *consiliarius* in the imperial administration may be identified with that of a *symphonos*, a lawyer or barrister attached to the urban prefect; cf. J. F. Haldon, *Byzantium in the Seventh Century: The Transformation of a Culture* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990), 272 n. 69: 'The later *symphonos* attached to the urban prefect appears to
be descended from the late Roman assessor . . . But this is no guarantee that assessors were still attached to provincial governors. The consiliarius (assessor) who was purportedly involved in negotiations between Maximus Confessor and imperial officials in 656 may have been such an official; but the context offers no certainty for such an identification.'

55. The scholiast's gloss reads: 'This is the one who by race and inclination (was) Egyptian, and (was) truly an enemy of the truth.' Brandes, 181 and n. 256, signals the identification of the monk Menas with the Menas in the Record (§3 and §10), and suggests in n. 257 that perhaps he was from the circle of Cyrus of Alexandria.
56. The following doxology appears in two manuscripts (O and R) and in a slightly longer form in the Latin translation: 'Again the holy man said, lifting his hands to the sky: “Glory to you, only-begotten Son of God and Word of the Father, who always strengthens in word and deed, and makes wise in the Holy Spirit, those who are persecuted and suffer on your account with you. Glory to you, holy Trinity, uncreated, sempiternal, without beginning, without end, unchangeable, immortal, incorruptible, consubstantial and supersubstantial, and indivisible giver of life, giver of light, perfector, our God, glory to you, glory to you, the hope and salvation of all those who worship you in orthodox faith.”''
57. The text from this point until the end of the document appears in small print, as this passage and The Third Sentence against them seem to be later additions to the text, and do not appear in the Latin translation of Anastasius Bibliothecarius. In Brandes, 156, and PMB 176, it is pointed out that this third sentence shows remarkably little knowledge of the earlier trials against Martin, and must stem from shortly after 692. See Brandes, 207 n. 426, for bibliographical sources on the Third Sentence. The Latin version in Mansi 11. 732r–734a16 (= PG 90. 1709r–1711r and PL 129. 6590r–6590q) is merely the editor's translation.
58. This word is glossed as 'gleaning or black or dark'.
59. The first sentence was passed after the trial of 655, as recorded in the Record §13; the second was passed at Rhægium (see Dispute §13); and the third at the trial in Constantinople in 662.
60. The praetorium of the eparch of the city was in the Mese — the central avenue of the capital — between Constantine’s forum and the Milion (Brandes, 208 n. 435). On the Mese, which commenced from the Milion, the initial milestone of the empire, located in front of Hagia Sophia, see ODB 1346ff.
62. H. Leclercq lists the fourteen sections of the city which were established in the fourth century and remained at least until the time of the Arab invasions.
LETTER OF MAXIMUS

1. i.e. 18 April 658. Anastasius the Disciple was in exile in Perberis at this time, as was Maximus, in a different camp.
2. This is Patriarch Peter of Constantinople (654–66).
3. The Greek word ἀναφέρω means 'to make known, to show'. It is clear from the rest of the letter, however, that what the patriarch made known was conveyed not by himself in writing, but orally by other persons invested with secular authority. Hence we have translated 'sent me a message'.
4. For the recent developments under the pontificate of Vitalian see the general introduction. While Vitalian showed himself compliant with imperial demands, the patriarchates of Antioch, Alexandria, and Jerusalem had ceased to exist in any real sense by this time. The force of the emperor's claim that all five churches have been united is thus more rhetorical than anything else.
5. Cf. Record §7 and n. 40.
6. i.e. the emperor.
7. The word used here is παράκατος, a transliteration of the Latin technical term.
8. There is a textual problem here. Perhaps ßēg is not meant as the adjective meaning 'divine' but as an abbreviation for a proper name, e.g. Theodore (Θεόδωρος), as the word order of the Greek suggests.
9. The following coda has been added by Anastasius or a compiler, and does not appear in the Greek; cf. Introduction, Letter of Maximus.
10. Or 'who'.

LETTER TO THE MONKS OF CAGLIARI

1. The Latin de cetero is probably, as elsewhere, a faulty translation of the Greek λοιπόν.
3. The scholiast explains: 'Here “cause” stands for that which antecedes matter or for the origin of matter.'
4. Something has fallen out of the Latin here.
NOTES

5. Lit. 'this', standing for 'substance and power'.
6. This is a very confused passage: perhaps our text is corrupt, or Anastasius has not understood the original, or he was using a corrupted text.
7. Lit. 'is'; the objects 'will' and 'activity' are treated grammatically as a single entity.
8. e.g. Severus, Letter 3 to John the Abbot, in Diekamp, Doctrina Patrum, 309–10, p. xxiv. Severus is often the nominal opponent in Maximus' arguments, as for example in Opus. 3.
12. Anastasius has not understood this passage well. It would seem to be a reference to the apocriharies sent forth from Constantinople with letters from the emperor or patriarch declaring the doctrine of one will to be the orthodox position.
13. The monothelites are also likened to Arians in the Recens 54. This is a typical Maximian oversimplification of the opponents' position, in order to reduce it to absurdity. The Arians were often accused of polytheism, a belief in God and the Son as two separate entities (Louth, Maximus, 196 n. 16). This seemed to Maximus to be also the logical conclusion of the Severan party's denial of Pope Leo's statement of two energies in Christ, based on the distinction between the acts of Christ as God, and acts of Christ as a man. The Severans would not speak of two energies, nor of one, because they believed that the will was inextricably linked with energy, and because they wanted to avoid on the one hand an Apollinarian confusion of the natures, and on the other a Euchian fusion of them. They said, in accordance with Severus, that one will and every divine and human energy proceed from one and the same God Incarnate (Maximus, Opus. 3, PG 91. 493–594, trans. by Louth, Maximus, 153), and that there was no natural will in Christ the man (ibid. 498, trans. by Louth, Maximus, 194).

LETTER OF ANASTASIVUS APOCRISIARIUS TO THEODOSIVS OF GANGRA

1. This introductory paragraph only appears in the Latin text.
2. Gregory Nazianzen, Adversus Arianos et in seipsum (Oriat 33), 4, ll. 1–8 (PG 30.10), ed. C. Moreschini, Scr 318 (Paris: CERF, 1983), 162–4. This is a question in the original Greek of Gregory's text, but not in the Latin version.
3. i.e. Jerusalem. Garrigues, 'Maxime', 447 n. 76, comments on the connection
between Theodosius of Gangra and Theodore Spoudaeus and the association of Spoudae in Jerusalem.

4. The Latin sermonis fastidium does not correspond to the Greek, which is corrupt.

5. i.e. 8 June 662.

6. The fortress of Muri (Tsikhe-Mur in) Lechkhumi near Tsageri, Georgia (Kekelidze, 36), where there was a monastery of St Maximus in the 18th cent. (see Berthold, 31 n. 32).

7. Scotoris (= Codori) was a fortress on the bank of the river of the same name, on the border between Abasgia and Apsilia (Kekelidze, 25–8).

8. A fortress in Mesimana, a region of Alania in the north Caucasus (Kekelidze, 25–8). Devreese, ‘La lettre’, 11 n. 6, notes that Bouchloon was mentioned by Agathias, Hist. 3. 15.

9. Lit. ‘fort’.

10. Or ‘Suaniae’.

11. i.e. 22 or 24 July 662.

12. i.e. 18 July 662.


14. Latin Mucorius; Mukuris or Mucoria, mentioned in sixth-century sources, was a part of Lazica between the rivers Rioni and Ckhenistsqali (Kekelidze, 29 f.)

15. According to Kekelidze, 34, this is the fortress Takveri in the gorge of Lechkhumi.

16. From here on to the end of the paragraph the translation is supplied on the basis of the Latin and the previous calculation of the date in Greek.

17. See §4 n. 11.

18. i.e. Saturday 13 Aug. 662.

19. There is a tradition among the people of the village of Alexandrovskaya, near Sukhumi, that they live in the region of ancient Phusta (Qukhchishvili, Georgia 4, 54).

20. There is a switch in subject here from ‘God’ to ‘he’, i.e. the chief.

21. Lit. ‘prayer . . . and groan’.

22. Lit. ‘mile-posts’. The author of the Commemoration relates that Gregory the Patriarch’s estate was at Zichachoria, and that Anastasius ended his days in the camp of Thouames, situated above the villa Mochoes, in the border region of Apsilia.

23. i.e. in Jerusalem. Garrigues, ‘Maxime’, 447 n. 76, seems to understand this sentence as referring to the brothers Theodore and Theodosius, who are also described elsewhere as ‘germane brothers’. However, syntactically this is impossible, although we must allow for the possibility of error in Anastasius’ translation.

24. Probably Stephen of Dora, the Palestinian sent by Sophronius to Rome c. 638. His father was the cimicliarch or treasurer of the Church of the Holy Resurrection in Jerusalem.
NOTES

25. i.e. 1 Jan. 665.
26. The Latin pro quo etiam causa est is not clear; the Greek text recommences at this point in the sentence.
28. A high-ranking dignitary (see ODB 1257).
29. This is an anacolouthon in Greek.
30. Pt. Hippolytus, Testimonia, in Dickep, Doctrina Patrum, 324. 1. 15.
31. Lit. 'lift from'.
33. Brightman, Liturgies Eastern and Western, 538 n. 17, refers to this formula as used in the Record, cf. n. 24.
34. i.e. 11 Oct. 666.

COMMENORATION

1. This anacolouthon seems to indicate that we are dealing with a liturgical rubric referring not only to Maximus and Martin, but also to other saints whose deaths were commemorated on the same day.
3. This prologue is preserved in the Latin; the following prologue (§§2–3) from the Greek is of a later date.
4. This spelling is found in the text here and in the following paragraph, but obviously Constans II (641–68) is meant.
5. There is something wrong with the syntax here: the subject of the verb is missing.
6. This refers to the trial of Maximus, Anastasius the Disciple and Anastasius the Monk at Constantinople in 662, at which they were condemned to exile. The amputation of the right hand and tongue of Maximus and the Apocrisarius is also described in the Third Synaxis at the end of the Dispute §17.
7. Lit. 'to himself'.
8. The protocolary was the head secretary of the praetorian prefect, or emperor of Constantinople. The emperor of the city was the supreme judge in Constantinople and its vicinity, and chief of police, with jurisdiction over prisons (ODB 705). The praetorian prefect's importance declined in the seventh century and the last one known by name, Alexander, dates to 698 (ODB 1710).
9. i.e. by means of the prosthesis.
10. Lit. 'of this kind', i.e. the letter of Anastasius to Theodosius of Gangra.
11. Brightman, Liturgies Eastern and Western, 538 n. 17, refers to this formula as used in the Record, cf. n. 24.
12. i.e. Sunday, 11 Oct. 666.
13. Modern Nesebur in Bulgaria. Anastasius had been transferred from Trebizond to Mesembria by the time of the dispute between Maximus and Theodosius of Caesarea Bithynia in August 656.

14. i.e. from 647/8, the time of the publication of the Typos, until 666.

15. i.e. imperial guards and civil bureaux (cf. Lampe, 1361). Brandes, 209 n. 444, suggests that he was perhaps the praefectus annonae, in charge of the grain supply for the city.

16. Abydos, the ancient town of Mysia, on the Hellespont, the site of the town north-east of Cannakale, Turkey, and a toll station until late Byzantine times (Webster’s New Geographical Dictionary (Springfield, Mass.: Merriam–Webster, 1988), 4).

17. A Greek colony in the Chersonese near modern Sebastopol (ODB 418).

18. 26 Oct. 655.


20. This is the only attestation of this word in the lexica. Brandes, 158 n. 103, notes that it brings to mind the institution of a guard-regiment of the imperial Tagmata under Empress Irene, first mentioned in 791. See ODB 2167, s.v. ‘Vigla’.

21. Brandes, 161, suggests with reason that the naming of the sacellarius in this document alone is evidence of a corrupted and interpolated text. Boukoleon was perhaps a nickname for ‘Leon’.

22. Gregory the eunuch is also spoken of as praefectus eunuchus ex cubiculariis in the Commenration of Pope Martin (PL 129, 597a–597a2). Brandes, 174 n. 203, believes that the title given here as ‘the Eunuch and eparch of the city truly called pitiable’ is certainly corrupt, as to have a eunuch in the office of eparch of the city is unthinkable. He suggests rather that Gregory was in charge of the imperial bedchamber (praefectus sacri cubiculii).

23. A suggestion that Julian the Apostle (361–3) also begrudged saints the martyrdom they longed for. The author of the Panarion of Eunapius Chronicius, ed. and trans. A. Cameron and J. Herrin (Leiden: Brill, 1984), ch. 42, 117, claimed that ‘Julian, hated of God, burned many Christians (in a furnace in the Hippodrome) on the pretext of their being criminals’ (our parenthesis).

24. Martin spent 178 days in two prisons in Constantinople, according to the author of the Gesta papa Martini (PL 129, 496a–496b); 93 days in the Frondaria (PL 129, 599a), and 85 days in the Diomedes prison (PL 120, 596a). His tribulation only lasted for three years if we count the years 653 to 655 inclusively.

25. The Ecumenical Councils of 325, 381, 431, 451, and 553 respectively.


27. i.e. 16 September 655; cf. the author of the Greek Vita Martini (BHG 2229), ed. P. Peeters, AB 51 (1933), 261 (ch. 12), who dates Martin’s death to 15 April 656. Peeters, ibid. 249, states that it is impossible to choose between the two dates.

28. 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.

29. The *Vita Martini*, 262–3, also mentions Martin’s burial in the church of St Maria of Blachernai, named after the Blachernai church in Constantinople.


31. The Greek form of this term (κόμης) was used in later times to refer to subaltern officers of the army (*ODB* 4:85); later, in the 8th and 9th cents., the κόμης τῆς κόρης was an official on the staff of a strategos, probably with judicial and police duties (*ODB* 11:39).

32. We understand this to mean that the area was largely uncharted and admitted of access only with difficulty, particularly in winter.

33. The eleventh indiction of the previous cycle lasted from September 652 to August 653. It was indeed ten years later that Maximus and his disciple Anastasius died (662), but we have no other evidence that they were in exile from 652 to 653.

34. This is a plural verb, of which the subjects are Maximus and Anastasius his disciple.

35. Lit. 'of this kind'.

36. Lit. 'of this kind'.

37. This is the region north-east of Armenia and east of Iberia: see *ODB* 5:2, s.v. 'Albania'. Betararous is in the vicinity of the Caspian Sea; see Brandes, 157 n. 100, and *PMBC* 177 n. 50.

38. For the sake of clarity we have introduced three paragraphs in the translation, each covering one of the author's points (marked in italics: *First* . . . *Second* . . . *Third* . . .).

39. 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 operation with respect to Christ.

40. The Epicureans were much maligned by Christians, as they did not believe in a providential God or in the immortality of humankind. They were the quintessential atheists, 'the completely godless', as our author puts it.

41. Peter II of Alexandria was nominated by Athanasius as his successor as bishop of Alexandria in 373, but his throne was usurped by an Arian candidate, at 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* 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* 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 either.
42. As commonly in patristic literature, the spiritual contest is envisaged here, 
presided over, and judged, by God the Father or Christ.
43. This scholion is only found in the Latin text.

AGAINST THE PEOPLE OF CONSTANTINOPLE

1. Lit. 'a drop of heaven'.
3. The patrician who was present at the second phase of Maximus' dispute with 
Theodosius at Rh nugium: the alternative name is a pun on the meaning of 
Epiphanius: 'shining forth'.
4. Another pun on words of similar sound.
5. Theodosius, bishop of Caesarea Bithynia, engaged in a dispute with Maximus 
in Biza in 656, recorded in the Disputa above. Here there is another play on 
words to describe his failure in his episcopal duty.
6. This may be meant to indicate that Maximus followed on in the theological 
tradition of the apostle John and Gregory Nazianzen, who both bore this title, 
or it may simply be a reference to Maximus as one of a group of three staunch 
opponents of monothelitism, the other two being his disciples Anastasius the 
monk and Anastasius the Apocrysius.
7. The word can also mean 'excommunicated'.
8. These last two unusual expressions are found in Palladius, Palladii Dialogus de 
Vita Ioannis Chrysostomi, ed. F. R. Coleman-Norton (Cambridge: Cambridge 
9. This is the Ambigua, a commentary on difficult passages of the Fathers, 
especially of Gregory Nazianzen and ps.-Dionysius the Areopagite (PG 51. 
1032–1417). Its popularity may be measured by the fact that it was translated 
into Latin by John Scottus Eriugena in 9th-cent. Francia.
10. I.e. the two Centuries on Theology and the Incarnate Deification of the Son of God 
(CPG 765); and the four Centuries on Law (CPG 765).
11. Presumably the proceedings of the Lateran Council (on which see the following 
note) are meant.
12. The after-effects of the Lateran Synod of 649 were wide-reaching in their 
political and ecclesiastical implications. As a direct result of Pope Martin's 
condemnation of imperial policy, and his refusal to seek imperial approval 
for his election, he was arrested in Rome and brought to trial in Constanti 
nope, from where he was sent into exile in the Chersonese. This brought 
the criticism of the western church down still more strongly upon the 
emperor and his patriarchs, who continued their refusal to reopen the debate.
13. This may be an allusion to Constans II as the successor of his grandfather 
Heraclius, who was first responsible, together with Patriarch Sergius, for the 
promulgation of the monothelite doctrine.
14. Perhaps a metaphorical sense is intended, and the tongue stands for the prayers and praise which the 'heretics' offered to God.

15. Cf. the final paragraph of the Dispute §17, where the Third Sentence is passed on. Maximus and his two disciples: after the two Anastasii have been flogged, Maximus and Anastasius the Apocrisiarius are to have their right hands and tongues amputated.

16. See Brightman, _Liturgies Eastern and Western_, 534 n. 24, on the use of this formula in the Byzantine liturgy before the seventh century; cf. Record n. 24.
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11 n. 35, 18–20, 31, 97, 161,
183 n. 42, 191 n. 11
Nicaea in Thrace (AD 357–360?)
89
Quinisext (AD 691/2) 176 n. 1
Rimini (AD 359) 181 n. 18
Rome (AD c. 679) 29
Seleucia (AD 359) 89
Sirmium (AD 357) 89
Tyre (AD 335) 89
Ecumenical:
First, at Nicaea (AD 325) 57, 161,
181 n. 23
Second, at Constantinople
(AD 381) 161, 182 n. 30,
190 n. 41
Third, at Ephesus (AD 431) 4 n. 3,
161, 182 n. 30
Fourth, at Chalcedon (AD 451) 1,
3–5, 8, 9, 12, 91, 125, 161,
178 n. 30, 182 n. 30,
189–90 n. 28
Fifth, at Constantinople (AD 553)
4 n. 3, 5, 6, 161
Sixth, at Constantinople (AD
680/1) 3, 8, 9 n. 23, 11 n. 35, 16
n. 55, 59, 30, 43 n. 179, 179 n. 43
image of 30
councils, Ecumenical (cont.):
  Seventh, at Nicea (AD 787)
    34 n. 134
  Eighth, at Constantinople
    (AD 869–70) 34

creeds:
  of Chalcedon (AD 431) 6
  of Constantinople (AD 381) 55, 57
  of Nicaea (AD 325) 26

Cross 101, 109, 115; see also True Cross

Cyril of Alexandria 3–5, 11, 13, 16, 17, 91, 93, 182 n. 28
  Cyrilian Chalcedonianism 4, 10;
    see also Neo-Chalcedonianism
  Cyrillic formulae 3–5, 11, 27
Cyril, brother of Methodius see
  Constantine-Cyril

Cyrus (of Phasis), patriarch of
  Alexandria 3, 9–12, 20, 29, 81,
  179 n. 33, 184 n. 55, 190 n. 39

Damasus, pope of Rome 190 n. 41
  Daniel (OT figure) 61
  Darius, Persian monarch 63
  David (Psalmist) 57, 93
  Demosthenes, stenographer 71
  Deundert, bishop of Cagliari 26,
    29 n. 109, 40
  devil 81, 87, 139, 159; see also Satan
  Diomedes, prison of 165, 189 n. 24
  Dionysius the Areopagite; see 22.
    Dionysius the Areopagite
  Dionysius, bishop of Alexandria 89
  Dionysius, pope of Rome 89
  Dioscorus of Alexandria 89
  dipychs 71
  ecclesiastical 178 n. 27, 182 n. 31
    consular 180 n. 2
  domestics 183 n. 51
  Donus, pope of Rome 29 n. 110
  doxology 184 n. 56
  dyothelitism 1, 3, 20, 26, 41
  Eleutherius, cousin of Anastasius
    Bibliothecarius 34
  emissary 23 n. 99, 39, 129, 179 n. 39
  eparch 71
    eparch of the city 119, 157, 161,
    188 n. 8; see also praetorian
    prefect
  Epicureans 169
  Epiphanius, patrician 33, 59, 107–15, 173
  Ermengarde, daughter of Emperor
    Louis II 34
  Eucratas 61
  Eudocia, empress 183 n. 45
  Eudoxius, patriarch of Antioch 89
  Eugenius, pope of Rome 23, 25, 35,
    179 n. 33, 183 n. 46
  Eunomians 16 n. 57
  eunuch 179 n. 31; see also Gregory the
    Eunuch
  Euphemia, St 161
  Euprepius, son of Plutinus 2, 18, 21,
    41, 157, 163, 171
  Eutyches of Alexandria 182 n. 36
  Evagrius of Pontus 178 n. 29
  exarch 53, 59
    of Ravenna 14, 18, 151, 177 n. 13 &
    15
  exchange of properties, see
    communicatio idiomatum
  excubitor 176 n. 3, 183 n. 50

Felix III, pope of Rome 4 n. 4
  finance minister 49, 51, 53, 59, 71; see
    also sacellarius
  florilegium:
    Greek (dyothelite) 20, 30
    monothelite 20, 29
    Roman 20, 29
  Franks 2

Gabriel, angel 105
  general 115, 117, 145
  acting general 115
  see also strategi

George Arses of Alexandria 8
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George, priest of monastery of Cilicia 183 n. 42
George, priest of Rome 29 n. 113
Goths 5
Great palace see palace of Constantinople
Greeks 7, 71; see also Byzantines
Gregory, abbot in Betararous 26, 165
Gregory the cunuch, eparch of Constantinople 159
Gregory, exarch of Carthage 7, 17, 23, 51
Gregory Nazianzen 16, 18 n. 71, 133, 186 n. 2, 191 n. 6 & 9
Gregory, the patrician in Lazica 25, 145, 155, 187 n. 22
Gregory, the secretary, son of Photinus 55, 65
Gregory the Wonder-Worker (Thaumaturgos) 28 n. 108, 89, 91
Guarimputus 35 n. 136
Hadrian II, pope of Rome 34
hagioleogonema 43, 44, 177 n. 14
Hesiodon 4 n. 4
Heraclius, emperor 1, 3, 6–9, 14, 27, 51, 149, 180 n. 46, 183 n. 45, 191 n. 13
Heraclius, son of Eudocia, see Constantine III
Heraclonas, son of Martina 14, 183 n. 45
heterousias 57
Hilary of Poitiers 20
Hippolytus, Bishop of Portus
Romanus, see Pr.-Hippolytus
Holy Sepulchre, shrine of 6
homoiousios 181 n. 20
homoousios 57, 89
Honorius, pope of Rome 13–15, 36, 180 n. 47
Ibas, bishop of Edessa 5, 11
Ignatius 34 n. 130
Irene, empress 189 n. 20
Italo-Greek 28, 31
Jacob Baradaeus 5
Jacobite church 5, 8
Jerusalem, church of 24, 121
Jews 57, 93, 153
Job (OT figure) 79, 149
John the Almsgiver, patriarch of Alexandria 8
John, apostle 191 n. 6
John, bishop of Portua 29 n. 113
John, bishop of Reggio 29 n. 113
John Chila the ex-sabatier 53
John, the cimiliarch 49, 141
John, the consiliarius 117, 178 n. 28
John Chrysostom 28 n. 108, 41, 91
John, deacon of Rome 29 n. 113
John, the ex-saeclarius 49
John Moschus 178 n. 30
John IV, pope of Rome 1, 14, 67
John VIII, pope of Rome 35
John, priest of St Sabbas 183 n. 42
John Scoutus Eriugena 191 n. 9
John of Scythopolis 10
Joseph (OT figure) 79
Julian, emperor 161, 179 n. 43
Julius, pope of Rome 28 n. 108, 91
Justin, bishop of Cagliari 29 n. 109
Justin I, emperor 4
Justinian I, emperor 4–6, 12 n. 36, 161
kandidatos 177 n. 11
keepers of the colours 115
Laon, Cathedral School of 32
Lateran Synod, see councils, local – Lateran
Lazicals 135, 155, 165
Lebarnikios, patriarch of Lazica 153
legate 25, 29, 36; see also emissary
Leo I, emperor 176 n. 3
Leo I, pope of Rome 9, 10, 20, 186 n. 15
Leo IV, pope of Rome 33
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Libellus (Lateran Aeta) 19
Liber Pontificalis 23
liturgy, Byzantine 61, 178 n. 24 & 27, 192 n. 16
Lothar, emperor 33
Louis II, emperor of Italy 2, 33–4
Macarius, patriarch of Antioch 29
Macedonius, patriarch of Constantinople 51, 181 n. 18
Macedonius, monothelite patriarch of Antioch 180 n. 49
magistros 145, 155
mandates 176 n. 2
Marcellus of Ancyra 15 n. 55
Marinus, deacon of Cyprus 8 n. 15, 15
Martin I, pope of Rome 1, 2, 7, 14, 18–23, 25, 30, 41, 42, 115, 117, 143, 149, 151, 159, 161, 163, 165, 171, 176 n. 4, 177 n. 13, 179 n. 38, 191 n. 12
Martina, empress 14–15, 183 n. 45
Mary 73, 141, 161; see also Mother of God
Maurice, emperor 6
Maximus the Confessor passim
Melchisedek 57
Menas the monk/Father 59, 69, 117
Menas, patriarch of Constantinople 9
Mercurius, master of the soldiers 33 n. 126
Mese 184 n. 60
Methodius, brother of Cyril 33
Michael, angel 105
Middle-Pentecost 37, 121
Milion 184 n. 60
Milvian Bridge 23
Mistranian, cemeteries 163
monastery:
  Armenian monastery (Rome), called Renati 183 n. 42
  of StArsenius, Lazica 26
  of Chrysopolis 14
  of Cilicia (Rome) 183 n. 42
of StJohn the Baptist, Albania 26, 165
of St Maximus, Tiseri 187 n. 6
of St Sabas, Rome 179 n. 44
of St Theodore, Rhegium 127
monogenesis 1–3, 6–12, 17, 179 n. 33
monks:
  Byzantine 19
  Cagliari 24, 38, 39
  Greek 19, 31, 39
  Latin 20
  Scythian 4
  Sicilian 28
monophysitism 1 n. 1, 4 n. 4, 12, 182 n. 36; see also non-Chalcedonianism
monothelitism 1, 2, 7, 8, 13, 14, 17, 20–3, 25 n. 105, 26, 29, 30, 43, 149, 151, 176–7 n. 10, 186 n. 13, 190 n. 39, 191 n. 13
Moses 155
Mother of God 73, 101, 115, 117, 141, 161; see also Theotokos
Muhammad 7
Mure, fortress 187 n. 6
Muslims 7, 180 n. 46; see also Arabs
Neo-Chalcedonianism 4, see also Cyrilian Chalcedonianism
Nestorius 28 n. 108, 91, 107
Nestorian church 5
Nicetas 8
Nicholas, bishop of Anagni 33 n. 126
Nicholas I, pope of Rome 2, 33, 34
Nikephoros, patriarch of Constantinople 7 n. 11
non-Chalcedonianism 1, 3–5, 8, 9
non-Chalcedonianism 4
see also monophysitism
Normans 31
officer of the guard 159
Olympius, exarch of Ravenna 7, 20, 22
Origen 23, 59
Origenism 5, 23, 61, 178 n. 29
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Pact of Union 3, 10 n. 30, 11–12, 14, 20, 179 n. 33
palace of Constantinople 49, 69, 77, 117, 183 n. 40
palace guards 49; see also eunuchae
patrician 145, 173, 176 n. 4; see also
Epiphanius; Gregory the
patrician; Peter, general of
Numidia; Plato the patrician;
Troylus
patricians elect 81
Paul, apostle 93, 105
Paul the Blind 9
Paul, consul of Constantinople 77, 107, 180 n. 3
Paul II, patriarch of Constantinople 15, 18, 20, 29, 81, 89, 101, 159, 176–7 n. 10, 177 n. 19, 190 n. 39
Paul of Samosata 89
Pelagius, pope of Rome 6
Pentecost 37 n. 153
Persians 1, 6–9
Peter, apostle 55, 93, 105, 121, 123, 159, 171
see of 7
Peter the Fuller, patriarch of Antioch 4
Peter, general of Numidia (alias the
patrician) 49, 51, 53
Peter Mongus, patriarch of
Alexandria 4 n. 4
Peter I, patriarch of Alexandria 188 n. 41
Peter II, patriarchal candidate of
Alexandria 189, 188 n. 41
Peter, patriarch of Constantinople 23, 24, 29, 37, 38, 77, 180 n. 49, 185 n. 9, 190 n. 39
Philippikos Bardanes, emperor 30
Phocas, emperor 6
Photinus, father of Gregory the
Secretary 55
Photius, patriarch of Constantinople
34 nn. 130 & 134
Plato the patrician 53
Plutinus, miller of the emperor 18, 157
praefectus annonae 189 n. 15
praefectus sacrarum sacurarum 189 n. 22
praetorian prefect 153; see also eparch of
the city
praetorian prefecture (praetorium) 119, 159
Prandia, prison of 189 n. 24
primicerius of the notaries 53
privy chamber 49, 69, 71, 73
protosecretary 153
Ps.-Dionysius the Areopagite 3, 11, 14, 16, 18, 20, 28, 30, 32 n. 122, 33 n. 129, 143, 191 n. 9
Ps.-Hippolytus, bishop of Portus
Romanus 21, 40, 145
Pyrrhus, patriarch of Constantinople 1, 12 n. 42, 14, 15, 17–18, 20, 23, 24, 26, 29, 59, 61, 67, 71, 81, 89, 101, 176–7 n. 10, 190 n. 39
referendarii 179 n. 43
Rome, bishop (pope) of 5, 24, 99, 123, 159
church of 5, 24, 121
clergy of 23
Roman empire 51, 73
Romans 51, 73
see of 63, 99
Rufinus of Aquileia 23
sacellarius 176 nn. 4 & 5, 189 n. 21
Sacr (110 & 112
Saracens 23, 34, 49; see also Arabs
Satans 53, 61, 69, 91, 115
scholastikos 183 n. 52
senate of Constantinople 22, 49, 51, 55, 63, 119, 178 n. 28
Sergius Eucratas 61, 63, 67
Sergius Magadali 51, 53
Sergius, patriarch of Constantinople 3, 6–9, 12–14, 20, 26, 27, 29, 67, 81, 89, 101, 149, 190 n. 39, 191 n. 13
Severinus, pope of Rome 14, 15 n. 52
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Severus, patriarch of Antioch 5, 11, 91, 127
Severans 10, 186 n. 13
Severan bishops 11
Slavs 7, see also Avar-Slavs
Sophronius, patriarch of Jerusalem 3, 7, 11-13, 25, 117, 178-9 n. 30, 187 n. 94
Spoudæi 41-2, 186-7 n. 3
Stephania, wife of Pope Hadrian II 34
Stephen, monk 29
Stephen (of Dora) 13, 26
Stephen, son of John the cimilarch 26, 40, 141, 145; see also Stephen (of Dora)
stratēgos 183 n. 48, 190 n. 31
subaltern 53, 190 n. 31; see also kandidatos
symposon 183-4 n. 52
synaxía 109, 117, 147, 155; see also liturgy, Byzantine
synods, see councils
Syrian/Leontine phrase 9, 27

Tagmata 189 n. 20
Takveri, fortress 187 n. 15
tetraconarc 157
Thalassius, abbot 15 n. 52
Thalassius, priest of Armenian monastery (Rome) 183 n. 42
Theocharistos, priest 53
Theodora, empress 5, 12 n. 36
Theodore Askidas 5
Theodore, bishop of Mopsuestia 5, 11
Theodore Chila 53
Theodore of Colonia (brother of Heraclius) 183 n. 48
Theodore, legate of Ravenna 29 n. 113
Theodore of Pharan 9, 20, 29-30
Theodore, pope of Rome 1, 14, 18, 19, 51, 53, 73
Theodore, priest of the holy Lavra (Africa) 183 n. 42
Theodore, priest of Rome 29 n. 113
Theodore, protosecretary 153
Theodore Chila, son of John 53
Theodore, son of Plutinus 2, 15, 21, 41, 157, 159, 171
Theodore Spoudæus 2, 21, 25, 26, 36-8, 40-2, 151, 165, 186-7 n. 3, 187 n. 23
Theodore, bishop of Cyrillus 5, 11
Theodosius, bishop of Caesarea 21, 24, 27, 28, 36, 37 n. 152, 77-111, 173, 188 n. 13
Theodosius, consul of Constantinople 77, 99, 105, 115, 180 n. 3
Theodosius of Gangra 2, 21, 25, 36, 37, 40, 41, 133, 165, 186-7 n. 3, 187 n. 22, 188 n. 10
Theodosius, patriarch of Alexandria 12 n. 36
Theodosian party 5, 12, 179 n. 33
theopaschion 4
theopaschite formula 3-5, 11
Theophanes, chronographer 7 n. 11, 42
Theotokos 11; see also Mary, Mother of God
Thomas, Father 51, 53
Three Chapters controversy 5, 6
Timothy Aelurus 28 n. 108, 93
Trisagion 4
Trollius, patrician 53, 61, 67, 69, 73, 107-17
True Cross 6, 7
Trullanum 49 n. 1
Turrianus, Franciscus 41 n. 170
Valens, emperor 190 n. 41
Victor of Tunnuna 6 n. 10
Vigilius, pope of Rome 5, 6, 9
Vitalian, pope of Rome 24-5, 185 n. 4
Zacharias, bishop of Anagni 34 n. 130
Zeno, emperor 4 n. 4