

# A MONOTHELETE SYRIAC COMPILATION OF PSEUDO-APOSTOLIC ACTS PRESERVED ONLY IN SLAVONIC AND THE ENTRANCE OF CONSTANS II INTO ROME IN 663

*Basil Lourié*

*To the memory of my teacher R.P. Michel van Esbroeck, S.J. (1934–2003)*<sup>1</sup>

## Introduction

The long compilation *Narration against the Romans* preserved only in Slavonic in Russian manuscripts quotes much earlier sources. All these sources are still unstudied and overlooked by specialists in Early Christian<sup>2</sup> literature. The long compilation itself has fared slightly better: it has been published twice (in different recensions and never critically<sup>3</sup>), and the history of its Slavonic recensions has been studied by Olga Valerievna Chumicheva, Galina

---

<sup>1</sup> In the present study, hagiographical material belongs to domains especially beloved by Père Michel. Such a work stirred up vivid memories of our communication, that is, of my apprenticeship. I am also grateful to those who helped me in different ways, especially Maria Korogodina who discovered this apocryphal anthology to me, and also the late Nikolai Gavriushin, Denis Beletsky, Elizabeth Castelli, Alexandra Elbakian, Sergey V. Ivanov, Ágnes Kriza, Maria Lidova, Elena Ludilova, Alexey Muraviev, Alexander Simonov (whose help was a *conditio sine qua non* for accomplishing this study), Nikolai Seleznyov, Alin Suciu, Olga Vardazaryan, Natalia Veselova, and Nataliya Yanchevskaya. My special thanks go to Maria Cioatǎ for her heroic work in editing and copyediting my article, and to the two other editors of this volume, Emanuela Timotin and Anissava Miltenova, for having generously accepted such a voluminous study. This research was carried out with a financial support of the Russian Foundation for Basic Research, project 18-011-01243 “Formation of the conceptual categorical apparatus of Eastern Christian philosophical and theological thought of the third and the fourth centuries.”

<sup>2</sup> Here and below I use the term “Early Christian” in a broad sense including the period up to *ca.* AD 700, that is, up to the Arab conquest of a part of Byzantium and its immediate aftermaths.

<sup>3</sup> A. N. Попов (A. N. Popov), *Историко-литературный обзор древнерусских полемических сочинений против латинян: XI–XV вв.*, Moscow, 1875, p. 191–238, and G. S. Barankova (Г. С. Баранкова), “Текстологические и языковые особенности антилатинского апокрифического памятника «Сказание о двенадцати апостолах, о латине и о опресноках»,” *Вестник ПСТГУ. I. Богословие. Философия*, 2009, вып. 3 (27), p. 67–92. Thereafter, respectively, P, B, with the page number(s).

Serafimovna Barankova, Olga Lvovna Novikova, and Maria Vladimirovna Korogodina.<sup>4</sup>

According to the classification proposed by Barankova (B 67-81), there are three recensions of the *Narration*:

1. Short (краткая) recension: containing a series of fragmentary stories related to the apostles, followed by several short quotations from other early Christian works, and finally an anti-Latin postface by a Byzantine author. This compilation has been produced in Greek. It survived in a Slavonic translation, which shows very archaic features going back to early Bulgarian schools.
2. Complete (полная) recension: the text of the short recension remains intact but a very long treatise has been added, using as the main source the already known Slavonic translation of the treatise by Nicetas Stethatos against the unleavened bread. The added part does not contain ancient Christian material.
3. Elaborated (пространная) recension: the text of the complete recension remains intact but a relatively long treatise has been added at the beginning. Its main part is the fragmentary work that we have recently published in a critical edition with an introduction, English translation, and notes.<sup>5</sup> This important earlier text (datable to the mid-seventh century or somewhat later) has been translated into Slavonic from Greek, but its lost Greek original would have been a translation from the lost Syriac. In Slavonic (Russian) manuscripts, it has also been transmitted as a separate text, independent from the *Narration*. It has been added to the elaborated recension of the *Narration* by a Russian compiler, who provided as a transition between this addition and the extant text a rhetorical passage composed mostly from the quotations of the anaphora of Basil the Great in its known Slavonic translation.<sup>6</sup>

The short recension has been published by Barankova according to the earliest manuscript (early 15<sup>th</sup> century) with variant readings from two sixteenth-century manuscripts (B 81-92). The elaborated recension has been published by Andrei Nikolaevich Popov (1841–1881) according to a fifteenth-century

---

<sup>4</sup> These works have been published since 2008; for the complete bibliography and discussion, see M. V. Korogodina (M. B. Корогодина), *Кормчие книги XV — первой половины XVII века*, 2 vols, Moscow – Sankt Petersburg, 2017, vol. 1, p. 167-172.

<sup>5</sup> M. A. Korogodina, B. Lourié, “*On the Perdition of the Higher Intellect and on the Image of Light*: Critical Edition, Translation, and Commentary,” in I. Dorfmann-Lazarev (ed.), *Esoteric and Apocryphal Sources in the Development of Christianity and Judaism: Eastern Mediterranean, Near East and Beyond*, Leiden, 2021, p. 217-261.

<sup>6</sup> P 194-195; we did not mention this fact in M. A. Korogodina, B. Lourié, “*On the Perdition*,” whereas we made this observation in collaboration.

manuscript (now lost). The complete recension has never been published.<sup>7</sup> A selective analysis of variant readings in Gospel quotations made by Korogodina demonstrated that the earliest readings are sometimes found in the short recension but sometimes in the elaborated one, thus proving that the later editor has also had access to the lost archetype.<sup>8</sup> This conclusion will be corroborated with observations in the present article, which focusses on the early Christian material shared by all three recensions introduced here. This early Christian material can be divided into two uneven groups: a long cycle of fragmentary stories related to the apostles, followed by two quotations allegedly from Hippolytus of Rome. Although the article will only deal with the first of these (items 1-4 in the list below), Hippolytus is included in the outline of the early Christian material of the *Narration*, because these contents have not yet been described, and they deserve to be wider known to specialists of Early Christian literature and their medieval reception.

Outline of the early Christian material within the *Narration against the Romans*:

1. A short introduction by the Byzantine compiler (B 81 / P 195-196): the authority of the apostles is invoked to justify Greek liturgical customs, especially those related to the Eucharist.
2. The *Twelve Apostles* (12 апостола. якоже есть писано<sup>9</sup>; “12 apostles. As it is written...”; B 81-86 / P 196-204). This part is, in turn, a compilation of three different texts (without counting “Pseudo-Pseudo-Dionysius” as the fourth). They contradict each other as they provide different stories about the distribution of the missionary lands between the apostles and about the apostolic council in Jerusalem.
  - 2.1. *Twelve Apostles I* (B 81-83 / P 196-199): the election by Christ of the twelve apostles is situated at Mt 9:36-10:1 (“when he saw the multitudes, he was moved with compassion on them, because they fainted, and were scattered abroad, as sheep having no shepherd. And when he had called unto him his twelve disciples...” KJV); then follows a long digest of Jesus’s sermon from John 15:1–17:26. Then, the story of the apostles who, before going preaching, were quarrelling about the distribution of the lands (бысть в нихъ распря “there was a quarrel among them”), which resulted in allotting to Peter “the western land,” whereas to “Saul,” accompanied by Barnabas, “the service for all the churches.”

<sup>7</sup> Within the elaborated recension, the text corresponding to the complete one begins with the words “To you our sermon, oh cunning Romans!”; P 195.

<sup>8</sup> M V. Korogodina (M. B. Корогодина), *Кормчие книги*, vol. 1, p. 170-171.

<sup>9</sup> Here and below, I quote the Slavonic text in the most simplified rendering, without taking the manuscripts’ orthography into consideration. This is justified because all the manuscripts are much later than the text itself, and because my study does not address issues for which the exact spelling is important.

- 2.2. *Twelve Apostles II* (B 83-86 / P 199-204): the main topic is the apostolic council in Jerusalem in the fourth (thus in P) or fourteenth (in B) year after the Ascension of Christ, at Pentecost. This is a rich and important pseudo-apostolic source. It provides an alternative version of the account of the division of lands between the apostles which is incompatible with the account presented in *Twelve Apostles I*.
- 2.3. Pseudo-Pseudo-Dionysius (B 86 / P 204): a fragment from an otherwise unknown epistle on the omophorion of the bishops. This quotation is presented by the compiler as a commentary to the running text of the *Twelve Apostles*.
- 2.4. *Twelve Apostles III* (B 86 / P 204-205): an alternative story of the apostolic council in Jerusalem, this time dated to the seventh (not fourth or fourteenth) year after the Ascension, and not on Pentecost but on March 14, which is certainly to be understood as Nisan 14.
3. Evodius (B 86 / P 205–206): the third alternative account of the same apostolic council in Jerusalem. It takes place at Pentecost as in the *Twelve Apostles II*, but this time in the same year as the Ascension.
4. Pseudo-Pseudo-Clementine (B 86-90 / P 206-211), also known as *The Acts of Peter in Rome*: a long but unfinished story of Peter's preaching in Rome.
5. A very short invective to the "cunning Romans" by a Byzantine compiler (вам же слово да слышано будет о хитрии римляне "let the word be heard by you, oh cunning Romans"; B 90/ P 211): apparently, marking the transition from the properly apostolic material to patristics.
6. Hippolytus of Rome (B 90 / P 211-212): a reference to the *Apostolic Tradition* (P's and B's identification of the source as Hippolytus's fragments in the *Chronicon paschale* is unhelpful<sup>10</sup>) followed by a fragment from an otherwise unknown letter.<sup>11</sup>

<sup>10</sup> P 211, with a reference to *Chronicon paschale*. Ad exemplar vaticanum recensuit L. Dindorfius, 2 vols, Bonnae, 1832, vol. 1, p. 12 (to correct to p. 12-13); repeated in B 71; on this lost and hardly identifiable work by Hippolytus, see M. D. Litwa, *Refutation of All Heresies. Translated with an Introduction and Notes*, Atlanta, GA, 2016, p. xxxviii, note 48; the two fragments referred to here deal with the Passover according to the Law and the death of Christ, and, therefore, are not related to our Slavonic text. The Slavonic is, however, easily recognisable: слышите ипполита божественного апостола и епископа в своих книгах глаголюща о пении и службе святых таин, яко хлеб и вино и вода в божественных таинах повеле предати "hear the divine apostle and bishop Hippolytus saying in his writings on singing [*means liturgical rites*] and the liturgy of holy mysteries/sacraments, that the bread and the wine and the water he [*sc.*, *Christ*] ordered to dispense in the divine mysteries/sacraments." This is a reference to the *Apostolic Tradition* (dedicated exactly to the matters specified in the Slavonic heading), an early third-century work ascribed to Hippolytus. Its Greek original is lost, but there are Latin, Coptic, Arabic, and Ethiopic versions and an indirect textual tradition in other works, which make a reconstruction possible. The place referred to in our Slavonic treatise is 21.27: "And then let the oblation be presented by the deacons to the bishop and let him give thanks [over] the bread <...> [and over] the cup mixed with wine" (thus the Latin version; the word "mixed" refers to water), cp. a more explicit paraphrase in the 4<sup>th</sup>-century Syriac *Testamentum Domini*: "But the bread is offered <...> Let the cup be mixed with wine – mixed with wine and water, for it is a sign of blood and of the laver;" see all versions and indirect witnesses translated in parallel in P. F. Bradshaw, M. E. Johnson,

7. A short postface of the Byzantine compiler (B 90-91 / P 212) – followed by a highly rhetorical treatise (according to Barankova, also of Byzantine origin) “Oh great Church of Rome!”

The still unstudied early Christian sources are collected in the Byzantine kernel of the treatise preserved separately as the short recension and within larger macroforms in the two other recensions. The medieval transmission of the early Christian and early Byzantine material preserved in our Slavonic text will also be in the focus of our attention. This is interesting in itself, but, moreover, it is necessary for making it possible to discern between the pre-eighth-century material and the later additions. The medieval transmission of NT apocrypha is also important for a deeper understanding of the transmission of these texts within anti-Latin polemics and within Slavonic contexts. The following study will deal with points from 1 to 4 of the above outline, which represents a florilegium collected from otherwise unknown apocryphal acts of the apostles. This earlier florilegium was reused, as I will show, by the eleventh-century Byzantine anti-Latin author of the Greek original of the short Slavonic recension. However, this earlier florilegium as a self-standing work (of course important *per se*) will almost escape from my present study that will be focused, instead, on its constitutional parts. Such a study of the parts is a prerequisite for a study of the whole, which would require additional sources and a different methodology.

After a brief analysis of the Byzantine introduction (item 1 in the outline above), I will consider each part of the apostolic florilegium separately. My approach consists of an analysis using the tools of critical hagiography with recourse to historical liturgics where appropriate. Moreover, I will discuss most of the lexical particularities of the Slavonic text, which often reveal a Syriac *Vorlage* underlying the lost Greek original of the extant Slavonic version. From the point of view of critical hagiography, our material belongs to the “epic” legends, which place imaginary events into a recognisable historical landscape of the epoch of their creation. In this way, such legends are precious historical sources for ecclesiastical geography and politics, missions, or sacred topography. In this respect, the richest source is the last and largest part of our apostolic florilegium, the *Acts of Peter in Rome*, which sheds some new light on the obscure period of Roman ecclesiastical history under the Monothelete union.

---

L. E. Phillips, *The Apostolic Tradition. A Commentary*, Minneapolis, MN, 2002, p. 120-121; cf. B. Botte, *La Tradition apostolique de Saint Hippolyte. Essai de reconstruction*, 5. verbesserte Auflage hrsg. von A. Gerhards unter Mitarbeit von S. Felbecker, Münster, 1989, p. 54-55.

<sup>11</sup> Rebuking an unnamed bishop subordinated to Hippolytus who, being a converted Jew, celebrated with unleavened bread. Although this fragment did not originate at the time of early Christianity, it does not need to be considered as a late Byzantine forgery. It could go back to earlier anti-Armenian polemics on the Eucharistic bread, where the unleavened bread was considered by the opponents as a symbol of apthartodocetic (“Julianist”) Christology.

“Epic” hagiography, unlike more “conventional” historical sources, suffered in a lesser extent from the *damnatio memoriae* that struck the main actors and many historical facts related to Monotheletism.

In contrast to Wilhelm Schneemelcher’s approach, I do not believe that there is any boundary between apocryphal and hagiographical literature,<sup>12</sup> and I take Éric Junod’s side in his polemic against Schneemelcher’s definition of New Testament apocrypha. Certainly, “[l]a production de la littérature apocryphe n’a pas de limite chronologique,” and, after the fourth century, apocryphal literature continued its development “tout en conservant des caractéristiques anciennes.”<sup>13</sup>

Therefore, critical hagiography is authorised to explore the apocryphal acts of apostles even without knowing *a priori* whether the text under study belongs to the pre-fourth-century period or not. Indeed, we have now a great number of such studies published by the Bollandist Michel van Esbroeck, only a small part of which will be referred to below. However, the father of modern critical hagiography Hippolyte Delehaye (1859–1941) was highly reluctant to proceed this way. He even wrote, in the introduction to his *Les Passions des martyrs et les genres littéraires* (1921, the manuscript was finished in 1917): “Bien que constituant un genre nettement défini, les Actes apocryphes des apôtres seront cette fois laissés de côté. <...> Cette littérature, dont les origines remontent très haut, a suivi des voies indépendantes, son influence sur les Actes des martyrs se constate relativement assez tard et a été exagérée.”<sup>14</sup> Delehaye’s methodological hesitations in this respect, which he expressed only after having barely escaped (and only with support from the secular authorities of Belgium), in 1912–1914, a condemnation by Rome of his earlier *Légendes*

<sup>12</sup> Cf. his definition of New Testament apocrypha as opposed to the post-fourth-century hagiographical literature in W. Schneemelcher, *New Testament Apocrypha*, English translation edited by R. McL. Wilson, 2 vols, Louisville/London, 1992, vol. 1, p. 61 (original German edition in 1989). On the historical development and theological agenda of this approach, see especially the seminal paper by Jean-Claude Picard (1943–1996), “L’apocryphe à l’étroit. Notes historiographiques sur le corpus d’apocryphes bibliques,” *Apocrypha* 1, 1990, p. 69–117 [reprinted in idem, *Le continent apocryphe. Essai sur les littératures apocryphes juive et chrétienne*, Steenbrugis – Turnhout, 1999, p. 13–51].

<sup>13</sup> É. Junod, “« Apocryphes du Nouveau Testament » : une appellation erronée et une collection artificielle. Discussion de la nouvelle définition proposée par W. Schneemelcher,” *Apocrypha* 3, 1992, p. 36. Junod’s attitude was supported, among others, by François Bovon, “Editing the Apocryphal Acts of the Apostles,” in F. Bovon, A. Graham Brock, Ch. R. Matthews (eds.), *The Apocryphal Acts of Apostles. Harvard Divinity School Studies*, Cambridge, MA, 1999, p. 3. For a bibliography of the discussion, see T. Burke, “Entering the Mainstream: Twenty-five Years of Research on the Christian Apocrypha,” in P. Piovaneli, T. Burke (eds.), with the collaboration of T. Pettipiece, *Rediscovering the Apocryphal Continent: New Perspectives on Early Christian and Late Antique Apocryphal Texts and Traditions*, Tübingen, 2015, p. 20–22.

<sup>14</sup> H. Delehaye, *Les Passions des martyrs et les genres littéraires*, 2<sup>e</sup> éd., Bruxelles, 1966, p. 12.

*hagiographiques* (1905),<sup>15</sup> will be recalled in the methodological postscriptum at the very end of this study.

## **Study of the Apostolic Florilegium within the *Narration against the Romans***

### **1. The Byzantine Introduction**

This late introduction is interesting as it enables evaluating the original contents of the compilation and provides clues for the dating of the Byzantine compilation.

#### **1.1. The Original Contents of the “Apostolic” Part**

The Byzantine compiler enumerates the sources he is going to quote. He lists the following authors: (1) Twelve Apostles; (2) “the great Pope Clement in his apocryphal (потаенныхъ) books,” where he wrote about the divine sacraments; (3) Dionysius (the Areopagite) on the same matter but “clearer”; (4) “the blessed Evodius”; (5) Hippolytus; (6) Timothy the Apostle, and (7?) “all disciples of Christ”: who unanimously witness in favour of the use of leavened bread rather than unleavened bread in the Eucharist. The reference to “all disciples of Christ” is nothing more than a rhetorical figure. The quotation from Timothy the Apostle is missing from the compilation. The study here is limited to the apostolic florilegium quoted before Hippolytus. It is important to note that these texts do not mention either leavened or unleavened bread. They do insist on the religious dependence of Christian Rome on the East – Jerusalem first of all, and Antioch as well.

#### **1.2. When Rome Separated from the East**

According to the compiler, the rupture between the Greeks and the Latins took place after 485 years of ecclesiastical unity (B 81 / P 196). The numer 485 is written in the manuscripts in Cyrillic numbers. Given the early date of the translation established by B, the possibility of the standard error in rendering Glagolitic numbers by Cyrillic scribes has to be considered. In this case, “485” in Cyrillic would be a rendering of “496” in the Glagolitic protograph. Both of these numbers point to the sixth century, rather than to the time of Photius or Michael Cerularius.

---

<sup>15</sup> Cf. B. Joassard, *Hippolyte Delehaye. Hagiographie critique et modernisme*, 2 vols, Bruxelles, 2000, here vol. 1, p. 261-316 *et passim*.

Indeed, we know the common opinion in eleventh- and twelfth-century Constantinople that the Latins separated themselves from the Eastern Patriarchates under Pope Vigilius at the ecumenical council which the Byzantine authors called the sixth. In 1054, just after the gesture of Cardinal Humbert in St Sophia of Constantinople, Michael Cerularius wrote to Patriarch Peter of Antioch that the Latin schism had already been created by Pope Vigilius at the sixth council (and, in response, received from Peter a lesson in Church history explaining that Vigilius lived in the epoch of the fifth ecumenical council, and that no schism had taken place at that time).<sup>16</sup> Nevertheless, in Constantinople in 1112, during the first conference between the Latins and the Greeks since 1054, an official Byzantine theologian, Nicetas Seides, continued to attribute the schism to Pope Vigilius and provided an exact chronology placing Vigilius at the sixth ecumenical council in 680–681.<sup>17</sup>

Not only these late Byzantine authors but also modern scholars, in evaluating their chronology of the schism or the identity of the six ecumenical councils recognised by Maximus the Confessor (580–662), forgot the Byzantine numeration of the councils before the Constantinopolitan council of 680–681. According to this earlier numeration, the Constantinopolitan council of 553 was indeed the sixth, whereas the fifth was the Constantinopolitan council of 536 (against Severus of Antioch).<sup>18</sup> Thus, such authors as Cerularius and Nicetas Seides were referring to an earlier tradition, even though they misunderstood the exact contents (chronology and which council) of this tradition.

Historically, the problem with Pope Vigilius who, although sojourning in Constantinople, at first did not subscribe to the condemnation of the Three Chapters in 553, was resolved in December of 553, when he eventually agreed with the decision of the Constantinopolitan council. This resulted, however, in a schism of about 150-years (from 554 to the end of the 7<sup>th</sup> century) within Italy (between Rome and Aquileia). Nevertheness the successive Popes continued to be against the partisans of the Three Chapters.

<sup>16</sup> Michaelis Cerularii *Epistola I. ad Petrum Patriarcham Antiochenum*, IX; C. Will, *Acta et scripta quae de controversiis ecclesiae graecae et latinae saeculo undecimo composite extant*, Lipsiae et Marburgi, 1861, p. 178-179; cf. Petri Antiocheni *Epistula ad Michaellem Cerularium*, II-IV, *ibidem*, p. 190-192.

<sup>17</sup> R. Gahbauer (P. Ferdinand), *Gegen den Primat des Papstes. Studien zu Niketas Seides: Edition, Einführung, Kommentar*. Inaugural-Dissertation zur Erlangung des Doktorgrades an der Ludwig-Maximilians-Universität zu München, München, 1975, p. 3; cf. commentary at p. 190.

<sup>18</sup> See S. Salaville, "La fête du concile de Nicée et les fêtes de conciles dans le rite byzantin," *Échos d'Orient* 24, 1925, p. 445-470. On the "six councils" in Maximus, see my review of the commented Russian translation of Maximus's *Opuscula Theologica et Polemica* by Gregory Benevich et alii: B. Lourié (B. M. Лурье), "Максим Исповедник и его китайская логика. Мысли по поводу новых публикаций Г. И. Беневи́ча и соавторов [Maximus the Confessor and His Chinese Logic. Some Thoughts about New Publication by Gregory I. Benevich and Co-Authors]," *Воли́ебная Гора* 17, 2016, p. 474-475.



Our Slavonic text's chronology points to the sixth century and expresses this tradition of attributing the schism to Pope Vigilius. Its implied date of the origin of the Christian Church is either 30/31 AD (if it follows the chronology "from the year of the Ascension," as some of its sources do, see below) or a different year slightly later or earlier. Adding the reconstructed Glagolitic number 496 to this date leads to the beginning of the reign of Justinian (527–565); adding the Cyrillic number 485, it leads to an earlier epoch: 484–518, known in Roman historiography as the "Acacian schism," but considered in the whole East as the schism of Rome.

It is more likely that our text implies "Justinianic" chronology, thus referring to what was to be called "the schism of Vigilius" by later Byzantine authors. There are two reasons for this. First: in Byzantine Chalcedonian historiography, the epoch between the *Henotikon* of Zeno (482) and the end of the reign of Anastasius (518) did not leave a good memory due to the persecutions of Chalcedonians in the second half of Anastasius's reign (after 505<sup>19</sup> and especially after 512), when the *Henotikon* was reinterpreted in an intolerant anti-Chalcedonian sense. Therefore, nobody then blamed Rome for having taken a distance from the Orient. Second: the "Justinianic" chronology is in general agreement with the witnessed tradition about the "sixth" ecumenical council in 553 as the starting point of the schism.

For our purpose it is however important to establish the date of the tradition of "Vigilius's schism" itself. There was no actual schism between the East and the West between 518 and 649, when the Lateran Council condemned Monotheletism, which was then the official confession of all Patriarchates of the East. From a monothelete viewpoint, the Lateran Council's attitude was indeed crypto-Nestorian, so that the charge that they supported the Three Chapters (then, the heresiological standard of the crypto-Nestorian view) would have been quite natural. This opened the way to a *téléscope* of the Italian Three Chapter schism that began immediately after the Council of 553 and the separation of Rome from Constantinople effectuated by the Lateran Council of 649.

The monothelete origin of the tradition of "Vigilius's schism" would sufficiently explain why it became misunderstood by later Byzantine authors. They discovered it in some archives where it laid forgotten from the time when Monotheletism was marginalised in the early eighth century. From the seventh to the eleventh century the tradition about the sixth-century schism with the Latins was forgotten, it had ceased to be a "living" tradition. Even Photius did not know about it.

Already at this point, a hypothesis can be formulated: the Byzantine *Vorlage* of our Slavonic document seems to belong to the monothelete tradition,

---

<sup>19</sup> M. van Esbroeck, "Le manifeste de Jean III le Nicéote en 505 dans le Livre des Lettres arméniens," *Revue des Études Arméniennes* 24, 1993, p. 27-46.

discovered in some archive after the schism of 1054. The late Byzantine polemicist used an earlier text in Greek composed against the Romans by a monothelete author in a different situation – referring to the schism which began in 649. This hypothesis will be confirmed below, without proposing a date for the monothelete florilegium as a whole.

## 2. Texts related to the Twelve Apostles

### 2.1. *Twelve Apostles I*

#### 2.1.1. Description of the Contents

Here and below I will elaborate on the summaries provided in the outline with some additional comments. It is still far from a thorough account exposing all peculiarities of these texts.

The first text, *Twelve Apostles I*, contains long Gospel quotations accompanied by short exegetical comments which still need to be studied. In particular, the prayer of Jesus in John 15:1–17:26 is interpreted as the consecration prayer ordaining the apostles as bishops. It is placed at the Last Supper – in accordance with the common medieval understanding of this scene, expressed for example in the services of Holy Week. However, such a literal understanding of John 17:17, 19 (“Sanctify them through thy truth: thy word is truth... And for their sakes I sanctify myself, that they also might be sanctified through the truth”, KJV) as a marker of a liturgical rite is unusual.

This text does not contain a specific description of the Jerusalem apostolic council. The scene of Pentecost, reasonably close to the account in Acts, is enough, for our author, to explain the origin of apostolic preaching and the division of the lands among the apostles. This story differs from the three other renderings of the same events in our florilegium, but, at least, the implied date of the event is Pentecost of the year when Christ ascended, that is, the same date as that of the Jerusalem council in Evodius.

The division of the missionary lands is described sparingly: to Peter, “the western land” (западная страна), to Saul (sc., Paul), together with Barnabas, по всем церквам служити [Р послужити] слову евангелиа “to serve the Gospel word throughout all the Churches”; B 83 / P 199). The eastern character of the coordinate system implied in such geography is rather striking: the world is divided into the “west” and all the rest.

The long Gospel quotations and especially an unusual ritualism in understanding Jesus’s farewell prayer in John prevent dating this fragment earlier than the fifth century.

### 2.1.2. A *Vorlage* in Syriac

The scene of the election of the twelve is described with the verbatim quotation from Luke 6:12-17a (B 82 / P 197), with one remarkable deviation at Lk 6:15, where the phrase Σίμωνα τὸν καλούμενον Ζηλωτὴν is rendered as “Simon the рыбитникъ.” The word рыбитникъ is a *hapax legomenon*<sup>20</sup> and is different from the word рыбарь that means “fisher.” The word рыбитникъ could mean something like “the one who is somewhat connected to fish.” It is important that, in the context, this word does not point to an occupation but it is used as a substitute of “Zelotes”, a kind of nickname.

The appearance of this unexpected word is explainable with reference to a Syriac original underlying the lost Greek *Vorlage* of the available Slavonic text. In the gospels, Simon does have another nickname, “Canananite”: Σίμων ὁ Καναναῖος (Mt 10:4) “Simon the Cananite” or, in Syriac, ܣܝܡܘܢ ܕܩܢܢܢܝܬܐ. This spelling would have been misread by the Greek translator as ܦܝܫܐ “of fish”<sup>21</sup> – implying the *lectio defectiva* and *dālat*, ܐ joined with the medial form of *nūn* read *pro* ܐ. I would stress that such an error in translation is a very strong proof of a Syriac original. Such a misreading is likely in the Estrangelo Syriac script (uncial) but not in the *Serṭō* (“monophysite” western cursive).

This is not the only case when difficult places in our apostolic florilegium become understandable when taking Syriac into consideration. However, the text has no specific mark of a direct translation from Syriac into Slavonic. Therefore, it would be reasonable to ascribe the errors in the translation from Syriac to the translator into Greek.

## 2.2. Twelve Apostles II

### 2.2.1. Description of the Contents

This fragment preserves a rather long story. The text begins with the words: сему же бывшу. четвертому же лету наставшу. бысть в них строи церковный “when did it happen, and when came the fourth year, there was, among them, the ecclesiastical council”<sup>22</sup> (P 199) or сему же бывшу 4-му на десять лету наставшу. бысть в них строи церковный “when did it happen, when the fourteenth year came, there was, among them, the ecclesiastical council” (B 83). Сему же бывшу “when did it happen” is a connecting phrase

<sup>20</sup> В 78, with a reference to И. И. Срезневский, *Материалы для словаря древне-русского языка по письменным памятникам*, 3 vols, St Petersburg, 1893–1912, vol. 3, col. 206 (who quoted our text according to P).

<sup>21</sup> Cf. R. Payne Smith, *Thesaurus Syriacus*, 2 vols, Oxford, 1879–1901 [thereafter *TS*], col. 2324, for the spelling ܦܝܫܐ instead of the standard ܦܝܫܐ.

<sup>22</sup> See below, section 2.2.2, for the Slavonic term строи in the meaning of “council.”

inserted by the compiler between the two sources. Then follows a description of the apostolic council in Jerusalem. The next sentence describes how the apostles were invited to this council, thus confirming the understanding of строи as “council” (and not in its normal usage as rendering φροντίς, οἰκονομία or sometimes λόγος<sup>23</sup>): и послаша епистолиа по всем градом. да быша пришли апостоли от всех стран “and they sent epistles to all cities for the apostles would arrive from all countries.”

It is not specified explicitly from what year the four or fourteen years are counted. Although it is clear that the counting begins in the year of the Passion, there is no explicit reference to the chronology “after the Ascension,” as in the *Twelve Apostles III* and probably in Evodius. Nevertheless, the fourth year after the Ascension is the year of Peter’s consecration as the bishop of Antioch according to John Malalas (ca. 490–after 570, a Syrian author writing in Greek)<sup>24</sup> and the *Chronicon Paschale*<sup>25</sup> written under Heraclius (610–641). Both borrow here from a common source that used a peculiar Syrian chronology “after the Ascension” implying that the Ascension took place in AD 31.<sup>26</sup> In our Slavonic account, Peter “gave” the see of Antioch to Paul (see below), rather than becoming the bishop of Antioch himself.

The day of the apostolic council was the very day of Pentecost. All apostles were present, including Paul and Barnabas who had arrived from Antioch. It is emphasised that there were no bishops, priests, and deacons amongst them. “The mother of Jesus together with other women” was also present (бе бо [бо B, not P] мати Исусова со инеми женами; В 83 / Р 200). They performed the ceremony of breaking “the sacred breads” (хлебы священныя) into seventy pieces (7-ю десять; *ibidem*). This number refers to the seventy apostles and does not include the mother of Jesus and the other women. The phrase about these women is to be considered as a later interpolation, possibly influenced by the description of the same council in the *Twelve Apostles III*, where Jesus’s mother is present. It seems to contradict the next scene where the apostles, after having finished their gathering, go together to the mother of Jesus – who was, therefore, in a different (and even in a remote) place.

<sup>23</sup> *Slovník jazyka staroslověnského / Lexicon linguae palaeoslovenicae*, ed. J. Kurz, 5 vols, Praha, 1958–2016 [thereafter *LLP*], vol. 4, p. 182. Barankova noticed that the meaning “council” for строи only occurs in our text (В 80).

<sup>24</sup> X, 15; Ioannis Malalae, *Chronographia*. Recensuit I. Thurn, Berolini/Novi Eboracici, 2000, p. 183; cf. *The Chronicle of John Malalas*, Translated by E. Jeffreys, M. Jeffreys, R. Scott, Canberra, 1986 [repr. Leiden, 2017], p. 128.

<sup>25</sup> *Chronicon paschale*, vol. 1, p. 431.

<sup>26</sup> See, for the details, H. Gelzer, *Sextus Julius Africanus und die byzantinische Chronographie*, 2 Bde, Leipzig, 1885–1898, Bd. 2., p. 166–167; E. Jeffreys with B. Croke, R. Scott, *Studies in John Malalas*, Sydney, 2006 [repr. Leiden, 2017], p. 122–124. For the later Syrian tradition of this chronology, see J.-M. Vosté, “L’ère de l’Ascension de Notre-Seigneur dans les manuscrits nestoriens,” *Orientalia Christiana Periodica* 7, 1941, p. 233–250.

Then, after having broken bread, the apostles decided to establish the holy orders (ставили чины церковныя) – those of bishop, presbyter, deacon, (*B's text adds* subdeacon), reader, singer, and other orders (B 83-84 / P 200). The proceedings described in this scene clearly reveal a hierarchy amongst the Apostles. At first, James the brother of Lord addressed apparently the whole assembly – using the appeal “fathers and brothers and lords (отцы и братия и господие)” – but speaking directly only to Peter in a low voice (рече тихо петрови). The apostles approved what James had said but only two of them made speeches: Peter is the first, John the Theologian the second. Thus, the hierarchy is clear: James is the head above all apostles; the second place belongs to Peter, and the third to John. Placing James above Peter was quite usual in the Orient but the appearance of John as the third is not so common. We will see that this is the mark of an Ephesian origin of this legend. John's speech is relatively long and provides commandments, allegedly ordered by Jesus himself, for the liturgy, the faith in the Holy Trinity, and the canon of Scriptures, although the latter in a very generalised manner (B 83 / P 200-201). The three hypostases of the Trinity are called образы “images” (да разньство творят образом “let they make a distinction between the images”), which is another anomaly in the Slavonic language of our fragment (образъ normally translates σχῆμα, χαρακτήρ, τύπος, μορφή, εἶδος, ὁμοίωσις,<sup>27</sup> but neither ὑπόστασις nor πρόσωπον).

Then, Paul appeared as the fourth among the apostles according to their relative importance. He proposed to write down the commandments just discussed. In turn, James proposed to consecrate him bishop and presided over the Twelve at the consecration (B 84-85 / P 201-202). The consecration prayer is quoted *in extenso*. It is very peculiar. For instance, it opens with the appeal о боже всяя твари содетелю (“Oh God, the creator of all creatures,” the initial “oh” is absent in B's text), which is not normal for either consecration or ordination prayers.<sup>28</sup> Moreover, the usual parallel (in many Oriental rites) between the person to be consecrated and Moses is completed with a quite unusual comparison with Elijah and John.<sup>29</sup> The appearance of John could be

<sup>27</sup> *LLP*, vol. 2, p. 484-486.

<sup>28</sup> The only remote parallel can be found in the special consecration prayer for the Patriarch of the “monophysite” Church of Antioch, which is not used for the ordinary bishops; it is attributed to Clement of Rome: “Dieu qui avez fait et consolidé toutes choses avec puissance, et avez posé les fondements de tout l'univers par une pensée...” (translated from unpublished manuscripts): B. de Smet, “Le rituel du sacre des évêques et des patriarches dans l'Église syrienne d'Antioche. Traduction,” *L'Orient syrien* 8, 1963, p. 202; cf. G. Khouri-Sarkis, “Le rituel du sacre des évêques et des patriarches dans l'Église syrienne d'Antioche. Introduction,” *ibidem*, p. 137-164.

<sup>29</sup> This prayer differs sharply from other known early and mediaeval prayers of consecration, including those in Pseudo-Clementine *Homilies* (4.72), the *Apostolic Constitutions*, the *Testamentum Domini*, the *Apostolic Tradition* of Ps.-Hippolytus, and the liturgical traditions of Jerusalem, Byzantium, and Alexandria. For an outline of the available material of consecration

ascribed, once more, to an Ephesian origin of the document. However, Elijah makes us wonder: he was, indeed, a priest but not a High Priest. One can recall here, of course, Moses and Elijah as the eschatological pair at the Transfiguration of Jesus and in some interpretations of Rev 11:3-12, where “the two witnesses” were understood as Elijah and Moses and not Elijah and Enoch,<sup>30</sup> but there are no similar formulations in the consecration or ordination prayers.

Paul, after the consecration, showed his divine gifts in preaching, and the apostles “ranked him together with Peter and John the Theologian” (и причтоша его с петром и с [и с *are lost in B's text*] иоанном с [с *is not in B's text*] богословцем; B 85 / P 202). Thus, the pyramid of the apostolic hierarchy is now completed: James is always on the peak with the previous level formed by Peter, John, and Paul.

Then, after the council finished, before departing for preaching, the apostles went all together “to the mother of the Lord” (к матери господни; *ibidem*). A touching scene follows, when Paul sees her for the first time, bows to her and presents his two beloved disciples, Dionysius and Timotheus (B 85 / P 202-203). The mentioning of Dionysius is a chronological marker, whereas Timotheus is a geographical one. Dionysius points to an epoch when the *Corpus Areopagiticum* became almost a part of the New Testament. For the Syrian anti-Chalcedonians, this occurred in the second quart of the sixth century, grace to Severus of Antioch, for other communities, more or less later. Timotheus points to Ephesus. Combined with the prominent role of John the Theologian, this mention of Timotheus, who was the second apostle of Ephesus after John the Theologian, provides a localisation of our legend in Ephesus.

---

prayers, one can suggest the old collection by Jean Morin (Joannes Morinus, 1591–1659): J. Morinus, *Commentarius de sacris ecclesiae ordinationibus, secundum antiquos et recentiores Latinos, Graecos, Syros et Babylonios*, editio nova [2<sup>nd</sup> ed.; first published in Paris, 1655], Antverpiae/Amstelodami, 1695, with the recent studies by H. Brakmann, “Die altkirchlichen Ordinationsgebete Jerusalems. Mit liturgiegeschichtlichen Beobachtungen zur christlichen Euchologie in Palestina, Syria, Iberia und im Sasanidenreich,” *Jahrbuch für Antike und Christentum* 47, 2004, p. 108-127; idem, “Pseudoapostolische Ordinationsgebete in apostolischen Kirchen beobachtungen zur gottesdienstlichen Rezeption der Traditio Apostolica und ihrer Deszendenten,” in H.-J. Feulner (ed.), *Liturgies in East and West: Ecumenical Relevance of Early Liturgical Development. Acts of the International Symposium Vindobonnense I, Vienna, November 17-20, 2007*, Vienna, 2013, p. 61-98.

<sup>30</sup> The biblical reminiscences in this passage of Revelation allow establishing that the original pair meant by the author of the book was Elijah and Moses, not Enoch. See, among others, R. H. Charles, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Revelation of St John with Introduction, Notes, and Indices and Also the Greek Text and English Translation*, 2 vols, New York, 1920, vol. 1, p. 281-282; R. Bauckham, “The Martyrdom of Enoch and Elijah: Jewish or Christian?,” *Journal of Biblical Literature* 95, 1976, p. 447-58; idem, *The Climax of Prophecy. Studies on the Book of Revelation*, Edinburgh, 1993, p. 273-283; P. Prigent, *L'Apocalypse de Saint Jean*, Lausanne/Paris, 1981, p. 166; D. Haug, *Die Zwei Zeugen. Eine exegetische Studie über Apok 11, 1–13*, Münster i. W., 1936, esp. p. 105.

It is not said where the house of the mother of the Lord was located. We know that three options were theoretically possible: Jerusalem (the upper room in Sion), Bethlehem, and Ephesus.<sup>31</sup> The Ephesian colouring of our legend make us suppose that the Theotokos lived, according to our legend, in Ephesus. Indeed, her home seems to be far from Jerusalem, because the apostles asked her “to make an effort / to take the trouble” (да бы потрудилася) to go to the Holy City (B 85 / P 203). This phrase excludes the Jerusalem localisation of Mary’s house and is hardly compatible with the Bethlehem one: Bethlehem is located about 9 km from Jerusalem, a short distance. If difficulties of the journey are alluded to, and the whole context of our legend is Ephesian, we have to conclude that the house of Mary was in Ephesus.

In Jerusalem, the twelve apostles eventually divided the lands for preaching to each of them (B 85 / P 203), as follows:

1. Peter: “the great city of Rome with the whole *ager regius* (ἀγορὰ βασιλική)” (великий град рим со всею областью царскою). I believe this reading from P is correct, whereas that of B is not: “...with the whole dominion of the Church” (...со всею областью церковною). Confusion between царский and церковный is typical in Slavonic writing, especially in Cyrillic where both words are normally abbreviated in a similar way.
2. Paul (he received these lands from Peter! The two apostles are by no means equal): Antioch, Caesarea (it is not explicitly mentioned which one, but probably the one in Palestine as it is located in the same region), Samaria, and “the whole domain of Antioch which is called Assyria” (и весь предел антиохийский. еже зовется асурия).
3. John the Theologian: Ephesus and the coastal region (поморие).
4. Andrew: Byzantium.
5. Matthew together with Barthelemy: “Higher Ethiopia in which there are three nations” (вышняя ефиопия. в ней же 3 языци).
6. Thomas: to the Parthians, Medes, Persians, Hyrcanites [Ὑρκανοῖς – иркәне in B, юркәне in P; both forms, as well as the two following ethnonyms are lacking in the dictionaries;<sup>32</sup> the inhabitants of Hyrcania, Ὑρκανία, the modern city of Gorgan in northern Iran and the adjacent southern coastal region of the Caspian Sea], Nephthalites [εφθάλιτες in P,

<sup>31</sup> These variants are reported in different legends about the death of the Mother of God: the two main branches of *Transitus* legends (Sion or Bethlehem) and the Ephesian legend without the *Transitus*. Cf., as an introduction to these traditions, S. J. Shoemaker, *Ancient Traditions of the Virgin Mary's Dormition and Assumption*, Oxford, 2006; cf. seminal papers by M. van Esbroeck, *Aux origines de la Dormition de la Vierge. Études historiques sur les traditions orientales*, Aldershot, 1995; cf. also S.C. Mimouni, *Dormition et assomption de Marie. Histoire des traditions anciennes*, Paris, 1995; idem, *Les traditions anciennes sur la Dormition et l'Assomption de Marie. Études littéraires, historiques et doctrinales*, Leiden/Boston, 2011.

<sup>32</sup> Including those that took into account Popov’s edition, such as Sreznevskij and the *Словарь русского языка XI–XVII вв.* by the Russian Academy of Sciences, Москва, 1975–.

ехтати В; s. below, section 2.2.2], Margians [μαρғиανή; the inhabitants of Μαρғиανή “Margiana,” Merv in the Central Asia; s. section 2.2.2], and the Great India.<sup>33</sup>

7. James of Alphaeus: Palestine.
8. James the Brother of Lord: Jerusalem, Galilea, and “the Trachonitis land of the kingdom of Jerusalem” (трахоничьская страна царства ерусалимова). This geography contains a reminiscence of the united monarchy of David and Solomon, even though Trachonitis (the south of modern Syria) was not part of it.<sup>34</sup>
9. Philipp: Phrygia, Hierapolis, Ирополь (В; Р: ирнополь, obviously a corruption from иринополь in Cyrillic; doublet of Hierapolis or Heliopolis?), and the coastal region (поморие).
10. Simon the Cananite, Cleopas, and Judas the brother of James: in Jerusalem together with James.

Putting aside those traditions concerning the division of the lands between the apostles which predate the sixth century (Peter, John the Theologian, Andrew, the most of the areas attributed to Thomas, James the Brother of Lord, Philipp), we see other unusual features:

- (1) Appropriation of Paul to the patriarchate of Antioch.
- (2) Jerusalem and Palestine as a reservoir of as many apostles as possible, including Simon the Cananite.
- (3) Absence of the Caucasus from this geography, which is a discontinuation of the Byzantine ecclesiastical geography since Justinian of associating Simon the Cananite with the Caucasus.<sup>35</sup>

<sup>33</sup> Cf. the closest parallel in Pseudo-Hippolyte of Rome, *Index apostolorum discipulorumque*, under Nr 8 (Thomas), where, beside India, the list is the following: Πάρθοις, Μήδοις, Πέρσαις, Ὑρκανοῖς, Βακτροῖς [the Bactrians], Μάργοις; Th. Schermann, *Prophetarum vitae fabulosae, indices apostolorum discipulorumque Domini Dorotheo, Epiphanio, Hippolyto aliisque vindicata*, Lipsiae, 1907, p. 166; in the *Indices apostolorum* by Ps.-Epiphanius and Ps.-Dorotheus, the *lectio difficilior* Μάργοις is replaced with Μάγοις “to Zoroastrians / Persians,” thus producing a repetition of the same ethnos under another name (cf. *ibidem*, p. 111, 155). Cf. a similar list in Gregory Bar Hebraeus (1226–1286), the Catholicos of the “monophysite” Syrian Church of Antioch, where among the peoples allotted to Thomas are ܡܪܓܝܢܐ /*margū*/ “Margians”: Gregorii Barhebraei, *Chronicon ecclesiasticum*, ed. J. B. Abbeloos, Th. J. Lamy. 3 t., Parisiis – Lovanii, 1872–1877, vol. 3, p. 5 (cf. transl., p. 4). Cf. as well B. Kaim, M. Kornacka, “Religious Landscape of the Ancient Merv Oasis,” *Iran. Journal of the British Institute of Persian Studies* 54, 2016, p. 47–72, esp. 59–60. Cf. *TS*, col. 2214, for the city name *Alexandria Margiana* (Merv), ܡܪܓܝܢܐ /*margyānōs*/. The Slavonic form with the second /m/ as the last consonant is incorrect; see its explanation below, section 3.2.

<sup>34</sup> It was, however, a part of the Roman province *Syria Palestina*, which was subdivided in 390 into several parts, with Jerusalem belonging to the new province *Palestina Prima*, and Trachintis to *Arabia*.

<sup>35</sup> Cf. M. van Esbroeck, “Le substrat hagiographique de la mission khazare de Constantin-Cyrille,” *Analecta Bollandiana* 104, 1986, p. 337–348; idem, “Lazique, Mingrélie, Svanéthie et Aphkhazie



- (4) Absence of Alexandria, even though Ethiopia (that means here “Nubia,” see below) is named; formally one would say that the Apostle Mark was considered as one of the Seventy but not of the Twelve. Nevertheless, such a complete silence on such an important city is striking.
- (5) Nubia (called here Ethiopia, as is the case in Acts 8:27) is presented as containing three independent states, immediately recognisable as Nobatia, Makuria, and Alodia (Alwa), which corresponds to the reality of the sixth and a part of the seventh century (before the unknown date in the seventh century when Makuria annexed or conquered Nobatia).<sup>36</sup>
- (6) Thomas preaching to the Hephthalites who are called with their specific name (see below, section 2.2.2, on its spelling), not with the indiscriminate term “Turks”. This is a mark of a sixth-century context: having appeared in the fifth century, the Hephthalites gradually lost their specific name in the Greek and Syriac sources. After they fell under dominion of the Turkic (Göktürk) Khaganate in the mid-sixth century, they were commonly called “Turks” by the eighth century.<sup>37</sup>

This geography points to a specific Syrian group of the second half of the sixth and the seventh century: the followers of the anti-Chalcedonian Severianist Patriarch of Antioch Paul Beth-Ukkame (564-581). The best-known bishops of this group were John of Ephesus (*ca.* 507–*ca.* 589), a famous Church historian and hagiographer, and Longinus who became the apostle of Nobatia and Alodia, the only two states where this kind of Syrian “monophysite” faith became accepted at state level.<sup>38</sup>

---

du IV<sup>e</sup> au IX<sup>e</sup> siècle,” in *Il Caucaso: cerniera fra culture dal Mediterraneo alla Persia (s. IX-XI). Settimana di Studio del Centro Italiano di Studi sull'Alto Medioevo [CISAM], Spoleto, 20-26 avril 1995*, Spoleto, 1996, p. 195-218; idem, “La postérité littéraire des villes fortifiées de Théodose,” in J.-P. Mahé, R. W. Thomson (eds.), *From Byzantium to Iran. Armenian studies in Honour of Nina Garsoïan*, Atlanta, GA, 1997, p. 361-378.

<sup>36</sup> See L. P. Kirwan, “The Emergence of the United Kingdom of Nubia,” *Sudan Notes and Records* 61, 1980, p. 134-139; especially for the conversions of the three states of Nubia, see B. Lourié, “India ‘far beyond Egypt.’ Barlaam and Ioasaph and Nubia in the 6<sup>th</sup> century,” in D. Bumazhnov, E. Grypeou, T. B. Sailors, A. Toepel (eds.), *Bibel, Byzanz und Christlicher Orient. Festschrift für Stephanus Gerö zum 65. Geburtstag*, Leuven, 2011, p. 135-180 (on the conversion of Makuria into Byzantine Orthodoxy), and idem, “Slavonic Pseudepigrapha, Nubia, and the Syrians,” in T. Nicklas, C. R. Moss, Ch. Tuckett, J. Verheyden (eds.), *The Other Side: Apocryphal Perspectives on Ancient Christian “Orthodoxies,”* Göttingen, 2017, p. 225-250 (on the conversion of Nobatia and Alodia into the Severianism of the followers of Paul Beth-Ukkame who were in schism with the Severianist Jacobites).

<sup>37</sup> See, for a concise summary of many studies on the Hephthalites and Christianity among them, M. Tezcan, “On ‘Nestorian’ Christianity among the Hephthalites or the White Huns,” in L. Tang, D. W. Winkler (eds.), *Artifact, Text, Context: Studies on Syriac Christianity in China and Central Asia*, Zürich, 2020, p. 195-212.

<sup>38</sup> I have tried to provide the most up-to-date history of the Paulist faction of the Severianists in B. Lourié, “Slavonic Pseudepigrapha, Nubia, and the Syrians.”

Ephesus was an alternative centre of the cult of the Theotokos compared with the one at Gethsemane with its shrine of the Theotokos and the *Transitus* legends.<sup>39</sup> It belonged to the Patriarchate of Antioch. The “Paulianists” had a strong community in Alexandria, but they failed to establish a patriarch of their own except for a very short period. Thus, for them, the symbolical centre of the Church was Jerusalem, although formally their Church was ruled by Patriarch Paul from Antioch. Keeping the importance of Ephesus in mind, and with specific interests in Nubia, while ignoring the Patriarchate of Alexandria, they would have drawn an ecclesiastical map of the world implied in our source. This conclusion will be further corroborated in the demonstration of a Syriac *Vorlage* underlying this fragment.

What follows is an interesting description of the liturgical services and liturgical dresses established by the apostles (B 85-86 / P 203-204), without forgetting the *Trisagion*, even though without the Christological addition. There are serious reasons to doubt whether the seditious words “crucified for us” were removed by the seventh-century Melkite editor of our florilegium. Among others, the clerical tonsure is also mentioned: “the bald patch (produced by) hair cutting” (еже влас острижением плешь; B 86, corrupted in P 204); the circular tonsure was obligatory for the clergy (especially bishops and priests), in the first millennium, in both East and West, and was believed to be an apostolic institution.<sup>40</sup> The apostolic origin of the tonsure has been considered beyond doubt, but there were, in the Orient, some disagreements concerning the exact history of its establishment. Our author insists that the clerical tonsure has been established at the apostolic council of Jerusalem under the presidency of James. This point of view is consistent with his representation of James as the head of the apostles but is unique among the known documents. The author of an unpublished rhymed *memro* ascribed to James of Serugh (ca. 451–521) mentions two other points of view: that the tonsure was established by Peter either in Rome or in Antioch. This *memro* (the attribution and date of which remain unresolved questions) is a paraphrase of an earlier Syriac document (preserved in Arabic), the *Acts of Peter, John, and Paul in Antioch*, where the origin of the tonsure goes back to the scene of incarceration of Peter and John, when, to mock them, “the tops/central parts of their heads” (وسط رؤسهما) were

<sup>39</sup> To my knowledge, the latest account placing the grave of the Theotokos in Ephesus is the eighth-century Syriac list of the apostles: M. van Esbroeck, “Neuf listes d’apôtres orientales,” *Augustinianum* 34, 1994, p. 109-199, here list VIII, p. 188/143 (txt/tr.). M. van Esbroeck supposed (*ibidem*, p. 141) that this list was composed by Jacob of Edessa (ca. 640–708).

<sup>40</sup> Cf. H. Leclercq, “Tonsure,” in *DACL*, t. XV/2, Paris, 1953, col. 2430-2443, esp. col. 2433-2435 (for the clerical tonsure in Byzantium and the Orient).



additional meanings including that of “image.”<sup>43</sup> This case is a revealing example of the low quality of the Greek translation: even the most important theological term fell victim to the translator’s ineptitude.

(3) The ethnonym *ехтани* (P) or *ехтати* (B). There is nothing similar among the ethnonyms used in the preserved Syriac texts. However, the Slavonic word is similar to the names for Hephthalites in Armenian (Հեփթաղ /*hep’tall*/) and Arabic (هياطلة /*hayāṭlāl*/ and other forms which do not preserve or substitute /*fl*/ of this ethnonym in Greek). The Arabic uses Syriac words. This identification is corroborated with the geography of our text, where this ethnic group is mentioned between the Hyrcanites and the Margians, so located between the Caspian Sea and the Oasis of Merv. This was the territory of the Hephthalite kingdom. We have to reconstruct the consonant Syriac root underlying our Slavonic word as *hṭl*, presuming the possible (typical) misreading of the Syriac *lāmaḡ* as *nūn*, which would have resulted in *hṭn*, and, ultimately, *ехтани*.

(4) Slavonic *мапроми* instead of \**марзи* (from *μάργοι*). This is certainly a misreading of Syriac /*margūl*/ “Margians” in the western “monophysite” cursive writing *Serṭō*, where *waw* and *mīm* became especially similar: compare the correct spelling *مرجوه* *mrgw* with the erroneous spelling *مرجم* *mrgm*.

(5) The passage on the consecration of James (P 204, with B 86 variant readings in square brackets) contains an internal contradiction, and its syntax is chaotic:

по научению святого духа поставиша  
же иакова брата господня. съ же  
бысть первый патриарх в  
иерусалиме поставлением святого  
духа. постановление же его бысть  
сице. владыка бо христос сам сего  
нарече и постави. но не [понеже  
*instead of* но не] сановным  
поставлением, но си [се] последи  
сановное поставление бысть ему.

According to the teaching of the Holy Spirit,  
they consecrated James the Brother of Lord.  
He became the first patriarch in Jerusalem by  
the consecration of the Holy Spirit. And his  
consecration was in the following manner:  
indeed, the Lord Christ himself appointed him  
and consecrated, but not [because *instead of*  
but not] with the regular consecration (rite),  
but this... after... the regular consecration  
was to him.

Slavonic *сановный* “belonging to a (high) rank” is here an unhelpful translation of a Genitive construction with *τάξις* (there was no adjective of this noun). In Byzantine Greek, the meanings of *τάξις* included both “holy order/rank” and “regular procedure”; the same was true for the Syriac loanwords going back to the unique Greek *τάξις*. My English translation from Slavonic corrects this error of the Slavonic translator. The general idea of the passage is rather clear: Christ himself consecrated James with the Holy Spirit, without using the regular liturgical rite. However, at the end, our author seems to have

<sup>43</sup> TS, col. 3292: *species, similitudo, effigies*.

said that James eventually received the regular consecration, but the syntax of this sentence is far from smooth. B's text is even worse: it reads понеже ("because") instead of the correct но не ("but not"), thus confusing но with по, which is not unusual in Cyrillic writing, and adding the particle же. This edition results in the meaningless sentence ("Christ... consecrated, because with the regular consecration rite, but this after the regular consecration rite"), rather than reformulating in order to avoid a mention of an irregular consecration of James.

Putting aside the corruptions that occurred in the Slavic transmission of the text, an important problem occurs with the word последи "after." To restore the syntax, one has to recognise the Syriac phrasal verb ܐܡܢܐ "he was" (ܐܡܢܐ) followed by ܡܠܟܐ "instead, because" having the double meaning *successit* and *in ejus locum substitus est*.<sup>44</sup> The Greek translator understood *successit* ("was after," последи... бысть), but the true meaning is "was instead." Therefore, the sentence is to be restored to "...the Lord Christ himself appointed him and consecrated, but not with the regular consecration (rite), but this instead of the regular consecration was to him."

### 2.3. Pseudo-Pseudo-Dionysius

The account of the consecration of James is followed by an otherwise unknown Pseudo-Pseudo-Dionysian fragment (B 86 / P 204). It is dedicated to the liturgical vestments and, therefore, continues the topic of the final part of the *Twelve Apostles II*. It opens with the phrase "as the great Dionysius writes in his works to some bishop" (якоже великий дионисий в своих словесах пишет к некоему епископу), thus representing itself as belonging to the secondary pseudepigraphic corpus ascribed to Pseudo-Dionysius the Areopagite. These "Pseudo-Pseudo" works are well-known (CPG 6630–6637) in Latin, Syriac, Arabic, Coptic, Ethiopic, Armenian, and Georgian, even one piece in Greek (CPG 6636), but not in Slavonic. However, the Slavonic dossier of Pseudo-Pseudo-Dionysius, although ignored by CPG, exists and contains, beside the present fragment, a very short fragment of an otherwise unknown cosmological treatise.<sup>45</sup>

The "Pseudo-Pseudo" corpus is mostly (if not exclusively) a seventh-century phenomenon related to the anti-Chalcedonian milieu(x) of Syria, but its original language might have been Greek, not necessarily Syriac.<sup>46</sup>

The present fragment is certainly interesting for the history of the bishop's omophorion which made its appearance no later than the early fifth

<sup>44</sup> TS, col. 984.

<sup>45</sup> Pointed out by the late Nikolai Konstantinovich Gavriushin (1946–2019), to whom I am very grateful for sharing this unpublished text with me; see N. K. Gavriushin (Н. К. Гаврюшин), "Источники и списки космологического трактата XV в. «О небеси»,» *Вопросы истории естествознания и техники*, 1988, № 1, p. 132–139, here p. 137 (as the last, 42<sup>nd</sup> item in the fifteenth-century Russian florilegium "On the Heaven").

<sup>46</sup> Cf. A. Binggeli, "Les traditions hagiographiques orientales liées à Denys l'Aréopagite," *Bibliothèque de l'École des chartes* 172, 2014, p. 141–153.

century, probably in Alexandria.<sup>47</sup> The point made by Ps.-Ps.-Dionysius here is that the omophorion belongs exclusively to bishops, and no other clergy is allowed to wear it. In the Byzantine context, such a warning looks meaningless, because the difference between the bishop's omophoria and the deacon's oraria was obvious. However, in the various Oriental non-Byzantine churches, confusions between the terminology used for different clergy's vestments were quite common: omophorion (of the bishops), the epitracheilion (of the priests), and the orarion (of the deacons).<sup>48</sup> It is quite imaginable they might have been confused in practice as well.

Looking ahead (cf. section 4.10), it may be noticed that this apostolic instruction about the omophorion relates well to the historical events alluded to in this apostolic collection: the entrance of Constans II into Rome in 663. One of the culminating scenes of the visit was the deposition of a bishop's omophorion (called with its standard Latin equivalent *pallium* in the *Liber pontificalis*) at the altar of St Peter's cathedral.

#### 2.4. *Twelve Apostles III*

After the insertion of the Pseudo-Pseudo-Dionysius fragment, the narration of the apostolic council in Jerusalem is resumed but quoting a different source (B 86 / P 204-205). The new fragment begins *ex abrupto* in a blatant contradiction with the final scene of the *Twelve Apostles II*: "And the twelve apostles placed their hands on James and prayed..." (возложиша руце оба на 10 апостола на иакова и помолишася); then follows a short consecration prayer, the beginning of which is similar to the prayer in the *Twelve Apostles II* for Paul, while the prayer itself is shorter and different. In this variant of the story, James is ordained with the Twelve, thus being inferior to them according to the principle of Heb 7:7 (τὸ ἑλάττω ὑπὸ τοῦ κρείττονος εὐλογεῖται).

Another difference compared with the *Twelve Apostles II* is the presence of the Theotokos: "There were there 8000 [thus in B; P: 50] brothers, and there was there the mother of the Lord the Theotokos" (ту быша братия 8000 и бе ту мати господня богородица). The difference in numbers is typical for the Cyrillic (where и with a diacritic means "8000," whereas the very similar letter н means "50"). The number 8000 seems to be genuine, because it would have been obtained by adding up the 3000 from Acts 2:41 and the 5000 from Acts 4:4.

<sup>47</sup> See H. Leclercq, "Omophorion," in *DACL*, t. XII/2, Paris, 1936, col. 2089-2090; J.-M. Fiey, "Les signes distinctifs anciens des prélats syriaques orientaux," in *Mélanges Antoine Guillaumont. Contributions à l'étude des christianismes orientaux*, Genève, 1988, p. 287-297, esp. p. 294-295 (on *ma'apra*), and especially K. C. Innemée, *Ecclesiastical Dress in the Medieval Near East*, Leiden, 1992, *passim*.

<sup>48</sup> Cf. *ibidem*, p. 41-42.

There are other differences with the two previous accounts of the apostolic council, including the date – this time, unconnected to the Pentecost and in a different year.

The consecration prayer does not appear to be archaic: at the end, it mentions the capacity of the consecrated bishop to anoint the king. It is still unknown when unction became a part of the coronation rite in Byzantium. At least, it is included in the coronation rite in the *Euchologium Barberini*, the name given to a manuscript of the second half of the eighth century,<sup>49</sup> which is the earliest *euchologion* available. It is very likely that the unction appeared at some date in the seventh century<sup>50</sup> introduced by one of the emperors struck by *damnatio memoriae*.

The apostolic council took place, this time, in the seventh year after the Ascension and on March 14. This date is referring to Nisan 14 as the feast and not to Good Friday. This is certainly an interesting reminiscence of the Quartodeciman tradition. The seventh year after the Ascension is mentioned in a Greek fragment of Evodius as the year of the lapidation of Stephanus.<sup>51</sup>

The ecclesiastical geography is explained in the account of establishing the episcopal sees. After the consecration of James, the Twelve consecrated six bishops to Damascus, Caesarea Philippi, Samaria [the town is meant: Samaria, alias Sebastia, Hebrew Shomron, famous for the martyrdom church of John the Baptist], Antioch (all these bishops pass unnamed), and Linus to Rome who was sent there together with Peter. Peter belonged to the Twelve, and so, he is not to be counted among these six bishops. However, including Linus, only five bishops (*via* their sees) are enumerated. One can suppose here an erroneous rendering of the Glagolitic number “5” via Cyrillic (that would result to “6”).

In this geography, Damascus became more important than Antioch. This is a clear mark of the Umayyad Caliphate, with its capital in Damascus (661–750), especially of the period before the 720s, when the caliphs in Damascus began to lose their power. The northern Palestinian towns Samaria and Caesarea Philippi became especially important in the same perspective, looking at Palestine from Damascus. Our document corroborates somewhat ambiguous data on Christian activity in Caesarea Philippi in the late eighth and the early ninth centuries.<sup>52</sup> With this geography, the *Twelve Apostles III* can confidently be dated to the second half of the seventh century and not later than the early

<sup>49</sup> S. Parenti, E. Velikovska, *L'eucologio Barberini gr. 336 (ff. 1-263)*, Seconda edizione riveduta, Rome, 2000, p. 178; for the date, see *ibidem*, p. 20.

<sup>50</sup> Cf. also L. Brubaker, *Vision and Meaning in Ninth-Century Byzantium: Image as Exegesis in the Homilies of Gregory of Nazianzus*, Cambridge, 1999, p. 187-188.

<sup>51</sup> In one of the two fragments of an unknown work attributed to Evodius quoted in Nicephorus Callistus Xanthopoulos (1268/1274–after 1328) in his *Historia ecclesiastica*, II, 3; PG 145, col. 757 C.

<sup>52</sup> J. F. Wilson, *Caesarea Philippi: Baniyas, the Lost City of Pan*, London, 2004, p. 114-120.

eighth century, and, what is especially important, its *Sitz im Leben* can be placed in the Umayyad Caliphate.

### 3. Evodius

#### 3.1. Evodius's Identity (and a Syriac *Vorlage*)

Evodius has been introduced to the reader at the very beginning of the florilegium: *евод бо блаженный приим стол святаго апостола. последнее жилище Божие* “Evodius the blessed who received the see of the holy apostle, the last abode of God” (B 81 / P 196). The name of the apostle is missing. The phrase “the last dwelling/abode of God” is highly problematic.

Once more, to clarify this obscure sentence, we must resort to retroversion into Syriac. In Syriac, the word that means “dwelling, abode” ܐܠܝܬܐ looks similarly to ܐܠܡܝܬܐ “city” (especially to a reader who would have forgotten that the former has no feminine suffix ܐ). However, the phrase ܐܠܡܝܬܐ ܐܠܠܗܐ “city of God” was the standard Syriac rendering of Θεούπολις, the only official name of Antioch since the winter of 528/529, which was used in a mandatory way in the titles of its bishops.<sup>53</sup> Thus, instead of the mysterious “dwelling/abode of God” we have to read ܐܠܡܝܬܐ ܐܠܠܗܐ, that is, Θεούπολις, Antioch.

Then, the word “last” must be understood as ܐܠܝܬܐ /*hritō*/, the feminine from ܐܠܝܬܐ /*hrinō*/ “another,” which has been mistakenly read as its nearly homograph ܐܠܡܝܬܐ /*hrōytō*/, the feminine from of ܐܠܝܬܐ /*hrōyō*/ “later, last” This refers to Antioch as “another” (and not “last”) city of God – obviously, after Jerusalem.

Therefore, the phrase should be restored as follows:

“Evodius the blessed who received the see of the holy apostle [Peter], another Theoupolis” (ܐܠܡܝܬܐ ܐܠܠܗܐ ܐܠܝܬܐ).

This sounds in harmony with the contents of the two Evodian fragments in our florilegium (where he indeed is the successor of Peter in Antioch), and, moreover, with Eusebius's notice about Evodius as the second bishop of Antioch after Peter (*Historia ecclesiastica* III, 22). The veneration of Evodius as the second bishop of Antioch and the immediate predecessor of Ignatius was widespread everywhere except for Egypt. In Egypt, taken aside a rare exception,

<sup>53</sup> The city's name was changed by order of Justinian shortly after the great earthquake on November 29, 528; see John Malalas, *Chronographia*, XVIII, 29; Ioannis Malalae, *Chronographia*, p. 371; cf. *The Chronicle of John Malalas*, p. 258, footnotes; the exact date of the earthquake is provided by Theophanis *Chronographia*, recensuit C. de Boor, 2 vols, Lipsiae, 1883–1885, vol. 1, p. 177–178. For the historical context, see E. Chrysos, “Eine Konjektur zu Johannes Malalas,” *Jahrbuch der Österreichischen Byzantinistik* 15, 1966, p. 147–152.



he also was venerated as Peter's successor, but in his function as bishop of Rome.<sup>54</sup> Beside three works, originally written in Coptic, two fragments from a unique letter with the incipit *Φῶς* ("Light") are ascribed to Evodius and quoted in Greek by Nicephorus Callistus Xanthopoulos; for him, Evodius is a successor (διάδοχος) of the apostles, but he did not name his see.<sup>55</sup> Nevertheless, for a Byzantine author, this see would have hardly been other than Antioch.

Evodius's name as the alleged author of an apostolic pseudepigraphon is rare, and the contents of our Evodius document, as we will see, is no less exceptional.

### 3.2. Three Fragments from a Single Source

The opening phrase dates the events to the very year of the Passion: "and after the Ascension of our Lord Jesus Christ, as the great Evodius writes in his holy books, when the apostles were gathered together, it is said [*this* *рече* is a usual calque of Greek *φησί*], at the upper place [*sc.*, the upper room in Sion], the Holy Spirit said unto them..." (по вознесении же господи нашего иисуса христа. яко же се [*се not in P*] великий еводий в святых своих книгах пишет глаголя, собранным рече апостолом на горнем месте рече к ним дух святыи...; В 86 / Р 208). The opening episode clearly describes the Pentecost, even though this is not explicitly stated.

The text continues with two breaks, both containing a promise "to say more about this later." It seems unlikely that these phrases are the work of the author himself, as an author would not place two similar phrases as close to each other as this. These breaks are thus better explained as inserted by a compiler.

The first break is placed after a description of Eucharistic customs: "...as we shall tell clearer elsewhere, but here let us go back to the previous" [*that is, to the liturgical topics*] (яко же инде скажем яснее. zde же на подлежащее възвратимся; В 87 / Р 206). The next text in our florilegium dealing with the Eucharist is the second fragment ascribed to Hippolytus of Rome. One cannot prove that the editor of Evodius has had exactly this text in mind.

The second break seems to be misplaced in our florilegium, but points with certitude to a larger compilation: after having mentioned the Lord's

<sup>54</sup> For the Coptic (and Copto-Arabic) dossier of Evodius, see A. Suci, *The Berlin-Strasbourg Apocryphon: A Coptic Apostolic Memoir*, Tübingen, 2017, esp. p. 102-105 *et passim*. "Evodius of Rome" is in the Coptic literature the author of at least two, but most probably three works: *On the Dormition of the Virgin* (CANT 133; clavis coptica 0151), *On the Passion 1* (clavis coptica 0149; the title with the author's name is lost; attributed to "Evodius of Rome" by indirect evidence), and *On the Passion 2* (CANT 81; clavis coptica 0150).

<sup>55</sup> *Historia ecclesiastica*, II, 3; PG 145, col. 757 B, 760 A, here col. 757 B. I am grateful to Alin Suci for drawing my attention to these fragments that are missing from CPG.

prophecy about the future success of the preaching of the twenty-four converted rhetors from Antioch, the editor added: "...as it, indeed, happened later, as we shall tell elsewhere in more details" (яко же и бысть последи. яко же инде скажем пространее; P 206) or "...as it indeed happened, as we shall tell later elsewhere in more details" (якоже и бысть. последи же инде скажем пространее; B 87). Probably, the two "elsewhere" of our editor refer to the lost part of a larger Syriac compilation, which also contained a fragment ascribed to the apostle Timotheus (cf. above, section 1.1).

### 3.3. Evodius, fr. 1: Ananias the Syrian as the First Bishop

The first fragment contains one scene and a liturgical commentary.

When, apparently at Pentecost, the Holy Spirit instructed the apostles to ordinate priests, build churches, and consecrate altars, Peter presented the first candidate for bishop, Ananias, who came from Antioch. He is especially worthy of consecration, Peter said, because he was a friend of Jesus and "very experienced in both Greek and Syriac languages" (хитре бо елиньский и сурский язык умеет; P 205, slightly different in B 86). The need for knowledge of Syriac would have been obvious for the intended audience. Such an exaltation of Ananias as the *first* Christian bishop and a beloved disciple of Jesus (clearly patterned after John the Theologian) seems to be unprecedented. Of course, it has nothing to do with the Byzantine traditions related to Ananias (cf. his *Passio*, BHG 75x-76a), but I do not know any parallel in Syriac or other Oriental documents either. Our document fits in with Syrian Petrine traditions where Peter's mission to Rome is used to demonstrate Rome's theological dependence on Antioch. This tradition can also be found in the *Acts of Peter* in the next section of our Slavonic compilation. It is distinct from a much more widespread tradition where Rome is placed under the leadership of Jerusalem, as it is in the *Twelve Apostles II* and many Byzantine sources.

### 3.4. Evodius, fr. 1: The Chalice Destined to Become the Holy Grail

After the account of Ananias's consecration, the author makes a digression about the liturgical life of the apostles before the institution of bishops and other clergy. They were using Jesus's funeral shroud "unfolded on the table/altar in the house of John called Mark at the upper place, where Jesus Christ ate with his disciples" (простираху на трапезе в дому иоанове. наречемаго марка на месте горнем. идеже Исус христос со ученики своими яде; B 86-87; almost the same text as in P 205). In this account, the upper room in Sion traditionally considered as the place of the Last Supper and the house of John the Theologian is confounded with another Jerusalem lodgement, the house of John Mark, which also was used for Eucharistic assemblies (Acts 12:12). This

identification of the houses implies identification of John the Theologian with John Mark.<sup>56</sup> The latter was closely connected with Peter, and therefore, our fragment indirectly establishes a supremacy of Peter over John the Theologian, which in the Syrian context would imply a supremacy of Antioch over Ephesus.<sup>57</sup>

The apostles gathered in this upper room during the night, with incense and candles, and chanted some psalms of David. After this chanting, they partook “of pure [*or* venerated?] breads and the golden chalice that Simon the Leper has had given to Jesus Christ, and the wine after having mixed (it) with warm water, as we shall tell clearer elsewhere” (чистыя [*this word is subtracted under the titlo and could be alternatively read as* честныя] хлеба и чашу златую. же бе дал симон прокаженный Исус христу. и растворивше с теплою водою вино. якоже инде скажем яснее; В 87 / Р 205-206, quote at 206). This sentence has a problematic syntax (the mixed wine is presented as separate from the chalice) and ends exactly at the end of fragment 1. The most likely explanation of this irregularity is that the last phrase (about the warm water) was inserted by the anti-Latin Byzantine editor. In 1054 and shortly after, the Byzantine rite of *zeon* (pouring the hot water into the consecrated chalice) was an important element of anti-Latin polemics.<sup>58</sup>

The most precious detail in this account is, in every sense of the word, the golden chalice. Its first feature is that it was preserved in the upper room of Sion, the location of the apostolic liturgical gatherings. The chalice of the Last Supper as preserved in Sion has a long tradition of its own.<sup>59</sup> Our text does not claim explicitly that the golden chalice was that of the Last Supper, but it seems to be implied in the presentation of the liturgical practices of the apostles between the Last Supper and the Pentecost in the upper room where the Last Supper had taken place.

<sup>56</sup> Historically untenable (cf. R. Bauckham, *Jesus and the Eyewitnesses: The Gospel as Eyewitness Testimony*, Grand Rapids, MI – Cambridge, 2006, *passim*, esp. p. 206, note 10) but quite widespread; cf. E. J. Bruns, “The Confusion between John and John Mark in Antiquity,” *Scripture* 17, 1965, p. 23-26.

<sup>57</sup> The part of John Mark’s dossier related to the *Acts of Barnabas* (CANT 285 = BHG 225) does not seem to be alluded to here.

<sup>58</sup> On the respective liturgical developments, see R. F. Taft, *A History of the Liturgy of St John Chrysostom*. Vol. 5. *The Precommunion Rites*, Rome, 2000, p. 441-502; A.S. Slutsky (A. С. Слуцкий), “Византийские литургические чины «Соединения Даров» и «Теплоты»: ранние славянские версии,” *Византийский временник* 65 (90), 2006, p. 126-145. The theological relevance of the rite of *zeon* for the Greco-Latin polemics has been first discovered by Lodewijk Herman Grondijs (1878–1961) in his 1941 dissertation; cf. his final publication on these theological topics: L. H. Grondijs, “Der Heilige Geist in den Schriften des Niketas Stethatos,” *Byzantinische Zeitschrift* 51, 1958, p. 329-354 (not mentioned in R. F. Taft, *A History of the Liturgy of St John Chrysostom*).

<sup>59</sup> See a detailed study in B. Lourié, “The Inscription on the Chalice of Solomon: A New Reading in the Light of New Textual and Liturgical Witnesses,” *Scrinium* 13, 2017, p. 170-198.

Indeed, this chalice is, in all branches of the tradition, precious. Nevertheless, in our particular case, the Sion chalice has other features that so far had not been attested in known documents of the first millennium: (1) this chalice belonged to Jesus personally, and (2) he acquired it as a gift from Simon the Leper. The earliest witnesses to these features known so far are the verse and prose recensions of the *Joseph d'Armathie* romance ascribed to Robert de Boron (otherwise known under the modern title *Le Roman de l'Estoire dou Graal*), approximately dated to 1200. This is already the second case where our Slavonic florilegium has a source in common with late twelfth-century French literature. The first case has been known since 1886: the *chanson de geste* dated to ca. 1190, *Aspremont*, which borrows from the seventh-century hagiographical dossier of St Pancratius of Tauromenium which overlaps with the *Acts of Peter* also found in our Slavonic florilegium (see below, section 4.5.3). This demonstrates that French authors at the time of the Third Crusade (1189–1192) had access to the seventh-century oriental hagiographical legends.

### 3.5. Excursus: Some Jerusalem Legends in the Grail Cycle

Here we limit ourselves to the immediate context of the chalice motif in the Grail cycle. The chalice first appeared in the prose and verse versions of *Joseph d'Armathie*. These are two distinct works with disputable mutual relationship, and the traditional attribution to Robert de Boron has been debated. The prose version is known in numerous manuscripts, whereas there is only one witness to the verse version. Probably, as Linda Gowans has argued based on new manuscript data, the prose version was penned by Robert de Boron, whereas the verse version was created later by "...a poet who in the course of his search for rhyme and scansion both expanded his original and at times undermined its narrative cohesion."<sup>60</sup> I will quote the prose version first.<sup>61</sup>

According to Robert de Boron's story, Jesus was arrested at the very place of the Last Supper. This place was not the Sion upper room but the house of Simon the Leper, implied to be located in Gethsemane. The tradition of the

<sup>60</sup> L. Gowans, "What did Robert de Boron really write?," in B. Wheeler (ed.), *Arthurian Studies in Honour of P. J. C. Field*, Cambridge, 2004, p. 15-28, at p. 27.

<sup>61</sup> According to the modern critical edition by Richard O'Gorman: Robert de Boron, *Joseph d'Armathie. A Critical Edition of the Verse and Prose Versions*, Toronto, 1995, with page numbers within the text. The much-commented passage corresponding to vv. 893-920 (p. 110; p. 111 for the prose version) is irrelevant for our purposes. As shown by R. Heinzel, *Über die französischen Gralromane*, Wien, 1891, p. 103 that passage is inspired by the Mediaeval Latin liturgical commentaries; cf. also R. O'Gorman, Robert de Boron, p. 361 (with further bibliography), and, especially, idem, "Ecclesiastical Tradition and the Holy Grail," *Australian Journal of French Studies* 6, 1969, p. 3-8, where he developed and criticised observations by Allen Cabaniss, "Joseph of Arimathea and a Chalice," *University of Mississippi Studies in English* 4, 1963, p. 61-67 [repr. in idem, *Liturgy and Literature: Selected Essays*, Tuscaloosa, AL, 1970, p. 109-113].

localisation of the Last Supper at the very place of the arrest in Gethsemane appeared no later than the early sixth century and continued to be known, at least, until the ninth century.<sup>62</sup> There is no source mentioning Simon the Leper as the owner of the Gethsemane house, but at least one early sixth-century Jerusalem source mentions that this alleged place of the Last Supper used to be occupied by sick people.<sup>63</sup> The fact that a source which attributes the Gethsemane house directly to Simon the Leper is still unknown, does not justify the view that all these details were invented by Robert de Boron.<sup>64</sup>

The relevant part of *Joseph d'Armathie* is now correctly considered as inspired mostly by the *Cura sanitatis Tiberii* (CANT 69; approximately 6<sup>th</sup> century) and the *Vindicta Salvatoris* (CANT 70; approximately 7<sup>th</sup> century).<sup>65</sup> These apocrypha, however, do not contain any motif related to the chalice.<sup>66</sup>

<sup>62</sup> See J. Wilkinson, *Jerusalem Pilgrims before the Crusades*, Warminster, 1977, p. 61 (*Breviarius to Jerusalem*, 7, only in form B; early 6<sup>th</sup> century), 66 (Theodosius, *The Topography of the Holy Land*, 10; before 518), and 144 (Bernard the Monk, *A Journey to the Holy Places and Babylon*, 13; ca. 870).

<sup>63</sup> *Breviarius*, 7, rec. B: "A basilica is there where at one time sick persons used to wash and be healed. <...> There too Judas betrayed our Lord Jesus Christ. There too is the place where the Lord had supper with his disciples and from which he went up onto the Mount" (Wilkinson's tr., *ibidem*, p. 61). These pilgrims' reports are witnesses of what they have been told by their guides. Possibly, some of these traditions reported by guides were exclusively oral.

<sup>64</sup> It became rather common in Arthurian scholarship to consider this literature as "imaginative" in the sense that its Christian legends would have been invented without any sources: cf. a manifesto of such an approach in R. Barber, "The Search of the Sources: The Case of the Grail," in N. J. Lacy (ed.), *A History of Arthurian Scholarship*, Cambridge, 2006, p. 19-36, esp. p. 36. Such attitudes are concomitant with a lack of knowledge of relevant hagiographical legends. Thus, no Grail scholar supposed that the scene with Jesus's arrest after the Last Supper on the spot and the role of Simon the Leper has had any background in the real sacred topography of Jerusalem, even though pilgrims' accounts were already widely known in the 19<sup>th</sup> century. Robert de Boron in his search for early Christian traditions underlying the Grail legends was working as a hagiographer and not as a modern author of fiction. He was obliged to look for the truth as verified by ancient hagiographical legends.

<sup>65</sup> See Gérard Gros dealing with Robert de Boron in his commentaries to his edition of the *Josephus* of the *Vulgate*: G. Gros, "Joseph d'Armathie. Notice," in Ph. Walter, D. Poirion (eds.), *Le Livre du Graal. I. Joseph d'Armathie. Merlin. Les Premiers Faits du roi Arthur*, Paris, 2001 (Bibliothèque de la Pléiade 476), p. 1665-1681, p. 1668; cf. already R. Heinzel, *Über die französischen Gralromane*, p. 102 (but Heinzel still did not know the *Cura sanitatis Tiberii* first published by Ernst von Dobschütz in 1899). Cf. also R. Gounelle, "Les origines littéraires de la légende de Véronique et de la Sainte Face: La *Cura sanitatis Tiberii* et la *Vindicta Salvatoris*," in A. Monaci Castagno (ed.), *Sacre impronte e oggetti. «non fatti da mano d'uomo» nelle religioni. Atti del Convegno Internazionale – Torino, 18-20 maggio 2010*, Alessandria, 2011, p. 231-251.

<sup>66</sup> Some scholars thought, however, that Robert de Boron followed the legend of the Mandylinion but changed its object into a vessel. See, most recently, D. Scavone, "Joseph of Arimathea, the Holy Grail, and the Edessa Icon," *Arthuriana* 9, 1999, p. 1-31, who failed to quote R. Heinzel, *Über die französischen Gralromane*, p. 102, where this hypothesis has already been formulated (among others).

As in our Evodius text, the chalice of the Last Supper belonged to Jesus. In *Joseph*, it is not stated explicitly that Simon the Leper gave it to Jesus, but it was used in Simon's house. Thus, Robert de Boron followed the same tradition. The most relevant passages are the following:

La ou Jesu fu pris chiés Simon si estoit laienz ses vessiaus la ou il sacrefoit. A la prise ot un Juif qui trova ce vaisel, si le prist... (p. 61).	Where Jesus was arrested, at Simon's [home], there was his vessel in which he had celebrated. At the arrest was present a Jew who found this vessel and took it...
Leenz eut un veissel mout gent Ou Criz feisoit son sacrement. Uns Juis le veissel trouva Chiés Symon, sel prit et garda, Car Jhesu fu d'ilec menez Et devant Pilate livreiz. (verses 395-400, p. 60)	There was a very elegant/costly vessel In which Christ had made his sacrament. One Jew found the vessel At Simon's [home], then, took it to himself and kept it, When Jesus has been taken out of there And brought before Pilate.

Then, this Jew gave the vessel to Pilate, and Pilate eventually gave it to Joseph of Arimathea. Passing the vessel to Joseph, Pilate stressed that the object belonged to Jesus: *...que je ne vel riens retenir de chose qui ce soe fust* (p. 73, 75) "...because I do not want to keep anything what was his"; *...qu'il o soe ne vouloit / Rien retenir qui Jhesu fust* (vv. 514-515, pp. 72, 74) "...because he did not want to keep with him anything what belonged to Jesus."

The existence of an apocryphal source behind these passages of *Joseph d'Armatheie* was first supposed by Evgenij Vasil'evich Anichkov (1866–1937) in an article<sup>67</sup> that has been completely rejected by the scholarly consensus almost immediately after its publication.<sup>68</sup> Not that it did not deserve it, but Anichkov's supposition of an apocryphon underlying this episode is now exactly confirmed.

Amongst the legends about the chalice of the Last Supper, there is no known text in which this chalice has been transmitted to Joseph of Arimathea, even though it is unlikely that Robert de Boron arbitrarily handed the chalice to Joseph. The Jerusalem hagiographical dossier of a vessel containing the blood issued from the dead body of Jesus is attested in a much-distorted form within the dossier of the martyr Baripsabas.<sup>69</sup> His martyrdom is preserved in very short

<sup>67</sup> E. Anitchkof, "Le Saint Graal et les rites eucharistiques," *Romania* 55, 1929, p. 175: "Cette version doit remonter à un apocryphe..." (concerning vv. 395-400 quoted above).

<sup>68</sup> The decisive voice was that of Myrrha Lot-Borodine (1882–1954): M. Lot-Borodine, "Autour du Saint Graal. À propos de travaux récents. II. Les Rites eucharistiques chez Robert le Boron et Chrétien de Troyes," *Romania* 57, 1931, p. 147-205.

<sup>69</sup> For his full hagiographic dossier, see B. Lourié, "John II of Jerusalem's Homily on the Encaenia of St Sion and Its Calendrical Background," in B. Outtier, C. B. Horn, B. Lourié, A. Ostrovsky (eds.), *Armenia between Byzantium and the Orient: Celebrating the Memory of Karen Yuzbashian (1927–2009)*, Leiden – Boston, 2019, p. 152-196, esp. p. 176-177 (with further bibliography).

summaries and references that contradict each other. The modest figure of the monk Baripsabas is paralleled in a more than modest kind of vessel he used for Jesus's blood, a pumpkin. Nevertheless, originally Baripsabas was, in Second Temple Jewish and Early Christian traditions, a deified High Priest (that is, God himself serving as a High Priest). His place in the actual Byzantine calendar, September 10, still refers to *Yom Kippur* (Tishri 10) and therefore to a ritual involving blood and performed exclusively by the High Priest. It seems that in the same manner as the divine High Priest devolved into a humble monk, his precious chalice, preceding the fate of Cinderella's carriage, turned into a pumpkin.

A Byzantine legend of Joseph of Arimathea keeping a vessel with Jesus's blood must have existed being an alternative to the legend of the martyr Baripsabas. The latter is available in scattered fragments, whereas the former is (still?) unattested.

### 3.6. Evodius, fr. 2: Twenty-Four Converted Rhetors

Fragment 2 contains an otherwise unknown elaboration on John 20:26. The Slavonic text is as follows (B 87 / P 206). After 7 (Cyrillic numeral) days, "all" were gathered for commemorating the Lord's resurrection, and "there was a doxology according to the rite of matins." "Because" (?)<sup>70</sup> the mother of the Lord together with John arrived, from John's house (cf. John 19:26), to the tomb, according to the custom. And there were also with them "...Mary of James and Salome, and Mary of Cleopas, and, with other women [to notice this typically Semitic concatenation of *wa* ("and")], 20 (Cyrillic numeral) virgins, who together remained (терпяще = ὑπομένοντες<sup>71</sup>) in prayers and supplications (молитвою и молением; cf. Heb 5:7: δεήσεις τε καὶ ἱκετηρίας). There were<sup>72</sup> 24 (Cyrillic numeral) renowned men (муж нарочитых), the rhetors who went from Antioch at the (Passover) feast to see Jesus (John 12:20: ἦσαν δὲ Ἑλλήνες τινες ἐκ τῶν ἀναβαινόντων ἵνα προσκυνήσωσιν ἐν τῇ ἑορτῇ) and to whom Jesus said the parable on the grain of wheat" (John 12:24, summarised in the Slavonic). "They were in the Jewish faith. They *came up to worship at the feast* (John 12:20) in Jerusalem." It is about them that the Lord said a prophecy about the success of their preaching (see above, section 3.2). Then, the citation suddenly

---

There is a commonly overlooked article on Baripsabas's cult in possible connexion with Grail legends: G. Mayer, "Parzival und der Hl. Varipsava. Zur Vorgeschichte der mittelalterlichen Gralsdichtungen," in M. Braun, E. Koschmieder (eds.), *Slawistische Studien zum V. Internationalen Slawistenkongress in Sofia*, Göttingen, 1963, p. 319-341.

<sup>70</sup> Slavonic has бо; this could mean that the following scene took place just before this gathering in an even earlier morning time.

<sup>71</sup> Cf. *LLP*, vol. 2, p. 501.

<sup>72</sup> The location is unspecified, but seems to have been near the tomb rather than at the apostolic gathering; P uses an archaic verbal form: бяхуть же ту; В бяху же ту.

stops, so that it remains unknown what happened between these rhetors and the females accompanying the mother of the Lord and John the Theologian.

The first observation to be made is the parallelism between this story and John 20:1-23, the early visit of women to the tomb preceding the Sunday gathering of the disciples. In John 20:26, this is followed by the gathering the next Sunday, but our text adds another visit to the tomb, by women and John, specifying that such visits became a custom. The wording in Slavonic – по 7 паки днии “after 7 days *again*” – reveals its dependence on John 20:26: καὶ μεθ’ ἡμέρας ὀκτὼ πάλιν. In the Slavonic, паки “again” is inexplicable if it is not the rendering of πάλιν in John 20:26. Of course, the number 7 is to be corrected into 8, being a typical error in transcription from Glagolitic into Cyrillic. Our fragment opens with the initial words of John 20:26 and adds a scene before the gathering with the assurance of Thomas.

The number of the rhetors looks symbolic, alluding to twenty-four priestly *mishmarot* (“courses”) in 1 Chr 24-26, and the same number of elders in Revelation 4:4.<sup>73</sup> It thus seems to be a correct rendering from Glagolitic (the usual correction of “45” instead of “24,” does not make sense). Twenty virgins together with four named women form another group of twenty-four, probably implying a connexion with the group of the twenty-four rhetors; this is another reason to assume that the numeral is correct (instead of “restoring” “20” to “40”).

The prophecy said by the Lord about the rhetors is recoverable. It is not the parable of the grain of wheat itself, but a somewhat different story reported by Epiphanius (*ca.* 376) without any reference to his source:

(7) With this child [*sc.*, Jesus] the blood of circumcision finally ceased to flow, as he says in the Gospel – when Greeks arrived to see him, approached Philip, and told him, “Show us Jesus,” and Philip told John [“*Andrew*” in John 12:22; *thus, in one manuscript, “John” erased, “Andrew” inserted in the margin*] and John [*once more, in the same manuscript, “John” erased, “Andrew” inserted in the margin*] told Jesus, “Certain Greeks desire to see thee.” [Cf. John 12:22]. (8) And the Lord replied at once, “Now hath come the glory of God (νῦν ἔφθασεν ἡ δόξα τοῦ θεοῦ),” to show that physical circumcision, which had served for a while as a type, was passing away, but that uncircumcision in the flesh possesses a greater circumcision in the spirit, since it sees Christ and has comprehended him in truth.<sup>74</sup>

<sup>73</sup> Perhaps another relevant parallel is *b. Berakhot* 55b: עשרים וארבעה פותרי חלומות היו בירושלים (“There were twenty-four dream interpreters in Jerusalem”).

<sup>74</sup> Epiphanius, *Panarion*, 30.27.7-8; Epiphanius, (*Ancoratus und Panarion*), hrsg. von K. Holl. Bd. I. *Ancoratus und Panarion Haer.* 1-33, Leipzig, 1915, p. 370-371; tr.: *The Panarion of Epiphanius of Salamis*, translated by F. Williams. Book I (Sects 1-46). Second Edition, Revised and Expanded, Leiden/Boston, 2009, p. 155-156. Unlike Epiphanius’s quotations from the texts that he considered heterodox, this passage is overlooked by the scholars; for instance, it is not mentioned by A. F. J. Klijn, *Jewish-Christian Gospel Tradition*, Leiden, 1992.



The prophecy “Now hath come the glory of God” is fitting with the Slavonic rendering in the indirect speech: “that through them the faith will propagate” (яко о [o *lost in B*] сих хотяше вера распространитися; P). This prophecy made clear why it was important that these people were Greeks. However, in Epiphanius, they were not converted to Judaism. The participation of John instead of Andrew is an important common feature with the story preserved in Slavonic, although the story in Slavonic is a continuation of the initial part of the story reported by Epiphanius.

### 3.7. Evodius, fr. 3: More than One Glagolitic Protograph

The last Evodius fragment is very short. It briefly mentions the success of apostolic preaching in Jerusalem, especially by Peter and, after him, John. For the compiler of the florilegium, this quotation would have been interesting as it takes Peter to Jerusalem.

The success consisted of a great number of baptisms and anointings. The number of converted people is 3000 in P but only 600 in B; in both cases, the numbers are not written down but designated with Cyrillic numerals. The number 600 is much less than expected, as in the New Testament Book of Acts conversions after preaching by the apostles are numbered only in thousands (e.g. Acts 2:41, 4:4); moreover, the number 3000 is known from Acts 2:41 and, therefore, must be genuine.

The confusion between “3000” and “600” is easily explainable in Glagolitic, where the respective letters, *glagoli* (Ѧ) and *xěrb* (Ѧ) look very similar. This fact is interesting in demonstrating that not the entire Cyrillic manuscript tradition of our work goes back to one Glagolitic protograph.

### 3.8. The Enigma of Evodius

Evodius is the most enigmatic author in our florilegium. It would be premature to pronounce on his *Sitz im Leben*, with the unique exception of an obvious statement that he was not only *a* Syrian but also *very* Syrian. We are unable to find any mark for dating.

## 4. Pseudo-Pseudo-Clementines, or *The Acts of Peter in Rome*

### 4.1. An Outline

The otherwise unknown *Acts of Peter in Rome* are allegedly written by “Pope Clement” (B 87 / P 206). This claim would be insufficient for justifying our title “Pseudo-Pseudo-Clementines” for the whole work. The attribution of Petrine apocrypha to Clement of Rome is of course quite common from the

earliest epoch onwards, but not all of these works are called Clementines, even “Pseudo.” The Pseudo-Clementines are, in modern scholarly usage, two large and mostly overlapping works: the *Recognitiones* completely preserved in a Latin version and the *Homiliae* preserved in the original Greek, and a great number of different epitomes in different languages.<sup>75</sup> We will see that our Slavonic text, although it does not belong directly to this vast library, presents itself as a continuation of the story. Its author impersonates the author already known as Pseudo-Clement and could thus be named Pseudo-Pseudo-Clement, author of the Pseudo-Pseudo-Clementines.

The text suddenly breaks off and contains, at least, one break within it. Below I divide the text into parts of uneven length but more or less even importance.

1. Peter in Rome in so far unsuccessful competition with Simon [obviously, the Magician] (B 87 / P 206).
2. Enumeration of Peter’s companions (B 87 / P 206).
3. Healing of Sophia and conversion of her relatives including the Emperor and, then, many ordinary people (B 87 / P 206-207).
4. Rite of catechumenate of Sophia’s husband (B 87 / P 207).
5. Peter’s victory over Simon (B 87 / P 207).
6. Building of the great church dedicated to the Theotokos and called Sophia (B 87-88 / P 207).
7. Peter places the relics of St Stephanus in the new church (B 88 / P 207-208).
8. Break between the fragments (B 88 / P 208).
9. Baptism of the population of Rome (B 88-90 / P 208-211).
  - 9.1. Peter’s catechesis on Easter Sunday (B 88 / P 208).
  - 9.2. Baptismal rite on the next day (B 88-89 / P 208-209).
  - 9.3. Long farewell sermon by Peter (B 89-90 / P 209-211).

This outline suggests that, unlike most of the pseudo-apostolic Acts, this text emphasises liturgics and sacred topography, which is always inseparable from hagiographical legends about relics and/or other sacred objects.

#### 4.2. A Syriac *Vorlage* and the Slavonic for “Basilica”

For this part of our florilegium, the main proof of the existence of a *Vorlage* in Syriac is that it follows a Syriac baptismal rite. The liturgical data will be analysed below (section 4.11). There are also two linguistic hallmarks pointing to a Syriac *Vorlage*.

---

<sup>75</sup> See the basic bibliography in the entry *CANT* 209.

Barankova already noticed (B 80) that the standard phrase “day of terrible (*i. e.* final) judgment” contains, in our text, an apparently unfitting word for “judgment”: в день страшнаго позору (B 89 / P 210), with позор (the normal range of meanings of which are θεωρία, θέατρον, ὄρασις, θρίαμβος<sup>76</sup>) instead of суд. This is a mistranslation from Syriac, where ܠܥܠܐ, having the literal meaning “open space” and, then, “market,” attained the meaning of the Ancient Greek ἀγορά (*forum*) as “place of assembly” and “court.”<sup>77</sup> However, in Byzantine Greek, the only meaning of ἀγορά remained “market.”<sup>78</sup> Therefore, the Byzantine Greek translator was deprived of the opportunity to use a word with an equivalent spectrum of meanings, although he grasped the general meaning of the Syriac phrase. It seems that he chose εἰς ἡμέραν τῆς θεωρίας or θεάτρον (as denoting an open place or the place of assembly) instead of the idiomatic εἰς ἡμέραν τῆς κρίσεως.

Another hallmark of Syriac is a strange phrase огласи в катихумен (P) that became simply огласив “having made (him) catechumen” in B (for the whole passage, see section 7.10.1). The reading of P is the *difficilior* one and certainly ancient, because it preserves the transliterated Greek term катихумен (κατηχούμενον), known elsewhere in Slavonic<sup>79</sup> but somewhat difficult for a Russian scribe. Nevertheless, the phrase in P is not smooth. One would expect here a *terminus technicus* ποιῆσαι κατηχούμενον “to make catechumen”<sup>80</sup> but not a construction with a conjunction (ἐν or εἰς rendered with в in Slavonic). The Slavonic verbs огласити and оглашати have no other meanings than κατηχεῖν or κατηχεῖσθαι.<sup>81</sup> Therefore, the Slavonic renders here a bizarre Greek pleonasm, where the cognate words κατήχησεν and κατηχούμενον were used with some conjunction between them. Such a construction, however, would have been natural in Syriac, where two different roots, *rt'* and *lmd*, were used for rendering the Greek words derived from κατηχεῖν in the meanings related to the Christian pre-baptismal rites.<sup>82</sup>

<sup>76</sup> LLP, vol. 2, p. 116.

<sup>77</sup> TS, col. 4102-4103, s.vv. ܠܥܠܐ and ܠܡܥܠܐ. Cf. English “forensic” derived from Latin *forum*.

<sup>78</sup> E. Trapp et alii, *Lexikon zur byzantinischen Gräzität besonders des 9.-12. Jahrhunderts*, 2 vols, Wien, 1994–2017, vol. 1, p. 12. For normal renderings of ἀγορά in Slavonic, see Гръцко-църковнославянски речник. Съставен от Иван Христов въз основа на Речника на църковнославянския език от архимандрит д-р Атанасий Бончев (Библиотека «Към изворите»), Света Гора, 2019, p. 30: eight synonyms (including купля, торг etc.) with general meaning “market” or “(market) place.” G. W. H. Lampe, *A Patristic Greek Lexicon*, Oxford, 1961, p. 23, still provides, beside the meaning “market-place,” one fifth-century example of the meaning “court” but encapsulated within the phrase δικαστικὴ ἀγορά “law-court.”

<sup>79</sup> LLP, vol. 2, p. 17.

<sup>80</sup> Cf. already in S. Parenti, E. Velikovska, *L'eucologio Barberini*, p. 119: Εὐχὴ εἰς τὸ ποιῆσαι κατηχούμενον.

<sup>81</sup> LLP, vol. 2, p. 511.

<sup>82</sup> TS, col. 1954 and 3993-3994.

There is another lexical peculiarity noticed by Barankova (B 80): the word полата, normally meaning “palace,” used as a synonym for “church”: созда великую ону полату. еже и донныне церковь есть в риме “she (Sophia) created that great *polata* which is until now a church in Rome” (B 88 / P 207). This could be understood – theoretically speaking – as a mistranslation from Syriac, but, in fact, this is certainly a difficult (but probably correct) case of translation from Greek. Indeed, in Syriac, the word ܥܠܡܐ having the meanings of both “palace” and “temple” was sometimes used for the church. Such an explanation, however, is useless for the present case. It is clear that the Slavonic renders here the Greek noun βασιλική in the meaning “basilica”<sup>83</sup> (going, in turn, to the Syriac loanword from Greek ܥܠܡܐ or ܥܠܡܐ), because, in the context, as we will demonstrate below, the *Sancta Maria Antiqua* basilica is meant.

#### 4.3. The Hagiographical Substrate of the Syriac Petrine Acts

There are four pseudo-apostolic compositions especially close to our *Acts of Peter*. One of them, the *Doctrina Simonis Petri in urbe Roma*, is important mostly for understanding the literary context of our Slavonic *Acts*, whereas the *Praedicatio Petri* (Arabic and Ethiopic) and the Pseudo-Clementine Epitome, are so close that they help to fill some lacunae in the Slavonic account which has been carelessly abridged in many places. Moreover, the hagiographical dossier of St Pancratius of Tauromenium (also a pseudo-apostolic legend) is close to our Slavonic *Acts* to the same extent as the other two.

All these legends belong to what Michel van Esbroeck called the hagiographical substrate<sup>84</sup> of our Slavonic *Acts*. Normally, hagiographical legends tend to express themselves using older legends assumed to be known to the target audience. These older legends form the hagiographical substrate of a new legend, or, in other words, they form the language in which this new legend speaks.

The hagiographical substrate is often multilayered. Thus, in our Slavonic *Acts*, the *Praedicatio Petri*, the Pseudo-Clementine Epitome, and St Pancratius’s dossier form the surface layer directly adjacent to our legend. They are older than our legend but belong to the same epoch, or, so-to-say, the same generation of pseudo-apostolic writings. The *Doctrina Simonis Petri* belongs to a deeper

<sup>83</sup> The dictionaries provide no Slavonic equivalent for βασιλική in the meaning “basilica”; cf. *Гръко-църковнославянски речник* and M. Argirovski (М. Аргировски) (ed.), *Речник на грчко-църковнословенски лексички паралели*, Skopje, 2003. The lack of a comparative base makes it impossible to evaluate the quality of the Slavonic translation of this term.

<sup>84</sup> M. van Esbroeck, “Le substrat hagiographique de la mission khazare de Constantin-Cyrille;” cf. my *Introduction to Critical Hagiography*, in Russian: В. Лурье (В. М. Лурье), *Введение в критическую агиографию*, St Petersburg, 2009.

layer, that is, to a previous generation of pseudo-apostolic writings (roughly fifth century). However, all these legends are remote successors of the earliest Petrine *Acts* (CANT 190: *Acta Petri primigenia*) dated to the second or third century. In the hagiographical substrate, the more recent a layer is, the more important it is for understanding the specific message of the legend under study. Thus, our attention will be focused on the most recent legends underlying our Slavonic *Acts*.

Our analysis below will go through two steps. The first is to define the *Sitz im Leben*, that is, the historical realm in which our Slavonic *Acts* were composed and to which they actually refer. The second is to recover the specific message of the legend, its *raison d'être*.

#### 4.3.1. *Doctrina Simonis Petri in urbe Roma*

The *Doctrina Simonis Petri in urbe Roma* (CANT 199 = BHO 936) dated to the fifth century, if not earlier, is preserved (and written) in Syriac. The text is published according to two later manuscripts,<sup>85</sup> whereas the earliest one (fifth century) contains some important variant readings but still waits for its editor.<sup>86</sup> This work influenced some Syriac writers of Petrine acts: at least, it was used as one of the sources for the Syriac *Acta Petri* CANT 200 (BHO 935).<sup>87</sup> Here, the Apostle Peter is preaching in Rome. Unlike in our Slavonic text, Peter has no companions. The plot is simplified to the very minimum but includes, nevertheless, the building of the first Christian church in the city, and, what is especially similar to our Slavonic text, rather long sermons by Peter are written down more or less *in extenso*. These sermons, however, have very little in common with those in our *Acts*. This work is interesting as it shows a pattern of what can be called homiletic Acts of Peter.

#### 4.3.2. *Praedicatio Petri* (Arabic and Ethiopic)

The most relevant work for the present study is substantially later and, therefore, belongs to the understudied domain of early medieval

<sup>85</sup> W. Cureton, *Ancient Syriac Documents Relative to the Earliest Establishment of Christianity in Edessa and the Neighbouring Countries, from the Year after Our Lord's Ascension to the Beginning of the Fourth Century*, London, 1864, p. 35-41 (Syriac pagination, text) / 35-41 (tr.).

<sup>86</sup> See M. van Esbroeck, "Le manuscrit syriaque nouvelle série 4 de Leningrad (V<sup>e</sup> siècle)," in *Mélanges Antoine Guillaumont. Contributions à l'étude des christianismes orientaux*, Genève, 1988, p. 211-219.

<sup>87</sup> F. Stanley Jones, "The History of Simon Cephas, the Chief of Apostles. Translation and Introduction," in T. Burke, B. Landau (eds.), *New Testament Apocrypha. More Noncanonical Scripts*, vol. 1, Grand Rapids, MI, 2016, p. 371-394, esp. p. 372 (here the date of the St Petersburg manuscript is indicated incorrectly as "6<sup>th</sup> cent.;" the author does not mention M. van Esbroeck, "Le manuscrit syriaque.").

pseudepigrapha.<sup>88</sup> It is preserved in four recensions. Two slightly different self-standing recensions in Arabic are both indexed under the number *CANT* 202, *Praedicatio Petri (arabice)*, and under the numbers of *BHO* 938 and 943.<sup>89</sup> Two other recensions belong to a long pseudo-apostolic composition *CANT* 205 agglomerated from seven different pieces and preserved in Arabic (karshuni, that is, written with the Syriac alphabet, *BHO* 951 b)<sup>90</sup> and Ethiopic (*BHO* 944-950, with a separate number for each of its seven parts);<sup>91</sup> the piece we are interested in is the fourth (*BHO* 947 for the Ethiopic).<sup>92</sup>

The great Bollandist Paul Peeters (1870–1950) was the last scholar who occupied himself with this almost forgotten “misérable rhapsodie”<sup>93</sup> as a whole. He argued that the whole “rhapsody” was created in Egypt and, probably, in Coptic. Among his arguments, there is one very convincing, based on a mistranslation in Arabic possible only from Coptic (where a “noble man” became a “gate keeper”), but it applies only to the self-standing recensions *CANT* 202 but not to the “bound” recension *BHO* 947, where the translation is correct. Moreover, the Syriac origin of the third part and even its background in the real sacred topography of Antioch has been demonstrated by Michel van Esbroeck in his study accompanying the publication of the earliest available recension of the story.<sup>94</sup>

<sup>88</sup> For 20<sup>th</sup>-century studies in medieval Petrine apocrypha, see G. Poupon, “Les ‘Actes de Pierre’ et leur remaniement,” in W. Haase (Hrsg.), *Religion (Vorkonstantinisches Christentum: Leben und Umwelt Jesu; Neues Testament [kanonische Schriften und Apokryphen], Schluss*), Berlin/New York, 1988, p. 4363-4383, esp. p. 4364-4367. Cf. E. Norelli, “Situation des apocryphes pétriniens,” *Apocrypha* 2, 1991, p. 31-83; J. N. Bremmer (ed.), *Apocryphal Acts of Peter: Magic, Miracles and Gnosticism*, Leuven, 1998; C. M. Thomas, *The Acts of Peter, Gospel Literature, and the Ancient Novel: Rewriting the Past*, Oxford, 2003. These studies are limited to the earliest Petrine apocrypha. Despite the title, nothing is said about the works we are interested in in the recent volume: R. Dijkstra (ed.), *The Early Reception and Appropriation of the Apostle Peter (60–800 CE): The Anchors of the Fisherman*, Leiden, 2020.

<sup>89</sup> *BHO* 938: M. Dunlop Gibson, *Apocrypha Sinaitica*, London/Cambridge, 1896, p. 56-62 (Arabic pagination, text) / 52-59 (tr.); *BHO* 943: A. Smith Lewis, *Acta Mythologica Apostolorum*, London/Cambridge, 1904, p. 179-184 (Arabic pagination, text) / 210-216 (tr.).

<sup>90</sup> Still unpublished. A detailed summary with long extracts in the karshuni original and German translation are provided by E. Sachau, *Verzeichniss der syrischen Handschriften*, Abt. 2., Berlin, 1899, p. 736-741 (Nr 243).

<sup>91</sup> E. A. Wallis Budge, *The Contendings*, vol. 1, p. 382-435 (text); vol. 2, p. 466-526 (tr.). The original subdivision of the Ethiopic version into eight chapters does not match that of Peeters.

<sup>92</sup> E. A. Wallis Budge, *The Contendings*, vol. 1, p. 416-420; vol. 2, p. 505-509.

<sup>93</sup> P. Peeters, “Notes sur la légende des apôtres S. Pierre et S. Paul dans la littérature syrienne,” *Analecta Bollandiana* 21, 1902, p. 121-140, here p. 136, note 4; another epithet he applied to this composition is “cet absurde farrago” (p. 138).

<sup>94</sup> M. van Esbroeck, “La légende des apôtres Pierre, Jean et Paul à Antioche.” Cf. a study of an exact topographical detail in the third-century *Recognitiones*: P. Liverani, “Pietro turista. La visita ad Arado secondo le Pseudo-Clementine,” in E. Dal Covolo, R. Fusco (a cura di), *Il contributo delle scienze storiche allo studio del Nuovo Testamento. Atti del Convegno. Roma, 2-6 ottobre 2002*, Città del Vaticano, 2005, p. 136-145.

One can add that the second part (*BHO* 945), being clearly one of dozens of epitomised accounts of the Pseudo-Clementine *Recognitiones* (as Peeters already noticed in *BHO*), has specific affinities with a Syriac epitome *CANT* 209.7.1, and, therefore, must go back to a Syriac *Vorlage*; this text will be examined in the next section (4.3.3). Thus, the Ethiopic legend *BHO* 947 and its Arabic predecessors (similar to *BHO* 938 and 943 and to the relevant part of *BHO* 951 b), still belong to the realm of Syriac hagiography even though they have been preserved in languages other than Syriac. The common archetype of these Arabic and Ethiopic recensions was written in Syriac. We designate it \*S. It will be important to us for understanding the plot of our Slavonic Acts (see below, section 4.4).

### 4.3.3. A Pseudo-Clementine Epitome and Its Historical Context

Our interest in the following text is motivated by the need to “recognise” the two brothers of Clement mentioned in our Slavonic text. Among the Pseudo-Clementine epitomes there is one known within the composition *CANT* 205 in Arabic and Ethiopic, which has some important affinities with our Slavonic text. The Ethiopic is a translation from Arabic, and the Arabic clearly is a translation from Syriac. The Syriac recension preserved in *CANT* 209.7.1 seems to be earlier than the *Vorlage* of the mentioned Arabic version.<sup>95</sup> The following considerations will of course be very preliminary, especially since there are several Arabic Pseudo-Clementine epitomes which are still unpublished and unstudied.<sup>96</sup>

The Syriac *Vorlage* of our epitome has been published twice (according to different manuscripts).<sup>97</sup> The Syriac preserves the original names of the male relatives of Clement (his father and two brothers), known from the *Homiliae* and the *Recognitiones*: Φαῦστος, Φαυστίνοϛ, and Φαυστιανός respectively, but changes his mother’s name Ματθιδία into Μητροδώρα (ܡܬܪܕܘܪܐ). The name Metrodora is specific to the whole Syriac tradition of the *Recognitiones* and the

<sup>95</sup> The entry *CANT* 209.7.1 does not mention the “bound” Arabic karshuni and Ethiopic versions which are dealt with in this section.

<sup>96</sup> Cf. the list of some manuscripts in Georg Graf, *Geschichte der christlichen arabischen Literatur*, Bd. I, Città del Vaticano, 1944, p. 304. Cf. M. van Esbroeck, “Incidence des versions arabes chrétiennes pour la reconstitution des textes perdus,” in G. Contamine (ed.), *Traduction et traducteurs au Moyen Âge. Actes du colloque international du Centre national de la recherche scientifique / Institut de recherche et d’histoire des textes*, 26-28 mai 1986, Paris, 1989, p. 133-143, and A. Bausi, “Alcune osservazioni sul *Gadla ḥawāryāt*,” *Istituto universitario orientale [di Napoli]. Annali* 60-61, 2000–2001, p. 77-114, esp. p. 106 in our text (labelled here Pt 3 and called “un testimone importante della letteratura pseudo-clementina”).

<sup>97</sup> P. Bedjan, *Acta martyrum et sanctorum*, vol. 6, Parisii/Lipsiae, 1896, p. 1-17; A. Mingana, “Some Early Judaeo-Christian Documents in the John Rylands Library,” *Bulletin of the John Rylands University Library of Manchester* 4, 1917–1918, p. 59-118, esp. 90-108 (text), 66-76 (tr.).

*Homiliae* and appeared already in the text of the complete Syriac version.<sup>98</sup> It has been preserved in the Arabic and Ethiopic versions of this particular epitome, although many other epitomes use other names for this woman.

The Arabic and Ethiopic versions, however, provide different names for the male relatives of Clement. In the Arabic karshuni,<sup>99</sup> we find the same female name as in the Syriac (distorted to ܡܪܝܡܐ, and, in another place, ܡܪܝܡܐ), but the male names have been changed: the two brothers of Clement are named ܩܨܬܝܢ *qstyn* (Κώνστας) and ܩܨܬܢܬܝܢ *qstntyn* (Κωνσταντῖνος). The father acquired here a derived and probably fictitious name ܩܨܬܩܘܨ *qstqws* (\*Κώνστακος?<sup>100</sup>). What is important, all the three male names, even after having been changed, continue to be derived from the same root, as were Faustus, Faustinus, and Faustianus.

In another Arabic manuscript (regular, not karshuni), partially published by Paul de Lagarde,<sup>101</sup> the situation is the same. The names of Clement's two brothers are ܩܨܬܝܢ *qsts* and ܩܨܬܢܬܝܢ *qstntyns* or ܩܨܬܢܬܝܢ *qstntyn*, which de Lagarde interpreted as Constans and Constantine. The father's name is severely grabbed: ܩܨܬܩܘܨ *hrstws* or ܩܨܬܩܘܨ *grstws*. Paul de Lagarde provided a reconstruction of the father's name in three steps:<sup>102</sup> (1) both Arabic forms were further distortions of ܩܨܬܩܘܨ; this, in turn, was (2) a transliteration of *Serṭō* Syriac ܩܨܬܩܘܨ, the latter being (3) a distortion of ܩܨܬܩܘܨ. Thus, de Lagarde reconstructed the father's name as Constans, the same name as a son, but this time written with full spelling, containing all *matres lectionis*: ܩܨܬܩܘܨ. Two Constanses, even with different spellings, is an unlikely result, because both later epitomes and their ancient Pseudo-Clementine sources rendered these three names distinctly, although very similar. Now, taking the karshuni reading into account, the fourth step can be made by recognising in *Serṭō* Syriac ܩܨܬܩܘܨ *qwsṭws* a distortion of ܩܨܬܩܘܨ *qwsṭqs* (\*Κώνστακος?).

<sup>98</sup> Clementis Romani *Recognitiones syriace*. Ed. P. A. de Lagarde, Lipsiae – Londini, 1861, p. 149.19 (Syriac pagination) etc.; W. Frankenberg, *Die Syrische Clementinen mit griechischem Paralleltext. Eine vorarbeit zu dem literargeschichtlichen Problem der Sammlung*, Leipzig, 1937, p. 294.5 etc. Here the spelling is less correct, omitting the second consonant *yōḏ* (ܡܪܝܡܐܐ); thus, the modern translator reads *Matradora*; see J. G. Gebhardt, *The Syriac Clementine Recognitions and Homilies. The First Complete Translation of the Text*, Nashville, TN, 2014, p. 152 etc., but Frankenberg restored Greek name as Μητροδώρα (W. Frankenberg, *Die Syrische Clementinen*, p. 295.5 etc.).

<sup>99</sup> E. Sachau, *Verzeichniss*, p. 736-738.

<sup>100</sup> This name does not occur in the Byzantine documents. However, the very similar name Κωνστάκης occurs twice in the early 14<sup>th</sup> century (*PLP* 14108 and 14109). The existence of the name \*Κώνστακος in Middle Byzantine vernacular Greek is possible.

<sup>101</sup> P. de Lagarde, "Noch einmal die Schatzhöhle," in *idem, Mittheilungen*, Bd. 4, Göttingen, 1891, p. 6-16, esp. 12-15 (text), 15-16 (commentary).

<sup>102</sup> *Ibidem*, p. 16.



The Ethiopic largely preserved the same names for Clements' relatives, although the strange name *qstqws* disappeared, and the father remained unnamed. All other names are preserved perfectly. The mother's name is 𐩨𐩣𐩪𐩬𐩪𐩥𐩰: /*mätrodora*/, the brothers' names are 𐩧𐩬𐩪𐩥𐩰: /*qostos*/ and 𐩧𐩬𐩪𐩥𐩰𐩪𐩥𐩰: /*qestāntinos*/.

Is this name change simply a result of a habitual confusion between *f* (ف) and *q* (ق) in Arabic mediaeval manuscripts (which is possible also in Syriac, especially in *Sertō* writing, although less likely) or a deliberate change? Paul de Lagarde opted for a confusion in the Arabic.<sup>103</sup> This is not plausible, however, due to the specific changes in the father's name. His original name Faustus was changed into Constans and given to his elder son. Another son, Faustinus, became Constantine. The remaining name Faustinus was left for the father, a longer name instead of the shortest name he had in the original Pseudo-Clementine romance. The father's new name in the Arabic manuscripts must thus have been longer than Constans as reconstructed by de Lagarde. Far from being a multiple random error, the changes of the three names reveal a deliberate system.

Indeed, it would have hardly been otherwise, taking into consideration that Constans and Constantine reflect the strikingly recognisable pair of names of the two co-emperors from 654 to 668, Κώνστας and Κωνσταντῖνος: Constans II (reigning years: 641–668) and his son Constantine IV (reigning years: 654–685). More exactly, these two co-emperors were ruling as a pair only until 659, when two more co-emperors were proclaimed, Tiberius and Heraclius (but only the senior emperor ruled *de facto*: at first Constans II and after he was killed, Constantine IV). Constans II's father was Constantine III, who had reigned for four months in 641 before dying. Thus, all three imperial names were derived from the same root. The editor responsible for the lost Syriac original of our Arabic and Ethiopic recensions did not allow two Constantines in one legend, but provided slightly different names.

It is difficult not to see a propagandistic tool in the edited epitome. Constans II, officially acting together with his son on behalf of the two co-emperors, was between 653 and 657 on the cutting edge of his struggle with Rome trying to convince the Pope of the monothelete "right faith" of his edict *Typos* (648).

The main events can be recalled as follows. In 649, the *Typos* was anathematised by the Lateran Council under Pope Martin. On 17 June 653, Martin and Maximus the Confessor were arrested in Lateran and brought to Constantinople. In 654 Martin was condemned to exile. The new Pope Eugene I was elected when Martin was alive. Eugene's legates, acting on behalf of the Pope, entered into communion with the patriarch of Constantinople and the

<sup>103</sup> *Ibidem*, p. 16.

Emperor, thus performing the very same action that Martin and Maximus considered as falling into heresy. They preferred to be tortured rather than to enter into Eucharistic communion with the Patriarch and the Emperor. The Pope was reluctant to proclaim Monotheletism openly in Rome. He died in 657, two years after his predecessor Martin, who had died in Chersonesus in 655. Maximus and his two disciples were exiled to Thrace after a long trial (653–655). Maximus and his circle continued to be an influential opponent of Monotheletism even from there. Patriarch Paul of Constantinople died in 653, and the next Patriarch Pyrrhus died almost as soon as he was appointed. The new patriarch elected in 654 was called Peter (654–666). The legates of the newly elected Pope Vitalian (657) entered into communion with the Patriarch and the Emperor. The Emperor presented Vitalian with a luxury liturgical gospel. This gift is an extraordinary gesture<sup>104</sup> to be understood as teaching in faith (see below, section 4.5.3). Vitalian's attitude toward Monotheletism continued to be ambiguous until Constans II's visit to Rome in 663. His being in Eucharistic communion with the monothelete Patriarch and Emperor was sufficient for severing himself from the Church of Pope Martin and Maximus the Confessor, but it was insufficient by a long way for firmly establishing Monotheletism in the Patriarchate of Rome.

The legend can now be read as it would have been understood in the actual context of the 650s. The first bishop Peter together with his assistants Constans and Constantine goes to Rome for teaching the right faith. Such an exact parallel to Patriarch Peter, Constans II, and Constantine IV looked natural, because Clement of Rome was traditionally considered as an imperial relative (see below, section 4.5.2). Clement's brothers were thought to be real ancestors of the present co-emperors. The choice for the names Constans and Constantine, the former being relatively rare, points certainly to the period of 654 to 659. Our Slavonic legend applied similar (monothelete) but not imperial propaganda to the situation of the 660s.

---

<sup>104</sup> This was certainly not a "diplomatic gift" without any confessional message, *pace* Andrew J. Ekonomou, *Byzantine Rome and the Greek Popes: Eastern Influences on Rome and the Papacy from Gregory the Great to Zacharias, A.D. 590–752*, Lanham, 2007, p. 162 and 184, note 35. As a support for this view, the author refers to J. Lowden, "The Luxury Book as Diplomatic Gift," in J. Shepard, S. Franklin (eds.), *Byzantine Diplomacy. Papers from the Twenty-fourth Spring Symposium of Byzantine Studies, Cambridge, March 1990*, Aldershot/Brookfield, VT, 1992, p. 249–260, who, however, concluded that "...only in most unusual circumstances, we may judge, was an illustrated book considered appropriate as a diplomatic gift" (*ibidem*, p. 260). Lowden did not mention the gospel sent by Constans II to Vitalian. The case of such an enthronisation gift to the Pope (or any other pontiff) is unique.

#### 4.4. Narrative Pattern

The Slavonic narrative sometimes looks as a careless retelling, omitting important details which later in the story are treated as if they have been told. This effect could be explained as either negligent use of an earlier source by the author himself or as the result of later editing. Byzantine editing is clearly perceptible in the description of the baptismal rite (see below, section 4.11). The plot of our Slavonic *Acts* can be summarised and compared with its Syriac archetype (\*S) as follows (Table 1).

Table 1

Slavonic <i>Acts of Peter</i>	*S
Peter has nowhere to stay (не бе петрови где обитати; B 87 / P 206). The problem was posed but it was never said where Peter eventually stayed.	Peter is homeless in Rome. A girl and her father invited him to their rich home.
<p>A confused account of a scene between the Emperor and Peter; mentioned are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>the healing of Sophia (from an unnamed disease),</li> <li>her husband and his rank of синклит (συγκλητικός),</li> <li>some kind of demonstration of Peter's "power" before the Emperor (the wording goes back to the <i>Acta Petri primigenia</i>, CANT 190, the scenes of the competition with Simon the Magician). At this place, the earliest <i>Acts</i> CANT 190 deal with the resurrection of a dead person, and *S specified that it was the son of the Emperor himself who was brought back to life.</li> <li>No mention of the Emperor's son, but instead Sophia herself became a relative of the Emperor (цесарска рода; B 87 / P 207).</li> </ul>	<p>Peter healed the unnamed daughter of a noble man from leprosy. She had contracted that disease at the very moment of entering into the house of her husband after the completion of their wedding ceremony, which forced her to return to her father's home. Her unnamed husband was a member of nobility.</p> <p>After the healed woman introduced Peter to the Emperor, the apostle resurrected his son. The Emperor converted.</p>
The first church in Rome was built by Sophia. The place is not specified, but judging from the context, it must have been located on the Palatine Hill; the account tends to preserve the unity of place: the Palatine and the River Tiber nearby.	The first church in Rome was built in the house of the father of the healed woman. This episode is attested by the recensions in miscellanies, but missing in the self-standing versions.
Baptism of the whole city of Rome described to the smallest details.	Baptism of the whole city of Rome, described with liturgical details.

The scene between Peter and the Emperor (unnamed in both Slavonic and \*S) requires a more detailed analysis. It is difficult to provide an exact translation, because the consequence of the events is not always obvious. The quotation below follows P taking into account significant variant readings from B:

слышав о нас кесарь. посла [B присла] петрови претя ему сурово. не учити ему о имени исус [исус *omitted in P*] христове. смущаеши рече град. егда бо и софию от недуга въстави петр. яже [P *has erroneous* иже] бе цесарска роду. рече же цесарь. аще имаши кую силу яви ю. егда же ю исцели. приде ту цесарь ея ради. и муж ея синклит саном на [B *erroneously omits* на] чудо. (B 87 / P 206-207).

When the Emperor heard about us, he sent to Peter forbidding him harshly to teach about the name of Jesus Christ “You create a trouble, he said, in the city.” Because (?) when Peter raised Sophia from the disease, – she belonged to Emperor’s family, – while (?) the Emperor said: “If you have any power, make it shown.” But when (Peter) healed her, then the Emperor arrived there (? where?) because of her, and her husband (who was) a *synklitikos* by the rank for the miracle.

It seems that the events could be recovered as following: the Emperor forbade Peter to preach, but, then a situation occurred in which Peter was asked by the Emperor to make “his” power shown by healing Sophia, not his son but his relative. The text does not make it explicit whether the Emperor was present at the scene at the moment of healing or whether he arrived after it. If he was present, as is the case throughout the earlier Petrine apocrypha, then the next приде “arrived” must be understood in the meaning “joined Peter’s flock”. The general meaning is understandable but the text as it now stands is far from well written. Possibly, it was corrupted by either translators or editors.

The location of the church in our text will be discussed below (sections 4.6 and 4.7). In \*S, it is placed in the house of the father of the healed woman who was a relative of the Emperor. Thus, the place implied is an estate belonging to the imperial family. The karshuni recension provides, in the context of the establishment of this church, the father’s personal name ܐܪܥܘܦܐܝܘܨ<sup>105</sup>, that is clearly “Areopagus” (from Ἀρειος πάγος, not “Areopagites”). The Ethiopic, in the same context, provides his name as አወፋሪኮስ<sup>106</sup> /äwäfrikos/, which suggests that the Ethiopian translator read in his Arabic original (in the Arabic writing, not karshuni) something similar to اوفريكوس. This name looks as a distortion of مركينوس *mrkynws*, that is, Μαρκιανός “Marcian,” where the somewhat unexpected *k* instead of *q* most likely reveals a frequent misreading in Syriac *Serṭō*: ܣܪܬܐ read as ܣܪܬܐ.

<sup>105</sup> E. Sachau, *Verzeichniss*, p. 739.

<sup>106</sup> E. A. Wallis Budge, *Contendings*, vol. 2, p. 420.

The early documents make no reference to a disciple of Peter with the name Marcian, but such a disciple appeared in the seventh century as the first bishop of Syracuse: St Marcian. Peter himself had consecrated him in Antioch for Sicily. He features in our Slavonic legend (see below, section 4.5.4). Therefore, the Ethiopic version provides an additional proof of a connexion between the hagiographical tradition of \*S and the Slavonic *Acts of Peter*. In comparison with the archetype, the name of Marcian is a later and, strictly speaking, incorrect replacement of a personal name that became incomprehensible. However, this addition still kept the story in its original network of hagiographical legends representing the aspirations of a Syrian monothelete or monophysite milieu. The editor responsible for introducing “Marcian” (in either Syriac or Arabic) must have been sure that, at least, he took this name from the right basket. The name Areopagus, being a *lectio difficilior*, sounds much more authentic and can be attributed to \*S. In hagiography, personal names and toponyms are interchangeable. It can thus be assumed that this father’s name is a toponym referring to some place in Rome. This topographical indication should be taken seriously, given that the *Passions épiques*, using fictitious characters and placing them into a remote past, always deal with the political geo- and topography of their own time.<sup>107</sup>

From a linguistic point of view, this place should be the *Campus Martius*. However, this point of view is not the most adequate. In the Athens of the apostolic acts, canonical and non-canonical, the Areopagus is the main place of the city and, thus, an equivalent of the *Forum Romanum* rather than of the *Campus Martius* situated on the opposite side from the Capitoline Hill. In seventh-century Rome, *Campus Martius* became the place where the largest part of the Roman population lived – due to the accessibility of water from the Tiber, while the aqueducts that supplied other parts of the city with water were destroyed by barbarian invasions. Given that the name of the father of the healed woman actually refers to the place of the first Christian church in Rome, it must refer rather to the *Forum Romanum* than to a common building area. We will see (section 4.7) that this localisation is not as unhistorical as it might seem. It is corroborated with both our Slavonic *Acts* and with the history of Byzantine Rome immediately after the Empire brought it back from the Goths.

A description of the baptismal rite in its liturgical details is a usual feature of pseudo-apostolic Acts. The description in the text under discussion is exceptionally detailed and comparable even to the earliest (pre-fourth century) *Acts of Thomas* (CANT 245). In \*S, this section is short but curious: Peter was

<sup>107</sup> Cf. M. van Esbroeck, “La légende des apôtres Pierre, Jean et Paul à Antioche,” on the sacred topography of Antioch. The seminal theoretical study of the validity of geographical markers in the hagiographical legends is H. Delehay, *Cinq leçons sur la méthode hagiographique*, Bruxelles, 1934, p. 7-17 (ch. I, “Les coordonnées hagiographiques”). For more details, see my “Introduction to the Critical Hagiography”: B. Lourié (B. M. Лурье), *Введение в критическую агиографию*.

not able to baptise the people one by one because of their number; therefore, he sprinkled some water on them, “and on whomsoever one drop fell, he was baptised.”<sup>108</sup>

The scenes where Simon the Magician is involved are reduced to such an extent that they could have been inspired by almost any work of the earlier tradition, and it is impossible to point out their specific source.

#### 4.5. Peter's Companions

Peter's companions are mentioned at the very beginning but do not feature in the story, except for Clement who is the narrator and Linus who makes an appearance (see section 4.11.1). This does not make them less important. All of them are *virī apostolici* who established the hierarchy of the church by occupying the sees of Rome (Linus and Clement himself), Antioch (Ignatius), and Taormina / Tauromenium in Sicily (Pancratius). For our legend, the respective sees are at least equal to Rome (Antioch is in fact, considered to be higher). It is not surprising that in most of the different *Acts of Peter*, he goes to preach in Rome being alone, sometimes after having demonstratively said farewell to other apostles. Our Slavonic story where Peter enters Rome with companions is an exception.

The list of Peter's companions is as follows: аз климент вкупе. обема братама со мною. и лин епископ и панкрат бывшии последи в таврономии (P) / тавремении (B) епископ с другом. игнат унии последи и патриарх антиохийский “I, Clement, together with the two brothers with me, and Linus the bishop, and Pancratius who would later become bishop in Tauromenium, with a friend, the young Ignatius, who (would be) later the patriarch of Antioch” (P 206; text in B 87 is almost the same). In this group, only Linus does not require any comments.

Three persons remain unnamed: the two brothers of Clement and the friend of Pancratius. The reason is rather obvious: for being named within this list, one has to represent an ecclesiastical see comparable with Rome. The ecclesiological-political message of our legend is clearly about Rome's appropriate place in respect to Antioch and Sicily. For this reason, companions without a relevant church office remain unnamed. The fact that they are mentioned at all in this legend must be for specific reasons.

##### 4.5.1. Clement's Two Brothers

It is now clear that the Clement of our legend took his two brothers from the Pseudo-Clementines. It remains to be seen what their purpose is and to

---

<sup>108</sup> Translation by M. D. Gibson, *Apocrypha Sinaitica*, p. 59.

which of the different types of Pseudo-Clementine legends it relates. Clement's brothers have no activity nor personal names, nor any other features. The two brothers are present exclusively as a Pseudo-Clementine library stamp. Apparently, our legend has no particular connexion to the Pseudo-Clementines, but we already know that there is a connexion behind the scene. Both our legend's main prototype (see above, sections 4.3.2 and 4.4) and a Pseudo-Clementine epitome (section 4.3.3) are parts of a long pseudo-apostolic compilation (*CANT* 205), which is preserved in Arabic and Ethiopic but has been produced in Syriac. This is reason enough to attribute to the two brothers the names Constans and Constantine rather than Faustinus and Faustianus.

Our legend is also clearly monothelete and datable to the reign of Constans II. This statement can be made without a detailed analysis (which nevertheless will be provided below), because the presence of Pancratius reveals the ecclesiastical status of Sicily, which existed during the short time when the imperial capital *de facto* was there, from 663 to 668. Thus, based on its Church political contents, our legend was a continuation of the Pseudo-Clementine epitome from *CANT* 205. The latter was dealing with the situation of the mid-650s, whereas the present legend deals with that of the mid-660s, thus being a veritable continuation of the message written in the symbolical language of hagiography. Both legends support Constans II in his enlightening of Rome with the Orthodox (monothelete) faith. In this context, the Pseudo-Clementine affiliation, implicitly referring to Constans II in person, was a loyalty indicator and an equivalent of the note "Continued. See the beginning in the previous number" in a modern magazine.

All this said, the coordinate system in the Slavonic legend is different from that of our Pseudo-Clementine epitome: its origin is located not in Constantinople (represented by the names of the two co-emperors in the epitome) but in Antioch (represented by Ignatius, see below, section 4.5.5). The Slavonic legend is also a piece of propaganda, but its main interested party is the Syrians (with their patriarchate of Antioch), rather than the Emperor as in the epitome.

#### 4.5.2. Clement, Clement's Uncle and Aunt

It was "common knowledge" in early mediaeval Christianity that Clement of Rome belonged to the imperial family of Flavii. Most often, however, his degree of relation remained unspecified. Our Slavonic text, on the contrary, is precise: a *synkletikos*, the husband of Sophia who was a relative of the Emperor, was Clement's paternal uncle (сґрыи; В 87 / Р 207). Putting, for the time being, Sophia's peculiar name aside (see below, section 4.7), a familiar *topos* of early Christian hagiography can be seen: Clement of Rome in kinship with Christian martyr consul Flavius Clemens (AD 60–95, consul in 95 shortly before having been executed by Domitianus) and his wife Christian confessor

Flavia Domitilla (64–early 2<sup>nd</sup> century). The later identification of these two Clements had not yet taken place; it became common from the second half of the first millennium.<sup>109</sup>

Historically, consul Flavius Clemens was a great-nephew of Emperor Vespasianus and a son of a cousin of Emperor Domitianus. His wife Flavia Domitilla<sup>110</sup> was a niece of Emperor Domitianus (and thus a grandniece of Vespasianus).<sup>111</sup> According to a short but detailed account by Dion Cassius in the *Historia Romana*, 67.14 (early third century), Flavius Clemens and Flavia Domitilla were convicted of “atheism, a charge on which many others who drifted into Jewish ways were condemned (ἐγκλημα ἀθεότητος, ὅφ’ ἦς καὶ ἄλλοι ἐξ τῶν Ἰουδαίων ἦθη ἐξοκέλλοντες πολλοὶ κατεδικάσθησαν).”<sup>112</sup> Flavius Clemens was decapitated; Flavia Domitilla was exiled to the Pontine Islands (about 120 km from Rome, at the time three days sailing from Rome’s port Portus), the usual place of exile for Roman nobility, where she died after many years.

Dion Cassius’s data were known to Byzantine learned men (after all, we read Dion Cassius only in extracts made by them) but normally were uninteresting for hagiographers. The hagiographers were trying to keep up with rapidly growing cults of Domitilla and Clement of Rome. The cult of the holy Pope of Rome, who has never been mentioned as a martyr in the earliest sources, first captured Flavius Clement in its orbit, and then, absorbed him definitively.<sup>113</sup>

The cult of Domitilla was developed in several directions, both under her own name and, since the late fifth century, with the name of the holy martyr

<sup>109</sup> For the hagiographical dossier of Clement of Rome in respect to his connexion to the Flavii, see B. Pouderon, “Clément de Rome, Flavius Clemens et le Clément juif,” in Ph. Luisier (ed.), *Studi su Clemente Romano. Atti degli incontri in Roma, 19 marzo e 22 novembre 2001*, Roma, 2003, p. 196-218. For his hagiographical dossier as a whole, see H. Delehaye, *Étude sur le légendier romain. Les saints de novembre et de décembre*, Bruxelles, 1936, p. 96-116; C. Lanéry, “Hagiographie d’Italie (300-550) – I. Les Passions latines composées en Italie,” in G. Philippart (sous la direction de), *Hagiographies. Histoire internationale de la littérature hagiographique latine et vernaculaire en Occident des origines à 1550*, vol. 5, Turnhout, 2010, p. 15-369, esp. 88-96; M. Lapidge, *The Roman Martyrs: Introduction, Translations, and Commentary*, Oxford, 2018, p. 165-179.

<sup>110</sup> She was the third Flavia Domitilla in the family, after her grandmother and mother: the spouse of Vespasianus Flavia Domitilla I and her daughter Flavia Domitilla II.

<sup>111</sup> For the historical data, see esp. G. Townend, “Some Flavian Connections,” *The Journal of Roman Studies* 51, 1961, p. 54-62. For the persecution of Flavius Clemens and Flavia Domitilla by Domitianus, see also P. Pergola, “La condamnation des Flaviens ‘chrétiens’ sous Domitien : persécution religieuse ou répression à caractère politique?,” *Mélanges de l’École française de Rome. Antiquité* 90, 1978, p. 407-423.

<sup>112</sup> *Dio’s Roman History*, with an English Translation by E. Cary, vol. 8, Cambridge, MA, 1925, p. 348 (text) / 349 (tr.).

<sup>113</sup> Bernard Pouderon (“Clément de Rome”) thinks that the reason was a strong Jewish-Christian connexion of Flavius Clemens, but I doubt that, in early second-century Rome, there would have been a Christian group to which such a connexion was feeble.



Anastasia the Widow.<sup>114</sup> Domitilla was venerated as an ascetic saint. In the late fourth century, the *cellulae* in the island of the *Pontia* where Flavia Domitilla “underwent a long martyrdom” (*in quibus illa [Domitilla] longum martyrium duxerat*) was a place of pilgrimage. A friend of Hieronymus, Paula, visited these “cells” on her way from Rome to the Holy Land as a source of inspiration for her further monastic life.<sup>115</sup> In the *Passio SS. Nerei et Achillei*, Clement of Rome made Domitilla a consecrated virgin, having performed the rite of veiling (*velatio*).<sup>116</sup> In a similar manner, in our Slavonic legend, Peter will make a later avatar of Flavia Domitilla, Sophia, nun and abbess.

Domitilla is already “separated” from Flavius Clemens by *ca.* 324, in the *Historia ecclesiastica* by Eusebius (3.18.14), where she is named his niece: ἐξ ἀδελφῆς γεγονυῖαν Φλαυίου Κλήμεντος (“begotten from a sister of Flavius Clemens”).<sup>117</sup> In the *Passio SS. Nerei et Achillei*, Domitilla is Flavius Clemens’s niece, and Clement of Rome becomes Flavius Clement’s nephew.<sup>118</sup>

It is important to notice that our Slavonic text does not presuppose this editing of Domitilla’s biography and is, in this sense, unique and archaising. However, our Slavonic legend follows the Roman hagiographical tradition making Flavius Clemens the paternal uncle of Clement of Rome. The stage of development of our legends, when Clement of Rome had already become a nephew of Flavius Clemens but the latter still remained the husband of Domitilla has only been attested, even if indirectly, by our Slavonic legend.

Without insisting too much on this point, it can be observed that our author’s unusual knowledge of the Roman hagiographical tradition that made Flavius Clemens the paternal uncle of Pope Clement goes in the same line with his knowledge of Roman topography (see below, section 7.6). Although not written in the interests of Rome, our legend demonstrates a rather good knowledge of Roman realities.

<sup>114</sup> For the part of the hagiographical dossier of Domitilla where she appears under her own name, see esp. C. Lanéry, “Hagiographie d’Italie,” p. 113-125; M. Lapidge, *The Roman Martyrs*, p. 201-227. The main item of this part of the dossier is the fifth-century Latin *Passio SS. Nerei et Achillei*, already consisting of several earlier legends. On the early history of the cult of Anastasia, I prepare a separate study focused on its roots in the Eastern Roman Empire.

<sup>115</sup> Hieronymus, *Epistula CVIII*, 7; I. Hilberg, *Sancti Eusebii Hieronymi Epistulae*. Pars II: *Epistulae LXXI–CXX*, Vindobonae/Lipsiae, 1912, 312; written in 404.

<sup>116</sup> M. Lapidge, *The Roman Martyrs*, p. 216 and note 42.

<sup>117</sup> Eusèbe de Césarée, *Histoire ecclésiastique. Livres I-IV*, Texte grec, traduction et annotation par G. Bardy, Paris, 1952, p. 122.

<sup>118</sup> For this purpose, the hagiographer introduced two fictitious siblings of Flavius Clemens: a sister Plautilla who becomes the mother of Domitilla, and an unnamed brother who becomes the father of Clement of Rome; M. Lapidge, *The Roman Martyrs*, p. 215 and note 40. Of course, for a historian, a direct disciple of the Apostle Peter should have been two generations older than Flavius Clemens.

### 4.5.3 Excursus: Hagiographical Dossier of Pancratius of Tauromenium

In any hagiographic legend any mention of a saint besides its main character works as a hyperlink: the reader belonging to the target audience is presumed “to click” it in his or her memory and thus get access to the appropriate context for understanding the actual message of a given legend. Sometimes, however, such a hyperlink leads to an extremely rich site – to such an extent that only a minor part of its materials is relevant to the references implied by the legend we started with. This is the case with the double hagiographical dossier of Pancratius of Tauromenium and his unnamed friend, who is immediately recognisable as Marcian of Syracuse.

I will try to focus on the topics directly relevant to our Slavonic text. Nevertheless, there is a need to introduce the hagiographical dossier, the study of which was brilliantly inaugurated by Alexander Nikolaevich Veselovsky (1838–1906) as early as 1886,<sup>119</sup> but its further investigation has been prevented for a long time by various circumstances. Eventually, in 1986, Cynthia Stallman prepared a critical edition of the main item of the dossier of both Pancratius and Marcian,<sup>120</sup> *Vita Pancratii* allegedly written by Evagrius, his disciple and successor to the see of Tauromenium (BHG 1410, cf. 1410a, 1410b, 1410e), but her publication was delayed until 2018 due to her premature death in 1992.<sup>121</sup> In

<sup>119</sup> A. N. Veselovsky (A. H. Веселовский), “Из истории романа и повести. Материалы и исследования,” *Сборник Отделения русского языка и словесности Императорской Академии наук* 40, 1886, p. 1-511 and (in Appendix having a separate pagination) 1-80; the relevant part is “II. Эпизод о Тавре и Мении в апокрифическом житии св. Панкратия,” p. 65-128 and Appendix, p. 67-80. In the posthumous edition of Cynthia Stallman’s work (s. below) the date of publication “1896” is erroneous; Stallman kept the right date in her manuscript PhD thesis: C. Stallman, *The Life of S. Pancratius of Taormina*, 2 vols, Oxford, 1986, vol. 2, p. viii, note 2.

<sup>120</sup> For Marcian’s dossier as a whole, see, most recently, A. Campione, “Il Martirologio Geronimiano e la Sicilia: esempi di agiografia regionale,” *Vetera Christianorum* 42, 2005, p. 15-35, here p. 23-28 [this section is repeated in a larger study: eadem, “La Sicilia nel Martirologio Geronimiano,” in T. Sardella, G. Zito (a cura di), *Euplo e Lucia. 304–2004. Agiografia e tradizioni culturali in Sicilia. Atti del Convegno di Studi organizzato dall’Arcidiocesi di Catania et dall’Arcidiocesi di Siracusa. Catania-Siracusa 1-2 ottobre 2004*, Catania, 2006 (Quaderni di Synaxis, 18; Synaxis XXIII/2, 2005), p. 179-245, at 206-212]; F. P. Massara, “Marciano di Siracusa nell’iconografia siciliana,” in V. Messina, V. Lombino (a cura di) con la collaborazione di S. Costanza, *Vescovi, Sicilia, Mediterraneo nella tarda antichità. Atti del I convegno di studi (Palermo, 29-30 ottobre 2010)*, Caltanissetta, 2012, p. 275-292 (with previous bibliography). This dossier is untraceable before the mid-seventh century and belongs mostly if not completely to Oriental traditions.

<sup>121</sup> C. J. Stallman-Pacitti, *The Life of Saint Pancratios of Taormina. Greek Text, English Translation and Commentary*. Ed. by J. B. Burke, Leiden/Boston, 2018. This book has been prepared by the author’s friends using a printout found by them in 2017 and the matching files then found on her computer; see Editor’s Note by John Burke, p. VII-VIII. The bibliography provided in this edition is completed by the author to February 1992.

the same period, Michel van Esbroeck studied the *Vita Pancratii* in various respects, especially in its background (hagiographical substrate) and its Armenian and Georgian connexions.<sup>122</sup> Some later but important parts of the dossier<sup>123</sup> remain understudied or even unstudied, such as the complete Georgian<sup>124</sup> and Slavonic<sup>125</sup> versions of the *Vita Pancratii*.

The present Greek text of the *Vita* contradicts, in some details, the corresponding entry of the *Synaxarium* of Constantinople (the earliest recension of which has now been dated to the mid-tenth century<sup>126</sup>) under July 9; this fact made van Esbroeck postulate the existence of an earlier Greek recension. Several episodes of demonstrative icon veneration were dated by scholarly consensus to the first iconoclastic period, that is, after *ca.* 730; van Esbroeck, however, considered them as later interpolations in a work otherwise perfectly

<sup>122</sup> M. van Esbroeck, U. Zanetti, "Le dossier hagiographique de saint Pancrace de Taormine," in S. Pricoco (a cura di), *Storia della Sicilia e tradizione agiografica nella tarda antichità. Atti del convegno di studi (Catania, 20-22 maggio 1986)*, Soveria Mannelli, 1988, p. 155-171; M. van Esbroeck, "Le contexte politique de la Vie de Pancrace de Tauromenium," in S. Pricoco, F. R. Nervo, T. Sardella (a cura di), *Sicilia e Italia suburbicaria tra IV e VIII secolo. Atti del Convegno di studi (Catania, 24-27 ottobre 1989)*, Soveria Mannelli, 1991, p. 185-196.

<sup>123</sup> An example of historical importance of a later reworking of the *Vita* is an eighth-century panegyric BHG 1411, where it is stated that the church founded in Tauromenium by Pancratius (unnamed in the *Vita*) became subsequently renamed after St Laurence; see C. J. Stallman-Pacitti, "The Encomium of S. Pancratius of Taormina by Gregory the Pagurite," *Byzantion* 60, 1990, p. 334-365, here p. 354; cf. 355 and 339. The cult of St Laurence has had a specific role, still understudied, in the hagiographical traditions tending to subordinate the Roman see to the East; cf. below, section 4.9.2.

<sup>124</sup> *Баграт, епископ Тавроменийский. Грузинский текст по рукописям XI в.* С предисловием и переводом издал А. Хаханов (Труды по востоковедению, издаваемые Лазаревским Институтом Восточных Языков, вып. 19), Moscow, 1904 (Georgian text without translation, although "translation" is mentioned in the title). Cf. M. van Esbroeck, "Le contexte," p. 167-168. Pancratius was the patron saint of the Caucasian Bagratid dynasty (the Iranian name Bagrat, while actually derived from the Old Persian *Bagadāta* "gift of God," was then considered, in the Caucasus, as an equivalent of "Pancratius"). The famous translator Euthymius the Hagiorite (*ca.* 955-1028) undertook his work for the Bagratid prince David III the Great, Kuropalates (930s-1000/1001).

<sup>125</sup> The Slavonic version made by a certain "presbyter John" (also known as the translator of the *Vita Antonii* by Athanasius the Great) in the tenth (possibly early eleventh) century remains unpublished, except for a large fragment published by Veselovsky in the Appendix to A. Н. Веселовский, "Из истории романа и повести," Appendix, p. 69-78. Cf. K. Ivanova (К. Иванова), *Bibliotheca Hagiographica Balcano-Slavica*, Sofia, 2008, p. 581-582. On this Slavonic version see, especially, Б. Ст. Ангелов, "Презвитер Йован," in idem, *Из старата българска, руска и сръбска литература*. Кн. II, Sofia, 1967, p. 106-138 (with a publication of a relatively short fragment), and, most recently, I. Miltenov (Я. Милтенев), "Славянская рукописная традиция Жития Панкратия Тавроменийского," *Wiener Slavistischer Almanach* 82, 2013, p. 135-143 (with further bibliography).

<sup>126</sup> See A. Luzzi, "Synaxaria and the Synaxarion of Constantinople," in S. Efthymiadis (ed.), *The Ashgate Research Companion to Byzantine Hagiography*, vol. 2, *Genres and Contexts*, Farnham/Burlington, VT, 2014, p. 197-208.

fitting within the second half of the seventh century. Stallman reconsidered these episodes as a rather normal practice of the majority of Christians before the iconoclastic crisis and, therefore, accepted them as genuine while dating the *Vita* to a pre-730 period.<sup>127</sup> I would support Stallman's conclusion but not her treatment of *demonstrative* veneration of icons as having no polemical intention. Now we know that, in the late seventh and the early eighth centuries, the veneration of icons became a point of disaccord within the Armenian Church.<sup>128</sup> However, Armenian connexions are quite important for the author of the *Vita* of Pancratius.<sup>129</sup> Thus, I would prefer to consider these episodes as polemical ones aimed at the Armenian Church. This is even more natural if (as I will try to substantiate in this section below) the author of the *Vita Pancratii* was a monothelete, and thus in communion with the Armenian Church since the Council of Theodosiopolis/Karin of 633.

Somewhat problematic is, however, Stallman's key argument for a pre-730s date. Before his death, Pancratius instructs his disciple and hagiographer Evagrius to go to Rome to be consecrated bishop of Tauromenium by the Apostle Peter. She considered this as a mark of the period preceding Sicily's transfer to Constantinopolitan jurisdiction, for which the earliest and most plausible date is 732/733<sup>130</sup>. However, the hagiographer could hardly have made Pancratius consecrated by Peter in Antioch to end up making his successor consecrated in Rome. I cannot consider this testament about Rome otherwise than a blatant contradiction to the whole ideology of the *Vita* – not only to Pancratius's consecration in Antioch but also to the *Vita*'s view that Tauromenium is the ecclesiastical centre of the whole of Sicily together with Ravenna and Rhegium (Reggio in Calabria).<sup>131</sup> In the original recension of the *Vita*, the Church of Tauromenium must have been autocephalous, and so, its bishop would have been consecrated in Tauromenium.

<sup>127</sup> C. J. Stallman-Pacitti, *The Life*, p. 15.

<sup>128</sup> M. van Esbroeck, "Le discours du Catholicos Sahak III en 691 et quelques dossiers annexes au Quinisexte," in G. Nedungatt, M. Featherstone (eds.), *The Council in Trullo revisited*, Rome, 1995, p. 323-454.

<sup>129</sup> See esp. M. van Esbroeck, "Le contexte politique." These connexions are emphasised either by making Pancratius a native of the Byzantine province of Pontos (thus the *Vita*) or making him arrive there after the death of his parents (*Synaxarium*), without producing a consistent text in the *Vita*; cf. Stallman-Pacitti, *The Life*, p. 45, note 6 (Pontos as a link with the Armenians); cf. p. 43, note 3; p. 49, note 12 (inconsistency in the *Vita* due to plot's complication because of Pontos), and ch. 315 (p. 456/457-458/459) on Armenian vestments (liturgical, I think) sent to Pancratius from Pontos.

<sup>130</sup> C. J. Stallman-Pacitti, *The Life*, p. 15-16.

<sup>131</sup> Pancratius established the Christian Church in Calabria and Ravenna before Peter's arrival there and Stephan's consecration by Peter as the first bishop of Rhegium; see C. J. Stallman-Pacitti, *The Life*, p. 454/455 (ch. 312), cf. note 286 on p. 454-455 and p. 19-20. This tradition about the establishment of the Church of Calabria is not known elsewhere.

The *Vita* does not express an official view of either Rome or Ravenna, but it is not interested in Constantinople's point of view either. It is overtly Syrian. Pancratius and Evagrius are Syrians, natives of Antioch. Marcian is a native of Jerusalem, but he was consecrated bishop by Peter together with Pancratius in Antioch, thus becoming a "Syrian bishop" too. The *Vita* explains Tauromenium's origins and its relations with mainland Southern Italy using a very long mythological "novel within a novel" of Tauros and Menia, the cofounders of Tauromenium, where Tauros is a Syrian and a descendant of Nimrod, the founder of the Syrian royal dynasty.<sup>132</sup> An especially high density of Syrian presence in seventh- and eight-century Italy, especially in the South and in Rome, is a known fact.<sup>133</sup>

From such a "Syrian" viewpoint, Constans II's edict of 666, issued from his then *de facto* capital Syracuse, proclaiming the Church of Ravenna autocephalous,<sup>134</sup> should have been read as proclaiming autocephalous the Church of Tauromenium with its suffragan dioceses of Syracuse, Ravenna, and Rhegium. Such a view would have been, at least partially, correct historically, because any real ecclesiastical dependency of Sicily on Rome was excluded during the stay of Constans II in Syracuse (from 663 to 668). In hagiography, the imaginary worlds of hagiographers are encountered rather than the real worlds of history; however, the former were designed to change the latter.

One more point of connection with Constans II: the *Vita Pancratii* presents the conversion of Tauromenium through a miraculous appearing of a healing book that later turns out to be the Gospel.<sup>135</sup> The hagiographer borrowed from the same treasury of symbols as Constans II when sending, in 657, a liturgical Gospel to Pope Vitalian. In both cases, the Gospel was the cure for the disease of faith and not simply a depository of true faith as it is e.g. in the *Life of St John Calybite*.

<sup>132</sup> Cf. "Le roman de Tauros et Ménia relie la Sicilie à l'Orient (à la Syria par Tauros et à la Macédonie par Ménia), et fait allusion à d'anciennes alliances dynastiques (Tauros serait descendant de Nemrod);" M. van Esbroeck, U. Zanetti, "Le dossier hagiographique," p. 164.

<sup>133</sup> Between 678 and 758, eleven Popes were Sicilians (and only two were Romans), and, among these Sicilians, five were Syrians: J.-M. Sansterre, *Les moines grecs et orientaux à Rome aux époques byzantine et carolingienne (milieu du VI<sup>e</sup> s. – fin du IX<sup>e</sup> s.)*, 2 vols, Bruxelles, 1983, vol. 1, p. 20; vol. 2, p. 75-76; cf. *passim*. In Ravenna, according to Agnellus, the eight-century biographer of its pontiffs, the row of Syrian bishops opened by the Peter's disciple Apollinaris himself was concluded only by Peter I Chrysologus (ca. 431–450); Agnellus of Ravenna, *The Book of Pontiffs of the Church of Ravenna*, Translated with an introduction and notes by D. M. Deliyannis, Washington, DC, 2004, p. 120.

<sup>134</sup> Cf. a new study and edition of the edict in S. Cosentino, "Constans II, Ravenna's Autocephaly and the Panel of the Privileges in St Apollinare in Classe: A Reappraisal," in T. Γ. Κόλιας, K. Γ. Πιτσάκης (eds.), *Aureus. Τόμος αφιερωμένος στον καθηγητή Ευάγγελο Κ. Χρυσό*, Athens, 2014, p. 153-169.

<sup>135</sup> This story begins in ch. 115; C. J. Stallman-Pacitti, *The Life*, p. 216.

To sum up, the *Vita* in its original recension expressed a “Syrian” view on the ecclesiastical realities at the time when Constans II reigned from Syracuse. These realities remained unchanged until 682, when Constantine IV, after having become dyothelete at the 680–681 Council in Constantinople, returned the Church of Ravenna to the Roman jurisdiction. The *terminus post quem* established by Stallman for the *Vita* belongs to this period: 678, the first successful use of “Greek fire” with a tube (σίφων) in the battle of Cyzicus.<sup>136</sup>

The *Vita*’s attitude towards Constans II’s ecclesiastical reform of 666 was certainly positive. This fact, considered together with the Syrian origin of its author (at least, its fictitious author Evagrius), already reveals some affinities with a monothelite milieu. The author’s monothelite orientation can be established definitively by taking into account the strong “monophysite” substrate of the *Vita* as shown by Michel van Esbroeck.<sup>137</sup> In the realities of the seventh century and in the milieux loyal to Byzantine imperial ecclesiastical politics, this means Monotheletism. As van Esbroeck observed, in Italy the two rival traditions of Palestine monasticism, that of Maximus the Confessor and the Laura of St Chariton on the one side and a tradition “de la même nature que la Vie primitive de Pancrace” on the other continued to be in conflict.<sup>138</sup> A naïve view that Italy attracted only the adversaries of Monotheletism has been disproved long ago.<sup>139</sup> The Palestine monastic circles opposite to those of Maximus the Confessor were perfectly integrated within the Syrian and Syriac-speaking milieu: this is visible for example in the Maronite *psogos* of Maximus written in Syriac.<sup>140</sup>

Finally, it has to be mentioned that the *Vita of Pancratius* became the main source on Italy for the author of the *Aspremont*, a French *chanson de geste* written shortly before 1194, in the epoch of the Third Crusade.<sup>141</sup> I have already

<sup>136</sup> C. J. Stallman-Pacitti, *The Life*, p. 12 and 389, note 216. She provides an even later *terminus post quem*, an implicit reference to the so-called light *solidi*, but this suggests a date after 705 only in the Sicilian context, whereas, in Byzantium, as she noticed herself, such *solidi* were produced from the reign of Justinian I to the first reign of Justinian II (685–695).

<sup>137</sup> M. van Esbroeck, “Le contexte,” esp. p. 194–195.

<sup>138</sup> *Ibidem*, p. 195.

<sup>139</sup> See, definitively, J.-M. Sansterre, *Les moines*, vol. 1, p. 19; vol. II, p. 72–73, note 75, and p. 75, note 103.

<sup>140</sup> S. Brock, “An Early Syriac Life of Maximus the Confessor,” *Analecta Bollandiana* 91, 1973, p. 299–346 [repr. in idem, *Syriac Perspectives on Late Antiquity*, London, 1984, ch. XII].

<sup>141</sup> The *Aspremont* is focused on the war with the Arabs which took place in the Aspromonte mountain massif in Calabria near Reggio. The French author borrowed intensively from the “Tauros and Menia” part of the *Vita Pancratii*, where another war is described in the same setting. This fact was observed by Veselovsky before the complete publication of the *Aspremont*: Веселовский, “Из истории,” p. 122–128. Veselovsky’s discovery has never been forgotten by historians of hagiography (M. van Esbroeck, U. Zanetti, “Le dossier,” p. 166; C. J. Stallman-Pacitti, *The Life*, *passim*) but remains unknown to historians of literature, even in the studies focused on the sources of the *Aspremont*: S. Szogs, *Aspremont. Entwicklungsgeschichte und*

noticed a common source of another French work from the same knightly milieu, *Josephe d'Arimathie* de Robert de Boron, with our Evodius fragment (section 3.5).

#### 4.5.4. Pancratius of Tauromenium and His Friend (Marcian of Syracuse)

In the Slavonic *Acts of Peter* the appearance of Pancratius with his unnamed friend amongst the companions of Peter in Rome points to the period of Constans II's reign from Syracuse, from 663 to 668. Pancratius of Taormina is already with Peter before the conversion of Rome. The fact that the *Acts* present the Church of Sicily as at least equal to the Church of Rome is a justification of Constans II's ecclesiastical politics and especially of his edict of 666. The exact nature of the mutual relations between the sees of Ravenna, Syracuse, Tauromenium, and Rhegium in the 660s is still unclear,<sup>142</sup> but it is beyond doubt that this edict affected not only the Exarchate of Ravenna but also Calabria and Sicily.

According to the hagiographical tradition described in the previous section, Pancratius and Marcian were together consecrated in Antioch by Peter to become bishops "in western parts" (ἐπὶ τὰ ἐσπέρια μέρη). Subsequently God revealed Tauromenium as the see for the one and Syracuse for the other.<sup>143</sup>

As our Slavonic *Acts*, the *Vita Pancratii* insists on a number of occasions on Tauromenium's superiority over Syracuse, including even a semi-conflict on the jurisdiction within Sicily.<sup>144</sup> This explains why our Slavonic text mentions "Pancratius with his friend" instead of "Marcian with his friend." The exact nature of the relations between Tauromenium and Syracuse remains unclear, however, one often-neglected important point becomes even more striking when taking the Slavonic *Acts* into account: in placing Tauromenium higher than the imperial residence Syracuse, the tradition that is shared by both *Vita Pancratii* and Slavonic *Acts of Peter* represents itself as unofficial and

---

*Stellung innerhalb der Karlsgeste*, Halle (Saale), 1931; R. van Waard, *Études sur l'origine et la formation de la Chanson d'Aspremont*, Groningen, 1937; W. van Emden, "La Chanson d'Aspremont and the Third Crusade," *Reading Medieval Studies* 18, 1992, p. 57-80; cf. the online bibliography "La chanson d'Aspremont" <http://www.chansondaspremont.eu/>, where all the manuscripts of the poem have been published.

<sup>142</sup> Augusta Acconcia Longo supposed that the dioceses of Ravenna and Syracuse were somewhat united; see A. Acconcia Longo, "Siracusa e Taormina nell'agiografia italogreca," *Rivista di studi bizantini e neoellenici*, n.s., 26, 1990, p. 33-54, p. 43, note 57 [repr. in eadem, *Ricerchi di agiografia italogreca*, Roma, 2003, p. 53-74].

<sup>143</sup> C. J. Stallman-Pacitti, *The Life*, p. 62 and p. 62-85.

<sup>144</sup> These cases are carefully commented by Stallman; see *ibidem*, p. 18, the section of the *Vita* called by Stallman "A Jurisdictional Dispute" (p. 372/373-380/381 with footnotes), *et passim*.

<sup>147</sup> Syriac: P. Bedjan, *Acta Martyrorum et Sanctorum*, vol. 6, p. 538; English: A. M. Taylor, *History of Mar Domitius the Healer: Translation from the Syriac*, London, 1938, p. 6.



Peter's companions, who went to Rome not to remain there (as Linus and Clement with his brothers) nor to go further into Italy (as Pancratius and his friend), but to return to Antioch. There could be no other purpose in this appearance of Ignatius than making him a teacher of Rome at the beginning (or shortly before the beginning) of his episcopate. This is an additional symbol of Antioch's – viz. Syrian – superiority over Rome.

#### 4.6. Roman Topography

The following topographical indications in the Slavonic *Acts of Peter* deserve to be taken most seriously. The first church in Rome is dedicated to the Theotokos. It is placed at the foot of a rock, as is evident from the scene where Peter held a catechism on the eve of the Baptism near this church (B 88 / P 208). In B, he demanded his still unbaptised flock to arrive and sit down inside the church: повели всему народу приити в церковь <...> и повеле им сести. Then, however, Peter preached from “a high rock that is in Rome until now” (высок камык еже и донныне в риме есть). The hagiographer certainly knew the place. The catechetical homily delivered from a rock would have required an outdoor setting. Indeed, in P we read instead of приити в (“to arrive in/inside”) a *lectio difficilior* против церковь. The syntax of this phrase seems corrupt but its meaning is clear: “in front of the church.” This outdoor location is, moreover, more fitting with the unbaptised state of the flock. These data are already suggesting that the church is the *Sancta Maria Antiqua* at the slope of the Palatine Hill, and the rock from where Peter preached is located above it, near the ramp of Domitianus. This church was not the first Christian church in Rome, but at least the first Christian church at the Palatine Hill. Even more important, it was the first Byzantine church built after the definitive liberation of Rome from the Goths (552). The church was rebuilt from some secular building no earlier than in the reign of Justin II (565–578) but still in the sixth century.<sup>148</sup> The church's name Sophia will be discussed below (section 4.7).

The apocryphon continues with the day of the Baptism (B 88-89 / P 209). For the Baptism, the flock has been divided into two. The main part (without women) was baptised in an unnamed place the identity of which has been taken for granted. This must have been the Tiber – still near to the Palatine Hill. The women were baptised in “a private/singular place of the city called Tiberias [the Slavonic toponym implies Greek Τιβηριάς, Gen. Τιβηριάδος]” (особное место града. еже зовется тивириада (P; тиверьада B). This certainly is the Domus Tiberiana, the earliest of the imperial palaces located at the Palatine Hill; this palace is situated just above the *Sancta Maria Antiqua*. The

<sup>148</sup> M. Maskarinec, *City of Saints: Rebuilding Rome in the Early Middle Ages*, Philadelphia, PN, 2018, p. 39: later in the sixth century.

ramp of Domitianus leads from this church to the Domus Tiberiana thus unifying the two structures into a single complex. In the large garden of the Domus Tiberiana, excavations of the 1860s discovered an oval first-century piscine measuring 11.8 by 8 metres,<sup>149</sup> large enough to be used as a baptistery. Probably our author considered this piscine as the actual font where the baptism of Emperor Tiberius allegedly took place (according to the *Cura sanitatis Tiberii*).<sup>150</sup> The involvement of the Domus Tiberiana in our story corroborates our identification of the church as the *Sancta Maria Antiqua*.

The central action in the Slavonic *Acts of Peter* thus takes place in a narrow space of the north-west corner of the Palatine Hill: the basilica *Sancta Maria Antiqua*, the Domus Tiberiana, and the Tiber nearby.

In 663, Constans II spent twelve days in Rome lodging at the Domus Augustana (the modern name of the palace of Domitianus) located not far from the Domus Tiberiana. It was then the only imperial palace preserved in good condition.<sup>151</sup> Constans entered Rome as the Roman Emperor and needed to make a historical imperial palace his residence. His entrance and reception were both patterned after ancient Roman customs.<sup>152</sup> Constans II thus became the first and the last Byzantine emperor who ever visited Rome.

In our Slavonic apocryphon, where Peter became a person close to the Emperor, Peter performed his most important acts in close proximity to the Emperor's palace. After 663, the places mentioned in our legend maintained their value as imperial symbols.

#### 4.7. Sophia: An Imaginary Woman and Her Real Church

Our "Slavonic" story ends with the monastic tonsure of Sophia and her husband and many other converts who chose monasticism. Sophia became an

<sup>149</sup> J. Higginbotham, *Piscinae: Artificial Fishponds in Roman Italy*, Chapel Hill and London, 1997, p. 118-120.

<sup>150</sup> In the seventh-century (date uncertain) *Vindicta Salvatoris* (CANT 70), the baptism of Tiberius was modelled after the baptism of Constantine the Great in the *Actus Silvestri* (on the latter, see below, section 4.10). Both emperors were healed from leprosy with baptismal waters, both received baptism in their imperial palace that, in both cases, was Lateran; see J. Fried, *Donation of Constantine and Constitutum Constantini: The Misinterpretation of a Fiction and its Original Meaning*, Berlin/New York, 2007, p. 45, note 242. The sixth-century (date uncertain) *Cura sanitatis Tiberii* (CANT 69), however, describes the same healing of Tiberius from leprosy with baptismal waters but does not specify the place, while it is clear that the imperial palace is meant. It is not to be excluded that the implied topographical tradition would have been associated with the Domus Tiberiana. The baptismal font of the Constantinian baptisterium in Lateran was of similar dimensions (circle with internal diameter 8.5 m and external diameter ca 10.5 m) to those of the piscine of the Domus Tiberiana; cf. O. Brandt, "Deer, Lambs and Water in the Lateran Baptistry," *Rivista di archeologia cristiana* 81, 2005, p. 131-156, at p. 148.

<sup>151</sup> J. Osborne, *Rome in the Eighth Century: A History in Art*, Cambridge, 2020, p. 38.

<sup>152</sup> Cf. A. J. Ekonomou, *Byzantine Rome and Greek Popes*, p. 172-173, 175.

abbess (B 89 / P 210). The number of nuns with Sophia is given as either 160 (P) or 107 (B), both in Cyrillic numerals. Here our legend borrows from an authoritative tradition of a monastery in Rome lead by Abbess Sophia. This tradition is articulated in the seventh-century *Passio* of Anastasia “the Virgin” or “the Roman” (BHG 76z; later recensions 76x, 76zd). Here, Anastasia is a nun in the monastery of Abbess Sophia in Rome, where the total number of nuns is five.

The legend of Anastasia the Virgin has been studied in detail by Hippolyte Delehay, François Halkin, and Paul Devos, but our knowledge of the relevant traditions is still at its very beginning. This legend belongs to extremely proliferating cults, around which formed an extremely complicated network of legends containing elements that exists both in the imaginary world of hagiography and in the historical world. Its imaginary part is formed by traditions related to different Anastasiae as well as different Sophiae (no less than two dozens), while its historical part is formed by mutual relations, from the fourth to the seventh century, between different cities (Sirmium, Thessalonica, Constantinople, Rome, Aquileia, Ravenna, Jerusalem, and even Alexandria), peoples (Byzantine Greeks, Goths, Romans, Syrians), and even two Byzantine *Augustae*, Sophia (before 535 – after 601) and Anastasia (died in 594 advanced in years).<sup>153</sup> I will introduce below only the data most relevant to our Slavonic *Acts*.

The text of the *Passio* of Anastasia the Virgin is mostly “plagiarised” (literally!) from the Greek version of the *Passio* of Febronia of Nisibin (BHG 569);<sup>154</sup> I date its Syriac original to early seventh century.<sup>155</sup> The total number of nuns in Febronia’s monastery was fifty.

The name of the abbess, Sophia, has been borrowed from another and today less known legend of Sophia as the abbess of a monastery in Edessa; the number of nuns there is once again fifty. This legend disappeared in Syriac but it has been preserved in Arabic and Ethiopic (in the Coptic and Ethiopic Synaxaria). The church dedicated to “the Virgins” in the famous Ethiopian holy site Lalibāla is dedicated to these Edessian martyrs.<sup>156</sup>

<sup>153</sup> This large dossier has already been touched upon in the present study within the discussion of the link between the historical Flavia Domitilla and Anastasia the Widow (section 4.5.2). In our Slavonic *Acts*, Sophia’s background is composed of two Anastasia legends, those of the Widow and of the Virgin. I hope to publish a study on the complete Anastasia dossier in the near future.

<sup>154</sup> The fact is established by P. Devos, “Sainte Anastasie la Vierge et la source de sa Passion BHG<sup>3</sup> 76z,” *Analecta Bollandiana* 80, 1962, p. 33-51.

<sup>155</sup> Cf. an earlier date in S. P. Brock, S. Ashbrook Harvey, *Holy Women of the Syrian Orient*, Updated edition with a new preface, Berkeley/Los Angeles/London, 1998, p. 150-176.

<sup>156</sup> On this legend, see especially M. E. Heldman, “Legends of Lālibālā: The Development of an Ethiopian Pilgrimage Site,” *RES: Anthropology and Aesthetics* 27, 1995, p. 25-38, at p. 25-27, who, however, puts forward an untenable thesis that the legend is of Ethiopian origin. Even if we accept Heldman’s unlikely (but still not to be absolutely excluded) opinion that the corresponding

What is the number of nuns in our Slavonic document? This is one more case when recovering the transliterated Glagolitic numerals would be of help, even though Cyrillic “160” includes the letter *ksi* inexistent in Glagolitic. However, behind Cyrillic “107” a misreading or misspelling in Glagolitic is recognisable: “7” (ѿ *živete*) instead of “50” (ѿ *ludi*). This reconstruction is corroborated with “160” in P, due to the frequent confusion in Cyrillic between *zělo* “7” and *ksi* “60.” This reconstruction resulted in “150,” or 50 trice. The enlarged number is a mark of a later date, but the fact that the new number is a multiplication of the usual fifty still keeps our legend connected with Syriac hagiography and its Greek translations.

The *Passio* of Anastasia the Virgin leads us to the Roman Forum. Sophia buried the relics of her spiritual child exactly there. The word “Forum” is barely recognisable in the Greek manuscripts. Only in later recensions, the burial has been relocated to the *Forum Boarium*, that is to the Anastasia church at the foot of the Palatine Hill in the *titulus Anastasiae*, which was dedicated to Anastasia the Widow.<sup>157</sup> Indeed, a martyrium of Anastasia at the *Forum Romanum* looked bewildering even in Greek eyes.

---

entry of the Synaxarium would have been translated from Ethiopic into Arabic and not *vice versa*, we have to take into account a larger context of Syrian (and not Ethiopian!) legends such as the *Passio* of Febronia and the legend of another Sophia of Edessa, *BHG* 739 and its Syriac original (the *Miracle* of the Edessian confessors Gurias, Samonas, and Abib with the virgin Euphemia married to a Goth and with her mother Sophia), related to the Sophia cathedral in Edessa; on this legend, see B. Lourié (B. M. Лурье), “Евфимия в Эдессе и Евфимия в Халкидоне: две агиографические легенды на фоне догматических споров,” in *Мир православия*. Сборник статей. Отв. ред. митрополит Волгоградский и Камышинский Герман. Вып. 7, Volgograd, 2008, p. 8-40; since then “a broadly structuralist reading of the text” appeared by Th. Dimambro, “Women on the Edge: Violence, ‘Othering’, and the Limits of Imperial Power in *Euphemia and the Goth*,” in K. Cooper, J. Wood (eds.), *Social Control in Late Antiquity: The Violence of Small Worlds*, Cambridge, 2020, p. 318-336, at p. 319, and, therefore, made without recognising many historically important details but focused on the “questions of gender, identity, violence” (p. 318). I suppose that the Aksum church of the Virgins has been dedicated to the same martyrs of Edessa; see B. Lourié (B. M. Лурье), “Из Иерусалима в Аксум через Храм Соломона: архаичные предания о Сионе и Ковчеге Завета в составе Кебра Негест и их трансляция через Константинополь,” *Христианский Восток* 2, 2000, no. 8, p. 176-178.

<sup>157</sup> See H. Delehay, *Étude sur le légendier romain*, p. 257, note 19. Anastasia is said to be buried ἐν τόπῳ καλουμένῳ Ψόρῳ (§ 9); Delehay wrote in the footnote to his edition of *BHG* 76z: “*legendum videtur φόρῳ*. *Versio latina* in locum qui vocabatur Proforo.” *BHG* 76x has the same readings with the initial Ψ (F. Halkin, *Légendes grecques de « Martyres romaines »*, Bruxelles, 1973, p. 169-170, note 2), but *BHG* 76zd actually contains the reading Φόρῳ (*ibidem*, p. 178, note 4) restored by Delehay who had not seen this reading in a source. This place is located in Μεσοποταμία Ῥώμης “Mesopotamia of Rome” (*ibidem*, p. 178), which Halkin identifies with the *Forum Boarium*: “Il s’agit apparemment de l’église Sainte-Anastasie au pied du Palatin, en face du Forum Boarium et entre les deux « vallées » qui séparent le Palatin du Capitole et de l’Aventin” (*ibidem*, p. 171). “Cette Mésopotamie de Rome, Halkin added, pourrait aussi, comme me le suggère le P. Devos, être une vague reminiscence de la patrie du S<sup>te</sup> Fébronie, martyre à Nisibe à Mésopotamie” (*ibidem*, p. 171, note 2).

In the available manuscripts, the topography of the legend of Anastasia the Virgin has certainly been edited, but the Forum localisation of Anastasia's burial place is recovered reliably. Within the plot of the legend, this would imply with a high degree of plausibility that this place was either within or nearby Sophia's monastery. This localisation matches the Roman topography attested in our Slavonic legend, where the Sophia church is adjacent to the *Forum Romanum* (several hundred metres, depending on the route), not to say that, in this Greek text, the whole Palatine Hill would have been included into the notion of the Forum. This matching is hardly a coincidence. Let us recall that in the legend \*S prototypical to our Slavonic legend Peter built the first church in Rome at the place called Areopagus (thus in the karshuni witness, see section 4.4); the topographic meaning of this word must be the Roman Forum.

The very idea that the first church built by the apostle is to be called Sophia is also attested in a late Arabic recension of the legend already known to us as the third part of *CANT* 205, the *Acts of Peter, John, and Paul in Antioch* (see above, section 4.3.2). In this legend, the apostles established the great church called *Κασιανοῦ* in Antioch. The church is historical, and its name is preserved in Greek. In a late recension of this legend, this historical name is followed by an additional one, in Arabic "Ayaya [*sc.* Hagia] Sufya" (ايايا صوفيا).<sup>158</sup> This name is alien to this legend but merged with it from the traditions described in section 4.3. Thus, even the explicit name Sophia for the first apostolic church in a capital city does not belong exclusively to our legend in Slavonic.

The imaginary burial of an imaginary saint described in the legend can be located in earthly topography as the *Sancta Maria Antiqua*. If two different early Byzantine hagiographic traditions call this church Sophia (one directly, another one indirectly), it makes sense to listen to them, despite of the silence of Western sources. Considering the fact that the *Sancta Maria Antiqua* is a Byzantine building, it is important to take the relevant Byzantine legends into consideration. On this account, it is plausible that Sophia was an earlier name of the church. In spite of the name Sophia, this church was dedicated to the Theotokos, unlike St Sophia of Constantinople, which had the Nativity of Christ as dedication feast. A Sophia church dedicated to the Theotokos existed also in Jerusalem. It was built before 445 on the place of the praetorium<sup>159</sup> and its main

<sup>158</sup> M. van Esbroeck, "Un apocryphe sur les apôtres Pierre, Jean et Paul dans le ms. Mingana 40, pièce 30," in R. Ebied, H. Teule (eds.), *Studies on the Christian Arabic Heritage in Honour of Father Prof. Dr. Samir Khalil Samir S.I. at the Occasion of his Sixty-Fifth Birthday*, Leuven, 2004, p. 243-261, at p. 260 (text) / 253 (tr.).

<sup>159</sup> H. Vincent, F.-M. Abel, *Jérusalem. Recherches de topographie, d'archéologie et d'histoire*, vol. 2, *Jérusalem nouvelle*, Paris, 1922, p. 571-577; P. Maraval, *Lieux saints et pèlerinages d'Orient. Histoire et géographie des origines à la conquête arabe*, Paris, 1985, p. 260-261.

anniversaries were interwoven with the mid-fifth-century Jerusalem Dormition cycle.<sup>160</sup>

In the historical context of the transformation of a secular Roman building into a Christian basilica during the last quarter of the sixth century attributing the name Sophia to the new church would have been a natural choice. Sophia was the name of the Augusta (the empress), the wife and later widow of Justin II. She had been involved with imperial affairs from the very beginning of Justin's reign in 565. Around 572, when Justin was struck with dementia, she became the regent. After Justin's death in 578, she preserved her title of Augusta and high status until the end of her life (died no earlier than in 601) and continued to be involved in political and civil matters. "It looks", Averil Cameron wrote, "as though Sophia's influence showed itself especially in religious matters. Justin's own piety was formidable, but it was matched by that of his wife."<sup>161</sup> It is thus very probable that Sophia was involved in some way or other with the construction of the *Sancta Maria Antiqua*.

This presupposition becomes all the more likely if a document of imperial ideology is taken into consideration, which established a direct symbolical link between Empress Sophia and the St Sophia church in Constantinople. In his laudation poem (IV, 264-279) of late 566 or early 567, the court poet Corippus wrote that the building of St Sophia by Justinian has had a meaning of great mystery pointing to the future empress Sophia. "What was previously obscure [when the Sophia church had already been built but Sophia was not yet reigning] is now [when Sophia became Empress] revealed" (*manifesta luce vidimus ... quod ante clausum erat*).<sup>162</sup> In a manner, the Slavonic legend similarly makes a direct symbolic link between a Sophia church and a member of the imperial family called Sophia.

Sophia in the Slavonic legend has one remote historical prototype in Flavia Domitilla, another more recent historical prototype, Sophia Augusta, and an imaginary prototype in Abbess Sophia of the Syriac legend. This imaginary prototype facilitated the appropriation of the historical Sophia in Syriac hagiography. Sophia's church is the *Sancta Maria Antiqua*, but its original Byzantine name was church of St Sophia.

<sup>160</sup> M. van Esbroeck, "The Saint as a Symbol," in S. Hackel (ed.), *The Byzantine Saint. University of Birmingham 14<sup>th</sup> Spring Symposium of Byzantine Studies*, London, 1981, p. 128-140, at p. 136-138.

<sup>161</sup> A. Cameron, "The Empress Sophia," *Byzantion* 45, 1975, p. 5-21, here p. 12; cf. esp. p. 12-14, 21. Cf. Sophia's biography in L. Garland, *Byzantine Empresses: Women and Power in Byzantium, AD 527-1204*, London, 1999, p. 40-57, 251-255.

<sup>162</sup> Flavius Cresconius Corippus, *In laudem Iustini Agusti minoris*, libri IV. Ed. with translation and commentary by A. Cameron, London, 1976, p. 81 (text) / 115 (tr.); for the date of Book IV, see p. 2.

#### 4.8. Construction of the Sophia Church

Unfortunately, an essential section of the Slavonic *Acts of Peter* has been shortened so drastically that its meaning is difficult to discern. All that it reveals about the building and dedication of the first Roman church is that Sophia, to construct the basilica, used money brought to her by “13 virgins”, “30 hundreds of thousands of gold (coins)” 30. сот тысяч злат (P 207; B 88 has 30 сот злата “30 hundreds of gold”, which seems too small an amount for the genre of hagiography).

Once again, these numbers must be read “in Glagolitic” to recover their symbolism. This results in 24 virgins rather than 13 and 50 rather than 30 hundreds of thousands of gold coins. The Pentecostal symbolism of fifty, already encountered in this legend in the number of Sophia’s nuns, is obvious, while “twenty-four virgins” remains an unresolved issue. The Evodius fragments (section 3.2) contained the appearance of 24 women as a counterpart to 24 would-be priests, but the tradition of twenty-four implied both there and in the section discussed here remains unknown.

The church was constructed apparently during the 40 days of preparation for the Baptism of the people of Rome and was consecrated on Easter Sunday. Its dedication is mentioned but not described just before the scene with the relics of St Stephanus.

#### 4.9. The Relics of St Stephanus

##### 4.9.1. Liturgical Setting

The mentioning of the dedication of the church is followed by a scene which is easier to translate than to paraphrase (B 88 / P 207-208):

по освящении по сея церкви бысть  
сиде. възем мощи святаго  
первомученика стефана и  
затворив церковь рече молитву  
сию. боже отец господи нашего  
исус христа. иже святою своею и  
богоносною плотию. иже есть  
писана в молитвѣных словесех.  
иакова брата господня. то же инде  
писано. а о сих сиде по ряду.

After the consecration/dedication of this church, it was the following. After having taken the relics of Protomartyr Stephanus and closed the church (Peter) said this prayer: “Oh God the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, who with his holy and godbearing flesh...” that is written in the prayer words of James the Brother of the Lord. And that is written elsewhere. And about this thus in details [follows the account of the Baptism].

The end of this quotation marks the interruption of the section on the church, the story switches to a description of the Baptism. The interrupted account is irreparably lost. Some observations can nevertheless be made.

The words quoted as taken from some Liturgy (“prayer words”) of James are unknown to me, although the same opening words are present in a prayer at the *Pater* in the Jerusalem liturgy of James in various languages (Ὁ θεὸς καὶ πατὴρ τοῦ κυρίου καὶ θεοῦ καὶ σωτῆρος ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ<sup>163</sup>). It is evident from the context, however, that the prayer in the *Acts of Peter in Rome* is an anaphora prayer *proprie*. Closing the doors of the church marks the beginning of the liturgy of the faithful. All catechumens are to be dismissed before the anaphora, implying the entire Roman flock, since the present scene took place before their Baptism.

Our account separates the rite of consecration of the church itself from the first Eucharistic liturgy on the newly consecrated altar. Everything is clear, up to this point. Only the anaphora of James remains unidentified, in spite of consulting all published anaphorae, especially in Syriac. The quoted text is hardly fictive, but our knowledge of the anaphorae that were used in the seventh century, especially among the Maronites, is incomplete. There are more than eighty Syriac anaphorae preserved but most of them are still unpublished.

Easter liturgy in an empty church is an uncommon and certainly significant symbol, but I am unable to decipher it. From a liturgical point of view, it would have been normal to perform the Baptism service on Great Saturday instead of on Bright Monday. Both these days were traditionally considered as especially suitable for Baptism, but Great Saturday was the Baptism day *par excellence*. The tradition to perform Baptism on Great Saturday is traceable at least from the fourth century onwards. There must have been a strong reason to postpone the Baptism of the entire flock to the Monday. No less important is the consecration of a church on the very day of Easter Sunday, which is by no means normal.<sup>164</sup> There certainly are some riddles here, which I have not yet managed to resolve.

#### 4.9.2. The Relics of St Stephanus in Rome and the Legend *BHL*

7878

The presence of St Stephanus’s relics in our fragmentary Slavonic *Acts* is limited to one scene. They are never mentioned elsewhere, and there is no explanation of their importance for the plot either. Our text, translated from the symbolic language of hagiography into the ordinary language of history, pretends that relics of Stephanus – obviously not the whole body but some easily

<sup>163</sup> B.-Ch. Mercier, *La liturgie de Saint Jacques. Édition critique du texte grec avec traduction latine*, Paris, 1946 [Patrologia Orientalis 26, fasc. 2, N° 126; repr. Turnhout, 1997], p. 108 [222].

<sup>164</sup> At present, an unwritten tradition preserved in the Syrian Orthodox Church (“monophysite”) forbids the consecration of the church on the days of the greatest feasts including Easter; see A. Silvanos, *The Rite of Consecration of the Church according to the Syrian Orthodox Tradition*, PhD Thesis, University of Manchester, 2014 (unpublished), p. 190.



portable part – have been placed in the *Sancta Maria Antiqua* no later than in 663, the visit of Constans II (*the terminus post quem* for our *Acts*). Can this claim be taken seriously? I think this might be assumed based on the legend *BHL* 7878 on the *Translatio* of the relics of St Stephanus from Constantinople to Rome.<sup>165</sup>

The relics of St Stephanus, after having been miraculously discovered near Jerusalem in 415,<sup>166</sup> were almost immediately divided and distributed throughout the world, although most of the body remained in Jerusalem.<sup>167</sup> A part of Stephanus's body brought from Jerusalem to Constantinople by Empress Eudocia in 439 was placed in St Laurentius basilica which had been constructed at this time by Empress Pulcheria.<sup>168</sup> From this moment onwards, the relics of the two deacons became connected in hagiography, as we will see in the Roman legend *BHL* 7878.

The most popular story of the *Translatio* to Constantinople became, however, the legend *BHG* 1650 with its different later recensions and versions (including the Latin ones, *BHL* 7857-7858). This is a short fantastic novel containing reminiscences of the historical discovery of 415 but putting the action into the time of the reign of Constantine the Great. According to this story, the entire coffin of Stephanus was translated.<sup>169</sup> This legend remains understudied,

<sup>165</sup> The introductory part and the end of the text are published by Angelo Mai [Angelus Maius], *Spicilegium Romanum*, vol. 4, Romae, 1840, p. 285-288; the main portion of the account, omitted by Mai, was published by Robert Lechat (anonymously) in his "Ad catalogum codicum hagiographicorum Bibliothecae publicae Audomarapolitanae appendix," *Analecta Bollandiana* 49, 1931, p. 102-116, at p. 112-116; a French translation with commentary in: D. Labadie, *L'invention du protomartyr Étienne : sainteté, pouvoir et controverse dans l'Antiquité (Ier-VIe s.)*. Thèse de doctorat de l'Université de recherche Paris Science et Lettres. Préparée à l'École Pratique des Hautes Études, Paris, 2017, p. 547-555. There is also an abbreviated recension of the same story *BHL* 7879 and *versiculi* based on this story *BHL* 7880 and 7881 (all unpublished in full). Cf. below on Bruno di Segni's edition of this story. As a general overview of Stephanus's dossier, including the *Translatio* accounts, see F. Bovon, "The Dossier on Stephen, the First Martyr," *Harvard Theological Review* 96, 2003, p. 279-315, and Labadie, *L'invention*.

<sup>166</sup> On this discovery, see esp. M. van Esbroeck, "Jean de Jérusalem et les cultes de S. Étienne, de la Sainte-Sion et de la Croix," *Analecta Bollandiana* 102, 1984, p. 99-134.

<sup>167</sup> Cf. E. Clark, "Claims on the Bones of Saint Stephen: The Partisans of Melania and Eudocia," *Church History* 51, 1982, p. 141-156.

<sup>168</sup> This seems to be a historical fact, although it has been attested only in a later source, the *Chronicon* by Marcellinus (covering events from 379 to 534, but Marcellinus's notice came under the exact year of Eudocia's return from the Holy Land, 439): *Eudocia uxor Theodosii principis ab Hierosolymis urbem regiam remeavit, beatissimi Stephani primi martyris reliquias, quae in basilica sancti Laurentii positae uenerantur, secum deferens* "Eudocia, the wife of the First Citizen [*sc.*, *Princeps civitatis*, an official title of the emperors] Theodosius returned from Jerusalem to the reigning city taking with her the relics of Protomartyr Stephanus, which are venerated deposited in the basilica of Saint Laurentius;" *Chronica minora saec. IV. V. VI. VII*, ed. Th. Mommsen, Berolini, 1894, p. 80.

<sup>169</sup> H. Delehaye, "Quelques dates du martyrologe hiéronymien," *Analecta Bollandiana* 49, 1931, p. 22-50, at p. 27-30; F. Bovon, "The Dossier," p. 300-301.

and its *Sitz im Leben* and direct purpose are unknown. It cannot be earlier than the late fifth century.

St Stephanus's relics were venerated in St Laurentius church in Constantinople but it was not pretended that the entire body was there. Meanwhile, the location of the complete body of Stephanus (at least, the torso with the head) disappeared from the eyes of modern historians: there is no documental account mentioning Stephanus's body, more or less complete, comparable with that of 415.<sup>170</sup>

The Roman legend *BHL* 7878, attributed to Archdeacon Lucius, can be summarized as follows. An unnamed daughter of Emperor Theodosius, residing with her father in Rome, became possessed by a demon. The name of the Pope of Rome was Pelagius. The demon said that he would leave the girl only in the presence of the body of St Stephanus. The Emperor became ready to send his daughter to Constantinople, but the demon said that this would be useless: he would leave the girl only in Rome, the city of the martyrdom of Peter and Paul. The task to deprive the people of Constantinople of their precious relics was by no means easy. Eventually, the Emperor and the Pope agreed to an exchange: the relics of St Laurentius for the relics of St Stephanus. Needless to say that, when the relics of Stephanus arrived in Rome, they became miraculously attached to the relics of Laurentius. Thus, the promised exchange turned out to be impossible. The relics of Stephen remained deposited in the church of St Laurentius, where the Emperor's daughter was healed.

This is followed by the most relevant episode for the current study,<sup>171</sup> which explains why the complete bodies of the two saints are unavailable while the right hand of Stephanus is in Rome: *Pelagius autem papa dextrum armum beati Stephani ad ecclesiam Sancti Petri, amborum reconditis corporis sanctorum, grande cum honore devexit, magnaue Romanorum civium cum exultatione sepelevit* "Then Pope Pelagius, when the two bodies of the saints were concealed, transported with a great honour the right hand of Blessed Stephanus to Saint Peter's church, and he buried (them) with rejoicing of many Roman citizens." "The Greeks," however, attempted to take the body of Laurentius, but immediately fell as if dead. By the prayers of the Pope and the faithful they little by little (*paulatim*) recovered temporarily but all died within ten days (*nec unus post decem dies superfuit*). However, those Latins who were observing the Greek's attempt at stealing the relics silently, which implies they supported it (*delationi sancti corporis consenserunt silendo*), became mad (*tanquam frenetici mente capti*) and began to wander and roam and could not

<sup>170</sup> I do not count *BHL* 4788, the alleged act of inspection of the common coffin of Stephanus and Laurentius in 1447, where the bodies of both were found intact as they were at the moment of death of each of them: [Anonymous publisher,] "De recognitione corporum SS. Laurentii et Stephani," *Analecta Bollandiana* 5, 1886, p. 192.

<sup>171</sup> R. Lechat, "Ad catalogum," p. 116.

calm down during the entire time the coffin was open (*quousque non est clausus tumulus*). “When the coffin became closed, and the bodies of the saints became honestly concealed” (*Operto autem tumulo et sanctis honeste reconditis corporibus*), they recovered completely. The message of these episodes is obvious: the bodies of both saints are present within the coffin but no one is allowed to look at them. *BHL* 7878 is an etiological legend about the right hand of St Stephanus claimed to be in the Pope’s possession. By the time of the creation of the legend, the alleged right hand of Stephanus would have been allowable for veneration in St Peter’s Basilica.<sup>172</sup>

The author of this unartful legend was not too worried that the translation was initiated by a demon. Evidently, he was even less worried about chronology: the two Popes with the name Pelagius ruled in the years 556–561 and 579–580, while the two Emperors Theodosii belonged to the fourth and fifth centuries. The author’s most sensible mismatch with reality, however, was placing the Byzantine Emperor in the Old Rome. Bruno de Segni felt this, and, in his recension of this legend (*BHL* 7882–7885), returned the Emperor to Constantinople and left his daughter alone in Rome.<sup>173</sup>

This apparently strange detail, a Byzantine Emperor living in Rome, could hardly be explained as an invention of the Roman hagiographer. Such an invention would be pointless. Mediocre hagiographers, like the present one, are flatly rational and stingy with details. Therefore, such an exotic detail must be a representation of an unavoidable real fact faced by the hagiographer. The legend seems to deal with a historical situation when the right hand of Stephanus appeared in Rome in some connexion with a Byzantine emperor’s stay in the city. A need to rewrite history arose later. If this Emperor was Constans II, who was in Rome in 663 – and indeed, there was no other Byzantine emperor who stayed in Rome, – the reason of rewriting history is self-evident: to delete any memory of the monothelete past.

Therefore, I think that our Slavic legend and the Latin legend *BHL* 7878 deal with the same event, the deposition in Rome of Stephanus’s right hand by Constans II. Both legends were aimed at rewriting history at the expense of the original meaning of the real action by Constans. The Roman author tried to delete any memory of Monotheletism when the Roman Church headed by Pope

<sup>172</sup> The date of the manuscript is the 13<sup>th</sup> century: [R. Lechat,] “Catalogus codicum hagiographicorum latinorum Bibliothecae publicae Audomaropolitanae,” *Analecta Bollandiana* 47, 1929, p. 241–306, at p. 272–273. The legend was known to Bruno di Segni (1045/1049–1123), see below.

<sup>173</sup> Hagiographi Bollandiani, *Catalogus codicum hagiographicorum Bibliothecae regiae Bruxellensis*, Pars I, vol. 1, Bruxellis, 1886, p. 70–74. Bruno provides the daughter with a name, Eudoxia (*ibidem*, p. 70), thus making clear that he identified the Emperor as Theodosius II (402–450), the father of Licinia Eudoxia (422–ca. 493). Probably, Bruno knew that Theodosius I would have been chronologically incompatible with the discovering of the relics of St Stephanus, while Theodosius II – with lodgement in Rome. Angelo Mai “restored” the Emperor’s name as Tiberius.

Vitalian was in demonstrative Eucharistic communion with the murderer of Pope Martin. For the monothelete author of our *Acts*, the relics of St Stephanus should have been presented as the apostolic legacy from “Antioch,” that is, in the actual seventh-century context, from the Syrians.

The account of the *Liber Pontificalis* on Constans II’s twelve-day stay in Rome describes his programme with exact dates.<sup>174</sup> It mentions that the Emperor had arrived on Wednesday, July 5, and visited a church of St Mary on Saturday, July 8, 663. The visit to this church was one of several visits to churches in Rome for prayer and leaving gifts: *die sabbato ad sanctam Mariam, itemque donum obtulit* “on Saturday [*sc.*, *the Emperor travelled for prayer*] to St Mary’s and again he presented a gift.”<sup>175</sup> On the next day, Sunday, July 9, Constans visited the basilica of St Peter, where he presented at the altar the gold-wrought *pallium* (that is, the omophorion, the sign of a bishop’s power that could be sent only from a higher-rank person to a lower-rank one). This was one of the culmination points of the entire stay in Rome and probably the most important among the three gifts presented by the Emperor to Roman churches; it

<sup>174</sup> In the *Vita of Vitalian*; see L. Duchesne, *Le Liber Pontificalis. Texte, introduction et commentaire*, vol. 1, Paris, 1886 (Bibliothèque des Écoles françaises d’Athènes et de Rome. 2<sup>e</sup> série), p. 343-344; another edition: *Libri pontificalis pars prior*, ed. Th. Mommsen, Berolini, 1898 (MGH. Gestorum Pontificum Romanorum vol. 1), p. 186-189; cf. *The Book of Pontiffs* (*Liber Pontificalis*). *The Ancient Biographies of the First Ninety Roman Bishops to AD 715*, Revised edition, translated with introduction and notes by R. Davis, Liverpool, 2010, p. 69-70. The part of the *Liber pontificalis* between Martin and Agatho is still understudied, while the recent article by R. McKitterick, “The Papacy and Byzantium in the Seventh- and Early Eighth-Century Sections of the *Liber pontificalis*,” *Papers of the British School at Rome* 84, 2016, p. 241-273, is an important step in this direction. The editorial history of the respective chapters is hardly recoverable without understanding their language of liturgical and legendary symbolism, especially in the *Life of Vitalian* (which partially will be dealt with here), and canonical problems that would have occupied the mind of the editor(s). The greatest among such problems often goes unnoticed. For instance, McKitterick wrote (*ibidem*, p. 267): “The popes energetically upheld orthodox doctrine in the face of severe opposition and aggression from Constantinople, centred on monotheletism,” whereas, from a canonical point of view then shared by both the Constantinopolitan monothelete authorities and the leaders of the Lateran Council of 649, Pope Martin and Maximus the Confessor, to become a monothelete it was sufficient to enter in Eucharistic communion with the Monotheletes, as all Popes from Eugen I to Agatho duly did, and Vitalian did so in the most solemn ceremonies during Constans II’s visit to Rome. All of them did exactly what Martin, Maximus, and their followers refused to do. One can wonder whether such a behaviour became embarrassing for a hypothetical post-681 editor of the *Life of Vitalian*, who, at least, might have added black paint to the image of Constans II at the end of the account of him, while preserving the exact dates of the events related to his visit to Rome.

<sup>175</sup> L. Duchesne, *Le Liber Pontificalis*, p. 343; *Libri pontificalis*, p. 187; *The Book of Pontiffs*, p. 70. A. J. Ekonomou, *Byzantine Rome and Greek Popes*, p. 173, identifies this church as the church of St Mary *ad praesepe* (Santa Maria Maggiore), but on unspecified grounds, besides the statement that this church was “a sanctuary that had been the site of many of the tumultuous events that accounted for much of the animosity that had existed between Constans and the Romans.”

will be discussed below (section 4.10). The two other gifts remain unnamed in the *Liber pontificalis*.<sup>176</sup>

Without taking our Slavonic *Acts* into account, it already seems very likely that the right hand of Stephanus has been brought to Rome by Constans II, and was thus one of the two gifts that remained unspecified in the *Liber pontificalis*. The Slavonic *Acts of Peter* corroborate this conclusion and adds some probability to the supposition that this relic was originally deposited in the *Sancta Maria Antiqua*. The next section investigates traces of the relics of Stephanus in this church.

#### 4.9.3. St Stephanus in the *Sancta Maria Antiqua*

The *Sancta Maria Antiqua* was indeed a very special place for the cult of St Stephanus. The Church's main south-facing altar is flanked by two chambers. The southeast chamber (on the left) contained another altar (its marble base lies *in situ*) with a fresco of the Crucifixion on the wall behind it. Some traces of a marble chancel screen are also present.<sup>177</sup> The southwest chamber (on the right) is similar but different. It contains traces of a marble transenna ("vertical channels, roughly cut in the brickwork of the side walls") but does not contain traces of an altar.<sup>178</sup> On the southern wall, in the great rectangular niche<sup>179</sup> that starts at floor level, there is a fresco with five almost life-size (*ca.* 1.60 m) figures of saints. Other niches with frescoes elsewhere in the same church start at eye level, but in the present case there was clearly an intention to make this group of five saints appear as if they go out to meet the beholder. Such a composition presupposed that there was no massive construction such as an altar in front of the niche, which would have blocked the view of the lower part of the fresco. The central figure among the five is St Stephanus holding a censer swinging on its chains. All the figures have been identified by inscriptions, from left to right: Cosmas, Abbacyrus, Stephen, Procopius, Damian. Based on the central position of Stephanus, Gordon McNeil

<sup>176</sup> Namely, another gift for the basilica of St Peter, presented during his first visit on July 5, the very day of his arrival in Rome, and the gift for the church of St Mary. It is not to be excluded that, in the original text of the *Vita of Vitalian*, the two unnamed gifts were specified, but a post-681 editor wished to purge the important relics (the supposed identification of these gifts) of an association with the name of the unorthodox Emperor. Later interpolated manuscripts mention a visit of the Emperor to the basilica of St Paul and the presentation of a gift there on July 6, but this is clearly a late invention.

<sup>177</sup> R. Krautheimer, W. Frankl, S. Corbett, *Corpus basilicarum christianarum Romae. The Early Christian Basilicas of Rome (IV – IX Cent.)*, vol. 2, Città del Vaticano, 1959, p. 261-262.

<sup>178</sup> *Ibidem*, p. 262.

<sup>179</sup> P. J. Nordhagen, *The Frescoes of John VII (A. D. 705-707) in S. Maria Antiqua in Rome*, Roma, 1968, p. 64: 2.57 m high, 1.91 m wide, 22 cm deep, the *velum* under the feet of the saints is 35 cm in height.

Rushforth has already supposed that the chapel would have been “dedicated under his name.”<sup>180</sup> This hypothesis has been supported by Joseph Wilpert, in the same work where he coined the name “Die Kapelle der Ärzte” (“The Chapel of Physicians”) for this chamber, which has become the standard name adopted by modern historiography.<sup>181</sup> Nevertheless, in subsequent historiography, the chamber became only “the Chapel of Physicians,” and the central place of Stephanus, who was not a physician, became overlooked. Indeed, in the chamber, the west and north walls are occupied by the row of saint healers, where the images of Cosmas, Damianos, and Abakkyros are repeated (the fresco of St Dometius mentioned in section 4.5.5 belongs to this row); this row of frescoes is performed in a different manner and placed at a height of 2.45 m.<sup>182</sup>

The key for understanding the purpose of the main fresco of the chamber is the appearance of the figure of Procopius the martyr next to Stephanus. Chiara Bordino rightly observed that Procopius could not be foreign to the host of saint healers, despite the fact that he is always depicted as a military saint in familiar iconography. That iconography is post-iconoclastic, whereas the fresco in the *Sancta Maria Antiqua* is the earliest known representation of the martyr. It preserves only a part of the halo and the inscription, thus providing no data to decide whether St Procopius was represented as a military saint or as a healer. The image of St Procopius as a healer would correspond to his earliest legend (the so-called first legend, *BHG* 1576). It retained from the biography of the historical martyr in Caesarea of Palestine beheaded in AD 303 that he had the ecclesiastical offices of reader and of exorcist (τῇ τῶν ἀναγνώστων ἅμα καὶ ἐπορκιστῶν χάριτι τετιμημένος “honoured with the grace of the readers as well as the exorcists”). The transformation of the clergyman into a warrior was a later phenomenon represented by the second (*BHG* 1577) and third (Metaphrastic: *BHG* 1578-1579) legends.<sup>183</sup>

<sup>180</sup> G. McN. Rushforth, “S. Maria Antiqua,” *Papers of the British School in Rome* 1, 1902, p. 1-123, at p. 80.

<sup>181</sup> J. Wilpert, *Die römischen Mosaiken und Malereien der kirchlichen Bauten vom IV. bis XIII. Jahrhundert*, Bd. 2., Freiburg im Breisgau, 1916, p. 675-677, esp. p. 676: St Stephanus “...nimmt die Mitte, also den Hauptplatz, ein. Deshalb hat man die nicht unmögliche Vermutung ausgesprochen, daß die Kapelle ihm geweiht gewesen sei.”

<sup>182</sup> The *velum* starts at a height of 1.25 m and its own height is 1.2 m; P. J. Nordhagen, *The Frescoes of John VII*, p. 56.

<sup>183</sup> C. Bordino, “Nella capella dei santi *Anargyroi*,” p. 206. The hagiographic dossier of Procopius was studied by Hippolyte Delehaye in his *Les légendes grecques des saints militaires*, Paris, 1909, p. 77-89 (study) and 214-233 (texts); *BHG* 1576 is published *ibid*, p. 214-227, quoted p. 216. For the most detailed account of the history of the cult, see Ch. Walter, *The Warrior Saints in Byzantine Art and Tradition*, Aldershot/Brookfield, 2003 [repr. London/New York, 2016], p. 94-100.

The link between Procopius and Stephanus becomes clear if the day of commemoration of Procopius is taken into account: July 8, the day of Constans II's visit to "Sancta Maria."<sup>184</sup>

In summary, the hagiographic analysis of both the Slavonic *Acts* of Peter and *BHL* 7878 resulted in the identification of Constans II as the person responsible for the appearance of a part (probably the right hand) of St Stephanus's body in Rome. Moreover, our *Acts of Peter*, being a contemporary account, points to the *Sancta Maria Antiqua* as the place where this relic was deposited. *BHL* 7878 points to St Peter's Basilica, but this text has been edited later on and could reflect the situation posterior to the earthquake of 847, when the *Sancta Maria Antiqua* was destroyed and its sacred objects would have been relocated. Finally, the *Liber Pontificalis* mentions Constans II's visit to a church of Mary, where he left an unspecified gift on the day of commemoration of St Procopius. From the hagiographic documents it can be learned that one of the two gifts, unidentified in the *Liber Pontificalis*, left in Roman churches by Constans II were the relics of St Stephanus. One of the Roman Marian churches, namely, the *Sancta Maria Antiqua*, contains a very solemn shrine of Stephanus, where he is depicted side by side with Procopius. The unusual composition seen on this fresco can be explained by the fact that St Stephanus's relics were deposited in this church on the day of commemoration of St Procopius. The choice of the *Sancta Maria Antiqua* for a relic related with Constantinople appears quite natural, given that this church served as a religious and cultural link between Rome and Byzantium.

It can be concluded that the "Chapel of Physicians" was constructed as the place of veneration of the relics (probably only the right hand) of St Stephanus. There was no altar there, but a relatively small reliquary which would not have blocked the sight of the lower part of the fresco. The three remaining figures on the same fresco are the most venerated saint unmercenary healers, *anargyroi* (for example, the image of Abacyros occurs four times in this church: two images in this chamber and two elsewhere). The topic of healing expressed in the fresco is also the main topic of *BHL* 7878, namely the exorcism and the healing of the mental illness (demonic possession) of those Romans who did not oppose the incurably obsessed Greeks. This is a straightforward expression of the ideology of Constans II's visit: imposing the right faith of

<sup>184</sup> This is the main date of his memory throughout the Christian world (while the historical date of the martyrdom is July 7); cf., for the dates in different Christian traditions, J.-M. Sauget, "Procopio," in *Bibliotheca Sanctorum*, vol. 10, Roma, 1968, col. 1159-1166, esp. col. 1164-1165. Oddly enough, the first legend provides the date of the martyrdom erroneously "translated" into the Roman form of the Julian calendar: τῇ πρὸ ὀκτῶ εἰδῶν ἰουλίῳ (H. Delehay, *Les legendes*, p. 227), a calque of the *ante diem octavum Idus Iulii*, which results in July 6 and not July 8. Such errors in the two directions were, however, quite common. This particular case is interesting as a hallmark of the Latin environment of the Greek author or editor of *BHG* 1576.

Monotheletism on the Romans and dispelling the obsession of “Maximism,” as the Monotheletes often called the Dyotheletes.

The composition of the fresco and, very probably the fresco itself as a material object<sup>185</sup> are to be dated to 663 or shortly thereafter, that is, within the timespan proposed by Ernst Kitzinger<sup>186</sup> followed by Richard Krautheimer with his co-authors,<sup>187</sup> in contradiction to the current consensus that dates this fresco to John VII’s pontificate (705-707).<sup>188</sup> Both dates were proposed exclusively on stylistic grounds. According to Kitzinger and Krautheimer with co-authors the row of saint healers on the west and north walls belong to the same period as the fresco with St Stephanus, but the present study has not found objections against accepting the date of 705-707 advocated by the current consensus for those frescoes.

It can thus be confirmed that on 8 July, 663, the commemoration day of St Procopius, Constans II deposed the relics of St Stephanus in the *Sancta Maria Antiqua*, and the southwest chamber adjacent to the main altar was transformed into the shrine of St Stephanus. The new local cult of St Stephanus became interconnected with those of St Procopius (as an exorcist rather than a warrior) and other saint healers. This act of Constans II was part of a larger plan of monothelete “healing” of Rome.

#### **4.10. The *pallium* of Constans II, the *colobium* of St James, and the *Actus Silvestri***

Now we are in a position to return to the culminating event of Constans II’s visit to Rome, the most important for understanding its ecclesiological meaning. Immediately after the phrase related to Saturday, July 8, 663 (quoted above, section 4.9.2), the *Liber pontificalis* continues: *Dominicorum die processit ad sanctum Petrum cum exercitu suo, omnes cum cereis, et offeruit super altare ipsum palleum* [spelling variant: *pallium*] *auro textilem; et celebratae sunt missae* “On Sunday [July 9] he proceeded to St Peter’s with his army, all with wax candles, and on its altar he presented a gold-wrought pallium;

<sup>185</sup> I make this distinction in order to take into account the opinion by David Knipp according to whom this fresco was a copy of an earlier icon: D. Knipp, “The Chapel of Physicians,” p. 10. Knipp himself strongly believes in it: “The icon of the five saints... reflects beyond doubt a famous model, since it was the center of worship in the chapel, occupying the most significant place,” — but his “since” looks as a *non sequitur* error, because to be a center of worship does not entail to be a copy of an earlier image.

<sup>186</sup> E. Kitzinger, *Römische Malerei vom Beginn des 7. Bis zur Mitte des 8. Jahrhunderts*. Inaugural-Dissertation. München, 1934, p. 51, endnote 55.

<sup>187</sup> R. Krautheimer, W. Frankl, S. Corbett, *Corpus basilicarum christianarum Romae*, vol. 2, p. 262.

<sup>188</sup> Cf., most recently, C. Bordino, “Nella capella dei santi *Anagyroi*,” p. 200 (with further bibliography).



and mass was celebrated.”<sup>189</sup> This *pallium* was clearly a sign of Constantinople’s and/or imperial supremacy over the Church of Rome, as one can see directly from the meaning of *pallium* as a liturgical vestment: in the seventh century, it was already not a mantle but the Latin equivalent of the Greek *omophorion*, a symbol of episcopal dignity. The Emperor of New Rome – and, implicitly, the Patriarch of New Rome Peter – bestowed to the See of Old Rome (not to the Pope personally) this main episcopal insignium.

This action, however, has a hagiographical substrate of its own, then clearly recognisable in Rome. The Old Basilica of St Peter, where the action took place, was in the seventh century the main cathedral of the Church of Rome. As such, it appropriated the hagiographical legend of the earlier and original cathedral of Rome, the basilica of the Saviour in Lateran (renamed to St John’s by the end of the first millennium).<sup>190</sup> The related Lateran legend was the *Acts* of Pope Sylvester, *Actus Silvestri* (BHL 7744b-f).<sup>191</sup> The *Actus Silvestri* are the Roman legend on the conversion of Constantine and the resulting transformation of Rome into the capital of the Christian Empire, symbolised by

<sup>189</sup> L. Duchesne, *Le Liber Pontificalis*, p. 343; *Libri pontificalis*, p. 187; *The Book of Pontiffs*, p. 70 (slightly changed).

<sup>190</sup> The programme of Constans II’s visit shows the preeminent role of the basilica of St Peter and the secondary role of that of Lateran: he visited St Peter’s thrice (on the day of arrival, July 5, on Sunday, July 9, and on the next Sunday, July 16), whereas he visited Lateran only on Saturday, July 15, where he bathed and dined in the basilica of Pope Vigilius: L. Duchesne, *Le Liber Pontificalis*, p. 343; *Libri pontificalis*, p. 187; *The Book of Pontiffs*, p. 70.

<sup>191</sup> On this legend that remained understudied for so long and still has not received a critical edition, see especially the recent studies by G. Fowden, “The Last Days of Constantine: Oppositional Versions and Their Influence,” *The Journal of Roman Studies* 84, 1994, p. 146-170, as well as by T. Canella, *Gli Actus Silvestri. Genesi di una leggenda su Costantino imperatore*, Spoleto: Centro italiano di studi sull’alto medioevo, 2006, and E. Wirbelauer, “La riche mémoire d’un évêque de Rome méconnu, Silvestre,” in Ph. Blaudeau, P. Van Nuffelen (eds.), *L’historiographie tardo-antique et la transmission des savoirs*, Berlin/Boston, 2015, p. 319-332; cf. T. Canella, “Gli *Actus Silvestri* tra Oriente e Occidente. Storia e diffusione di una leggenda costantiniana,” in A. Melloni et alii (direzione scientifica), *Costantino I. Enciclopedia Costantiniana sulla figura e l’immagine dell’imperatore del cosiddetto editto di Milano. 313-2013*, 3 vols., Romae, 2013, vol. 2, p. 241-258. For the history of the text and its different recensions, the most important study remains that by W. Levison, “Konstantinische Schenkung und Sylvester-Legende,” in *Miscellanea Francesco Ehrle. Scritti di storia e paleografia pubblicati ... in occasione dell’ottantesimo natalizio dell’e. mo. Cardinale Francesco Ehrle*, vol. 2, Città del Vaticano, 1924, p. 159-247 [repr. in W. Levison, *Aus rheinischer und fränkischer Frühzeit. Ausgewählte Aufsätze*, Düsseldorf, 1947, p. 390-465], followed by a series of articles by Wilhelm Pohlkamp, especially (for the most detailed review of the available Latin recensions) W. Pohlkamp, “Textfassungen, literarische Formen und geschichtliche Funktionen der römischen Sylvester-Akten,” *Francia. Forschungen zur westeuropäischen Geschichte* 19, 1992, p. 115-196; however, Pohlkamp’s fourth-century dating of the legend is hardly acceptable for the texts of the available recensions; cf. esp. Fowden’s, Canella’s, and Wirbelauer’s studies mentioned above. An early date would be acceptable for the original core of the legend but it is difficult to define it even in outline.

the construction of the Lateran basilica. According to this legend, Pope Sylvester baptised Constantine—and, by this act, healed him from leprosy—at the very place of the future basilica, in the Lateran imperial palace.<sup>192</sup> The *Actus Silvestri* were written as a legend dedicated to a shrine rather than to a saint (although it also contains the hagiographical coordinates necessary for the commemoration of Sylvester), namely, to the Lateran Basilica as to the first and main church of the Christian Empire.<sup>193</sup>

The earliest recension of the *Actus Silvestri* available, A1, has now convincingly been dated to the middle of the sixth century or somewhat later,<sup>194</sup> whereas the legend itself is substantially earlier, being mentioned *ca* AD 500 in the *Decretum Gelasianum* (ch. 4), where it was recommended as already widely known and read “in accordance with ancient usage.”<sup>195</sup> The earliest form of the legend is difficult to restore but it must be dated to the early fifth century at the latest.<sup>196</sup>

Long before Constans II, the role of the Lateran Basilica became appropriated by the basilica of St Peter in Vatican, where Constans II was to depose the *pallium*. St Peter’s was a Constantinian building too, but its original purpose was to be the memorial of St Peter and a burial place for distinguished Christians. However, since the early sixth century at the latest, it became the main papal church instead of Lateran. Pope Symmachus presented St Peter’s “as

<sup>192</sup> B. Mombritius, *Sanctuarium seu Vitae Sanctorum*, notam hanc editionem curaverunt duo monachi Solesmensenses [D. A. Brunet et D. H. Quentin]. 2 vols, Paris, 1910, vol. 2, p. 512. Mombritius published (in his book of *ca* 1475) Levison’s recension C which is a compilation of the earliest recension A1 and the slightly later recension B1; the Greek and Oriental recensions go to B1. So far, there is no complete edition of A1.

<sup>193</sup> As Wilhelm Pohlkamp demonstrated in a series of articles with an analysis of hagiographical coordinates; see, the latest, W. Pohlkamp, “*Memoria Silvestri*. Zur frühen Erinnerungs- und Verehrungsgeschichte des Tagesheiligen vom 31. Dezember,” in U. Ludwig, Th. Schilp (Hrsg.), *Nomen et fraternitas. Festschrift für Dieter Geuenich zum 65. Geburtstag*, Berlin/New York, 2008, p. 249-296, at p. 285-286 *et passim*. Pohlkamp’s hagiographical approach was supported by E. Wirbelauer, “La riche mémoire,” p. 324; cf. also C. Jäggi, “Mater et caput omnium ecclesiarum: Visual Strategies in the Rivalry between San Giovanni in Laterano and San Pietro in Vaticano,” in L. Bosman, I. P. Haynes, P. Laverani (eds.), *The Basilica of Saint John Lateran to 1600*, Cambridge, 2020, p. 294-317.

<sup>194</sup> T. Canella, *Gli Actus Silvestri*, p. 265-267 *et passim*.

<sup>195</sup> E. von Dobschütz, *Das Decretum Gelasianum de libris recipiendis et non recipiendis in kritischem Text herausgegeben und untersucht* (TU 38, H. 4), Leipzig, 1912, p. 42-43: *item actus beati Silvestri <...> a multus tamen in urbe Roma catholicis legi cognovimus et pro antiquo usu multae hoc imitantur ecclesiae* “then, the *Actus Silvestri* <...> are read, as we know, by many catholics in the city of Rome, and many Churches follow this (example) in accordance with ancient usage.” The textual problems of the *Decretum Gelasianum* are still rather far from being resolved, but, at least, there is a kind of consensus that its chapters 4 and 5 were written *ca* 500.

<sup>196</sup> Cf. T. Canella, *Gli Actus Silvestri*, for the analysis of some possible sources.

a branch of the Lateran, or rather a fully adequate replacement of the cathedral.”<sup>197</sup>

When Constans II entered the basilica of St Peter, he entered the symbolical realm of Lateran already transferred to St Peter’s. He saw inside, on the triumphal arc before the altar, a mosaic depicting Constantine the Great presenting this church to Christ, with a dedicatory verse inscription,<sup>198</sup> and another Constantinian dedicatory verse inscription within the altar, on the apsis wall;<sup>199</sup> both mosaics were of the time of Constantine himself.<sup>200</sup> However, before having seen these two mosaics, Constans must have seen a very large mosaic occupying the whole façade of the basilica, dated to the pontificate of Leo the Great (440–461). It contained an apocalyptic scene (a clipeated bust of Christ against a sky-blue background with the four winged “living beings” [Ezekiel 1:5-28; Rev 4:6-8] above and the twenty-four elders [Rev 4:4] below), on which Constantine the Great and the Apostle Peter were also depicted.<sup>201</sup> One of the verse inscriptions on this mosaic, apparently the most conspicuous, was an exhortation on behalf of Constantine, where an allusion to the *Actus Silvestri* was immediately recognisable<sup>202</sup>:

*Credite victuras anima remeante  
favillas  
rursus ad amissum posse redire diem.  
Nam vaga bis quinos iam luna  
resumpserat orbes*

Believe that with the soul’s return, the ashes destined for  
victory  
can turn again to the light which has been lost!  
Indeed, the wandering moon had twice commenced the  
fives of its orbits,<sup>203</sup>

<sup>197</sup> C. Jäggi, “Mater et caput omnium ecclesiarum,” p. 300. Jäggi relates this shift to the outcome of the schism (498–506) between Pope Symmachus, who established his see in St Peter’s without having access to Lateran, and Pope Laurentius, who held the historical see in Lateran but without access to St Peter’s. Symmachus won. Pope Leo I’s mosaic that will be discussed further on demonstrated that this transformation of St Peter’s into a “new Lateran” began, at least, in the mid-fifth century.

<sup>198</sup> On this mosaic and its inscription, see esp. P. Liverani, “Saint Peter’s, Leo the Great and the leprosy of Constantine,” *Papers of the British School at Rome* 76, 2008, p. 155-172. On the mosaics discussed in this section, see also H. Brandenburg, *Die konstantinische Petersbasilika am Vatikan in Rom. Anmerkungen zu ihrer Chronologie, Architektur und Ausstattung*, Regensburg, 2017, p. 95-110, esp. p. 107. All these mosaics were destroyed, but their compositions are recoverable from preserved descriptions and similar mosaics elsewhere; the texts of their inscriptions are preserved perfectly in the seventh-century collections of such verses.

<sup>199</sup> On this mosaic and its inscription, see esp. P. Liverani, “Saint Peter’s.”

<sup>200</sup> For the recent unconvincing attempts to postpone the date of construction of the basilica, see especially P. Liverani, “Old St Peter’s and the Emperor Constans? A debate with G. W. Bowersock,” *Journal of Roman Archaeology* 28, 2015, p. 485-504. See here for a detailed bibliography of the proponents and the adversaries of such view, first advanced by Glen W. Bowersock in 2002.

<sup>201</sup> As demonstrated by P. Liverani, “Saint Peter’s,” p. 164-165.

<sup>202</sup> This observation belongs to Paolo Liverani, “Saint Peter’s.”; I quote the Latin text and its English translation by Robert Coates-Stephens (with modifications) from this article, p. 165.

<sup>203</sup> This phrase refers to ten lunar months, the full gestation age.

*nutabat dubia cum mihi morte salus  
inrita letiferos auxit medicina dolores  
crevit et humana morbus ab arte  
meus.  
O quantum Petro largitur Christus  
honorem  
ille dedit vitam reddidit iste mihi.*

but for me uncertain salvation was flickering and yielding  
to death.  
Useless medicine increased my bodily agonies  
and my sickness grew, due to the art of human origin.  
Oh, with what great honour Peter has been rewarded by  
Christ!  
One gave me life, and the other has returned it to me.

The inscription alludes to the salient episodes of the *Actus Silvestri*, although in a slightly different form than the preserved recensions: Constantine healed after the Baptism is like a newborn (the preserved texts of the *Actus Silvestri* do not count the number of lunar months of “gestation” but, nevertheless, make a reference to Naaman’s healing [2 Kings 5] and that of the blind-born [John 9], which were traditionally understood as a creation of new flesh<sup>204</sup>), he attributed his healing to the Apostle Peter alone (and not to both Peter and Paul who, according to the available texts, appeared to him together in a dream), and there is no mention of Pope Sylvester.<sup>205</sup> Some of these differences would have resulted from a possible adaptation of the Lateran legend to the new home (especially the reference to Peter alone, without Paul).

With this mosaic, the symbolic landscape of St Peter’s, already with a strong presence of Constantine the Great, became reshaped into the scene of the *Actus Silvestri*, the birthplace of the Christian Empire.

On Sunday, July 9, 663, Constans II entered this symbolical realm for performing the symbolical act of deposing the *pallium*. The *pallium* (omophorion) was then the most remarkable insignium of episcopal dignity, as also encountered in our Slavonic Pseudo-Pseudo-Dionysian fragment (cf. section 2.3). However, it was then a relatively new symbol, still requiring explanations and precautions in the style of our Pseudo-Pseudo-Dionysius.

According to the history as it is told in the *Actus Silvestri*, the first liturgical vestment was brought to Rome under Pope Sylvester by Euphrosynus, an Oriental bishop and Christian confessor whose historical prototype can be

<sup>204</sup> B. Mombritius, *Sanctuarium*, vol. 2, p. 513; cf. Th. L. Brodie, “Jesus as the New Elisha: Cracking the Code,” *The Expository Times* 93, 1981, p. 39-42. It is not clear for how long Constantine remained ill, according to the available recensions.

<sup>205</sup> Most probably, Sylvester’s name was implied, because it was mentioned as early as in the *Decretum Gelasianum*. The earliest name of the anti-Arian Roman Pope who allegedly baptised Constantine was Eusebius (a fictitious figure, see below), the homonym of the historical Eusebius, formerly of Neocaesarea, then of Constantinople, the New Rome, who actually baptised Constantine; he was an Arian bishop and the leader of the Arian party. According to the *Actus Silvestri*, Constantine was baptised in his imperial palace in Rome long before his death, when he was at full strength. Historically, he was baptised on his deathbed in the state villa in Nicomedia at the very beginning of his interrupted military campaign against Iran, although he himself planned to be baptised, after the victory, in the river Jordan; cf. G. Fowden, “The Last Days of Constantine.”

identified as Euphrosynus, bishop of Rhodes.<sup>206</sup> Unlike the Romans, this Euphrosynus used a specific liturgical vestment, *colobium*.<sup>207</sup>

*Qui accedens ad sacrificanda Christi misteria, candidissimo colobio induebatur, quod colobium sancti Jacobi apostoli fuisse commemorabat. Dicebat enim justum esse ac reverentie, ut dum divinis misteriis sacerdos adssistit, his utatur vestibus, que habitum apostolicum in sacerdotem exhibeant. Sic factum est ut a sancto Silvestro et a presbiteribus ejus vel diaconibus coloviorum sumpsit initium. Quod Marcus, Julius et*

Who [Euphrosynus], preparing himself for sacrificing Christ's mysteries, has dressed in a whitest *colobium*, about which *colobium* he recalled that it was that of Saint James. Thus, he said that it is justful and respectful if the celebrant, when he is in presence of the divine mysteries, uses these vestments, which expose the celebrant in the apostolic attire. Thus, it became that the use of *colobium* began with saint Sylvester and his presbyters or deacons. And in the same way it was

<sup>206</sup> The name Euphrosynus is not known among the holy bishops. There is, however, unexpected evidence which identifies the bishop of the legend with the bishop Euphrosynus of Rhodes, one of the Fathers of the Council of Nicaea. In recension A1, bishop Euphrosynus is *ex orientis partibus* with no further specification (I quote A1 according to the partial publication, preserving manuscript spellings, by C. Narbey, *Supplément aux Acta Sanctorum pour des Vies de saints de l'époque mérovingienne*, 2 tomes, Paris, 1895–1912, vol. 2, p. 168; the same reading in C: B. Mombricitus, *Sanctuarium*, vol. 2, p. 509), whereas in B1 (and in the Greek and Oriental recensions) he is *episcopus Pamphyliae* (W. Levison, "Konstantinische Schenkung," p. 422). Pamphylia was a province having, in 325, seven episcopal sees, with Perga as the capital city; "bishop of Pamphylia" would never have been an official title. However, most of the lists of the Fathers of Nicaea place, immediately after the seven bishops of Pamphylia, the name of the bishops of "Islands," where the first in the group is always Euphrosynus of Rhodes. The subtitles of the respective groups, Παμφυλία(ς) and Νήσων, are not always preserved in the manuscripts. See H. Gelzer, H. Hilgenfeld, O. Cuntz (eds.), *Patrum Nicaenorum Nomina latine, graece, coptice, syriace, arabice, armeniace*, mit einem Nachwort von Ch. Marksches. Neudruck der 1. Auflage (1898), Stuttgartiae et Lipsiae, 1995 (Bibliotheca scriptorum graecorum et romanorum Teubneriana), p. 41–42 (Latin recensions), 68 (Greek), 110 and 134 (Syriac), 206 (Armenian); and also bilingual Greek-Syriac recensions: V. N. Beneshevich (В. Н. Бенешевич), "Новые данные для исторической географии Ближнего Востока. (Из греко-сирийского списка отцов Никейского I вселенского собора)," *Известия Кавказского историко-археологического института в Тифлисе*, 2, 1917–1925 (published 1927), p. 111–134, at p. 117 [reprinted in E. Honigmann, "Sur les listes des évêques participant aux conciles de Nicée, de Constantinople et de Chalcédoine," *Byzantion* 12, 1937, p. 323–347, at p. 336] and H. Kaufhold, "Griechisch-syrische Väterlisten der frühen griechischen Synoden," *Oriens Christianus* 77, 1993, p. 1–96, at p. 65. Therefore, the name of Euphrosynus might have been very easily added, by mistake, to the group of the Pamphylian bishops, and *episcopus Pamphyliae* in B1 is to be understood as "a bishop of the province of Pamphylia." The very connexion between the name of the bishop, Euphrosynus, and Pamphylia goes back to the lists of the Nicaean Fathers. It seems most probable that B1 is here closer to the common archetype of A1 and B1. Of course, bishop Euphrosynus of the legend has no need to be more similar to his historical prototype than Pope Sylvester has to his own. Unfortunately, the reason of the appearance of the bishop of Rhodes here seems to be lost together with the archetype of A1 and B1.

<sup>207</sup> C. Narbey, *Supplément*, vol. 2, p. 168; the same passage in C has only minor stylistic differences: B. Mombricitus, *Sanctuarium*, vol. 2, p. 509. B1's text (unpublished for the whole of this fragment; I consulted it *via* the Greek recension BHG 1630: F. Combefis, *Illustrium Christi martyrum lecti triumphi, vetustis Graecorum monumentis consignati*, Parisiis, 1660, p. 266) is different in several details but, for our present purpose, its meaning is the same.

*Liberius eo hordine usi sunt. Postea autem colovia in dalmaticis comutata sunt.*

used by [Popes] Mark [536], Julius [337–352], and Liberius [352–366]. After them, the *colobia* were changed to the dalmatics.

One must not overstate the value of this fragment for the history of liturgical vestments.<sup>208</sup> Its real importance consists in the reference to the head of the Church of Jerusalem, St James: the Church of Rome receives her unique sacerdotal insignium from the Church of Jerusalem.<sup>209</sup> Therefore, the see of Rome depends on the see of Jerusalem,<sup>210</sup> as it is also stated in our text *12 Apostles II*. In Syrian ideology, however, such a reference to the primacy of Jerusalem served to establish the priority of Antioch over Rome, whereas, in Byzantium, it served to establish a *de facto* priority of Constantinople as if acting on behalf of Jerusalem. In this way, Constans II's action with the *pallium*, invoking the *colobium* of St James, preceded the leitmotif of the future Byzantine argumentation against the primacy of Rome, the appellation to the "Mother of the Churches," the Holy Sion.

#### 4.11. A Maronite Baptismal Rite and Byzantine Censorship

##### 4.11.1. The Liturgical Data in the Slavonic *Acts of Peter*

The Slavonic *Acts of Peter* contain a detailed description of the baptismal rite. Something however has been lost, apparently due to the break

<sup>208</sup> Cf. H. Leclercq, "Dalmatique," in *DACL*, vol. IV/1, 1920, col. 111–119, at col. 112. In Latin texts the term *colobium* means either "dalmatic" (Greek στηχάριον) or, as in the present case, a kind of dalmatic where the sleeves are absent or reduced to the very minimum (Greek κολόβιον).

<sup>209</sup> It was noticed for the first time by Michel van Esbroeck, who contraposed the *Actus Silvestri* to the Latin *Inventio Crucis* legend (*BHL* 4169), where the situation is the opposite: the bishop of Jerusalem, Judas-Cyriacus, is consecrated by the (fictitious) Pope of Rome, Eusebius; see M. van Esbroeck, "Rome l'ancienne et Constantinople vue de l'Arménie," in P. Siniscalco, P. Catalano (a cura di), *La nozione di «Romano» tra cittadinanza e universalità, Atti del II Seminario internazionale di studi storici Da Roma alla Terza Roma (Roma 21-23 aprile 1982)*, Napoli, 1983, p. 151-155, at p. 153. Given that the legend of Judas-Cyriacus is by origin, most probably, Greek (cf. *BHG* 396) or, much less probably, Syriac, but certainly not Latin (cf. H. J. W. Drijvers, J. W. Drijvers, *The Finding of the True Cross: The Judas Kyriakos Legend in Syriac. Introduction, Text and Translation*, Lovanii, 1997, p. 21-27), its hierarchy of episcopal sees could be understood better in accordance with canon 3 of the Second Ecumenical Council (381). This canon establishes Rome at the highest place and the New Rome, Constantinople, at the next place, thus implying that the other major sees (Jerusalem, Ephesus, Alexandria, and Antioch) are inferior to these two. For the fictitious figure of Pope Eusebius, an earlier avatar of the "mythologised" Pope Sylvester, see esp. M. van Esbroeck, "Le soi-disant roman de Julien l'Apostat," in H. J. W. Drijvers et alii (eds.), *IV Symposium Syriacum. 1984. Literary Genres in Syriac Literature (Groningen – Oosterhesselen 10-12 September)*, Roma, 1987, p. 191-202.

<sup>210</sup> This meaning of this scene that certainly belongs to the core of the *Actus Silvestri* contradicts the laws allegedly issued by Constantine in favour of the Roman primacy, which belong to the sixth-century editorial layer; these laws are studied in T. Canella, *Gli Actus Silvestri*.

between the two fragments (see above, section 4.9.1). The first fragment describes the rite of catechumenate performed by Peter for one man, Sophia's husband (B 87 / P 207), but, in the second fragment, the whole flock including this man is baptised after a 40-day catechumenate (B 88-89 / P 208-209). The scene(s) with the rite of catechumenate for the whole flock is (are) missing. This must be a mistake by an editor, who abbreviated the original work, and not of the author. The coherence of the story has thus been affected, but, if the compiler was interested in extracting a liturgical manual, he must have found it appropriate to avoid excessive repetition of a rite which had already been described.

The description of the rite of catechumenate is the following (with my reconstruction of the text slightly but differently distorted in B and P):

сего же огласи в катихумен [P; B: огласив, <i>the next word</i> катихумен missed]. маслом помаза и. и вложи и [B; in P missed] пост до 40 днии.	(Peter) catechised this man (to become) catechumen, anointed him with the oil and imposed (ἐπιτέθηκε / κατατέθηκε) <sup>211</sup> on him fasting for 40 days.
---	---

The lexical difficulties in this passage were discussed above (section 4.2). The passage shows that the rite of making catechumen included instruction (catechism) and anointment with oil, but it remains unspecified which parts of the body were anointed.

The second fragment begins with the long catechism delivered by Peter from the top of a rock (B 88 / P 208; see section 4.6) on Easter Sunday, the first day after the forty-day fast (B 87 / P 207). The Baptism took place the next day. In this sermon Peter alludes to the main theological topics symbolised in the part of the baptismal rite from the beginning until the recitation of the Creed (the confession of faith); and he instructs people to come tomorrow in white robes.

The rite of the Baptism *proprie* has been described as follows (B 88 / P 209, the text quoted is from P with some variant readings of B in square brackets; I end the quotation before Peter's farewell sermon); my translation includes some necessary explanations:

и став петр на висоце месте и рече к людем. обещасте ли ся богови. якоже вчера рекосте.	And Peter standing on a high place said to the people: "Do you promise to God [to keep the true faith <sup>212</sup> ], as you said yesterday?" And all of
---	--

<sup>211</sup> Cf. *LLP*, vol. 1, p. 302.

<sup>212</sup> In the baptismal terminology, the confession of faith preceded with the abjuration from Satan and the solemn association of oneself to Christ, is called "promise" (ἐπαγγελία); cf. *Constitutiones apostolicae*, 7.42.1, cf. 7.41.1; *Les constitutions apostoliques*, introduction, texte critique, traduction et notes par M. Metzger, vol. 3, Paris, 1987, p. 100 and 96.

они же вси отвещаша еи. честнии апостоле. апостол же се слышав. възрев на небо и рече великим гласом. благословен бог просвеща вся и святя [В *corrupted* святая] в веки веком аминь. и повеле им съодетися и влести в воду. и абие [P; В потом же] повеле их мазати крестообразно на всех удех. жен же не крести ту. но особ с софиєю. и крести народы повеле им погрузитися во имя отца. таже во имя сына. и паки во имя святого духа. семуже бывшую возгреме гром с небесе страшно. яко поколебатися всему граду. и явишася луча огньны страшны. пришествие бо параклитово осени их. и гласи с небесе слышахуся. яко жадает елень на источники водныя и прокое [*to read* прочая]. и пак. блажени имже отпущена суть безакония. имже прикрываша греси их. петр же сам пояше и нам повелеваше пети. и изведе люди вон. и повеле по единому приходити к себе. и мазаше я хризмою. чело. очи. уста. ноздри. уши. и таче повелеваше надевати на ня линови епископу и сущим с ним прозвутером и иным диаконом венца червлёныя. на главы их обязати. на них же крест. и белая стихаря. и ногавица. и сандалиа. и повеле всем в руце свеща дати. ити в церковь и ту препочити. сам же шед на особое место града. иже зовется тивириада. поим с собою тъкмо единех ученик. и кръсти блаженую софию. с прочими женами градскими и помаза я вся святою хризмою. и

them answered: "Yes, oh honourable Apostle!" Hearing this, the Apostle, looking up to the heaven, said very loudly: *Blessed is God, Who illumineth and sanctifieth everything unto ages of ages.* And (Peter) commanded them to undress and to enter the water. And instantly [P; B after this] (Peter) commanded to anoint them tracing the sign of the cross on all members (of the body). However, he did not baptise there the women, but (baptised them) separately with Sophia. And (Peter) baptised the people: commanded them to immerse in the name of the Father, then in the name of the Son, and once again in the name of the Holy Spirit. Then when it happened, terrible thunder roared from the heaven, so that the whole city trembled, and appeared terrible fire rays, because the coming of the Paraclete overshadowed them, and voices were heard from heaven: *As the hart panteth after the water brooks* (Ps. 41:1 LXX) and so on; and again: *Blessed are those whose transgressions are forgiven and whose sins are covered* (Ps. 31:1 LXX). Peter sung himself and commanded to us to sing. Then he brought people out of there (*sc.*, from the water) and commanded to arrive to him one by one, and he anointed them with the chrism (myron): on the front, on the eyes, on the mouth, on the nostrils, on the ears. Then he commanded to Bishop Linus and the presbyters which were with him (with Linus) [*that is, to the whole Roman clergy with the bishop at its head*] to put on them red crowns (in the form of headbands) having (embroidered) the (sign of the) cross, wounding them around their heads, and (to put on them as well) white dalmatics (στυχάρια), and trousers, and sandals, and commanded to give everyone a candle in their hands and to go to the church to have a rest there. Meanwhile, (Peter) himself, having come to an isolated place of the city called Tiberias and taking with him only the disciples, baptised the blessed Sophia with other women of the city and anointed them with the holy chrism, and commanded to all of them to go to the church, with the burning candles in their hands, while he himself went to the church



повеле им всем ити в церковь. after them.  
 свеща горяща имуща в руку. сам  
 же после иде в церковь.

Oddly enough, this description does not mention the Eucharist following the Baptismal service. Probably it was omitted by the compiler of the florilegium without having marked the break in the text. In addition to this, the account is severely confused. Byzantine and Oriental elements are mixed together and, what is completely beyond reason, the main part of the flock (without women) entered into the water twice. This is clearly a result of unhelpful editing. It would be useful to systematise the material according to the elements of the baptismal rite without attempting to make corrections but omitting the repetition of a part of the rite made for the women. Thus, we obtain the following scheme:

1. Repetition of the “promise” (that is, of the confession of faith proclaimed the day before).
2. The Byzantine exclamation before the prebaptismal anointing with oil, abbreviated (its complete form is Εὐλογητὸς ὁ θεὸς ὁ φωτίζων καὶ ἁγιάζων πάντα ἄνθρωπον ἐρχόμενον εἰς τὸν κόσμον, νῦν καὶ ἀεὶ καὶ εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας τῶν αἰώνων. Ἀμήν<sup>213</sup> “Blessed is God, Who illumineth and sanctifieth every man that comes into the world, now and ever and unto ages of ages. Amen”).
3. The first mentioning of the people entering into the water.
4. Anointing with oil (thus, the people must have come out of the water): Peter does not anoint himself but delegates this duty to his ministers; the whole body is anointed but with tracing the signs of the cross (these two kinds of anointment are technically incompatible: either you make the signs of the cross on a few of the most important parts of the body, or you anoint the body everywhere simply by touching, without drawing crosses).
5. The second occurrence of entering into water, triple immersion.
6. Thunder, voices from heaven – when people are in the water; theological meaning is explained (the coming of the Paraclete) but liturgical not (it represents the consecration of the baptismal waters, see next section).
7. Ps. 41:1 LXX sung still in water.
8. Ps. 31:1 LXX sung still in water.
9. Anointing with myron performed by Peter himself; only the most important parts of the body are anointed.
10. Crowning with a cloth headband.
11. Dressing.
12. Procession with the candles to the church.

<sup>213</sup> S. Parenti, E. Velikovska, *L'eucologio Barberini*, p. 130; М. Арранц, *Избранные сочинения по литургике*. Том V. *Введение в таинства Византийской традиции*, Rome – Moscow, 2006, p. 504.

Points 2 to 10 contain details specific to different baptismal rites, exploring them in a bit more detail will help to understand this unrealistic baptismal scheme.

#### 4.11.2. Elements of Byzantine and Oriental Baptismal Rites

A comparison between the corresponding elements of the baptismal service in our *Acts* and the Byzantine rite is presented in Table 2<sup>214</sup>.

Table 2

Byzantine Baptismal Rite	Baptismal Rite in the Slavonic <i>Acts of Peter</i>
Consecration of the water; consecration of the oil.	Not mentioned explicitly.
Exclamation Εὐλογητὸς ὁ θεὸς ὁ φωτίζων καὶ ἁγιάζων...	Quoted in an abbreviated form, but present.
Anointing with the oil: the priest anoints only the front, the breast, and between the shoulders; then a deacon (deaconess for the women) anoints the whole body.	Anointing with the oil performed by the ministers and not by the celebrant; the whole body is anointed.
Triple immersion.	Triple immersion, but this is already the second entering into the water.
Ps. 31:1 LXX sung after the immersion (and again, after the anointing with myron).	Ps. 31:1 LXX sung only once, after the immersion but still in the water.
Anointment with the myron: performed by the celebrant only on the most important parts of the body (front, eyes, nostrils, mouth, ears).	Exactly the same.

The crowning clearly is an Oriental element. In the East, the Byzantine and Armenian rites have no crowning at all, but the Coptic and Ethiopic rites use a literal crown, whereas in all Syrian rites the crown is represented by a cloth headband.<sup>215</sup> It is obvious that the Byzantine layer in the baptismal rite in our *Acts* is a later modification, while the original layer belongs to the Syrian liturgical family. Within the Syrian family, Ps. 41:1 LXX leads us to the Maronite rite in one of its early forms. Here, this verse occurs in the anaphora of

<sup>214</sup> For the Byzantine rite, see S. Parenti, E. Velikovska, *L'eucologio Barberini*, p. 130-131; M. Арранц, *Избранные труды по литургии*, T. V, p. 504-512.

<sup>215</sup> M. E. Johnson, *The Rites of Christian Initiation: Their Evolution and Interpretation*, Revised and Expanded Edition, Collegeville, MN, 2007, p. 301.

the consecration of the baptismal waters.<sup>216</sup> To my knowledge, this verse does not occur in any other preserved rite of the consecration of the baptismal waters. In such rites, emphasis is always put on the imagery of the Jordan and the Baptism of Jesus, while the motif of water for drinking is absent or (in non-baptismal water consecration rites) marginalised. This verse was very popular, however, in early (at least up to the sixth century) Latin Christianity, as is visible in Christian art, especially in baptisteries (including in Rome).<sup>217</sup> Its liturgical usage was however different in early Latin Christianity: not in the consecration of the waters but in the chant of the catechumens in their procession to the baptistery.<sup>218</sup> In our *Acts of Peter*, the place of Ps. 41:1 LXX is certainly different.

Ps. 41:1 LXX, sung *within* the waters by the humans and above the waters by heavenly voices, provides a precious hint. The corresponding scene, with thunder and fires, must be interpreted as the consecration of the baptismal waters, as it should be according to the Maronite rite. Among the Syrian baptismal rites, the Maronite is one of the most conservative. Even more conservative was the Syriac Melkite baptismal rite. The conservatism of these rites consisted especially in their fidelity to the ancient Syrian baptismal tradition with the absence of any post-baptismal anointing,<sup>219</sup> whereas, in other Syrian traditions, it was introduced in the period from the early fifth century (the Western rite of Antioch) to the mid-seventh century (the rite of the Church of the East).<sup>220</sup> During the seventh century, the Melkites were Monotheletes like the

<sup>216</sup> A. Mouhanna, *Les rites de l'initiation dans l'Église Maronite*, Rome, 1980, p. 45.

<sup>217</sup> Mostly mosaics but sometimes, following the example of the Constantinian baptisterium in Lateran, there were sculptures of deers. In the Lateran baptisterium, according to the most recent reconstruction, seven golden sculptures of deers (ca 70 cm high) "must have stood on the rim [of the round baptismal font]... with their bodies parallel to the rim and only their heads turned towards the centre of the font," with "water flowing from their mouths into the font." "This position would emphasize the movement of the animal in a kind of circular procession around the rim, imitating or illustrating the circular procession which possibly was done by the believers around the font"; O. Brandt, "Deer, Lambs and Water," p. 154, cf. p. 149, fig. 5.

<sup>218</sup> R. M. Jensen, *Living Water: Images, Symbols, and Settings of Early Christian Baptism*, Leiden/Boston, 2011, p. 252-254 *et passim*. However, the place of the deer in the Lateran baptisterium could refer to some other ceremony (e.g. the triple circumambulation of the font after the baptism) of a very early baptismal rite still in use at the time of Constantine.

<sup>219</sup> Cf. A. Mouhanna, *Les rites*, p. 264, on the archaisms in the Maronite rite including the demonstrability of the fact that "le rite baptismal dans l'Église Maronite apparaît profondément enraciné dans la tradition antiochienne primitive qui ne connaissait pas d'onction postbaptismale"; for the Syriac Melkite rite preserving anointing only once (before the immersion) even in the twelfth century; see S. Brock, "A Short Melkite Baptismal Service in Syriac," *Parole de l'Orient* 3, 1972, p. 119-130. The place of this originally single anointing varied, either before or after the consecration of the waters.

<sup>220</sup> On anointments in the Syrian traditions, see esp.: G. Winkler, "The Original Meaning of the Prebaptismal Anointing and Its Implications," *Worship* 52, 1978, no. 1, p. 24-45 [repr. in eadem, *Studies in Early Christian Liturgy and Its Context*, Aldershot/Brookfield, VT, 1997, ch. I];

Maronites, but their respective Syriac liturgical traditions originated from different centres: the Maronites were liturgically closer to East Syria with Edessa, while the Melkites to West Syria with Antioch. The *Acts of Peter* do not attest to the earliest stage of the development of the baptismal rite when there was only one pre-baptismal anointment, but to some later stage when two pre-baptismal anointments were established. Let us recall that Sophia's husband was anointed when becoming a catechumen. The second anointment, immediately before the Baptism, was of course the most important.

For the Byzantine reader, our *Acts*, in their original form, presented a baptismal rite claiming apostolic authority but deprived of the anointing with myron. This must have appeared intolerable. Duplication of the entering into the waters seems to be a result of inconsistent efforts by, at least, two different editors. Eventually, the post-baptismal anointing was added, patterned exactly after the Byzantine model. The original pre-baptismal anointing became confused with the Byzantine anointing of the whole body.<sup>221</sup> Originally, only the most important parts of the body were anointed with the sign of the cross. The rite can now be reconstructed.

#### 4.11.3. The Baptismal Rite in the *Acts of Peter* (and the *Vita Pancratii*)

The previous section identified the later additions to the description of the baptismal service in the *Slavonic Acts of Peter*: the Byzantine elements (including the post-baptismal anointment with myron) and the first entering into the water (an editorial mistake). Without these additions, a relatively coherent account emerges. The next step is to provide a liturgical interpretation of the scene with thunder and fires. In the context of Syrian traditions, the thunder and fires obviously symbolise the consecration of the baptismal waters. It is patterned after the account of Jesus's baptism in the Jordan according to the description in the main gospel of Syrian antiquity, the *Diatessaron*. The account in the *Diatessaron* is fuller than that of the four gospels. It is responsible for the tradition which has spread throughout the Christian world of witnessing at Jesus's Baptism light and fire from above and/or within the water. This tradition was especially emphasised in exegetical and liturgical texts in Syriac (and

---

S. Brock, "The Transition to a Post-Baptismal Anointing in the Antiochene Rite," in B. D. Spinks (ed.), *The Sacrifice of Praise: Studies in Honour of A.H. Couratin*, Rome, 1981, p. 249-257 [repr. in idem, *The Holy Spirit in the Syrian Baptismal Tradition* (3<sup>rd</sup> ed.), Piscataway, NJ, 2013, p. 165-174]; B. Varghese, *Les onctions baptismales dans la tradition syrienne*, Lovanii, 1989.

<sup>221</sup> It was accepted as well by most of the Syriac rites, where the number of anointments increased up to the record number four in the rite of Antioch; cf. S. Brock, "Studies in the Early History of the Syrian Orthodox Baptismal Liturgy," *The Journal of Theological Studies* 23, 1972, p. 16-64, at p. 16-27.

Armenian, due to their dependency on Syrian traditions).<sup>222</sup> These traditions derived from the *Diatessaron* are sufficient to explain the fire rays in the scene of the Baptism in the Tiber, but not the thunder. The thunder represents another heavenly voice at the Baptism of Jesus (Matthew 3:17 and parallels), and the substitution itself was made in a traditional way (cf. John 12:29, in turn, referring to Exodus 19:16 and 20:18). Therefore, the scheme of the period preceeding baptism (catechumenate) and the baptismal service in our *Acts* is the following:

Preparation period:

1. Becoming catechumen by means of an anointing with oil.
2. 40-day period of catechumenate.

The baptismal service:

3. The baptismal candidates are anointed (only at this point in the service, not also after the immersion).
4. Consecration of the waters with Ps. 41:1 LXX.
5. Triple immersion.
6. Crowning (Syrian type, with cloth headband).
7. Dressing in white robes.
8. Procession to the church holding candles.

It is not necessary to speculate here whether two different kinds of oil were used for the two anointments (the blessed oil for becoming catechumen and the myron at the beginning of the baptismal service). The distinction between the myron and the regular oil is relatively ancient but the strict requirement to use them differently in the baptismal rites is relatively late. For instance, in the West Syrian rite of Antioch, this practice was introduced in the eighth if not the tenth century.<sup>223</sup>

The reconstruction presented here is corroborated with the data of the *Vita Pancratii*. After the conversion of a heathen priestess, Pancratius baptised her in the following way: “Then the Saint instructed her and after anointing her with holy oil, baptized her, and at the completion of the laying aside of the robes, he ordained her deaconess”.<sup>224</sup> This description implies the basic scheme

<sup>222</sup> An ample dossier is provided by G. Winkler, “Die Licht-Erscheinung bei der Taufe Jesu und der Ursprung des Epiphaniestes. Eine Untersuchung griechischer, syrischer, armenischer und lateinischer Quellen,” *Oriens Christianus* 78, 1994, p. 177-229.

<sup>223</sup> B. Varghese, *Les onctions*, p. 341.

<sup>224</sup> C. J. Stallman-Pacitti, *The Life*, p. 238/239-240/241 (text/tr.): ὁ οὖν μακάριος κατηχήσας αὐτὴν καὶ χρίσας τῷ ἁγίῳ ἐλαίῳ ἐβάπτισεν, καὶ ἐν τῷ συμπληρωθῆναι τὴν ἀπόθεσιν τῶν ἀμφίων ἐχειροτόνησεν αὐτὴν διάκονον.

of catechism – pre-baptismal anointing – baptism – dressing (followed by the ordination to deaconess), and without post-baptismal anointment. No wonder that so closely connected hagiographic works as our *Acts* and the *Vita Pancratii* testify to the same liturgical tradition.

#### 4.12. What are the Slavonic *Acts of Peter*?

The *Acts of Peter* are preserved in two major fragments, both containing later modifications such as editing and abbreviations. Nevertheless, they remain recognisable as a fascinating work of Syrian monothelete propaganda of the mid-660s or somewhat later. Substantiated hopes of return to official Monotheletism were alive, at least, in the early eighth century. Our *Acts of Peter* implicitly refer to an earlier (mid-650s) monothelete propagandistic legend written from an imperial (not Syrian) viewpoint as a new recension of an earlier Syriac Pseudo-Clementine epitome; both works were written in Syriac but preserved in other languages. The Slavonic *Acts* were written within a network of hagiographic legends produced in the two languages, Greek and Syriac, in the interests of the monothelete part of the Syrian diaspora in Italy (mostly in the south, Sicily, and Rome).

The Slavonic *Acts* are unique in their data on the sacred topography of Rome and especially the basilica *Sancta Maria Antiqua*. Its alternative name Sophia witnessed directly by our *Acts* but indirectly also by the *Passio* of Anastasia the Virgin would have been its original official Byzantine name. The occurrence in the *Acts* of the relics of St Stephanus is also of significant importance. The *Acts* are full of important liturgical information that remains largely unexplored even after the present study. Finally, these *Acts* are an addition to the very meagre collection of monothelete documents. They contribute nothing to current knowledge of their theology, but reveal much about Church politics.

#### Conclusion

The present study focused on the New Testament apocryphal material within a long compilation entitled *Narration Against the Romans* which survives only in the Slavonic language in Russian manuscripts, and exists in three recensions: short, complete, and elaborated. All three recensions preserve the eleventh-century Byzantine core, where an anonymous Byzantine anti-Latin polemicist used an earlier source that was available to him in Greek. This earlier source was a Greek monothelete florilegium consisting of texts translated from Syriac where a series of quotations from pseudo-apostolic writings aimed to demonstrate the subordinate status of the see of Rome to an Eastern Church (see Table 3 below). The latter, however, is not the Patriarchate of Constantinople but

that of Antioch, sometimes represented as, in turn, subordinated to the Church of Jerusalem. The implied ecclesiastical map of the world is clearly Syrian.

I left the question of whether the monothelite florilegium was composed in Syriac or in Greek unresolved. If I am not wrong in my impression that the quality of the Greek translation from Syriac in the *Acts of Peter* is better than in the other parts, then our Syriac texts would have been translated into Greek by different translators on different occasions, and, therefore, the monothelite florilegium would have been produced in Greek. I am far from sure about this, however.

The New Testament apocryphal material examined in this study consists of the following fragmentary narrative works: three different texts related to the twelve apostles, with a Pseudo-Pseudo-Dionysian fragment inserted in between the second and third texts; followed by a text ascribed to Evodius, the successor of Peter in Antioch, and thirdly a work within the tradition of attributing Petrine Apocrypha to Clement of Rome: the *Acts of Peter in Rome*. The main results of our analysis of these pieces are presented in Table 3.

Table 3

Source	Date	Milieu and/or Place of Origin	The See of Rome is subordinated to
<i>12 Apostles I</i>	No earlier than the 5 <sup>th</sup> century	East of Byzantium	an unspecified Eastern See (Jerusalem or Antioch?)
<i>12 Apostles II</i>	Late 6 <sup>th</sup> or early 7 <sup>th</sup> century	“Paulists” (followers of Paul Beth-Ukkame)	Antioch (which in turn is subordinated to Jerusalem)
<b>Pseudo-Pseudo-Dionysius</b>	7 <sup>th</sup> century?	A Syrian milieu?	—
<i>12 Apostles III</i>	Second half of the 7 <sup>th</sup> century or early 8 <sup>th</sup> century	Syrian Christians in the Umayyad Caliphate (near Caesarea Philippi?)	Damascus (successor of Antioch)
<b>Evodius</b>	Unknown	A non-identified Syrian milieu	Antioch
<i>Acts of Peter in Rome</i>	Shortly after 663	Syrian Monothelites in Italia	Antioch

The latest datable works within the material studied in the present article are *Twelve Apostle III* (a post-661 date in the late seventh or the early eighth century) and the *Acts of Peter* (written after the visit of Constans II to Rome in 663). These are the only available *terminus post quem* for the date of the

monothelete florilegium (the Greek pre-11<sup>th</sup>-century source of the 11<sup>th</sup>-century Byzantine anti-Latin author).

An addition to the Pseudo-Pseudo-Areopagitic corpus is of special interest as it is the second identified (and the only published) piece of this corpus in Slavonic. Its ultimately Syriac origin is expectably taking into account the history of this secondary pseudepigraphic *Corpus Pseudo-Pseudo-Dionysiacum*.

The *Acts of Peter in Rome* provided some historical data on the *Sancta Maria Antiqua* church in Rome and Constans II's sojourn in Rome in 663. In particular, they helped to demonstrate that the southwest chamber adjacent to the main altar of the basilica was transformed into the solemn shrine for veneration of a relic of St Stephanus deposited there by Constans on July 8, 663. They also helped to understand the meaning of the *pallium* deposited by Constans on the altar of the basilica of St Peter; this act, in turn, becomes more understandable seen against its background (hagiographical substrate) in the *Actus Silvestri*. The respective lines of the *Liber pontificalis* are to be read in the same language as they were written, within the realm of liturgical and hagiographical symbolism. Thus, the case of the *Acts of Peter* would recall the famous etching at the title page of the first volume of the *Acta Sanctorum* (1643), where the figure of *Veritas* using a magnifying glass redirects daylight into an obscure cave, and the subscription says *Obscura revelo*. This iconic message of the founding father of the Bollandists Jean Bolland (1596–1665) is echoed by a still justified note of a Bollandist of our epoch who complained about the reluctance of historians to use as sources hagiographical legends that were created as tools of propaganda: "...l'aspect historique de la littérature de propagande échappe à l'histoire positiviste, dont elle fait cependant partie."<sup>225</sup>

In the history of texts and literature, our Slavonic documents are interesting for both earlier and later periods. Some inclusions of early Christian apocryphal traditions that expectably occur in our later documents are pertinent to earlier epochs. Thus, the same *Acts of Peter* are an indirect witness to an intermediate phase of the Roman cults of Flavia Domitilla and Pope Clement, where Flavia Domitilla still preserved her historical status of the wife of Flavius Clement (whereas she was transformed into his niece as early as in Eusebius), while Clement of Rome had already become Flavius Clement's nephew (as it became normal for the Roman fifth-century hagiography). Perhaps the most interesting early material is preserved in Evodius, fragment 2: the fragmentary scene with converted Greek rhetors from Antioch, allegedly those who arrived to Jesus in John 12:22, the continuation of which seems to be preserved in an often-overlooked passage of Epiphanius. This apocryphal gospel tradition has never been described so far.

---

<sup>225</sup> M. van Esbroeck, "Le soi-disant roman de Julien l'Apostat," p. 202, note 27.



At the same time, our hagiographical documents are pertinent to some later literary traditions and especially the French literature of the period of the Third Crusade (late thirteenth century). So far, it was known that the *Life of St Pancratius of Tauromenium*, referred to in our Slavonic *Acts of Peter*, was an important source for the *Aspremont*. We can add now that our Evodius refers to the Jerusalem legend that is a previously unrecognised source used by Robert de Boron in his exposition of the history of the Holy Grail.

Finally, our Slavonic documents are especially rich in liturgical data which I was able to explore here only superficially. Different materials related to the rites of bishop consecration remain especially intriguing.

The above incomplete recapitulation of the topics discussed in connexion with our Slavonic text could provide a general idea of how important the study of late apocryphal literature could be. Indeed, its very informativeness concerning its own – late – epoch creates an obstacle for its study by historians of Early Christian apocrypha. Nevertheless, these late documents are not negligible even in the studies of early traditions.

Therefore, the apocryphal literature that, according to Éric Junod's saying quoted in the Introduction to the present study, "n'a pas de limite chronologique," requires methods of critical hagiography, which are not especially familiar to those whose domain is biblical and apocryphal studies. This interdisciplinary gap resulted from an unexpected parting of the ways between critical hagiography of Delehaye and biblical historical criticism of Lagrange by whom Delehaye was inspired. I will conclude this study with a brief discussion of this methodological issue.

### **Methodological Postscriptum: Critical Hagiography and Biblical Criticism**

As numerous studies show,<sup>226</sup> the main difficulties of Delehaye and the Bollandists with the Roman ecclesiastical authorities were provoked by their association with the school of biblical criticism by Marie-Joseph Lagrange, O.P. (1855–1938).<sup>227</sup> In the epoch of the anti-modernist struggle in the Roman Catholic Church and especially after Pius X's anti-modernist encyclical *Pascendi Dominici gregis* (1907), any infringement of literal truthfulness of the Bible was considered as criminal.<sup>228</sup> It remained, however, difficult to explain

<sup>226</sup> Amongst them, of an exceptional value is Bernard Joassard's monograph *Hippolyte Delehaye*.

<sup>227</sup> On him, see esp. B. Montagnes, *Marie-Joseph Lagrange. Une biographie critique*, Paris, 2004, with further bibliography.

<sup>228</sup> The normative teaching of the epoch was Leo XIII's encyclical *Providentissimus Deus* (1893), where the doctrine of divine inspiration was explained as direct dictation by God: *Neque enim eorum ratio librorum similis atque communium putanda est; sed, quoniam sunt ab ipso Spiritu*

why the methods of critical hagiography must remain unapplicable to the Bible. The programmatic book of Delehaye *Légendes hagiographiques* (1905)<sup>229</sup> appeared almost immediately after the programmatic book of Lagrange *La méthode historique* (1903 and 1904),<sup>230</sup> and the audience was thus exposed to a strong temptation of reading the former as a sequel of the latter.

Delehaye himself, unlike some of his defenders,<sup>231</sup> has never stated explicitly that, from a scholarly viewpoint, there must be an impenetrable wall between hagiographical literature and the Bible. He has never changed or restricted his classical definition of *le document hagiographique* as distinct from any other documents that would mention some saints: "...tout monument écrit inspiré par le culte des saints, et destiné à le promouvoir."<sup>232</sup> One would hardly deny that the Bible is produced by and destined to such a cult of the unique God, which implies a cult of saints (patriarchs, prophets, and others), and it would be hardly demonstrable that even the cult of Jesus is, from this point of view, staying apart from all other cults of saints. If critical hagiography deals with

---

*Sancto dictate...* ("For the Sacred Scripture is not like other books. Dictated by the Holy Ghost, it..."); here and below quotations from the papal encyclicals and their English translations are from the site *La Santa Sede* (vatican.va).

<sup>229</sup> H. Delehaye, *Les légendes hagiographiques*, Bruxelles, 1905. Delehaye and Lagrange prepared their respective programmatic books simultaneously. Delehaye's book was an expansion of his long 1903 article with the same title: H. Delehaye, "Les légendes hagiographiques," *Revue des questions historiques* 74, 1903, p. 56-122.

<sup>230</sup> After the first edition (1903), especially remarkable was the second one with an addition of the "Note pour le second tirage," where the author answered his critics formulating explicitly that "[t]outes les pages qui suivent supposent que la Bible est une matière mixte," where dogmas of faith are mixed with a "bon nombre de prétendus dogmes historiques et littéraires"; M.-J. Lagrange, *La méthode historique*, Édition augmentée, Paris, 1904 (Études bibliques), p. XVIII-XIX. This understanding of the Bible was hardly compatible with that of divine dictation in the *Providentissimus* of Leo XIII. Nevertheless, Lagrange's distance from modernism was much greater: "[l]a légende a sa vérité, supérieure, assez souvent, à celle des critiques," in the way that, e.g., "l'Abraham de la Bible est beaucoup plus vrai que celui de tel ou tel critique, et c'est ce qui nous importe de plus" (*ibidem*, p. XII-XIII). Cf., for a concise but detailed analysis, F. Refoulé, "La méthode historico-critique et le Père Lagrange," *Revue des sciences philosophiques et théologiques* 76, 1992, p. 553-558.

<sup>231</sup> E.g. one of the censors of *Les légendes hagiographiques*, Paul Goethals, S.J., wrote in 1904: "En étudiant les principes de critique qui guident les hagiographes, l'idée vient facilement qu'ils pourraient être aussi bien applicable à la Bible, application que les hétérodoxes ne manquent pas de faire ; mais les catholiques instruits qui liront les « Légendes hagiographiques » savent établir la différence entre les écrits sans autorité historique et les livres inspirés préservés d'altérations depuis une haute antiquité et garantis par l'Église" (B. Joassart, *Hippolyte Delehaye*, vol. 2, p. 530); one can notice that he has only two arguments, one theological and another (somewhat naive) from the textual tradition, but no argument that would be both of scholarly value and based on the internal structure of the texts.

<sup>232</sup> H. Delehaye, *Les légendes*, p. 2; repeated in the reworked definitive third edition: H. Delehaye, *Les légendes hagiographiques*, 3<sup>me</sup> éd., Bruxelles, 1927, p. 2.

documents produced by cults and for cultic purposes, there is no *scholarly* reasons to exclude the Bible (not to say apocryphal literature) from hagiography.

Delehaye in his *Légendes* avoided dotting I's and crossing T's, but this was completed for him by such an authoritative reviewer as Salomon Reinach, who took as an example Delehaye's treatment of a scene with a talking dog from the earliest *Acta Petri* (CANT 190).<sup>233</sup> Delehaye understood this dog as a "reminiscence" of Balaam's donkey, but Reinach asked why both talking dog and talking donkey are not reminiscences of the talking animals in folklore. He continued: "Si l'on répond que l'histoire de l'âne de Balaam est garantie par l'autorité de l'Église, l'œuvre de la critique scientifique devient inutile".<sup>234</sup> Indeed, this is exactly what the conservative critics of Delehaye thought considering his critical hagiography: "inutile" at best. In the light of this story, one can better understand Delehaye's refusal to consider the apocryphal acts of apostles in his 1921 *Les Passions des martyrs*, which I quoted in the Introduction. Touching the apocryphal acts could have been especially painful for him.

Delehaye's deepest sympathy toward Lagrange's personality and his scientific approach are a well-known fact. Delehaye collected and closely followed Lagrange's publications and his periodical *Revue biblique*.<sup>235</sup> However, the role of Lagrange's ideas in the pre-history of Delehaye's critical hagiography remains understudied. In my opinion, an article by Lagrange published in 1896 predefined Delehaye's way of thinking, namely, his idea that the historicity of a legend drastically depends on its *genre littéraire*. Delehaye articulated this view in *Les légendes hagiographiques* and exposed it most systematically in *Les Passions des martyrs et les genres littéraires*. It was Lagrange who was the first to declare: "Nous avons le principe de critique littéraire : l'intention de l'auteur se manifeste par le genre qu'il a choisi."<sup>236</sup> Then Lagrange discerned three biblical genres easily recognisable in Delehaye's classification of hagiographical literature:<sup>237</sup>

1. Different kinds of stories void of historical value; Lagrange called them with several terms including "histoire édifiante" and "roman" (let us recall Delehaye's notion of *roman hagiographique*);
2. Historical writing properly, "une histoire officielle ou des mémoires exactes" (let us recall Delehaye's notion of *Passion historique*);

<sup>233</sup> H. Delehaye, *Les légendes*, 1905, p. 59-60.

<sup>234</sup> S. Reinach, [review of H. Delehaye, *Les légendes hagiographiques*, 1905], *Revue critique d'histoire et de littérature* 59, 1905, p. 422-425, at p. 424.

<sup>235</sup> Cf. B. Joassart, *Hippolyte Delehaye, passim*.

<sup>236</sup> M.-J. Lagrange, "L'inspiration et les exigences de la critique," *Revue biblique* 5, 1896, p. 496-518, at p. 507.

<sup>237</sup> *Ibidem*, esp. p. 510-513.

3. “Entre l’histoire édifiante et l’histoire proprement dite, se place l’histoire des origines” (Delehaye was not to borrow the wording but adapted the very idea to hagiography in his notion of *Passion épique*).

For Delehaye, the two fundamental poles of hagiographical writings were “historical” and “epic” genres, while the latter has an extension to that of *roman hagiographique*. One can see that a basic principle of Delehaye’s critical hagiography, the value of hagiographical genre, and an outline of the genre classification were borrowed from Lagrange. The second fundamental principle, the definition of hagiographical documents as those that are proper to a cult, was specific to Delehaye, but Delehaye did not elaborate on its very formal consequences until his lectures of the early 1930s published as *Cinq leçons sur la méthode hagiographique* (1934).

One can wonder why Delehaye himself has never referred to Lagrange in his *Les Passions des martyrs et les genres littéraires* in 1921. The answer is that it was too late: one year before, the pertinent (and other) of Lagrange’s ideas had already been referred to by Benedict XV in his encyclical *Spiritus Paracletus* (1920) aimed at condemnation of Lagrange’s biblical criticism. The Pope mentioned in particular those who invent *genera quaedam litterarum* in the holy books.<sup>238</sup> In this way, the unfinished bridge between biblical criticism and critical hagiography was blown up.

Today we can and we have to revisit the question of whether the notion of hagiographical document is applicable to biblical and parabiblical writings. I hope to have just demonstrated that this question was resolved for Delehaye, even though he was forbidden to discuss it publicly; one can feel the same attitude in the studies of apocryphal literature by some other Bollandists, especially Paul Peeters and Michel van Esbroeck. However, a major obstacle in studying earliest Christian (including New Testament) and Jewish pre-Christian texts with the tools of critical hagiography is our unawareness of the respective cults. Therefore, for the pre-Qumranic epoch, such a goal was unreachable.

Delehaye spent much effort in reconstructing Christian calendars of the first millennium and formulated, towards the end of his life (in his *Cinq leçons*),

<sup>238</sup> *In quos Hieronymus, si adhuc viveret, utique acerrima illa sermonis sui tela coniiceret, quod, sensu et iudicio Ecclesiae posthabito, nimis facile ad citationes quas vocant implicitas vel ad narrationes specie tenus historicas confugiunt; aut genera quaedam litterarum in libris sacris inveniri contendunt, quibuscum integra ac perfecta verbi divini veritas componi nequeat; aut de Bibliorum origine ita opinantur, ut eorundem labet vel prorsus pereat auctoritas* (“If Jerome were living now he would sharpen his keenest controversial weapons against people who set aside what is the mind and judgment of the Church, and take too ready a refuge in such notions as ‘implicit quotations’ or ‘pseudo-historical narratives,’ or in ‘kinds of literature’ in the Bible such as cannot be reconciled with the entire and perfect truth of God’s word, or who suggest such origins of the Bible as must inevitably weaken—if not destroy—its authority.”)

the notion of hagiographic coordinates.<sup>239</sup> This notion, I would say, grasps the “geolocation” of the cult for which the hagiographer worked in the hagiographer’s real world, regardless of whether he employs the “epic” or “historical” genre. These coordinates are the basic formal features, like a skeleton, of the respective cult. However, for the pre-fourth-century Christian texts and the Bible, such a detailed knowledge of the implied liturgical rites is not easily available. Even the implied liturgical calendars are never known *a priori*, and their reconstruction is a difficult task even in our post-Qumranic epoch. Today, at least, we can begin with the generalisation of the methods of critical hagiography by applying them to these early texts, including the New Testament apocrypha.<sup>240</sup>

### Abbreviations

В — Г. С. Баранкова, “Текстологические и языковые особенности антилатинского апокрифического памятника «Сказание о двенадцати апостолах, о латине и о опресноках»,” *Вестник ПСТГУ. I. Богословие. Философия*, 2009, вып. 3 (27), p. 67-92.

Р — А. Н. Попов, *Историко-литературный обзор древнерусских полемических сочинений против латинян: XI–XV вв.* Москва, Типография Т. Рис, 1875.

<sup>239</sup> On this notion, see above, section 4.4.

<sup>240</sup> Cf. a case study in B. Lourié, “The Liturgical Cycle in 3 *Maccabees* and the 2 *Enoch* Calendar,” in M. Leroy, M. Staszak (eds.), *Perceptions du temps dans la Bible*, Leuven/Paris/Bristol, CT, 2018, p. 156-170; I am especially glad for having published this article in the series created by Fr. Lagrange, where he published his *La méthode historique*.

