

the miracles of saints cyrus and john: the greek text and its transmission

Bronwen Neil

Abstract

The text entitled *The Miracles of Saints Cyrus and John* was composed in Greek by Sophronius, patriarch of Jerusalem (634-638). The text concerns the miracles of two healing saints: Cyrus, supposedly a physician of Alexandria, and John, a soldier in Egypt. Their cult was established by the ‘discovery’ of their relics by Cyril of Alexandria in the fifth century, and it replaced the local Egyptian cult of Isis at Menouthis. After the Arab conquest of Egypt it spread to Rome and Constantinople, and an Arabic legend of the saints’ healings developed. It is argued that Sophronius used his version of the miracles to strengthen his claims for the orthodoxy of those who opposed the imperially-sponsored doctrines of monoenergism and its later development, monothelism. Sophronius’s text was translated into Latin by Anastasius Bibliothecarius in the late ninth century and survives in a single manuscript. By examining Anastasius’s political motives for this choice of text, we find it being used to argue for Roman orthodoxy and primacy in the latter half of the ninth century. A translation of Anastasius’s preface to a related text is given in the appendix.

The Greek text entitled *The Miracles of Saints Cyrus and John* was composed by Sophronius, patriarch of Jerusalem. Sophronius taught rhetoric in Damascus before he became a monk in the monastery of St Theodosius, and later patriarch of Jerusalem (634-638).¹ He is usually identified with Sophronius the Sophist, as in our Latin text.² His patriarchate ended violently with the conquest of the city by Caliph ‘Umar in 638. The text concerns the miracles of two healing saints: Cyrus, supposedly a physician of Alexandria, and John, a soldier in Egypt. Cyrus and John were supposedly martyred in Diocletian’s persecutions (301-304), in the city of Canopus, east of Alexandria. Their cult was established by the ‘discovery’ of their relics in Alexandria by Cyril of Alexandria in the fifth century, and quickly replaced the local Egyptian cult of Isis. After the Arab conquest of Palestine in 636 and then of Damascus, the legend spread to Rome and Constantinople, and an Arabic legend of the saints’ healings developed.

¹ On the life of Sophronius, see C von Schönborn, *Sophrone de Jérusalem. Vie monastique et confession dogmatique* (Théologie historique 20, Paris, 1972). A full index of Sophronius’s extant works can be found in *Clavis Patrum Graecarum* 3, ed M Geerard and J Noret (2nd ed: Turnhout, 2003) [CPG] 7635-7653.

² A Papadakis, *Oxford Dictionary of Byzantium* 3 ed A Kazhdan (Oxford, 1991) 1928 sv ‘Sophronios’, warns that the arguments for this identification are not conclusive.

The geographical origins of the saints were disputed.³ According to the Arabic *Synaxarium*, compiled by the thirteenth-century Copt, Michael, bishop of Athrib and Malig, both saints were Alexandrians. Others relate that Cyrus was a native of Alexandria and John was from the Syrian city of Edessa. Sophronius does not claim that Cyrus was a physician, so why were Cyrus and John associated specifically with healing? The Greek *Vita et Miracula*⁴ records that Cyrus practised the art of medicine, and had a workshop (*ergasterion*) which was afterwards transformed into a temple dedicated to the three boy-saints, Hananiah, Mishael, and Azariah. These were the three saints of *Daniel* 1:6, otherwise known as Shadrach, Meshach and Abednego. Their shrine was established by Apollinarius, sixth-century patriarch of Alexandria (551-569).⁵

Collections of miracle stories were an established genre in the Christian tradition by the seventh century. Byzantine miracle collections from this period include those of the physician-saints Cosmas and Damian, the Coptic father Menas, and St Artemios;⁶ in the west, Gregory of Tours' collections of the miracles of St Martin of Tours. Miracle stories also featured commonly in hagiography.⁷

In the company of his friend and fellow monk John Moschus, Sophronius travelled widely in Egypt and Palestine, and met many who

³ *Synaxarium Alexandrinum* 2 ed J Forget (Corpus Scriptorum Christianorum Orientalium 48, Beirut, 1906) 2, 252: of course historicity cannot be assumed.

⁴ *Novum Auctarium Bibliothecae Hagiographicae Graecae* ed F Halkin (Subsidia Hagiographica 65, Brussels, 1984) [BHG] 469; there is no modern edition other than that in J-P Migne (ed), *Patrologia Graeca* [PG] 87, 3677-3689.

⁵ S Holman discusses the collocation of this shrine with the shrine at Menouthis in her article, 'Rich and poor in a healing sanctuary: therapeutic pairing in Sophronius of Jerusalem's *Miracles of Ss. Cyrus and John*', *Papers of the Second Annual Pappas Patristics Institute Conference, 'Wealth and Poverty in Early Christianity', October 2005* (Boston, forthcoming). I am grateful to Dr Holman for the opportunity to review an early draft of her paper before publication.

⁶ See A-J Festugière (trans), *Sainte Thècle, Saints Côme et Damien, Saints Cyr et Jean (Extraits), Saint Georges* (Paris, 1971); V S Crisafulli and J W Nesbitt (ed and trans), *The Miracles of St Artemios: A collection of Miracle Stories by an anonymous author of seventh-century Byzantium* (Leiden, 1997); J Duffy and E Bourbouhakis, 'Five Miracles of St Menas' 65-81 in J W Nesbitt (ed), *Byzantine Authors: literary activities and preoccupations. Texts and translations dedicated to the memory of Nicolas Oikonomides* (Boston, 2003).

⁷ Eg Gregory of Tours' *Life of St Julian*. D Webb, *Medieval European Pilgrimage c. 700-c. 1500* (Basingstoke, 2002) 52-54, discusses these western texts as well as dealing with the healing miracles associated with pilgrimages in the later medieval period. The healing miracles of a self-styled Byzantine saint, Nikephoros Blemmydes, who was also trained as a doctor, are discussed briefly by J A Munitiz, 'Self-Canonisation: the "partial account" of Nikephoros Blemmydes' 164-168 in *The Byzantine Saint*, ed S Hackel (Crestwood, 2001).

claimed to be the subject of miracles by Sts Cyrus and John.⁸ Thus the text began life, as so much of popular early Christian literature did, as an oral tradition. The text is divided into three sections, according to the provenance of the stories. Miracles 1-35 concern natives of Alexandria:

... lest we bring any insult to that city, which is the greatest and best, and the most delightful, and is to be preferred on this account; so that the miracles which begin this account should be believed, with so great a people and such a city testifying that they are true ...⁹

36-69 are about Egyptians and Libyans, and 51-70 are about ‘foreigners’. As we are concerned with transmission here rather than content, I will not delve into the miraculous material, except to relate one favourite, the 53rd miracle.¹⁰ This was told to Sophronius by a man from Eleutheropolis (Beyt Guvrin), about 50 km south of Jerusalem. It concerns a boy called Theodore, the servant of Procopius of Eleutheropolis. The boy had a growth above his nose. He went to the sea, seeking a cure from Cyrus and John. While swimming, he was seized by a shark (*canis marinus*), which grabbed him by the heel in its jaws. He called upon Sts Cyrus and John to save him, and he was cast up on the dry land and cured of both the wound to his foot and his facial deformity, leaving us to wonder whether the shark bit the tumour off Theodore’s face,

The manuscript tradition

There are only two manuscript witnesses to the Greek text, a tenth- or thirteenth-century Vatican codex containing the whole 70 chapters (C),¹³ and a tenth- or eleventh-century Berlin codex (F), containing a selection of 15 chapters.¹⁴ Their recent editor Fernandez Marcos lamented that the second witness only offers a selection of chapters, but claims that its readings are as reliable as the Vatican codex.¹⁵ Sophronius's text was translated into Latin by the papal librarian and bilingual translator Anastasius Bibliothecarius in the late ninth century. His Latin version survives in a single manuscript, *Vaticanus latinus* 5410, which contains a translation of the miracles¹⁶ followed by a narration of the translation of the saints' relics from Alexandria to Rome when Egypt was threatened by the Arab invasion.¹⁷ The Greek text has suffered in the transmission process.¹⁸

The Latin version seems to have been based on a third Greek witness which no longer survives. It is of key importance because it was composed within 250 years of the original. Of this version, Duffy writes: 'in spite of all its shortcomings, [it] is extremely valuable for showing up gaps in the Greek or for confirming needed corrections'.¹⁹ Thus the Latin can be used to confirm variant readings in both C and F in different instances (this conclusion is of course only restricted to observations on the 15 chapters contained in F). Many of the deviations between the three manuscripts – two Greek, one Latin – have been pointed out by Duffy, but

¹³ Cardinal Angelo Mai produced the *editio princeps* of both the Greek and the Latin texts in *Spicilegium Romanum* III, 97-669. On the accuracy of this edition Duffy, 'Observations', 77, warns: 'However, attention to detail was not his strong point and one cannot always rely on his reading of the manuscript'. The Migne version of the Greek text in *PG* 87, 3424-3676, was taken over from Mai with some unreported emendations. Mai, *Spicilegium Romanum* III, vii, dates *Vaticanus graecus* 1607 to the thirteenth century; cf Duffy, 'Observations', 77, to the tenth century.

¹⁴ The whole text is found in *Vaticanus graecus* 1607 folios 34-150 (s X ex/s XIII, from the monastery of Cryptaferata), while *Berolinensis graecus* 220 (Phill 1623) folios 214r-237v contains only 15 of the 70 chapters (1-7, 23, 26, 27, 41, 42, 45, 46 and 59). This manuscript is from the tenth or eleventh century. Both are described by N Fernandez Marcos, *Los Thaumata de Sofronio: Contribución al estudio de la Incubatio cristiana* (Madrid, 1975) 231-237.

¹⁵ On the Berlin codex, Marcos, *Thaumata*, 236: 'y es una lástima que sólo se conserve esta selección de milagros, porque sus lecturas son tan fidedignas como las del código de la Biblioteca Vaticana'.

¹⁶ *Vaticanus latinus* 5410, folios 61v-195v. The manuscript is very late, of seventeenth- or eighteenth-century provenance.

¹⁷ *Vaticanus latinus* 5410, folios 195v-199r.

¹⁸ Duffy, 'Observations', 77: 'either having been poorly transcribed or, more likely, because it passes along a work which had already been infested with mistakes and misunderstandings from an earlier period', ie *Vaticanus graecus* 1607.

¹⁹ Duffy, 'Observations', 77.

an equal number has gone unremarked in his study. Duffy employed three criteria to propose certain corrections and emendations to the Greek text edition made by Fernandez Marcos.²⁰ These aids were: 1. the Latin translation; 2. checking suspect readings in the modern editions against *Vaticanus graecus* 1607; and 3. stylistic considerations such as the author's preference for unusual words and forms, and his observance of the metrical rules governing prose rhythm.²¹

In what follows I focus on what the Greek, the Latin and, to a lesser extent, the Arabic versions of this text have to tell us about the relations between Christians in the eras in which they were composed. I argue that Sophronius used his version of the miracles to strengthen his claims for the orthodoxy of those who opposed the imperially-sponsored doctrines of monoenergism and its later development, monothelitism. Anastasius Bibliothecarius will be shown to have had an important role in the ninth century in the western dissemination of the cult of these eastern healers for political ends.

The Greek version of the *Miracula*

The original Greek version, composed between 610 and 620,²² gives a colourful portrayal of the wide variety of practices surrounding healing in Egypt and Palestine. Along with spells, prayers, charms and amulets,²³ Sophronius described the Christian adoption of the pagan practice of incubation,²⁴ in which the diseased or deformed person slept next to a shrine to access the healing power of the divine, in this case the sanctuary of saints Cyrus and John. The sanctuary itself was centred on the church dedicated to the four evangelists, built on the site of the famous heathen temple of Menuthis, two miles east of Canopus, after it was destroyed by monks. It was to this church that Cyril, patriarch of Alexandria (412-444) had the newly uncovered relics of Cyrus and John transported on 28 June 414, and it became an important pilgrimage centre. The relics were transferred to Rome in 634, and placed in the suburban church of St Passera (a corruption of Abbas Cyrus) on *via Portuensis*.²⁵

²⁰ Duffy, 'Observations', 78-90.

²¹ Duffy, 'Observations', 77-78.

²² In *Miracula* chapter 8, Sophronius refers to John the Almsgiver as the current patriarch (of Alexandria). John's patriarchate lasted from 610 to 620, allowing us to date the work to this period: Mai, *Spicilegium Romanum* III, 129 note 1. Duffy, 'Observations', 71, states that it was written 'around the year 610'.

²³ See T Nissen, 'Medizin und Magi bei Sophronios', *Byzantinische Zeitschrift* 39 (1939) 349-381.

²⁴ On the pagan practice of incubation in the Temple of Menuthis, see Marcos, *Thaumata*, 33-59.

²⁵ Mai, *Spicilegium Romanum* III, xi.

This fact offers a clue to the purpose to which the work was put, some years after its composition. At that time, Sophronius was in correspondence with Pope Honorius (625-638) over the monoenergist controversy, in which he hoped to gain Roman support against the Emperor Heraclius and Sergius, patriarch of Constantinople. Alexandria had gone over to 'the dark side' with the signing of the pact of union by its patriarch Cyrus in June 633, endorsing monoenergism. The text of the *Miracles* may have accompanied the relics to Rome in 634, a perfect gift to Pope Honorius, underlining the orthodoxy of these two Alexandrian martyrs, in stark contrast to the heresy recently embraced by the Alexandrian patriarch Cyrus. In that year, too, Sophronius may have been in Rome with John Moschus, who died in that city.²⁶ In the same year, Sophronius issued his *Synodical Letter*, which contained a strong rejection of the imperially-sponsored doctrine of monoenergism.²⁷ Unfortunately Honorius missed the point entirely and ended up initiating a new heresy, monothelism, through his careless use of the term 'one will'. This term appeared in his letter of congratulations to Sergius for obtaining theological agreement with the eastern churches on the basis of the pact of union.²⁸ Thus the monothelite doctrine was born, and was only finally put to rest at the sixth ecumenical council in 680-681.²⁹

The Latin translation by Anastasius Bibliothecarius

How did these *Miracula* come to be translated by Anastasius Bibliothecarius in the 870s? It seems that the text was sent to an unnamed *sacerdos sacerdotis Christi*, probably a priest of St Passera on *via Portuensis*, where the relics of Cyrus and John had been deposited. It is clear from the preface to his translation of Sophronius' *Passion of Saints*

²⁶ The death of John Moschus, while he and Sophronius were in Rome, is dated to September of the eighth indiction, either in 619 or 634: see J Wortley (trans), *The Spiritual Meadow by John Moschos (also known as John Eviratus)* (Kalamazoo, 1992) xx.

²⁷ CPG 7635 (PG 87, 3148-3200 in a Latin version). A recent study and translation have been made by P Allen, *Sophronius of Jerusalem's Synodical Letter. A Monoenergist Dossier* (forthcoming). On the development of the monoenergist and monothelite controversies, in which Maximus the Confessor played a vital role, see my introduction to P Allen and B Neil, *Maximus the Confessor and his Companions: Documents from Exile* (Oxford Early Christian Texts, Oxford, 2002) 11-12.

²⁸ CPG 9375: 'unde et unam voluntatem fatemur domini Jesu Christi', *Acta Conciliorum Oecumenicorum* ser 2, 2/2 ed R Riedinger (Berlin, 1992) 551.14-15. In a later letter to Sergius (CPG 9377), Honorius seems to retreat from this position, perhaps as a result of receiving Sophronius's *Synodical Letter*, but the damage was done. See Allen and Neil, *Maximus the Confessor*, 12-13.

²⁹ Honorius himself was condemned by this council in Constantinople: see G. Kreuzer, *Die Honoriusfrage im Mittelalter und in der Neuzeit* (Päpste und Papsttum 8, Stuttgart, 1975).

*Cyrus and John*³⁰ that he chose to translate Sophronius' works because he considered the monk a worthy example of opposition to 'the rulers of the Christian world'. Interestingly, he also praised Sophronius for opposing leaders of foreign religions, by which he might have meant the Arabs who attacked Jerusalem in 638, or the pagans who worshipped at their own healing shrines. The preface survives in only one manuscript from Chartres,³¹ which is severely mutilated in the upper margin, so our text is somewhat corrupted and only a partial translation is possible (see Appendix).

Anastasius writes that the priest of the church where Cyrus and John's feast was to be celebrated 'the next day' (31 January 875) had pressed him to translate this passion, even though he was busy with many other things, and in poor health. Anastasius praises Sophronius for the works he wrote for the instruction of the faithful – his homilies and hagiographic writing – and for clearly preaching the orthodox faith (by which the reader is to understand two energies and two wills in Christ). Anastasius mentions the *Miracula* in this preface, saying that 12 chapters have already been translated into Latin by another, and promising to translate the remaining chapters if his life lasts long enough. He died c 879, so we can deduce that the *Miracles* were translated in the four years following February 875. No more is known of the mysterious allusion to a Latin translation of 12 chapters by Boniface *consiliarius*. A certain Boniface *consiliarius* is mentioned in the *Acts of the Seventh Ecumenical Council*, also translated by Anastasius.³² This Boniface was sent by Pope Benedict II (683-685) to Macarius of Antioch, just after Macarius had been condemned by the sixth ecumenical council.³³ Macarius had presented the monothelite case to the council with the monk Stephen, but was accused of producing false texts, and was consequently anathematised. It is interesting to speculate whether this earlier version was related to the 15 chapters preserved in the Greek manuscript of Berlin.

Anastasius's borrowing from the patrimony of Greek hagiography was not new. He had translated many Greek saints' lives, as well as the acts of the seventh and eighth ecumenical councils, as part of a political project to bolster the papacy's claims to primacy, against the claims being made by the Byzantine emperors Michael II (842-847) and Basil (867-886). Anastasius found a formidable rival in the patriarch of Constantinople,

³⁰ *Praefatio X*, in E Perels and G Laehr (eds), *Anastasio Bibliothecarii Epistolae sive Praefationes* (Monumenta Germaniae Historica Epistolae VII Karolini Aevi V, Munich, 1978) 426-27 [MGH VII]. This is translated in the Appendix below.

³¹ Chartres 63 (115) folio 64 (s IX/X). Cf *Catalogue général des manuscrits des départements* 11, 62.

³² See PL 129, 227B.

³³ *Pref. X*, Perels and Laehr (eds), MGH VII, 427 note 3.

Photius. An important aspect of their power struggle was the Greek claim to the superior riches of its literary heritage against its poor Roman relations. Such a claim was bolstered by Photius's production of the *Bibliotheca*. His arch-rival Anastasius undertook his Latin translations as secretary and librarian to popes Nicholas and Hadrian II respectively, and he addressed the prefaces of several of his translations to them, as well as to Pope John VIII (872-882), the Frankish emperor Charles the Bald, and several key figures in the papal curia who formed part of Italian and Carolingian patronage networks.³⁴

I have demonstrated elsewhere³⁵ that the anti-monothelite dossier was compiled to show how the Greek hierarchy had already more than once interfered in doctrinal matters with drastic consequences. This was especially so for Pope Martin I [649-653], who had convened the first Lateran council to condemn monothelitism.³⁶ Martin was arrested in Rome, taken to Constantinople for trial, and died in exile on the Crimea. Rome objected to the challenge to its authority in this sphere. The close connection between those texts and this one is revealed in the preface to the *Collectanea*, addressed to John the Deacon in 874, the year before the dedication of the Latin *Passion*.³⁷ Anastasius lists the sources that he used to compile the *Collectanea*, which included extracts of a letter of Maximus the Confessor to Peter the *illustris*, in which Maximus defended the memory of Pope Honorius, calling him 'great' and 'divine'.³⁸ This was an important point to make, because Honorius had been condemned by the sixth ecumenical council – along with Cyrus of Alexandria, and Sergius, Pyrrhus, Paul and Peter, all patriarchs of Constantinople – for his part in originating the monothelite heresy. The extracts, he writes, also concerned Sophronius of Jerusalem, 'concerning whom we have often made mention in our translated writings'.³⁹

³⁴ After a failed attempt upon the papal throne in 855, Anastasius became unofficial secretary of Pope Nicholas I. He was restored to the priesthood in 867 upon Hadrian's inauguration, and was elevated to *Bibliothecarius sanctae romanae ecclesiae* soon afterwards. On his chequered career in the papal chancery, see Allen and Neil, *Maximus*, 32-35, and more recently, B Neil, *Seventh-century Popes and Martyrs: the political hagiography of Anastasius Bibliothecarius* (Sydney and Brussels, 2006 in press).

³⁵ Neil, *Seventh-century Popes* (see note 34).

³⁶ Many Greek monks attended the council in 649, which condemned monothelitism and monoenergism and those who advocated these doctrines. The *Acts* are found in R Riedinger (ed), *Acta conciliorum oecumenicorum* series 2 vol 1: *Concilium Lateranense a. 649 celebratum* (Berlin, 1984).

³⁷ This preface has been edited and translated in Neil, *Seventh-century Popes*.

³⁸ *PL* 129, 575a-b.

³⁹ *Pref* IX, Perels and Laehr (eds), *MGH* VII, 425.16-19.

Conclusion

The transmission history of this miracle collection in three languages is testimony to the way that hagiography could be used for political as well as devotional ends. The two saints, Cyrus and John, who were either both Alexandrians (according to the Arabic version), or an Alexandrian and an Edessan (in the Greek and Latin versions) were co-opted in the struggle first of all against paganism, led by Cyril and his monks in the fifth century, and then against monoenergist heresy by Sophronius in the seventh century. The text may have been used as part of Sophronius's bid to get Honorius on side, and to discredit the Alexandrian patriarch who had signed the pact of union at Constantinople's bidding. The Arabic legend served to remind Christians under Arab domination of the importance of their local saints, and to keep their religious traditions alive during the introduction of Islam. In the ninth century, Anastasius Bibliothecarius sought with his Latin translation similarly to discredit Constantinople, and to lend prestige and orthodoxy to the papacy by using the circumstances of Sophronius's opposition to Sergius of Constantinople to counter that city's claims against Rome for power in the ecclesiastical arena. The two-line tag at the end of Anastasius's preface to the *Passion of Cyrus and John* neatly sums up his translation project:

Holy one, receive at last with joy the trials of the saints,
That had been Greek and now with skill have become Latin.⁴⁰

Acknowledgement

I am grateful to the ARC for the postdoctoral fellowship that allowed me to initiate this research at Australian Catholic University.

⁴⁰ *Pref. X*, Perels and Laehr (eds), *MGH VII*, 427.15-16: *Sume sacer tandem sanctorum letus agones, Grai qui fuerant, factos nunc arte Latinos.*

Appendix: translation of preface 10

Anastasius Bibliothecarius to an unnamed priest.⁴¹

... translation of the texts. You wanted to compel me ... humble though I am, to translate the passion of the saints Cyrus and John from Greek into the Roman tongue, and I pondered the reason you urged me to this (task) with such great perseverance, while I was engaged in other things. But absolutely nothing else came to mind except that you are bound by brotherly love, that longs to restore its neighbours not only in Greek but also in Latin by the nourishment of the saving word, and to inflame (them) towards the pious examples and strenuous struggles of these men on behalf of Christ. Especially since that church⁴² indeed is radiant with miracles where, in the presence of the city, you fulfil the divine rituals and funeral devotions in memory of these most victorious martyrs. And look, the festal day of their annual celebration is near at hand.⁴³ Therefore, I have made satisfaction to your devotion to the best of my ability. Having put aside the work at hand for a brief time, I preferred to obey your wishes, even though I have been ill. Indeed the two versions of their passion ... the path of interpretation your piety wanted to advance, and encouraged.

And its author was St Sophronius, who afterwards became famous as patriarch of Jerusalem. His celebrated mention is found in many collected writings of our predecessors, [but] also in the sixth holy and universal council,⁴⁴ especially since he published several small works for the instruction of many, and clearly preached the teachings of the orthodox faith. And he also collated not only the *Passion* of these outstanding martyrs,⁴⁵ but also 70 – which is a sacred number for us – chapters of their miracles. Indeed, not only to the rulers of the Christian world, but also to rulers of foreign religions he raised up a wall of impregnable truth on behalf of the house of God, and proved it by the constancy of strong argumentation. Twelve chapters of his miracles and the preface were once translated by Boniface the *consiliarius* at the request of Theodore, leader of the defenders of the Roman church.⁴⁶ As for the rest, if my life lasts with

⁴¹ This translation, incomplete in parts, is made from Perels and Laehr's edition of the single manuscript witness, the mutilated *Chartres* 63 (115) folio 64 (s IX/X), in *MGH VII*, 426-427. The title has been supplied by me.

⁴² Believed to be the Church of St Passera on *via Portuensis*.

⁴³ 31 January, the day following the composition of this letter.

⁴⁴ The sixth ecumenical council, held in Constantinople in 680-681, condemned monothelitism and monoenergism.

⁴⁵ The preface or *protheoria* is *BHG* 475; the 'passion' is actually the *Encomium* (*BHG* 476) (*PG* 87, 3379-3421).

⁴⁶ Pope Theodore (642-649) was instrumental in bringing about the Lateran Synod held in Rome in 649, shortly after his death, under the auspices of Pope Martin. As mentioned above (see note 33), a certain Boniface was referred to in the *Acts* of

God as its author <...> the translation of these <I will complete>. Do not cease to pray to God, most reverend priest of Christ the priest.

Dated the third calends of February⁴⁷ in the eighth indiction, the third year of our lord Pope John VIII.⁴⁸

Holy one, receive at last with joy the trials of the saints,
That had been Greek and now with skill have become Latin.

the Seventh Ecumenical Council as being sent by Pope Benedict II to Macarius of Antioch after the Sixth Ecumenical Council of 680-681. If the identification of the two Bonifaces is correct, we must accept his active role in church affairs over a span of some 40 years.

⁴⁷ 30 January 875.

⁴⁸ John VIII (872-882). Anastasius died c 879.