EDITED BY
PAULINE ALLEN
BRONWEN NEIL

The Oxford Handbook *of* MAXIMUS THE CONFESSOR

THE OXFORD HANDBOOK OF

MAXIMUS THE CONFESSOR

THE OXFORD HANDBOOK OF

MAXIMUS THE CONFESSOR

Edited by

PAULINE ALLEN

and

BRONWEN NEIL

OXFORD
UNIVERSITY PRESS

OXFORD
UNIVERSITY PRESS

Great Clarendon Street, Oxford, OX2 6DP,
United Kingdom

Oxford University Press is a department of the University of Oxford.
It furthers the University's objective of excellence in research, scholarship,
and education by publishing worldwide. Oxford is a registered trade mark of
Oxford University Press in the UK and in certain other countries

First Edition published in 2015

Impression: 1

Published in the United States of America by Oxford University Press
198 Madison Avenue, New York, NY 10016, United States of America

British Library Cataloguing in Publication Data
Data available

Library of Congress Control Number: 2014956586

ISBN 978–0–19–967383–4

Printed and bound by
CPI Group (UK) Ltd, Croydon, CR0 4YY

Cover image: *Maximus the Confessor and His Miracles*,
17th-century icon, Stroganov School. Solvychegodsk Museum
of Art and History, Solvychegodsk, Russia. © SIKHM.

Preface

Maximus the Confessor (*c.*580–662) has, in recent decades, become one of the most discussed figures in contemporary patristic studies. A witness to this is the number of conferences dedicated to the study of Maximus and his works, first at Fribourg in Switzerland (1981), followed by recent annual symposia in Tblisi (Georgia), and a major conference in Belgrade (2012). Maximus was the subject of several panels at the Oxford International Patristics Conference (2011), the International Byzantine Congress held in Sofia (2011), and several recent annual meetings of the North American Patristics Society (2012, 2013). Most recently, an international round-table was devoted to the Confessor at St Andrew's Greek Orthodox College, Sydney (2013).

This resurgence of interest is due, in part, to the relatively recent discovery and critical edition of his works in various genres, including a treatise on the ascetic life *(LA),* the four hundred chapters on love *(Car.)*, two hundred chapters on theology and the Incarnation *(Th.oec.)*, a commentary on the Lord's Prayer *(Or.dom.)*, two separate books of *Ambigua* addressed to John (*Amb.Io.*) and to Thomas (*Amb.Th.*), the *Questions and Doubts (QD)* explaining difficult passages of scripture and the Fathers, the *Question Addressed to Thalassius (Q.Thal.)*, a commentary on the liturgy (*Myst.*), and the *Short Theological and Polemical Works (Opusc.)*. In his day, the impact of these works reached far beyond the Greek East, with his involvement in the western resistance to imperial heresy, notably at the Lateran Synod in 649. Together with Pope Martin I (649–53 CE), Maximus the Confessor and his circle were the most vocal opponents of Constantinople's introduction of the doctrine of monothelitism. This dispute over the number of wills in Christ became a contest between the imperial government and church of Constantinople on the one hand, and the bishop of Rome in concert with eastern monks such as Maximus, John Moschus, and Sophronius on the other, over the right to define orthodoxy. A basic understanding of the difficult relations between church and state in this troubled period at the close of Late Antiquity is necessary for a full appreciation of Maximus' contribution to this controversy. The editors of this volume aim to provide the political and historical background to Maximus' activities, as well as a summary of his achievements in the spheres of theology and philosophy.

The Theological Background

The reasons for Maximus' opposition to the doctrines of monoenergism and monothelitism were complex, and have often been poorly understood. The first dispute concerned the number and nature of the activities or operations, sometimes translated 'energies', in Christ: one human and one divine (the orthodox position, known as dyenergism), or one divine activity that somehow subsumed the human. The imperially-sponsored doctrine of one activity (monoenergism) was meant to secure unity between Constantinople and the church of Alexandria, which had on the whole remained committed to the doctrine of one nature in Christ (miaphysitism) from before the Council of Chalcedon in 451. The second controversy developed out of the first, and concerned the number of wills in Christ. Maximus argued that if Christ only had one activity, he must also have one will, which was demonstrably false. One only had to look at Christ's internal struggle in the Garden of Gethsemane to realize that he had two wills, his and the Father's, one human and the other divine. Maximus maintained that belief in two wills in Christ (dyothelitism) was the only orthodox possibility.

Over the course of seven years Maximus endured two trials in Constantinople (655 and 662), three exiles, and possibly mutilation for his commitment to the doctrines of two activities and two wills in Christ. In this doctrinal controversy he found staunch allies in the bishops of Rome, especially Theodore II and his successor Martin I, who convened the Lateran Synod of 649 to condemn monothelitism.

Up until now, scholars have had to rely on Polycarp Sherwood's reconstruction of events in Maximus' life and the dating of his works that was presented in *An Annotated Date-List of Works of Maximus the Confessor* (Sherwood 1952). The discovery of a new Syriac life of Maximus, edited by Brock (1973), and the edition of a dossier of Greek biographical documents by Allen and Neil (1999) have allowed us to revisit this timeline. In the opening chapter below, Pauline Allen provides an introduction to Maximus' life, trials and exiles, and assesses the radically different accounts of his life that are presented in the Greek and Syriac *Lives* of Maximus. Her chapter concludes with a provisional reconstruction of a timeline of significant events in Maximus' life. Marek Jankowiak and Phil Booth provide a new date-list for the works of Maximus which will definitively replace Sherwood's.

Walter Kaegi then gives an overview of the political background to Maximus' life and thought, shaped by the onset of radical change in the Byzantine Empire, Arab and Persian attacks, and the formation of Byzantine responses, which may be characterized as foreign policy 'on the run'. The doctrinal controversies of the sixth century, when various kinds of neo-Chalcedonianism arose as a response to the ongoing conflicts caused by the Council of Chalcedon, provide the theological background to the emergence of the monoenergist and monothelite doctrines that proved a crux for Maximian theology (Cyril Hovorun).

A Question of Influence

Maximus was the synthesist par excellence of Byzantine theology, drawing on both western and eastern sources for his unique formulations. Seven of our authors examine the major influences on Maximian thought. Marius Portaru looks at the influences from classical philosophy, especially Aristotle and Platonism. The controversial impact of Origen and the metaphysics of Origenism, especially on Maximus' theory of the reasons or rational principles (*logoi*), and rational creatures (*logika*), is examined by Pascal Mueller-Jourdan. The influence of Byzantine ascetics such as Diadochus of Photice, the author(s) of the Macarian Homilies, the desert Fathers, and the Gaza ascetics is illustrated by Marcus Plested. Ysabel De Andia highlights the influence of Ps-Dionysius the Areopagite on aspects of Maximus' mystagogy. In his development of the concept of intention or deliberative will or mindset, Maximus owed a debt to John Chrysostom and other fourth-century theologians that has often been unrecognized (Raymond Laird). Similarly, the controversial evidence for Augustine of Hippo's influence on the doctrine of the will presented in the *Acts* of the Lateran Synod of 649 needs to be reassessed (Johannes Börjesson). The concept of providence in Maximus' cosmology, and its philosophical origins, are also shown to be crucial to the development of Maximus' theory of deliberative will (Bronwen Neil).

The Intersection of Maximian Thought and Praxis

The main lines of Maximian thought cover the operation of human and divine will, the mediating role of Christ, the ascetic life and divinization or *theosis*, the relationship between knowledge and virtue, and the place of the liturgy in the life of the church. In all these areas, Maximus' first point of reference is scripture. Maximian modes of biblical exegesis are the subject of Paul M. Blowers' contribution. Peter Van Deun gives a precise taxonomy of the many literary genres used by Maximus, among them questions-and-answers, chapters grouped in centuries, letters, tracts, and exegetical works. The passions and the virtues, and their part in the Christian path to perfection, are treated by Demetrios Bathrellos.

One of the significant new areas of research on Maximus is his Christocentric cosmology, introduced by Torstein Tollefsen in his 2008 book, *The Christocentric Cosmology of St Maximus the Confessor*, to which he returns here, showing the complex Maximian understanding of how human beings participate in the divine and the created cosmos. This theory of participation is not shared by all, notably Jean-Claude Larchet. Maximus' understanding of the vexed question of universal restoration (*apokatastasis*) is a well-known but little understood aspect of his thinking. Andreas Andreopoulos explores Maximus' understanding of eschatology as a concept and a promise that

impacted as much on the present as on the future. Jean-Claude Larchet considers Maximus' somewhat controversial understanding of the doctrine of divinization—the capacity for human beings to become gods.

The key text for Maximus' spiritual anthropology is *Amb.Io. 7*, with its Aristotelian underpinnings, and its emphasis on the role of the spiritual senses (Adam Cooper). Doru Costache argues that Maximus developed an ontological 'theory of everything' in two key passages (*Amb.Io.* 41 and *Q.Thal.* 48), in which he fleshed out his theory of five fundamental divisions in Creation, and the corresponding five levels of unification achieved by Christ's Incarnation.

It is important that in all this we do not lose sight of the fact that Maximian theology and philosophy were inherently practical, and aimed at providing a framework for successful Christian community. George Berthold offers important caveats on the practicality of Maximus' theology, as evidenced in the *Four Centuries on Charity*, and Thomas Cattoi demonstrates the central significance of Eucharist and the liturgy in Maximian thought and praxis.

Reception from the Middle Ages to the Twenty-First Century

Maximus has played an important role in the mediaeval West, and in the Georgian, Ukrainian, and Russian traditions up to the present. Lela Khoperia and Grigory Benevich treat the Georgian and Slavic traditions, respectively. Catherine Kavanagh examines the reception of Maximian thought in the West during the Carolingian period, especially as mediated by the works of the Irish theologian John Scottus Eriugena.

Maximus was rediscovered in the twentieth century by such great scholars as Polycarp Sherwood, Hans von Balthasar, Walther Völker, and Lars Thunberg. Since the 1970s there has been a concerted effort by the editors of the Corpus Christianorum to produce quality editions and translations of Maximus' works, and their Latin translations. The Beauchesne series of the 1970s has also made the texts available to a wider audience. Since the first accessible introductions to Maximus' works in translation were published in English by Andrew Louth (1996) and in French by Jean-Claude Larchet and Emmanuel Ponsoye (1994, 1998a, 1998b, 1999, 2010), a florescence of interest has occurred, witnessed by the number of new studies in the past decade, and a major symposium on Maximus held in Belgrade in 2012. Our last five chapters consider the reception of Maximus in various spheres: in later Byzantine and modern Orthodox theology (Andrew Louth); in contemporary systematic theology on questions of the will and human agency (Ian McFarland), in-depth psychology (Michael Bakker), and in ecumenical dialogue, especially on the questions of papal primacy and the inclusion of the *Filioque* clause in the recitation of the creed (A. Edward Siecienski). Finally, Joshua Lollar reviews the contribution

made by scholars in the twentieth century in retrieving and rehabilitating Maximus' works, and asks what directions may be taken in the century ahead.

It is the fruits of these studies that we present below, bringing together for the first time a collection of chapters by the foremost scholars in the field that will integrate Maximus' works and thought into the history of his life in the politically troubled times of seventh-century Byzantium. To this end, the volume is divided into four parts: 1. Historical Setting; 2. Theological and Philosophical Influences; 3. Works and Thought; and 4. Reception. Each chapter will be accompanied by a bibliography of references and recommendations for further reading.

A note on terminology may be helpful. We have tried to translate the Greek terms wherever they appear, providing the Greek in brackets, but two terms appear so frequently that we have transliterated them: *logos* and *logismoi*. The first term, *logos* (plural *logoi*), has been translated variously by different authors within. Its range of meanings includes reason, underlying principle, or rational principle, or inner principle. It is related to, but different from, the Logos, or second person of the Trinity, the Word. *Logismoi* can mean mere thoughts, or more negatively, distracting trains of thought, or even obsessive thoughts. *Energeia* is another word that is often found in the texts cited below, and is difficult to translate with just one English word: it can mean 'activity', 'operation', or even 'energy', in a divine or human sense. *Tropos* is the mode of existence of any being, person, or object in its very nature. Translations of original texts are the authors' own unless indicated otherwise. The editors have imposed inclusive language on the texts, even where it has proved somewhat awkward.

Acknowledgements

We would like to express our gratitude to Walter Kaegi and his technical assistant Roberto Marques for allowing us to reproduce two maps of the Byzantine Empire. Thanks are due also to Sandra Sewell and Amanda Thorley for their careful work on the manuscript, and to Trish Darcy for preparing the indices of persons and biblical citations. Wendy Mayer kindly translated Ysabel De Andia's chapter from French.

The editorial bureau at Oxford University Press, headed by Tom Perridge, and including Karen Raith, Lizzie Robottom, Alex Johnson—and others whose names we never knew—have been wonderful. Finally, we would like to thank each of the contributors for their efforts. We hope that their scholarship will expose a new audience to the riches of Maximus' theology, philosophy, and spirituality, and that more experienced readers will be inspired to pursue new directions of study on this challenging Byzantine thinker and his work.

Bronwen Neil and Pauline Allen
12 August 2014

Contents

PART IV RECEPTION

List of Illustrations

Maps

Tables

List of Abbreviations

Works by Maximus with Editions and Translations

Amb.Io. = Ambigua ad Iohannem (Difficult Passages Addressed to John) PG 91. 1061A–1417C, Constas 2014, Jeauneau 1988 (Latin trans. by John Scottus Eriugena).

Amb.Th. = Ambigua ad Thomam (Difficult Passages Addressed to Thomas) PG 91. 1032–1060, Constas 2014, Janssens 2002, Larchet–Ponsoye 1994, Lollar 2010.

Cap. XV = Capita XV (Fifteen Chapters) PG 90. 1177–1185.

Car. = Capita de caritate (Centuries on Love) PG 90. 959–1082, Berthold 1985: 33–98, Ceresa-Gastaldo 1963, Sherwood 1955a.

DP = Disputatio cum Pyrrho (Dispute with Pyrrhus) PG 91. 288–353, Doucet 1972.

Epp. = Epistulae (Letters) PG 91. 364–649, Larchet–Ponsoye 1998b.

Ep.Max. = Maximi Epistola ad Anastasium monachum discipulum (Letter of Maximus to Anastasius the Monk and Disciple) Allen–Neil 2002: 120–23.

In ps. LIX = Expositio in psalmum LIX (Commentary on Psalm 59) Van Deun 1991: 3–22.

LA = Liber asceticus (On the Ascetic Life) Sherwood 1955a, Van Deun 2000a.

Myst. = Mystagogia (Mystagogy) PG 91. 658–718, Lot-Borodine 1963, Berthold 1985: 181–225, Sotiropoulos 1978, Boudignon 2011.

Opusc. = Opuscula theologica et polemica (Small Theological and Polemical Works) PG 91. 9–285, Larchet–Ponsoye 1998a.

Or.dom. = Expositio orationis dominicae (Commentary on the Lord's Prayer) Berthold 1985: 99–125, Van Deun 1991: 27–73.

QD = Quaestiones et dubia (Questions and Doubtful Passages) Declerck 1982, Larchet–Ponsoye 1999, Prassas 2010.

Q.Thal. = Quaestiones ad Thalassium (Questions Addressed to Thalassius) Laga–Steel 1980/1990, Larchet–Vinel 2010.

Q.Theop. = Quaestiones ad Theopemptum (*Questions Addressed to Theopemptus*) B. Roosen and P. Van Deun (eds.) (2003), 'A Critical Edition of the *Quaestiones ad Theopemptum* of Maximus the Confessor', *Journal of Eastern Christian Studies* 55: 65–79.

Th.oec. = Capita theologica et oeconomica (Chapters on Theology and the Economy) PG 90. 1084–1173, Berthold 1985: 129–80.

TS = Testimonia et syllogismi (Testimonies and Syllogisms) Neil 2006: 266–303.

Works Related to Maximus' Life

DB = Disputatio Bizyae cum Theodosio (Dispute at Bizya with Theodosius) Allen–Neil 2002: 76–119.

Ep.Anast. = Anastasii Apocrisiarii epistola ad Theodosium Gangrensem (Letter of Anastasius Apocrisiarius to Theodosius of Gangra) Allen–Neil 2002: 132–47.

Ep. ad Anast. = Epistula Maximi ad Anastasium, Allen–Neil 1999.

Hypom. = Hypomnesticum (Commemoration) Allen–Neil 2002: 148–71.

Narrationes = Narrationes de exsilio sancti papae Martini (Account of the Exile of Holy Pope Martin) Neil 2006: 166–233.

RM = Relatio motionis (Record of the Trial) Allen–Neil 2002: 48–74.

Vita Maximi (graece) (Life of Maximus [Greek]) Neil–Allen 2003.

Vita Maximi (syriace) (*Life of Maximus [Syriac])* Brock 1973.

Works by Other Ancient Authors

Aristotle
- *An. = De anima*
- *Met. = Metaphysica*

Athanasius of Alexandria
- *C.Gent. = Contra Gentes*
- *Inc. = De incarnatione verbi*

Augustine
- *C.Jul.imp. = Contra Julianum imperatorem*
- *C.serm.Ar. = Contra sermonem Arianorum*
- *Civ.Dei = De civitate Dei*
- *Conf. = Confessiones*
- *Enarr.in Ps. = Enarrationes in Psalmos*

Cyril of Alexandria
- *In Ioan. = Commentarii in Johannem*
- *In Psal. = Commentarii in Psalmos*

Diadochus of Photice
- *Cap. = Capita centum de perfectione spirituali*

Evagrius Ponticus
- *Keph. = Kephalaia gnostica*
- *Orat. = De oratione capitula*
- *Prak. = Capita practica ad Anatolium* [*Praktikos*]

Gregory of Nazianzus
- *Antirr.adu.Apol. = Antirrheticus aduersus Apollinarium*

Gregory of Nyssa
- *C.Eun.* = *Contra Eunomium Libri*
- *In Cant.* = *In Canticum canticorum*
- *Opif.* = *De hominis opificio*
- *Or.cat.* = *Oratio catechetica*
- *Perf.* = *De perfectione*

Irenaeus
- *Adu.haer.* = *Aduersus haereses*

John Chrysostom
- *Cat. ad illum.* = *Catecheses ad illuminandos*
- *1 Cor.* = *Homiliae in epistulam 1 ad Corinthios*
- *Gal.* = *Commentarius in epistulam ad Galatas*
- *Gen.* = *Homiliae in Genesim*
- *Heb.* = *Homiliae in epistulam ad Hebraeos*
- *Joan.* = *Homiliae in Johannem*
- *Matt.* = *Homiliae in Matthaeum*
- *Paen.* = *De paenitentia*
- *Perf.car.* = *De perfecta caritate*
- *Rom.* = *Homiliae in epistulam ad Romanos*
- *2 Tim.* = *Homiliae in epistulam 2 ad Timotheum*

John of Damascus
- *Dial.* = *Dialectica*
- *Exp.fid.* = *Expositio fidei*
- *Haer.* = *De haerisibus*

LP = *Liber Pontificalis*

Nemesius of Emesa
- *Nat. hom.* = *De natura hominis*

Origen of Alexandria
- *Frag. in Ps.* = *Fragmenta in diuersos Psalmos in catenis*
- *Joh.* = *Commentarii in Johannem*
- *Matt.* = *Commentarii in Matthaeum*
- *Princ.* = *De principiis*
- *Rom.* = *Commentarii in Romanos*

Photius
- *Bibl.* = *Bibliotheca*

Plotinus
- *Enn.* = *Enneades*

Ps-Dionysius the Areopagite
- *Div.nom.* = *De divinis nominibus*
- *Hier.cael.* = *De caelesti hierarchia*
- *Hier.eccl.* = *De ecclesiastica hierarchia*
- *Theol.myst.* = *De mystica theologia*

Sarapion of Thmuis
Contra Man. = *Contra Manichaeos*
Theophanes (the Confessor)
Chron. = *Chronographia*

Periodicals, Collections, and Reference Works

ACO I.i.i.	E. Schwartz (ed.), *Acta Conciliorum Oecumenicorum,* I.i.i. *Concilium Universale Ephesenum* (Berlin–Leipzig: W. de Gruyter, 1927)
ACO II.i.i.	E. Schwartz (ed.), *Acta Conciliorum Oecumenicorum,* II.i.i. *Concilium Universale Chalcedonense* (Berlin–Leipzig: W. de Gruyter, 1933)
ACO II.ii.i.	E. Schwartz (ed.), *Acta Conciliorum Oecumenicorum,* II.ii.i. *Conciliorum Universale Chalcedonense* (Berlin–Leipzig: W. de Gruyter, 1940)
ACO IV.i.	J. Straub (ed.), *Acta Conciliorum Oecumenicorum,* iv.i. *Concilium Universale Constantinopolitanum sub Iustiniano habitum* (Berlin: W. de Gruyter, 1971)
Allen–Neil 1999	P. Allen and B. Neil (eds.), *Scripta Saeculi VII vitam Maximi Confessoris illustrantia cum Latina interpretatione Anastasii Bibliothecarii iuxta posita*, CCSG 39 (Turnhout–Leuven: Brepols, 1999)
Allen–Neil 2002	P. Allen and B. Neil (eds. and trans.), *Maximus the Confessor and his Companions: Documents from Exile*, OECT (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002)
von Balthasar 1941	*Kosmische Liturgie. Höhe und Krise des griechischen Weltbildes bei Maximus Confessor* (*Apex and Crisis of the Greek Image of the Universe in Maximus the Confessor*) (Freiburg im Breisgau: Herder, 1941)
von Balthasar 1961	*Kosmische Liturgie. Das Weltbild Maximus' des Bekenners*, 2nd edn. (Einsiedeln: Johannes-Verlag, 1961)
von Balthasar 2003	H. U. von Balthasar, *Cosmic Liturgy: The Universe According to Maximus the Confessor*, trans. B. E. Daley, SJ (San Francisco: Ignatius, 1988; repr. 2003)
Berthold 1985	G. C. Berthold (trans.), *Maximus Confessor: Selected Writings*, Classics of Western Spirituality (New York: Paulist Press, 1985)
Blowers–Wilken 2003	P. M. Blowers and R. L. Wilken (trans.), *On the Cosmic Mystery of Jesus Christ: Maximus the Confessor*, Popular Patristics Series (Crestwood, NY: St Vladimir's Seminary Press, 2003)

Boudignon 2011	C. Boudignon (ed.), *Mystagogia*, CCSG 69 (Turnhout: Brepols, 2011)
Brock 1973	S. Brock (ed. and trans.), 'An Early Syriac Life of Maximus the Confessor', *Analecta Bollandiana* 91 (1973): 302–19. Repr. in S. Brock, *Syriac Perspectives on Late Antiquity,* Collected Studies Series 199 (London: Variorum Reprints, 1992), ch. 12
CCCM	Corpus Christianorum Continuatio Medievalis
CCSG	Corpus Christianorum Series Graeca
CCSL	Corpus Christianorum Series Latina
Ceresa-Gastaldo 1963	A. Ceresa-Gastaldo (ed.), *Massimo confessore. Capitoli sulla carità* (Rome: Editrice Studium, 1963)
Constas 2014	N. Constas (trans.), *Maximos the Confessor, The Ambigua*, Dumbarton Oaks Medieval Library 28, 2 vols (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2014)
CPG	*Clavis Patrum Graecorum*
CPG Supp.	*Clavis Patrum Graecorum Supplementum*
CSCO	Corpus Scriptorum Christianorum Orientalium
Declerck 1982	J. Declerck (ed.), *Quaestiones et dubia*, CCSG 10 (Turnhout: Brepols, 1982)
Van Deun 1991	P. Van Deun (ed.), *Opuscula exegetica duo*, CCSG 23 (Turnhout: Brepols, 1991)
Van Deun 2000a	P. Van Deun (ed.), *Liber asceticus*, CCSG 40 (Turnhout: Brepols, 2000)
Doucet 1972	M. Doucet (ed. and trans.), *Dispute de Maxime le Confesseur avec Pyrrhus. Introduction, texte critique, traduction et notes*, diss., Montreal (1972)
Ep./Epp.	*Epistula/Epistulae*
Farrell 1990	J. P. Farrell (trans.), *The Disputation with Pyrrhus of our Father among the Saints Maximus the Confessor* (Canan: St Tikhon's Seminary Press, 1990)
GCS	Die griechischen christlichen Schriftsteller der ersten drei Jahrhunderte
GNO	Gregorii Nysseni Opera
Grillmeier ii.i.	A. Grillmeier, *Christ in Christian Tradition*, 2. *From the Council of Chalcedon (451) to Gregory the Great (590–604)*, part 1. *Reception and Contradiction,* trans. P. Allen and J. Cawte (London–Louisville, KY: Mowbray, 1987).
Grillmeier ii.ii.	A. Grillmeier with T. Hainthaler, *Christ in Christian Tradition*, 2. *From the Council of Chalcedon (451) to Gregory*

	the Great (590–604), part 2. *The Church of Constantinople in the Sixth Century*, trans. J. Cawte and P. Allen (London–Louisville, KY: Mowbray, 1995)
Heil–Ritter 1991	G. Heil and A. M. Ritter (eds.), *Corpus Dionysiacum II: Pseudo-Dionysius Areopagita, De Coelesti Hierarchia, De Ecclesiastica Hierarchia, De Mystica Theologia, Epistulae*, PTS 36 (Berlin: W. de Gruyter, 1991)
Heinzer–Schönborn	Heinzer, F. and von Schönborn, C. (eds.), *Maximus the Confessor. Actes du Symposium sur Maxime le Confesseur. Friburg, 2–5 septembre 1980* (Fribourg, Switzerland: Éditions universitaires, 1982)
Janssens 2002	B. Janssens (ed.), *Ambigua ad Thomam una cum Epistula secunda ad eundem*, CCSG 48 (Turnhout: Brepols, 2002)
Jeauneau 1988	E. Jeauneau (ed.), *Ambigua ad Iohannem iuxta Iohannis Scoti Eriugenae latinam interpretationem*, CCSG 18 (Turnhout: Brepols, 1988)
JECS	*Journal of Early Christian Studies*
JÖB	*Jahrbuch der Österreichischen Byzantinistik*
JTS ns	*Journal of Theological Studies new series*
Laga–Steel 1980	C. Laga and C. Steel (eds.), *Quaestiones ad Thalassium I, Quaestiones I–LV, una cum latina interpretatione Ioannis Scotti Eriugenae*, CCSG 7 (Turnhout: Brepols, 1980)
Laga–Steel 1990	C. Laga and C. Steel (eds.), *Quaestiones ad Thalassium II, Quaestiones LVI–LXV, una cum latina interpretatione Ioannis Scotti Eriugenae*, CCSG 22 (Turnhout: Brepols, 1990)
Larchet–Ponsoye 1994	J.-C. Larchet and E. Ponsoye (trans.), *Maxime le Confesseur, Ambigua, avec commentaires par Dumitru Staniloae* (Paris: Ancre, 1994)
Larchet–Ponsoye 1998a	J.-C. Larchet and E. Ponsoye (trans.), *Maxime le Confesseur: Lettres* (Paris: Cerf, 1998)
Larchet–Ponsoye 1998b	J.-C. Larchet and E. Ponsoye (trans.), *Maxime le Confesseur: Opuscules théologiques et polémiques* (Paris: Cerf, 1998)
Larchet–Ponsoye 1999	J.-C. Larchet and E. Ponsoye (trans.), *Maxime le Confesseur: Questions et difficultés* (Quaestiones et dubia) (Paris: Cerf, 1999)
Larchet–Vinel 2010	J.-C. Larchet and F. Vinel (trans.), *Questions à Thalassios: Tome I*, SC 529 (Paris: Cerf, 2010)

LCL	The Loeb Classical Library
Liddell et al. 1996	Liddell, G., Scott, R., Jones, H. S., and McKenzie, R., *A Greek-English Lexicon with a Revised Supplement*, 9th edn. (Oxford: Clarendon Press).
Lollar 2010	J. Lollar (trans.), *Maximus the Confessor. Ambigua to Thomas and Second Letter to Thomas*, Corpus Christianorum in Translation (Turnhout: Brepols, 2010)
Lot-Borodine 1963	M. Lot-Borodine (trans.), 'La Mystagogie de saint Maxime', *Irenikon* 13–15 (1936–38); repr. in A. Hamman, *L'Initiation chrétienne* (Paris: Desclée de Brouwer, 1963).
Louth 1996	A. Louth (trans.), *Maximus the Confessor*, The Early Church Fathers (London: Routledge, 1996)
LXX	*Septuagint*
Neil 2006	B. Neil (ed. and trans.), *Seventh-Century Popes and Martyrs: The Political Hagiography of Anastasius Bibliothecarius*, Studia Antiqua Australiensia 2 (Turnhout–Sydney: Brepols, 2006)
Neil–Allen 2003	B. Neil and P. Allen (eds. and trans.), *The Life of Maximus the Confessor—Recension 3*, Early Christian Studies 6 (Strathfield: St Pauls, 2003)
OECS	Oxford Early Christian Studies
OECT	Oxford Early Christian Texts
Or.	*Oratio*
PG	J.-P. Migne (ed.), *Patrologiae cursus completus. Series Graeca,* 161 vols. (Paris: Petit Montrouge, 1857–66)
PL	J.-P. Migne (ed.), *Patrologiae cursus completus. Series Latina,* 221 vols. (Paris: Garnier, 1844–65)
Prassas 2010	D. Prassas (trans.), *St Maximus the Confessor's Questions and Doubts* (DeKalb, IL: Northern Illinois University Press, 2010)
PTS	Patristische Texte und Studien
Riedinger, ACO i.	R. Riedinger (ed.), *Acta Conciliorum Oecumenicorum,* i. *Concilium Lateranense a. 649 celebratum,* 2nd series (Berlin: W. de Gruyter, 1984)
Roosen and Van Deun 2003	B. Roosen and P. Van Deun (eds.), 'A Critical Edition of the *Quaestiones ad Theopemptum* of Maximus the Confessor', *Journal of Eastern Christian Studies* 55 (2003): 65–79

SC	Sources Chrétiennes
Sherwood 1952	*An Annotated Date-List of the Works of Maximus the Confessor*, Studia Anselmiana 30 (Rome: Herder, 1952)
Sherwood 1955a	P. Sherwood (trans.), *The Ascetic Life, The Four Centuries on Charity* (New York: Newman Press, 1955)
Sherwood 1955b	P. Sherwood, *The Earlier* Ambigua *of St Maximus the Confessor* (Rome: Herder, 1955)
Sotiropoulos 2001	C. G. Sotiropoulos (ed. and trans.), *Η Μυσταγωγία του αγίου Μαξίμου του Ομολογητού*, PhD diss., Athens (1978; rev. edn. 2001)
StP	*Studia Patristica*
Suchla 1990	B. Suchla (ed.), *Corpus Dionysiacum 1: Pseudo-Dionysius Areopagita. De divinis nominibus*, PTS 33 (Berlin–New York: W. de Gruyter, 1990)
Thunberg 1995	L. Thunberg, *Microcosm and Mediator: The Theological Anthropology of Maximus the Confessor*, 2nd edn. (Chicago: Open Court, 1995)
VC	*Vigiliae Christianae*
VCS	Supplements to *Vigiliae Christianae*

List of Contributors

Pauline Allen is professor and director of the Centre for Early Christian Studies at Australian Catholic University, Brisbane, and honorary researcher at University of Pretoria and Sydney College of Divinity.

Andreas Andreopoulos is a reader in Orthodox Christianity and programme leader of the Master of Theology in Orthodox Studies at the University of Winchester.

Michael Bakker is director of the Amsterdam Centre for Eastern Orthodox Theology (ACEOT) at the Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam and a deacon in the Russian Orthodox Church.

Demetrios Bathrellos is a priest in Athens, Greece. He teaches theology at the Hellenic Open University, Athens, and at the Institute for Orthodox Christian Studies, Cambridge.

Grigory Benevich is a senior researcher and head of department in the Russian Christian Academy for the Humanities (St. Petersburg).

George C. Berthold is a Catholic priest in the Archdiocese of Boston.

Paul M. Blowers is Dean E. Walker Professor of Church History at Emmanuel Christian Seminary, Johnson City, Tennessee.

Phil Booth is A. G. Leventis Lecturer in Eastern Christianity in the Faculty of Theology and Religion at the University of Oxford.

Johannes Börjesson is a PhD candidate in the Faculty of Divinity, University of Cambridge.

Thomas Cattoi is associate professor of Christology and Cultures at the Jesuit School of Theology at Santa Clara University.

Adam G. Cooper is a senior lecturer in theology at the John Paul II Institute for Marriage and Family, Melbourne.

Doru Costache is senior lecturer in patristics at St Andrew's Greek Orthodox Theological College (Sydney College of Divinity, Australia).

Ysabel De Andia is director of research in ancient philosophy at the National Centre of Scientific Research (CNRS), Paris.

Cyril Hovorun is a scholar in patristics and ecclesiology. His most recent position was at the Yale Divinity School.

Marek Jankowiak is a research associate at the Faculty of Oriental Studies at the University of Oxford.

Walter E. Kaegi is professor of history and a permanent voting member of the Oriental Institute of The University of Chicago.

Catherine Kavanagh is senior lecturer in philosophy at Mary Immaculate College (Limerick, Ireland).

Lela Khoperia is a postdoctoral researcher at the Centre for Exploration of Georgian Antiquities at St Andrew's Georgian University (Tbilisi, Georgia).

Raymond J. Laird is an honorary fellow of the Centre for Early Christian Studies, Australian Catholic University, Brisbane.

Jean-Claude Larchet, PhD and ThD, is an independent scholar at Strasbourg (France).

Joshua Lollar is lecturer in the Department of Religious Studies at the University of Kansas (USA) and priest of St Nicholas Orthodox Church, Lawrence, Kansas.

Andrew Louth is professor emeritus of Patristic and Byzantine theology at the University of Durham and a visiting professor at the Vrije Universiteit, Amsterdam.

Ian A. McFarland is Bishop Mack B. and Rose Y. Stokes Professor of Theology and Associate Dean of Faculty and Academic Affairs at Emory University's Candler School of Theology.

Pascal Mueller-Jourdan is professor of Ancient Philosophy at the Catholic University of the West, Angers, France.

Bronwen Neil is an assistant professor and assistant director of the Centre for Early Christian Studies at Australian Catholic University, Brisbane.

Marcus Plested is associate professor in the Department of Theology at Marquette University in Milwaukee.

Marius Portaru is a PhD student at the Patristic Institute 'Augustinianum' (Rome).

A. Edward Siecienski is associate professor of Religion and Pappas Professor of Byzantine Culture and Religion at the Richard Stockton College of New Jersey.

Torstein T. Tollefsen is professor of philosophy at the University of Oslo (Norway) in the Department of Philosophy, Classics, History of Art and Ideas.

Peter Van Deun is professor of Byzantine studies in the Arts Faculty of the Katholieke Universiteit Leuven (Belgium).

PART I

HISTORICAL SETTING

The first section places Maximus in his historical setting, starting with an overview of his life and times, and a discussion of the differences between the Greek and Syriac versions of the *Life of Maximus*. The second chapter provides an update of Sherwood's (1952) *Date-List of Works of St Maximus the Confessor*, and a reconstructed timeline of significant events in the life of Maximus. Overviews of the theological context of neo-Chalcedonianism and the political–military context of seventh-century Byzantium are also included here.

CHAPTER 1

LIFE AND TIMES OF MAXIMUS THE CONFESSOR

PAULINE ALLEN

In this chapter I shall briefly outline the historical background to Maximus' life and works and discuss some of the significant others in his life. After a brief account of the Confessor's works, I deal with the main sources for his life, discussing their reliability, before attempting a chronological reconstruction and a timeline.

Background

In his lifetime, which spanned the period *c.*580–662, Maximus was the subject of no fewer than five Byzantine emperors: Tiberius (578–82), Maurice (582–602), Phocas (602–10), Heraclius (610–41) (see Reinink and Stolte 2002), and Constans II (645–68) (Haldon 1997; Kaegi 2003). In addition, he lived through the times of many patriarchs of Constantinople and bishops of Rome. The reigns of the emperors in Constantinople during this period stood in the shadows cast by the fall-out after the Council of Chalcedon (451) and the increasing dangers posed by Avars, Slavs, Persians, and Arabs. After the death of Muhammad in 632, Damascus and Emesa fell to the Muslims in 635, Syria soon after, and Jerusalem was surrendered to the Arabs by Patriarch Sophronius in 637 or 638 (Ekonomou 2007: 60). This was followed by Muslim conquests in North Africa from 642 (Kaegi 2010: 116–44). These were turbulent times in which internal, external, and ecclesiastical politics overlapped.[1] It is significant that in this period three of the five patriarchates of the church of the East quickly passed out of the Byzantine emperor's jurisdiction, leaving only Constantinople and Rome. As a result of wars there were huge numbers of displaced people within the empire as many Greeks fled from the eastern

[1] Winkelmann 1987; Knežević 2012: 137–47; Jankowiak 2009; Booth 2013. See Hovorun 2015.

provinces to the West, especially to Carthage, Sicily, southern Italy, and Rome (Sansterre 1980). Among these refugees was a large number of monks, including Maximus the Confessor, whose forced sojourns in the West were advantageous to his efforts to fight imperial heresy. As can be seen from the suggested timeline at the end of this chapter, Maximus' ties with Africa were particularly strong: he was there between 626 and 630, in 632, 633, or 644, and again, at the latest, in 641 and 645, arguing for orthodox doctrine. To the Confessor and others, Byzantine military defeats were directly caused by the monoenergist and monothelite policies of Emperors Heraclius and Constans II.

On the ecclesiastical front, the repeated imperial efforts to secure religious unity that had been attempted from 451 onwards continued, albeit in other guises and with different goals. Emperor Tiberius and his successors had failed in reconciling not only anti-Chalcedonians with pro-Chalcedonians but also various anti-Chalcedonian groups with each other, especially those in the patriarchates of Antioch and Alexandria (Allen 2013).The tritheist dispute in particular proved a stumbling block to unity in the ranks of the opponents of Chalcedon, but may have had ramifications on the other side of the Chalcedonian fence as well. Heraclius assumed an energetic role, first of all trying to broker a deal between the patriarchates of Antioch and Alexandria, a deal which the sources dismiss as 'wishy-washy' (ὑδροβάφη).[2] While this union has been traditionally dated to 616 (e.g. by Olster 1985; Allen 2009: 24–6), it is now argued that in fact it occurred in 617 (Jankowiak 2009: 18–20; cf. Booth 2013: 104–5, 237). A well-documented meeting in Mabbug in 629/30 between Heraclius and Athanasius Gammal, anti-Chalcedonian patriarch of Antioch (593–631), demonstrates that by that stage the focus of internal religious conflict had shifted from tritheism to monoenergism, or the doctrine of one activity (*energeia*) in Christ,[3] also master-minded by Emperor Heraclius, who was aided by Sergius, the versatile patriarch of Constantinople (610–38) (van Dieten 1972: 1–56).

Monoenergism was intended by Heraclius and Sergius as a project with the aim of restoring ecclesiastical unity (Hovorun 2008: 55–67). Its assertion of one activity in Christ could appeal to the anti-Chalcedonians, while its retention of the two-nature doctrine would pacify the adherents of the Council of 451. However, it has been argued that the difference between the doctrines of one or two activities was more terminological than real (Price 2010: 223; Booth 2013: 218; cf. Tannous 2014). Be that as it may, in time it seemed only natural to some that the assertion of one activity in Christ necessitated also the affirmation of one will (θέλησις, θέλημα), thereby inaugurating the monothelite debate.

Various official documents played a role in the evolution of the monoenergist movement. On 3 June 633 a *Plerophoria* (announcement or pact of union) was promulgated in Alexandria by the patriarch and *augustalis* Cyrus,[4] a convert to monoenergism, with

[2] Theophanes, *Chron.* AM 6121; ed. de Boor 1883/1: 330. 5–11, trans. Mango–Scott 1997: 461; recension 2 of *Vita Maximi* (Greek), PG 90. 77C; recension 3, ed. and trans. Neil–Allen 2003: 54–5.

[3] Lange 2012: 531–622; Allen 2013: 198; Booth 2013: 202–5, 221, 237.

[4] Winkelmann 2001: 66 nr. 27; Hovorun 2008: 67–72; Jankowiak 2009: 89–96; Allen 2009: 28, 168–73; Booth 2013: 205–22, 327.

the intention of rallying the various parties under the banner of Cyril, Chalcedon, and the Fifth Ecumenical Council of 553. Among others, Sophronius, by this time patriarch of Jerusalem, objected to this document in a confrontation with Patriarch Cyrus later reported by Maximus in his *Opusc.*12 (PG 91. 143C–D; see Booth 2013: 209). However, the anti-Chalcedonian party in Alexandria agreed to its terms and was reconciled, to the great satisfaction of Cyrus and Sergius.

In a *Psephos* or resolution, which can be dated to August 633 (Winkelmann 2001: 73–4, nr. 36), Sergius asserted that there should be no further talk of either one or two activities in Christ, and that, subsequent to the 'union' effected in Alexandria, Cyrus should henceforth avoid mentioning one or two activities (Allen 2009: 29). Likewise Sophronius, later patriarch of Jerusalem, was to abstain from speaking of one or two activities in Christ. We may assume that these concessions were made in the face of objections which had been made by Sophronius and his follower, Maximus the Confessor, to the doctrine of monoenergism (Winkelmann 2001: 72–3, nr. 35), although in the *Synodical Letter* which Sophronius circulated to fellow bishops on his accession as patriarch in 634, he adopts a careful tone about doctrinal debates (Jankowiak 2009: 133; Allen 2009: 44–5). Curiously, the *Psephos* was approved by Maximus, although he sought clarification of certain terms contained in it.[5] These developments were reported by Sergius to Pope Honorius (625–38), who, theologically inept as he was, sent his congratulations on the theological agreement in the eastern churches. This letter, which dates to 634/5, contained what was to become the kernel of the doctrine of monothelitism, namely a confession of one will in Christ, such that Honorius was later credited with being the inventor of the heresy (Allen 2009: 33, 204–9).

The Syriac *Life* informs us that soon afterwards, probably in the first half of 636, Sophronius continued his resistance to monoenergism by writing a letter to Bishop Arcadius of Cyprus at the insistence of Maximus (Brock 1973: 315–16). This letter survives only in part (Albert–von Schönborn 1978). Present were Patriarchs Cyrus of Alexandria, Sergius of Constantinople, Sophronius himself, and representatives of the incumbents of other sees, including the author of the Syriac *Life*. Maximus purportedly did not attend, sending Anastasius the disciple in his stead. The upshot of the council was that a letter was sent to Heraclius outlining the 'doctrine of Sophronius and the rascal Maximus' (Brock 1973: 317), which prompted the emperor to publish an edict, known as the *Ekthesis* (Jankowiak 2009: 149; Booth 2013: 239–41).

The traditional date of the *Ekthesis* or statement is 638, but Jankowiak has argued convincingly that it was published shortly after the Council of Cyprus, thus in 636 (Jankowiak 2009: 159). In the document, which was composed by Patriarch Sergius, the debate moves from the terminology associated with the activity or activities in Christ to that of the will or wills.[6] All discussion of one or two activities is forbidden, and one

[5] Although several scholars have argued that Maximus had reservations: summary in Jankowiak 2009: 104–5 n.340.

[6] Winkelmann 2001: 85–6 nr. 50; Hovorun 2008: 73–6; Jankowiak 2009: 150–9; Allen 2009: 33–4, 208–17.

will is confessed in Christ. The edict was accepted warmly by Sergius' successor, Pyrrhus (638–41), a Palestinian monk who was probably an adversary of Sophronius (Jankowiak 2009: 181).The *Ekthesis* signalled another failed attempt at ecclesiastical union, in that opposition to it grew, particularly in the West, where Popes Severinus (638–40), John IV (640–42), Theodore I (642–49), and Martin (649–53) refused to accept it. Only ten years afterwards, the document was rescinded by the *Typos* or regulation, an edict issued in the name of Emperor Constans II, which forbade any mention of either one or two activities or wills in Christ (Winkelmann 2001: 123 nr. 106; Hovorun 2008: 82–3). Unperturbed by the *Typos*, Maximus continued to oppose monothelitism and seems to have come out openly against it in *c.*640 (Louth 1996: 16). In the meantime Anastasius the apocrisiarius and other dyothelites in Constantinople were sent into exile, possibly because of their resistance to the document (Allen–Neil 2002: 156; Jankowiak 2009: 241; Booth 2013: 292–3).

Meanwhile, the imperial house was in disarray. In 641 Emperor Heraclius died and left the crown to Constantine III and Heraclonas, two sons by different mothers. When Constantine died shortly afterwards, Martina, the mother of Heraclonas and infamously both the wife and niece of the recently deceased emperor, seized power. However, her reign was short lived as she was deposed in November of the same year and replaced by Constans II, Heraclius' grandson. The monothelite patriarch of Constantinople, Pyrrhus, a supporter of Martina, was either deposed or resigned at the same time and retreated to Africa (van Dieten 1972: 57–75; Booth 2013: 252–3). Thus it is that in July 645 we find Maximus and Pyrrhus engaged in a theological dispute on the topics of activities and wills, which was subsequently recorded either by the Confessor himself or by a supporter (Booth 2013: 285–7). Not surprisingly, we find that Maximus won the dispute and, moreover, that his opponent, realizing the error of his ways, went to Rome, where he anathematized the *Ekthesis* and was received by the dyothelite pope Theodore I (642–49), who had connections with Palestine and Sophronius (Ekonomou 2007: 92–8). Maximus' engagement with an ex-patriarch of Constantinople and his vindication of his own theological position testify to his increasing stature in the monothelite debate (Boudignon 2007: 256–65), and, as Jankowiak plausibly suggests, to his plan of ensuring orthodoxy in the West to replace what had been lost in the East because of preoccupation with Arab invasions (Jankowiak 2009: 220–1).

Maximus' strong stand against imperial documents dictating one or two activities or wills was followed by Pope Martin in the Lateran Synod, convened in October 649 to condemn both the *Ekthesis* and the *Typos* (Conte 1989). Although Maximus proclaimed it one of the 'holy six councils'—thereby claiming for it ecumenical status (*Opusc.* 11, PG 91. 137C–140B)—it was convened without imperial sanction and, in Booth's words, this 'underscored a blatant usurpation of imperial prerogative that did not, it seems, go unnoticed in the East' (Booth 2013: 293). It has been suggested that Maximus was the author of the proceedings of the synod, and that they had been composed in Greek beforehand and were then translated into Latin by the Byzantine monks who came to Rome with him after being displaced by the troubles in the East (Riedinger 1977, 1982, 1985; Sansterre 1980: 117–19)—a veritable monastic 'collectif' in the eyes of Boudignon

(2007). Maximus' name appears in the subscriptions to the *libellus* included in the proceedings of the council, as well as the names of two monks called Anastasius, perhaps the disciple and the apocrisiarius, although we cannot be sure that any of the trio was present. Because of its anathematization of three patriarchs of Constantinople (Sergius, Pyrrhus, and Paul), the Lateran Synod encountered a very angry reception in the eastern capital (Hovorun 2008: 83–6) which culminated in the arrest of the synod's proponents, Pope Martin (charged with treason; Alexakis 1996: 20–1), Maximus, and his disciples (Allen–Neil 2002: 19–21), and their subsequent trials, exiles, and deaths. Although Maximus was not mentioned at the Sixth Ecumenical Council in Constantinople in 680/1, no doubt to avoid embarrassing the imperial government so soon after his condemnation and martyrdom, the doctrine of the two wills in Christ, so vigorously upheld by the Confessor, Martin, and their followers, was nevertheless vindicated at the Council, although the monothelite doctrine had a brief revival under the emperor Philippikos Bardanes (711–13).

The 'show trials' of Pope Martin I and Maximus before the senate in Constantinople after the Lateran Synod can only be understood in the context of the crisis facing Byzantium in the form of Muslim invasions (Haldon 1985; Brandes 1998). The trials were designed by the senate to shift the blame for the general crisis onto their dyothelite opponents and to present them as criminals (Brandes 1998: 212). Once Maximus, in particular, was out of the way, the imperial government could turn its attention to thwarting the influence of the eastern monks in the West, a process that was aided by the re-establishment of communion between the patriarchates of Constantinople and Rome (Jankowiak 2009: 310).

Significant Others

To appreciate Maximus' life and times we need to consider some significant others in his life, his doctrinal struggles, and ultimately his death. The first of these is the monastic group around John Moschus, a Cilician born around 550 (Chadwick 1974), who, together with his disciple and lifelong companion Sophronius, appears to have visited Egyptian monasteries under the reign of Tiberius (578–82) (Allen 2009: 16–17; Booth 2013: 44–5). Author of an influential monastic work, the *Spiritual Meadow*, John and, later, his anti-Chalcedonian followers, hard-core monastics known as the Eukratades (Chadwick 1974; Boudignon 2007: 253), were instrumental in resisting imperial compromise on doctrinal issues. After fleeing the approach of the Persians, Moschus and Sophronius ended up in Alexandria, where they became intimates of the Chalcedonian patriarch, John the Almsgiver (610–20), whose biography they wrote jointly (Allen 2009: 18). Through Sophronius, whom Maximus seems to have met in North Africa in the 620s in the company of Greek monks devoted to Moschus (d. *c.*634: Louth 1998; Jankowiak–Booth 2015), there developed a long-lasting master–student relationship (although, as we shall see in the hostile Syriac tradition of Maximus' life, the relationship

was the other way around). Sophronius' fight on behalf of Chalcedonian orthodoxy and in particular against monoenergism was to be carried on, with refined terminology and argumentation, by Maximus (Allen 2009: 21).

Two men named Anastasius played a critical role in Maximus' life. These were Anastasius the monk/disciple and Anastasius the apocrisiarius (papal legate). In addition, Maximus had a number of supporters among dyothelite monks and state officials.

It appears that in 617/8 Maximus met an African monk, Anastasius (Allen–Neil 2002: 70–1; Jankowiak–Booth 2015), who became a close disciple and followed him to his death, as we learn in several of the biographical documents enumerated in the References to this chapter. From Anastasius we have a letter to the monks of Cagliari (*CPG* 7725) on the topic of monothelitism. He underwent the two trials of Maximus and was exiled with him (Larchet 2013: 82–3), although he did not suffer the same mutilation as his master and the apocrisiarius. The disciple died on 22 or 24 July 662 at or in transit to Souania (Allen–Neil 2002: 25).

We do not know where Maximus met Anastasius the apocrisiarius, who was also a monk (Lilie 1999: 79–80 nr. 238). Like other *apocrisiarii* in the Byzantine capital, Anastasius reacted negatively to the publication of the *Typos* and was relegated to Trebizond, where he remained for several years. According to the second recension of the Greek *Life* (PG 90. 85D–88A), Anastasius was arrested with Maximus and Anastasius the disciple in Rome for his stand against monothelitism, but this document is not reliable. In any case, the apocrisiarius was in exile in Mesembria sometime before August 656 (Allen–Neil 2002: 88–101). Although he was not present at the first trial, at the second trial Anastasius was condemned, suffered mutilation like Maximus (his tongue and right hand being cut off), and was also exiled to Lazica, where he died on 11 October 666. In the year before his death, the apocrisiarius wrote a letter to Theodosius of Gangra (*CPG* 7733, see the section titled 'Sources for the Life of Maximus, and a Possible Chronological Reconstruction'), asking for assistance in the vicissitudes of his various exiles (subsequently to Bouculus, Thacyria, and other places; Allen–Neil 2002: 25–6; Larchet 2013: 83–6).

Pope Martin I (649–53) had also been apocrisiarius in Constantinople at the time of the publication of the *Typos* in 648. On their resistance to the document, the *apocrisiarii* were forced to leave the capital, and Martin returned to Rome, just in time to succeed Pope Theodore. Instead of seeking the customary imperial approval for his elevation to the papacy, Martin convened the Lateran Synod, secure in the knowledge that he had the support of Maximus and a huge number of eastern dyothelite monks in the cause for orthodoxy. As we have seen, Martin and other prominent proponents of the synod incurred imperial displeasure for their efforts, were arrested in Rome, and taken to Constantinople. Martin was subjected to the same 'show trial' as Maximus and the Anastasii in 653 and condemned to death, although this sentence was subsequently commuted to exile in Cherson. Martin's letters and an eyewitness account (Allen–Neil 2002: 148–71) detail his sufferings there for two years before his death on 16 September 655 (Neil 2006).

One of the biographical documents that has come down to us is the *Commemoration* composed in late 668 or early 669 by the poorly educated Theodore Spudaeus, in which

he relates the sufferings in exile of Pope Martin I (649–55), Maximus, the two Anastasii, and their supporters in the dyothelite cause, brothers Theodore and Euprepius, imperial chief bakers who financed the campaign (Neil 2006: 95; and *Narr*. 1, Neil 2006: 166). The brothers were exiled to Cherson shortly before Martin, and Euprepius died there on 26 October 655 (Neil 2006: 95). Theodore Spudaeus relates how he and his brother Theodosius of Gangra (the addressee of the letter of Anastasius the apocrisiarius) made the long trek to the Caucasus to visit Martin in exile, only to find that the pope was already dead.

Works of Maximus

The works of Maximus have received increasing scholarly attention over the past two decades (Van Deun 1998–99, 2009; Knežević 2012), a testimony to the stature he has attained, not only as a historical figure, but also as a theologian and spiritual writer. His *c.*fifty letters (*CPG* 7699), most of which cannot be dated with certainty, demonstrate how well connected he was: his addressees include bishops, clergy, abbots, monks, imperial officials like *cubicularii* and *sacellarii*, in various locations, to whom Maximus writes, also from various locations. His monumental work *Questions Addressed to Thalassius* (*Q.Thal., CPG* 7688) is an exposition on scriptural interpretation, while shorter works, *Questions and Doubts* (*QD, CPG* 7689), *Questions to Theopemptus* (*Q.Theop., CPG* 7696), *Exposition on Psalm 59* (*In ps. LIX, CPG* 7690), and *On the Lord's Prayer (Or.dom*., *CPG* 7691), also deal with the same topic.

The *Small Works* (*Opusc., CPG* 7696) are twenty-seven theological and doctrinal short pieces on topics like activities and wills, including definitions of theological and christological terms such as 'distinction', 'union', 'quality', 'property', 'difference', 'essence', 'nature', 'hypostasis', and 'person'. Similar are the *Two Centuries on the Theology and the Incarnation* (*Th.oec*., *CPG* 7694), while the *Dispute with Pyrrhus* (*DP, CPG* 7698) is an extensive dialogue on the subject of wills and operations.

In the following category we encounter the Confessor's spiritual works: *On the Ascetic Life* (*LA, CPG* 7692), a dialogue between two monastics on the ascetic life; *Four Centuries on Love* (*Car*., *CPG* 7693), which constitutes four hundred sayings on the ascetic life; *Mystagogy* (*Myst., CPG* 7704), a work on liturgical theology and symbols in which the influence of Ps-Dionysius can be seen (cf. Laird 2015), and scholia on Ps-Dionysius (*CPG* 7708).

Next we have two sets of *Ambigua*, or explications of difficult passages in works of the Fathers. *Amb.Io.* deals with difficulties in Gregory of Nazianzen, and includes a refutation of Origenism, while *Amb.Th.* comments on difficult passages in Ps-Dionysius and Gregory Nazianzen (both *CPG* 7705).

In a category of its own, we have the *Computus ecclesiasticus* (*CPG* 7606), which relies on Alexandrian rather than Byzantine chronology and includes chronological tables.

In addition to these works there are short pieces surviving in a variety of manuscripts (*CPG* 7707), fragments and scholia in *catenae* and other works, including the *Doctrina Patrum*. The Greek texts in the anti-monothelite florilegium preserved in the acta of the *Lateran Synod* have also been attributed to Maximus (Riedinger 1982: 118).[7]

Finally, a Georgian *Life of the Virgin* is attributed to the Confessor; it was probably composed in the seventh century by someone conversant with the Marian traditions of Palestine and Constantinople, and, although its authenticity has been disputed, there seems to be no reason not to follow the traditional attribution to Maximus (Shoemaker 2012: 13; Khoperia 2015; cf. Booth forthcoming, who argues that it is a tenth-century work).

Noteworthy in this short account of Maximus' works is the influence of Ps-Dionysius and Maximus' refutation of Origenism (Benevich et al. 2007; Benevich 2009; Plested 2015). The Confessor's role as an interpreter of Ps-Dionysius has been hailed as one of his most significant contributions to the history of Christian thought (Pelikan 1982: 398); Maximus accepted Ps-Dionysius' theology as well as his philosophy, liturgical theology, and his view of the cosmos (Louth 1996: 29). With regard to 'Origenism', which had been so prevalent in monastic circles, even though Maximus refuted it (especially in *Amb.Io.* 7), he was able to save its ascetical richness while weeding out some of its more questionable aspects (Louth 1996: 24–5).

Sources for the Life of Maximus, and a Possible Chronological Reconstruction

This chapter will not detail the chronology of Maximus' works, because this was done by Sherwood in his influential date-list (1952), which was significantly revised by Jankowiak and Booth (2015). Instead I shall use the works as far as possible to supplement the biographical and hagiographical documents.

I begin with the Greek sources for the life of Maximus. There are three recensions of the *Vita* and their relationship is very vexed (Devreesse 1928; Neil 2001). In addition we have various epitomized *Lives*, passions, and documents which were integrated into the three recensions in various ways (Allen 1985: 12; Roosen 2010). Also to be mentioned are the letters of Maximus, some of which contain biographical and/or chronological information;[8] these still await a critical edition. Many of these sources for Maximus' biography have been inaccessible, blighted by inaccurate chronology, ancient and modern hagiographical bias, and the lack of modern critical editions of their texts. For example,

[7] Alexakis 1996: 26–31 gives a thorough analysis of the florilegia used at this Council.

[8] Sahas 2003: 100–10, relying on Sherwood's date-list; Jankowiak–Booth 2015; Blowers forthcoming.

the work of M. D. Muretov, who in 1913–14 published in instalments partial editions of documents pertaining to the Greek, Georgian, and Slavonic traditions of the life of the Confessor (see Benevich 2015), had little impact because the work remained difficult to access. Another significant name in the quest for the biography of Maximus is S. L. Epifanovich, who in 1917 published a number of epitomized biographies of the Confessor and some of Maximus' works themselves. Again the inaccessibility of this research impeded subsequent investigation into the biography of Maximus (Allen 1985: 11–12). Another name that looms large in research on the biography of Maximus is that of R. Devreesse, who was the first to detect that, behind the text of what is still today with misleading simplicity referred to as the *Life* of Maximus (*BHG* 1234), there lurked what he decided to call three recensions (Devreesse 1928).

Until the recent edition of the third recension (Neil–Allen 2003), only one of these three recensions had been edited, namely the second (PG 90. 68–109), which is of least value. The contributions to the question of the inter-relationship of the three recensions by Devreesse (1928), Lackner (1967), Bracke (1980), and van Dieten (1972) have been contradictory. Bracke in particular relied on the epitome BHG 1233m as the source for the oldest version of the *Life* (van Dieten 1982; Allen 1985: 15–17), while Lackner, followed by Bracke, posited the existence of an *Urpassio*, or archetype, composed close to Maximus' death, from which the three recensions were composed. It is now agreed that the earliest possible date for the *Life* in its present forms is the late tenth century (Neil–Allen 2003: 24; Roosen 2010), the *terminus post quem* for the *Vita* B of Theodore Studite (BHG 1755), parts of which Lackner plausibly demonstrated were taken over to supply an account of Maximus' early years, contained in all three recensions (Lackner 1967: 294–8; Roosen 2010: 446–51).The superior value of the *Passiones* of Maximus over against the later *Vitae* has also been argued for (Roosen 2010). The question of the interrelationship of the various Greek biographical documents will be further elucidated in Roosen's forthcoming edition of the second recension, but suffice it to say here that the place of the epitomized *Lives* in the tradition is also fraught (Allen 1985: 19; Roosen 2010).

It is important to note that all three recensions depend on at least three of four documents: Maximus' *DP* (PG 91. 288–353), *RM, DB*, and the *Ep.Max.*, the last three having received a recent critical edition and translation (Allen–Neil 2002: 48–74, 76–123). These are discussed below. However, as already said, the use of the documents in the three recensions differs. For example, recension 3 contains verbatim the *RM* and the *DB*, but in reverse chronological order. Furthermore, there are indications that the author(s) of this recension deliberately manipulated the sources (Neil–Allen 2003: 24–5).

The recent edition of seven biographical documents, some of which have been mentioned and are reliably dated, has advanced our knowledge of the imperial reaction against monothelitism after 646, a date after which we have very few surviving works of Maximus (Louth 1996: 192; Allen–Neil 2002: 21–2). With these documents we are on somewhat surer ground for the events and chronology of Maximus' later life. They are:

1. *Record of the Trial (RM)* (*CPG* 7736), an eyewitness account of the events of the trial of Maximus and his disciple Anastasius in Constantinople in 655, in which

Maximus is sentenced to exile in Bizya and his disciple Anastasius to Perberis. No more precise date for this trial than the year 655 can be given. Various authors have been suggested for the document, ranging from both Anastasii to Theodore Spudaeus and Theodosius of Gangra, but the question must remain open (Allen–Neil 2002: 35–6, 48–74).

2. *Dispute at Bizya between Maximus and Theodosius, bishop of Caesarea Bithynia (DB)* (*CPG* 7735), which took place during Maximus' exile in Bizya (north-west of Constantinople) in August 656; it was written within a year of the events described and also contains an account of further discussions held at Rhegium and Selymbria in the following month. The document was written in either 656 or 657, and, like the *RM*, its authorship is disputed (Allen–Neil 2002: 36–7, 76–119).
3. *Letter of Maximus to Anastasius the monk, his disciple (Ep.Max.)* (*CPG* 7701), dated 19 April 658 while both were in exile in Perberis (Thrace). The letter gives a verbatim account of a discussion between Maximus and representatives of an unnamed patriarch who has been identified as Peter of Constantinople (654–66) (Bracke 1980: 66). It can now be securely dated to 19 April 658 (Allen–Neil 2002: 37–8, 120–3).
4. *Letter of Anastasius to the monks of Cagliari (Ep.mon.)* (*CPG* 7725), traditionally ascribed to Anastasius the disciple (Allen–Neil 2002: 39–40), seeks the help of monks in Rome and encourages them in their continued resistance to monothelitism. Dated after 19 April 658 (Allen–Neil 2002: 39–40, 124–31), it survives only in a Latin translation.
5. *Letter of Anastasius the apocrisiarius to Theodore of Gangra (Ep.Anast.)* (*CPG* 7733), accompanied by *testimonia* attributed to Hippolytus, bishop of Portus Romanus, and syllogisms, probably composed by Anastasius. It was written not long before Anastasius' death in exile in Lazica on 11 October 666 (Allen–Neil 2002: 40–2, 132–47; see Neil 2015).
6. *Commemoration* (*Hypom.)* (*CPG* 7968), a record of the sufferings in exile of Pope Martin I, Maximus, the two Anastasii, and their associates Theodore and Euprepius, all martyrs for the dyothelite cause. It was composed in late 668 or early 669 by their supporter, Theodore Spudaeus (Allen–Neil 2002: 41–2, 148–71).
7. *Against the people of Constantinople* (*Adu.Const.*) (*CPG* 7740), an anonymous later piece of invective composed by a monk who was a vehement supporter of Maximus. If it is not the work of Anastasius the apocrisiarius, its author may be connected with the compilers of the *Doctrina Patrum* (Allen–Neil 2002: 43, 172–5).

These documents are indispensable for examining Maximus' final years, his exiles, and death, as well as the fates of his companions, and give us a much surer historical footing than do any of the *Lives* or epitomes. The Greek *Lives*, following the hagiographical

account of the early years of Theodore the Studite, situate Maximus' noble origins in Constantinople, where he eventually became chief secretary of imperial records (a position that in fact came into being later: Lackner 1971). Subsequently, Maximus became a monk in the monastery of Chrysopolis (modern Scutari) and reluctantly ended up as its abbot. This exemplary life was followed by Maximus' travels to the West to combat monothelitism, and then to Africa, followed by a sojourn in Rome. In varying detail the *Lives* then recount Maximus' trials, exile, and death. Because of his mutilation and subsequent tribulations, Maximus was accorded the title 'Confessor' for the faith.

If the aspects of the Greek tradition of Maximus' biography (or, better said, hagiography) and its components were not complicated enough, we have also a much earlier Syriac *Life*, preserved in a late seventh-century manuscript, which is hostile to him and gives the Confessor a completely different pedigree, including a Palestinian rather than a Constantinopolitan background (Brilliantov 1917: 2; Brock 1973; Jankowiak–Booth 2015).This account purports to be written by Gregory or George of Resh'aina, a member of the clergy of Patriarch Sophronius of Jerusalem, and to contain eyewitness reports. Its title announces the tenor of the narrative: 'The history concerning the wicked Maximus of Palestine who blasphemed against his creator, and whose tongue was cut out' (Brock 1973: 301). According to the clearly anti-dyothelite composer of this text, Maximus was born of a Samaritan and a Persian slave-girl, and became a Palestinian monk, while Sophronius assumed a subordinate role to him. Maximus is said to follow or consort with Origenists, pagans, and Nestorians. Unfortunately, the ending of the short document is missing.

While we are not unused to such dichotomous characterizations of prominent figures across ancient confessional dividing lines—for example, *Kaiserkritik* in the immediate post-Chalcedonian tradition, or representations of the sixth-century empress Theodora—the Syriac *Life* of Maximus has tended to polarize scholars, meeting with both negativity (e.g. Van Deun 2009: 105; cf. Jankowiak–Booth 2015) and unqualified acceptance (e.g. Garrigues 1976: 410–56). Telling against Maximus' Constantinopolitan provenance is the fact that his philosophical position, especially with regard to neo-Platonism, links him more readily to the Alexandrian rather than to the Constantinopolitan tradition (Boudignon 2004: 13–22), while his responses to Origenism make more sense in the context of Palestinian monasticism, where the Origenist controversy had raged in the sixth century (Booth 2013: 149). A Palestinian connection also explains more readily Maximus' relationship with the circle of John Moschus and Sophronius. Conversely, a Palestinian origin makes it more difficult to credit Maximus' relationships with high-profile officials of the court in Constantinople and elsewhere in the Byzantine world, such as Peter *illustris* (Jankowiak–Booth 2015) and George, the eparch of Africa (Blowers forthcoming). This has had to be explained away by speculating a brief sojourn in Constantinople (Boudignon 2004: 35–6; Booth 2013: 155).

It will be obvious that reconciling a later hagiographical tradition with a purportedly early account poses a serious methodological problem in reconstructing the life of the Confessor (Louth 1996: 199 n.11), and few of his letters can be dated with certainty.

However, below I shall attempt to reconstruct a tentative timeline for his life, according to the sources we have available and their reliability. It should be noted here that the biographical materials contained in the Georgian tradition are translations from the tenth to twelfth centuries based on Greek originals, and therefore support the Graeco-Latin, not the Syriac, tradition (Khoperia 2009: 41; cf. Khoperia 2015). Gaps in the chronology of Maximus' life in the Syriac biography are striking—there is a lacuna of about forty years from his entry into the Palaia Lavra until his discipleship under Sophronius—as are the fabrications, borrowings, and hagiographical gambits in the Greek *Life* and other Greek biographical documents.

Tentative Timeline

579/80: Birth of Maximus (*RM*, Allen–Neil 2002: 70–1).

610s: Maximus became monk in Palaia Lavra (speculative date; *Syriac Life*, Brock 1973: 315).

617/8: Maximus met the African Anastasius, his future disciple and lifelong companion (*RM*, Allen–Neil 70–1; for Anastasius' African provenance see Syriac *Life*, Brock 1973: 317–8).

Post 626 until at least 630: Avar-Slav siege of Constantinople forces Maximus to flee his monastic community in Asia Minor and go to North Africa, where he interacts with Sophronius and the Eukratades.

632: Maximus was in Africa; objected to forced baptism of Jews (*Ep*. 8; Devreesse 1937). Also *Epp*. 8, 28, 30 from this time (Jankowiak–Booth 2015; Blowers forthcoming).

633 or 634: Maximus in Carthage (*Ep*. 14 to Peter *illustris*; Blowers forthcoming).

Late 634: Maximus becomes disciple of Sophronius in Palestine (Syriac *Life*; Brock 1973: 315–6).

First half of 636: Maximus' 'doctrine' condemned by Council of Cyprus (Booth 2013: 239–41).

*c.*640: Maximus voices publicly his opposition to monoenergism and monothelitism.

641 at latest: Return to Africa (Jankowiak–Booth 2015).

July 645: Dispute in Carthage with deposed monothelite patriarch of Constantinople, Pyrrhus (Booth 2013: 285–7; see Jankowiak–Booth 2015).

646: Maximus goes to Rome (Syriac *Life*, Brock 1973: 315–6).

October 649: Lateran Synod (Riedinger 1997, 1982, 1985; Conte 1989).

653: Arrest of Pope Martin in Rome, exiled in 654, died 16 Sept. 655 (Neil 2006: 96). Maximus goes to Constantinople under arrest.

655: Trial of Maximus and Anastasius the Monk (Allen–Neil 2002: 35). Exile to Bizya (Thrace).

August 656: Dispute with Theodosius, bishop of Caesarea Bithynia in Bizya (*DB*; Allen–Neil 2002: 22–5).

662: Second trial in Constantinople; Maximus and the two Anastasii exiled to Lazica (now Georgia) (Allen–Neil 2002: 25–6).

13 August 662: Death of Maximus at a fort called Schemaris (Muretov 1917; Allen–Neil 2002: 134–5).[9]

Suggested Reading

For a revision of Sherwood's 1952 date-list of Maximus' works, the reader is referred to Jankowiak–Booth 2015. The different genres of Maximus' writings are discussed by Van Deun 2015; Brock 1973 provides the text of the Syriac *Vita.* Neil–Allen 2003 contains an edition and translation of the Greek *Vita Maximi* in its third recension. Neil 2001 examines the provenance and dating of this text and the other two recensions, revisiting Lackner 1967.

References

Primary Sources

Allen–Neil (2002), *Maximus the Confessor and his Companions: Documents from Exile*, OECT (Oxford: Oxford University Press).

Gregory or George of Resh'aina (?), *Vita Maximi (syriace)*
Brock 1973.

Maximus the Confessor, *varia* Epifanovich, S. L. (1917), *Materialy k Izucheniju Zizni Tvorenij Prep. Maksima Ispovednika* [*Materials for the Study of Maximus the Confessor's Life and Works*] (Kiev: Tipografija Universiteta Sv. Vladimira).

Maximus the Confessor (?), *Vita beatae virginis*
Shoemaker, S. J. (trans. and notes) (2012), *The Life of the Virgin. Maximus the Confessor* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press).

Neil–Allen (2003), *Vita Maximi (graece)* (Life of Maximus [Greek]).

Sophronius *Letter to Arcadius of Cyprus*
Albert, M. and von Schönborn, C. (ed. and trans.) (1978), *Lettre de Sophrone de Jérusalem à Arcadius de Chypre: Version syriaque inédite du texte grec perdu*, Patrologia Orientalis 39, part 2 (Turnhout: Brepols).

Theophanes, *Chron.*
Boor, C. de (ed.) (1883), *Theophanes, Chronographia*, 2 vols. (Leipzig: Teubner); trans. and annotated by C. Mango and R. Scott, with the assistance of G. Greatrex, *The Chronicle of Theophanes Confessor: Byzantine and Near Eastern History AD 284–813* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1997).

Vita Maximi (*graece*)
Muretov, M. D. (ed. and trans.) (1913–14), 'Sv. Maksima Ispovednika zhitie. Perevod, izdanie i primechanie' ['The Life of St Maximus the Confessor. Translation, Edition, and Commentary'], *Bogoslovskij Vestnik* (no number): 1–272.

[9] However, Andrey Vinogradov now argues for a location either in Omarishar or another fortress in the Upper Kodori, a river in modern Abkazia (Vinogradov 2013; see Benevich 2015). See also Larchet 2013, who tries to reconstruct the exiles of Maximus and the two Anastasii on the basis of archaeological evidence.

Secondary Sources

Alexakis, A. (1996), *Codex Parisinus 1115 and Its Archetype*, Dumbarton Oaks Studies 34 (Washington, DC: Dumbarton Oaks).

Allen, P. (1985), 'Blue-print for the Edition of *Documenta ad vitam Maximi Confessoris spectantia*', in C. Laga, J. A. Munitiz, and L. Van Rompay (eds.), *After Chalcedon: Studies in Theology and Church History Offered to Professor Albert Van Roey for his Seventieth Birthday*, Orientalia Lovaniensia Analecta 18 (Leuven: Peeters), 11–21.

Allen, P. (2009), *Sophronius of Jerusalem and Seventh-Century Heresy: The Synodical Letter and Other Documents*, OECT (Oxford: Oxford University Press).

Allen, P. (2013), 'Religious Conflict between Antioch and Alexandria *c.*565–630 CE', in W. Mayer and B. Neil (eds.), *Religious Conflict from Early Christianity to the Rise of Islam*, Arbeiten zur Kirchengeschichte 121 (Berlin: W. de Gruyter), 187–99.

Benevich, G. (2009), 'Maximus the Confessor's Polemics against Anti-Origenism: *Epistulae* 6 and 7 as a Context for the *Ambigua ad Iohannem*', *Revue d'histoire ecclésiastique* 104: 5–15.

Benevich, G. (2015), 'Maximus' Heritage in Russia and Ukraine', in P. Allen and B. Neil (eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of Maximus the Confessor* (Oxford: Oxford University Press), 460–79.

Benevich, G., Choufrine, A., and Biriukov, D. (2007), *Maxim Ispovednik: Polemica s Origenizmom i Monoenergizmom* [*Maximus the Confessor: Polemics against Origenism and Monoenergism*] (St. Petersburg: Izkatel'stvo St Petersburgskogo Gosudarstvennogo Universiteta).

Blowers, P. M. (forthcoming), *Maximus the Confessor: Jesus Christ and the Transfiguration of the World*, Christian Theology in Context (Oxford: Oxford University Press).

Booth, P. (2013), *Crisis of Empire: Doctrine and Dissent at the End of Late Antiquity* (Berkeley: University of California Press).

Booth, P. (forthcoming), 'On the *Life of the Virgin* Attributed to Maximus Confessor'.

Boudignon, C. (2004), 'Maxime le Confesseur était-il constantinopolitain?', in B. Janssens, B. Roosen, and P. Van Deun (eds.), *Philomathestatos. Studies in Greek Patristic and Byzantine Texts Presented to Jacques Noret for his Sixty-Fifth Birthday*, Orientalia Lovaniensia Analecta 137 (Leuven: Peeters), 11–43.

Boudignon, C. (2007), 'Le Pouvoir de l'anathème ou Maxime le Confesseur et les moines palestiniens du VIIe siècle', in A. Camplani and G. Filoramo (eds.), *Foundations of Power and Conflicts of Authority in Late-Antique Monasticism*, Orientalia Lovanensia Analecta 157 (Leuven: Peeters), 245–74.

Bracke, R. (1980), *'Ad Sancti Maximi vitam:* Studie van de biografische documenten en de Levensbeschrijvingen betreffende Maximus Confessor (*ca.*580–662)', PhD diss., Leuven.

Brandes, W. (1998), '"Juristische" Krisenbewältigung im 7. Jahrhundert? Die Prozesse gegen Papst Martin I. und Maximos Homologetes', in L. Burgmann (ed.), *Fontes Minores* 10, *Forschungen zur Byzantinischen Rechtsgeschichte*, ed. D. Simon, Band 22 (Frankfurt am Main: Löwenklau-Gesellschaft), 141–212.

Brilliantov, A. (1917), 'O meste konchiny i pogrebenija sv. Maksima Ispovednika' ['Concerning the Site of St Maximus the Confessor's Death and Burial'], *Cristianskij Vostok* 6: 1–62.

Chadwick, H. (1974), 'John Moschus and His Friend Sophronius the Sophist', *JTS ns* 25: 41–74.

Conte, P. (1989), *Il Synodo Lateranense dell'ottobre 649*, Collezione Teologica 3 (Vatican: Libreria Editrice Vaticana).

Deun, P. Van (1998–99), 'Maxime le Confesseur: État de la question et bibliographie exhaustive', *Sacris Erudiri* 38: 485–573.

Deun, P. Van (2009), 'Développements récents des recherches sur Maxime le Confesseur (1998–2009)', *Sacris Erudiri* 48: 245–310.

Deun, P. Van (2015), 'Maximus the Confessor's Use of Literary Genres', in P. Allen and B. Neil (eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of Maximus the Confessor* (Oxford: Oxford University Press), 274–86.
Devreesse, R. (1928), 'La Vie de S. Maxime le Confesseur et ses recensions', *Analecta Bollandiana* 46: 5–49.
Devreesse, R. (1937), 'La Fin inédite d'une lettre de Saint Maxime: Un baptême forcé de Juifs et de Samaritans à Carthage en 632', *Revue des Sciences Religieuses* 17: 25–35.
Dieten, J. L. van (1972), *Geschichte der Patriarchen von Sergios I. bis Johannes VI. (610–715), Enzyklopädie der griechischen Patriarchen von Konstantinopel*, Teil 4 (Amsterdam: A. M. Hakkert).
Dieten, J. L. van (1982), Review of Bracke 1980 (see above) in *Byzantinische Zeitschrift* 75: 359–61.
Ekonomou, A. J. (2007), *Byzantine Rome and the Greek Popes: Eastern Influences on Rome and the Papacy from Gregory the Great to Zacharias, A.D. 590–752* (Lanham: Lexington Books).
Garrigues, J. M. (1976), 'Le martyre de saint Maxime le Confesseur', *Revue Thomiste* 76: 410–52.
Haldon, J. F. (1985), 'Ideology and the Byzantine State in the Seventh Century: The "Trial" of Maximus the Confessor', in V. Vavřínek (ed.), *From Late Antiquity to Early Byzantium: Proceedings of the Byzantinological Symposium in the 16th Eirene Conference* (Prague: Academia), 87–91.
Haldon, J. F. (1997), *Byzantium in the Seventh Century: The Transformation of a Culture*, 2nd edn. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).
Hovorun, C. (2008), *Will, Action and Freedom: Christological Controversies in the Seventh Century*, The Medieval Mediterranean 77 (Leiden: Brill).
Hovorun, C. (2015), 'Maximus, a Cautious Chalcedonian', in P. Allen and B. Neil (eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of Maximus the Confessor* (Oxford: Oxford University Press), 105–24.
Jankowiak, M. (2009), 'Essai d'histoire politique du monothélisme à partir de la correspondance entre les empereurs byzantines, les patriarches de Constantinople et les papes de Rome', PhD diss., Paris and Warsaw.
Jankowiak, M. and Booth, P. (2015), 'A New Date-List of the Works of Maximus the Confessor', in P. Allen and B. Neil (eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of Maximus the Confessor* (Oxford: Oxford University Press), 19–83.
Kaegi, W. E. (2003), *Heraclius Emperor of Byzantium* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).
Kaegi, W. E. (2010), *Muslim Expansion and Byzantine Collapse in North Africa* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).
Khoperia, L. (2009), 'Maximus the Confessor: Life and Works in the Georgian Tradition', in T. Mgaloblishvili and L. Khoperia (eds.), *Maximus the Confessor and Georgia*, Iberica Caucasica 3 (London: Bennett & Bloom), 25–48.
Khoperia, L. (2015), 'The Georgian Tradition on Maximus the Confessor', in P. Allen and B. Neil (eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of Maximus the Confessor* (Oxford: Oxford University Press), 439–59.
Kneževiċ, M. (2012), *Maximus the Confessor (580–662): Bibliography, Bibliographia serbica theologica* 6 (Belgrade: University of Belgrade).
Lackner, W. (1967), 'Zur Quellen und Datierung der Maximosvita *(BHG³1234)*', *Analecta Bollandiana* 85: 285–316.
Lackner, W. (1971), 'Der Amtstitel Maximos des Bekenners', *JÖB* 20: 63–5.
Laird, R. J. (2015), 'Mindset (γνώμη) in John Chrysostom', in P. Allen and B. Neil (eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of Maximus the Confessor* (Oxford: Oxford University Press), 194–211.
Lange, C. (2012), *Mia Energeia: Untersuchungen zur Einigungspolitik des Kaisers Heraclius und des Patriarchen Sergius von Constantinopel*, Studien und Texte zu Antike und Christentum 66 (Tubingen: Mohr Siebeck).
Larchet, J.-C. (2013), 'Le Martyre, l'exil et la mort de saint Maxime le confesseur et de ses deux disciples, Anastase le moine et Anastase l'apocrisiaire: Quelques précisions en rapport avec des découvertes archéologiques récentes', *Revue d'histoire ecclésiastique* 108: 65–97.

Lilie, R.-J. et al. (1999), *Prosopographie der mittel-byzantinischen Zeit, Erste Abteilung (651–867), Aaron [#1]–Georgios [#2182]* (Berlin: W. de Gruyter).
Louth, A. (trans.) (1996), *Maximus the Confessor*, The Early Church Fathers (London: Routledge).
Louth, A. (1998), 'Did John Moschus Really Die in Constantinople?', *JTS ns* 49: 149–54.
Neil, B. (2001), 'The Greek *Life* of Maximus the Confessor (*BHG* 1234) and its Three Recensions', *StP* 36: 46–53.
Neil, B. (2006), *Seventh-Century Popes and Martyrs: The Political Hagiography of Anastasius Bibliothecarius*, Studia Antiqua Australiensia 2 (Turnhout: Brepols).
Neil, B. (2015), 'Divine Providence and the Gnomic Will before Maximus', in P. Allen and B. Neil (eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of Maximus the Confessor* (Oxford: Oxford University Press), 235–49.
Olster, D. (1985), 'Chalcedonian and Monophysite: The Union of 616', *Bulletin de la Société d'Archéologie Copte* 27: 93–108.
Pelikan, J. (1982), 'The Place of Maximus Confessor in the History of Christian Thought', in Heinzer–Schönborn, 387–402.
Plested, M. (2015), 'The Ascetic Tradition', in P. Allen and B. Neil (eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of Maximus the Confessor* (Oxford: Oxford University Press), 164–76.
Price, R. (2010), 'Monotheletism: A Heresy or a Form of Words?', *StP* 48: 221–32.
Reinink, G. J. and Stolte, B. H. (eds.) (2002), *The Reign of Heraclius (610–641): Crisis and Confrontation* (Leuven–Paris–Dudley, MA: Peeters).
Riedinger, R. (1977), 'Griechische Konzilsakten auf demWege ins lateinische Mittelalter', *Annuarium Historiae Conciliorum* 9: 253–301; repr. in R. Riedinger, *Kleine Schriften zu den Konzilsakten des 7. Jahrhunderts*, Instrumenta Patristica 34 (Turnhout: Brepols, 1998), 43–91.
Riedinger, R. (1982), 'Die Lateransynode von 649 und Maximus Confessor', in Heinzer–Schönborn, 111–21; repr. in R. Riedinger, *Kleine Schriften zu den Konzilsakten des 7. Jahrhunderts*, Instrumenta Patristica 34 (Turnhout: Brepols, 1998), 169–79.
Riedinger, R. (1985), 'Die Lateranakten von 649: Ein Werk der Byzantiner um Maximos Homologetes', *Byzantina* 13: 517–34; repr. in R. Riedinger, *Kleine Schriften zu den Konzilsakten des 7. Jahrhunderts*, Instrumenta Patristica 34 (Turnhout: Brepols, 1998), 223–38.
Roosen, B. (2010), '*Maximi Confessoris Vitae et Passiones Graecae: The Development of a Hagiographic Dossier*', *Byzantion* 80: 408–61.
Sahas, D. J. (2003), 'The Demonizing Force of the Arab Conquests: The Case of Maximus (*ca.*580–662) as a Political "Confessor"', *JÖB* 53: 97–116.
Sansterre, J.-M. (1980), *Les Moines grecs et orientaux à Rome aux époques byzantine et carolingienne (milieu du Ve fin du IXe siècle)*, 2 vols. (Brussels: Académie Royale de Belgique).
Sherwood, P. (1952), *An Annotated Date-List of the Works of Maximus the Confessor*, Studia Anselmiana 30 (Rome: Herder).
Tannous, J. (2014), 'In Search of Monothelitism', *Dumbarton Oaks Papers* 68: forthcoming.
Vinogradov, A. J. (2013), 'Esche raz k voprosu o meste ssilki, smerti i pogrebeniya prp. Maxima Ispovednika', *Bogoslovskie Trudi* [*Theological Studies*], 45: 219–37.
Winkelmann, F. (1987), 'Die Quellen zur Erforschung des monenergetisch-monotheletischen Streites', *Klio* 69/2: 515–59; repr. in *Studien zu Konstantin dem Grossen und zur Byzantinischen Kirchengeschichte* (Birmingham: University of Birmingham Centre for Byzantine, Ottoman and Modern Greek Studies, 1993), nr. 7.
Winkelmann, F. (2001), *Der monenergetisch-monotheletische Streit*, Berliner Byzantinische Studien 6 (Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang).

CHAPTER 2

A NEW DATE-LIST OF THE WORKS OF MAXIMUS THE CONFESSOR

MAREK JANKOWIAK AND PHIL BOOTH

The works of Maximus the Confessor were arranged chronologically by Polycarp Sherwood in 1952. This masterly work, based on an intimate knowledge of Maximus' oeuvre, would have stood the test of time if the chronological framework on which it was based had not been significantly modified in the course of the last forty years. Sherwood based a significant part of his reasoning—in particular for the earlier works of Maximus—on a narrative of Maximus' Constantinopolitan origins derived from his Greek hagiographic corpus, but this narrative has been progressively undermined, and instead the seventh-century *Syriac Life* has gradually come to be accepted as a crucial, and often strikingly accurate, source for the origins and life of Maximus, despite its polemical purpose and content (see Allen 2015). As a result of this revisionism, Sherwood's chronological framework, as constructed on the basis of the Greek hagiographic corpus, has become obsolete, as too has the attempt to fit certain prosopographical and topographical details contained within Maximus' own corpus (in particular in the *Letters*) into that same framework. At the same time, our understanding of the monoenergist and monothelite crises has been transformed by the publication of new editions, especially in the CCSG, and translations (e.g. Allen–Neil 1999; Allen–Neil 2002; Neil–Allen 2003; Neil 2006; Allen 2009). These have allowed for a reconsideration of the chronology and context of crucial events (Jankowiak 2009), of the theological origins of monoenergist and monothelite doctrines (Uthemann 1997; Lange 2012), and of the wider ideological and political imperatives and contexts (esp. Brandes 1998; Ohme 2008; Booth 2013). There are, therefore, more than ample grounds for reconsidering the chronology of Maximus' entire corpus.

The Chronological Framework

Our chronology of Maximus' life is based upon the *Syriac Life* and on information that can be gleaned from his works or other contemporary sources describing his opposition to the imperial church. Maximus was born in 579/80 (*RM*, ed. Allen–Neil 1999: 47. 450) in Ḥeṣfin in the Golan Heights (*Syriac Life* 1). The *Syriac Life* describes in detail his Palestinian background and childhood, until his entrance as a novice to the Palaia Laura—also known as the monastery of Chariton or Souka—in the Judean Desert at the age of 10 (*Syriac Life* 1–5). It is, however, silent about the next four decades of his life. When the narrative recommences (*Syriac Life* 6–7), Maximus has become the disciple of Sophronius, patriarch of Jerusalem from late 634 (cf. *Epp.* 8 and 13, where the relationship seems well established in 632–33). Sophronius was a Damascene and a Palestinian monk who, along with his spiritual master John Moschus, is known to have retreated at some point before 610 to Alexandria in the face of the advancing Persian troops, and there to have become active at the side of the Chalcedonian patriarch John the Almsgiver (*Prologue to the Spiritual Meadow*, with Booth 2013: 49–53). Maximus' later correspondence reveals his acquaintance with several Alexandrians, and we might suppose that he too was there in this same period (Boudignon 2004: 15–22; see now also *Add.* 34). In 617/8, he met an African, Anastasius, who became his disciple and closest collaborator (*RM* 47. 453; *Syriac Life* 19). Anastasius was once the *notarios* of the grandmother of the emperor Constans II (*DB*, ed. Allen–Neil 1999: 141. 746–7), that is, either Fabia Eudocia, the wife of Emperor Heraclius until her death in 612, herself also of African origin, or perhaps the wife of Heraclius' cousin Nicetas (Boudignon 2004: 31–4). Where the pair met we do not know—one can think of Africa or Alexandria—but at this stage Maximus was eminent enough an ascetic to acquire a former imperial *notarios* as his disciple.

The itinerary of Maximus during the Persian war is uncertain. The letters that he wrote to several eastern correspondents in the summer of 632 speak of a barbarian threat that he had fled, no doubt the Persian conquest of Palestine (614) and Egypt (619), accompanied by unrest among Arab tribes (see below on *Epp.* 8, 28, 30). By 632, however, he was certainly in North Africa, which had become the rallying point for refugees fleeing the Persians, such as John Moschus, who is attested there around 630 (*Spiritual Meadow* 196, with Booth 2013: 110) and died in Rome in 634 or a little before (*Prologue to the Spiritual Meadow*, with Louth 1998), and Sophronius (*Opusc.* 12, 142A). If Maximus had earlier been in Alexandria, then he may have followed a similar westward route to Moschus and Sophronius, who are said to have visited 'various islands' in their flight from the beleaguered eastern provinces.[1] Indeed, Maximus counts amongst his later correspondents persons on Cyprus (*Ep.* 20; *Opusc.* 1, 7, 10, 19–20) and Crete (*Ep.* 21; cf.

[1] *Prologue to the Spiritual Meadow*, with *Epitome of the Life of John the Almsgiver* 16 (Cyprus) and John Moschus, *Spiritual Meadow* 30 (Cyprus), 108 (Samos).

Opusc. 3, 49C), and it is tempting to suppose that he encountered such persons as he travelled westward in this period.

The *Syriac Life* (7–10) places Maximus back in Palestine around 634, counselling Sophronius, now patriarch of Jerusalem, in the early days of the controversy over the Chalcedonian union with the miaphysites of Egypt in June 633 (see Jankowiak 2009: 84–96; Booth 2013: 205–8). Condemned for his doctrine at the Council of Cyprus, which probably took place in 636 (Jankowiak 2009: 146–9), Maximus spent several years in relative isolation in the East (in Palestine?) before retreating again to North Africa (*Syriac Life* 11–18). From Maximus' own corpus, we can place him in that province in November 641 (*Ep.* 12; and cf. *Computus*). Here he renewed the association of his circle with the prefect George (*Epp.* 1, 11–12, 18, 44–5, B). After George's recall to Constantinople, in which Maximus seems to have played a role, the latter became associated with the patrician and general Gregory (*DP* [288A] and *RM* 17. 53–62). Having defeated the former patriarch of Constantinople, Pyrrhus, at a public debate in Carthage in July 645 (*DP* [288A]), Maximus then travelled to Rome (*Syriac Life* 19; cf. *DP* [353A]; *RM* 21.105–16; *Opusc.* 9), where he co-organized the Lateran Council of October 649 and no doubt authored a significant part of its *Acts* (Riedinger 1982, 1985). He probably stayed in Rome at least until the arrest of Pope Martin in June 653; the precise circumstances of his own arrest are unknown, although it perhaps occurred at the same time (so Theophanes, *Chron.* AM 6121). He was then put on trial in Constantinople in 655 and exiled to Bizya in Thrace (*RM*). He resisted imperial overtures to secure his doctrinal approval in 656 and 658 (*DB*; *Ep. ad Anast.*), and perhaps became associated with the revolt of Theodosius, the brother of the emperor Constans II, in 659/60 (Jankowiak 2009: 341–7). Condemned at a general council in 661 or 662,[2] he was flogged, mutilated and exiled to Lazica, where he died on 13 August 662.

Dating the Corpus

The majority of precise chronological indications have been edited out of Maximus' corpus—apparently before it reached Photius in the ninth century (editing of Maximus' letters is mentioned in the *Bibl.*, ed. Henry 1959–77: 157b30–31)—with the following few exceptions:

- *Letter* 7: 2 August, indiction 1 (628 or 643), place unknown.
- *Letter* 8: Easter or Pentecost of the current indiction 5 (632), from Carthage.
- *Computus*: between 5 October 640 (thirty-first year of Heraclius) and *c.*mid-February 641 (when news of Heraclius' death on 11 January 641 is supposed to have reached Carthage: Grierson 1962), probably in Africa.

[2] On which see *DB* 149–51; *Acts of the Sixth Ecumenical Council*, ed. Riedinger 1990–2: 228–30; Michael the Syrian, *Chronicle* 11.9, Chabot 1899: 423–7 (text); 1910: 433–7 (trans.); *Anonymous Chronicle to 1234*, Chabot 1916: 130; and also Jankowiak 2013c.

- *Letter* 12: November of the current indiction 15 (641), from Africa.
- *Dispute with Pyrrhus*: July, indiction 3 (645), in Carthage.

These dates allow us to ascertain that Maximus was in Africa in 632 and that, after his return to the East, noted in the *Syriac Life* 18, he returned there in 641 at the latest. But with the exception of these five works, the remainder of Maximus' production can only be dated by internal criteria. We will establish the dates of the individual works in the first instance through mentions of, or allusions to, events that can otherwise be dated or to people that are known to have engaged with Maximus at specific points of time. In the second instance, we will offer an approximate chronological range on the basis of the intellectual context of the work at hand. In certain instances, the latter approach can distinguish earlier from later texts: thus it is evident that Maximus, over the course of his career, changed his mind on such doctrinal issues as, for example, the use of 'one will' or 'one operation' in anthropological contexts, the application of γνώμη to Christ, or the authenticity of certain patristic texts. In contrast to the approach of Sherwood, however, we will wherever possible avoid offering chronological certainties on the basis of the supposed evolution of Maximus' thought. Although this evolution of course occurred, this criterion remains problematic for two reasons: first, it leads to circular reasoning, with individual works being assigned to the assumed periods in Maximus' theological development, and in turn corroborating the chronological framework; and second, it presupposes an explicit, linear development of Maximus' doctrine, so that, for example, monoenergism is *always* acknowledged after 633, or certain words (e.g. ἐνεργητικός, θελητικός) can be used to distinguish earlier from later works (see Sherwood 1952). Thus we discover, for example, that although in the period *c.*640–42 Maximus had voiced his public opposition to monoenergism and monothelitism, both doctrines are a conspicuous absence from a significant group of letters written to the capital in the same period, in connection with the affair of the Alexandrian nuns.

Our objective is therefore threefold: first, to undo some of the chronological and contextual precision of Sherwood, whose date-list depended on the now discredited Constantinopolitan tradition of Maximus' origins and its various modern embellishments; second, to establish as many fixed chronological points as possible for Maximus' various works, or to suggest reasonable contexts or chronological ranges within which each might be interpreted; and third, to provide a more secure basis from which to understand the evolving concerns of Maximus over the course of his career.

The *Letters*, *Opuscula*, and *Additamenta*: Problems of Transmission and Edition

The vast majority of Maximus' works that can be assigned a more or less tentative date belong to his *Letters* and the so-called *Opuscula*. Research on these texts is, however,

marred by the lack of a modern edition. We regret that the long-announced and much-anticipated edition in the CCSG is still not available. Our conclusions remain therefore provisional and will have to be modified when the edition has been published. In the meantime, we have used the edition published by François Combefis in 1675 and reprinted in PG 91. 9–285 and 364–649. Although Combefis' work is a product of outstanding scholarship by the standards of the time, it is based on a limited number of manuscripts and does not always establish the best available text (see, for example, *Epp.* 8 and 14). It is particularly treacherous in designating the names of the recipients, which are sometimes contradicted in the manuscripts and in many cases can be improved.

The edition of Combefis imposed the division of the corpus of Maximus' short works into *Letters* and *Opuscula*, and established a provisional (but now canonical) order of works within each of these two groups. Neither of these corresponds to the shape in which these texts have been transmitted in the manuscripts. Many of the *Opuscula* are in reality letters, and they are not transmitted as a distinct body of texts; they seem, however, as a rule to be later than the *Letters*, which end *c.*641/2. The sequence of the *Letters* and *Opuscula* in the manuscripts (see, e.g. Van Deun 1991: lii–lv and cviii–cxi) does not suggest any original arrangement of Maximus' short works; the future edition will no doubt address this question. It seems, however, improbable that there was ever a single canonical collection of Maximus' *Letters*.

A precious early witness to the transmission of Maximus' works, in particular the *Letters*, is the ninth-century summary compiled by Photius in codices 192A–195 of his *Bibliotheca*. All the works which the patriarch lists can be identified, more or less confidently, with extant texts, with the exception of a second letter to 'the monk Sophronius surnamed Eucratas' (*codex* 192B, ed. Henry 1959–77: 157b11–12; cf. *Ep.* 8). The text of Photius also allows us to name the anonymous abbess to whom Maximus addressed *Letter* 11 as Iania, no doubt identical with the 'Ioannia' whom *Letter* 12 identifies as the abbess of one of two Alexandrian monasteries mentioned therein. Photius' ignorance of many of Maximus' works shows that they have never circulated as a single corpus; his Roman contemporary, Anastasius the Librarian, knew some writings of Maximus, which now survive only in his Latin translation (see *Ep. ad Thalassium* and *Opusc.* 12).

In 1917, Sergei Leont'evich Epifanovich published in Kiev thirty-three texts attributed to Maximus in the manuscripts, even though he doubted Maximus' authorship of many of the texts he edited (see *CPG* 7707). The First World War, the Russian revolution, and the death of Epifanovich in the following year made this edition notoriously difficult to obtain. Eighteen of these texts have now been re-edited in the magisterial doctoral thesis of Bram Roosen (2001), the conclusions of which we have endeavoured to integrate. Those texts which Roosen identifies as genuine texts of Maximus we include under the title *Additamenta*, preserving the numbering of Epifanovich and *CPG*. However, we have excluded the composite *Opusculum* 23 attributed by Combefis to Maximus but which Roosen regards as spurious (Roosen 2001/3: 697–701, 715–6, 825–9).

Some Prosopographical Notes

Before moving to the date-list itself, it is expedient to deal with some recurrent prosopographical problems related to some of the more prominent recipients of Maximus' correspondence. These persons are:

1. John Cubicularius: John is the recipient of Maximus' *Letters* 2, 3, 4, 10, 12, 27, 44–5, and what we have called *Letter D*; as discussed below, he does not appear to be the recipient of *Letter* 24/43. Of these, *Letter* 12 alone has a firm date—soon after November 641—although at least *Letters* 44–5 belong in the same general context. It seems certain that the other letters precede these, and that John's association with Maximus was at this stage well established; indeed, it is now evident from *Letter D* that Maximus knew John before his election to the rank of the *cubicularius*. The origins of that acquaintance are nevertheless obscure. John's attachment to the imperial court in Constantinople, and Maximus' association with him, cannot be used to support the notion that Maximus was from Constantinople. John Cubicularius is the only certain contact of Maximus at the imperial court, and the precise nature and origins of their apparent friendship must remain unclear. Some of Maximus' letters to John can be read as attempts to ingratiate himself with a powerful contact at the court, rather than evidence of an abiding closeness.
2. Constantine Sacellarius, or rather ἀπὸ σακελλαρίων (see the full title to *Letter* 5 preserved in *Laurent. Plut.* 57.7 f. 17^{v}: τοῦ αὐτοῦ Κωνσταντίνῳ ἰλλουστρίῳ καὶ ἀπὸ σακελλαρίων, confirmed in Photius, *Bibl., codex* 192B, ed. Henry 1959–77: 157b21–2): Constantine is the recipient of *Letters* 5 and 24/43, the latter dated with some confidence to 628/9. The universal assumption of modern scholarship is that Constantine's official position places him in the capital, so that his association with Maximus is again cited to support the latter's supposed Constantinopolitan origins. But the title *sacellarius* does not demand that Constantine was the imperial *sacellarius*, a top-ranking dignitary and a predecessor of the *sacellarius* who led the trials against Pope Martin in 653 and against Maximus in 655 (Brandes 1998: 160–2). Provincial *sacellarii* are attested in Italy and North Africa (Brandes 2002: 442–9)—see, for example, the *sacellarius* of Peter, general of Numidia, *c.*633 (*RM* 15. 28–9). The rank *illustris* attributed to Constantine also points to the same provinces, since by the seventh century it had virtually disappeared from the East, but was still used in the West (Koch 1903: 43–5).
3. Peter the Illustris: Peter the Illustris is the recipient of *Letters* 13 and 14, and *Opusculum* 12, the last dated to *c.*645. Some scholars have suggested an identification of this Peter the Illustris with the patrician Peter, whose career can be followed in a variety of sources, provided that they all, as seems probable, refer to the same

person (Duval 1971; Zuckerman 2002: 173–4). He appears in the *Relatio motionis* as the general of Numidia and is said to have corresponded with Maximus in *c.*633 (above); on an African seal as ἀπὸ ὑπατῶν, patrician and *dux* (Laurent 1962: 85–7 nr 92, an African connection is suggested by the image of Augustine on the obverse); in an African inscription from Telergma in Numidia dated to 636 as *Pe[t]ro patriciho (h)ac Africana probincia* (referring to Numidia or perhaps to the entire Byzantine Africa; see Duval and Février 1969: 259 and 317–20); and in his epitaph at Sbeïtla (Duval 1956: 284–6: *Petrus em(i)n(en)t(issimu)s*) where he was buried at the age of 65 and in indiction 10 (probably 651/2 rather than 636/7); he is also identified with the Peter *patricius* to whom Maximus dedicated his *Computus* in 641/2 (below). The identification of this Peter with Maximus' correspondent Peter the Illustris is, however, uncertain, although it has important implications for the dating and understanding of Maximus' texts, as indicated below. On the one hand—as Zuckerman (2002: 173–4) points out in a brief aside—if the Peter of the *Letters* and *Opusculum* 12 was the general and *patricius* who appears elsewhere, he should have been too eminent to bear the more humble title *illustris*, in particular in *Opusculum* 12, by which time Maximus had already dedicated the *Computus* to him using the title *patricius*. On the other hand, however—and assuming that our texts preserve the addressees' proper titles—*Opusculum* 12, in which Maximus begs Peter 'to command to all' (*praecipere omnibus* [144A]) that the ex-patriarch Pyrrhus not be addressed with certain honorific titles, suggests that Peter the Illustris, despite his rank, commands some position of power, as we might expect of our *patricius*. The identification of the two, therefore, must remain tentative but is not impossible. At the least, Peter the Illustris appears as a person of some considerable standing. Once again his title, *illustris*, suggests a western career.

4. Thalassius: Thalassius is the recipient of the *Questions Addressed to Thalassius, Letters* 9, 26, 41–2, *A*, and of the partly extant treatise *On the operations and the wills* (witnessed in *Opusc.* 2 and 3). He appears to be that 'Thalassius the Libyan' or 'Thalassius the African' who authored the Greek *Centuries on Theology* (PG 91. 1428A–1469C), and who is presented in an extant spiritual tale as the leader of the monks at Carthage during the reign of Heraclius (Nau 1902: 84; cf. also *BHG* 1318a). Like Maximus' disciple Anastasius, he seems to have been a bilingual North African, but whether he had resided there all his life is far from clear, in particular if he is also to be identified with that Thalassius who later led the Armenian monks of Renatus at Rome in 649. These monks seem to have been recent immigrants from the East via North Africa (*Acts of the Lateran Council*, Riedinger 1984: 50, 57, with Boudignon 2007: 298). It is therefore possible that Maximus was acquainted with Thalassius for a considerable time.
5. John of Cyzicus: The identification of John is perhaps the most tortuous of those questions which relate to Maximus' known correspondents. Maximus' *Ambigua to John*, of which the Greek is extant, but to which the earliest witness is Eriugena's ninth-century Latin translation, is addressed 'To the most

sacred and blessed John, Archbishop of Cyzicus' (πρὸς Ἰωάννην ἀρχιεπίσκοπον Κυζίκου, PG 91. 1061A, or *sanctissimo ac beatissimo archiepiscopo Kyzi Iohanni* in the Latin), and within the preface Maximus states that he had once been in John's presence (Jeauneau 1988: 17. 21–5). The precise place and time of his meeting with John being unknown, it remains problematic to assume on this basis that Maximus had once been in Cyzicus. Even more problematic is the modern identification of 'John Archbishop of Cyzicus' with the 'bishop Curisicius' (Κυρισίκιος) to whom are addressed *Letters* 28 and 29. This addressee was known also to Photius (*Bibl., codex* 192B, 157b16), but the name Curisicius is barely known otherwise. Combefis, followed by most scholars (e.g. Sherwood 1952: 16–20), proposed to emend the addressee from πρὸς Κυρισίκιον ἐπίσκοπον to πρὸς Κυζικηνὸν ἐπίσκοπον (PG 91. 619–620 n.[m]) and thence to identify him with the dedicatee of the *Ambigua to John*. But a bishop of Cyzicus would be called ἐπίσκοπος Κυζίκου or ἐπίσκοπος τῆς Κυζικηνῶν μητροπόλεως, and not Κυζικηνὸς ἐπίσκοπος (see e.g. the subscriptions in the *Acts of the Sixth Ecumenical Council*). Combefis' emended Κυζικινός can, therefore, only be understood as an ethnonym, which makes one think of the Ἰωάννης ὁ Κυζικηνός who appears in John Moschus' *Spiritual Meadow* (3064D–3065A) but who, however, is not otherwise known to have been a bishop, and who is there located in Palestine. This conundrum does not seem possible to solve, and it is sounder to avoid collapsing the evidence so as to support Maximus' long association with an 'archbishop of Cyzicus', and even his presence in the same city.

6. Marinus: To one Marinus are addressed a series of works: (in chronological order) *Letter* 20, *Opuscula* 7, 20, 10, 1, 2(?), 19. Within these, we can trace the progression of Marinus through the clerical hierarchy, for in *Letter* 20 he is a monk; in *Opusculum* 7 a deacon; and in *Opusculum* 20 and the remaining texts a priest. Sherwood (1952: 34) hesitated over the identification as one person, since he placed *Opusculum* 20 before *Opusculum* 7, which is in fact improbable. Therefore no impediment remains to thinking that Maximus had a single correspondent Marinus. The title of *Opusculum* 7 states that it was sent to Cyprus; that of *Opusculum* 10 puts Marinus 'in Cyprus'; and that of *Opusculum* 1 calls him 'most holy priest and *oikonomos* of the most holy metropolis of Constantia of the island of Cyprus'.[3] Assuming that Marinus had always been on Cyprus, it is possible that Maximus met him there during his first westward retreat during the Persian invasion; but his first extant correspondence with him nevertheless dates to *c.*636 (*Ep.* 20). It seems that Marinus might be a close associate of the influential archbishop Arcadius of Cyprus (on whom see Jankowiak 2009: 139–49, and Booth 2013: 261 n.138); see esp. *Opusc.* 20 (PG 91. 245B–D), with Jankowiak 2009: 197–9.

[3] *Ferrarensis* 144, f. 100^{v}, in Martini 1896: 344: πρὸς Μαρῖνον τὸν ὁσιώτατον πρεσβύτερον καὶ οἰκονόμον τῆς ἁγιωτάτης μητροπόλεως Κωνσταντίας τῆς Κυπρίων νήσου.

7. Theocharistus: The addressee of the *Mystagogy*. He seems to be the same as that 'most holy priest Theocharistus, brother of the [Italian] exarch', probably Plato (645–9), who appears in *RM* (21. 108–9), in the context of Maximus' presence in Rome; cf. also *Acts of the Lateran Council* (Riedinger 1984: 57), perhaps listing our Theocharistus amongst the signatories to the petition of eastern monks therein submitted. If this is also the 'most magnificent *illustris* lord Theocharistus' who appears in *Letter* 44 (644D) as the bearer of a missive from North Africa to the capital, in the period *c.*640–42, then Maximus must also have known him in North Africa. The rank of *illustris* points, again, to western origins. (See also Boudignon 2004: 38–41.)
8. Theodosius of Gangra: Addressee of a single Maximian work excerpted in *Opusculum* 26a, *Additamentum* 20, and *Additamentum* 38. He is also the recipient of a letter of Anastasius Apocrisiarius written in 665/6, where he is said to reside at that time *in sancta Christi nostri civitate*, that is, in Jerusalem (Allen–Neil 1999: 173). Together with his brother Theodore Spudaeus, with whom he authored the *Hypomnesticum* (ed. Allen–Neil 1999: 196–227), he was instrumental in documenting the exiles of Maximus and other members of his circle. Both, it seems, were Palestinian monks (see Noret 2000 and Booth 2013: 302 n.111). They first appear in Rome during the pontificate of Martin, but Theodore then moved to Constantinople, where he witnessed Martin's trial and visited him in his prison in winter 653/4. Theodosius and Theodore also witnessed the trial of Maximus, Anastasius the Monk, and Anastasius Apocrisiarius in Constantinople in 662, visited a dyothelite exile in Crimea perhaps in 666/7, and finally visited Lazica again *c.*668/9. Theodosius' acquaintance with Maximus thus belongs to the latter part of Maximus' career. See references in Lilie et al. (1998–2002: nos. 7439 and 7816).

A Note on the Arrangement of the Texts

Readers should note that, rather than replicating the strict chronological arrangement of Sherwood, we have attempted to arrange our texts into loose groups within an overarching biographical framework, since certain texts (such as those which chronicle the development of Maximus' position on the wills, or those which relate to the affair of the prefect George) are best discussed together. For ease of reference we include a final table which sets out the approximate chronological placement of each text in the corpus, and which readers can consult to discover the position of a particular text. Individual entries contain the conventional title of the work in English, the editions (starting from the newest, but always including a reference to PG), the *CPG* number, the date proposed

by Sherwood, and other secondary literature directly relevant for the dating, followed by our discussion.

The Date-List

1. Major Texts of the Earlier Period

1. Liber Asceticus

Ed. Van Deun 2000a; PG 90. 912–956. *CPG* 7692. Sherwood 1952: 26 nr 10 = 'By 626'.

Early (before *c.*633/4). A dialogue between a novice and an elder on the ascetic life, progressing to an extended tirade on the need for compunction in the face of moral decline, perhaps prompted by the Persian occupation of the East. Closely connected with the *Centuries on Love*, which it precedes (see below) and with which it often appears in the manuscripts; similarly written at the request of Father Elpidius. The consensus on an early date (Sherwood 1952; von Balthasar 1941: 155) has been disputed by Dalmais (e.g. 1952, 1953), who preferred a date during Maximus' exile (655–62). This is unlikely for several reasons: (1) the simple nature of the prose, in contrast to the wider corpus (see Van Deun 2000a: xvi); (2) its survival, which would make it one of only three texts indisputably authored by Maximus himself to have survived from this period of exile and imprisonment (cf. *Ep. ad Anast.* and *Responses to Theodosius of Gangra*, see section 75); (3) the apparent ease with which Maximus is able to dispatch it to a correspondent, without reference to his present predicament; (4) Dalmais' view that our text represents the pinnacle of Maximus' ascetic vision is improbable, given the failure to integrate that vision within a wider christological and sacramental context, as in other prominent works (see e.g. *Or.dom., Myst.*); (5) most importantly, the absence of christological polemic and the text's indifference to monothelitism, in contrast to the demonstrable output of Maximus' circle in this period (*RM, DB*, perhaps *DP*, etc.).

2. Centuries on Love

Ed. Ceresa-Gastaldo 1963; PG 90. 960–1073. *CPG* 7693. Sherwood 1952: 26 nr 11 = 'By 626'.

Early (before *c.*633/4). Four hundred aphorisms on the spiritual life. It seems to have been produced in tandem with the *Book on the Ascetic Life*, as established in the declaration: 'I have sent to your holiness, Father Elpidius, in addition to the treatise on the ascetic life also the treatise on love, in lots of one hundred chapters in equal number to the four gospels' (Ceresa-Gastaldo 1963: 48; PG 90. 960A, corr. Van Deun 2000a: xviii).

3. Ambigua to John

Ed. PG 91. 1061–1417; improved text in Constas 2014 vol. 1: 62–451, vol. 2: 2–330; Jeauneau 1988 (Eriugena's Latin translation). *CPG* 7705.2. Sherwood 1952: 31–2 nr 26 = '628–30'.

Cf. Larchet 1998a: 29–30 (628–34) and 41 (628–30). The Greek text is in preparation for CCSG.

Early (before *c.*633/4), perhaps *c.*628? The text deals with certain difficulties in Gregory of Nazianzus. The addressee is 'John archbishop of Cyzicus', on whom see the prosopographical section. The text probably precedes the monoenergist crisis, not least because, as Larchet had noted, 'certains passages … se prêtent à une interprétation monoénergiste' (1998a: 29–30), for example at *Ambigua* 3, where Maximus refers to 'the one and unique operation in all of God and those worthy of God' (PG 91. 1076C = Jeauneau 1988: 26), a phrase he later retracted (*Opusc.* 1, 33A–B). One prominent and oft-commented theme of the text is the refutation of Origenism (esp. *Amb.Io.* 7, 15, 42), a particular concern of Palestinian authors in the preceding century, and perhaps reflecting Maximus' Palestinian origins. Parallels between the anti-Origenism of our text and that of *Letters* 6–7 (Benevich 2009) suggest a date close to 628 (see section 13). For Maximus' refutation of Origenism see also e.g. Sherwood 1955b; Cooper 2005: 65–95.

4. *Questions to Thalassius*

Ed. Laga–Steel 1980/1990; PG 90. 244–785. *CPG* 7688. Sherwood 1952: 34–5 nr 36 = 'between 630 and 633–34'; Larchet 1998a: 49 = 630–34.

Early (before *c.*633/4), but after the *Ambigua to John*. A huge work of scriptural interpretation, which should be called *Answers to Thalassius*; its addressee can perhaps be associated with 'Thalassius the Libyan and African' who wrote his own *Centuries on Love*; see the prosopographical section. Post-dates the *Ambigua to John* since Maximus refers to *Amb.Io.* 67 (Laga–Steel 1980: 39.59–61); also, *Question* 48 develops thoughts first present in *Amb.Io.* 41 (Laga–Steel 1980: ix). The *terminus ante quem* is perhaps indicated in the absence of discussion on the operation. Note also that the position on the wills of Christ is noticeably under-developed: see the application to him of προαίρεσις at *Questions to Thalassius* 42 (Laga–Steel 1980: 7.285–9), later retracted in *Opusculum* 1 (29D–32A). For detailed discussion of the text, see Blowers (1991).

5. *Questions and Doubts*

Ed. Declerck 1982; PG 90. 785–856. *CPG* 7689. Sherwood 1952: 26 nr 13 = 'By 626'.

Early (before *c.*633/4). The text comprises a series of questions and responses on scriptural and theological difficulties. Sherwood's dating follows von Balthasar's classification of our text among the earlier works (1941: 149–56), based upon the absence of charged observations on the operations and wills (see e.g. *Question* 21, Declerck 1982: 19); but his *terminus ante quem* relies on the discredited narrative of Maximus' Constantinopolitan origins. *Question* 162 (Declerck 1982: 113), discussing the raising of a house's roof at Luke 5: 19, affirms that 'those who have seen these places for themselves say that the roofs of the houses are made of the lightest pumice stone', in a possible allusion to Maximus' own Palestinian experience.

6. *Exposition on Psalm 59*

Ed. Van Deun 1991; PG 90. 856–872. *CPG* 7690. Sherwood 1952: 26 nr 12 = 'By 626'.

Early. Sherwood's *terminus ante quem* is based on the obsolete narrative of Maximus' stay in Cyzicus. Van Deun agrees that the text is early, but suspends judgement until a precise linguistic study has been completed (1991: xx–xxi). The association of *Psalm* 59, in which the psalmist desires to be liberated from war, with the Avar siege of Constantinople in 626 (e.g. Cantarella 1931: 58) ignores the continuous warfare which had characterized the period from 603.

7. Exposition on the Lord's Prayer

Ed. Van Deun 1991; PG 90. 872–909. *CPG* 7691. Sherwood 1952: 31 nr 25 = '628–30'.

Early (before *c.*636). Sherwood's dating of the text to the African period is unwarranted (Van Deun 1991: xxi), but that the text predates the christological controversies is established in Maximus' understanding and language of the will. He predicts his later commitment to 'two natural wills' in Christ (see e.g. Berthold 2011), but still applies to Christ the concept of γνώμη (Van Deun 1991: 34. 135–9), in contrast to his later thought, and qualifies the will as 'single' or 'one' when discussing the union of man and God (Van Deun 1991: 33. 111–15, 37. 181–2), unthinkable after the publication of the *Ekthesis* in 636 (see Booth 2013: 265–6, and cf. *Myst.*; *Ep.* 2; *Opusc.* 14, 18). Sherwood notes intellectual affinities with other early works: the *Mystagogy*, the *Ambigua to John*, and the *Questions to Thalassius*.

8. Theological and Economical Chapters

Ed. PG 90. 1084–1173. *CPG* 7694. Sherwood 1952: 35 nr 37 = '630–34'.

Early (but after the *Ambigua to John*). Sherwood's dating appears to be based on von Balthasar's observation (1941: 155) of dependence upon the *Questions to Thalassius* and the *Ambigua to John*; the latter dependence is confirmed in Sherwood 1955b: 106–9.

9. Mystagogy

Ed. Boudignon 2011; Sotiropoulos 2001; PG 91. 657–717. *CPG* 7704. Sherwood 1952: 32 nr 27 = '628–30'; Boudignon 2002: 317 = 630s.

Early (after the first retreat to the West, before *c.*636). An ascetical commentary on the eucharistic liturgy, dedicated to 'lord Theocharistus', on whom see the prosopographical section. The text has few chronological pointers, but based on the absence of pregnant christological references most critics have dated the text to Maximus' first African retreat. An early date is also suggested in the perhaps unguarded reference to the union of Christians according to a 'single identity of γνώμη' (Boudignon 2011: 60. 957), which echoes similarly unguarded phrases in other early works (see e.g. *Or.dom.*; *Ep.* 2; *Opusc.* 14, 18).

10. Scholia on Pseudo-Dionysius

Cf. PG 4, 16–432, 528–576; Epifanovich 1917: 111–208 (*Add.* 37). *CPG* 7708. Not in Sherwood.

Date indeterminable. Maximus' *scholia* on Ps-Dionysius are mixed in with those of other authors (e.g. in PG 4) and are difficult to distinguish; see the comments of Suchla (1980). It is reasonable to assume that the *Scholia* were produced in the same period as the *Mystagogy*, the latter explicitly being conceived as a supplement to Ps-Dionysius' *Ecclesiastical Hierarchy* (Boudignon 2011: 6. 54–8). The lack of a full modern edition is an impediment to further precision.

11. Fifteen Chapters

Ed. PG 90. 1177–1392. *CPG* 7695. Sherwood 1952: 35–6 nr 37a = '630–34'.

Date indeterminable; but perhaps early. The 500 chapters, as edited in the PG, are a late compilation, perhaps composed in the early twelfth century by Nicetas of Heraclea (Van Deun 1995: 19–24), of various works of Maximus, mainly the *Questions to Thalassius*. Only chapters 1–15 (PG 90. 1177A–1185C) and 16–25 (PG 90. 1185C–1189A) have independent traditions.[4] Sherwood sees 'no criterion for date' and joins them 'for time, as do the manuscripts in contiguity', to the *Theological and Economical Chapters*.

12. Questions to Theopemptus Scholasticus

Ed. Roosen and Van Deun 2003; PG 90. 1393–1400; Gitlbauer 1878: 85–9. *CPG* 7696. Sherwood 1952: 37 nr 41 = '630–33?'

Date indeterminable; but perhaps early. Maximus answers three scriptural difficulties put to him by Theopemptus *scholasticus*, who is probably to be identified with the Theopemptus mentioned in 641 in *Letter* 18 as an agent of the African prefect George (Roosen and Van Deun 2003: 68), which might point towards the date of the text. But the probable connection of Theopemptus with the circle of Alexandrian lawyers (Boudignon 2004: 15) does not exclude an earlier date. There are few chronological indicators within the text. As with the *Questions to Thalassius*—in the tradition of which our text also belongs—the traditional title of our text is a misnomer for *Answers to Theopemptus*.

2. Minor Early Texts

13. Letter 6—To Jordanes (or John the Sophist, or Archbishop John?), on 'The Soul is Incorporeal'

Ed. PG 91. 424C–433A. *CPG* 7699.6. Sherwood 1952: 25 nr 5 = 'Before 624–25?'; Larchet 1998a: 41–2 = 628–30.

Probably *c.*628. The addressee is given by Combefis as 'the most holy and most blessed archbishop John', but most manuscripts name Jordanes, with the exception of the *Laurent. Plut.* 57.7, which has 'John the sophist' (f. 2^{r}: τοῦ αὐτοῦ πρὸς Ἰωάννην σοφιστήν, noticed by Epifanovich [1917: xiii]; Photius also knew a letter to such an addressee: *Bibl., codex* 192B, ed. Henry 1959–77: 157b12–13). In response to a request from the recipient,

[4] See Laga–Steel 1980: lxxvi–lxxxii; Laga–Steel 1990: xlv–xlviii; De Vocht 1987: 415–20.

Maximus writes a treatise against those who claim that the resurrection body will be corporeal after the manner of the terrestrial body (with its composite humours). The topic—which recalls the clash of the Constantinopolitan patriarch Eutychius with Gregory the Great in the late sixth century—is close to that of *Letter 7*, also dedicated to the fate of the soul after death and almost certainly addressed to Jordanes, which suggests that the addressee is the same. This would place our letter *c.*628 (below). Sherwood (1952), Larchet (1998a), and Benevich (2009) draw attention to the close theological affinities with the *Ambigua to John*, which support this early date, as do references to the soul's 'natural operations' and 'operations according to nature' (432B) in a context which does not suggest that the terms are pregnant or controversial. The letter thus belongs to a period when the association of nature and operation is made, but before the outbreak of the monoenergist crisis in 633/4. Benevich (2009) claims that Maximus' opponents are extreme anti-Origenists, which might make us think of Palestine as a context. But those opponents' views recall the position of the Latin Fathers (including Gregory the Great), that the resurrection body would be composed of the same materials as the terrestrial (see e.g. Bynum 1995). Is Maximus refuting the opinion of Latin theologians whom he encountered in the West?

14. *Letter 7—To Jordanes the Priest, that after Death the Soul Retains its Intellectual Activity and is Separated from None of its Natural Powers*

Ed. PG 91. 433A–440B. *CPG* 7699.7. Sherwood 1952: 31 nr 24 = '628 (643?)'.

August 628. Clearly linked to *Letter* 6. Maximus' correspondent has questioned him about a widespread doctrine put about by some prominent monks 'there', that 'the soul has obtained the ability to think and to reason from the body and, so they say, it cannot do these things without the body' (PG 91. 437A), and furthermore that after the resurrection the humours will continue to animate the body (PG 91. 433C). Benevich (2009) again argues that these doctrines represent an extreme form of anti-Origenism which Maximus then tempers, and he associates the text with specific doctrines contained within the *Ambigua to John*. Although it is tempting to think of a Palestinian context for such discussions, the debate on the fate of the posthumous soul was widespread and does not provide a means for placing the recipient (Dal Santo 2012). *Pace* Combefis, who has a priest John as the addressee, the manuscripts name Jordanes (Sherwood 1952), who is known only as the potential recipient of *Letters* 6–8. Maximus received the letter 'on the second day of the current month of August of the present first indiction' and was informed 'that you, my masters, who are the cause of all good things for me, are in good health' (PG 91. 433A). The first indiction corresponds to 628 or 643; the former date is preferable for a number of reasons: (1) Maximus plays on the theme of presence and absence, and of perception of the recipient with the eyes of faith, familiar from e.g. *Letters* 2, 4, 5, 8, 13, 23, 24, and 27, none of which is sure to belong to Maximus' second retreat to the West, and some of which certainly belong to the first period; (2) Maximus dwells on the natural properties and natural operation of the soul (PG 91. 436C–D), in terms reminiscent of *Letter* 6, and with little indication of the imminent controversies surrounding such terms; (3) Maximus refers to the controversy as a sign of the coming

of the Antichrist, a theme more frequent in his early writings;[5] (4) affinities with the *Ambigua to John*, identified by Sherwood 1952. Maximus' complaint that there is no one to defend the true faith διὰ τὴν ἐπικρατοῦσαν τοῦ καιροῦ πονηρίαν (PG 91. 440B9–10) also fits the date of 628, before the Persian war was over.

15. *Letter 13—To Peter the Illustris, Short Exposé of the Dogmas of Severus*

Ed. PG 91. 509B–533A. *CPG* 7699.13. Sherwood 1952: 39–40 nr 44 = '633–34'; Larchet 1998a: 52 n.1 = 'troisième trimestre 633'; Boudignon 2004: 16 = 633.

Between 629 and 633? A lengthy refutation of the Severan doctrine of one composite nature, occasioned by some recent converts who 'returned … as a dog to its vomit' (PG 91. 512B). Maximus thanks God for Peter's safe completion of a sea voyage (PG 91. 509C6); Peter has left the place where Maximus is residing, and sailed to somewhere where 'blessed father Sophronius' is also (PG 91. 533A). He complains of a lack of books (PG 91. 532D) and encourages Peter to resist the triple (why 'triple'?) wave of the heresy. The modern consensus on the dating is based upon the identification of our Peter Illustris with the Peter, general of Numidia, who according to the *Relatio motionis* was dispatched in 633 to Alexandria. It is then tempting to associate (as did Sherwood 1952; Larchet 1998a: 51) the miaphysite converts/apostates with the Alexandrian union of June 633 (Maximus seems to have ignored the union of 629 with the Syrian Jacobites), and to place both Peter and Sophronius in Alexandria, where Sophronius is known to have protested soon after the union's realization in June 633 (see e.g. *Opusc.* 12). But apart from prosopographical problems pointed out above, there are several impediments to placing our letter in this context: (1) A rather imprecise statement of the Logos' assumption of the human operations ('The Word of God, neither in respect of *logos* nor *tropos*, has the powers which correspond to the natural operations of the nature assumed by him' [i.e. the *human* nature] [PG 91. 532B7–10]), which seems unguarded, and must place our text before the outbreak of the monenergist crisis in 633; (2) Maximus' statement of agreement with 'those that currently govern the church' (PG 91. 532C5–7) cannot be reconciled with the conflict between Sophronius and Cyrus of Alexandria; (3) the return of the Severans to their former confession implies that some time has passed. Our letter must, however, pre-date the elevation of Sophronius, called 'abba', to the patriarchate of Jerusalem late in 634; (4) given Sophronius' and Maximus' resistance to the union, one must wonder if Maximus would have here inveighed against Severan dissent from it. These doubts encourage us to place *Letter* 13 before the union of Alexandria, but after the policy of reunification of the imperial church had started to be implemented in 628. We are not informed about the events in Alexandria between the evacuation of the Persians in 629 and the union of June 633, but we can presume that the union was preceded by earlier attempts and negotiations between the churches. We may therefore be dealing here with one of the earliest responses of Maximus to Heraclius' policy of

[5] E.g. in *Epp.* 8 and 14 (540B); *Car.* 2.31; *Amb.Io.* (1132A); but also in *Ep.* 12 (497D), and *DB* 93. 211.

ecclesiastical unions. As elsewhere he plays on the theme of presence and absence, a theme which appears in other letters which seem without doubt to belong to the first period of exile in North Africa; cf. *Letters* 2, 4, 5, 8, 23, 24, 27.

16. Opusculum 13—On the Two Natures of Christ

Ed. PG 91. 145A–149A; cf. the fragment in Epifanovich 1917: 61–2 (*Add.* 16), which might be a lost fragment of our text (thus *CPG*). *CPG* 7697.13 and 7707.16. Sherwood 1952: 27 nr 15 = 'Date uncertain. Perhaps Crete 626/7?' So also Larchet 1998b: 19.

Date indeterminable, but perhaps before 633/4. The text is a short, anti-miaphysite, anti-Nestorian doctrinal statement across ten chapters, in which the absence of references to the operations perhaps encourages preference for a date before 633/4. Maximus insists on the distinction of the two natures only 'by the eyes of the intellect' (148B–C), which is a standard neo-Chalcedonian expression, but does not seem to have been used by him after the union of Alexandria. The attempt in Sherwood, and thence Larchet, to link this text to the Cretan sojourn reported in *Opusculum* 3 (in which operations and wills are said to have been debated), and then to date this sojourn to 626/7, is pure speculation; cf. the discussion of *Opusculum* 3. We know little of the purpose and even less of the context.

17. Opusculum 14/Additamentum 21—Various Definitions

Ed. PG 91. 149B–153B; a longer version in Epifanovich 1917: 68–70 (*Add.* 21, see also Roosen 2001/1: 5). *CPG* 7697.14 and 7707.21. Sherwood 1952: 42–3 nr 50 = 'By 640'. So also Larchet 1998b: 33.

Probably before 633/4. A short treatise defining central theological and christological terms. Towards the end (but not in all manuscripts) it includes a brief definition of δύναμις with reference to ἐνέργεια, and then θέλημα, distinguishing natural and gnomic wills (153A–B). But the fact that ἐνέργεια is not the lead term in the definition, and the rather vague definitions of the will and (in particular) the operation, encourage a date before 633/4. (For similar language cf. *Or.dom.*; *Ep.* 2; *Opusc.* 18; *Myst.*). An earlier date—at least before the *Ekthesis* (636)—is also encouraged in the definition of 'relational union' as that 'which brings different γνῶμαι together into one will' (152C), on which see also *Opusculum* 18. Epifanovich (1917: ix–x) points out parallels with other works of Maximus, mainly *Letter* 15 and, to a lesser degree, *Letter* 12.

18. Opusculum 18—Definitions of Unions

Ed. Van Deun 2000b, seeming to suggest a date after 633/4; PG 91. 213A–216A. *CPG* 7697.18. Sherwood 1952: 30 nr 22 = '626–33'; so also Larchet 1998b: 20.

Early, perhaps *c.*634/5. Maximus offers definitions of twelve different types of union. The third of these—'union in respect of relation, concerns the γνῶμαι [and results] in one will'—is paralleled in Sophronius' *Synodical Letter* (*Acts of the Sixth Ecumenical Council*, Riedinger 1990–2: 438) written in 634/5. Maximus uses a similar language concerning 'one will' in *Letter* 2, the *Exposition on the Lord's Prayer*, and in particular

Opusculum 14. All this suggests a date before the *Ekthesis*, and probably around the time of Sophronius' *Synodical Letter*.

19. Letter 23—To Stephen the Priest and Abbot

Ed. PG 91. 605D–608B. *CPG* 7699.23. Sherwood 1952: 33 nr 30 = '628/9?'; so also Larchet 1998a: 46.

*c.*632 or 642. A short note on the themes of separation and spiritual love. Some manuscripts give a fuller title than Combefis (*Vat. gr.* 504: κυρίῳ ἀββᾷ Στεφάνῳ πρεσβυτέρῳ; *Vat. gr.* 507, f. 113^{v}: κυρίῳ ἀββᾷ Στεφάνῳ πρεσβυτέρῳ; *Laurent. Plut.* 57.7: πρὸς Στέφανον πρεσβύτερον καὶ ἡγούμενον), thus undermining the attempt of Larchet (1998a: 47) to establish a chronological order for correspondence with Stephen on the basis of the absent title of hegoumen. Stephen was also the recipient of *Letters* 22, 40, and *B*, and from the first and last of these appears to have been a person of some standing. Maximus seems to address an entire community rather than an individual, since he refers to 'venerable Fathers' and 'disciples and teachers of love', and asks them not to forget him, 'your child and disciple' (608A), but it is unclear whether this indicates Maximus' former placement in that community, or constitutes a simple *confessio humilitatis*. The connection of the aforementioned 'Fathers' with Chrysopolis (Sherwood 1952; Larchet 1998a) is once again based upon the discredited Greek *Life*; we cannot know where Stephen and his community were. The theme of estrangement is reminiscent of *Letter* 8 to Sophronius (summer of 632) and of other letters composed during his first presence in North Africa (*Epp.* 2, 4, 5, 7, 8, 24, and 27). We should note, however, that in *Letter B* Maximus contacted Stephen in connection with the affair of the prefect George (641–2), to which *Letter* 22 may also be related (see section 53). The similarity of tone in *Letters* 22 and 23 perhaps suggests the same connection also for the latter.

20. Letter 40—To the Same (sc. Stephen, Priest and Hegoumen)

Ed. PG 91. 633C–636A; partly re-edited by B. Markesinis in Janssens 2002: xxiv. *CPG* 7699.40. Sherwood 1952: 34 nr 34 = '630–34'. Larchet 1998a: 47 = 634.

*c.*634? Extant only in *Laurent. Plut.* 57.7, f. 2^{r} (τοῦ αὐτοῦ πρὸς τὸν αὐτόν), where it is preceded by *Letter B* (τοῦ αὐτοῦ πρὸς Στέφανον θεοφιλέστατον πρεσβύτερον καὶ ἡγούμενον). The addressee is thus Stephen, the recipient of *Letters* 22, 23, and *B*, and not Thalassius as in the fragmentary edition of Combefis (PG 91. 633C).[6] The improved text by Markesinis shows Maximus hesitant to accept a command from Stephen, for which Abba Thomas would apparently be a more suitable executor. The command in question is thought to have been eventually passed by Thomas over to Maximus, who then wrote the *Ambigua to Thomas*, which implies a date *c.*634 (Janssens 2002: xxv).

[6] See also Epifanovich 1917: xiii, and Canart 1964: 426 n.1.

3. Maximus and the Officials

21. *Letter 5—To Constantine, the Illustris and (former?) Sacellarius, on Ethics*

Ed. PG 91. 420C–424C. *CPG* 7699.5. Sherwood 1952: 24 nr 1 = 'date uncertain'.

Perhaps *c.*628. Full title in *Laurent. Plut.* 57.7, f. 17^{v} (τοῦ αὐτοῦ Κωνσταντίνῳ ἰλλουστρίῳ καὶ ἀπὸ σακελλαρίων); ἀπὸ σακελλαρίων is confirmed by Photius (*Bibl., codex* 192B, ed. Henry 1959–77: 157b21–22). *Vat. gr.* 504, f. 153^{v}, adds 'on ethics' (ἐπιστολὴ πρὸς Κωνσταντῖνον σακελλάριον ἠθική). For Constantine, see the prosopographical section above. Praise of ascetic virtue and warning of judgement. Maximus addresses the recipient in similar terms as in *Letter* 4 to John Cubicularius ('my master', 420C; cf. 413A), but the theme of presence and absence (420C) is less strongly phrased. The appearance of that theme also encourages an earlier date (cf. *Letters* 2, 4, 8, 13, 23, 24, 27). The other letter to Constantine the *sacellarius* is *Letter* 24/43, dated to *c.*628; Larchet 1998a: 40 (if we read '628' for '638') suggests that the two letters are close to each other.

22. *Letter 24 = Letter 43—To Constantine (the former?) Sacellarius or to John Cubicularius*

Ed. PG 91. 608B–613A and 637B–641C. *CPG* 7699.24 and 43. Sherwood 1952: 32 nr 28 = '628–29'; Larchet 1998a: 40 = 638 (appears to be a misprint for '628').

Probably 628–9. Response to recipient's letter announcing universal peace to Maximus (608C=637C: εἰρήνης κοσμικῆς εὐαγγέλια τὸ γράμμα κομίσαν). Maximus does not share the triumphalist mood of his correspondent; he rather encourages him to make peace with God, and expresses the remarkable opinion that peace on earth and subsequent admiration for the emperor should not detract from the greater war against the passions (Booth 2013: 162–3). *Letters* 24 (to Constantine) and 43 (to John) are virtually identical, save for the addressee. Combefis (PG 91. 607–608 n.[i]) thought it unlikely that two identical letters should have been addressed to two different addressees. The absence of *Letter* 24 from the only manuscript that transmitted *Letter* 43 (*Laurent. Plut.* 57.7) supports this view. The letter was thus probably dispatched to Constantine the Sacellarius, as indicated by the majority of manuscripts, the recipient also of *Letter* 5. Maximus is far away from his correspondent (608C=637C), and that he needs to be informed of the peace suggests that he is at some remove from the East, perhaps in North Africa. The peace is in all likelihood that realized in Heraclius' accord with Kavadh Shiroe in April 628, or perhaps that agreed with the general Shahrbaraz in July 629, but it is not impossible to think of other periods of cessation of warfare, for instance the two treaties which Cyrus of Alexandria concluded with the Arabs in *c.*636 and in 641 (Hoyland 1997: 574–90).

23. *Letter D—To John*

Unpublished, extant in *Cantabrig. Colleg. S. Trinit.* O.3.48, s. XII, f. 64^{v}–65^{v}. *CPG* 7703. Not in Sherwood. See Canart 1964: 419–20.