

## Notes and Documents

### *The Restoration of the Cross at Jerusalem*

IN an elaborate paper recently published Bolotov has studied the chronology of the years 628–30 of our era. In the present note I desire to show that the Russian scholar's suggested reconstruction is untenable and, further, to propose a different solution.<sup>1</sup> The crucial point in the discussion is the date of the restoration of the Cross, which had been captured by the Persians on the fall of Jerusalem in 614. Bolotov's reconstruction of the chronology<sup>2</sup> may be roughly outlined as follows: After the preliminary negotiations of Heraclius with Persia in the spring of 628, of which an account is given in the Paschal chronicle, Sheroe (or Kobad) sent the newly appointed Catholicos Ishoyab on an embassy to the emperor (August–September 628). The Persian king was mortally ill at the time, and was anxious that Heraclius should protect his infant son Ardeshir:<sup>3</sup> he would choose a Christian to influence a Christian, and the mission was the more

<sup>1</sup> See V. Bolotov, *K Istorii Imperatora Irakliya*, in *Vizantiiskii Vremennik*, xiv (1907), St. Petersburg, 1908, pp. 68–124; E. A. W. Budge, *The Book of Governors, The Historia Monastica of Thomas Bishop of Marga A. D. 840*, 2 vols., London, 1893; J. Labourt, *Le Christianisme dans l'Empire perse sous la dynastie Sassanide*, in *Bibliothèque de l'Enseignement de l'Histoire Ecclésiastique*, 2<sup>me</sup> édition, Paris, 1904; N. Marr, *Antiokh Stratig, Plyenienie Ierusalima Persami v 614 g.*, St. Petersburg, 1909; *Tekstui i Razviskanija po armenio-gruzinskoj Filologii*, Kniga viii, Izdaniya Fakulteta Vostochnnikh yazikov imperatorskago S. Peterburgskago Universiteta (if Marr's work should be inaccessible, see Archimandrit Kallistos, 'Αρχιεπισκοπος Στρατηγος, "Αλωσις της Ιερουσαλημ υπό των Περσών τῷ 614 Γεωργιανῶν κείμενον, &c., ἐν Ἱερουσαλήμοις. τύπος Π. Τάφου 1910, reprinted from *Nía Ziῶn ΣΤ και Ζ' ἔτους*, which gives a résumé of Marr's work and a Greek translation of the Georgian text, and compare also F. C. Conybeare, *ante*, xxv. 602, 1910); Th. Nöldeke, *Geschichte der Perser und Araber zur Zeit der Sassaniden, aus der arabischen Chronik des Tabari, &c.*, Leyden, 1879 (cited hereafter as *Geschichte*), and *Die von Quidi herausgegebene syrische Chronik*, in *Sitzungsberichte der kaiserl. Akad. der Wissenschaften in Wien*, cxxviii, Abh. ix, 1893; A. Pernice, *L'Imperatore Eraclio, Saggio di Storia Bizantina* (Pubblicazioni del reale Istituto di Studi Superiori Pratici e di Perfezionamento in Firenze, 1906); L. Sternbach, in *Rozprawy Akademii Umiejetnosci. Wydział Filologiczny*, Serya ii, tom. xv, Krakow, 1900, and *Georgii Pisidae Carmina Inedita* (Wiener Studien, xiii (1891), pp. 1–62; xiv (1892), pp. 51–68); W. A. Wigram, *An Introduction to the History of the Assyrian Church or the Church of the Sassanid Persian Empire*, London, 1910.

<sup>2</sup> *Op. cit.* pp. 77–84.

<sup>3</sup> Compare the confused notice in Nicephorus 20<sup>th</sup>, ed. de Boor.

likely to succeed if Ishoyab bore with him the Holy Cross. The delay in sending this may well have been due to the difficulty of discovering the sacred relic, which might have been placed, Bolotov suggests,<sup>4</sup> in one of the monasteries, either Nestorian or Monophysite, favoured at different times by Sirin, the Christian wife of Chosroes;<sup>5</sup> its precise location might have been thus uncertain.<sup>6</sup> The solemnity of the occasion and the fact that Ishoyab was unaccompanied by other Nestorian bishops serve to explain why the Catholicos ventured to attend a celebration of the eucharist in the emperor's presence, probably at Theodosiopolis.<sup>7</sup> Heraclius then held the synod of Karin (i.e. Theodosiopolis) and effected a union with the Armenian church (in the winter of 628-9), after which he distributed pieces of the true Cross among the notables of Armenia and thence proceeded to Caesarea.<sup>8</sup> From Caesarea, it would seem, Heraclius sent the true Cross to Constantinople,<sup>9</sup> and in June the Persians began to evacuate Roman territory, while in July 629 the emperor finally concluded terms of peace with Sahrbarâz at Arabissos Tripotamos.<sup>10</sup> He returned to Constantinople, probably in September 629, and in the spring of 630, in the month of March, bore the Cross to Jerusalem, where it was restored to the place from which it had been carried in 614. In this year Heraclius assisted Sahrbarâz in his successful attack on the Persian capital, where Ardashir had been reigning since October 629.<sup>11</sup> This reconstruction of the chronology has been accepted by Professor Marr,<sup>12</sup> who therefore

<sup>4</sup> *Op. Cit.* pp. 79-81.

<sup>5</sup> On her change from the Nestorian to the Monophysite allegiance compare Wigram, pp. 253, 259.

<sup>6</sup> This is in itself improbable: and further, compare the definite assertion (overlooked by Bolotov) of *Chron. Guidi*, ed. Nöldeke, p. 32, mentioning the Cross of Christ, 'das sie von Jerusalem gebracht hatten und das in persischen Schatzhause niedergelegt war'.

<sup>7</sup> That Ishoyab was dispatched by Sheroc on a mission to Heraclius unaccompanied by any metropolitans or bishops is purely conjectural. Thomas of Marga, who alone (Budge, ii, pp. 125 *seqq.*) places this embassy in the reign of Sheroc (though cf. Barhebraei, *Chronicon Ecclesiasticum*, ed. Abbeloos and Lamy, Paris, 1877, vol. iii, coll. 114-16—the patriarch a rege Persarum missus est legatus ad Graecorum imperatorem), states that there went with him the metropolitans of Nisibis and Adiabeno and other influential bishops of the Nestorian church. For Bolotov's reasons for his conjectural reconstruction see *Viz. Vrem.*, *loc. cit.*, pp. 86 *seqq.* The mission of which Thomas of Marga speaks was almost certainly dispatched by Bôrân, who became queen in 630. Cf. Budge, *loc. cit.*, n. 2; *Chron. Guidi*, pp. 32-3; H. Gismondi, *Maris Amri et Slibae de Patriarchis Nestorianorum Commentaria*, pars i, Romae, 1899, p. 64; pars ii, Romae, 1896, p. 31; Nöldeke, *Geschichte*, p. 312, n. 1; Labourt, pp. 242-3; Wigram, pp. 300 *seqq.*

<sup>8</sup> John Mamikonian, *Fragmenta Historicorum Graecorum*, ed. Muller, v. ii. 380.

<sup>9</sup> Niceph. 22.

<sup>10</sup> *Corpus Scriptorum Christianorum Orientalium, Scriptores Syri*, Versio, Series tertia, tomus iv, *Chronica Minora*, pars secunda, Paris, 1904, pp. 108, 113, 114.

<sup>11</sup> This summary will serve our present purpose; the student will consult Bolotov's paper for the elaborate argumentation by which he seeks to support his conclusions.

<sup>12</sup> Marr, p. 5.

concludes that the Cross was restored to its place in Jerusalem on 21 March 630, adopting the date 21 March from Antiochus Strategos.

But Bolotov has not paid sufficient attention to the western authorities, and he has altogether neglected two important sources—the chronicle of Agapius of Hierapolis and the *Carmina Inedita* of George of Pisidia. We can best take these for the starting-point of our criticism.

(i) The text of that part of the chronicle of Agapius with which we are concerned is not yet published, but a Russian translation by Baron von Rosen appeared in 1884 in the *Journal of the Ministry of Public Enlightenment*. As this periodical is to be found in but few libraries in the west of Europe, I may be pardoned for giving an English rendering from the Russian of the two relevant passages.<sup>13</sup> (p. 72) After the accession of Sheroc—

Then Heraclius departed on his way back and stopped at the village called Semanen. This is the same village where the ark stopped in the flood in the days of Noah: and he went up to the mountain called Al-Djüdi, and looked upon it at the place of the ark and gazed on all four sides. And then he went in the direction of Amid and there he spent the whole of that winter. And Sheroc the son of Kisre [Chosroes] sent ambassadors to Heraclius asking for peace. And Heraclius agreed thereto on condition that all the towns and villages which his father [i.e. Chosroes] had taken from the Greeks should be restored and that Heraclius should send into Persia all the Persians which were in his power. [Here follows a mention of certain philosophers of the time.] . . . Then Heraclius determined to depart for Mesopotamia and Syria, and he summoned to him his brother Theodore and ordered him to grant the Persians who were to be found in the whole of Mesopotamia and Syria permission to retire from his empire and to return into Persia. And Theodore started forth at the head of the advance-guard, and Heraclius began to go into each town one after another and to settle his representatives in them, until he had gone round them all, and then returned to his kingdom to Constantinople. [Then follows an account of Theodore's difficulties at Edessa and Heraclius' subsequent attempts to introduce orthodoxy there. Further, evidently from another source, on p. 64 we read: In the 18th year of Heraclius] Kesra [Chosroes] son of Hormizd emperor of the Persians was killed, after he had reigned 38 years. Then after him his son Kobad reigned, and concluded peace with the Greeks, and returned to them the towns which he and others had captured up to Dara which is above Nisibin. [A comet appears.] Then Heraclius gave orders to the Greeks that they should leave the territory [of the Persians (*e coniectura*)] and should go to the territory of the Greeks in

<sup>13</sup> Baron von Rosen, *Zamyetki o Lyetopisi Agapiya Manbidzhakago*, in *Zhurnal Ministerstva Narodnago Prosvyeshcheniya*, pt. ccxxxi, February 1884, pp. 47-75; and for information on Agapius see A. Vasiliev, *Agapy, Manbidzhsky kristiansky arabsky Istorik X Vyeka*, in *Viz. Vrem.* xi (1904), pp. 674-87.

accordance with the terms of the peace which Greeks and Persians had concluded with each other. And Sahrbaz [Sahrbaráz] gave orders to all the Persians that they should return to their own land, each to his own town and family, and that they should not raise disturbances in the land, but they did not attend to his words. And in the end of the 20th year of Heraclius the Persians made an expedition to the Euphrates, and Shahrbaz [Sahrbaráz] took [into captivity] many warriors of the Greeks, and many of the Persian [read Greek] generals and their followers were killed.<sup>14</sup> And in the 21st year of Heraclius Shahrbaz [Sahrbaráz] died who had grasped at empire over the Persians, and Burân his daughter [the relationship is of course incorrect] reigned. And she concluded peace with the Greeks and then died.

From this we learn that Heraclius did retire into Armenia in 628, and thus we gain a confirmation of the account of John Mamikonian, who may be reasonably trusted at this point, as Bolotov has truly observed (p. 90), since he is here recording local traditions and copying from a local chronicle of the year 681. He writes as follows (I employ the translation of Emine as I am unfortunately unable to read the original Armenian):<sup>15</sup> Heraclius after his victory over Persia

ramena la Sainte Croix avec les captifs. Il passa sans s'arrêter devant beaucoup de localités, distribua beaucoup de morceaux [de la Croix] dans le pays d'Arménie et aux grands seigneurs. Lorsqu'il se rendit à Eveznavan<sup>16</sup> le serviteur en coupa un grand morceau et voulut s'enfuir.<sup>17</sup> Mais quelqu'un, l'ayant su, en informa le roi qui lui reprit ce morceau, et lui trancha la tête. Étant ensuite allé à Césarée avec son armée, Héraclius remit ce fragment au patriarche de Césarée qui s'appelait Jean et lui-même gagna sa ville capitale de Constantinople.

Then follows the subsequent history of this piece of the Cross, which after many vicissitudes was treasured at Dzidzarn in Armenia.

But we gain from Agapius the further important fact that Heraclius spent the whole winter at Amida: this, apart from the further arguments adduced by Owsepian in his *Entstehungsgeschichte des Monothelitismus*,<sup>18</sup> disproves Bolotov's view that Heraclius remained at Theodosiopolis (Karin) and held the famous

<sup>14</sup> So Baron von Rosen: but this is a mistaken translation; the authority which Agapius is transcribing is referring to the fact that Roman troops acted in concert with Sahrbaráz in his invasion of Persia; cf. Sebeos, Macler's translation, Paris, 1904 *Chron. Gudi*, pp. 30 *seqq.* We should therefore, I doubt not, translate 'and Sahrbaráz took [as his allies] many warriors of the Greeks, and many of the Persian generals and their followers were killed'.

<sup>15</sup> *Fragmenta Historicorum Graecorum*, ed. Müller, v. ii. 380.

<sup>16</sup> Eveznavan is apparently only mentioned in this passage; its precise position seems to be unknown: cf. H. Hübschmann, *Die altarmenischen Ortsnamen*, &c., in *Indogermanische Forschungen*, xvi (1904), p. 424.

<sup>17</sup> 'Relics are fair game—things that the most honourable and conscientious of men may blamelessly annex:' Wigram, p. 303.

<sup>18</sup> Leipzig, 1897

synod there during the winter of 628-9. The emperor's difficulties were in fact by no means surmounted: Sahrbaráz was still in Asia Minor with his army, and refused to recognize the authority of Ardeshir.<sup>19</sup> At Amida Heraclius occupied a strong position on the frontier from which he could best take effective action.

(ii) The cardinal confusion, however, in Bolotov's account arises from the fact that he, with Sternbach, places Heraclius's return to the capital before the restoration of the Cross in Jerusalem.<sup>20</sup> This is shown to be wrong by the carefully dated account of Nicephorus, p. 22, which we must shortly consider, and, as Pernice<sup>21</sup> has seen, by an important passage in the *Carmina Inedita* of George of Pisidia: in the poet's *Αὐτοσχέδιοι πρὸς τὴν γενομένην ἀνάγνωσιν τῶν κελεύσεων*<sup>22</sup> *χάριν τῆς ἀποκαταστάσεως τῶν τιμίων ξύλων* he begins:

ὦ Γολγοθᾶ σκίρτησον· ἢ κτίσις πάλιν  
 ὄλη σε τιμᾶ καὶ καλεῖ θερόδοχον  
 ἐκ Περσίδος γὰρ ὁ βασιλεὺς ἀφειγμένος  
 τὸν σταυρὸν ἐν σοὶ δεικνύει πεπηγμένον.<sup>23</sup>

This is confirmed by the unedited chronicle<sup>24</sup> contained in *Codex Matritensis Palat.* 40, at f. 408. Heraclius τὰ τίμια ξύλα ἀπὸ Περσίδος ἀναλαβὼν καὶ εἰς Ἱερουσαλὴμ παραγενόμενος, κ.τ.λ., and by the whole series of chroniclers who are represented by Georgius Monachus.<sup>25</sup> There can, indeed, be no doubt on this point. The text of Theophanes<sup>26</sup> can be for the moment reserved for future discussion.<sup>27</sup>

(iii) But when was it that Heraclius made this journey to Jerusalem? Pernice accepts the traditional date for the restoration of the Cross—14 September—but this is disproved by a hitherto unnoticed passage of George of Pisidia. In the *Carmina Inedita*, no. ii, vv. 104 *seqq.*,<sup>28</sup> we read

τούτων παρ' ἡμῖν τῶν ἀγαθῶν ἠγγελμένων  
 εἰς καιρὸν εὐπρόσδεκτον, εἰς νικηφόρον,  
 ὅτε προσελθὼν τοῖς τυράννοις τῶν τάφων  
 ὁ τὴν καθ' ἡμᾶς οὐσίαν ἀναπλάσας  
 ζῶην ἐφήκε τῷ νεκρῷ τοῦ Λαζάρου—

<sup>19</sup> Cf. Sebeos, pp. 86-7.

<sup>20</sup> Sternbach (*Rozprawy*, &c., p. 36) in 628, Bolotov in 629.

<sup>21</sup> Pernice, appendix iii, p. 317.

<sup>22</sup> Cf. Sternbach in *Wiener Studien*, xiii (1891), p. 29, n. 12. *κέλευσις* is the technical term for an imperial dispatch. Compare for the use of the word *Chron. Pasch.*, p. 728, 15, 729, 15, 730, 3, &c.; Geo. Pisid., *De Bello Avarico*, 30.

<sup>23</sup> *Carmina Inedita*, ii, in *Wiener Studien*, xiii, 4-5.

<sup>24</sup> Falsely attributed to Cyril of Alexandria and George of Pisidia. On the manuscripts of this chronicle cf. Th. Preger, *Die angebliche Chronik des hl. Kyrillos und Georgios Pisides*, in *Byz. Zeitschr.* vii (1898), pp. 129-33.

<sup>25</sup> Ed. de Boor, Leipzig, 1904, ii. 672.

<sup>26</sup> Ed. de Boor, l. 327-8.

<sup>27</sup> Cf. *infra*, p. 293 *seqq.*

<sup>28</sup> Sternbach, p. 8.

ἴδει γὰρ οἶμαι τῇ νεκρῶν ἀναστάσει  
σταυροῦ γενέσθαι καὶ πάλιν μηνύματα.  
ὅλη συνήλθεν εἰς ἑαυτὴν ἡ πόλις (? ἑορτὴν οἱ ἀνάκτορ,  
ε οοσι. Sternbach)

ὡς ψάμμος ὡς ῥοῦς ὡς ἄμετρα κύματα  
ποιούντα πολλὰς σωματώδεις ἐκχύσεις·  
σπουδὴν γὰρ εἶχον, ὡς δορκὰς ἐν θέρει  
διψύσα καὶ σφύζουσα, συντόμως φθάσαι  
τῶν σῶν, κράτιστε, συλλαβῶν τὰς ἱμάδας.

That is, the news of the triumphant restoration of the Cross reached the capital when the inhabitants were celebrating the festival of the resurrection of Lazarus. But, as Hoffmann has shown,<sup>29</sup> this festival was celebrated by the Greek church on the Saturday before Palm Sunday.<sup>30</sup> Therefore the generally received September date for the restoration of the Cross is untenable.<sup>31</sup> But Antiochus Strategos gives 21 March :<sup>32</sup> is this then 21 March of 629 or, as Bolotov and Marr maintain, March 630 ?<sup>33</sup> In 629 the 'Saturday of Lazarus' <sup>34</sup> fell on 9 April, but in 630 on 30 March. That the news of the restoration of the Cross should travel from Jerusalem to Constantinople in eight days is, considering the confused state of the empire after the protracted Persian war, surely impossible. We are compelled to adopt the year 629, and thus the contemporary poem of George agrees with and supports the dating of Antiochus Strategos.

(iv) From Jerusalem the emperor turned to recover the towns which had been captured by the Persians. We know from Thomas the Presbyter that Alexandria and the towns of Syria were evacuated in June 629, and in July 629 Heraclius, marching north, met Sahrbarâz at Arabissos, and concluded an agreement with him whereby the Euphrates was to be the boundary between the two realms.<sup>35</sup> Thence it would appear he marched to Caesarea.<sup>36</sup> We are now in a position to consider the evidence of Nicephorus. After describing the restoration of the Cross in Jerusalem, he continues :<sup>37</sup>

ἰψωθέντων δὲ αὐτῶν (i. e. τὰ ζωποια ξύλα) ἐκεῖσε εὐθὺς ἐς τὸ Βυζάντιον ὁ βασιλεὺς ἐξέπεμψεν. ἃ δὴ Σέργιος ὁ τοῦ Βυζαντίου ἱεράρχης ἐκ Βλαχερνῶν

<sup>29</sup> In a learned note in H. Feige, *Die Geschichte des Mär 'Abdishô'*, Kiel, 1890, Nachträge zu Anmerkung 23, pp. 56-7.

<sup>30</sup> Cf. Nilles, *Calendarium utriusque Ecclesiae, &c.*, ed. 2, Innsbruck, 1897, ii, pp. 195 seqq.

<sup>31</sup> Theophanes is in fact quite right when he states, 629: τούτῳ τῷ ἔτει ἀνάγας ὁ βασιλεὺς ἄμα ἔαρι . . . ἐπὶ τὰ Ἱεροσόλυμα ἐπορεύετο ἀπαγαγὼν τὰ τίμα καὶ ζωποια ξύλα τοῦ ἀποδοῦναι τῷ θεῷ τὴν εὐχαριστίαν, 328, <sup>12-13</sup>; for a further proof cf. Geo. Psaid. *Carpina Inedita*, ii. l. 7 νέους προουτρέπει(ς φονίκαν κλάδου | πρὸς τὴν ἀπαιτὴν τοῦ νέου νισπέρου: the fresh young shoots appear in spring, not in September.

<sup>32</sup> Cf. Conybeare, *op. cit.*, xxv. 516.

<sup>33</sup> Cf. Labourt, p. 242, who dates the return of the cross after 27 April 630.

<sup>34</sup> Cf. Budge, i, p. xx.

<sup>35</sup> Cf. *supra*, p. 288.

<sup>36</sup> Cf. John Mamikonian, *supra*, p. 290.

<sup>37</sup> p. 22, ed. de Boor.

(ἱερὸν δὲ αἱ Βλαχέρναι τῆς θεομήτορος) λιτανεύων ὑπεδέξατο, καὶ πρὸς τὴν μεγίστην ἐκκλησίαν ἀγαγὼν ταῦτα ἀνύψωσε· δευτέρα δὲ ἦν ἰνδικτιῶν ἡνῖκα ταῦτα ἐπράττοντο· μετ' οὐ πολὺ δὲ καὶ Ἡράκλειος πρὸς τὸ Βυζάντιον ἐχώρει, ἐπὶ πολλῆς εὐφημίας καὶ δόξης ὑπερβαλλούσης παρὰ τῶν ἐκάστω δεχθεῖς.

The order of events is thus exaltation of the Cross in Jerusalem, then a similar exaltation in Constantinople, and after this the return of the emperor to his capital. But the Cross itself must have remained in Jerusalem :<sup>38</sup> the passage of John Mamikonian above quoted enables us to offer an explanation of the difficulty. Just as Heraclius had given fragments of the true Cross to Armenian nobles, and as another fragment was later given to the church in Caesarea, so doubtless he dispatched from Jerusalem a piece of the sacred relic to Constantinople.<sup>39</sup> This reached the capital during the second indiction, i. e. before 1 September 629, and soon after, i. e. directly he had concluded the peace with Sahrbaráz, the emperor himself made a triumphal progress to Constantinople (probably in August 629).

(v) There remains the extremely difficult problem of the text of Theophanes. The order of events as given by him is as follows : 628 : Theodore is dispatched to superintend the return of the Persians from Roman territory and from the cities of the empire. Heraclius enters the capital thus celebrating a *μυστικὴ θεωρία* : as God at creation had toiled for six days and then enjoyed the Sabbath of His rest, so Heraclius after six years of warfare was at length at peace. 629 : Heraclius leaves the capital in the spring for Jerusalem and restores the Cross. How are we to explain this error in the order of events ? We may at once notice that the material used by Theophanes contradicts his own chronology : the six years of warfare are 623<sup>40</sup> to 628 ; the 'Sabbatic year' is therefore 629, and not as Theophanes gives, 628. The following paragraph is only offered tentatively as a contribution towards a possible solution.<sup>41</sup>

Emphasizing this qualification, I suggest that Theophanes had before him two sources, each of which was thoroughly well informed. He attempted to combine them and to fit them into his annalistic scheme, and the result has been confusion. One source (B) is represented for us by Georgius Monachus, Leo Grammaticus, Theodosius Melitenus, the unpublished Pseudo-Pisides, the unedited Constantinus Lascaris, and, apparently in a very abbreviated form by Michael Glycas ; further, in part

<sup>38</sup> Until the capture of the city by Saladin.

<sup>39</sup> Cf. Sergy, *Polnnyy Myezyzaiselov Vostoka*, 2nd ed., Vladimir (1901), II. ii. 375-6.

<sup>40</sup> That the second campaign of Heraclius began in 623 and not (as Gerland maintains) in 624 I have endeavoured to prove in a paper on 'The Date of the Avar Surprise' which will shortly appear in the *Byzantinische Zeitschrift*.

<sup>41</sup> For the unedited texts used by me for the following paragraph I am indebted to Sternbach, *Rozprawy, &c.*, pp. 35 seqq.

by Theophanes, Cedrenus, and the unedited Codex Parisinus Gr. 1712. The other source (A) can only be reconstructed from Theophanes himself and from the shorter and slightly different version in Cedrenus. Some subsequent chronicler made a conflation of A and B, and this conflation is represented in different ways by the unedited Symeon Magister, by Ephraemius, and in an individual form by Zonaras.<sup>42</sup> Source A was probably of eastern origin, and was not concerned with the affairs of Constantinople and the west; it had close affinities with the authority used (probably mediately) by Agapius of Hierapolis (cited above). Source B would seem to have been written in the capital, and to have made use of some part of the *Heraclias* of George of Pisidia now lost to us.<sup>43</sup> Source A contained a full account of the restoration of the Cross to Jerusalem, carefully dating the event—and, as we have seen, rightly—to the spring of 629. Theophanes determined to follow source A for Heraclius's visit to the holy city. It has, however, long been recognized that Theophanes has confused his chronology by placing the accession of Sheroc and the conclusion of peace in 627. Kretschmann's attempt to follow the chronology of Theophanes at this point was foredoomed to failure.<sup>44</sup> Owing to this antedating of the accession of Sheroc, and the Cross being restored only in 629, Theophanes was in difficulties as to how to fill up the year 628—what was the emperor doing during these twelve months? As he wrote, he had before him the western source (B), which after a summary mention of the setting up of the Cross in Jerusalem dealt at length with the return of Heraclius to Constantinople. He saw in this account an activity of the emperor which would provide material for the awkward hiatus in the chronological scheme which he had himself created by antedating events under the year 627. Clearly in 628, he argued, Heraclius returned to the capital. He accordingly adopted the western source (B) for his chronicle of the year 628, but having previously rightly determined to follow source A in placing the restoration of the Cross in the spring of 629, he naturally omitted the brief reference to that event which stood in source B before the account of the emperor's return to the capital. Thus when using source A for the year 629 he adapted it to his own composite scheme by

<sup>42</sup> The *Synopsis Sathae* (K. N. Sathas, *Μεσαιωνική Βιβλιοθήκη, τόμος ζ'* Venice, 1894, p. 108) stands alone, but has considerable resemblances to Theophanes.

<sup>43</sup> H. C. Rawlinson, 'The Site of the Atropatenian Ecbatana,' *Journal of the Royal Geographical Society*, x (1840), pp. 65-168, long ago showed that the *Heraclias*, as it has come down to us, extends only to the capture, not of Dastagero, but of Ganzaca (Takhti-Soleiman) in the first year of the second Persian campaign in 623. On the lost cantos of the *Heraclias* cf. Pernice, *op. cit.* xlii-xiv. I accept his arguments.

<sup>44</sup> Kretschmann, *Die Kämpfe zwischen Heraclius I und Chosroes II*, Teil i, Programm, Domschule zu Güstrow, 1875, Teil ii, 1876.

adding the words ἀπὸ τῆς βασιλευούσης πόλεως (328<sup>13-14</sup>), thus making Heraclius depart for Jerusalem from Constantinople, in which he was, of course, in error.

Before tracing the two sources in our authorities it is only right to note a possible consequence of this hypothesis. As we have seen, source B states fully the theory of the *μυστικὴ θεωρία*. Those who have studied long and closely the style and thought of George of Pisidia must, I think, agree with Sternbach<sup>45</sup> that this whole conception can only have arisen in the pious fancy of the court poet, and, following Pernice's argument, almost as certainly must have appeared in the lost cantos of the *Heraclias*. If this were so, a source of Theophanes had already used the poems of George as material for a prose chronicle. We might thus be led to the conclusion that the account given by Theophanes of the Persian campaigns was derived by him only mediately from George of Pisidia, and that he was here transcribing the work of an earlier historian.

#### *Traces of A and B in the Byzantine Historians*

Source A. Its reconstruction for the purpose of this note (with which cf. Agapius, p. 72).

Theophanes, 327<sup>19</sup>, εἰρήνης (δὲ) γενομένης μεταξύ Περσῶν καὶ Ῥωμαίων, ἀπίστευτον ὁ βασιλεὺς Θεόδωρον τὸν ἑαυτοῦ ἀδελφὸν (τὸν ἀδελφὸν αὐτοῦ Cedr. I 735 Bonn) μετὰ γραμμάτων καὶ ἀνθρώπων Σιρόου, τοῦ βασιλέως Περσῶν (μετὰ γ. Σιρόῃ τῷ βασιλεῖ Περσῶν καὶ ἀνθρώπων αὐτοῦ Cedr.), ὅπως τοὺς ἐν Ἐδέσῃ καὶ Παλαιστίνῃ καὶ Ἱεροσολύμοις (κ. Ἱερ. om. Cedr.) καὶ ταῖς λοιπαῖς πόλεσι τῶν Ῥωμαίων (τ. Ῥω. om. Cedr.) Πέρσας μετὰ εἰρήνης (μετ' εἰρήνης Cedr.) ἀποστρέψωσιν ἐν Περσίδι καὶ ἀβλαβῶς παρέλθωσι τὴν τῶν Ῥωμαίων γῆν. (ἐν δὲ τῷ ἑνεακαιδεκάτῳ ἔτει τῆς βασιλείας αὐτοῦ) Theoph. 328<sup>13</sup> ἀπάρas ὁ βασιλεὺς ἅμα ἔαρι [ἀπὸ τῆς βασιλευούσης πόλεως secludendum, cf. supra] ἐπὶ τὰ Ἱεροσόλυμα ἐπορεύετο ἀπαγαγὼν τὰ τίμα καὶ ζυφοποιὰ ξύλα τοῦ ἀποδοῦναι τῷ θεῷ τὴν εὐχαριστίαν. ἐλθόντι δὲ αὐτῷ ἐν Τιβεριάδι, κ.τ.λ. usque ad 328,<sup>20</sup>: [haec omnia semper ab inferioris aetatis scriptoribus omissa] εἰσελθὼν δὲ ὁ βασιλεὺς ἐν Ἱεροσολύμοις καὶ ἀποκαταστήσας Ζαχαρίαν τὸν πατριάρχην καὶ τὰ τίμα καὶ ζυφοποιὰ ξύλα εἰς τὸν ἴδιον τόπον καὶ πολλὰ εὐχαριστήσας τῷ θεῷ ἀπῆλασε τοὺς Ἑβραίους ἀπὸ τῆς ἁγίας πόλεως . . . usque ad πλησιάζειν. καταλαβὼν δὲ τὴν Ἐδέσαν ἀπέδωκε τὴν ἐκκλησίαν τοῖς ὀρθοδόξοις, κ.τ.λ. (Theoph. 328<sup>13</sup> sqq. = Cedrenus τῷ ἴσ' ἔτει ἅμα ἔαρι ἀπάρas ὁ βασιλεὺς τῆς βασιλίδος ἐπὶ τὰ Ἱεροσόλυμα ἐπορεύθη καὶ ἀπῆγαγε τὰ τίμα καὶ ζυφοποιὰ ξύλα καὶ ἀποδοὺς τῷ θεῷ τὴν εὐχαριστίαν ἀποκατέστησε τὸν πατριάρχην Ζαχαρίαν. [sequuntur Iudaeorum exclusio et Nestorianorum ex Edessa expulsio.]

Source A appears otherwise only to be found in a conflation with source B; cf. *infra*.

Source B. Its reconstruction for the purpose of this note.

A good representative of source B is Georgius Monachus:<sup>46</sup> there are

<sup>45</sup> *Rozprawy, &c.*, pp. 35 seqq.

<sup>46</sup> Ed. De Boor, ii. 672.

only slight verbal differences between the text of Georgius Monachus and that of Leo Grammaticus<sup>47</sup> and Theodosius Melitenus.<sup>48</sup> I have, however, inserted in brackets ( ) the most important variations of the chronicle of Pseudo-Pisides, Codex Matritensis Palat. 40, f. 408 *seqq.*

(Heraclius) οὐκ ἐφείσατο κατασφάζων καὶ πυρπολῶν καὶ καταστρέφων πᾶσαν τὴν Περσιδα ἐν ἔτεσιν ἕξ. τῷ δὲ ἑβδόμῳ ἔτει τὰ ζυφοκῶα ξύλα τοῦ πανσέπτου σταυροῦ ἀναλαβῶν εἰς Ἱερουσαλὴμ παραγενόμενος (τὰ τίμια ξύλα ἀπὸ Περσιδος ἀναλαβῶν καὶ εἰς Ἱερ. παραγ.) καὶ ταῦτα καθηψώσας μετὰ πολλῆς χαρᾶς καὶ εἰρήνης ἐπὶ τὴν Κωνσταντινούπολιν ὑπέστρεψε μυστικὴν τινα θεωρίαν ἐν τούτῳ πληρώσας· ὡσπερ γὰρ ἐν ἡμέραις ἕξ ὁ θεὸς πᾶσαν τὴν κτίσιν δημιουργήσας τὴν ἑβδόμην ἀναπαύσεως ἡμέραν ἐκάλεσεν, οὕτω δὴ καὶ οὗτος ἐν τοῖς ἕξ χρόνοις πολλοὺς διανύσας πολέμους<sup>49</sup> καὶ κοπιῶσας, ἐν τῷ ἑβδόμῳ ἔτει μετ' εἰρήνης ὑποστρέψας ἀνεπαύσατο. οἱ δὲ τῆς πόλεως τὴν ἔλκεσιν αὐτοῦ γνόντες ἀκατασχέτῳ πῶψ πάντες εἰς τὴν Ἱερίαν ἐξῆλθον (ἐν τοῖς παλατίοις τῆς Ἱερίας ἐξῆλθον), σὺν τῷ πατριάρχῳ καὶ Κωνσταντίνῳ τῷ βασιλεῖ καὶ νιῷ αὐτοῦ, βασιάζοντες κλάδους ἐλαιῶν καὶ λαμπάδας εὐφημοῦντες αὐτὸν μετὰ πολλῆς εὐφροσύνης. καὶ ὁ μὲν υἱὸς αὐτοῦ προσελθὼν ἔπεσεν εἰς τοὺς πόδας τοῦ πατρός, ὁ δὲ πατήρ περιπλακείς τῷ υἱῷ κατέβριξαν ἀμφότεροι τὴν γῆν τοῖς δάκρυσιν· ὡσπερ θεασάμενος ὁ λαὸς εὐχαριστηρίους ὕμνους τῷ θεῷ σὺν δάκρυσιν ἀνέπεμπον καὶ οὕτω λαβόντες τὸν βασιλεῖα χαίροντες εὐφημοῦντες. κροτοῦντες εἰσῆλθον ἐν τῇ πόλει (εἰσῆλθον εἰς τὸ παλάτιον).

Later traces of this hypothetical source (B).

Theophanes, 327<sup>54</sup>, treats source B thus :

628 : ὁ δὲ βασιλεὺς ἐν ἕξ ἔτεσι καταπολεμήσας τὴν Περσιδα τῷ ζ' ἔτει εἰρηνεύσας μετὰ χαρᾶς μεγάλης ἐπὶ Κωνσταντινούπολιν ὑπέστρεψε (omni crucis mentione omissa et restitutione crucis in annum 629 translata) μυστικὴν τινα θεωρίαν ἐν τούτῳ πληρώσας. ἐν γὰρ ἕξ ἡμέραις πᾶσαν τὴν κτίσιν δημιουργήσας ὁ θεὸς τὴν ἑβδόμην ἀναπαύσεως ἡμέραν ἐκάλεσεν· οὕτω καὶ αὐτὸς ἐν τοῖς ἕξ χρόνοις πολλοὺς πόνους διανύσας<sup>50</sup> τῷ ἑβδόμῳ ἔτει μετ' εἰρήνης καὶ χαρᾶς ἐν τῇ πόλει ὑποστρέψας ἀνεπαύσατο. ὁ δὲ λαὸς τῆς πόλεως τὴν ἔλκεσιν αὐτοῦ μαθόντες ἀκατασχέτῳ πῶψ πάντες εἰς τὴν Ἱερίαν ἐξῆλθον εἰς συνάντησιν αὐτοῦ σὺν τῷ πατριάρχῳ καὶ Κωνσταντίνῳ τῷ βασιλεῖ καὶ νιῷ αὐτοῦ, βασιάζοντες κλάδους ἐλαιῶν καὶ λαμπάδας, εὐφημοῦντες αὐτὸν μετὰ χαρᾶς καὶ δακρῶν· προσελθὼν δὲ ὁ υἱὸς αὐτοῦ ἔπεσεν ἐπὶ τοὺς πόδας αὐτοῦ καὶ περιπλακείς αὐτῷ ἔβριξαν ἀμφότεροι τὴν γῆν τοῖς δάκρυσιν. τοῦτο θεασάμενος ὁ λαὸς ἅπαντες εὐχαριστηρίους ὕμνους τῷ θεῷ ἀνέπεμπον· καὶ οὕτω λαβόντες τὸν βασιλεῖα σικρωτῶντες εἰσῆλθον ἐν τῇ πόλει.

Cedrenus, i. 735, represents an abbreviated form of Theophanes.

Following on καὶ ἀβλαβῶς παρελθούσι τὴν τῶν Ῥωμαίων γῆν of the hypothetical source (A) he proceeds μυστικὸν δὲ τι ἐνταῦθα θεωρεῖται· τὴν γὰρ κτίσιν πᾶσαν ὁ θεὸς ἐν ἕξ ἡμέραις ἐποίησε καὶ τῇ ζ' ἀνεπαύσατο καὶ ὁ βασιλεὺς ἐν ἕξ ἔτεσι τὴν Περσιδα καταπολεμήσας τῷ ζ' εἰρήνευσε καὶ μετὰ χαρᾶς τὴν Κωνσταντινούπολιν καταλαμβάνει. ὁ δὲ λαὸς τῆς πόλεως μετὰ τοῦ βασιλέως Κων-

<sup>47</sup> Pp. 152 *seqq.* (Bonn).

<sup>48</sup> Ed. Tafel, in *Monumenta Saecularia*, published by the Königl. bayerische Akademie der Wissenschaften, Munich, 1859, pp. 105 *seqq.*

<sup>49</sup> Here Theophanes represents more nearly than Georgius Monachus the original text of B = George of Pisidia. αὐτός for the emperor is a peculiarity of the style of the poet, and George does not use *πάλεμος* save in one place, *Exp. Pers.* iii. 63, which Sternbach has emended; *Rozprawy*, &c., p. 18.

σταντίου τοῦ υἱοῦ τοῦ Ἡρακλείου καὶ τοῦ πατριάρχου Σεργίου, μετὰ κλάδων ἐλαίων καὶ λαμπάδων τοῦτον ὑποδεξάμενος εὐχαριστοῦντες τῷ θεῷ εἰς τὰ βασιλῆα εἰσήγαγον.

The text of the unpublished Codex Parisinus Gr. 1712, f. 180<sup>v</sup> seqq. is extremely instructive and deserves careful study. It represents the effort of an unskilful scribe to combine the text of Theophanes with the shorter version of Cedrenus. It is, I should imagine, but rarely that one has so good an opportunity of watching a conflation in the making. The manuscript is by Sternbach denoted Π, and I reproduce from him the actual text, of which he himself has not noted the full significance.

ὁ δὲ βασιλεὺς ἐν ἑξ ἔτει τὴν Περσίδα καταπολεμήσας τῷ ζ' ἔτη εἰρηνεύσας μετὰ χαρᾶς μεγάλης ἐπι (sine accentu) Κωνσταντινουπόλεως ὑπέστραψε μυστικὴν τινὰ θεωρίαν ἐν τούτῳ πληρώσας· ἐν γὰρ ἑξ ἡμέραις πᾶσαν τὴν κτίσιν δημιουργήσας ὁ θεὸς τὴν ἑβδόμην ἀναπαύσεως ἡμέραν ἐκάλεσεν οὕτω καὶ αὐτὸς ἐν τοῖς ἑξ (inc. f. 181<sup>r</sup>.) χρόνοις πολλοὺς πόνους διανοίσας τῷ ἑβδόμῳ ἔτει μετ' εἰρήνης καὶ χαρᾶς ἐν τῇ πόλει ὑποστράψας ἀνεπαύσατο. ὁ δὲ λαὸς τῆς πόλεως μετὰ τοῦ βασιλέως Κωνσταντίνου τοῦ υἱοῦ Ἡρακλείου καὶ τοῦ πατριάρχου Σεργίου μαθίνας τὴν ἱλυσιν τοῦ βασιλέως ἐξῆλθεν εἰς συνάντησιν αὐτοῦ σὺν τῷ πατριάρχῳ καὶ Κωνσταντίνῳ τῷ βασιλεῖ καὶ υἱῷ αὐτοῦ βαστάζοντες κλάδους ἐλαίων καὶ λαμπάδων εὐφημοῦντες αὐτὸν μετὰ χαρᾶς. προσελθὼν δὲ ὁ υἱὸς αὐτοῦ ἔπεσεν ἐπὶ τοὺς πόδας αὐτοῦ καὶ περιπλακεῖς αὐτῷ ἱβρεῶν ἀμφότεροι τὴν γῆν τοῖς δάκρυσι. τοῦτο θεασάμενος ὁ λαὸς πάντες εὐχαριστήριους ὕμνους τῷ Θεῷ ἀνέπεμπον καὶ οὕτω λαβόντες τὸν βασιλέα σκιρτῶντες εἰς τὰ βασιλῆα εἰσήγαγον.

It is impossible, so far as I am aware, to follow further the hypothetical source (B) in the form which it took in the hands of Theophanes, Cedrenus, and the scribe of Π. But the unedited Constantinus Lascaris of Codex Matritensis, iv. 72 (f. 170<sup>r</sup>) represents another and independent abbreviation of B. He writes :

καὶ ἑξ ἔτη τοὺς Πέρσας ἰδόν· τῷ δὲ ἑβδόμῳ ἀναλαβὼν τὸ ζῳποῖον αἶγον ξύλον καὶ ἄλλα καὶ εἰς Ἱερουσαλὴμ παραγενόμενος ἴψωσε. καὶ μετὰ ταῦτα ἐπανήκεν εἰς τὴν πόλιν φ' ὑπήντησαν πάντες περιχαρῶς μετὰ κλάδων ἐλαίων καὶ λιμπάδων δορυφορουμένῳ καὶ ὁ υἱὸς αὐτοῦ Κωνσταντίνος.

It will be noted that the proper order of events as it stood in the original form of B before Theophanes operated upon it is here restored.

I am further inclined to think, though this might be disputed, that Michael Glycas<sup>60</sup> represents another independent, original, and highly abbreviated form of B (with reminiscences from other parts of B ?) :

ἐν ἑξ ἔτει πᾶσαν καθελὼν τὴν Περσίδα καὶ αὐτὸν τὸν Χοσρόην, ὃς ἑαυτὸν ἀπεθίωσε, πρὸς τούτοις δὲ καὶ τὸ τρίμον ξύλον ἐπανασώσας (ἔτυχε γὰρ ἀπὸ Ἱεροσολύμων σκυλευθῆναι) λαμπρῶς ἐπανάειξε.

We have now reached the last stage of this inquiry. Some later authority attempted to combine sources A and B, and we have now to seek the traces of this conflation.

We find it in the unedited Symeon Magister of the Codex Escorialensis, Y. 1. 4, f. 62<sup>v</sup>.

Τὰ ζῳποῖα ξύλα καὶ τὸν πατριάρχην Ζαχαρίαν ἐν Ἱεροσολύμοις ἀπεκατέστησε μεγαλοπρεπῶς ὑποστράψας ἐν τῇ βασιλίδι τῶν πόλεων· ὃν ὁ πατριάρχης Σέργιος καὶ Κωνσταντίνος ὁ [υἱὸς αὐτοῦ καὶ] βασιλεὺς καὶ υἱὸς αὐτοῦ σὺν παντὶ τῷ λαφῷ μεθ' ὅσης τῆς ἡδονῆς ὑπεδέξαντο, ἐλαίων (sic) κλάδους καὶ λαμπάδας κατέχοντες.

<sup>60</sup> p. 512. 12 (Bonn).

The unmistakable conjunction of the restoration of Cross and patriarch can only represent A, and the now familiar text of B reappears.

The same fusion, with alterations demanded by the exigencies of a metrical form, appears in Ephraemius, vv. 1395-1400 :<sup>51</sup>

ταῦτ' ἐν χρόνις ἐξ Ἡράκλειος ἀνάσας  
 ξύλα τε σεπτὰ καὶ Σιών ἀρχιθύτην  
 Ἱερουσαλήμ ἐγκαταστήσας πύλει  
 πρὸς βασιλίδα καθυποστρέφει πόλιν  
 ἐν ἑβδόμῳ κάλλιστα χαίρων τῷ χρόνῳ  
 ἱμνούμενος στόμασιν ἀστῶν μυρίων.

We have yet another representative of this class in Zonaras, xiv. 16. 22,<sup>52</sup> together with what is probably an addition by Zonaras himself :

ταῦτα ἐν ἑξ ἔτεσιν ἀνάσας Ἡράκλειος καὶ ἀποκαταστήσας τῇ Ἱερουσαλήμ τὴν τίμια ξύλα καὶ τὸν πατριάρχην αὐτόν, τῷ ἑβδόμῳ ἐπανήλθεν εἰς τὴν βασιλείαν μετ' εὐφημίας καὶ κρότων δεχθεὶς καὶ λαμπρότητος παρὰ τε τῆς γεροσύνης (a Zonara interpositum ?) καὶ τοῦ πλήθους τῆς πόλεως.

Notice that the true order of events is restored, and that therefore this fusion was not made through consulting the chronicle of Theophanes or Cedrenus.

(vi) With regard to the contradictions in the eastern authorities,<sup>53</sup> it should be borne in mind that the terms of the peace with Persia were (1) evacuation of Roman territory by the Persians and on each side the surrender of prisoners of war, and (2) the restoration of the Holy Cross. Thus as each successive ruler of Persia entered into treaty relations with Rome it was concluded that these were the terms agreed upon between the two empires, the chroniclers thus ignoring the fact that the Cross had reached the hands of Heraclius by the close of the year 628.<sup>54</sup> The negotiations were begun by Sheroc, the Cross itself was perhaps restored under Ardeshir (ascended the throne October 628), Sahrbaráz ultimately accepted (July 629) the condition that Roman territory should be evacuated, and when with the aid of Roman troops he had overthrown Ardeshir only to fall a victim to assassination after a forty-days' rule, his successor, the Queen Bórán, felt it imperative to placate the emperor through an imposing embassy of Christian prelates.<sup>55</sup> The terms accepted in each case were apparently the same, and thus the restoration of the Cross has been attributed to each sovereign in turn,<sup>56</sup> although as a matter of fact neither Sahrbaráz nor Bórán was concerned in the matter.

<sup>51</sup> p. 65 (Bonn).

<sup>52</sup> Vol. iii, pp. 211-12 (Bonn).

<sup>53</sup> Most of these are tabulated and classified by Bolotov in a note on p. 84.

<sup>54</sup> 'Die verschiedenen Unterhandlungen und Gesandtschaften der rasch wechselnden (persischen) Fürsten konnten schon von den Zeitgenossen leicht verwechselt werden,' Nöldeke, *Chron. Guidi*, p. 32, n. 1.

<sup>55</sup> Cf. *supra*, p. 288, n. 7.

<sup>56</sup> An interesting parallel to this confusion may be seen in Nicephorus, who although he knows that the Cross was restored in 629 yet attributes that restoration to Sahrbaráz, who only ascended the Persian throne in 630; cf. 21<sup>12</sup> with 22<sup>14</sup>.

(vii) Lastly, there remains an unexplained difficulty. The eastern church had long observed a festival in honour of the invention of the Cross,<sup>57</sup> celebrated on 14 September,<sup>58</sup> and did not apparently introduce a new celebration to commemorate its restoration, but joined this to the older rite. This new celebration was, however, introduced in the west, and such a commemorative festival can be traced as early as c. 650.<sup>59</sup> This was observed on 3 May. Why was this date chosen? Is it possible that the fragment of the true Cross sent by the emperor to Constantinople reached the capital on this date?<sup>60</sup>

We are at the end of our discussion, and as a result it would appear that we may safely accept the date given by Antiochus Strategos for the solemn restoration of the Cross in Jerusalem, viz. 21 March, and further that this took place in the year 629.

NORMAN H. BAYNES.

### Burgundian Notes

#### II. CISALPINUS AND CONSTANTINUS<sup>1</sup>

FLODOARD of Rheims is conspicuous among mediæval annalists for his orderliness and precision. He relates facts as they came to his knowledge. He does not think it his business to examine the relations of cause and effect: he simply sets down the in-

<sup>57</sup> So rightly the pilgrim Theodosius about 530: P. Geyer, *Itinera Hierosolymitana Saeculi IIII-VIII*, Vindobonae, 1898 (*Corpus Scriptorum Eccles. Lat.* xxxix. 149). More usually the festival is known as the ἑπέσις τοῦ τιμίου καὶ φησσοῦ σταυροῦ ὁ τῶν ἁγίων ἔθλων; thence its western name Exaltatio Crucis: cf. Arculf in Adamnanus, *De locis Sanctis*, 3. 3; Geyer, *op. cit.*, pp. 286. 22, 287. 3 *seqq.*, 288. 11, 295. 21, 322. 14.

<sup>58</sup> This festival was only known in the west in the eighth century, and won its way to acceptance slowly and partially. It was received quite late in many churches, e.g. in Milan in 1035.

<sup>59</sup> Cf. K. A. Heinrich Kellner, *Heortology*, London, 1908, pp. 333-41; and for further information on the subject see von Maltzew, *Myesyatseslov pravoslavnoi Katolicheskoï Vostochnoi Tserkvi*, pt. i, pp. 81, 93, Berlin, 1900; G. Debol'sky, *Dni Bogoluzheniya prav. Kath. Vost. Tserkvi*, Kniga i, pp. 84, 91, St. Petersburg, 1846. It is interesting to notice that in the west the festival celebrated for the victory of Heraclius on 12 December 627 continued to be observed for a longer period than in the east, and was kept on the same day as the commemoration of the exaltation of the Cross. For the evidence of this compare S. A. Morcelli, *Μηρολόγιον τῶν Εὐαγγελίων Ἑορταστικόν εἰς Calendarium Ecclesiae Constantinopolitanæ*, Rome, 1788, i. 266-7; and Sergy, *Polnuy Myesyatseslov Vostoka*, Moscow, 1876, II. i. 327; and Zamyetki, II. ii. 289 *seqq.*, 2nd ed., Vladimir, 1901, II. i. 383, II. ii. 374 *seqq.*

<sup>60</sup> I am unable to offer any suggestion why the Egyptian and Abyssinian Synaxaria give for 6 March a Manifestatio S. Crucis per Heraclium Imp.

<sup>1</sup> The first of these notes appeared last year (xxvi. 310-17). The present paper was in part written very long ago, but I have only recently had the opportunity of putting my materials into shape. I am again under great obligations to my friend the Rev. W. A. B. Coolidge, who has directed me to a good deal of evidence which would probably have otherwise eluded me; but I have no reason to suppose that he shares the views which I here advocate.