



Johann Anton Zieme (Halle)

 <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-9742-0439>

THE *DE HAERESIBUS ET SYNODIS* OF GERMANOS I OF CONSTANTINOPLE AS A SOURCE ON EARLY BYZANTINE HERESIES? PROSPECTS OF A CRITICAL EDITION*

Abstract. A new, critical edition of the 8th-century treatise *De haeresibus et synodis* (CPG 8020) by Patriarch Germanus I of Constantinople is in progress; it will provide new insights, especially into the large extent of sources that were copied or paraphrased. The article takes a close look at three chapters that could be considered as sources for different Christian heresies (Manichaeism, Montanism and Christological dissenters) in 8th-century Byzantium and some of the first new text- and source-critical findings. The accounts on Manichaeism and Montanism are based on older, lost sources and can therefore not be consulted as historical sources on these heresies in the Early Byzantine age. The account of the Ecumenical Councils involved in the Christological controversies attributes faith formulas to Councils that did not actually issue them and thus must be dismissed as a historical source on the course of these controversies as well. Nevertheless all three chapters, like the rest of the treatise, testify to the views of an Early Byzantine theologian on heresies and Church Councils and to how he reached his views. This scope for further study is deduced from the character of the text itself and thus especially appropriate.

Keywords: *De haeresibus et synodis*, Patriarch Germanus I of Constantinople, critical edition, Christian heresies, Church Councils, Byzantium

One of the major obstacles to writing the history of Byzantium and Byzantine Christianity in the 7th and 8th centuries is the scarcity of sources. This is even more the case when one is interested in the large field of Christian “heresies”¹. It is nevertheless essential to study such a source with the right approach, an approach that is best deduced from the character of the source itself.

* This article is an extended version of my paper presented at the *Colloquia Ceranea* III in April of 2021. It could be improved thanks to some helpful comments by its reviewers.

¹ In this article, I will be using the term “heresy” and its cognates (without quotation marks hereafter) for just the same religious groups as in the sources consulted, only in order to simplify. No dogmatic judgement is intended hereby.

The mid-size treatise *De haeresibus et synodis* (CPG 8020) attributed to Patriarch Germanus I of Constantinople (in office 715–730)² is considered as one of the main sources on Christian heresies in 7th- and 8th-century Byzantium, e.g. in two overview articles on this topic by J. Gouillard³ and I. Rochow⁴. However, any approach to this work remains problematic, as the only edition available to us is non-critical and heavily outdated. It was edited by cardinal A. Mai and published in 1842⁵, based on only one manuscript (cod. Vat. gr. 2198). This edition was reprinted without changes by J.-P. Migne in his *Patrologia graeca*⁶. With the aim of facilitating research on Germanus' treatise and Early Byzantine Christianity in general, the first part of my doctoral thesis consists of the critical edition of the *De haeresibus et synodis*, based on all accessible manuscripts⁷. An important feature of this new edition, next to the critical apparatus, will be an apparatus of

² There are quite a few reasons to challenge this attribution (cf. the summary by L. BRUBAKER, J. HALDON, *Byzantium in the Iconoclast Era (ca 680–850). The Sources. An Annotated Survey. With a Section on The Architecture of Iconoclasm: the Buildings* by R. OUSTERHOUT, Aldershot 2001 [= BBOM, 7], p. 247–248, leading them to conclude that the whole treatise is inauthentic), but this is not the place to discuss this matter at length. In my forthcoming thesis, I will plead for the authenticity of *De haeresibus et synodis* except for cap. 40–43. For this article, the assumption that Germanus is the author of the chapters in question shall suffice.

³ Cf. J. GOUILLARD, *L'hérésie dans l'empire byzantin des origines au XII^e siècle*, TM 1, 1965 (= *La vie religieuse à Byzance*, ed. IDEM, London 1981, no I), p. 304–306.

⁴ Cf. I. ROCHOW, *Zu einigen oppositionellen religiösen Strömungen*, [in:] *Byzanz im 7. Jahrhundert. Untersuchungen zur Herausbildung des Feudalismus*, ed. F. WINKELMANN et al., Berlin 1978 [= BBA, 48], p. 265.

⁵ *Spicilegium Romanum*, vol. VII, S. Germani I. Patriarchae Constantinopolitani *De haeresibus et synodis. Photii item Patr. Syntagma canonum*, ed. A. MAI, Roma 1842, p. 3–73. The Latin translation printed below the Greek text was produced by A. Mai as well (it is not an ancient translation).

⁶ GERMANUS, *De haeresibus et synodis* (CPG 8020), [in:] PG, vol. XCVIII, col. 39–88 (cetera: GERMANUS, *De haeresibus et synodis*). As the *Patrologia* is more easily accessible than A. Mai's *Spicilegium Romanum*, all references will be made to this reprint. Another reprint with slight changes to the text is to be found in *Σύνταγμα τῶν θείων καὶ ἱερῶν κανόνων τῶν τε ἁγίων καὶ πανευφημῶν ἀποστόλων, καὶ τῶν ἱερῶν οἰκουμενικῶν καὶ τοπικῶν συνόδων, καὶ τῶν κατὰ μέρος ἁγίων πατέρων, ἐκδοθέν, σὺν πλείσταις ἄλλαις τὴν ἐκκλησιαστικὴν κατάστασιν διεπούσαις διατάξεσι, μετὰ τῶν ἀρχαίων ἐξηγητῶν, Καὶ διαφόρων ἀναγνωσμάτων*, vol. I, Φωτίου πατριάρχου Κωνσταντινουπόλεως Νομοκανῶν, μετὰ τῶν σχολίων Θεοδώρου τοῦ Βαλσαμῶνος. Τούτοις προσετέθησαν καὶ τὰ περὶ τῶν ἁγίων καὶ οἰκουμενικῶν συνόδων, ὑπὸ τε Γερμανοῦ καὶ Φωτίου, τῶν πατριάρχων Κωνσταντινουπόλεως, καὶ Νεῖλου, μητροπολίτου Ῥόδου, κτλ. Συνοπτικῶς ἱστορούμενα, ed. Γ.Α. ΡΑΛΛΗΣ, Μ. ΠΟΤΑΝΗΣ, Ἀθήνησιν 1852, p. 339–369. So far there is one modern translation, into Italian: *Timoteo e Germano di Costantinopoli. Gli scritti. Introduzione, traduzione e note*, trans. F. CARCIONE, Roma 1993 [= CTP, 107], p. 75–115.

⁷ The database *Pinakes* offers a quick overview: [https://pinakes.irht.cnrs.fr/notices/oeuvre/2793/\[30 VII 2021\]](https://pinakes.irht.cnrs.fr/notices/oeuvre/2793/[30 VII 2021]). The edition will be complemented by a German translation and a historical contextual study.

textual sources, based on an extensive search for implicit quotations (copied text), paraphrases and allusions⁸.

In this article, I will present three passages from Germanus' *De haeresibus et synodis* that could be considered as sources on certain heretical groups in 7th–8th-century Byzantium⁹ and some results of my text- and source-critical research¹⁰. On the basis of these results, I will then reassess whether considering them as historical sources on Early Byzantine heresies is appropriate – and if not, for what they *can* serve as sources. Thus I will deduce an approach for further study of the *De haeresibus et synodis* from the character of the text itself.

Germanus on the Manichaeans

The heresy of Manichaeism is presented in cap. 4 of *De haeresibus et synodis*, with a short account of some of its teachings, Mani's activities and the Christian refutation by Cyril of Jerusalem. This chapter does not rank among the most interesting Western sources on Manichaeism¹¹, due to its late date. There are nevertheless two reasons why it may be of interest to Byzantine studies: first, some major heresies of the Middle Byzantine period are, in one way or another, associated with Manichaeism, most prominently Paulicianism and Bogomilism¹². Therefore any historical evidence for actual Manichaeans still living in the Byzantine world and for their beliefs would be very welcome¹³. A second reason is that Germanus actually gives a list of Mani's books that is not extant in any other source (more on that below).

The research linked to the critical edition of *De haeresibus et synodis* has shown that the wording of this chapter is very close to two other texts, the *Chronicle* of Georgius Monachus and the *Church History* of Socrates Scholasticus. Here a synopsis of the comparable passages:

⁸ This search was mostly done by means of – and made only possible thanks to – the *Thesaurus Linguae Graecae*. Very few references to possible sources were included by A. Mai in his edition, which are now updated and rendered more precisely.

⁹ Some of the heresies that may raise interest will not be considered in this article: the Athinganoi and the Paulianists on the one hand (referenced in GERMANUS, *De haeresibus et synodis*, cap. 48, PG, vol. XCVIII, col. 84), because the short remarks referring to them actually obscure more than they convey (cf. J. GOUILLARD, *L'hérésie...*, p. 306–307); and Iconoclasm (dealt with in GERMANUS, *De haeresibus et synodis*, cap. 40–43, PG, vol. XCVIII, col. 77–81), because it deserves more attention than can be paid to it in the limited space of this paper.

¹⁰ Naturally, not all questions raised by the concerning passages can be discussed in the following lines. The patient reader shall be referred to my thesis.

¹¹ It is e.g. not included in the compendium *Greek and Latin Sources on Manichaean Cosmogony and Ethics*, trans. G. FOX, J. SHELDON, praef. S.N.C. LIEU, Turnhout 2010 [= CFM. Series Subsidia, 6] (cetera: *Greek and Latin Sources*).

¹² Cf. e.g. J. GOUILLARD, *L'hérésie...*, p. 307–309.

¹³ For an important legal mention of Manichaeism in 8th-century Byzantium see below, note 26.

	GERMANUS, <i>De haeresibus et synodis</i> , cap. 4 ¹⁴	
5	Ἔτι δὲ Μανιχαῖοι, καὶ Μοντανοὶ, καὶ οἱ τούτοις προσόμοιοι ἀνέστησαν κατ' αὐτῆς οὐ τοὺς τυχόντας αὐτῇ παρέχοντες ἀγῶνας, τοῦ μὲν Μανιχαίου πολλὴν ματαιοσύνην καὶ πλάνην καὶ ῥυπαρίαν τοῖς ἑαυτοῦ δόγμασιν ἀναμιξάντος,	
		GEORGIUS MONACHUS, VIII, 44, vol. II, p. 469, 11–15 ¹⁵
10	καὶ τέλος τὴν μὲν ἑαυτοῦ παλαιὰν νομοθεσίαν καὶ αὐτὴν τὴν κτίσιν κακοῦ τινος καὶ οὐκ ἀγαθοῦ εἶναι λέγοντος ἐπίταγμα, ἀγαθοῦ δὲ μᾶλλον τὴν νέαν ἢ τὴν μέλλουσαν, καὶ βίαν τινὰ ὑπομένειν ἐκείνην ἐκ τούτου,	Ὁ τοίνυν ἐμβρόντητος οὗτος Μάνης ἀποβαλλόμενος τὴν παλαιὰν διαθήκην καὶ τὴν κτίσιν πᾶσαν [...] οὐκ ἀγαθοῦ τινος θεοῦ γεγονέναι βλασφημῶν [...], τὴν νέαν ὡς ἀγαθοῦ δῆθεν προσίεται θεοῦ,
		SOCRATES SCHOLASTICUS, I, 22, 3, p. 66, 21–22 ¹⁶
15	ὡς καὶ δύο φύσεις νομοθετεῖν ἐν τῷ κόσμῳ, τουτέστιν ἀγαθὴν τε καὶ πονηράν,	δύο φύσεις εἰπῶν, ἀγαθὴν τε καὶ πονηράν
		GEORGIUS MONACHUS, VIII, 44, vol. II, p. 469, 12–14
20	καὶ μὴ ἀγαθοῦ εἶναι τὴν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου κατασκευὴν ἔργον, μῆτε τὴν ἄλλην, ὡς εἴρηται, κτίσιν ὑπὸ φθορὰν καὶ ἀλλοίωσιν οὔσαν· καὶ πλήρεις ἀσεβείας τοὺς ἑαυτοῦ λόγους ἐμπλήσαντος,	καὶ τὴν κτίσιν πᾶσαν καὶ τὴν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου κατασκευὴν οὐκ ἀγαθοῦ τινος θεοῦ γεγονέναι βλασφημῶν ὑπὸ φθορὰν καὶ ἀλλοίωσιν οὔσαν,

¹⁴ The text is issued from my yet unpublished edition; the older edition is to be found in *PG*, vol. XC VIII, col. 41, B21–44, B2. Line numbers refer to the text of *De haeresibus et synodis*. An English translation of the three chapters this article deals with is attached to this article; the references to the sources are not repeated there.

¹⁵ *Georgii Monachi Chronicon*, VIII, 44, vol. II, *Textum genuinum inde a Vespasiani imperio continens*, ed. C. DE BOOR, *Editionem anni MCMIV correctiorem curavit P. WIRTH*, Stuttgartiae 1978 [= BSGR] (cetera: GEORGIUS MONACHUS), p. 469, 11–15.

¹⁶ *SOKRATES, Kirchengeschichte*, I, 22, 3, ed. G.C. HANSEN, M. ŠIRINJAN, Berlin 1995 [= GCS.NF, 1; CPG, 6028] (cetera: SOCRATES SCHOLASTICUS), p. 66, 21–22.

		GEORGIUS MONACHUS, VIII, 44, vol. II, p. 469, 17–18
	καταδύσεις τινὰς ἑναγεῖς καὶ νυκτερινὰς τελετὰς καὶ ἀποβλήτους μίξεις ἐπιτηδεύσαντος,	καταδύσεις τινὰς ἑναγεῖς καὶ νυκτερινὰς τελετὰς καὶ παρανόμους ἐπιτηδεύσας μίξεις
		GEORGIUS MONACHUS, VIII, 44, vol. II, p. 469, 20–21
25	τὰ τῶν Ἑλλήνων μάταια δόγματα κυρώσαντος,	τὰ τῶν Ἑλλήνων πονηρὰ καὶ μάταια δόγματα κρατύνειν ἐσπούδακεν
		SOCRATES SCHOLASTICUS, I, 22, 8, p. 67, 19
	καὶ εἰμαρμένην εἰσάγοντος, καὶ μετενσωματώσεις νομοθετήσαντος,	καὶ εἰμαρμένην εἰσάγων τὸ ἐφ’ ἡμῖν ἀναίρει, καὶ μετενσωμάτων ἰσομοιῶν δογματίζει
		GEORGIUS MONACHUS, VIII, 44, vol. II, p. 469, 18–19
		καὶ εἰμαρμένην καὶ μετενσωματώσεις καὶ ἄλλα πλείστα φλυαρήσας καὶ δράσας καὶ διδάξας
		SOCRATES SCHOLASTICUS, I, 22, 8, p. 67, 21
30	καὶ τὸν Χριστὸν ἐν σαρκὶ γεγονέναι μὴ βουληθέντος.	καὶ τὸν Χριστὸν ἐν σαρκὶ γεγονέναι οὐ βούλεται
		GEORGIUS MONACHUS, VIII, 44, vol. II, p. 469, 8–9
	Κάντευθεν τέλος ἐπάξιον τῆς τοιαύτης αὐτοῦ νομοθεσίας ἀπενεγκαμένου	ὑπὲρ δὲ τούτου μισθὸν ἐπάξιον εἰκότως κομίζεται
		GEORGIUS MONACHUS, VIII, 44, vol. II, p. 469, 3–4
35	ὑπὸ τινος τῶν ἐθνικῶν βασιλέων, ζῶντος ἔτι τὴν δορὰν ἀποσπασθῆναι,	ὃν ὁ βασιλεὺς Περσῶν ἐξέδειρε ζῶντα
40	ᾧς φασιν, καὶ οὕτως τῷ θανάτῳ παραδοθῆναι· μάλιστα δὲ Κύριλλος ὁ Ἱεροσολύμων τὴν τούτου κατεγράψατο καὶ ἐστηλίτευσεν ἀσεβῆ διάνοιαν, αὐτὰ τὰ πράγματα τὰ τῆς μιαρᾶς αὐτοῦ καὶ ἀσέμνου διατάξας κατὰ λεπτὸν προτάξας, καὶ εἶθ’ οὕτως τὸν ἔλεγχον ἐπαγαγὼν τοῖς ἀθέοις αὐτοῦ καὶ παρανόμοις διδάγμασιν·	

45	ὁ γὰρ ἀσεβῆς οὗτος ἐτόλμησε καὶ ἑαυτὸν ἀπόστολον ὀνομάσαι	SOCRATES SCHOLASTICUS, I, 22, 8, p. 67, 24
		Ἐν δὲ ταῖς ἐπιστολαῖς καὶ ἀπόστολον ὀνομάζειν ἐτόλμησεν ἑαυτόν.
	καὶ τέσσαρα συντάξει βιβλία, ἃ καὶ ἐπεκάλεσε· « Τὸ εὐαγγέλιον », « Τῶν θησαυρῶν βιβλίον », « Τῶν μυστηρίων », ἕτερον « Τῶν τελετῶν. »	SOCRATES SCHOLASTICUS, I, 22, 5, p. 67, 4–6
		Εἶτα συγγράφει βιβλία τέσσαρα, ἐν μὲν ἐπονομάσας τῶν Μυστηρίων, ἕτερον δὲ τὸ Εὐαγγέλιον καὶ τὸν Θησαυρὸν τρίτον καὶ τέταρτον τὸ τῶν Κεφαλαίων. Τελετὰς δὲ τινὰς ποιεῖν σχηματιζόμενος [...]

The similarities between the texts of Germanus and Socrates (l. 14–15, 29–30, 43–48) are easily explained: Germanus used Socrates' *Church History* (directly or indirectly) and paraphrased parts of its account of Manichaeism. The use of this source also explains how Germanus' unique list of Mani's books ('*The Gospel*', '*Book of the Treasures*', '[sc. Book] of the *Mysteries*' and the last one '[sc. Book] of the *Rituals*') came to be: by a misreading (possibly due to physical damage of a manuscript) of Socrates' τέταρτον τὸ τῶν Κεφαλαίων. Τελετὰς δὲ τινὰς ποιεῖν σχηματιζόμενος (*the fourth one: [sc. Book] of the Principles. He pretended to perform certain rituals...*)¹⁷.

Almost all the rest of this chapter has great similarities with the account in Georgius' *Chronicle*. With respect to the chronology of the two works, there can be two explanations: either Georgius copied from Germanus – or both of them copied from a common source. Germanus' wording is sometimes mistakable (e.g. in l. 7–9: τέλος τὴν μὲν ἑαυτοῦ παλαιὰν νομοθεσίαν [...] κακοῦ τινος καὶ οὐκ ἀγαθοῦ εἶναι λέγοντος¹⁸) and even repetitive (l. 8–9: αὐτὴν τὴν κτίσιν κακοῦ τινος καὶ οὐκ ἀγαθοῦ εἶναι λέγοντος ἐπίταγμα, and l. 16–17: καὶ μὴ ἀγαθοῦ εἶναι τὴν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου κατασκευὴν ἔργον, μήτε τὴν ἄλλην). Georgius' *Chronicle* in contrast phrases very clearly and without repetitions (ἀποβαλλόμενος τὴν παλαιὰν διαθήκην [...] οὐκ ἀγαθοῦ τινος θεοῦ, and καὶ τὴν κτίσιν πᾶσαν καὶ τὴν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου κατασκευὴν οὐκ ἀγαθοῦ τινος θεοῦ γεγονέναι). Also, the respective paragraph in Georgius' *Chronicle* contains more information¹⁹ which is unlikely to come from another source, because Georgius usually does not mix two or more

¹⁷ For more on that book list, see below, note 57.

¹⁸ Here, especially the ἑαυτοῦ is irritating. As this phrase can only mean the Old Testament, the reflexive pronoun cannot be understood as such, but must be seen as referring to κακοῦ τινος ("of some evil [sc. god]"). Three independent manuscripts of Germanus just omit it, but this must be dismissed as a *lectio facilior*. See as well below, note 54.

¹⁹ Cf. GEORGIUS MONACHUS, VIII, 44, vol. II, p. 469, 11–21.

different sources, but uses one after the other (as can be seen in the *apparatus fontium* of C. de Boor's edition). Thus the second possibility is much more plausible: both authors relied on the same source, a somehow anti-Manichaean text.

Furthermore, both texts share one sentence that was literally copied from Socrates (l. 27–28) and another sentence (l. 25–26) that summarises a passage where Socrates lists the Greek philosophers Mani allegedly followed with his teachings²⁰. Both Germanus and Georgius could not have come to copy the very same sentence and rephrase another passage with the exact same words independently from one another. This implies that the common source to them was at least partly based on Socrates' account²¹.

In conclusion, I postulate a lost and so far unknown anti-Manichaean text, that is attested by Germanus' *De haeresibus et synodis* and Georgius' *Chronicle* and partly based on Socrates' *Church History*²². This work must have been compiled between the 5th (with Socrates' *Church History* as *terminus post quem*) and early 8th centuries (predating Germanus' treatise). It is possible that Germanus also copied the remaining Socratic sentences (including the book list) from this text rather than directly from Socrates' *Church History*, but this cannot be determined.

Interestingly, the one text explicitly mentioned in this chapter (l. 36–42), Cyril of Jerusalem's sixth *Catechesis*²³, can be ruled out as a source. Cyril's account

²⁰ [...] φανερώς Εμπεδοκλέους και Πυθαγόρου και Αιγυπτίων ταῖς δόξαις ἀκολουθήσας (SOCRATES SCHOLASTICUS, I, 22, 8, p. 67, 20sq).

²¹ Georgius actually used another Socratic passage for his account on Mani up until the list of Mani's books and their alleged backstory (cf. GEORGIUS MONACHUS, VIII, 44, vol. II, p. 468, 2 – 469, 3), but in the summarised form of the *Epitome* of Theodorus Lectors *Historia tripartita* (cf. THEODORUS LECTOR, *Epitome Historiae tripartitae*, 33, [in:] THEODOROS ANAGNOSTES, *Kirchengeschichte*, ed. G.C. HANSEN, ³Berlin–New York 2009 (Berlin 1995) [= *GCS.NF*, 3] (cetera: THEODORUS LECTOR), p. 16, 17 – 17, 8), as Georgius' editor, C. de Boor, pointed out in the apparatus. Georgius further uses Socrates' text via the *Historia tripartita* (cf. GEORGIUS MONACHUS, VIII, 44, vol. II, p. 469, 3–10), so he could very well have copied the sentence on the supposed belief in fate directly from there (Socrates' whole chapter I, 22 is included there, cf. THEODORUS LECTOR, p. 16). But why would he have then torn apart the sentence on the belief in fate (SOCRATES SCHOLASTICUS, I, 22, 8, p. 67, 18–19), which comes soon after the book list in Socrates (SOCRATES SCHOLASTICUS, I, 22, 5, p. 67, 4–6), from the latter? It seems much more plausible that Georgius used the same source, namely the one shared with Germanus, for this paragraph of his, including the part about Manichaean belief in fate.

²² In turn, Emperor Constantine VII Porphyrogenitus (*Excerpta historica iussu Imp. Constantini Porphyrogeniti confecta*, vol. II, ed. U.P. BOISSEVAIN, C. DE BOOR, T. BÜTTNER-WOBST, *Excerpta de virtutibus et vitiis*, pars I, rec. et praef. T. BÜTTNER-WOBST, ed. cur. A.G. ROOS, Berolini 1906, p. 141, 1 – 142, 20, with our passage in question p. 142, 1–10) and the *Suda* (*Suidae Lexicon*, vol. III, K–O.Ω, 147, ed. A. ADLER, Stutgardiae 1967 (1933) [= *LG*, 1], p. 318, 14 – 319, 17, with our passage in question p. 319, 1–7) copied the passage about Mani from Georgius Monachus, so this summary on Manichaeism must have been read a lot throughout the following Byzantine centuries. The *Suda* article is included in the compendium *Greek and Latin Sources*, p. 128–130.

²³ CYRILLUS HIEROSOLYMITANUS, *Catechesis* 6, 21–34 (CPG 3585.6), [in:] S. *Patris nostri Cyrilli Hierosolymorum Archiepiscopi opera quae supersunt omnia*, vol. I, rec. W.C. REISCHL, Monaci 1848 (cetera: CYRILLUS HIEROSOLYMITANUS, *Catechesis* 6), p. 184–204.

of Manichaeism basically covers the same points, but Germanus' wording is nowhere close to the one of Cyril's *Catechesis*. Then, the best explanation of this reference to Cyril's text, next to its hagiographical character, is that it constitutes a kind of "further reading" advice for the reader²⁴.

What does this imply for the source value of Germanus' chapter on Manichaeism? – It cannot be considered a historical source for real-life Manichaeism in 7th- or 8th-century Byzantium, because all the information on Manichaeism of this chapter was copied from one or more (when counting Socrates' *Church History*) earlier sources. Nevertheless the source value of cap. 4 of *De haeresibus et synodis* lies exactly in this point: it shows which texts an orthodox theologian of 8th-century Byzantium read on Manichaeism and how he formed his views on the "heresy" of Manichaeism.

Germanus on the Montanists

Cap. 5 of Germanus' *De haeresibus et synodis* was included in a collection of sources on the history of Montanism by Pierre de Labriolle²⁵. For several reasons, especially the intriguing mention of a forced baptism of "Montanists" under the rule of Emperor Leo III in 721/722 by Theophanes²⁶, scholars wonder whether there were still actual Montanists in 8th-century Byzantium – or if this and other mentions only use the name "Montanists" for a group without historical links to the 2nd century heresy²⁷. Looking at this chapter, the final part about a priest fighting the Montanist protagonists (l. 35–41) seems to be inspired by Eusebius' *Church History*, while no source could be identified for the rest of the text:

²⁴ The reference to Cyril's *Catechesis* in cap. 4 is only one of many such "further reading" advices throughout *De haeresibus et synodis*. For example, two more are contained in cap. 5 dealing with Montanism, see below. This feature of Germanus' treatise will be further discussed in my dissertation.

²⁵ Cf. P. DE LABRIOLLE, *Les sources de l'histoire du Montanisme. Textes grecs, latins, syriaques publiés avec une Introduction critique, une Traduction française (sic), des Notes et des «Indices»*, Fribourg–Paris 1913 [= CollF. NS, 15], p. 246–247.

²⁶ Cf. *Theophanis Chronographia*, AM 6214, vol. I, *Textum graecum continens*, rec. C. DE BOOR, Lipsiae 1883 (cetera: THEOPHANES), p. 401, 22–27. A. SHARE, *The Jews, the Montanists, and the Emperor Leo III*, BZ 59, 1966, p. 37–46 (= *Jews and other Minorities in Byzantium*, ed. IDEM, Jerusalem 1995, p. 109–118), discusses this notice at length. Though one does not need to agree with his final explanation, he points out well that it cannot have meant actual Montanists. Another famous 8th-century mention of Montanists is the law that Manichaeans and Montanists are to be punished with death which is contained in the *Ecloga* of the emperors Leo III and Constantine V: *Ecloga. Das Gesetzbuch Leons III. und Konstantinos' V.*, 17.52, ed. L. BURGMANN, Frankfurt am Main 1983 [= FBR, 10], p. 242. Interestingly, this law links Manichaeans and Montanists in way similar to how Germanus does it at the beginning of cap. 4. But both statements are so short, that any reflection on an influence of the *Ecloga* on Germanus' work or vice versa is speculative.

²⁷ Cf. J. GOUILLARD, *L'hérésie...*, p. 307–309, and I. ROCHOW, *Zu einigen...*, p. 271–273 (with further references).

	GERMANUS, <i>De haeresibus et synodis</i> , cap. 5 ²⁸	
5	<p>Τῶν δὲ Μοντανῶν διάφορος εἶναι λέγεται δόξα καὶ οὐ μονομερῆς, ἀλλὰ πολύτροπος· τὸ δὲ τέλειον αὐτῶν δόγμα ἐν τούτοις ἐστίν, ὅτι τε αὐτὸν τὸν Μοντανὸν λέγουσιν εἶναι τὸ πνεῦμα</p>	
10	<p>τὸ ἅγιον καὶ πάλιν τὸν αὐτὸν λόγον καὶ πνεῦμα· ἔτι δὲ καὶ ὀκτῶ εἶναι οὐρανοῦς νομοθετοῦσι, κολαστήρια τε φοβερά ἐν τῷ μέλλοντι αἰῶνι ἐξηγοῦνται, δράκοντάς τινας καὶ λέοντας ἐκ τῶν μυκτῆρων πῦρ ἀποπέμπειν μέλλοντας καὶ</p>	
15	<p>κατακαίειν τοὺς ἀδίκους, καὶ ἑτέρους ἀποκρέμασθαι ἀπὸ τῶν σαρκῶν, καὶ ἄλλα τινὰ πλήρη ματαιοσύνης μυθολογοῦσιν· εἰς κρίσιν δὲ τοὺς ἐκ πορνείας ἢ μοιχείας γεννηθέντας ἄγεσθαι, καὶ κολάζεσθαι ὑπὸ κολαστήρια τὰ</p>	
20	<p>δεινότατα, ὅτι μόνον ἐκ τούτων γεγέννηνται, κἄν αὐτῶν ὁ βίος μὴ παράνομος πέφυκεν· ἀλλ' οὐδὲ τοὺς ἀμαρτάνοντας ἔτι εἰς μετάνοιαν δέχονται ἢ τοὺς διγαμοῦντας συναχθῆναι μετ' αὐτῶν ἐν ταῖς συναγωγαῖς αὐτῶν ἀνέχονται,</p>	
25	<p>καὶ ἕτερα δὲ πάμπολλα παρόμοια τούτοις ἐπιτελεῖται αὐτοῖς· ταῦτα δὲ οἱ τῆς ἐξαιρέτου αὐτῶν τῷ δοκεῖν μοίρας ἐπιείγονται διαπράττεσθαι, τῶν λοιπῶν καὶ ἕτερα πλείω τούτων δεδρακότων ἔργα ἀσεβείας, καὶ τῷ βίῳ</p>	
30	<p>ἐπισφαλῆ καὶ κρημνῶν πλήρεις ἀτραποὺς ἐξηπλωκότων.</p> <p>Ἐλέγχεται δὲ καὶ τούτων ἡ σκοτώδης νομοθεσία καὶ ὑπὸ τῶν πάλαι γεγενημένων διδασκάλων ἡμῶν·</p>	
		EUSEBIUS, <i>Historia ecclesiastica</i> , V, 19, 3, vol. I, p. 480, 11–12 ²⁹

²⁸ The text is issued from my yet unpublished edition. The older edition is to be found in *PG*, vol. XCVIII, col. 44, A5–C4.

²⁹ *Eusebius Werke*, vol. II.1, *Die Kirchengeschichte*, V, 19, 3, ed. E. SCHWARTZ, T. MOMMSEN, *Zweite, unveränderte Auflage von F. WINKELMANN*, Berlin 1999 [= *GCS.NF*, 6.1; *CPG*, 3495] (cetera: EUSEBIUS, *Historia ecclesiastica*), p. 480, 11–12. This is part of a subscription by the bishop Aelius Publius Iulius to the *Epistula ad Caricum et Pontium* by Serapion of Antioch (*CPG* 1333), only preserved in Eusebius' *Church History*.

35	<p>ἔτι δὲ καὶ Σωτᾶ τινος ἱερέως τῆς Θράκης αὐτοψεὶ παραγεγονότος ἐν τῇ Ἀσίᾳ πρὸς Μοντανόν,</p> <p>καὶ βίαν τινὰ ὑπομένειν ἐκείνην ἐκ τούτου,</p>	<p>ὅτι Σωτᾶς ὁ μακάριος ὁ ἐν Ἀγχιάλῳ ἠθέλησε τὸν δαίμονα τὸν Πρισκίλλης ἐκβαλεῖν</p>
		<p>EUSEBIUS, <i>Historia ecclesiastica</i>, V, 16, 7, vol. I, p. 462, 10³⁰</p>
40	<p>Γράτου τότε ἀνθυπατεύοντος,</p> <p>καὶ τὸν λαλοῦντα δι' αὐτοῦ καὶ</p>	<p>κατὰ Γράτον Ἀσίας ἀνθύπατον</p>
		<p>EUSEBIUS, <i>Historia ecclesiastica</i>, V, 16, 16, vol. I, p. 466, 14–15³¹</p>
	<p>τῆς Μαξιμίλλης δαίμονα ἐλέγξαντος·</p>	<p>τοὺς τότε ἱερούς ἐπισκόπους πεπειρᾶσθαι μὲν τὸ ἐν τῇ Μαξιμίλλῃ πνεῦμα διελέγξει</p>
		<p>EUSEBIUS, <i>Historia ecclesiastica</i>, V, 18, 13, vol. I, p. 478, 10–13³²</p>
45	<p>λοιπὸν δὲ καὶ ὑπὸ Βασιλείου τοῦ μεγάλου καὶ Ἐπιφανίου τοῦ Κυπρίου μάλιστα κατὰ πασῶν τῶν αἵρέσεων πραγματείαν ἔγγραφον ἐκθεμένου.</p>	<p>ὡς ἄρα Ζωτικός, οὗ καὶ ὁ πρότερος συγγραφεὺς ἐμνημόνευσεν, ἐν Πεπούζοις προφητεύειν δὴ προσποιομένης τῆς Μαξιμίλλης ἐπιστάς διελέγξει τὸ ἐνεργοῦν ἐν αὐτῇ πνεῦμα πεπεῖραται</p>

In his edition, A. Mai noted vaguely that the latter part is inspired by Eusebius' accounts³³. With my new critical edition, this textual relationship can be affirmed with more evidence as the old edition read σώμα³⁴ instead of the priest's name Σωτᾶ in l. 35. It is apparent that Germanus' sentence is quite a patchwork of different passages of Eusebius' work, which leads me to assume the existence of an intermediate source that contained the compiled and shortened account of Sotas fighting the Montanists. It is otherwise lost.

³⁰ This is part of a lengthy quotation of an anonymous letter against the Montanists (CPG 1327), only preserved in Eusebius' *Church History*.

³¹ This is part of the same anonymous letter (CPG 1327).

³² This is part of a summary of the anti-Montanist letter of a certain Apollonius (CPG 1328), only preserved in Eusebius' *Church History*.

³³ Cf. PG, vol. XCVIII, col. 43/44, note 5.

³⁴ Cf. PG, vol. XCVIII, col. 44, B14.

The chapter ends (l. 42–45) with a mention of the refutations of Montanism written by Basil of Caesarea, in one of his important letters³⁵, and Epiphanius of Salamis, in his *Panarion*³⁶. Again, as with the reference to Cyril of Jerusalem's *Catechesis* in cap. 4, both of these texts are not sources of Germanus' account, but serve as a "further reading" advice.

The rest of Germanus' cap. 5 is quite similar in structure and character to cap. 4. Given the close connection of Manichaeans and Montanists (cap. 4, l. 1), it is imaginable that both chapters are actually based on the same text, a lost anti-heretical treatise. But this hypothesis cannot be proven and the account on the Montanists may very well stem from one or more other sources. The existence of an anti-Montanist source for at least a part of this chapter though can be assumed with good reason. It is then unlikely that Germanus may have gotten his information from real-life Montanists³⁷.

In conclusion, the passage of *De haeresibus et synodis* on Montanism cannot be regarded as a historical source on this heresy, but, just like the chapter on Manichaeism, as a source on a Byzantine orthodox theologian's view on it and on the material he used.

Germanus on the Christological Controversies

At last, I want to move to the Christological controversies of the 5th to 7th centuries, because this is the dogmatic battle where one is to expect the highest timeliness and accuracy from Germanus' treatise³⁸, as he was just living at the end of them and was still somehow involved in the aftermath³⁹. Germanus' portrayal of these controversies can be seen best in cap. 47, a short recapitulation of the Ecumenical Councils he discussed beforehand:

³⁵ BASILIUS CAESARIENSIS, *Epistula* 188, 1, 31–46 (CPG 2900.188), [in:] SAINT BASILE, *Lettres*, vol. II, ed. et trans. Y. COURTONNE, Paris 1961 [= CUF.SG, 149] (cetera: BASILIUS, *Epistula* 188), p. 122. Possibly, Germanus did not read this letter, which is also known as Basil's first canonic letter, as part of a collection of Basil's letters, but as part of a collection of patristic canons; the text corresponds to BASILIUS CAESARIENSIS, *Canon* 1 (CPG 2901.1), [in:] *Fonti. Fascicolo IX. Discipline générale antique (IV^e–IX^e s.)*, vol. II, *Les canons des Pères Grecs*, ed. P.-P. JOANNOU, Roma 1963, p. 95, 20 – 96, 13. This is conceivable, because such patristic canon collections were most probably circulating since the 5th century (cf. P.-P. JOANNOU, *Fonti. Fascicolo IX...*, p. XV–XVII).

³⁶ EPIPHANIUS, vol. II, *Panarion haer. 34–64*, 48, ed. K. HOLL, 2., *bearbeitete Auflage*, ed. J. DUMMER, Berlin 1980 [= GCS. *Epiphanius*, 2; CPG, 3745] (cetera: EPIPHANIUS, *Panarion*), p. 219, 5 – 241, 17.

³⁷ Thus confirming the doubts of the ongoing presence of Montanists in 8th-century Byzantium articulated by J. GOUILLARD, *L'hérésie...*, p. 308–310, and I. ROCHOW, *Zu einigen...*, p. 272–274.

³⁸ Cf. J. GOUILLARD, *L'hérésie...*, p. 306.

³⁹ According to THEOPHANES, AM 6204, p. 382, 10–21, Germanus, still being bishop of Cyzicus, supported Emperor Philippicus Bardanes in revoking the dogma of the Council of Constantinople III in 712. He evidently returned to orthodoxy after the end of Philippicus' reign.

	GERMANUS, <i>De haeresibus et synodis</i> , cap. 47 ⁴⁰	
	Ἄλυσις, ὡσπερ εἶπεῖν, καὶ σειρὰ ἀδιάσπα- στος ἀλλήλων ἐχομένη καὶ ἐκκρεμαμένη·	
		<i>Symbolum Nicaenum</i> , p. 230–236 (a. 325) ⁴¹
5	τῆς μὲν πρώτης ὀρισάσης ὁμοούσιον τῷ πατρὶ τὸν υἱὸν, παρεργησάσης δὲ καὶ εἰς τὸ πνεῦμα πιστεῦειν τὸ ἅγιον·	ὁμοούσιον τῷ πατρὶ [...] καὶ εἰς τὸ ἅγιον πνεῦμα [...]
		<i>Symbolum Nicaeno-Constantinopoli- tanum</i> , p. 248–250 (a. 381) ⁴²
	τῆς δὲ δευτέρας ὁμοούσιον καὶ τὸ πνεῦμα τοῦ πατρὸς καὶ τοῦ υἱοῦ τρανῶς ὀριζού- σης, ὡς ἐκ τοῦ πατρὸς ἐκπορευόμενον καὶ σὺν αὐτῷ καὶ τῷ υἱῷ προσκυνούμενον·	καὶ εἰς τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον, τὸ κύριον καὶ ζωοποιόν, τὸ ἐκ τοῦ πατρὸς ἐκπορευόμε- νον, τὸ σὺν πατρὶ καὶ υἱῷ συμπροσκυνού- μενον
		<i>Concilium Chalcedonense</i> , ACO, vol. II.1.2, p. 129, 24–25 (a. 451) ⁴³
10	τῆς τρίτης πάλιν αὐτὸν τὸν ἕνα κύριον ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦν Χριστὸν τέλειον ἐν θεότητι καὶ τέλειον ἐν ἀνθρωπότητι ὀριζούσης,	ὁμολογεῖν υἱὸν τὸν κύριον ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦν Χριστὸν συμφώνως ἅπαντες ἐκδιδάσκο- μεν, τέλειον τὸν αὐτὸν ἐν θεότητι καὶ τέ- λειον τὸν αὐτὸν ἐν ἀνθρωπότητι
		CYRILLUS ALEXANDRINUS, <i>Epistula ad Iohannem Antiochenum de pace</i> , ACO, vol. I.1.4, p. 17, 14–15 (a. 433) ⁴⁴
	ἕνα καὶ οὐ δύο υἱούς ⁴⁵	ἕνα Χριστὸν, ἕνα υἱόν, ἕνα κύριον ὁμολο- γοῦμεν

⁴⁰ The text is issued from my yet unpublished edition. The older edition is to be found in *PG*, vol. XCVIII, col. 84, C9–85, A10.

⁴¹ *Symbolum Nicaenum* (CPG 8512), [in:] *Il simbolo di Nicea e di Costantinopoli. Edizione critica*, ed. G.L. DOSSETTI, Roma 1967 [= TRSR, 2], p. 230.236.

⁴² *Symbolum Nicaeno-Constantinopolitanum* (CPG 8599), [in:] *Il simbolo di Nicea e di Costantinopoli. Edizione critica*, ed. G.L. DOSSETTI, Roma 1967 [= TRSR, 2], p. 248–250.

⁴³ *Concilium Chalcedonense, Actio V* (CPG 9005), [in:] *Concilium universale Chalcedonense*, vol. I.2, *Actio secunda. Epistularum collectio B. Actiones III–VII*, ed. E. SCHWARTZ, Berolini–Lipsiae 1933 [= ACO, 2.1.2] (cetera: *Concilium Chalcedonense*), p. 129, 24–25.

⁴⁴ CYRILLUS ALEXANDRINUS, *Epistula ad Iohannem Antiochenum de pace* (CPG 5339), [in:] *Concilium universale Ephesenum*, vol. I, *Acta graeca*, pars IV, *Collectio Vaticana 120–139*, ed. E. SCHWARTZ, Berolini–Lipsiae 1928 [= ACO, 1.1.4], p. 17, 14–15.

⁴⁵ Cf. GERMANUS, *De haeresibus et synodis*, cap. 25, *PG*, vol. XCVIII, col. 64, B2–4.

		CYRILLUS ALEXANDRINUS, <i>Epistula altera ad Nestorium</i> , ACO, vol. I.1.1, p. 28, 10–11 (a. 430) ⁴⁶
		οὐ διαιρετέον τοιγαροῦν εἰς υἱοὺς δύο τὸν ἕνα κύριον Ἰησοῦν Χριστόν
		<i>Concilium Chalcedonense</i> , ACO, vol. II.1.2, p. 129, 24–25 (a. 451)
15	τῆς δὲ τετάρτης τὰ προλεχθέντα κυρούσης, καὶ τὸ τέλειον ἐν θεότητι καὶ τέλειον ἐν ἀνθρωπότητι τρανῶς διαγορευούσης ἔχειν αὐτόν,	τέλειον τὸν αὐτὸν ἐν θεότητι καὶ τέλειον τὸν αὐτὸν ἐν ἀνθρωπότητι
		<i>Concilium Chalcedonense</i> , ACO, vol. II.1.2, p. 129, 30–31 (a. 451)
20	καὶ δύο φύσεις ἐν αὐτῷ γνωρίζεσθαι ἀσυγχύτως, ἀχωρίστως, καὶ ἀδιαιρέτως δοξαζούσης.	ἐν δύο φύσεσιν ἀσυγχύτως ἀτρέπτως ἀδιαιρέτως ἀχωρίστως γνωριζόμενον
		<i>Concilium Lateranense</i> , ACO ser. II, vol. I, p. 374, 14–17 (a. 649) ⁴⁷
25	Ἡ πέμπτη τὰ αὐτὰ, ὡς εἶπεῖν, ἐκφωνήσασα καὶ καθ' ἑκατέραν φύσιν θελητικὸν αὐτὸν καὶ ἐνεργητικὸν τὸν κύριον ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦν Χριστόν τῆς ἡμῶν ἕνεκα σωτηρίας εἶναι τε καὶ γνωρίζεσθαι. ⁴⁸	τὸ καθ' ἑκατέραν αὐτοῦ φύσιν θελητικὸν κατὰ φύσιν τὸν αὐτὸν ὑπάρχειν τῆς ἡμῶν σωτηρίας
		<i>Concilium Lateranense</i> , ACO ser. II, vol. I, p. 374, 23–25 (a. 649)
		τὸ καθ' ἑκατέραν αὐτοῦ φύσιν ἐνεργητικὸν τὸν αὐτὸν ὑπάρχειν τῆς ἡμῶν σωτηρίας
		<i>Concilium Constantinopolitanum III</i> , ACO ser. II, vol. II.2, p. 774, 7–8 (a. 680/681) ⁴⁹

⁴⁶ CYRILLUS ALEXANDRINUS, *Epistula altera ad Nestorium* (CPG 5304), [in:] *Concilium universale Ephesenum*, vol. I, *Acta graeca*, pars I, *Collectio Vaticana 1–32*, ed. E. SCHWARTZ, Berolini–Lipsiae 1927 [= ACO, I.1.1], p. 28, 10–11.

⁴⁷ *Concilium Lateranense*, *Canones* (CPG 9402.5), [in:] *Concilium Lateranense a. 649 celebratum*, ed. R. RIEDINGER, Berolini 1984 [= ACO ser. II, 1] (cetera: *Concilium Lateranense*), p. 374, 14–17.

⁴⁸ Cf. GERMANUS, *De haeresibus et synodis*, cap. 34, *PG*, vol. XCVIII, col. 72, B14–C2.

⁴⁹ *Concilium Constantinopolitanum III*, *Actio XVIII* (CPG 9437), [in:] *Concilium universale Constantinopolitanum tertium. Concilii actiones XII–XVIII. Epistulae. Indices*, ed. R. RIEDINGER, Berolini 1992 [= ACO ser. II, 2.2] (cetera: *Concilium Constantinopolitanum III*), p. 774, 7–8.

30	<p>ή δὲ ἕκτη, καθὼς ἔφαμεν, τὰ τῶν ὅλων συνόδων ἐπεξέρχεται, καὶ τὰ τῶν ἀμφοτέρων κυροῖ, καὶ τὸν ὄρον οὕτως ἐκτίθεται, καὶ αὐτὴ τέλειον ἐν θεότητι καὶ ἐν ἀνθρωπότητι ὁμοίως ὀρίζει,</p>	<p>τέλειον ἐν θεότητι καὶ τέλειον τὸν αὐτὸν ἐν ἀνθρωπότητι</p>
		<p><i>Concilium Constantinopolitanum III</i>, ACO ser. II, vol. II.2, p. 774, 20–24 (a. 680/681)</p>
35	<p>καὶ δύο θελήσεις ἦτοι θελήματα καὶ δύο τὰς ἐνεργείας ἐν αὐτῷ διδάσκει· ἐπόμενον τε καὶ ὑπεῖκον τῷ θεϊκῷ θελήματι τὸ ἀνθρώπινον θέλημα ἐκφωνήσασα καὶ μὴ ἀντιπίπτον ἢ ἀντιτασσόμενον·</p>	<p>δύο φυσικὰς θελήσεις ἦτοι θελήματα ἐν αὐτῷ καὶ δύο φυσικὰς ἐνεργείας [...] Ὡσαύτως κηρύττομεν καὶ δύο μὲν φυσικὰ θελήματα οὐχ ὑπεναντία, μὴ γένοιτο, καθὼς οἱ ἀσεβεῖς ἔφησαν αἰρετικοί, ἀλλ' ἐπόμενον τὸ ἀνθρώπινον αὐτοῦ θέλημα καὶ μὴ ἀντιπίπτον ἢ ἀντιπαλαῖον, μᾶλλον μὲν οὖν καὶ ὑποτασσόμενον τῷ θείῳ αὐτοῦ καὶ πανσθενεῖ θελήματι</p>
40	<p>ἐκουσίως γὰρ αὐτὸν τὸν ἕνα κύριον ἡμῶν τὸν ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν ἀναδέξασθαι σαρκὶ θάνατον ὑποτίθεται καὶ θελήσει ἰδίᾳ ὑπὲρ πάντων ἡμῶν, ἀποστολικῶς εἰπεῖν, γεύσασθαι τοῦ θανάτου⁵⁰.</p>	

In this Council summary, Germanus quotes a succinct dogmatic formula for each Council. The ones he quotes for the Councils of Nicaea (325), Constantinople I (381), Chalcedon (451), and Constantinople III (680/681) are adequate. But the formulas allegedly decided by the Councils of Ephesus (431) and Constantinople II (553) are theological anachronisms. H.J. Sieben noticed this issue and came up with the explanation that Germanus anticipates the dogmatic formula of the following Council, with the aim of showing the identity of the faith proclaimed by each Council⁵¹. This explanation is based on a superficial reading of Germanus' text in the old edition – better insights can now be gained from the new edition.

The formula quoted for the Council of Ephesus (l. 10–13) is not straightforwardly taken from the Council of Chalcedon, but is actually a mix of the Chalcedonian formula of 451 (l. 10–12), the Formula of Reunion of 433 (as contained in the correspondence between Cyril of Alexandria and John of Antioch; l. 13), and Cyril's accusation of Nestorius (as contained in his second letter to Nestorius

⁵⁰ Cf. Heb 2: 9.

⁵¹ Cf. H.J. SIEBEN, *Die Konzilsidee der Alten Kirche*, Paderborn 1979 [= Kon. Reihe B: Untersuchungen], p. 370.

and canonised in Ephesus; l. 13). In the chapter that deals exclusively with Ephesus, cap. 25, Germanus quotes the very same formula as in cap. 47. This fact makes it clear he willingly presents it as Christological definition adopted by the Council of Ephesus in 451, and not just by mistake.

Regarding the Council of Constantinople II, the matter is somewhat simpler: the dogmatic definition Germanus quotes as the one that was coined by that Council is actually issued from the canons of the Lateran Council of 649. Again, it is quoted in the exact same way in cap. 34, the detailed account of the Council of Constantinople II. Just as with the alleged definition of Ephesus, this fact underlines that Germanus really treats this formula as the one of the Council of Constantinople II.

Of course it is true that Germanus wanted to express the inner link of the Ecumenical Councils with this chapter, as H.J. Sieben pointed out⁵² – this is literally what the first sentence says. But Germanus did not show this by anticipating the dogmatic formulas of each Council, the matter is more complex. The Councils of Ephesus and Constantinople II are the only two Ecumenical Councils that did not decide on a positive theological statement but ‘just’ issued anathemas. So in Germanus’ (or another author’s, more on that below) eyes, they must have been ‘holes’ to be filled with somehow appropriate formulas. The respective sentences do somehow relate to the general Christological questions discussed at these Councils, but simply have not been adopted as ‘definitions’ by the respective Councils.

Germanus quotes very literally the same phrases in cap. 25 and 47 and cap. 34 and 47 respectively. Therefore, the attribution of these formulas to the Councils of Ephesus and Constantinople II was surely not done *ad hoc*, but must have been well prepared. It is even possible that Germanus did not fabricate it himself, but that he copied it from a lost source, a small Council synopsis that catered to the need to ‘fill’ these dogmatic ‘holes’, though this cannot be proven.

Finally, what does this tell about the value of *De haeresibus et synodis* as a source on the Christological controversies? With dogmatic formulas taken from other Councils and letters, the history of the Councils of Ephesus and Constantinople II is presented in a distorted way and thus Germanus’ treatise should not be used as a source on the history of the Christological controversies up to the Council of Constantinople III⁵³. Nevertheless, the *De haeresibus et synodis* has its value in being a witness to the views on the Ecumenical Councils and to the general idea of Church Councils (“Konzilsidee”, as H.J. Sieben coined it) of an 8th-century Byzantine theologian.

⁵² Cf. *ibidem*.

⁵³ Concerning the (ecclesial) events of the years 712–715 (alluded to above, see note 39) though, Germanus’ account (cap. 38–39: *PG*, vol. CXVIII, col. 76, A9–D6) can and should be consulted. I will argue for that in my forthcoming thesis.

Conclusion

This article took a close look at three chapters of the *De haeresibus et synodis* of Patriarch Germanus I that deal with three topics relevant to the history of Early Byzantine Christianity. It thus showed how the new, critical edition I am preparing will shed new light on this text. An important feature of this new edition will be an extensive *apparatus fontium* that reveals a lot about the character of the text.

In the chapters on Manichaeism and Montanism, Germanus largely relies on earlier sources (that are partly lost) and thus cannot serve as a historical witness for the history of these two heresies. Nevertheless it can serve as a witness to the sources Byzantine theologians used and the views on these heresies they thus formed. One such source can partly be reconstructed, because it was also used by Georgius Monachus for his *Chronicle*.

Concerning the Christological controversies, I showed that up until the Council of Constantinople III (680/681), Germanus' treatise cannot be used as a historical source either. This is because his account is heavily influenced by a certain idea of Ecumenical Councils, to the extent that he attributes (willingly or unwillingly) dogmatic formulas to Councils that did not actually issue them.

It is quite trivial, but not less true, that a proper critical edition of an ancient text is the basis for any serious study of it and helps to assess its character. In the case of the *De haeresibus et synodis*, I was able to deduce a study scope that is appropriate to the character of the text from the text itself. In my further research, I will study this treatise, for the most part, not as a historical source on heresies and Church councils, but as an expression of orthodox Byzantine theology of the early 8th century.

Appendix: Translations

Cap. 4. And then the Manichaeans arose, the Montanists, and the likes of them against it (i.e. the Church) and got it into unordinary struggles. For Mani mixed his doctrines with a lot of stupidity, aberrancy, and sordidness, and said that his (i.e. the evil God's)⁵⁴ old law and creation itself are an accomplishment of some evil (sc. God) and not ordinance of a good one, and that rather the new or coming (sc. creation) is (sc. ordinance) of a good one; further that one (i.e. the good creation) would have to endure some violence from him (i.e. the evil God), so that two natures would be ruling the world, namely the good one and the evil one; and that neither the nature of man is a work of the good one nor the remaining creation, which, as has been said (sc. by Mani), is subject to decay and alteration.

⁵⁴ This use of the reflexive pronoun ἐαυτοῦ is irritating. According to regular grammar, it should refer to the subject of the clause, Mani, then not making sense. The only meaningful, though tautological rendering is given above, with the pronoun referring to the "evil god" of Manichaeism, κακοῦ τινοῦ in Greek. See as well above, note 18.

Furthermore he filled his teachings with impiety, performed some cursed immersion baths, night-time rituals, and abominable intercourse⁵⁵, confirmed the stupid doctrines of the pagans, introduced a “fate”, taught the transmigration of souls, and did not want (sc. to believe) that Christ had become incarnate.

Therefore he received an end worthy of such a teaching like his from one of the pagan kings: while he was still alive, his skin was removed and thus he was, as they say, handed over to death. Cyril of Jerusalem described and recorded his thinking extensively by listing the elements of his foul and ignoble system of thought one by one and then bringing forward the refutation of his ungodly and unlawful teachings⁵⁶. For this unholy man dared to call himself ‘apostle’ and to compile four books that he named ‘The Gospel’, ‘Book of the Treasures’, [sc. Book] of the Mysteries’ and the last one [sc. Book] of the Rituals⁵⁷.

Cap. 5. The doctrine of the Montanists is said to be different and not one-sided, but multifaceted. Their highest dogma among those is that they say that Montanus himself was the Holy Spirit and again the same Logos and Spirit. They further teach that there are eight heavens, tell of dreadful chastisements in the coming age, of some dragons and lions that will spew fire from their nostrils and burn the unrighteous, and that others will be left with hanging flesh. And they tell many more stupid things: that those born from unchastity or adultery will be condemned and chastised with the most terrible chastisements, only because they were begotten through these things, even though their own life had not been unlawful. And they do not admit those who have sinned (sc. themselves) to repentance, and they refuse that the remarried take part in their meetings; and many more such things are enforced by them. The members of their seemingly chosen group urge on these (sc. rules) being observed, whereas they did other ungodly works going beyond that and showed paths full of steep slopes to an (sc. already) unstable life.

Their obscure teaching was rebutted by our teachers living back then: a certain Sotas, a priest of Thrace, personally went to Montanus in Asia during Gratus’ proconsulate and rebutted the demon that was speaking through him and Maximilla. For the rest, he was also (sc. rebutted) by Basil the Great⁵⁸ and foremost by Epiphanius the Cyprian⁵⁹ who published a treatise against all heresies.

⁵⁵ In accordance with the ambiguity of the Greek word *μίξεις*, this should at least partly be understood as meaning sexual intercourse.

⁵⁶ This refers to CYRILLUS HIEROSOLYMITANUS, *Catechesis* 6, 21–34, p. 184–204.

⁵⁷ Most Christian sources have Mani write four books. This tradition traces back to the 4th century *Acta Archelai* (HEGEMONIUS, *Acta Archelai*, 52, 6, ed. C.H. BEESON, Leipzig 1906 [= *GCS. Hegemonius* (16); *CPG*, 3570], p. 91, 4–6). The difference is that the *Acta Archelai* (and, among others, Socrates’ *Church History*) have Terebinthus write the four books and Mani later claim their authorship. Surely in order to simplify it, this part of the story was abandoned in the course of time. Regarding the titles of the four books, see above (2. *Germanus on the Manichaeans*).

⁵⁸ This refers to BASILIUS, *Epistula* 188, p. 122; cf. as well above, note 35.

⁵⁹ This refers to EPIPHANIUS, *Panarion*, 48, p. 219, 5 – 241, 17.

Cap. 47. (Sc. The Councils) form a chain, so to say, and an inseparable line, clinging and attached to one another⁶⁰: the First (sc. Council) defined the Son as “consubstantial with the Father”, yet also mandated to believe “in the Holy Spirit”; the Second then defined the Spirit rightly as consubstantial with the Father and the Son, as he “proceeds from the Father” and “is worshipped together with him and the Son”. The Third in turn defined “our Lord Jesus Christ as one and the same, perfect in Godhead and perfect in manhood”, as one and not two sons; the Fourth then confirmed the aforesaid, declared rightly that he is “perfect in Godhead and perfect in manhood”, and held the opinion that two natures are acknowledged in him, “inconfusedly, inseparably, indivisibly”.

The Fifth proclaimed, so to say, the same things and that “our Lord Jesus Christ is in possession of a will and an energy in each of the two natures for the sake of our salvation” and is thus acknowledged. The Sixth went over, as we said, all the Councils, confirmed the (sc. decisions) of the other (sc. Councils), and issued a definition accordingly; also it defined him (i.e. Christ) as “perfect in Godhead and in manhood” and taught that there are “two wills or faculties of will and two energies in him”. It proclaimed that “the human will follows the divine will” and submits to it and that it (i.e. the human will) neither “resists” nor opposes it (i.e. the divine will). For it is assumed that our one Lord took death in the flesh upon himself in our place voluntarily and, to speak apostolically, “tasted death in the place of all of us”⁶¹ out of his own will.

Bibliography

Primary Sources

BASILIIUS CAESARIENSIS, *Canon 1* (CPG 2901.1), [in:] *Fonti. Fascicolo IX. Discipline générale antique (IV^e–IX^e s.)*, vol. II, *Les canons des Pères Grecs*, ed. P.-P. JOANNOU, Roma 1963.

BASILIIUS CAESARIENSIS, *Epistula 188* (CPG 2900.188), [in:] SAINT BASILE, *Lettres*, vol. II, ed. et trans. Y. COURTONNE, Paris 1961 [= Collection des Universités de France. Série grecque, 149], p. 120–131.

⁶⁰ In the Greek text, the syntax of this sentence is not wholly congruent and demands some supplementation. As there is no verb, it is best understood as a nominal clause, with Ἄλυσις [...] καὶ σειρά being the predicate nouns. There is no explicit subject, but the context makes it clear that this implicit subject can only be αἱ σύνοδοι. The main (nominal) clause is thus translated above, with the supplemented subject and verb. The following conjunct participle constitutes the second problem: the participles ἐχομένη καὶ ἐκκρεμαμένη are congruent in number with Ἄλυσις [...] καὶ σειρά, but the reciprocal pronoun ἀλλήλων, which is the object of the conjunct participle construction, cannot refer to these predicates. One reason for this is that the hendiadys Ἄλυσις [...] καὶ σειρά cannot be the antecedent of the plural pronoun ἀλλήλων; a second reason is of semantic nature: a chain cannot logically be “attached” to itself, only its links to one another. So, the only meaningful translation needs to treat the conjunct participle as referring to the implicit subject of the main clause, “the Councils” (αἱ σύνοδοι).

⁶¹ Cf. Heb 2: 9.

- Concilium Chalcedonense, Actio V* (CPG 9005), [in:] *Concilium universale Chalcedonense*, vol. I.2, *Actio secunda. Epistularum collectio B. Actiones III–VII*, ed. E. SCHWARTZ, Berolini–Lipsiae 1933 [= *Acta Conciliorum Oecumenicorum*, 2.1.2], p. 121–130.
- Concilium Constantinopolitanum III, Actio XVIII* (CPG 9437), [in:] *Concilium universale Constantinopolitanum tertium. Concilii actiones XII–XVIII. Epistulae. Indices*, ed. R. RIEDINGER, Berolini 1992 [= *Acta Conciliorum Oecumenicorum. Series secunda*, 2.2], p. 752–830.
- Concilium Lateranense, Canones* (CPG 9402.5), [in:] *Concilium Lateranense a. 649 celebratum*, ed. R. RIEDINGER, Berolini 1984 [= *Acta Conciliorum Oecumenicorum. Series secunda*, 1], p. 368–389.
- CYRILLUS ALEXANDRINUS, *Epistula ad Iohannem Antiochenum de pace* (CPG 5339), [in:] *Concilium universale Ephesenum*, vol. I, *Acta graeca*, pars IV, *Collectio Vaticana 120–139*, ed. E. SCHWARTZ, Berolini–Lipsiae 1928 [= *Acta Conciliorum Oecumenicorum*, I.1.4], p. 15–20.
- CYRILLUS ALEXANDRINUS, *Epistula altera ad Nestorium* (CPG 5304), [in:] *Concilium universale Ephesenum*, vol. I, *Acta graeca*, pars I, *Collectio Vaticana 1–32*, ed. E. SCHWARTZ, Berolini–Lipsiae 1927 [= *Acta Conciliorum Oecumenicorum*, I.1.1], p. 25–28.
- CYRILLUS HIEROSOLYMITANUS, *Catechesis 6* (CPG 3585.6), [in:] *S. Patris nostri Cyrilli Hierosolymorum Archiepiscopi opera quae supersunt omnia*, vol. I, rec. W.C. REISCHL, Monaci 1848, p. 154–206.
- Ecloga. Das Gesetzbuch Leons III. und Konstantinos' V.*, ed. L. BURGMANN, Frankfurt am Main 1983 [= *Forschungen zur Byzantinischen Rechtsgeschichte*, 10].
- EPIPHANIUS, vol. II, *Panarion haer. 34–64*, ed. K. HOLL, 2., *bearbeitete Auflage*, ed. J. DUMMER, Berlin 1980 [= *Die griechischen christlichen Schriftsteller der ersten Jahrhunderte. Epiphanius*, 2; *Clavis patrum graecorum*, 3745].
- Eusebius Werke*, vol. II.1, *Die Kirchengeschichte*, ed. E. SCHWARTZ, T. MOMMSEN, *Zweite, unveränderte Auflage von F. WINKELMANN*, Berlin 1999 [= *Die griechischen christlichen Schriftsteller der ersten Jahrhunderte. Neue Folge*, 6.1; *Clavis patrum graecorum*, 3495].
- Excerpta historica iussu Imp. Constantini Porphyrogeniti confecta*, vol. II, ed. U.P. BOISSEVAIN, C. DE BOOR, T. BÜTTNER-WOBST, *Excerpta de virtutibus et vitiis*, pars I, rec. et praef. T. BÜTTNER-WOBST, ed. cur. A.G. ROOS, Berolini 1906.
- Georgii Monachi Chronicon*, vol. II, *Textum genuinum inde a Vespasiani imperio continens*, ed. C. DE BOOR, *Editionem anni MCMIV correctiorem curavit P. WIRTH*, Stutgardiae 1978 [= *Bibliotheca Scriptorum Graecorum et Romanorum Teubneriana*], <https://doi.org/10.1515/9783111326580>
- GERMANUS, *De haeresibus et synodis* (CPG 8020), [in:] *Patrologiae cursus completus, Series graeca*, vol. XCVIII, ed. J.-P. MIGNE, Paris 1860, col. 39–88.
- Greek and Latin Sources on Manichaeae Cosmogony and Ethics*, trans. G. FOX, J. SHELDON, praef. S.N.C. LIEU, Turnhout 2010 [= *Corpus Fontium Manichaeorum. Series Subsidia*, 6].
- HEGEMONIUS, *Acta Archelai*, ed. C.H. BEESON, Leipzig 1906 [= *Die griechischen christlichen Schriftsteller der ersten drei Jahrhunderte. Hegemonius* (16); *Clavis patrum graecorum*, 3570].
- SOKRATES, *Kirchengeschichte*, ed. G.C. HANSEN, M. ŠIRINJAN, Berlin 1995 [= *Die griechischen christlichen Schriftsteller der ersten Jahrhunderte. Neue Folge*, 1; *Clavis patrum graecorum*, 6028].
- Spicilegium Romanum*, vol. VII, *S. Germani I. Patriarchae Constantinopolitani De haeresibus et synodis. Photii item Patr. Syntagma canonum*, ed. A. MAI, Roma 1842.
- Suidae Lexicon*, vol. III, K–O.Ω, ed. A. ADLER, Stutgardiae 1967 (1933) [= *Lexicographi graeci*, 1].
- Symbolum Nicaeno-Constantinopolitanum* (CPG 8599), [in:] *Il simbolo di Nicea e di Costantinopoli. Edizione critica*, ed. G.L. DOSSETTI, Roma 1967 [= *Testi e ricerche di scienze religiose*, 2], p. 244–250.

- Symbolum Nicaenum* (CPG 8512), [in:] *Il simbolo di Nicea e di Costantinopoli. Edizione critica*, ed. G.L. DOSSETTI, Roma 1967 [= Testi e ricerche di scienze religiose, 2], p. 226–240.
- Syntagma tōn theiōn kai ierōn kanonōn tōn te agiōn kai paneufimōn apostolōn, kai tōn ierōn oikoumenikōn kai topikōn synodōn, kai tōn kata meros agiōn paterōn, ekdothen, syn pleistais allais tīn ekklesiastikīn katastasin diepousais diataxesi, meta tōn archaiōn exīgītōn, Kai diafōrōn anagnōsmatōn*, vol. I, *Fōtiou patriarchou Kōnstantinoupoleōs Nomokanōn, meta tōn sxoliōn Theodōrou tou Valsamōnos. Toutois prosetethisan kai ta peri tōn agiōn kai oikoumenikōn synodōn, ypo te Germanou kai Fōtiou, tōn patriarxōn Kōnstantinoupoleōs, kai Neilou, mītropolitou Rodou, ktl. Synoptikōs istoroumena*, ed. G.A. RALLIS, M. POTLIS, Athīnisi 1852.
- THEODORUS LECTOR, *Epitome Historiae tripartitae*, [in:] THEODOROS ANAGNOSTES, *Kirchengeschichte*, ed. G.C. HANSEN, ²Berlin–New York 2009 (Berlin 1995) [= *Die griechischen christlichen Schriftsteller der ersten Jahrhunderte. Neue Folge*, 3], p. 2–157.
- Theophanis Chronographia*, vol. I, *Textum graecum continens*, rec. C. DE BOOR, Lipsiae 1883.
- Timoteo e Germano di Costantinopoli. Gli scritti. Introduzione, traduzione e note*, trans. F. CARCIONE, Roma 1993 [= Collana di testi patristici, 107].

Secondary Literature

- BRUBAKER L., HALDON J., *Byzantium in the Iconoclast Era (ca 680–850). The Sources. An Annotated Survey. With a Section on The Architecture of Iconoclasm: the Buildings* by R. OUSTERHOUT, Aldershot 2001 [= Birmingham Byzantine and Ottoman Monographs, 7].
- GOUILLARD J., *L'hérésie dans l'empire byzantin des origines au XII^e siècle*, “Travaux et mémoires” 1, 1965 (= *La vie religieuse à Byzance*, ed. J. GOUILLARD, London 1981, no I), p. 299–324.
- DE LABRIOLLE P., *Les sources de l'histoire du Montanisme. Textes grecs, latins, syriaques publiés avec une Introduction critique, une Traduction française (sic), des Notes et des «Indices»*, Fribourg–Paris 1913 [= *Collectanea Friburgensia. Nouvelle Série*, 15].
- ROCHOW I., *Zu einigen oppositionellen religiösen Strömungen*, [in:] *Byzanz im 7. Jahrhundert. Untersuchungen zur Herausbildung des Feudalismus*, ed. F. WINKELMANN et al., Berlin 1978 [= *Berliner byzantinistische Arbeiten*, 48], p. 225–288.
- SHARF A., *The Jews, the Montanists, and the Emperor Leo III*, “Byzantinische Zeitschrift” 59, 1966, p. 37–46 (= *Jews and other Minorities in Byzantium*, ed. A. SHARF, Jerusalem 1995, p. 109–118), <https://doi.org/10.1515/byzs.1966.59.1.37>
- SIEBEN H.J., *Die Konzilsidee der Alten Kirche*, Paderborn 1979 [= *Konziliengeschichte Reihe B: Untersuchungen*].

Johann Anton Zieme

Martin Luther University of Halle-Wittenberg
 Universitätsplatz 10
 06108 Halle, Germany
 jazieme@posteo.de

