



DOI: <https://doi.org/10.15688/jvolsu4.2022.6.9>

UDC 25(37)

LBC 86.313.3-574

Submitted: 23.06.2022

Accepted: 10.10.2022

**FIVE ANASTASIAE AND TWO FEBRONIAE:  
A GUIDED TOUR IN THE MAZE OF ANASTASIA LEGENDS \***

***Part Two. The Roman Dossier. I. Anastasia between Aquileia and Rome***

***1a. From Aquileia back to the Early Roman Legend \*\****

**Basil Lourié**

Institute of Philosophy and Law of the Siberian Branch of the Russian Academy of Sciences,  
Novosibirsk, Russian Federation

**Abstract.** Sections from 1 to 4 of Part Two of our study, which is dedicated to the western legends of Anastasia, are focused on an investigation of the Aquileian legend and, then, going in the reverse chronological order, on the early Roman legend before its reception in Aquileia. The plot line dedicated to Chrysogonus is an Aquileian addition lacking from the earlier Roman legend. The pious mother of Anastasia called Fausta belongs to the same plot line, whereas the mother of the “original” Anastasia was pagan.

**Key words:** Roman martyrs, St Anastasia, St Chrysogonus, Aquileia, Grado.

**Citation.** Lourié B. Five Anastasiae and Two Febroniae: A Guided Tour in the Maze of Anastasia Legends. Part Two. The Roman Dossier. I. Anastasia Between Aquileia and Rome. 1a. From Aquileia back to the Early Roman Legend. *Vestnik Volgogradskogo gosudarstvennogo universiteta. Seriya 4. Istoriya. Regionovedenie. Mezhdunarodnye otnosheniya* [Science Journal of Volgograd State University. History. Area Studies. International Relations], 2022, vol. 27, no. 6, pp. 98-130. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.15688/jvolsu4.2022.6.9>

УДК 25(37)

ББК 86.313.3-574

Дата поступления статьи: 23.06.2022

Дата принятия статьи: 10.10.2022

**ПЯТЬ АНАСТАСИЙ И ДВЕ ФЕВРОНИИ:  
ЭКСКУРСИЯ ПО ЛАБИРИНТУ ЛЕГЕНД ОБ АНАСТАСИИ \***

***Часть вторая. Римское досье. I. Анастасия между Аквилеей и Римом***

***1a. От Аквилеи обратно к ранней римской легенде \*\****

**Вадим Миронович Лурье**

Институт философии и права Сибирского отделения РАН, г. Новосибирск, Российская Федерация

**Аннотация.** Разделы с 1 по 4 части второй нашего исследования, посвященной западным легендам об Анастасии, охватывают аквилейскую легенду и далее, отталкиваясь от нее и двигаясь в обратном хронологическом порядке, раннюю римскую легенду, как она выглядела до ее адаптации в Аквилее. Вся сюжетная линия, связанная с мучеником Хрисогоном, была прибавлена в Аквилее, а в ранней римской легенде она отсутствовала. К этой же линии принадлежит упоминание о благочестивой матери Анастасии Фавсте, тогда как в оригинальной римской легенде мать Анастасии была язычницей.

**Ключевые слова:** римские мученики, св. Анастасия, св. Хрисогон, Аквилея, Grado.

**Цитирование.** Лурье В. М. Пять Анастасий и две Февронии: экскурсия по лабиринту легенд об Анастасии. Часть вторая. Римское досье. I. Анастасия между Аквилеей и Римом. 1a. От Аквилеи обратно к ранней римской легенде // Вестник Волгоградского государственного университета. Серия 4, История. Регионоведение. Международные отношения. – 2022. – Т. 27, № 6. – С. 98–130. – (На англ. яз.). – DOI: <https://doi.org/10.15688/jvolsu4.2022.6.9>

## 1. Introduction

The western hagiographical dossier of St Anastasia is very ample, especially because of the multiplication of her relics throughout different countries in the second Christian millennium. Our purpose will be, however, limited to Rome before the end of the Byzantine period in the eighth century.

As in Part One, we will follow, in general, the reverse chronological order, and this is why, before approaching Rome, we will have to begin with Aquileia from the seventh to the eleventh century. Thus, section 2 will be dedicated to the transformations of the cult of St Anastasia in Aquileia. This is necessary because the long Latin *Passio* of Anastasia (LLA) was affected by these transformations. We have to dispense with the Aquileian editorship before starting to deal with the Roman legend.

The Roman legend itself will be studied mostly in sections 3 to 5. These will be dedicated to the Roman hagiographical substrate of St Anastasia's legend: from material originally unrelated to Anastasia (section 3) to the earliest Roman cult of a certain Anastasia (section 4), and to the creation of the early pre-Byzantine Roman legend of Anastasia using the legends considered in section 3 with the addition of others (section 5). There we will discuss, among other things, the interconnection between the cults of Anastasia and Bassilla; the latter was the link between Anastasia and Sirmium.

The two following sections will be dedicated to the Roman cults where, in different ways, the veneration of St Anastasia was involved. Namely, they will be focused on the Roman stationary liturgies of Christmas (section 6) and the Epiphany (section 7) before the late sixth century, that is, in a rather understudied period for both. In this period, the church of Anastasia in Rome was one of the three or four most important churches of the city, with an appropriate place in the stationary liturgy, which became interwoven with the cult of St Anastasia.

Section 8 will be dedicated to the destiny of St Anastasia's relics between Rome and Sirmium.

Finally, section 9 will deal with Pope Symmachus's short-lived programme for the integration of the Petrine cult in the Vatican

with the pro-Gothic cult of St Anastasia. The monuments to this chimerical creation became the church in the west rotunda near Saint Peter's and a specific cult of St Anastasia together with St Petronilla.

One of the most venerated saints from the fifth to the sixth century, Anastasia, will lead us to the most important features of the contemporaneous life of the Roman Church.

## 2. The Latin Legend of Anastasia (LLA) and Its Aquileian Edition

In this section, we provide a survey of the contents of the Latin legend. We will discuss its complicated geography, and then we will evaluate the results of the intervention of an Aquileian editor.

Our main interest will be the Latin recension of the Anastasia legend before its editing in Aquileia. This recension must have been a faithful translation of the Greek Byzantine legend created for the deposition of Anastasia's relics in Constantinople. However, it must have been distinct from the autochthone Roman Anastasia legends, which partially were incorporated in the Roman core of the Byzantine legend.

The Latin legend of Anastasia (LLA) consists of five major parts which are also present in the Latin manuscript tradition separately and/or in different combinations; the Latin legend as a whole, therefore, has no proper number in *BHL* but is indexed as a combination of the Prologue *Omnia quae a sanctis gesta sunt* (incidentally, not indexed in *BHL*<sup>1</sup>), Part I (*Passio Chrysogoni*, *BHL* 1795), Part II (*Passio Agapes et sociarum*, *BHL* 118), Part III (*Passio Theodotae*, *BHL* 8093), and Part IV (*Passio ipsius Anastasiae*, *BHL* 401). The Prologue occurs in other Latin legends (see below, section 4.1). It was, most likely, added to LLA by some later editor.

### 2.1. The Latin Legend of Anastasia (LLA) and Its Geography

The LLA itself (without the Prologue) is usually considered as having been penned by a unique author who arranged the materials from different sources. This is an *a priori* presumption that I have never seen challenged nor even discussed<sup>2</sup>. However, a legend with

so complicated a geography could preserve editorial layers of different epochs and different ecclesiastical centres. The unity of the author as an *a priori* supposition is unacceptable. In the case of LLA, *a posteriori* it will turn out to be false.

Delehaye's judgment on the complicated geography of the Latin legend was not especially favourable: "En fait, il est difficile d'imaginer une combinaison plus absurde que celle qui réunit en une même action des martyrs immolés, on ne sait quand, à Aquilée [*sc.*, Chrysogonus], à Sirmium [*sc.*, Anastasia], à Thessalonique [*sc.*, Agape, Irene, and Chionia], à Nicée [*sc.*, Theodota with her sons], et il ne suffit pas de les faire voyager pour la rendre acceptable" [25, p. 136]. Recent scholars, with even more detailed observations of LLA's geography, have shown how inconsistent it is as well as physically impossible. There are, however, two options that could make such geography less absurd. This geography would:

1) chart important connexions between actual ecclesiastical centres, and/or

2) have a complicated stratigraphy consisting of several editorial layers, which would be a necessary consequence of adapting an old legend to new purposes and conditions.

Both mechanisms, to my opinion, were involved in the development of the presently available Latin recension.

Let us recapitulate the geographical information contained in the legend, while making sure not to confound the explicit geographical information we read and the understanding of it available to modern scholars (Table 1). These scholars, through some topographical and historical indications, have managed to make explicit otherwise obscure locations, whereas the intended audience of the legend was certainly neither so qualified nor supposed to be so.

Table 1. Geographical Data from the Latin Legend of Anastasia

Locality as named in the text	Locality as understood by the scholars <sup>3</sup>	Events	Chapter
Unnamed	Rome	Anastasia's birth, growing up, marriage, conversion	2
The same location	Rome	Chrysogonus under arrest	3
The same location	Rome	Correspondence between Chrysogonus and Anastasia; Anastasia's detainment by her husband	4–7
Aquileia, Rome	Aquileia, Rome	Anastasia accompanies Chrysogonus summoned by Diocletian to Aquileia; "...she made better provision to the saints at Aquileia than she had done at Rome."	8
Aquileia	Aquileia	Trial of Chrysogonus	8
<i>Aquae Gradatae</i> near Aquileia	Near the village of San Canzian d'Isonzo, 12 miles from Aquileia	Execution of Chrysogonus	8
An estate called <i>Ad Saltus</i> near Aquileia	Near the village of San Giovanni del Timavo, 12 miles from Aquileia	Home town of Agape, Chionia, and Irene and their priest Zoilus. Burying of Chrysogonus by Zoilus. Death of Zoilus	8–9
The same place as that of the interrogation of Chrysogonus	Aquileia	Interrogation of Agape, Chionia, and Irene by Diocletian	10–11
Macedonia	Thessalonica	Trials of Agape, Chionia, and Irene	12
Thessalonica	Thessalonica	Execution of Agape, Chionia, and Irene	18
Sirmium	Sirmium	Theodota with her three sons presented to Diocletian. She fled there from her city because of a persecution	19
Nicaea of Bithynia	Nicaea of Bithynia	Home town of Theodota	19

## End of table 1

Locality as named in the text	Locality as understood by the scholars <sup>3</sup>	Events	Chapter
The same place as that of the interrogation of Theodota	Sirmium	Interrogation of Anastasia by the prefect of Illyricum Probus	20
Rome	Rome	Anastasia said to Probus that she is a citizen of Rome and lived in Rome	21
The same place as that of the interrogation of Theodota	Rome <sup>4</sup>	Ulpian, the <i>summus pontifex</i> at the Capitol, intervened. Anastasia was handed over to Ulpian who placed her in his home	26
Still the same place	Rome <sup>5</sup>	Ulpian died; Anastasia left his house and went to the house of Theodota	28
Bithynia	Bithynia	Count Leucadius arrived from Bithynia; Theodota with her sons sent to Bithynia	29
The same place as that of the interrogation of Theodota	Rome	Anastasia is arrested in the house of Theodota and handed over to an unnamed judge (ch. 29) or the prefect (ch. 32) Lucillius <sup>6</sup>	29, 32
Nicaea in Bithynia	Nicaea in Bithynia	Martyrdom of Theodota with her sons	31
The same place as that of the interrogation of Theodota	Rome	Lucillius condemned Anastasia to be put in a punctured ship and to be drowned in the sea together with many criminals and St Eutychianus	35
<i>Palmariae</i> (now Pontine <sup>7</sup> ) islands	Pontine islands	Disembarking from the miraculously saved ship; solemn reception by the Christians exiled there	35
The same place	Pontine islands	Continuous liturgies by the Christian community gathered on the Pontine islands; arrival of the agents of Lucillius; martyrdom of all Christians (only the martyrdom of Anastasia is described in detail)	36
Unnamed	“Unclear” (Lapidge [54, p. 87, fn. 113]); Pontine islands (Delehay <sup>8</sup> )	Apollonia took the body of Anastasia and buried it in the garden of her house; then, she built a basilica on the same place	36
“A hidden location”	No comments by the modern scholars	The body of Anastasia “was kept in a hidden location. She was subsequently translated to the basilica built in the house of Apollonia.”	36 (the final passage of the entire text)

What one can see immediately from this table is that the two explicit mentions of Rome corroborate the feeling that the name of this city has been deliberately omitted in other places. Where the narrative of LLA implies Rome, the available text normally avoids making it explicit. Other locations remain, however, explicitly named.

One of the three exclusions, in ch. 8, is belated (the respective actions were mentioned earlier in the plot), and it has the purpose of comparison between Rome and Aquileia, not in

Rome’s favour: Anastasia showed better self-sacrificing when she arrived to Aquileia. The second and the third exclusions, ch. 21 and 32, are related to a characteristic of Anastasia (her noble origin) that does not make her a Roman saint. The lack of the mention of Rome in the very beginning of the story is especially striking. Even though modern scholars are successful in recognising Roman realities in the Latin legend, the intended audience of the editor who was responsible for this “anti-Roman” censorship would have been less sagacious.

This fact of “anti-Roman” censorship applied to a “Roman” legend has been overlooked so far and needs an explanation.

## 2.2. *The Aquileian Edition: Preliminary Considerations*

The text of the LLA looks to have been edited outside Rome with the purpose of making Anastasia less “Roman”. At the same time, there is, in this text, the plot line of Chrysogonus, which subordinates the martyrdom of Anastasia to this Aquileian saint. According to LLA, Chrysogonus became her mentor in Christianity. The story of Chrysogonus is not only easily detachable from the corpus of the legend but has an obvious bias: having made Chrysogonus the teacher of Anastasia, the editor introduced Chrysogonus as the highest religious authority in the legend, thus making the cult of Anastasia secondary with respect to him and dependent on him<sup>9</sup>. Such a construction of the plot of LLA is in sharp contrast with what we know about the Roman titular churches of St Chrysogonus and St Anastasia: the latter was one of the most important churches of the city (see below, section 6), whereas the former was rather ordinary and never reached a comparable status. Thus, the sacred topography implied in LLA is certainly not Roman, whereas it probably fits to the Aquileian landscape.

The concluding lines of LLA are especially revealing through their contrast between chronological exactitude and spatial imprecision. It is an account of the deposition of the relics of Anastasia in a new basilica on September 7. Below (sections 2.3.4 and 4.5) we will discuss this part of the text in detail, but now it is important to note that the only possibility to explain this lack of any geographical precision is a deliberate erasure. It is obvious that this concluding passage of LLA was intended to establish an additional commemoration of Anastasia related to her *depositio* and, therefore, must have had to contain indications of both the day and the place.

In the early Latin martyrologia, Chrysogonus is mentioned as a martyr with no connection to Anastasia. The scholarly consensus considers his story within LLA to be the adaptation of an early and subsequently lost *Passio* of the Aquileian martyr<sup>10</sup>. It is natural to conclude that suppression of the explicit mentions of Rome and

the subordination of Anastasia to Chrysogonus were made by the same hand working in the interests of the See of Aquileia at the expense of the interests of the See of Rome.

Now we provisionally keep open the question whether the Aquileian editor added the entire Chrysogonus plot line (that, under this supposition, was absent in the preceding Latin recension) or limited himself to shifting emphasis from Anastasia to Chrysogonus (who, in this case, must have been somewhat present in the preceding recension), but we will turn to this problem in section 2.4 and resolve it in favour of the first option.

The editing of LLA in Aquileia reveals three features of the editor’s milieu:

1. Inaccessibility (or very difficult accessibility) of Anastasia’s relics.
2. Antagonism (hostility, competition etc.) with either Old Rome or/and.
3. New Rome.

For the time being, let us put aside the problem of dating the recension of the Anastasia legend preceding the LLA, because, for now, we are interested only in the dating of its Aquileian recension. It must certainly have been posterior to the Latin recension where all Roman realities were explicit. Given that this lost Latin recension already contained the plot lines of Theodota and the three martyrs of Thessalonica, it must have been posterior to the transfer of Anastasia’s relics to Constantinople in 468–470<sup>11</sup>.

Keeping this in mind, we can try to choose the most fitting period of the ecclesiastical history of Aquileia with respect to the three features above. The periods to be taken into account are the following five:

- 1) Ostrogothic rule during the peace with Byzantium (from the late fifth century to 536);
- 2) the same rule during the Gothic war – until the taking of Aquileia by Byzantine troops (536–552);
- 3) Byzantine rule before the Three Chapters schism (552–554);
- 4) Byzantine rule when the Church of Aquileia broke off communion with the Pope of Rome, meanwhile without breaking it decisively with Constantinople<sup>12</sup> (554–568);
- 5) the Aquileian Church out of communion with both Rome and Constantinople under the Lombard rule (568–698)<sup>13</sup>.

The communion with Constantinople was certainly already broken by 606, when a part of the Aquileian Church entered into communion with Rome and established the new Byzantine-backed Aquileian patriarchate in Grado; however, Aquileia's communion with Constantinople would hardly have survived the Lombard invasion of 568.

Now we can look at all possible combinations of the three features of our Aquileian editor's milieu with these five historical periods to see which of the five is the most fitting with LLA (Table 2).

Table 2 demonstrates that the most plausible period when LLA (in its presently accessible recension) was composed is that of the strong opposition of the "tricapitoline" Patriarchate of Aquileia, protected by the Lombards, to both Old and New Romes – somewhere after 568 (if not after the schism within the Patriarchate of Aquileia in 606). This dating is compatible with that of the earliest manuscripts (late eighth century) but is much later than is usually thought. Let us discuss the history of LLA in somewhat more detail.

### 2.3. LLA and the Cult of Anastasia in Aquileia

In this section, the meaning of the peculiar geography of LLA will be interpreted within the history of the cult of Anastasia in the Patriarchates (both) of Aquileia. Our main question will be: What is the actual meaning of the geography presented in LLA, in its Aquileian recension? We will see that it satisfies the need to transfer Anastasia's martyrdom onto Aquileian soil. Such a need arose in the seventh century, and to this century LLA, in its Aquileian recension, is to be dated.

#### 2.3.1. Methodological Considerations and the *terminus post quem*

The current scholarly consensus proposes for LLA an early fifth-century dating<sup>14</sup>. This is a supposition without pretense to any kind of logically strict demonstration. It is based on two kinds of reasoning.

The first kind depends on an evaluation of the meaning and purpose of the legend. Without considering LLA as a hagiographical document serving a certain cult and understandable within this cult only, such reasoning becomes almost arbitrary and certainly not very productive<sup>15</sup>. However, once we take into account the meaning of the translation of Anastasia's relics from Sirmium to Constantinople (as we did in Part One of the present study), it becomes clear why Anastasia appeared flanked with Nicaean and Thessalonian saints. Given that these non-Roman saints are present in LLA, we thus obtain the *terminus post quem* 468–470 for LLA as well as for its lost Latin predecessor that will be edited in Aquileia.

Indeed, there was a cult of Anastasia in Rome before 468–470, and, therefore, it must have had legends of its own. In Part One of the present study, we have called (a part of) the corresponding Roman legends the Roman substrate of the Byzantine legend of Anastasia. We will discuss this early Roman cult of Anastasia(e) below (see esp. section 7).

The second kind of reasoning is, on the contrary, the strictest one. It is based on quotations or references to LLA in the later Latin literature, and we will discuss it below. It will be necessary to discern between three kinds of references to Anastasia legends: 1) references to the *Sondergut* of the Aquileian recension, 2) references to the pre-Aquileian Latin legend viz. unedited material

Table 2. Three Features of LLA against Five Possible Historical Backgrounds

	before 536	536–552	552–554	554–568	after 568
<b>Antagonism with Rome</b>	–	–	–	+	+
<b>Antagonism with Constantinople</b>	–	–	–	–?	+
<b>Inaccessibility of the relics</b>	–	+?	–	–	+

of LLA, and 3) references to non-Byzantine Roman legends of Anastasia, including – but not limited to – the Roman substrate of the Byzantine legend. So far, however, any reference to the cult of St Anastasia in Rome has been treated as a reference to LLA (as if there could have not been any other Anastasia legends).

### 2.3.2. *The Earliest References to the Aquileian Sondergut of LLA*

There are two pre-ninth-century texts having references to a legend of both Anastasia and Chrysogonus. One of them is datable more or less strictly, whereas the other one is not. The former is the *Martyrologium* of Bede the Venerable (672/673–735) datable to the early eighth century<sup>16</sup>. The latter is part of the hagiographical dossier of the martyrs Cantius, Cantianus, and Cantianilla, the so-called martyrs Cantiani. Their entire dossier exists only in Latin. The part of the dossier relevant to us is called by Cécile Lanéry *Passion 1* (*BHL* 1543–1548)<sup>17</sup>. It is not datable exactly in any way (except for the date of the earliest manuscripts as the *terminus ante quem*, the ninth century)<sup>18</sup> but is very helpful for understanding the scale and the contents of the Aquileian editorial intervention.

The Cantiani were historical martyrs of Aquileia under Diocletian, but historically related to neither Chrysogonus nor Anastasia. Their cult is attested to by artefacts of the fourth and fifth century and by a short sermon by Maximus, the first bishop of Turin († ca 420), *BHL* 1549<sup>19</sup>. This sermon has no connection to either Chrysogonus or LLA and is focused on a unique episode of the martyrdom (a failed attempt to escape from the persecutors on a chariot)<sup>20</sup>. It was used, however, by the author of *Passion 1*, who added *ad libitum* matter from LLA, including a number of characters (with the same functions and under the same names), and made the three martyrs share their place in martyrdom with Chrysogonus (*Ad Aquas Gradatas*).

With *Passion 1* of the Cantiani, we see a kind of appropriation of their cult by that of Chrysogonus. In a similar manner, we see, in LLA, an appropriation of the cult of Anastasia by the same cult of Chrysogonus. *Passion 1* of the Cantiani uses LLA, but it is difficult to evaluate how much it is posterior to it.

### 2.3.3. *Multiplication of Relics between Aquileia and Grado*

Transformations of hagiographical legends are an aspect of the transformations of the respective cults. Therefore, studying the Aquileian recension of LLA requires data on cults and relics.

In 568, the head of the “tricapitoline” patriarchate of Aquileia, Paulinus (or Paul) I (557–570), fled from the Lombard invasion to the island of Grado, not far from Aquileia, taking with him the Church’s treasures and relics. In the earliest account available to us, the mid-780s *Historia langobardorum* (II, 10) by Paul the Deacon, the relics remained unspecified and never mentioned apart from “treasures” (*omnem suae thesaurum ecclesiae deportavit*)<sup>21</sup>. In the later Venetian chronicles, however, the relics are mentioned under the respective saints’ names, although their lists differ from each other and are never exhaustive<sup>22</sup>. None of these chronicles mentions any relics of Anastasia, whereas the *Chronicon Gradense* (dated to the second half of the eleventh century, if not somewhat earlier<sup>23</sup>) narrates a story of delivering to Grado some relics, including those of the Cantiani, rescued from the devastated city of Aquileia (with the subsequent deposition of the relics of the Cantiani in the church of St John the Evangelist of Grado), still under Patriarch Paul (Paulinus) I (cf. [65, pp. 37, 41]).

Small pieces of the relics of several saints including the Cantiani were found, in 1871, in two fifth- or sixth-century decorated boxes deposited under the main altar of the Grado cathedral of St Euphemia<sup>24</sup>; the names of the saints were inscribed on the boxes. The cathedral, however, was dedicated in 579, substantially later than these two boxes were made (s. A. Tilatti [86, pp. 765–767]). For Venantius Fortunatus, between September 573 and April 576, the relics of the Cantiani were still in Aquileia<sup>25</sup>.

Be that as it may, one can be sure that, in Grado, there had accumulated plenty of relics of Aquileian saints. It is beyond any probability that all of them could have been kept in good order. The early seventh-century schism (606) and the late seventh-century reconciliation (698) between Grado and Aquileia added further confusion. According to the inevitable laws of nature, the relics started to multiply. It is difficult to evaluate

how many “copies” of the relics of different saints have been “discovered” since the seventh century. For us, however, it is important that there appeared, among others, “new” relics of Anastasia which were always connected with the “new” relics of the Cantiani. Meanwhile, the “old” (apparently genuine) relics of the Cantiani fell into oblivion. Their modest home in a village would have hardly been competitive with such centres as Grado and Aquileia. In general, the relics were and still are venerated according to the importance of the cults in which they are involved, with no respect at all to their historical provenance<sup>26</sup>.

In 1024, the patriarch of Aquileia Poppo (patriarch in 1019–1042) sacked the rival ecclesiastical centre of Grado with a military force. He carried off many ecclesiastical treasures including the relics. An apologetic account of this event is preserved in monk Gotschalculus’s *Translatio sanctae Anastasiae* (BHL 403) – the translation from a monastery in Verona, within the patriarchate of Aquileia (where they, together with the relics of the Cantiani, were deposited by Poppo after his raid on Grado), to his own Bavarian monastery of Benediktbeuren in 1053<sup>27</sup>. Gotschalculus testifies that, by 1024, the relics of Anastasia as well as those of the Cantiani, just as many others, were still in Grado, so that that Poppo must have planned an operation for “returning” them to their Aquileian “home”.

We do not know what then happened to the relics of the Cantiani in Verona, but, in 1307, they were once again discovered in the cathedral basilica of Aquileia, again together with the relics of St Anastasia, and, this time, also with the relics of St Chrysogonus<sup>28</sup>. It was opportune for the highly esteemed saints already unified within a ramified common cult to appear together in the main cathedral of the respective ecclesiastical region (patriarchate). As always, the relics were inevitably discovered everywhere where people of some power were actually in need of them.

The influence of the combined cult of Anastasia and the Cantiani increased in Aquileia and Grado. Naturally, it resulted in the appearance of new relics of theirs, even more than once. The composition of *Passion 1* of the Cantiani must have been both fruit and tool of this process, in which the Aquileian cults of the Cantiani and Anastasia became interwoven and put into the orbit of the cult of St Chrysogonus.

### 2.3.4. *The Martyrdom of Anastasia Packed into the Aquileian Landscape*

With the Gotschalculus’s account BHL 403, we reach the domain of sacred topography, so vital for understanding the Aquileian edition of LLA.

For Gotschalculus, who obviously was retelling an established tradition, the population of Grado are *Palmarientes cives*, “the citizens of Palmaria”, while *Palmaria* is, of course, the martyrdom place of Anastasia<sup>29</sup>. The place of action of LLA became the island of Grado instead of the Pontine islands and, indeed, Aquileia instead of Rome.

For Gotschalculus, the history of Anastasia’s relics ran as follows. Anastasia’s martyrdom took place *ad insulas Palmarias*; from the very beginning, Gotschalculus did not forget to mention the role of Chrysogonus as Anastasia’s mentor. Apollonia buried Anastasia *intra viridarium domus sue* (“in the garden of her villa”); then, at the same place where she buried Anastasia, Apollonia constructed a basilica (*basilicam fabricavit, ubi eam sepelivit*). In this passage, Gotschalculus quotes LLA generally verbatim, certainly with the text at hand, but with significant changes in comparison with the recensions available to us (see Table 3).

The date of the martyrdom of Anastasia in BHL 403, November 23, is at odds with all other sources. It is, however, significant that it is adjacent to the most common commemoration day of Chrysogonus, November 24; alternatively, some manuscripts of the *Martyrologium Hieronymianum* contain his commemoration on November 22 and 23<sup>30</sup>. We do not know which of these days was implied by the tradition in which Anastasia was commemorated on November 23, whereas, of course, November 24 is the most probable. This is the main difference of BHL 403, which has so far been overlooked.

Gotschalculus quoted LLA in a recension where only a single translation of the body of Anastasia was mentioned, from the place of the martyrdom to the place of the burial. In the next sentence after the quotation above, he continued once again mentioning this translation of the body as a unique act: *Dehinc postquam ista translatio facta est memorate virginis et martiris Anastasiae in supradicto loco, et ubi ecclesia brevi creverat tempore...* (“Then, after this translation was

made, when the virgin and martyr Anastasia was commemorated in the aforementioned place, where the church has had appeared in a short time...”).

The text of LLA is not so smooth. At first, it runs as does the text of Gotschalculus, naming only two locations, that of the martyrdom and that of the burial. Then, in the sentence containing the precise dates, most of the previous sentence is repeated, but the third place, “a hidden location” appeared between the two previously enumerated locations. This “hidden location” replaced the garden of Apollonia at her home. The text as it is allows the interpretation that this place was located outside Apollonia’s home but probably in another of her gardens. However, it would be much more natural to acknowledge that the phrase mentioning “a hidden place” goes back to a different tradition, where it was unrelated to any garden of Apollonia; but the basilica is now placed in Apollonia’s home, not the place of the first burial of Anastasia. It looks as though the actual ending of LLA agglomerates two contradictory traditions about Anastasia’s sepulture, the first one containing only a single translation, and the second one, two translations<sup>31</sup>. Gotschalculus followed the former.

Then Gotschalculus described a conflict between *Palmarienses cives et Aquileigensis civitatis episcopum* (“the citizens of Palmaria and the bishop of the city of Aquileia”), when the “Palmarians” attacked the Aquileians with a military force which carried out many murders and acts of violence and carried off many treasures and holy relics. This is why the relics of Anastasia, among others, were removed from Aquileia to *Palmaria*, that is, to Grado. Gotschalculus does not mention Rome at all. His geography is limited to Aquileia and Grado, even though the island of Grado is called by an unusual name.

The rivalry between Aquileia and Grado began in the early seventh century, when, in 606, Grado became the city of the alternative patriarch of Aquileia in communion with Rome, whereas the patriarch residing in Aquileia itself was not in communion with any other patriarchate. This rivalry could explain to us the coexistence of conflicting versions of the events in LLA. A provisional burial in “a hidden place” different from the commonly known basilica might have been introduced in order to reclaim the alleged rights of *Palmaria* on Grado for the relics of Anastasia. We will discuss the ending of LLA later (section 8.3), but we have to notice just now

Table 3. The Burial of Anastasia according to LLA and Gotschalculus

LLA (Moretti [66, pp. 184, 186])	BHL 403 (p. 225)
Tunc Apollonia christiana matrona per matronam praefecti meruit corpus eius tollere. Quod accipiens exosculatur, et aromatibus condiens atque dignis lintheaminibus obvolvens intra viridarium domus suae – ut decuit martyrem – sepelivit atque expenso non parvo pecuniae numero basilicam ubi eam sepelierat fabricavit. Passa est autem sancta Anastasia octavo kalendas ianuarias et in conditis habita. Deposita autem est postea quam basilica fabricata est in domo Apolloniae septimo idus septembris, in eadem basilica...	Apollonia quedam matrona christianissima tulit corpus sancte Anastasie virginis, et lintheaminibus obvolvens, intra viridarium domus sue posuit, et ut decuit martirem sepelivit, atque expenso non parvo pecuniae numero basilicam fabricavit, ubi eam sepelivit. Passa est vero sancta Anastasia 9. Kal. Decembris, postea autem deposita est ubi basilica fabricate est in domo Apollonie 7. Idus Septembris
A Christian matron named Apollonia, through the offices of the wife of the prefect, was permitted to remove her body. Taking it up she kissed it, and embalming it with spices, and wrapping it in appropriate linen clothes, she buried it in the garden of her home – as was fitting for a martyr; and, at no small monetary expense, she built a basilica where she had buried her. St Anastasia suffered martyrdom on 25 December and was kept in a hidden location. She was subsequently translated to the basilica built in the house of Apollonia on 7 September <...> Lapidge [54, p. 87]	A certain very Christian matron Apollonia removed the body of Saint Anastasia the virgin and wrapping it in linen clothes, she buried it in the garden of her home – as was fitting for a martyr; and at no small monetary expense she built a basilica where she had buried her. St Anastasia suffered martyrdom on 23 November, while was subsequently translated to the basilica built in the house of Apollonia on 7 September

that, in its present form, it seems to be affected by the competition between Grado and Aquileia. The “hidden place” is a later addition that, most probably, is a trace from a recension related to Grado.

Anyway, for Gotschalculus, the basilica of Apollonia was located in Aquileia. In this respect, the text of LLA that he quoted does not contradict his version. However, at the same time, his text of LLA was almost identical to LLA as we read it now. The anti-Roman censorship of LLA described above (sections 2.1 and 2.2) was not in vain. Now we see that, in Aquileia, the martyrdom of Anastasia was indeed separated from Rome and packed into the Aquileian landscape, and LLA provided a recension of Anastasia’s legend that would have been suitable for such usage.

The Aquileian landscape itself did not remain immovable. One can wonder whether the closeness of the commemoration dates of Anastasia and Chrysogonus in Gotschalculus’s account already implied the coincidence of the sites of their martyrdoms, that is, identifying Grado with *Ad Aquas Gradatas*. Even if such a geographical *téléscopage* did not take place in Gotschalculus, it was documented by Andrea Dandolo (1306–1354) in his *Chronica per extensum descripta*. He provided a short summary of LLA followed with a summary of *Passion 1* of the Cantiani and described the martyrdom site of Chrysogonus as *ad aquas gradatas, ubi postea Gradi civitas constructa fuit* [69, p. 28] (“*Ad Aquas Gradatas*, where later the city of Grado was built”). This was the final point of the evolution of the Aquileian sacred topography, when the hagiographical coordinates of Anastasia and Chrysogonus eventually coincided: Chrysogonus and Anastasia suffered martyrdom at the same place and (as we know from Gotschalculus) on two successive days. An early phase of this evolution is documented by LLA in its present recension, which is certainly Aquileian.

The phase of this evolution documented by Gotschalculus is closer to LLA, whereas the peculiar date November 23 is an innovation. Unlike Gotschalculus who followed the Aquileian version of the events in Anastasia’s burial, the editor of LLA hesitated between two competing versions. Indeed, in the seventh century, it was difficult to choose between Aquileia and Grado.

### 2.3.5. Conclusion on the Date of the Aquileian Editorial Layer: Seventh Century

Now we have confirmed our understanding of the geography of LLA as a result of deliberate editorship in Aquileia. This editorship must be dated to the seventh century, before 824 (when LLA was translated into Greek), before Bede the Venerable, in an epoch of competition between Aquileia and Grado, roughly contemporaneous but earlier than *Passion 1* of the Cantiani.

The Aquileian editorial layer of LLA is certainly posterior to the sixth century. In this century, we still do not have evidence of the entwining of the cults of Anastasia and Chrysogonus or references to the Aquileian *Sondergut* of LLA. If the contradictory ending of LLA reflects the competition between Grado and Aquileia, which seems to me most likely, the *terminus post quem* for LLA is 606, when the alternative patriarchate of Aquileia was established in Grado.

## 2.4. “Chrysogonization” and Fausta

In the Anastasia legend known to us as LLA, a mention of Anastasia’s mother Fausta, called by the name and attested to as *christianissima* and *casta*, is uniquely contained in a letter from Anastasia to Chrysogonus (in Moretti’s edition, [66, p. 110]). If the whole material related to Chrysogonus is an Aquileian addition, our Anastasia loses her Christian mother. This could drastically affect the image of the saint. This problem must be discussed in detail.

### 2.4.1. St Chrysogonus and gens Anicia

The name of Anastasia’s mother according to LLA, Fausta, belongs to the Roman aristocratic family of *Anicii*<sup>32</sup>. This family became connected to the cult of Chrysogonus.

From the very beginning, *Passion 1* of the Cantiani proclaims that they belonged to the family of *Anicii* that goes back to Emperor Carinus (reigned in 283–285): *qui de genere Aniciorum, hoc est divae memoriae Carini imperatoris noscuntur progeniti et intra urbem Romam in quarta decima regione generati atque educati probantur*<sup>33</sup> (“...who are from the family of *Anicii* that is known as descendants of Emperor

Carinus of divine memory, and who are renowned as being raised and educated in the city of Rome in the fourteenth region”).

Historically, the Anicians were not connected to Emperor Carinus, but they were connected with Aquileia, whereas Emperor Carinus, in turn, was thought, according to one of the popular versions reported by the late fourth-century *Historia Augusta*, to have been born in Aquileia<sup>34</sup>. This historical commentary, however, is still not sufficient for understanding the meaning of this reference to Carinus.

Carinus died after having been defeated by Diocletian, thus perhaps becoming, in the eyes of Christians, the latter’s victim. On the opposite site, the pagan author of the *Historia Augusta* was so hostile toward him that he went beyond the limits of probability in portraying Carinus as a monster [80, pp. 243-245]; this fact would corroborate a highly positive evaluation of Carinus by Christians. The mention of Carinus in *Passion I* is not without parallels in Christian hagiography. In the so-called Roman legend of Cosmas and Damian, Carinus takes the place of Constantine the Great: an edict similar to Constantine’s edict of Milan is ascribed to Carinus<sup>35</sup>.

The meaning of the connection between the Cantiani and the *Anicii* could stand to be clarified. As Cécile Lanéry noticed, “[c]ette famille était devenue, pour la Vénétie, l’emblème de l’aristocratie chrétienne: il n’est donc pas surprenant qu’un hagiographe ait choisi d’y rattacher les trois martyrs d’Aquilée, tout en assignant à ces derniers un parcours qui correspondait à l’aire d’influence des *Anicii* (Rome, la Vénétie)” [50, p. 436, n. 544].

The reference to the fourteenth region of Rome could be another reference to the Anicians and the cult of Chrysogonus: the titular church of Chrysogonus was located in this region, *Trans Tiberim*, the modern Trastevere. This church had existed since the first half of the fifth century; late twentieth-century archaeological studies did not confirm the hypothesis that a Christian church had existed here already in the fourth century. By the late fourth-century, the second-century Roman *domus* constructed on this place was, most likely, abandoned and, therefore, available for acquisition by certain members of the Church of Rome<sup>36</sup>. The question of mutual relations between the martyr of Aquileia Chrysogonus and the saint of Rome,

the namesake of the *titulus Chrysogoni*, is not as easy as it is often thought. The Roman church, most probably, possessed the relics of her saint since the first half of the fifth century, whereas, in Aquileia (in the village San Canzian d’Isonzo), there were also some relics of St Chrysogonus. This does not mean, however, that these two saints were necessarily not identical<sup>37</sup>. St Chrysogonus, like St Anastasia, is also an example of a saint with multiple avatars and multiplying relics... Given that *Passion I* establishes strong links between the cults of the Cantiani and Chrysogonus, it is possible, as Steffen Diefenbach supposed, that the reference to the fourteenth region at the very beginning of the *Passion I* implies the church of Chrysogonus. Diefenbach goes further, supposing that the Roman cult of Chrysogonus was itself a creation of the Aquileian-based branch of the *Anicii*<sup>38</sup>.

Even if Diefenbach’s hypothesis about the Anicians as the main supporters of Chrysogonus’s cult in Rome is far-fetched, *Passion I* of the Cantiani demonstrated a connection between Chrysogonus’s cult and the *Anicii* in a hagiographical tradition not forgotten by the ninth century. This tradition must go back to an earlier period, but not necessarily to the fourth or fifth century, as Diefenbach believes. Nevertheless, such a tradition is hardly posterior to the sixth century, the “Indian summer” that was enjoyed by the aristocracy of Rome under Odoacer and Theoderic<sup>39</sup>. After the Byzantine Reconquista of Italia under Justinian, the Roman aristocracy, including the Anicians, lost even a symbolical role in social life<sup>40</sup>. It cannot be ruled out, nevertheless, that, in Aquileia, the Anicians continued to be socially important throughout the seventh century.

Earlier, one of the most famous Anicians in ecclesiastical history, Demetrias (born *ca* 398, consecrated as a virgin as of 413, and died under Pope Leo I, before 460) contributed to transmitting to Rome the Palestinian cult of St Stephanus, whose relics were discovered near Jerusalem in 415 (she founded the suburban Santo Stefano basilica in Via Latina)<sup>41</sup>. Nevertheless, nothing similar is known concerning the hypothetical Anicians’ involvement in the development of the Roman cult of Chrysogonus, even though we can agree with Diefenbach that such an involvement would have been likely. Be that as it may, it is certain (as *Passion I* of the Cantiani testifies) that

the Aquileian cult of Chrysogonus was eventually shaped with reference to the Anicians<sup>42</sup>.

All that we know concerning the “Chrysogonization” of the cult of Anastasia fits the same pattern. Anastasia’s mother’s name, Fausta, is certainly a mark of Anastasia’s appropriation by the Anicians. Therefore, it could hardly belong to the pre-Aquileian Anastasia legend, as we can demonstrate definitively from the eastern texts.

#### 2.4.2. Anastasia’s Pre-Aquileian Mother: A Pagan

One has to notice that, in the Arabic and Georgian versions of the Anastasia legend (Martyrdom of Anastasia and Theodota), there is no mention of her mother at all. Indeed, these versions represent an abbreviated Greek recension. However, such an important detail would hardly have been skipped, had it been present in the complete recension. Anastasia’s father in these abbreviated recensions is preserved.

The Greek panegyric to Anastasia ascribed to a certain John (*BHG* 83b) provides additional data in its first part<sup>43</sup>. In one place (ch. 6), Anastasia is praised for becoming Christian despite her pagan ancestors and parents; her mother is explicitly called pagan (ed. B. Kotter [46, S. 291]):

Καὶ τὸ δὴ θαυμάσιον· οὐ γὰρ κληρὸν πατρῶον, ὃς ἄνωθεν κάτισιν εἰς τοὺς ὕστερον, οὐδέ, ὃ φασι, παῖς παρὰ πατρὸς τὴν πίστιν ἐδέξατο, ἀλλ’ ἐξ ἀγριελαιῶν τῆς ἀκάρπου τῶν Ἑλλήνων φυτῆς εἰς καλλιέλαιον ἐγκεντρίζεται, ὥστε λογισμοῦ κρίσει τὴν λῆψιν γενέσθαι τῆς χάριτος.

And what is especially wonderful: not by the ancestral lot that from the above went up to the latest (generation), nor, as it is said, the child received the faith from the father, but, from the fruitless wild olive tree of the race of pagans, she was grafted into a cultivated olive tree (cf. Rom 11:24), in order that the grace became received through a decision of reason.

Γίνεται τοιγαροῦν ἐξ ἀσεβῶν εὐσεβῆς καὶ ῥόδον ἐξ ἀκανθῶν, ἐξ Ἑλληνίδος χριστιανῆ. Καὶ τὴν πίστιν ἔσχεν ἔργον, οὐ πάρεργον.

Therefore, she became a pious from out of the impious and a rose from thorns (cf. Cant 2:2), from a pagan (woman), a Christian. And she acquired faith through work, not a by-work.

This fragment, where Anastasia’s mother is called Ἑλληνίς “pagan woman”, is sufficient for insisting that, in the Byzantine legend, there was no *christianissima* Fausta, and, therefore, the whole block of Chrysogonus-related content was absent. Within this block, the mention of Fausta was the unique detail that was apparently unconnected to Chrysogonus but important for the image of Anastasia. The entire “Chrysogonization” of the Anastasia legend now becomes explainable as an Aquileian editorial layer influenced by the Anicians. Thus, there are no Anicians and no Chrysogonus in the fifth-century Byzantine legend.

The Greek panegyrist did not preserve the name of Anastasia’s mother. Perhaps she passed unnamed in his source, although this is not certain.

#### 2.4.3. The Cult of Chrysogonus in Byzantium

The conclusion about the first appearance of Chrysogonus in the Anastasia legend being only in Aquileia can be corroborated with the data on the Byzantine cult of Chrysogonus.

The Roman feast of Chrysogonus on November 24 (this date of his martyrdom is preserved in LLA, *BHG* 81, and *Martyrologium Hieronymianum*) is present in the Synaxarium of Constantinople<sup>44</sup>, but is absent from the *Typikon* of the Great Church (ca 900). However, it was present already in the mid-tenth century first recension of the Synaxarium, since it follows from its presence in the Armenian version<sup>45</sup>.

Even then, in the tenth century, Chrysogonus did not in any case become a popular saint. There is only a single indication of his relative popularity. In the *Life of St Andrew the Fool*, in the scene when St Andrew was recalled to a feat of foolishness in Christ by St Anastasia (ch. 2), Anastasia appeared to him in a group of five women and one elder; the women were Theodota, Irene, Agape, Chionia, and Anastasia herself, while the elder was obviously Chrysogonus. The whole group becomes identifiable, once the name of Anastasia is pronounced. Chrysogonus, in accordance with LLA and *BHG* 81, is represented in this scene as a leader of the group<sup>46</sup>. This scene is, however, an exception in Byzantine hagiography.

The actual late ninth- and tenth-century liturgical tradition of Constantinople was

formulated in the *Typikon* of the Great Church. On December 22, the women alone were commemorated, without a mention of Chrysogonus: ἄθλησις τῆς ἁγίας Ἀναστασίας καὶ σὺν αὐτῇ ἁγίων γυναικῶν [58, p. 142] (“the contest of saint Anastasia and with her saint women”). This title of the respective entry is repeated in the Greek recension of the Synaxarium of Constantinople of *Vaticanus gr.* 2046 (12<sup>th</sup> cent., not taken into account in the edition by Delehaye) and the Slavonic version<sup>47</sup>. This notice refers to a more complete legend than the Martyrdom of Anastasia and Theodota; it implies that Irene, Agape, and Chionia are not forgotten. Chrysogonus, however, is absent from this list of the legend’s headliners. In other recensions of the Synaxarium of Constantinople, the long title of the entry mentioning, after Anastasia, Chrysogonus and the women, is a later addition to the earlier form of the title mentioning Anastasia alone, which is preserved in some Greek recensions as well as in the Armenian and Georgian versions<sup>48</sup>.

These facts demonstrate that, in the liturgical tradition of Constantinople, there was no specific veneration of Chrysogonus, even among the companions of Anastasia. It is only about the twelfth century when the situation began to change, and some recensions of the Synaxarium of Constantinople acquired, on December 22, a separate entry on Chrysogonus and/or a mention of the martyrdom of Chrysogonus at the end of the entry of Anastasia. Oddly enough, according to these sources, Chrysogonus was decapitated in Nicaea [23, pp. 335-338].

Therefore, for the pre-twelfth-century Byzantine cult of Anastasia the Widow, Chrysogonus was one among other companions of Anastasia, but not among the exceptional characters of her legend equal to her four women companions. The plot line of Chrysogonus seems to be completely unknown in Byzantium before the translation of LLA in 824; up to this date, there was no trace of any cult of Chrysogonus at all.

#### 2.4.4. Conclusion: No “Chrysogonization” in Byzantium

The Byzantine legend of Anastasia did not include the plot line of Chrysogonus. Therefore, the Latin translation of this legend that became available in Rome did not contain it either.

The part of LLA related to St Chrysogonus is an addition made by the Aquileian editor in the seventh century.

This editor kept in mind the interests of the Anician family. This is why he introduced “the most Christian” Fausta, the bearer of a recognisable Anician *cognomen*, instead of Anastasia’s “original” mother who was a pagan, perhaps unnamed.

Now we become authorized to conclude that the original Constantinopolitan legend of Anastasia consisted of three major blocks:

- 1) the Roman core;
- 2) the legend of Theodota, and
- 3) the legend of Irene, Agape, and Chionia.

The Roman core was free from Aquileian connotations, unconnected to the *titulus Chrysogoni* church in Rome, and unrelated to St Chrysogonus at all. It was unrelated to the Anicians either.

The pre-seventh-century legend of Anastasia the Widow is recoverable from LLA through subtraction of the elements related to St Chrysogonus and restoring to Anastasia her “original” pagan mother.

### 3. The Roman Hagiographical Substrate. I: Non-Anastasian Legends

Before the translation of the relics of St Anastasia from Sirmium to Constantinople, Anastasia was certainly venerated as a saint in Rome. We know very little about this cult. Our further investigation of it will proceed along two paths. At first, in the present section, we will study the legends belonging to the Roman core of the Byzantine Anastasia legend but only those that could not be behind the name choice of Anastasia. Then, in the next section, on the second path of investigation, we will trace the Roman pre-sixth century cult(s) of a saint (or saints) called Anastasia.

We will see, in this section, how deeply the legend of Anastasia the Widow was rooted in Roman legends. We will refrain, however, from attempts to collect the relevant Roman legends into a single puzzle. These legends are available to us as piles of tesserae from crumbled mosaics.

Even though, in this section, we limit ourselves to the pertinent non-Anastasian Roman legends, several important topics belonging to this already limited domain will be skipped (but

addressed later, section 7; see also Stem 2 in Part One). It is necessary, at this stage, to obtain a general outline of the Roman hagiographical substrate of the legend of St Anastasia. More details will follow later.

### 3.1. *Martyr Eutychianus: Pope Eutychianus and the Roman Martyr Eutychius*

The elder martyr Eutychianus was the leading figure among those who were, together with Anastasia, transported to the Palmaria islands in the punctured ship. He is usually considered as unknown elsewhere, but this is not true. His figure results from an amalgamation of the historical Pope Eutychianus and the historical Roman martyr Eutychius who entered Roman hagiography no later than the fifth century (probably in the late fourth).

In LLA (ch. 35), Eutychianus is presented as a bishop, even though his title is never made explicit<sup>49</sup>. The context, nevertheless, is clear: he has been condemned in Rome, as all others who were put on the punctured ship (the Aquileian editor deleted any mention of Rome in the corresponding scenes, but the context leaves no room for doubt). Anastasia asked him to make a prayer and perform baptism for those with them and even “kissed his knees” (*osculari coepit genua eius*). Anastasia’s words *Da orationem et baptizentur universi* (“Make a prayer [sc., perform the appropriate ecclesiastical rite] and let them all be baptized”)<sup>50</sup> have a sacramental meaning and would have been addressed only to a priest. Other elements of the context mark his rank as higher than that of an ordinary priest and allow us to identify him as a bishop (kissing his knees by Anastasia, his earlier status of a rich man and a philosopher) – evidently, a bishop of Rome, taken into account that he has been condemned in Rome, and that he became the last companion of Anastasia, another Roman martyr of the highest rank.

In Rome, there was no historical martyr Eutychianus. However, the historical Pope Eutychianus (274–282), while not a martyr, became a martyr in later legends. Their earliest occurrence is in the so-called second editing of the *Liber Pontificalis*, somewhere in the middle of the sixth century and after the Three Chapters affair<sup>51</sup>, but it must date to an earlier tradition. As Louis

Duchesne stated concerning Pope Eutychianus, “... nous ne possédons pas, tant s’en faut, tous les récits qui circulèrent à Rome, du IV<sup>e</sup> au VII<sup>e</sup> siècle, sur les martyrs et leurs sanctuaires” [32, p. 159]. Some of them, however, can be recovered, even though with many lacunae.

The historical Pope Eutychianus is beyond the scope of our study. We are interested in the martyr Pope Eutychianus created in the fourth or fifth century and also called Eutychius – thus according to manuscript *B<sup>1</sup>* of the *Liber Pontificalis*, one of the earliest ones (late seventh century)<sup>52</sup>. This oscillation of the name of the martyr Pope between Eutychianus and Eutychius already in the Roman evidence is significant for his identification with both the historical Roman martyr Eutychius and the companion of St Thessalonica commemorated on December 19 (see below, section 3.2.2).

The legend of the Roman martyr Eutychius is lost, but some traces are available thanks to both literary sources and archaeology. A brief and not very clear story of his martyrdom has survived in the short *elogium* (Nr 21) to the martyr written by Pope Damasus (366–384) within the span of two years, 383–384<sup>53</sup>. The martyr’s mention in the so-called *Martyrologium Hieronymianum* on July 2<sup>54</sup> erroneously attributes the deposition of his relics to the cemetery of Callistus [26, p. 348] instead of their real place in the catacombs of St Sebastian near to the St Sebastian basilica on the Via Appia; the marble plate with Damasus’s *elogium*, in perfect condition, is now preserved in the basilica, whereas it had originally been placed underground, marking the grave in the catacombs that had been revealed to Damasus in a dream as being that of the martyr<sup>55</sup>. The relevant part of the catacombs has been called, according to recently found inscriptions, *ad limina dom(i)ni Eutyci*, thus testifying that the grave of Eutychius has been considered as the main holy object of the area<sup>56</sup>.

Already Johann Peter Kirsch supposed that a confusion between the martyr Eutychius and Pope Eutychianus took place: according to him, the *Martyrologium Hieronymianum* would have meant, in the entry on July 2, not the martyr but the Pope; the error would have been provoked by two facts: Eutychius is here commemorated together with Pope Miltiades (311–314), and both Popes Miltiades and Eutychianus were deposed in

the catacomb of Callistus. According to Kirsch's hypothesis, the martyr indicated in the Damasian *elogium* is not mentioned in the *Martyrologium* at all, whereas Pope Eutychianus is commemorated twice, together with his proper commemoration day December 8 [45, S. 69]. This hypothesis has been rejected by Delehay, especially on the ground that Pope Eutychianus already had his own commemoration day<sup>57</sup>.

I would agree with Delehay in rejecting Kirsch's hypothesis "as it is" but I consider Kirsch's basic intuition to be true: although the martyr commemorated on July 2 is, indeed, the Roman martyr Eutychius whose martyrdom is known from the Damasian *elogium*, the confusion between this martyr and Pope Eutychianus took place, and Kirsch was right in explaining with such confusion the erroneous indication of the place of the Eutychius's grave in the *Martyrologium Hieronymianum*. Indeed, in the *Martyrologium*, martyr Eutychius stands together with Pope Miltiades, as if he was another Pope, Eutychianus, who has been buried in the same catacomb as Miltiades – in the area designated for popes. The Pope did not replace the martyr (*pace* Kirsch) nor *vice versa*, but the two resulted into a new hagiographic character – the martyr pope whose name was oscillating between Eutychianus and Eutychius, and who is known to us from the second "edition" of the *Liber Pontificalis*.

Such confusion would have not been possible within the realm of literary sources, because these sources themselves were dependent on the locations of the sacred objects they described. As far as the graves of the martyr Eutychius and Pope Eutychianus were known as two separate objects, such confusion would have been impossible. However, the grave of the martyr had been abandoned and probably lost after either landslides or one of the earthquakes in the fifth century (such as those that took place in 402, 429, and 443) that eventually destroyed "his" area in the catacomb *ex Vigna Chiaraviglio* and forced the translation of the marble plate with the Damasian *elogium* to the crypt of St Sebastian. The new grave of the martyr Eutychius in the crypt of St Sebastian has been venerated since the late sixth century at the latest<sup>58</sup>, but the circumstances of the translation of the relics remain obscure; there is no sign that it would have taken place at all. It looks much

more plausible that the original grave has been simply lost in one of the cataclysms of the first half of the fifth century, whereas the new grave in the St Sebastian crypt appeared substantially later, due to the quite common process of "autogenesis" of the venerated tombs and relics (yielding the relics previously lost or belonging to the saints that have never existed in the material world). The marble plate with the Damasian *elogium* would have been the only material link between the two graves of Eutychius.

Therefore, I would conclude that the cult of Pope Eutychianus absorbed the cult of the martyr Eutychius – in the way that both cults continued to exist separately but now also together with a third cult, that of Pope Eutychianus which acquired features of the martyr Eutychius, particularly that of being a martyr.

It was not unusual for a saint to acquire several biographies even without acquiring several sets of relics: the example of Theodore the Teron and Theodore the Stratelates sharing a single set of relics in Euchaita is probably the most well known but is not unique; it is interesting due to its early date (probably the fourth century). Another example is our St Anastasia herself.

Some uncertainty with the relics of Eutychius that certainly took place sometime in the first half of the fifth century, together with the high rank of the martyr in the eyes of the people and the similarity of his name with the name of the holy Pope, would have been enough for creating our martyr Pope Eutychianus/Eutychius. This solution is corroborated by the fact that the cult of martyr Eutychius alone became marginalised relatively soon after the late fourth century, and the relevant *Passio* has been lost; probably, the preservation of the Damasian marble plate was the only cause of the preservation of at least a vague memory of the martyr.

To sum up: Eutychianus is indeed the semi-imaginary (but semi-historical) pope of Rome, whose name was oscillating between Eutychianus and Eutychius, and whose biography was created using those of the historical Pope Eutychianus (not a martyr) and the historical Roman martyr Eutychius. This cult of a semi-imaginary saint was established by the middle of the fifth century, when it contributed to the legend of Anastasia.

### 3.2. The Companions of Eutychanus:

#### 270 Martyrs

Those who were baptised by Eutychanus became martyrs. Their number was “more than two hundred men and seventy women, not including small children” (*amplius quam ducenti viri et septuaginta feminae exceptis parvulis*)<sup>59</sup>. This number of martyrs, connected with the semi-legendary Eutychanus/Euty chius, is also a part of the hagiographical substrate: their legend pre-existed that of Anastasia.

#### 3.2.1. The Historical Pope and His Care of Martyrs

According to the *Liber Pontificalis*<sup>60</sup>, but only its second recension, Pope Euty chanus *et martyrio coronatur* (“and was crowned with martyrdom”). Among his deeds, it was stated – in both recensions – that he has buried many martyrs, whose exact number is, according to the manuscripts, either 342 or 362 (the latter number is provided by the manuscript *B'*): *Hic temporibus suis per diversa loca CCCXLII [B'CCCLXII] martyris manu sua sepelivit* “In his time he buried 342 [362] martyrs in various places with his own hands.” In connection with this activity, it is said that Pope Euty chanus established a rule concerning the mode of the burial of the martyrs. The Latin text of this rule is not completely clear but, for us, the very fact of some legislative activity related to the burial of the martyrs is important: together with the textological data allowing us to attribute the papal care of the bodies of the martyrs to the earliest recension of the *Liber Pontificalis* (ca 530), where Pope Euty chanus was still not a martyr, we have to conclude that Euty chanus was associated with a great assembly of martyrs already before having been merged with martyr Euty chius (in whose hagiographical dossier there was no such assembly, see below).

Already Duchesne connected the number of the martyrs buried by Euty chanus with the number of the martyrs deposited in the St Silvestre basilica on the Via Salaria, as reported in a seventh-century itinerary<sup>61</sup>, even though, as Duchesne himself noted, there is neither a hagiographical tradition explaining who these martyrs were nor any explicit link between them and Euty chanus. However, their total number is,

according to the different manuscripts, either 365 or 362, and the number 362 is present among the readings of the *Liber Pontificalis*; moreover, “... entre CCCXLII et CCCLXII la difference n'est pas grande, au point de vue paléographique, pas plus qu'entre CCCLXII et CCCLXV”<sup>62</sup>. We can add, to Duchesne's argumentation, that the reading “362” in this itinerary, in spite of being that of one manuscript against two, is the earliest one (this manuscript is of the eighth century, whereas the two others of the ninth or tenth century). Therefore, it is most plausible that the *Liber Pontificalis* implicitly attributed to Pope Euty chanus the burial of the 362 martyrs on the Via Salaria.

The number 270 accompanying Euty chanus in LLA refers to some other collective grave (or a pair of graves with the distribution 200 + 70, because LLA divides the sum of 270 into these parts) than that of the 362 martyrs of the Via Salaria.

A group of 270 martyrs has been possibly venerated in Rome in the catacomb *ad clivam Cucumeris* (“at the Cucumber Hill”, situated not far from the St Silvestre basilica on the Via Salaria), although the available data are not sufficiently clear<sup>63</sup>. It is possible than the number 270 goes back to some tradition related to the collective graves of this area – well known near ca 400 AD but confused and obscured in the later sources available to us.

LLA associates with Euty chius another group of martyrs, those 120 persons who were put in the punctured ship (ch. 35)<sup>64</sup>. The number 120 is relatively popular in the Roman *Passiones* and catacombs<sup>65</sup>, including the cemetery of Thrason on the Via Salaria Nuova<sup>66</sup>, situated less than 2 km from the same basilica of St Silvestre on the Via Salaria.

The results of this short inquiry are not precise but sufficient to conclude that the numbers of the martyrs with Euty chanus, both 270 and 120, were associated with his name in some Roman legends.

#### 3.2.2. Euty chanus/Euty chius and Those with Him in the East: Euty chius and Thessalonica

The following legend is important to show that the story of Euty chanus with 270 martyrs was a part of the Constantinopolitan legend of Anastasia.

This is the entry of the Synaxarium of Constantinople and its predecessor, the calendar of the *Typikon* of the Great Church on December 19:

ἄθλησις τῶν ἁγίων μεγαλομαρτύρων [ <i>Synaxarium</i> μαρτύρων] Εὐτυχίου καὶ Θεσσαλονίκης καὶ τῶν σὺν αὐτῷ [ <i>Synaxarium</i> : αὐτοῖς] ἀνδρῶν σ' [ <i>Synaxarium</i> διακοσίων] καὶ γυναικῶν ο' [ <i>Synaxarium</i> ἑβδομήκοντα] <sup>67</sup> .	The martyrdom of the saint great martyrs [ <i>Synaxarium</i> martyrs, without great] Euty chius and Thessalonica and with him [ <i>Synaxarium</i> them] men 200 [ <i>Synaxarium</i> two hundred] and women 70 [ <i>Synaxarium</i> seventy].
---	---

We immediately recognise, in this Euty chius, Euty chianus of LLA together with his companion martyrs, 200 men and 70 women. Only St Thessalonica looks somewhat strange in the place of Anastasia.

This entry is absent from the Armenian version of the Synaxarium, but omissions of such commemorations of little significance are, for this version, quite possible. The presence of this entry in the *Typikon* is sufficient to prove that it belongs to the earliest recension of the Synaxarium.

This entry in the Georgian version of the Synaxarium has an addition: *ῥομῆεῦς σὺν αὐτῷ ἐν Θεσσαλονικῆ* [98, p. 102] (“they were martyred in Thessalonica”). The Georgian translation was made by the famous writer George the Hagiorite (1009–1065). Obviously, he translated this phrase from his Greek original, where it was added by one of the Byzantine editors.

Nothing more is known so far about these saints.

There are a number of martyrs bearing the name of Euty chius and one other female martyr Thessalonica (a saint of Amphipolis in Macedonia whose “epic” *Passio* known from its epitome in the Synaxarium which made her suffer at the hands of her father, a pagan priest, together with Auctus and Taurion; all the three are commemorated on November 7<sup>68</sup>). The legend of Thessalonica of Amphipolis consists of a series of clichés known from other legends but, as it seems, shows no connection to the dossier of Anastasia.

Our present Thessalonica, a companion of Euty chius, has a very strong connection to Anastasia’s dossier and, more specially, to its insular segment. Such a coincidence of the

number 270 itself (which does not occur elsewhere in hagiography), its distribution between the two sexes (200 and 70), and the very name of Euty chius that we already know as alternating with Euty chianus leaves no doubt that we are dealing with an off-spring of Anastasia’s dossier. The date of the commemoration of Euty chius and Thessalonica, December 19, is hardly by chance so close to December 22, the day of Anastasia.

The change of the name of Anastasia to Thessalonica is understandable, especially if it occurred in a legend composed in the city of Thessalonica, exactly as it is specified by the notice preserved in the Georgian version.

The cult of Euty chius and Thessalonica must have had a Thessalonian origin, but it must have been based on the Greek source of LLA, the Constantinopolitan legend of Anastasia. It is clear from chronological considerations: by *ca* 900 (the date of the *Typikon* of the Great Church), this cult had already become a liturgical tradition recognised in the capital. It was impossible for *BHG* 81, the Greek translation of LLA made in 824, over the timespan of about 80 years, to spark development of a new cult in Thessalonica and, then, to provide its recognition in Constantinople. Such processes require centuries.

Therefore, we obtain proof that the story of Euty chianus/Euty chius and the 270 martyrs with him was already a part of the plot of the Constantinopolitan Anastasia legend.

### 3.3. *Euty chius/Euty ches and an Exiled Dame in the Pontine Islands*

The Roman legends connecting Euty chianus/Euty chius with a great group of martyrs did not contain any specific connection between him and a dame from the Roman nobility. Such a legend was connected with another Roman martyr with a similar but different name, Euty ches. The legend of Euty ches and a great Roman dame is preserved “encapsulated” in a larger legend that we need to discuss first.

#### 3.3.1. *Flavia Domitilla in the Fourth-Century Roman Hagiography*

The long legend is the Roman *Passio* of Nereus and Achilleus and those with them. This is an amalgam of six histories with an introduction

(BHL 6058): *Rescriptum Marcelli* (an elaboration on otherwise known Latin Petrine apocrypha, BHL 6059), *Passio SS. Petronillae et Feliculae* (BHL 6061), *Passio S. Nicomedes* (BHL 6062), *Passio SS. Nerei et Achillei* (BHL 6063), *Passio S. Eutychetis, Victorini et Maronis* (BHL 6064) – the main object of our interest, chapters 19–20 of the whole compilation, – and *Passio S. Domitillae* (BHL 6066)<sup>69</sup>. Despite the claim of the Latin author that he translated his text from Greek, the extant Greek recension, BHG 1327<sup>70</sup>, is a translation from the Latin; the Latin author tried to gain more confidence by referring to an authoritative Greek source<sup>71</sup>. The *Passio* belongs to hagiographical elaborations on the pseudo-apostolic acts. The action takes place in the entourage of Apostle Peter. One of the acting persons is his daughter Petronilla.

Domitilla is the main character of the whole composition. Her historical prototype is the granddaughter of Emperor Vespasian and a niece of Emperor Domitian Flavia Domitilla, the wife the consul Flavius Clement who was an uncle of Domitian<sup>72</sup>. Both spouses were Christians. In 95, they were persecuted by Domitian out of religious motives. Clement was executed, whereas Flavia Domitilla was exiled to the Pontine islands (namely, Ponza), where she died after having spent many years in exile. In the *Passio* of Nereus and Achilleus, Flavia Domitilla was made a contemporary of Apostle Peter, somewhat anachronistically but by the standards of hagiography, only slightly.

In the fourth-century Christian tradition, this Flavia Domitilla has been transformed into another Flavia Domitilla, a niece of consul Clement – perhaps a lesser historical personage and already the third Flavia Domitilla in a row (because the wife of Vespasian who was the mother of the exiled historical Flavia Domitilla was also called Flavia Domitilla). For our purposes, the difference between the second (historical) and the third (to a lesser extent historical) Flaviae Domitillae is insignificant, whereas significant is the fact, that, in the late fourth century, the *cellulae* in the island of the *Pontia* where Flavia Domitilla “underwent a long martyrdom” (*in quibus illa [Domitilla] longum Martyrion duxerat*) was a place of pilgrimage. A friend of Hieronymus, Paula, visited these “cells” on her way to the Holy Land as a source of inspiration for her further monastic life<sup>73</sup>.

The long legend of Domitilla and other people around her is now dated to the second half of the fifth century<sup>74</sup>. The story of the martyrs Eutyches (so in Latin; in Greek Εὐτύχιος “Euty chius”), Victorinus, and Maro BHL 6064 is present in all early manuscripts of the Latin legend (from eighth to tenth century) [47, p. 125].

### 3.3.2. *Euty chius in the Background of the Passio of Nereus and Achilleus*

One would be tempted to claim that the long *Passio* BHL 6058–6066 was used as a source by the Constantinopolitan hagiographer of Anastasia, who extracted from it both a great Roman dame exiled to the Pontine islands and the martyr Euty chius. Chronology would allow such a hypothesis providing that the long *Passio* was composed ca 450. Nevertheless, such a conclusion is unacceptable due to hagiographical reasons. In the long *Passio*, there is no pair made up of Domitilla and Euty ches, but a group formed by Domitilla with a trio of Euty ches, Victorinus, and Maro. Each of the three is buried in a specific place in the vicinity of Rome and is mentioned as such in the *Martyrologium Hieronymianum*; namely, Euty ches has been buried on the Via Nomentana – at the 16<sup>th</sup> mile according to the *Passio* or at the 18<sup>th</sup> mile according to the *Martyrologium*<sup>75</sup>. In this legend, there is no individual martyr Euty ches/Euty chius deposed in closeness to the city of Rome.

Therefore, the *Passio* of Nereus and Achilleus would have not been a source of the Constantinopolitan legend of Anastasia. This *Passio* and the legend of Anastasia must have had a common source related to the martyr Euty chius.

Apparently, Euty chius the martyr of Rome has nothing to do with Euty ches, a companion of Victorinus and Maro. They were not only buried in different places, but one of them was inside the city while another was outside. The cults that were developed around their respective graves were certainly not identical. Nevertheless, there are marks that the long *Passio* of Nereus and Achilleus absorbed the original legend of the martyr Euty chius as well. An episodic character, Felicula, repeats the most striking elements of Euty chius’s legend that we know from Damascus.

Among the very few things we know about Euty chius's martyrdom, there are two facts: he apparently died of starvation after having been without food two periods of six days, apparently by his own will (verses 6–7)<sup>76</sup>:

BIS SENI TRANSIERE DIES ALIMENTA  
NEGANTUR

twice six days passed, the food is denied;

MITTITUR IN BARATHRUM...

he is thrown into a deep dungeon...

“The food is denied” would point to a willing starvation. The *barathrum* “deep dungeon” is, most probably, the *Cloaca maxima*<sup>77</sup>.

In the long *Passio* of Nereus and Achilleus, Felicula, a young virgin, dies of starvation after having been without food for two periods as well, whereas not of six but seven days. Then, “...her body was taken down and thrown into the sewer” (*deposita & praecipitata est in cloacam*)<sup>78</sup>.

Felicula is introduced in an artificial manner, as a duplication of her foster-sister Petronilla (one of the major characters of the legend). After Petronilla's death, she became the object of undesirable attention from Petronilla's persecutor. Regardless of how naturally she was introduced into the plot, her hagiographical coordinate of place remains important. The *Passio* as a whole is constructed similarly to an itinerary unifying within a common network the catacombs of Domitilla, the nearby arcosolium with the famous fresco depicting the deceased matron Veneranda with Petronilla as her guardian saint and a psychopomp, and the basilica of Nereus and Achilleus having an underground part, in the catacombs of Domitilla.

Other characters (Nicomedes and the trio of Euty chius, Victorinus, and Maro) also represent otherwise known Christian shrines. Felicula is apparently represented in the same way – the place of her grave is stated to be at the seventh mile of the Via Ardeatina (on the same road as the catacombs of Domitilla but substantially farther from the city), where her relics are preserved *usque in hodiernum diem* (“until the present day”) (ch. 17)<sup>79</sup>. However, this locality is the only one in the *Passio* that is not verifiable from other written sources or archaeologically [54, p. 208]. It is hardly possible that the locality indicated in the *Passio* would have been fictitious, but the related shrine was rather short lived. This topographical indication could be interpreted as intended to

support a new cultic place, but the attempt did not have much success.

The parallels between the legends of Felicula and Euty chius are not accidental: the motif of throwing the body of a saint into a sewer was sufficiently popular, it is true, but its combination with death by starvation after having refused food, and especially following a series of two periods without food one immediately after another, is unique. The presence of Felicula in the *Passio* of Nereus and Achilleus is proof that its author used the legend of the Roman martyr Euty chius.

The main features of Euty chius's legendary biography were transmitted to Felicula, whereas Euty chius's name was used for another purpose – as a link with the legend of the trio of Euty ches, Victorinus, and Maro. The near-identity of the names of Euty chius and Euty ches would have been useful for the identification of the two martyrs. In a similar way, the biographies of Nereus and Achilleus were also changed in their *Passio*: in their *elogium* by Damasus, Nr 8 [88, pp. 98-101], they were warriors, but, in their *Passio*, they became eunuch servants, chamberlains of a great dame.

For the author of the *Passio* of Nereus and Achilleus, it was important to create a network of several martyr shrines both inside and outside the city by unifying them within a single legendary plot. The plot was subordinated to a pilgrimage route. Thus, he invented, for three graves located outside the city at a significant distance from each other, the unique trio of martyrs Euty ches, Victorinus, and Maro<sup>80</sup>.

In the *Passio*, the whole trio of these martyrs is connected with Domitilla (as her servants) when she was on one of the Pontine islands. It looks like an amplification of a simpler plot, where Domitilla was accompanied, on the island, by Euty ches/Euty chius/Euty chianus without Victorinus and Maro. At least, the most economic explanation would consist in a supposition that there was a legend of Domitilla with some Euty chius in the Pontine islands. Then, what we see in the *Passio* of Nereus and Achilleus, on the one hand, and in the legend of Anastasia, on the other, appeared as two different modes of amplification of this legend:

1. There was a legend of Domitilla with Euty chius in the Pontine islands (not preserved).
2. In the *Passio* of Nereus and Achilleus, it was amplified with the addition of the trio of Euty ches (identified with Euty chius), Victorinus, and Maro.

3. In the legend of Anastasia, it was amplified with the addition of the legend of Pope Eutychianus (identified with Eutychius) and two groups of martyrs, 120 and 270.

4. Moreover, in the legend of Anastasia, Domitilla changed her name to Anastasia.

#### 4. The Roman Hagiographical Substrate. II: An Outline of the Early Roman Anastasia Legend

There are a number of indications, both direct and indirect, of the Roman pre-sixth-century cult of St Anastasia. Normally, they are interpreted as if they refer to LLA. In fact, mostly they are not so specific as to allow us to define exactly which legend of Anastasia is meant. In the present section, we will discuss these indications, excluding, however, those that are directly related to the Roman church of St Anastasia. This church will be discussed in section 6. As a result, we will be able to discern between the data that, despite being somehow related to the Anastasia legends, do not contribute to our knowledge of the early Anastasia cult in Rome and the documents allowing us to figure out an outline of the early Roman legend of St Anastasia.

##### 4.1. The Prologue *Omnia quae*

We begin with the part of LLA that has had a literary career of its own, the prologue *Omnia quae* (no *BHL* number, see section 2 above). It contains a textual intercession with the early fifth-century *Passio Sebastiani*. Regardless of how this intercession could be explained (borrowing from the prologue to the *Passio* or vice versa or borrowing from a common source), the likelihood that this prologue was written by the author of LLA or of its earlier recension is extremely low.

This prologue occurs in five other *Passiones* and one Latin *Vita*. Both Henschenius (1675) and Mabillion (1685), independently from each other, supposed that this prologue originally belonged to an entire menologium and not to a specific legend, where it was placed before December 25, the date of the first legend in this menologium. This hypothesis was criticised by Bauduin de Graiffier<sup>81</sup>, but presently, as François Dolbeau concluded, it is impossible to decide whether

it is true or not [29, pp. 358-359]. Even if it is untrue, that is, even if this prologue was composed for a specific legend, it is impossible to decide for which one. The content of this prologue is unrelated to any specific hagiographical legend.

We have to conclude that any possible references to and quotations from the prologue *Omnia quae* say nothing about the cult of St Anastasia.

##### 4.2. The *Regula magistri*

Putting the prologue aside, there are three written sources possibly referring to a pre-sixth-century legend of Anastasia<sup>82</sup>. The first of them is *Regula magistri* 10, 44. The text has been dated by Adalbert de Vogüé to ca 500/525, a dating which became the scholarly consensus<sup>83</sup>.

The sentence identified by de Vogüé as a quotation from the interrogation of Irene in LLA (but lacking from the Greek *Passio BHG* 34) is introduced, in the *Regula*, with the words *Et item dicit scriptura [sic!]* [92, pp. 426/427-428/429; cf. 453 (txt/tr.)]. According to de Vogüé, it is LLA that is here called “Scripture”, but, under the pen of the author of the *Regula*, the words *scriptura* and *scriptum est* are normally applied also to Christian writings outside the Bible, such as hagiography and the *Enchiridion* of Sextus<sup>84</sup>.

It is also possible that the author of the *Regula* quoted not from LLA but from a source common with LLA. Anyway, the author of the *Regula magistri* is sufficiently late to be able to quote the Latin predecessor of LLA, that is, the Latin version of the Byzantine legend composed for the translation of Anastasia’s relics from Sirmium to Constantinople in 468–470.

##### 4.3. The *Libellus ad Gregoriam*

The *Libellus ad Gregoriam in palatio* is a pseudonymous work attributing itself to a certain John, evidently Chrysostom. Since the early twentieth century, it is usually ascribed to Arnobius the Younger (dating to the 430s–450s). Presently, it seems, Cécile Lanéry (who applied statistical methods) has definitely confirmed the authorship of Arnobius<sup>85</sup>.

The reference to Anastasia made in ch. 5 epitomises the earliest form of the Roman Anastasia legend available to us. It must be quoted in full<sup>86</sup>.

Sed concedam te illarum posse coniugum inueniri participem, quarum passiones et gesta euidentia testantur scripta. Cur ergo parua non sufferas, quae te magna posse sufferre confidis? Quas contra tyrannorum acies inuicte pugnasse, quas que uniuersa certa es risisse supplicia, quas florido sui cruore sanguinis coronatas sedes credis caelorum intrasse. Et ut ex multis paucarum et ex innumerabilibus saltim trium aut quattuor faciam mentionem, tuum, mihi, o sancta Anastasia, satis deo carum licet breuiter est commemorandum exemplum. Inlustris in saeculo, apud deum curasti esse inlustrior, cum pretiosiora obtinuisti in moribus, quam contempsisti in rebus; immo et morum censum obtinuisse te credimus et facultates atque praedia non perdidisse, sed cum domino commutasse, receptura centuplum, et aeternam uitam pariter susceptura. Quanta putas tolerantia maritalem iniuriam temperabas, quae ita crudelitatem tyranni tranquillo animo pertulisti, ut post uerbera carnificum, post que uniuersa supplicia gratanter etiam te assari permitteres? O decus christianarum omnium matronarum, quomodo putas pro amore pudicitiae contempsit fortiter quod libebat, quae tam libenter pro amore Christi perferre uoluit quod dolebat? Quanta putas plebeia sorte progenitae coniuges hoc intuitu corporeas minas et saeuientis tyranni os non pallentes metu, sed alacres in domino deriserunt, cum te inlustrem et delicatam pro defensione honestatis et fidei constanter uniuersa despexisse tormentorum genera conspexerunt? Merito te illo die caelos fecit Christus intrare, quo ipse descendit ad terras, et natalem passionis tuae cum suae adsumptionis natiuitate esse permisit; quia quod ille omnibus praestitit nascendo, tu multis patiendi praestasti. Et sicut ille contempta maiestate formam serui suscepit, ut nobis omnibus subueniret, ita ipsa contempta nobilitatis gloria ignominiam suscepisti personae, ut imitabilis esses et ut christianis omnibus patientiae dares exemplum, tam pro passione tua quam pro aedificatione omnium matronarum perpetuam gloriam perceptura

But let me admit that you might be able to find a place among those wives whose martyrdoms and deeds are witnessed by reliable documents. In sum, why would you not be willing to bear small trials, you who are sure you can bear great ones? There are many whom you believe to have fought victoriously against the battle-lines of tyrants and to have laughed at all manner of tortures, whom you believe to have entered the abode of the heavens crowned by the flowery gore of their own blood. And so that out of the many I may mention a few and out of the innumerable at least three or four, I must recount, though briefly, your example, o holy Anastasia, which is very dear to God. Distinguished in this world, you took care to be even more distinguished before God, since you obtained even more precious treasures in your character than you scorned among your possessions. Indeed, we believe you attained distinguishing wealth in your good character, and you did not lose wealth and property but rather made an exchange with God, as one who will receive the hundred-fold, and equally as one who will take on eternal life. With how great forbearance – in your view – did you manage the affront suffered in marriage, who so endured with tranquil soul the cruelty of a tyrant, that after the blows of the executioners and after all manner of tortures you rejoiced in allowing yourself even to be roasted? Oh ornament of all Christian married women (*matronarum*), in what way do you think for love of chastity she boldly scorned what was allowed to her, who so willingly desired for the sake of Christ to bear that which caused suffering? Think in this respect how many wives sprung from a lowly condition scoffed at physical threats and in the face of a raging tyrant, not pale with fear but eager in the Lord, when they saw that you, who are noble and dainty, had constantly scorned all kinds of torments for the defence of honour and faith? Justly Christ took you up into the heavens on the same day on which he himself descended to Earth, and He permitted the feast of your martyrdom to occur on the same day as the nativity of His Incarnation, because you, by suffering martyrdom, offered to many what He offered to all by being born. And just as, having despised majesty, He took on the form of a slave, so that He might assist us all, so you yourself, having despised the glory of nobility took on an ignominy of person, so that you might be imitable by others, and so that you might provide a model of endurance for all Christians, as one who will receive everlasting glory as much because you set an example for other married women as because of your martyrdom

These data are precious: they englobe features of the St Anastasia venerated in Rome before the cult of her relics was established in Constantinople. Here, as in LLA, Anastasia is a Roman matron who was tortured and

eventually “permitted to be roasted (*assari*)” (cf. in LLA: *Anastasia per manus et pedes extensa et ligata ad palos fixos, circa media eius ignis incensus est* “Anastasia, tied by her hands and feet to fixed stakes, had a fire kindled

about her abdomen”<sup>87</sup>) on December 25, on Christmas. Nevertheless, while mentioning her “love of chastity” (*amor pudicitiae*), Arnobius did not mention her permanent virginity. No wonder: unless he considered her a normal married woman, he would never cite her as an example for Gregoria, a Roman Christian matron experiencing difficulties in her marriage. Indeed, Anastasia as the virginal character of LLA would have been an inappropriate example for Arnobius’s purpose. The scholars so far have not been sensitive to this difference between the two Anastasiae, that of Arnobius and that of LLA<sup>88</sup>.

Arnobius refers to a written Anastasia legend, one of the *passiones et gesta* that are testified (*testantur*) by *evidentia... scripta* (“written evidence”). Therefore, the Roman legend, by the time of Arnobius, already existed in a written form. This form, however, was distinct from LLA.

We will see below (sections 5.1.2 and 5.1.3) that the historical Roman Anastasia who gave her name to the martyr was actually a married woman who had at least one son.

#### 4.4. The Passio Caeciliae

The *Passio Caeciliae* (BHL 1495) has some similarities with LLA, especially in the structure of the plot but also in phraseology, and is, according to Lanéry, a work of Arnobius the Younger as well<sup>89</sup>. The relevant places are noticed in the edition by Moretti [66, p. 41, n. 184; p. 104; p. 123; p. 156; p. 169]. They suggest that Arnobius as the hagiographer of St Caecilia was influenced by the Anastasia legend known to him. However, these parallels are not so specific as to allow us to discern between LLA and an earlier Roman text paraphrased in the *Libellus ad Gregoriam*.

I think that, in both cases – those of the *Libellus ad Gregoriam* and the *Passio Caeciliae* – Arnobius kept in mind a Latin legend of Anastasia that more or less coincided with what I have called the Roman core of the Anastasia legend. This legend will be further amplified in Constantinople in 468–470 thus resulting in the Byzantine legend written in Greek, this Greek text will be translated into Latin, and this Latin will be edited in Aquileia for becoming LLA.

#### 4.5. The Commemoration of St Anastasia on September 7

The *Martyrologium Hieronymianum* provides several commemoration dates for St Anastasia. All of them will be discussed in later sections (6 and 7), but now we are interested only in the date of September 7. As we recall, in LLA, this is the date of the deposition of the relics of St Anastasia by Apollonia. This date remains unknown to the Byzantine sources, with the natural exception of BHG 81 (Greek version of LLA) and its paraphrases.

The readings of the *Hieronymianum* for September 7 are confused but needed to be taken into account due to a relatively early date of this martyrologium (compiled in northern Italy in the second quarter of the fifth century, while actually available in a later recension produced in Auxerre, Gaul, about 592)<sup>90</sup>. On September 7, the three main manuscripts (E, B, and W)<sup>91</sup> contradict each other [75, p. 117]:

B: *et passio S̄ci Anastasii*

E: *s̄ci anastasi ep̄i*

W: *et pās̄ s̄ci anastasi cum sociis suis*

Delehaye proposed two alternative reconstructions. Either the martyr Anastasius of Salona is meant, who is actually commemorated on August 26 (in this case, one has to suppose an error: *VII id. sept.* instead of *VII kal. sept.*; moreover, erroneous are the additions *episcopi* in E and *cum sociis suis* in W; this Anastasius was a layman, a merchant, who was martyred alone) or Anastasia whose the day of whose deposition is, according to LLA, September 7 (in this case, the obviously defective reading *Anastasi* of E and W is to be restored to *Anastasiae*, the reading *episcopi* in E is, of course, erroneous, but the reading *cum sociis suis* in W is at place)<sup>92</sup>. The second understanding is certainly preferable as it supposes fewer errors in the manuscripts. The reading of W, in this case, would require only one restoration in the only obviously distorted place (*Anastasi*). This results in the following restored phrase: *et passio sancti Anastasiae cum sociis suis*.

Delehaye was hesitant to accept this reading only because he considered December 25 being the true date of St Anastasia’s martyrdom. I would add that the early mediaeval editors of the *Martyrologium Hieronymianum* shared

Delehaye's opinion and, therefore, tried to avoid the commemoration of St Anastasia with her companions on September 7.

Below (section 6) we will see that the commemoration of St Anastasia on December 25 is related to the role of the *titulus* church of Anastasia in the Roman Christmas stationary liturgy and unrelated to St Anastasia as a martyr. It is hardly probable that this date served as the commemoration day of St Anastasia since the very beginning of the St Anastasia cult in Rome. Therefore, another date of her martyrdom must be sought. The *Martyrologium Hieronymianum*, especially in manuscript W, provides us with exactly what we need, namely, traces of another commemoration day of the saint in the first half of the fifth century. This day is the same as indicated in LLA, with the only difference that LLA, being a later composition, harmonises two commemoration dates allotting to the earlier one the role of the date of deposition.

Let us return to the ending lines of LLA (quoted above, section 2.3.4): ...she [Apollonia] built a basilica where she had buried her. St Anastasia suffered martyrdom on 25 December and was kept in a hidden location. She was subsequently translated to the basilica built in the house of Apollonia on 7 September...

This text is obviously edited even before passing to the hands of the editor who worked in Aquileia trying to eliminate the Roman realities. The previous Roman text was not smooth either. For the author of the original text, there was no need to repeat at the very end of the *Passio* that Apollonia deposed Anastasia in the basilica in Apollonia's house, unless an editor – not the author – wished to add some new data, namely, to establish two separate days for the martyrdom and the deposition of the relics. In my opinion, the original Roman text contained a unique date, September 7, for the martyrdom.

#### 4.6. Preliminary Conclusions: An Outline of the Early Roman Anastasia Legend

The early Roman legend of St Anastasia roughly coincided with the part of LLA now called by the Bollandists *Passio ipsius Anastasiae* (*BHL* 401), although it contained neither an interconnection with the plot line of Chrysogonus nor mention of Fausta. This early Roman Anastasia

was born to the pagan parents. She was, indeed, a married woman and not a perpetual virgin.

The original commemoration day of this St Anastasia was September 7. The commemoration on December 25 was added – and became the principal date – only in the middle of the fifth century, perhaps during the pontificate of Leo the Great who drastically changed the role of the church of St Anastasia in Rome (see below, section 6). However, when this old Roman legend was imported to Constantinople in 468–470, the main commemoration date of St Anastasia was already December 25.

*To be continued...*

#### ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The author expresses his gratitude to André Binggeli, Elizabeth Castelli, Megan Dixon, Alexandra Elbakyan, Habib Ibrahim, Kai Juntunen, Maria Lidova, Fiodar Litvinau, Nicolai Markovich, Ugo Mondini, Oscar Santillino, Peter Shuvalov, Alexander Simonov, Pavel Turkin, Antonello Vilella, Andrey Vinogradov, and Nataliya Yanchevskaya.

#### NOTES

\* This work was accomplished with financial support of RFBR grant No. 21-012-41005 “Jerusalem and Understudied Apocrypha in Slavonic Translations: Textology, History, and Doctrines”.

\*\* The end of the article. The beginning see: Lourié B. Five Anastasiae and Two Febroniae: A Guided Tour in the Maze of Anastasia Legends. Part One. The Oriental Dossier. *Vestnik Volgogradskogo gosudarstvennogo universiteta. Seriya 4. Istorija. Regionovedenie. Mezhdunarodnye otnosheniya* [Science Journal of Volgograd State University. History. Area Studies. International Relations], 2021, vol. 26, no. 6, pp. 252-289. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.15688/jvolsu4.2021.6.20>

<sup>1</sup> Prologue *BHL* 400 (*Historiam priorum sanctorum ad aedificationem nostram*), indicated in *BHL* as that of LLA, although occurs in one of LLA's manuscripts (and, as the epilogue, in another LLA's manuscript), belongs to the *Passio* of Chrysanthus and Daria (*BHL* 1787); cf. J. Noret [68, pp. 116-117].

<sup>2</sup> Cf. especially Lanéry [52, pp. 56-58], Lapidge [54, pp. 57-62].

<sup>3</sup> As summarised by Michael Lapidge [54], *ad loco*.

<sup>4</sup> The presence of the Capitol and many other details reveal that the action is replaced from Sirmium to Rome.

<sup>5</sup> Cf.: “As we have seen (c. 19) Theodota – who was a citizen of Nicaea in Bithynia – apparently had a residence in *Sirmium*, where she was presented to Diocletian, who was in residence there. Are we to understand that Theodota also had a residence in Rome? Or has the author overlooked the fact that Ulpian brought Anastasia back with him from *Sirmium* to Rome? Or is Ulpian’s residence, and the trial of Anastasia, imagined as taking place in *Sirmium*?” (Lapidge [54, p. 82, fn. 97]).

<sup>6</sup> Lucillius’s name is restored by Moretti [66, p. 172], whereas the manuscripts instead *praefecto Lucillio* have here *praefecto Illyrici* (with a single exception having *praefecto Lucio*). Moretti explains this as an error *mendum e perseveratione*, because previously there was acting as *praefectus Illyrici* Probus in *Sirmium* [66, p. 69]. Lapidge, however, noticed, that this reading affects the geography of the *Passio*: “The emendation [proposed by Moretti and accepted by him. – B. L.] has the effect of removing the location of Anastasia’s trial from *Sirmium* in *Illyricum* (where, as we saw in c. 21, the *praefectus Illyrici* was named Probus, not Lucillius), and raises the possibility that, in the author’s conception, Anastasia was tried in Rome by the *urban* prefect Lucillius, who sentenced her to death by drowning (c. 35)” [54, p. 60, n. 29]. I would consider this place as an especially unfortunate attempt to eliminate Rome from the Martyrdom’s geography.

<sup>7</sup> Lying opposite the Bay of Naples in the Tyrrhenian Sea.

<sup>8</sup> Delehaye [25, p. 162]: “Cet édifice n’est pas, comme on pourrait le croire, la basilique romaine, le *titulus Anastasiae*, auquel il n’est fait aucune allusion dans notre légende. C’est une église bâtie, au dire de l’hagiographe, près de l’endroit où, d’après le récit, Anastasie a été martyrisée, c’est-à-dire dans l’île Palmaria.”

<sup>9</sup> For those who analysed LLA as an arbitrary fairy tale without its cult-formative function, the role of Chrysogonus remains unexplainable: cf. Lapidge [54, p. 57, fn. 16]: “It is not clear why the author should have wished to link Anastasia with St Chrysogonus”, with a reference to “the similar doubts raised by Mesnard” [63, p. 36]; the latter monograph has thus far been inaccessible to me.

<sup>10</sup> See, for the details, Lapidge [54, p. 57], with further bibliography.

<sup>11</sup> See Part One of the present study, sections 6 and 7, pp. 270-274.

<sup>12</sup> In this respect, especially revealing is the situation of *patricius* Iohannes, Justinian’s representative established in Aquileia: he retained communion with both the Patriarch of Aquileia Paulus and Pope Pelagius I, despite Pelagius’s demands to choose with whom of those two Iohannes would be in communion

(C. Sotinel [81, pp. 104-109]). In general, Claire Sotinel concluded, “[t]he churches separated from Rome [that is, the “tricapitoline” Churches of Aquileia and Milan] flourished under Byzantine rule” [81, p. 107].

<sup>13</sup> See esp. Sotinel [81]; cf. C. Azzara [8] and R. Bratož ([11, pp. 517-521] and [10]).

<sup>14</sup> It replaced the early twentieth-century scholarly consensus (established by Dufourcq and Delehaye) proposing a late fifth-century or early sixth-century date. Cf. especially A. Dufourcq [34, vols. I and II], *passim*; Delehaye [25, p. 151-171]; Moretti [66, pp. 24-37] (with a detailed bibliography).

<sup>15</sup> See Lapidge [54, p. 62-63]. There are several explanations of the meaning of LLA as a document understandable outside the cult. Thus, Lapidge proposed that LLA would have been an answer to simple curiosity about the origin of two Roman *tituli* (churches of Anastasia and of Chrysogonus) or a reading for Roman aristocratic intellectual women (Lapidge [54, pp. 57, 62-63]). Others classify LLA as “stories women want” (Moretti [66, pp. 37-38]) or even “an economical strike at Manichaeism’s most vulnerable point” [*sc.*, “the Manichaean stress on virginity”] using the potential of “socially and economically powerful” Christian matrons (K. Cooper [18, p. 142]). Such approaches disregard the very nature of the hagiographical legends (the *raison d’être* of which could not be other than (re)shaping a cult) and treat them as an arbitrary mix of history and fairy tales. Despite this methodological flaw, Moretti contributed to our knowledge of the history of the legend of Anastasia more than anybody else, and we will have to return to her study below. Efthymios Rizos is one of the rare scholars who has seen, in LLA, something more appropriate to the purpose and nature of hagiography calling LLA “a hagiographic product resulting from the collation of a series of initially independent texts, probably reflecting some form of linkage among their cults, which currently eludes us” [72, p. 206]. This “form of linkage” as well the linked cults themselves are the object of our present study.

<sup>16</sup> Relevant are the entries dedicated to Chrysogonus on November 24 (J. Dubois, G. Renaud [31, p. 213]) and to Anastasia on December 25 [31, p. 1]. They clearly refer to LLA when connecting Anastasia with Chrysogonus; this fact was noticed already by H. Quentin [71, pp. 58-60], where he discussed as well the entries of Theodota on August 2 [31, p. 142], Agape and Chionia on April 1 [31, p. 57], and Irene on April 5 [31, p. 58]. However, the entries of Chrysogonus and Anastasia (that allude to the *Sondergut* of the Aquileian recension), as well as that of Theodota, belong to the part of the *Martyrologium* preserved in late and highly interpolated manuscripts only; cf. Quentin [71, pp. 18-19, 114-119]; J. Dubois [30, pp. 38-39]. Therefore, one could not be absolutely

certain that these entries in their present form were written by Beda. However, even if they are completely genuine, they are sufficiently late not to affect our dating of the Aquileian recension of LLA.

<sup>17</sup> See her study of the entire dossier in C. Lanéry [50, pp. 388-390, 435-445]. This study of the written documents must be completed with a study of archaeological data (especially the grave discovered in San Canzian d'Isonzo in 1965, which, very plausibly, contained the authentic relics of the two brothers Cantiani and their sister) by Andrea Tilatti [86] (Tilatti, however, does not take into account Lanéry's study of the hagiographical dossier). In turn, I was unable to consult the study by Valeria Mattaloni referred to by Tilatti [59].

<sup>18</sup> C. Lanéry [50, p. 437]: "La Passion I fut donc rédigée entre la fin de l'Antiquité et le IXe siècle (premiers manuscrits de *BHL* 1544, 1545, et 1547)." She demonstrates that recension *BHL* 1545 is the earliest; recension *BHL* 1547, ascribed to Ambrosius of Milan, is Milanese, whereas all other recensions are Aquileian [50, pp. 435-441, 442-444]. This conclusion allows to explain the variability of commemoration dates in the *Martyrologium Hieronymianum*, where the Cantiani are commemorated on May 31 (in some manuscripts May 30) and June 14 (in some manuscripts June 15 or 17). As Victor Saxer noticed, only *BHL* 1547 has June 14, whereas other recension of *Passion I* has May [78, p. 379]. Thus, the date May 31 that was considered as the genuine one by Delehaye must be Aquileian, whereas June 14, must be Milanese.

<sup>19</sup> *Sermo* 15 in the critical edition by Almut Mutzenbecher [61, pp. 57-58]. This sermon was pronounced on the commemoration day of the saints (*Hodie beatissimorum Canti, Cantiani et Cantianillae natalis est*, p. 57), but this date is unknown. Later their commemoration days were May 31 (this date goes back, at least, to their cult in Grado, where, in the second half of the sixth century, their relics were translated) and June 14, 15, and 17 (these dates are connected with commemorations of the Aquileian martyrs Protus and Chrysogonus); cf. Delehaye, Quentin [26, p. 284].

<sup>20</sup> Victor Saxer supposed that this sermon is fragmentary, and the final part containing the description of the martyrdom proper and the sepulture is lost [78, p. 377].

<sup>21</sup> Ed. by L. Bethmann and G. Waitz [96, p. 78]. For the date of Paul's *Historia*, cf. R. McKitterick [62, p. 77].

<sup>22</sup> Cf. esp. a detailed study by Emanuela Colombi: [17, pp. 769-775].

<sup>23</sup> Cf. Colombi [17, pp. 767-768].

<sup>24</sup> In the actual Aquileian context, this saint was not simply a symbol of the Council of Chalcedon (as she became in the early sixth century already in

Constantinople) but a symbol of the "tricapitoline" defence of the Chalcedon against those who condemned the Three Chapters at the Constantinopolitan Council of 553. Cf. an observation by Giorgia Vocino [91, p. 274, n. 6].

<sup>25</sup> *Vita Sancti Martini*, IV, 658-659: *Aut Aquileiensem si fortasse accesseris urbem, / Cantianos Domini nimium venereris amicos* ("Or if you reach the city of Aquileia, / You will venerate very much the Cantiani, Lord's friends"); the latest edition: [90]. For the date of the poem, I follow Michael Roberts [73, p. 199].

<sup>26</sup> I believe that this is the main reason why the actual grave of the Cantiani was forgotten. Tilatti [86, pp. 778-779], cautiously supposes that their "old" relics were still venerated at their home in the thirteenth century, because, near their grave in San Canzian d'Isonzo, there was found a coin minted by Arlongo, who was the bishop of Trieste from 1261 to 1281. This coin, however, proves nothing beside the fact that the site itself was not abandoned. Indeed, it has never ceased to be a cultic place related to the Cantiani, as is testified by the village's name and the small church of St Cantianus still standing near the site of the historical grave. The local population, of course, might have been confident for a long time that they had the true relics of the Cantiani. Nevertheless, for the mainstream religious life of Aquileia, the situation must have been different. I would propose, as a *terminus ante quem* for the falling into oblivion of the actual grave of the Cantiani, the sacking of Grado by Patriarch Poppo of Aquileia in 1024 (s. below), but even this date seems too late.

<sup>27</sup> Preserved within the *Chronicon Benedictoburanum* composed in this monastery; ed. by W. Wattenbach [84, pp. 225-226]. The story itself is one of those of *furta sacra*, with no special interest for us.

<sup>28</sup> See, for the details, Tilatti [86, pp. 779-786]. The relics of the martyr Protus were also discovered, because Protus was made a companion of the Cantiani already in the *Passion I*. Lanéry noticed that Protus arrived there from the *Passio* of Eugenia, where he was the mentor in Christianity of Eugenia, as, in *Passion I*, he became the mentor of the Cantiani (cf. Lanéry [50, pp. 437-438]). It is true for Protus as a character in the plot of *Passion I*, but not for Protus as a saint. He is a historical martyr of Aquileia, probably the companion of Chrysogonus. In 1960, two early fourth-century sarcophagi, one with the name of Protus and another one with the name of Chrysogonus, were found under the small St Cantianus church in San Canziano di Isonza, less than 500 m from the site of the grave of the Cantiani; cf. Cuscito [21].

<sup>29</sup> Ed. Wattenbach [85, p. 225]. This fact was first properly noticed by Emanuela Colombi: [17, pp. 783-784].

<sup>30</sup> Cf. Delehayé, Quentin [26, pp. 612, 615, 618-619]; cf. G. Cuscito [21, p. 260].

<sup>31</sup> The Greek version, *BHG* 81, does not contain a mention of “a hidden place” but still preserves the structure with two endings, even though they are no longer contradictory (Halkin [42, p. 131]). The mention of “a hidden place” would have been omitted by either translator or editor of his Latin original.

<sup>32</sup> F. Chausson [15, p. 140; 16, p. 127, n. 77]: “*Faustus est le cognomen le plus caractéristique des Anicii des IIIe–IVe siècles.*”

<sup>33</sup> Quoted according to the earliest recension of *Passion 1*, *BHL* 1545 [6, cols. 438-442, quoted col. 438].

<sup>34</sup> See *Historia Augusta* in the *Vita* of his father Emperor Carus [80, p. 236]. Cf. Lellia Cracco Ruggini’s study on the possible historical and ideological background of this claim of the author of *Passion 1*: [20, pp. 77-82].

<sup>35</sup> See, for an outline of the hagiographical dossier of Cosmas and Damian, M. van Esbroeck [36]. Quite recently, Daniela Motta has examined hagiographical references to Carinus comparing them with those in historiography [67].

<sup>36</sup> H. Brandenburg [9, pp. 174-175, esp. p. 175] (“*Resta dubbio se la chiesa sia stata eretta prima o dopo il sacco di Roma di Alarico del 410*”). Cf. M. Cecchelli [14, pp. 232-238].

<sup>37</sup> Although the most widespread scholarly viewpoint consists in discerning between the homonymous martyr of Aquileia and founder of the Roman *titulus*, who could have been not a martyr and even not a saint; cf. Cuscito [21] (with further bibliography).

<sup>38</sup> S. Diefenbach [28, S. 361, 368-369, 371-372]. Of course, Diefenbach’s hypothesis that both cults of Chrysogonus and Anastasia were brought to Rome by *Anicii*, and both these saints were, in Rome, venerated together on the ground that they belonged to a group of Illyrian saints (see esp. [28, S. 353, 373-376]) seems to me unacceptable. Any guesses about pre-sixth-century connexions between the two cults are without any support in the sources. Nevertheless, I agree with Diefenbach’s intuition that the cult of Anastasia became connected to *Anicii*. However, I attribute this connexion to the Aquileian editorial layer of *LLA*; cf. below.

<sup>39</sup> Expression by Alan Cameron [12, p. 167].

<sup>40</sup> See Cameron [12].

<sup>41</sup> On Demetrias and her pious Christian female relatives, see: M. Gonsette [38]; A. S. Jacobs [44]; P. Laurence [55]; Anne N. Kurdock’s unpublished thesis [48], which is mostly but not completely included in her article [49].

<sup>42</sup> Diefenbach [28, S. 374] interpreted as an additional connection with the Anicians an inscription

*ICUR* I, 19 (*CIL* VI, 1712), now lost but described in the 17<sup>th</sup> century as placed on a marble column near the main altar of the *titulus Anastasia* church in Rome: *Clodius Adelfius v<ir> c<larissimus> ex praefectis urbis uxori incomparabili et sibi fecit* (“Clodius Adelfius [85, pp. 192-193], the very famous man [*i.e.*, senator], the former urban prefect [*praefectus urbi* in 351] made to his incomparable spouse and himself”). His spouse was the famous Roman poetess Proba who belonged to the clan of the Anicians; see, for the details: J.F. Matthews [60]. Diefenbach, following Rita Lizza Testa, noticed that the inscription is, by its wording, funerary, and, therefore, the column was made with no relation to any church; its use in the *Anastasia* church was certainly secondary. Nevertheless, Diefenbach writes: “Vielmehr dokumentiert die Inschrift – ebenso wie beim *titulus Chrysogoni* – auch beim *titulus Anastasiae* die Verbindung der *gens Anicia* zu einer außerrömischen Heiligen und der Etablierung ihres Kult in Rom” [28, S. 374-375]. This conclusion would be correct under the (absurd) supposition that later Anicians donated to the church a column from a destroyed grave of their ancestors. Recently Hendrik A. Wagner has supported Diefenbach’s supposition about the possible involvement of the Anicians in establishing the *titulus Chrysogoni*, whereas he remained silent about the *titulus Anastasiae* and the cult of Anastasia in general; cf. H. A. Wagner [95, S. 383-390, esp. S. 386].

<sup>43</sup> Let us recall that this panegyric in its second part, from ch. 11 (Kotter [46, S. 293]), is a recension of the Martyrdom of Anastasia and Theodota, slightly paraphrased; its first ten chapters are highly rhetorical but, nevertheless, not completely void of any biographical information.

<sup>44</sup> Delehayé [23, p. 255]: only a notice: *Καὶ ἄθλησις τοῦ ἁγίου μάρτυρος Χρυσσογόνου* (“And the contest of the holy martyr Chrysogonus”). This commemoration is not retained in the Georgian translation, but, nevertheless, Chrysogonus is mentioned in the long entry of St Anastasia on December 22 [98, p. 104].

<sup>45</sup> [97, vol. 11, pp. 296-297]. The Armenian notice (repeated, beside the earliest translation, in two other recensions of the Armenian Synaxarium) contains an attempt of clarifying who this Chrysogonus was: *Եւ մեծ վկային Կրիզիկաւն ի Հռոմ և բազում աշակերտաց նորա, սա Խռոսուգենու կնշի* “And (the commemoration) of the great martyr Krizikawn/Krizikōn in Rome and many disciples of him, who are called Chrysogenos/Χρυσόγενος/“Golden Family”.” The translator distinguished between “Krizikon” and Chrysogonus; the name of the latter is rendered almost exactly as *Խռոսուգենու* (*Xrusugenos*), but it is understood literally as “Golden Family”, thus evoking, as a folk etymology, the creation of imaginary disciples of Chrysogonus, who were allegedly martyred

with him; Aquileia as the martyrdom place remained unknown. The Armenian translator apparently tried to harmonise what he knew about “Krizikon” and what he read in the Greek Synaxarium about Chrysogonus. In the rather long epitome of the legend of Anastasia on December 22, the Armenian mentions Anastasia’s teacher as Ἰννικουγόνου “Chrysogonos” [97, vol. 12, p. 268], with a perfect spelling; the translator did not recognise in him the saint commemorated on November 24.

<sup>46</sup> L. Rydén [76, p. 20/21 (txt/tr.)]: ...καὶ ἰδοῦ πρεσβύτης τις δόξη πολλῇ κλειζόμενης καὶ μετ’ αὐτοῦ γυναῖκες πέντε ὀφθαλμοφανῶς τοῖς ἐκεῖσε ἐπέστησαν... (“...and behold, and old man vested in great glory accompanied by five women appeared there in full sight...”). Then, the elder is called ὄγέρων “elder”.

<sup>47</sup> V.B. Kryś’ko [2, p. 512] (for the Greek and the Slavonic). *Vat. gr.* 2046 is a recension especially close to the lost Greek original of the Slavonic translation; the Slavonic translation was made in Bulgaria in the eleventh century.

<sup>48</sup> Cf. [23, pp. 333-334] and [97, vol. 12, p. 268] and [98, p. 104].

<sup>49</sup> For Lanéry, however, Eutychianus is a layman [52, p. 58] – perhaps, because he has never been called priest or bishop explicitly.

<sup>50</sup> Ed. Moretti [66, p. 182], tr. Lapidge [54, p. 86].

<sup>51</sup> Cf. Sotinel [82].

<sup>52</sup> Th. Mommsen [64, p. 38], cf. Duchesne [32, p. 159], both in the apparatus criticus.

<sup>53</sup> See the latest edition, with the bibliography, in D. Trout [88, pp. 122-124, cf. 18-19]; cf. also [87]. For the date, see C. Carletti [13, p. 53].

<sup>54</sup> Ed. de Rossi and Duchesne [75, p. 85]. Delehaye considered and rejected a possibility of identity of this Eutyches with Eutychius from the *Acta S. Secundi* (*BHL* 7558) [27, p. 48].

<sup>55</sup> See, for the details, Carletti [13], where are summarised recent data from the excavations in the peripheral area of the cemetery of St Sebastian called *ex Vigna Chiaraviglio*.

<sup>56</sup> See, for the details, Carletti [13].

<sup>57</sup> See Delehaye’s commentary in [26, p. 348]: *Aegre probanda coniectura, quia illius depositio incidit in diem 8 decembris*.

<sup>58</sup> Cf. Carletti [13, p. 57]; in 1563, the marble plate was translated from the underground crypt to the overground basilica of St Sebastian. Obviously, by this time, the relics of the martyr had been considered lost.

<sup>59</sup> Ed. Moretti [66, p. 184]; tr.: Lapidge [54, p. 87].

<sup>60</sup> Ed. Duchesne [32, p. 159], ed. Mommsen [64, p. 38]; English tr. R. Davis [22, p. 11].

<sup>61</sup> Namely, in the text having two titles (of whom only the second covers its contents): *De locis sanctis martyrum quae sunt foris civitatis Romae. Ecclesiae quae intus Romae habentur*. It is presently dated to the decade between 635 and 645 (by Lapidge [54, p. 662]). The relevant text is (within a relatively long list of the relics in the basilica): *et in una sepultura sub altare maiore ccclxx*. [ms B: *ccclxxii*] “and in a unique grave under the major altar, 365 [362]” (*sc.*, martyrs) (ed. by F. Glorie [43, p. 320]).

<sup>62</sup> Duchesne [32, p. 159, n. 2], with a reference to the edition by de Rossi [74, pp. 176-177].

<sup>63</sup> In the anonymous itinerary *Notitia portarum, viarum, ecclesiarum circa urbem Romam* included in *liber* IV, capp. 351 and 352 of the *Gesta regum Anglorum* by William of Malmesbury (three editions: 1120, 1128, 1140) at the Cucumber Hill are enumerated, among others, *in uno sepulchro decenti sexaginta* [thus manuscripts of families B and C; family A *quadraginta*], *et in altero triginta* “in one tomb, two hundred sixty [forty] and in another, thirty (martyrs)” (R. Valentini, G. Zucchetti [89, p. 143]; reprinted by F. Glorie [43, p. 325]; cf. translation, but without variant readings in (Lapidge [54, p. 665]). For the date of this itinerary, between 648 and 682, see Valentini, Zucchetti [89, pp. 134-135], where is approved the dating by di Rossi [75, p. 146]. The variant reading “240” with the next number 30 result in number 270 of two groups of anonymous martyrs. In LLA, there are also two groups, but 200 (men) and 70 (women). Two groups *ad clivum Cucumeris* are mentioned in the *Passio recentior* of Polychronius and those with him *BHL* 6884 (late 5<sup>th</sup> or early 6<sup>th</sup> century according to Delehaye [24, p. 71] or shortly after the aftermath of the “Laurentian schism”, 506–514, according to Lapidge [54, pp. 324-325], ch. 35, but there the distribution is 46 + 120; text in Delehaye [24, p. 98], tr. Lapidge [54, p. 347]). In the *Passio* of Marius and Martha *BHL* 5543 (chs 2–3 acc. to Lapidge’s numeration), a unique group of 260 [*variant reading* 262] martyrs has been buried *ad clivum Cucumeris* (I. Bollandus, G. Henschenius [4, p. 216]), commented tr. In Lapidge [54, pp. 426-427, cf. 422-423]. The number 260 coincides with the number of the martyrs in one group reported by the *Notitia portarum* according to the majority of manuscripts, whereas the number 240 could be easily derived from it due to a scribal error (CCXL *pro* CCLX). Nevertheless, there is a solid argumentation in favour of the reading “262” (and not “260”) as genuine for *BHL* 5543: Lanzoni [53, pp. 510-512], supported by Delehaye, Quentin [26, p. 571]. Cf. also, on these numbers, L. Spera [83]. For the Cucumber Hill and its catacombs, so far unidentified, see bibliography in Lapidge [54, p. 347, fn. 115].

<sup>64</sup> Moretti [66, p. 180]: *Impositis ergo ad centum viginti* [some manuscripts add *ferme* “nearly”]

*hominibus reis in navi...*; tr. Lapidge [54, p. 86] follows the critical edition: “With nearly one hundred and twenty guilty persons placed in the ship...”.

<sup>65</sup> Cf. Delehaye, Quentin [26, p. 571], Delehaye [24, p. 69], and Spera [83, p. 372].

<sup>66</sup> See, for the whole dossier of the collective graves of the Roman martyrs, mostly anonymous, Lanzoni [53, pp. 510-512], Delehaye, Quentin [26, p. 571], and Spera [83].

<sup>67</sup> Mateos [58, p. 140] = Dmitrievskiy [1, p. 32] = Delehaye [23, p. 328] in all recensions including H\*, but, in some manuscripts, these saints are mentioned on December 18 [23, pp. 321, 325].

<sup>68</sup> Ed. Delehaye [23, pp. 202-204, cf. 199]; commemorated already in Mateos [58, p. 94] = Dmitrievskiy [1, p. 21]. Their full *Passio* is lost.

<sup>69</sup> Edition by G. Henschenius, D. Papebrochius [5, cols. 6-13]; commented tr.: Lapidge [54, pp. 201-227]; cf. also a commentary by Lanéry [52, pp. 113-125].

<sup>70</sup> Edition by H. Achelis [3].

<sup>71</sup> As has been established by F. Schaefer, whose study of the text is still indispensable [79].

<sup>72</sup> On her, see especially P. Pergola [70]. For their avatars in the Byzantine monothelete hagiography related to Rome, see B. Lourié [57].

<sup>73</sup> Hieronymus, *Epistula CVIII*, 7; I. Hilberg [77, p. 312]; written in 404.

<sup>74</sup> Lanéry [52, pp. 123-125], Lapidge [54, p. 210]; not all their arguments for a pre-sixth-century date are equally convincing.

<sup>75</sup> The difference is explained as a scribal error (confusion between XVI and XVIII) in Delehaye, Quentin [26, p. 465].

<sup>76</sup> Text and translation from Trout [88, pp. 122-123].

<sup>77</sup> See already de Waal [94, p. 270]; for a larger context, see M. Ghilardi [37].

<sup>78</sup> Ed. Henschenius, Papebrochius [5, p. 11]; tr. Lapidge [54, p. 221].

<sup>79</sup> Ed. Henschenius, Papebrochius [5, p. 11]; tr. Lapidge [54, p. 221].

<sup>80</sup> The grave of Eutyches was at the 16<sup>th</sup> or 18<sup>th</sup> mile from Rome on the Via Nomentana (see above), that of Victorinus, at the 60<sup>th</sup> mile of the Via Salaria, and that of Maro, at the 130<sup>th</sup> mile of the Via Salaria.

<sup>81</sup> B. de Graiffier [39]; cf. also B. de Graiffier [40; 41].

<sup>82</sup> Enumerated in Lanéry [52, pp. 55-56], who considers them as referring to LLA.

<sup>83</sup> Cf. criticisms Dunn [35] answered by de Vogüé [93].

<sup>84</sup> Cf. de Vogüé [92, pp. 216-217]. According to de Vogüé [92, p. 217], “*Scriptura* ne fait pas plus allusion que *libri* au caractère ‘scripturaire’ de l’œuvre”. I would rather say that the author of the *Regula* shared the common understanding of the

Byzantine Commonwealth that the biblical canons are not exhaustive lists of inspired writings.

<sup>85</sup> C. Lanéry [51]. The dissenting view was expressed by Kate Cooper, who placed this work into “the period between Valentinian III (425–455) and Theoderic the Great (493–526), and probably in the reign of Theoderic” [19, p. 44-45 *et passim*]. She promised, in 2007 (before the publication of Lanéry’s article), to publish an elaborated study with substantiation of this view, but has never published it.

<sup>86</sup> Ed. K.-D. Daur [7, pp. 198-199]; translation: Cooper [19, pp. 246-247].

<sup>87</sup> Text: Moretti [66, p. 184]; tr.: Lapidge [54, p. 87].

<sup>88</sup> Including Moretti [66, pp. 25-26] and Lanéry [52, p. 55]. Moretti goes so far as writes: “...il passo relative ad Anastasia sembra tradire la conoscenza non solo della sua storia ma anche del testo della PA [*Passio Anastasiae*]” [66, p. 25]. However, she substantiates this claim with parallels in content but not in wording.

<sup>89</sup> Lanéry [51]. This attribution is supported by Lapidge [54, pp. 139-143].

<sup>90</sup> The present consensus concerning the *Martyrologium Hieronymianum* (erroneously attributed to Jerome in some Latin manuscripts) goes back to the seminal article by Louis Duchesne [33]; cf. H. Leclercq [56, cols. 2530-2563] (for a detailed exposition of the studies by Giovanni Battista de Rossi and Louis Duchesne which are definitive for our knowledge of the *Hieronymianum* until presently) and the studies by Hippolyte Delehaye (especially his and H. Quentin’s *Commentarius perpetuus* [26]) referred to below.

<sup>91</sup> E = Echternach, 8<sup>th</sup> cent.; B = Bern, 9<sup>th</sup> cent.; W = Wolfenbüttel, 9<sup>th</sup> cent. The texts of these manuscripts are separately published in the edition by J.B. de Rossi and L. Duchesne (with variant readings of later manuscripts) [75, pp. II-LXXXII, 1-195]; on this edition is based H. Quentin’s reconstruction of the original text published with a commentary by H. Delehaye [26], which, however, should be consulted together with the edition of “raw material”.

<sup>92</sup> Ed. Delehaye, Quentin [26, p. 492-493].

## ABBREVIATIONS

CIL – Corpus Inscriptionum Latinarum.

ICUR – Inscriptiones Christianae Urbis Romae.

## REFERENCES

1. Dmitrievskiy A. *Opisanie liturgicheskikh rukopisey, khranyashchikhsya v bibliotekakh pravoslavnogo Vostoka. Tom 1. Tipiká. Chast 1. Pamyatniki patriarshikh ustavov i ktitorskie monastyrskie Tipikony* [Description of the Liturgical

Manuscripts Preserved in the Library of the Orthodox East. Vol. 1. Typika. Part 1. Monuments of Patriarchs' Institutions and Ktetors' Monasterian Typika]. Kyiv, Tipografiya G. T. Korhach-Novitskogo, 1895. CXLVII, 912, XXV p.

2. Krysko V.B. et al., ed. *Slavyano-russkiy prolog po drevneyshim spiskam. Sinaksar (zhitiynaya chast Prologa kratkoy redaktsii)* [The Russian Slavonic Prologos According to the Earliest Manuscripts. Synaxarium (Hagiographical Part of the Short Recension of the Prologos)]. In 2 vols. Vol. 1. Moscow, Izdatelskiy tsentr "Azbukovnik", 2010. LXXIX, 824 p.

3. Achelis H. *Acta SS. Nerei et Achillei*. Leipzig, J. C. Hinrichs'sche Buchhandlung, 1893. [4], 70 S. (Texte und Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der altchristlichen Literatur; Bd. 11.2).

4. Bollandus I., Henschenius G., eds. *Acta Sanctorum Ianuarii*. T. II. Antverpiae, Ioannes Meursius, 1643. [26], 1160, [75] p.; digital edition: *Acta Sanctorum: The Full Text Database, Ianuarii II*. Cambridge, Chadwyck-Healey, 1999.

5. Henschenius G., Papebrochius D., eds. *Acta Sanctorum. Maii*. T. III. Antverpiae, Michael Cnobarus, 1680, [7], lxxii, [10], 684, 73\*, [19] p.; digital edition: *Acta Sanctorum: The Full Text Database. Maii III*. Cambridge, Chadwyck-Healey, 2000.

6. Appendix ad Opera Sancti Germanii Parisiensis. Migne J.-P., ed. *Pelagii II, Joannis III, Benedicti I summorum pontificum opera omnia*. Parisiis, J.-P. Migne, 1849, cols. 100–628. (Patrologiae cursus completus. Series latina; vol. 72).

7. Daur K.-D., ed. *Arnobii Iunioris Opera omnia. Pars II. Opera minora*. Turnhout, Brepols, 1992. 352 p. (Corpus Christianorum. Series latina; vol. 25A).

8. Azzara C. Il regno longobardo in Italia i Tre Capitoli. Chazelle C., Cubitt C., eds. *The Crisis of the Oikoumene: The Three Chapters and the Failed Quest for Unity in the Sixth-Century Mediterranean*. Turnhout, Brepols, 2007, pp. 209-222. (Studies in the Early Middle Ages; vol. 14).

9. Brandenburg H. *Le prime chiese di Roma. IV–VII secolo*. Milano, Jaca Book, 2021. 367 p.

10. Bratož R. Die Geschichte des frühen Christentums im Gebiet zwischen Sirmium und Aquileia im Licht der neueren Forschungen. *Klio*, 1990, vol. 72, pp. 508-550.

11. Bratož R. Aquileia tra Teodosio e i Longobardi (379–568). Cuscito G., ed. *Aquileia dalle origini alla costituzione del Ducato Longobardo. Storia – amministrazione – società*. Trieste, Editreg, 2003, pp. 477-527. (Antichità altoadriatiche; vol. 54).

12. Cameron A. Anician Myths. *The Journal of Roman Studies*, 2012, vol. 102, pp. 133-171.

13. Carletti C. "Domine Eutychi". Un culto ritrovato nell'area cimiteriale di S. Sebastiano a Roma. *Vetera Christianorum*, 2002, vol. 39, pp. 35-60.

14. Cecchelli M. Dati da scavi recenti di monumenti cristiani. Sintesi relativa a diverse indagini in corso. *Mélanges de l'École française de Rome. Moyen-Âge*, 1999, vol. 111, pp. 227-251.

15. Chausson F. Une sœur de Constantin: Anastasia. Carrié J.-M., Lizzi Testa R., eds. *Humana sapit. Études d'Antiquité tardive offertes à Lellia Cracco Ruggini*. Turnhout, Brepols, 2002, pp. 131-155. (Bibliothèque de l'Antiquité tardive; vol. 3).

16. Chausson F. *Stemmata aurea. Constantin, Justine, Théodose. Revendications généalogiques et idéologie impériale au IV s. ap. J.C.* Roma, L'Erma di Bretschneider, 2007. 304 p. (Centro ricerche e documentazione sull'antichità classica. Monografie; vol. 26).

17. Colombi E. Storie di cronache e reliquie: la nascita del patriarcato di Grado nelle prime cronache veneziane. *Cristianesimo nella storia*, 2010, vol. 31, pp. 761-807.

18. Cooper K. *The Virgin and the Bride: Idealized Womanhood in Late Antiquity*. Cambridge, MA; London, 1996. XII, 180 p.

19. Cooper K. *The Fall of the Roman Household*. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 2007. XVI, 319 p.

20. Cracco Ruggini L. Gli Anicii a Roma e in Provincia, *Mélanges de l'École française de Rome. Moyen-Âge, Temps modernes*, 1988, vol. 100, pp. 69-85.

21. Cuscito G. Il culto di S. Crisogono fra Aquileia e Roma. *Antichità Altoadriatiche*, 1987, vol. 30, pp. 255-274.

22. Davis R. *The Book of Pontiffs (Liber Pontificalis). The Ancient Biographies of First Ninety Roman Bishops to AD 715*. Liverpool, Liverpool University Press, 1989. LIX, 139 p. (Translated Texts for Historians; vol. 6). (Repr.: 2010).

23. Delehaye H. Synaxarium Ecclesiae Constantinopolitanae, e codice Sirmondiano, nunc Berolinensi, adiectis synaxariis selectis. *Acta Sanctorum, Propylaeum Novembris*. Bruxellis, Socii Bollandiani, 1902, [3], LXXVI, 1181 p.; digital edition: *Acta Sanctorum: The Full Text Database, Nov. Propylaeum*. Cambridge, Chadwyck-Healey, 2002.

24. Delehaye H. Recherches sur le légendier romain: la Passion de S. Polychronius. *Analecta Bollandiana*, 1933, vol. 51, pp. 34-98 [unsigned].

25. Delehaye H. *Étude sur le légendier romain: les Saints de novembre et de décembre*. Bruxelles, Société des Bollandistes, 1936. 273 p. (Subsidia hagiographica; vol. 23).

26. Delehaye H., Quentin H. Commentarius Perpetuus in Martyrologium Hieronymianum. *Acta Sanctorum, Novembris*. T. II, Pars posterior. Bruxellis, Société des Bollandistes, 1931, [3], IX–XXIII, 721 p.; digital edition: *Acta Sanctorum: The Full Text*

*Database*. Nov. II. Pars II. Cambridge, Chadwyck-Healey, 2002.

27. Delehaye H. et al. *Martyrologium Romanus ad formam editionis typicae scholiis historicis instructum. Acta Sanctorum. Propylaeum Decembris*. Bruxellis, Société des Bollandistes, 1940, [XXIII], 660 p; digital edition: *Acta Sanctorum: The Full Text Database, Dec. Propylaeum*. Cambridge, Chadwyck-Healey, 2002.

28. Diefenbach S. *Römische Erinnerungsräume. Heiligenmemoria und kollektive Identitäten im Rom des 3. bis 5. Jahrhunderts n. Chr.* Berlin, New York, W. de Gruyter, 2007. XI, 635 S. (Millennium Studies; vol. 11).

29. Dolbeau F. Les prologues de légendiers latins. Hamesse J., ed. *Les prologues médiévaux. Actes du Colloque international organisé par l'Academia Belgica et l'Ecole française de Rome avec le concours de la F.I.D.E.M. (Rome, 26-28 mars 1998)*. Turnhout, Brepols, 2000, pp. 345-393. (FIDEM, Textes et études du Moyen Âge; vol. 15).

30. Dubois J. *Les martyrologes du Moyen Âge latin*. Brepols, Turnhout, 1978. 88 p. (Typologie des sources du Moyen Âge occidental; fasc. 26).

31. Dubois J., Renaud G. *Édition pratique des martyrologes de Bede, de l'Anonyme Lyonnais et de Florus*. Paris, Éditions du Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique, 1976. VII, 307 p. (Institut de recherche et d'histoire des textes. Bibliographies – Colloques – Travaux préparatoires).

32. Duchesne L. *Le Liber Pontificalis. Texte, introduction et commentaire*. T. I. Paris, E. Thorin, 1886. CCLXII, [2], 536 p. (Bibliothèque des Écoles françaises d'Athènes et de Rome; 2<sup>e</sup> série).

33. Duchesne L. À propos du Martyrologe Hiéronymien. *Analecta Bollandiana*, 1898, vol. 17, pp. 421-427.

34. Dufourcq A. *Études sur les "Gesta Martyrum" romains*. In 4 vols. Vol. I. Paris, A. Fontemoing, 1900. VIII, 441 p.; Vol. II. 1907. XI, 302 p. (Bibliothèque des Écoles françaises d'Athènes et de Rome; vol. 83/1-4).

35. Dunn M. Mastering Benedict: Monastic Rules and Their Authors in the Early Mediaeval World. *The English Historical Review*, 1990, vol. 105, pp. 567-594.

36. Esbroeck M. van. Cosmas and Damian, Saints. Atiya A.S., ed. *The Coptic Encyclopedia*. In 8 vols. Vol. 2. New York; Toronto, Macmillan, 1991, pp. 638-640.

37. Ghilardi M. Alla chiavica le carogne! Martiri e cloache. Bianchi E., ed. *La Cloaca maxime i sistemi fognari di Roma dall'antichità ad oggi*. Roma, Palombi, 2014, pp. 191-199, 249-262.

38. Gonsette M. Les directeurs spirituels de Démétriadé. Épisode de la lutte anti-pélagienne. *Nouvelle revue théologique*, 1938, vol. 60, pp. 783-801.

39. Graiffier B. de. Un prologue hagiographique hostile au décret de Gélase? *Analecta Bollandiana*, 1964, vol. 82, pp. 341-353.

40. Graiffier B. de. Un prologue "passe-partout". *Analecta Bollandiana*, 1972, vol. 90, p. 118.

41. Graiffier B. de. Nouveau témoin d'un prologue "passe-partout". *Analecta Bollandiana*, 1974, vol. 92, p. 352.

42. Halkin F. *Légendes grecques de "Martyres romaines"*. Bruxelles, Société des Bollandistes, 1973. 240 p. (Subsidia hagiographica; vol. 55).

43. Glorie F., ed. *Itineraria et alia geographica*. Turnhout, Brepols, 1965. XIII, [5], 495 p. (Corpus Christianorum. Series Latina; vol. 175).

44. Jacobs A.S. Writing Demetrias: Ascetic Logic in Ancient Christianity. *Church History*, 2000, vol. 69, pp. 719-748.

45. Kirsch J.P. *Der stadtrömische christliche Festkalender im Altertum. Textkritische Untersuchungen zu den römischen "Depositiones" und dem Martyrologium Hieronymianum*. Münster in Westf., Aschendorff, 1924. 256 S. (Liturgiegeschichtliche Quellen; vol. 7/8).

46. Kotter B. *Die Schriften des Johannes von Damaskos. V. Opera homiletica et hagiographica*. Berlin – New York, W. de Gruyter, 1988. XX, 607 S. (Patristische Texte und Studien; Bd. 29).

47. Kunzler M. *La liturgia della Chiesa*. Seconda edizione ampliata. Milano, Jaca Book, 2003. 621 p. (Amateca. Manuali di teologia cattolica; vol. 10).

48. Kurdock A.N. *The Anician Women: Patronage and Dynastic Strategy in a Late Roman Domus, 350 CE – 600 CE*. Ph.D. Thesis. Manchester, University of Manchester, 2003. 254 p.

49. Kurdock A.N. Demetrias Ancilla Dei: Anicia Demetrias and the problem of the missing patron. Cooper K., Hillner J., eds. *Religion, Dynasty, and Patronage in Early Christian Rome, 300–900*. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 2007, pp. 190-224.

50. Lanéry C. *Ambroise de Milan hagiographe*. Paris, Institut d'Études Augustiniennes, 2008. 621 p. (Collection des Études Augustiniennes. Série Antiquité; vol. 183).

51. Lanéry C. Nouvelle recherches d'hagiographie arnobienne: la Passion de Cécile (BHL 1495). Goulet M., ed. *Parva pro magnis munera. Études de littérature tardo-antique et médiévale offertes à François Dolbeau par ses élèves*. Turnhout, Brepols, 2009, pp. 553-559. (Instrumenta patristica et mediaevalia; vol. 51).

52. Lanéry C. Hagiographie d'Italie (300–550). I. Les Passions latines composées en Italie. Philippart G., ed. *Hagiographies. Histoire internationale de la littérature hagiographique latine et vernaculaire en Occident des origines à 1550*. Vol. 5. Turnhout, Brepols, 2010, pp. 15-369. (Corpus Christianorum).

53. Lanzoni F. *Le diocesi d'Italia dalle origini al principio del secolo VII (an. 604). Studio critico*. Vol. 1. Faenza, F. Lega, 1927. XV, 1122 p. (Studi e testi; vol. 35).

54. Lapidge M. *The Roman Martyrs. Introduction, Translation, and Commentary*. Oxford, Oxford University Press, 2018. XVII, 733 p. (Oxford Early Christian Studies).

55. Laurence P. Proba, Juliana et Démétrias. Le christianisme des femmes de la gens Anicia dans la première moitié du V<sup>e</sup> siècle. *Revue des Études Augustiniennes*, 2002, vol. 48, pp. 131-163.

56. Leclercq H. Martyrologe. Leclercq H., Cabrol F., eds. *Dictionnaire d'archéologie chrétienne et de liturgie*. T. 10. Partie 2. Paris, Letouzey et Ané, 1932, cols. 2523-2619.

57. Lourié B. A Monothelete Syriac Compilation of Pseudo-Apostolic Acts Preserved in Slavonic Only and the Entrance of Constans II into Rome in 663. Cioată M., Miltenova A., and Timotin E., eds. *Biblical Apocrypha in South-Eastern Europe and Related Areas. Proceedings of the session organised in the framework of the 12<sup>th</sup> International Congress of South-East European Studies (Bucharest, 2-6 September 2019)*. Brăila, Istros, 2021, pp. 125-217. (Bibliothèque de l'Institut d'Études Sud-Est Européennes; vol. 16).

58. Mateos J. *Le Typicon de la Grande Église. Ms. Saint-Croix n° 40, X<sup>e</sup> siècle. Introduction, texte critique, traduction et notes*. T. I. *Le cycle des douze mois*. Roma, PIO, 1962. XXVI, 389 p. (Orientalia Christiana Analecta; vol. 165).

59. Mattaloni V. *Passio Cantianorum*. E. Colombi, ed. *Le passioni dei martiri aquileiesi e istriani*. Vol. 2. Roma, Istituto Storico Italiano per il Medio Evo, 2013, pp. 135-254.

60. Matthews J.F. The Poetess Proba and Fourth-Century Rome: Questions of Interpretation. Christol M. et al., eds. *Institutions, société et vie politique dans l'Empire romain au IV<sup>e</sup> siècle ap. J.-C. Actes de la table ronde autour de l'oeuvre d'André Chastagnol (Paris, 20-21 janvier 1989)*. Rome, École Française de Rome, 1992, pp. 277-304. (Publications de l'École française de Rome; vol. 159).

61. Mutzenbecher A., ed. *Maximi episcopi Tauriensis. Collectionem sermonum antiquam nonnullis sermonibus extravagantibus adiectis*. Turnhout, Brepols, 1962. LXXVIII, 514 p. (Corpus Christianorum. Series latina; vol. 23).

62. McKitterick R. *History and Memory in the Carolingian World*. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 2004, XVI, 337 p.

63. Mesnard M. *La basilique de Saint Chrysogone à Rome*. Roma, Pontificio Istituto di archeologia cristiana; Paris, Les Belles Lettres, 1935. 169 p. (Studi di antichità Cristiana; vol. 9).

64. Mommsen Th. *Libri Pontificalis pars prior*. Berolini, Weidmann, 1898. CXL, 295 p., IV tab. (Monumentae Germaniae Historica. Gestorum Pontificum Romanorum; vol. I).

65. Monticolo G. *Cronache veneziane antichissime*. Vol. I. Roma, Istituto storico italiano, 1890. XL, 224 p. (Fonti per la storia d'Italia. Scrittori. Secoli X-XI).

66. Moretti P.F. *La Passio Anastasiae: Introduzione, testo critico, traduzione*. Roma, Herder, 2006. 238 p. (Studi e Testi TardoAntichi; vol. 3).

67. Motta D. Carino: homo omnium contaminatissimus o bene agens erga christianos? *Histos*, 2021, vol. 15, pp. 22-51.

68. Noret J. La Passion de Chrysanthe et Darie. A-t-elle été rédigée en grec ou en latin? *Analecta Bollandiana*, 1972, vol. 90, pp. 109-117.

69. Pastorello E. *Andreae Danduli, ducis Venetiarum, Chronica per extensum descripta: aa. 46-1280 d. C.* Bologna, N. Zanichelli, 1942. 405 p. (Raccolta degli storici italiani dal cinquecento al millecinquecento ordinata da L.A. Muratori. Nova edizione; t. XII, parte I).

70. Pergola P. La condamnation des Flaviens 'chrétiens' sous Domitien: persécution religieuse ou répression à caractère politique? *Mélanges de l'École française de Rome. Antiquité*, 1978, vol. 90, pp. 407-423.

71. Quentin H. *Martyrologes historiques du Moyen Âge. Étude sur la formation du Martyrologe romain*. Paris, J. Gabalda, 1908. XIV, 745 p.

72. Rizos E. Martyrs from North-Western Balkans in the Byzantine Ecclesiastical Tradition: Patterns and Mechanisms of Cult Transfer. Bugarski I., Heinrich-Tamáška O., eds. *Grenz Übergänge: Spätromisch, frühchristlich, frühbyzantinisch als Kategorien der historisch-archäologischen Forschung an der mittleren Donau. Akten des 27. Internationalen Symposiums der Grundprobleme der frühgeschichtlichen Entwicklung im mittleren Donaauraum, Ruma, 4.-7.11.2015*. Remshalden, BAG Verlag, 2016, S. 195-214. (Forschungen zu Spätantike und Mittelalter; Bd. 4).

73. Roberts M. *The Humblest Sparrow: The Poetry of Venantius Fortunatus*. Ann Arbor, The University of Michigan Press, 2009. 364 p.

74. Rossi G. B. de. *La Roma sotteranea cristiana*. T. I. Roma, Cromo-litografia pontificia, 1864. [6], 352, 86 p.

75. Rossi G.B. de, Duchesne L. Martyrologium Hieronymianum. Smedt C. de et al., eds. *Acta Sanctorum Novembris*. T. II, Pars prior. Bruxellis, Socii Bollandiani, 1894, pp. II-LXXXII, 1-195; digital edition: *Acta Sanctorum: The Full Text Database*. Nov. II. Pars I. Cambridge, Chadwyck-Healey, 2002.

76. Rydén L. *The Life of Andrew the Fool*. In 2 vols. Vol. 2. Uppsala, Uppsala University, 1995. 437 p. (Studia Byzantina Upsaliensia; vol. 4:2).

77. Hilberg I., ed. *Sancti Eusebii Hieronymi Epistulae. Pars II: Epistulae LXXI–CXX*. Vindobonae, F. Tempsky; Lipsiae, G. Freytag, 1912. 515 p. (Corpus Scriptorum Ecclesiasticorum Latinorum; vol. 55).
78. Saxer V. L'hagiographie ancienne d'Aquilée. À propos d'un livre récent. *Mélanges de l'École française de Rome. Moyen-Âge, Temps modernes*, 1980, vol. 92, pp. 373-392.
79. Schaefer F. Die Acten der Heiligen Nereus und Achilleus. Untersuchung über den Originaltext und die Zeit seiner Entstehung. *Römische Quartalschrift für christliche Altertumskunde und Kirchengeschichte*, 1894, Bd. 8, S. 89-119.
80. Hohl E., Samberger Ch., Seyfarth W., ed. *Scriptores Historiae Augustae*. In 2 vols. Vol. II. Leipzig, Teubner, 1965. 308 p. (Bibliotheca scriptorium graecorum et romanorum Teubneriana).
81. Sotinel C. The Three Chapters and the Transformations of Italy. Chazelle C., Cubitt C., eds. *The Crisis of the Oikoumene: The Three Chapters and the Failed Quest for Unity in the Sixth-Century Mediterranean*. Turnhout, Brepols, 2007, pp. 84-120. (Studies in the Early Middle Ages; vol. 14).
82. Sotinel C. Mémoire perdue ou mémoire manipulé: le Liber Pontificalis et la controverse des Trois Chapitres. Sartre M., Sotinel C., dir. *L'usage du passé entre l'antiquité tardive et Haut Moyen Âge. Hommage à Brigitte Beaujard*. Rennes, Presses universitaires de Rennes, 2008, pp. 59-76. (Histoire).
83. Spera L. Il santuario degli LXXX / DCCC martyres nell'Area I Callistiana. L'apporto di Joseph Wilpert al repertorio dei "culti cumulativi" nella Roma sotterranea. Heid S., ed. *Giuseppe Wilpert archeologo cristiano. Atti del Convegno (Roma – 16–19 maggio 2007)*. Città del Vaticano, Pontificio Istituto di archeologia cristiana, 2009, pp. 361-388. (Sussidi allo studio delle antichità cristiane; vol. 22).
84. Wattenbach W., ed. The Chronicon Benedictoburanum. Pertz G.H. *Chronica et annales aevi Salici*. Hannover, Hahn, 1851, pp. 224-229. (Monumenta Germaniae Historica. Scriptores; vol. 9).
85. Martindale J.R. et al. *The Prosopography of the Later Roman Empire*. Vol. 1. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1971. XXII, 1152 p.
86. Tilatti A. Le ossa dei santi Canziani. *Cristianesimo nella storia*, 2014, vol. 35, pp. 765-786.
87. Trout D. From the Elogia of Damasus to the Acta of the Gesta Martyrum: Re-staging Roman History. Alroth B., Scheffer Ch., eds. *Attitudes towards the Past in Antiquity. Creating Identities. Proceedings of an International Conference held at Stockholm University, 15–17 May 2009*. Stockholm, Stockholm University, 2014, pp. 312-320. (Acta Universitatis Stockholmiensis. Stockholm Studies in Classical Archaeology; vol. 14).
88. Trout D. *Damasus of Rome: The Epigraphic Poetry: Introduction, Texts, Translations, and Commentary*. Oxford, Oxford University Press, 2015. XXII, 207 p. (Oxford Early Christian Texts).
89. Valentini R., Zucchetti G. *Codice topografico della Città di Roma*. Vol. 2. Roma, Istituto storico italiano, 1942. XI, 397 p. (Fonti per la storia d'Italia pubblicate dall'Istituto storico italiano per il Medio Evo; vol. 88).
90. Quesnel S., ed. *Venance Fortunat. Œuvres. T. IV, Vie de saint Martin*. Paris, Les Belles-Lettres, 1996. XCV, 196 p. (Avec pagination double pour les pp. 1-101). (Coll. Budé; vol. 336).
91. Vocino G. Les saints en lice: hagiographie et reliques entre Cividale et Grado à l'époque carolingienne. Depreux Ph. de et al., eds. *Compétition et sacré au Haut Moyen Âge: entre médiation et exclusion*. Turnhout, Brepols, 2015, pp. 273-293. (Haut Moyen Âge; vol. 21).
92. Vogüé A. de. *La Règle du Maître. I. (Prologue–Ch. 10)*. Paris, Cerf, 1964. 457 p. (Sources chrétiennes; vol. 105).
93. Vogüé A. de. The Master and St. Benedict: A Reply to Marilyn Dunn. *English Historical Review*, 1992, vol. 107, pp. 95-103.
94. Waal A. de. Sant'Eutichio martire nel cimitero "ad Catacumbas". *Römische Quartalschrift für christliche Altertumskunde und Kirchengeschichte*, 1915, Bd. 29, S. 269-275.
95. Wagner H.A. *Das spätantike Rom und die stadtrömische Senatsaristokratie (395–455 n. Chr.). Eine althistorisch-archäologische Untersuchung*. Berlin, Boston, W. de Gruyter, 2021. X, 523 S. (Millennium-Studien; Bd. 91).
96. Waitz G. *Scriptores rerum Langobardicarum et Italicarum saec. VI–IX*. Vol. 1. Hannover, Hahn, 1878. 636 p. (Monumenta Germaniae Historica. Scriptores; vol. 3).
97. Apresyan M., ed. *Hamabarbar'yaysmawowrk'. Naxaçerenc'yan 6 xmbagrowt' yownneri* [A Synopsis of the Synaxaria. 6 Pre-Cerenc' Recensions]. In 12 vols. Vol. 11. Holy Etchmiadzin, s.n., 2011. 384 p.; vol. 12. 2010. 392 p.
98. Dolakidze M., Chitunashvili D., eds. *didi svnaksari giorgi mtats' mindeli* [Great Synaxarion by George the Hagiorite]. Tbilisi, s.n., 2017. 045, 635 p.

**Information About the Author**

**Basil Lourié**, Doctor of Sciences (Philosophy), Leading Researcher, Institute of Philosophy and Law of the Siberian Branch of the Russian Academy of Sciences, Nikolaeva St, 8, 630090 Novosibirsk, Russian Federation, hieromonk@gmail.com, <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-6618-2829>

**Информация об авторе**

**Вадим Миронович Лурье**, доктор философских наук, ведущий научный сотрудник, Институт философии и права Сибирского отделения РАН, ул. Николаева, 8, 630090 г. Новосибирск, Российская Федерация, hieromonk@gmail.com, <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-6618-2829>