



The Protonike Legend, the Doctrina Addai and Bishop Rabbula of Edessa

Jan Willem Drijvers

Vigiliae Christianae, Vol. 51, No. 3. (Aug., 1997), pp. 298-315.

Stable URL:

<http://links.jstor.org/sici?sici=0042-6032%28199708%2951%3A3%3C298%3ATPLTDA%3E2.0.CO%3B2-4>

Vigiliae Christianae is currently published by Brill Academic Publishers.

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of JSTOR's Terms and Conditions of Use, available at <http://www.jstor.org/about/terms.html>. JSTOR's Terms and Conditions of Use provides, in part, that unless you have obtained prior permission, you may not download an entire issue of a journal or multiple copies of articles, and you may use content in the JSTOR archive only for your personal, non-commercial use.

Please contact the publisher regarding any further use of this work. Publisher contact information may be obtained at <http://www.jstor.org/journals/bap.html>.

Each copy of any part of a JSTOR transmission must contain the same copyright notice that appears on the screen or printed page of such transmission.

JSTOR is an independent not-for-profit organization dedicated to creating and preserving a digital archive of scholarly journals. For more information regarding JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

THE PROTONIKE LEGEND, THE *DOCTRINA ADDAI*
AND BISHOP RABBULA OF EDESSA¹

BY

JAN WILLEM DRIJVERS

The Protonike legend tells the story of the discovery of the True Cross. Besides the Protonike legend two other versions of this story were known in Late Antiquity: the Helena legend and the Judas Kyriakos legend. Each version is named after its principal person. The Helena legend is the original from which the Kyriakos- and Protonike legends are derived. This legend reports how Helena, mother of Constantine the Great, came to Jerusalem to search for the Cross on which Jesus Christ was crucified. When three crosses were found the Cross of Christ was identified with the help of Macarius, bishop of Jerusalem, through a healing or resuscitation miracle. At the site where the Cross was discovered, a wonderful church was built, the Church of the Holy Sepulchre. Part of the Cross was kept in this church. Besides the Cross, the nails with which Christ's body was hammered to the Cross were also found. These were sent to Constantine. Some were used to make a horse's bridle, others were added to the emperor's helmet, thereby fulfilling the prophecy of Zechariah 14:20. The first surviving testimony for this version of the legend can be found in Ambrose's funeral oration for Theodosius the Great which dates from 395. However, it is known that the legend was first committed to writing in c. 390 by Gelasius of Caesarea, who incorporated the story in his now lost *Church History*.² At the beginning of the fifth century the Greek text of the legend as written down by Gelasius was translated into Latin by Rufinus and included in his *Historia Ecclesiastica*.³ It is generally assumed that Rufinus' text renders that of Gelasius faithfully.⁴ The "Urtext" of Gelasius/Rufinus was the beginning of a series of texts in Greek and Latin which in essence are all the same and which constitute the Helena legend.⁵

The Judas Kyriakos legend is in fact a development of the Helena legend. Helena still plays an important role in this version, but it is not she who finds the Cross and afterwards the nails, but the discovery is made by the

Jew Judas. After his discovery Judas converts to Christianity, adopts the name Kyriakos (“of the Lord”) and afterwards becomes bishop of Jerusalem. The Kyriakos version is characterized by a vehement anti-Judaism which may be one of the reasons for the story’s great popularity in the Western and Byzantine Middle Ages.⁶

The Protonike version differs considerably from the Helena and Kyriakos version of the legend of the discovery of the Cross. The two main differences are that the event of the discovery of the Cross is situated in the first century C.E. and that Helena as principal person of the legend is replaced by the empress Protonike, wife of the emperor Claudius.⁷ Protonike is clearly a fictional person. Her name has a symbolic meaning; it signifies “first victory” and stands for the first victory over pagans and especially Jews. Yet in spite of the differences the Protonike legend is still closely related to the original traditions of the *inventio crucis*, as the following summary makes clear.

Protonike, the wife of the emperor Claudius, when “Simon Peter one of the disciples was in the city of Rome, saw the signs and wonders and astonishing powers which he performed in the name of the Messiah [and] recanted the paganism of her fathers in which she lived.” She held the Messiah in great honor. She also wished to see Jerusalem and went there together with her two sons and her one virgin daughter. In Jerusalem she was visited by James, leader of the church of that city. Protonike asked him to show her Golgotha, the wood of the cross and Christ’s tomb. James replied that these “are under the authority of the Jews . . . and [they] do not permit us to go and pray there before Golgotha and the grave.” The Jews, said James, “persecute us so that we do not preach or proclaim in the name of the Messiah.” Protonike ordered the leaders of the Jews to deliver Golgotha, the grave and the cross to James and his followers. Later, when this was done, she entered Christ’s tomb where she found three crosses, one belonging to Christ and the other two belonging to the brigands who were crucified with him. The moment she entered the tomb “her virgin daughter fell down and died without pain, illness or any cause of death.” The empress immediately started to pray. Then her oldest son said to her: “Listen to what I have to say, your majesty. In my mind and reasoning this sudden death is not in vain; it was rather a marvelous visitation by which God could be glorified. . . . By the death of my sister we are able to perceive and learn which cross is the Messiah’s because the Messiah will not turn away from those who believe in and seek him.” Protonike recognized that her son had spoken wisely. She took one of the

crosses, placed it upon her dead daughter and began to pray: “. . . let my daughter live and arise that your name might be glorified by her when her soul returns to her body. May those who crucified you be ashamed and may those who worship you rejoice.” When this had no effect she took the second cross, put it upon the corpse of her daughter and prayed again. The second cross too did not bring the girl back to life. When, however, Protonike put the third cross upon her daughter “immediately, in that instant, in the twinkling of an eye, as the cross touched the corpse of her daughter, her daughter came back to life, suddenly arose, and glorified God who had restored her to life by his cross.” When thus the True Cross was recognized, Protonike gave it to James to keep it in great honour. She also ordered that a church be built over Golgotha and the tomb in order that these places might be honored. The pagans and Jews were displeased with what had happened “for because of it many had believed in the Messiah. Increasingly they saw the signs which had occurred by his name after his ascension were many times more than those which had occurred before his ascension.” After Protonike’s return to Rome “she related the things which had happened to Claudius Caesar. When Caesar heard it, he commanded all the Jews to leave the country of Italy. . . . She also told Simon Peter that which had happened.”⁸

Contrary to the Helena and Kyriakos versions which were widely known in the main tongues of Antiquity—Greek, Latin and Aramaic—the Protonike legend is only known in Syriac (and later in Armenian). We may therefore safely assume that it was not known outside the Syriac-speaking regions.⁹ The Protonike story circulated in two alternative forms in these Syriac-speaking regions: as part of the *Doctrina Addai*, the fictional legend about the foundation of the Edessene Church, and as an independent story.¹⁰

Since the last decades of the nineteenth century there has been a lively interest among theologians and historians in the story of the *inventio crucis*. Modern research started with the publication of various manuscripts of the legend.¹¹ However, the scholarly discussion found a temporary end with the publication of J. Straubinger’s *Die Kreuzauffindungslegende. Untersuchungen über ihre altchristlichen Fassungen mit besonderer Berücksichtigung der syrischen Texte* (Paderborn 1912).¹² Recently the discussion of the legend of the *inventio crucis* has been taken up again,¹³ mainly as a result of David Hunt’s *Holy Land Pilgrimage in the Later Roman Empire A.D. 312-460* (Oxford, 1982). The second chapter of this book “Constantine and the Holy Land. Helena—History and Legend” was a stimulus for modern research. In this chapter Hunt

argues that there must have been a connection between Constantine the Great's building of the Church of the Holy Sepulchre in Jerusalem in the second half of the 320s, the visit of Helena to the Holy Land *c.* 327 as described by Eusebius in his *Vita Constantini* (3.42-47) and the presence of relics of the Cross in this church as attested by the *Cathechetical Lectures* of bishop Cyril of Jerusalem dating from the end of the 340s.¹⁴ It has long been supposed that the legend was of Latin origin but recent research has made evident that the legend of the discovery of the Cross originated in Jerusalem in the middle or the second half of the fourth century.¹⁵ It is also generally agreed upon that the Kyriakos and Protonike versions of the legend are based on the Helena version.¹⁶

Research on the legend of the *inventio crucis* has been mainly focused on the origin of the Helena legend and on the Kyriakos version. The Protonike version has not yet attracted much attention. With regard to the Protonike story I would like to raise three points in this paper. First, why the story about Protonike's discovery of the Cross became part of the *Doctrina Addai*. Secondly, when the story became part of the *Doctrina* and who may have been responsible for its insertion. Thirdly, did the Protonike legend exist as an independent narrative before its becoming part of the *Doctrina*, or did it come into being because of the wish to incorporate the traditions about the discovery of the Cross into the *Doctrina*?

The *Doctrina Addai* or Abgar legend originated in the North Mesopotamian city of Edessa. It is the official, but fictional, report of the foundation of the Edessene church and relates how Christianity came to Edessa in apostolic times when King Abgar, surnamed Ukkâmâ (4 B.C.E.—7 C.E.;—13 C.E.—50 C.E.) reigned over the city. Abgar, who suffered from an unspecified disease, had heard about Jesus' healing miracles and invited him by letter to come to Edessa. Abgar assured him that in Edessa he could not only cure him but also that in his city he would be safe from the hostilities of the Jews. Jesus, however, declined Abgar's proposal, but promised to send him one of his disciples after his own ascension to heaven. After Jesus' death the apostle Addai was sent to Edessa by Jesus' alleged twin brother Judas Thomas. Addai cured Abgar and was consequently permitted to preach the Christian faith. Thanks to Addai, who was also made bishop of Edessa, Christianity spread rapidly among the Edessenes as well as among the inhabitants of the city's surrounding countryside. By the time of Addai's death the whole city had been converted.

The *Doctrina Addai* originated at the end of the third century, probably

in reaction to the spread of Manichaeism in North Mesopotamia. It must be considered as a piece of Christian propaganda which emphasizes the fact that Christianity in Edessa went back to the time of Christ himself.¹⁷ Over the centuries the *Doctrina* gradually developed and new elements and traditions—e.g. a legend about the portrait of Christ, a correspondence between Tiberius and Abgar, the Protonike legend—were incorporated until it reached its final redaction somewhere in the fifth century.¹⁸

Already in the last century it was concluded that the Protonike legend was incorporated into the *Doctrina* at a later stage. There is a *communis opinio* that this must have happened at the beginning of the fifth century.¹⁹ Even though the German scholar R.A. Lipsius, who at the end of the nineteenth century published a fundamental work on the *Doctrina Addai*, held the opinion that the Protonike legend “mit den Acten des Thaddaeus [= Addai] nur in einem sehr äusserlichen Zusammenhang steht,”²⁰ the *Doctrina* and the Protonike legend have much in common. One of the common characteristics is the anti-Judaism in both texts. King Abgar is described as a man who hated the Jews. In a letter he advised the emperor Tiberius to take action against the Jews in order to punish them for the crucifixion of Christ.²¹ On his deathbed Addai warns his priests to beware of the Jews and not to befriend them because they have the blood of Christ on their hands.²² In the Protonike legend the Jews are said to prosecute and imprison the Christians; furthermore, the Jews keep the Christians from visiting Golgotha and Christ's tomb, the Jews rejoice when Protonike's daughter falls dead upon entering the tomb, and the end of the story tells us how as a consequence of Protonike's experiences the Jews were expelled from Italy. I once thought that the anti-Jewish similarities between *Doctrina* and the Protonike legend were the only reason for including the legend in the foundation legend of the Edessene church.²³ However, there are more correspondences between the two texts.²⁴ The apostle Simon Peter is mentioned various times in the legend as well as in the *Doctrina*. His wonders and powers made Protonike convert to Christianity, as mentioned at the beginning of the legend. At the end of the legend when Protonike had returned to Rome, she went to Simon Peter to tell him everything that had happened in Jerusalem.²⁵ In his speech to the leading priests of the Edessene church shortly before his death, Addai mentions Simon Peter as the one who had sent the Letters of Paul from the city of Rome to Edessa: “. . . the Letters of Paul, which Simon Peter sent to us from the city of Rome. . . .” Near the end of the *Doctrina* Simon Peter is mentioned as bishop of Rome: “. . . Simon Peter . . . who had been Bishop there in Rome

twenty-five years in the days of Caesar who reigned there thirteen years."²⁶ The Protonike legend opens with a reference to Tiberius' war with the Spaniards: "Protonice, the wife of Claudius Caesar, whom Tiberius had made second in his kingdom when he went to war against the Spaniards who had rebelled against him. . . ."²⁷ This war is also referred to in the *Doctrina* where the correspondence between Abgar and Tiberius is discussed: "Because of the war with the Spaniards, who have rebelled against me. . . ."²⁸ A central theme of the *Doctrina Addai* are Christian acts of healing. Jesus himself was especially known to King Abgar as a good physician, whose ability is so great that he can even raise the dead to life again.²⁹ Because of his healing capacities Abgar wrote to Jesus requesting him to come to Edessa: "Abgar Ukkama to Jesus, the good Physician who has appeared in the land of Jerusalem; my Lord, peace. I have heard concerning you and your healing that you do not heal with drugs or roots; it is rather by your word that you give sight to the blind, cause the lame to walk, cleanse the lepers and cause the deaf to hear; by your word you heal spirits, lunatics, and those in pain. You even raise the dead."³⁰ The apostle Addai also has healing powers. He is able to cure Abgar from his disease and to restore to health many of his courtiers: "As soon as he [Addai] laid his hand upon him [Abgar] he was healed from the pain of his illness. . . . Moreover, in all the city he performed great healings. . . ."³¹ It is in fact this curing power of Addai which persuaded many Edessenes to become Christians. Healing is also a central theme of the Protonike story. The climax of the story is the raising from the dead of Protonike's daughter by the touch of the Holy Wood, by which the True Cross could be recognized. Important as the recognition of the Cross of Christ was, it has deservedly been argued that the healing miracle performed by the Holy Wood was of even greater importance than the discovery of the Cross as such.³² The Cross performs the same miracles as Jesus during his life on earth; one might even say that the Cross symbolises Christ himself.

The *Doctrina Addai* shows Edessa's desire to be considered one of the important Christian cities of the world. For this reason the *Doctrina* stresses that Edessa's Christianity goes back to the time of Jesus himself: Edessa's king and Jesus have corresponded³³ and one of his apostles converted the whole city shortly after Christ's crucifixion and ascension. Besides Edessa's longing for a special position in the Christian world, the *Doctrina* also demonstrates the city's wish to maintain good relations with Rome and the imperial house. With regard to this, the exchange of letters between Abgar and the emperor Tiberius is especially illustrative. The correspondence

about what to do with the Jews, the murderers of Christ, presents Abgar as a subordinate of Tiberius who offers his help to solve the "Jewish problem" and clearly demonstrates Edessa's intention to maintain a good relationship with Rome.³⁴ Besides Edessa and Rome, the only other city which figures in the *Doctrina Addai* is Jerusalem. It is Jerusalem where Abgar sends his letter to Jesus since he dwells and performs his healing miracles there. At the beginning of the *Doctrina* Jerusalem is presented as a Jewish city up to the moment of the discovery of the Cross. After the Cross is found Jews and pagans convert and a church is ordered to be built on Golgotha. In the fourth century the traditions about the discovery of the True Cross and the veneration of relics of the Cross in the Church of the Holy Sepulchre on Golgotha, made Jerusalem one of the foremost cities in the Christian world. Since according to these traditions the Cross was said to be discovered by the empress Helena, the mother of Constantine the Great, a direct relationship between Jerusalem, its bishop's see and the imperial house was established.³⁵ By incorporating the story about the discovery of the Cross into the *Doctrina Addai* Edessa associates itself with Jerusalem, an important if not the foremost Christian city of the East. But the insertion of the story also expresses a wish for a special bond between the Christian city of Edessa and the Christian imperial house.³⁶ Jerusalem, which because of the traditions about the *inventio crucis* had the emperor's special attention and patronage, must have served as example for Edessa. Especially since the fatal campaign against the Sasanians in 363, as a result of which Edessa had come to border on the Persian empire, good relations with the Roman imperial government were of great importance for the Edessenes.³⁷

We have seen so far that there are several points in common between the Protonike story and the *Doctrina Addai* and that the Protonike legend is not the "Fremdkörper" in the *Doctrina* that it was long supposed to be. We may also conclude that the incorporation of the tradition about the *inventio crucis* into the *Doctrina* must have been a conscious choice to emphasize Edessa's special status as a Christian city beginning at the time of Christ himself and to establish a connection with Jerusalem and with the imperial house. Besides these points there are also similarities of a theological nature between the Protonike legend and the *Doctrina Addai*.

The *Doctrina Addai* proclaims that Christ is God who was created by God and who has become man, that the Son of God is God, that Christ by his very nature is God, and that Christ is God with his Father.³⁸ Expressions like these and others in the *Doctrina* must be seen against the

fierce christological discussions which took place in Late Antiquity, especially in the eastern parts of the Roman Empire and thus also in Edessa. In the first half of the fifth century the christological debates focused on the issue of monophysitism and diophysitism. Monophysite ideas figure strongly in the *Doctrina*. The opinions the *Doctrina* expresses on the one nature of Christ cannot be seen as separate from the christological discussions in the fifth century.³⁹ Since, as we have seen, there are many resemblances between the *Doctrina Addai* and the Protonike legend, it is not surprising that the Protonike legend also displays monophysite features in two passages—prayers of the empress—where it is said that Christ is God in human form, and that Christ has only a godly nature: “The God who gave himself to death for all people, being crucified in this place and laid in this tomb, and who as God gives life to all . . .”; “. . . if this cross is yours, my Lord, and on it your humanity was hung by shameless men, show the strong and mighty power of your divinity which dwells in the humanity. . . .”⁴⁰

There is general agreement that the Protonike legend became part of the *Doctrina Addai* in the first decades of the fifth century (see n. 19). A more precise dating seems possible than this rather vague chronological indication. If we take into consideration what has thus far been said on the correspondences between the *Doctrina Addai* and the Protonike legend, there are various indications which date the incorporation of the traditions of the *inventio crucis* into the *Doctrina* in the years between 431 and 436 when the episcopate of Edessa was held by Rabbula. It is not even unlikely that Rabbula himself had a hand in the origin of the Protonike legend.

Rabbula became bishop of Edessa in 412 and occupied the Edessene see until his death in 436. After his death a *Vita Rabbulae* was composed in Syriac by an anonymous writer, which is the main document we possess for the history of Rabbula’s life.⁴¹ In this *vita* Rabbula is presented as a model bishop, who is praised for his pious and ascetic behaviour, as well as for the care of his flock and clergy. Rabbula came from a wealthy family near Qenneshrin (Chalcis). His mother was a Christian but his father was a pagan priest who is said to have performed offerings on behalf of Julian the Apostate when the latter passed by on his way to Persia to wage war against the Sasanians. Rabbula remained pagan in spite of the fact that his mother found him a Christian wife. Only after he had seen healing miracles performed by the hermit Abraham who lived near his estate at Qenneshrin did Rabbula become a Christian. He went to the holy sites

in Palestine and was baptized in the river Jordan. After this pilgrimage he sold his property and distributed the proceeds among the needy and poor. His mother and wife became nuns and he sent his children to a monastery. Rabbula himself lived an austere life of asceticism until he was elected bishop of Edessa. As bishop he cared for the orphans, widows, and spent large sums for the support of the poor.⁴² Also as bishop Rabbula led an ascetic life; he ate only once a day, some bread and vegetables, and he spent the night praying. In other words, Rabbula is presented as an *alter Christus*. The *vita* lacks any information on the various actions of bishop Rabbula, on his role at the Council of Ephesus (431) and on the profound religious conflicts which took place during his episcopate between Christians on the one hand and Jews and heretics on the other hand, as well as among Edessene Christians themselves on christological issues. Nor does the *vita* tell us anything about the building activities in Edessa undertaken by Rabbula.⁴³ The subjects about which the *Vita Rabbulae* is silent are therefore just as interesting as, and perhaps even of more interest, than the subjects about which it provides information.

In the first decades of his episcopacy Rabbula seems with regard to christology to have been an adherent of the Antiochene theology, whose main representative was Theodore of Mopsuestia. This theology was of a diophysite nature. The theological writings of Theodore were read at the famous School of Edessa, or the School of the Persians as it was also called.⁴⁴ We may therefore suppose that Edessa's bishop, his clergy and the teachers at the School of Edessa were adherents of the diophysite Antiochene theology. At the Council of Ephesus in 431, where the diophysite doctrines of Nestorius (a pupil of Theodore) were discussed, Rabbula's position is not altogether evident, but he seems to have supported the Antiochene party against Cyril of Alexandria who in his Twelve Anathemas had condemned the diophysitism of Nestorius.⁴⁵ However, back in Edessa Rabbula radically changed his doctrinal point of view—the emperor Theodosius' abandonment of Nestorius shortly after the Council of Ephesus and the possibility of losing his episcopal see as a consequence of his christological views may have something to do with this—and became a fervent supporter of Cyril of Alexandria and like him a fierce opponent of diophysite ideas. A lively correspondence between the two bishops ensued in which Rabbula severely criticizes the ideas of Theodore of Mopsuestia, expresses his monophysite sympathies and shows himself an enthusiastic adherent of Cyril. Rabbula was such an admirer of the Alexandrian bishop that he even translated one of his treatises into Syriac.⁴⁶ When in 433 Cyril and

the Antiochene bishop John, who had abandoned the ideas of Nestorius, came to an agreement, the so-called *Formula of Union*, Rabbula, who had already preached against the theology of Theodore and the doctrinal ideas of Nestorius,⁴⁷ saw his chance and condemned the theology of Theodore of Mopsuestia. Rabbula even had Theodore's writings burned.⁴⁸ Rabbula's actions brought him into open conflict with the School of Edessa and especially with Hiba, the head of the School. As a consequence of the polemics between the two men and their parties, Hiba was eventually sent into exile in 433.⁴⁹ The letter Hiba wrote to Mari shortly after he was exiled from Edessa is illuminating with respect to Rabbula's behaviour.⁵⁰ He calls Rabbula the Tyrant of Edessa who had declared the writings of Theodore anathema for personal reasons. Theodore had offended Rabbula at a synod and hence Rabbula bore a grudge against Theodore.⁵¹ The conflict between Rabbula's party, the monophysites, and that of Hiba, the diophysites, may have been accompanied by public riots in the streets of Edessa, just as happened sixteen years later in 449.⁵² What becomes clear from all this is that Rabbula apparently was not the *alter Christus* as presented in his *vita* and that since 431 the Edessene bishop had very strong monophysite sympathies for which he was even prepared to get into conflict with Hiba, who was not just anybody but the head of the prestigious School of Edessa.

The *Vita Rabbulae* informs us that Rabbula managed to convert thousands of heretics—among them Marcionites and Arians—and Jews to the right faith. Other heretics, like the Borborians, he expelled from his diocese because of the outrageousness of their ideas. Rabbula's efforts to win heretics for the orthodox faith did not go without violence and their places of worship were sometimes ravaged.⁵³ As to the conversion of the thousands of Jews, we may assume that their going over to Christianity was not an act of free will. From the *Chronicum Edessenum* we know that Rabbula converted the synagogue in Edessa into a church dedicated to the protomartyr St. Stephen.⁵⁴ The discovery of the relics of St. Stephen, who had been stoned to death by the Jews (Acts 7:58-59), was considered by the Christians evidence that the Jews were indeed guilty of his death, just as the finding of the Cross was proof that the Jews were responsible for the crucifixion of Christ.⁵⁵ The expropriation of the synagogue reflects the anti-Jewish climate in Edessa, which seems to have had a considerable Jewish community, and is an indication, if not evidence, of Rabbula's anti-Judaism.⁵⁶ For him there was only the orthodox faith, and everybody—diophysites, other heretics and Jews—had to adopt willingly or unwillingly the bishop's faith.

The *vita* reports that shortly after his conversion to Christianity, Rabbula

went to Jerusalem to visit the holy places.⁵⁷ Among the sites Rabbula visited were Golgotha and the Tomb of Christ,⁵⁸ and thus the Church of the Holy Sepulchre which was built over these sites. It may well be that in Jerusalem Rabbula, like many other pilgrims, first became acquainted with the legend of the *inventio crucis*. Relics of the Cross were kept in the Church of the Holy Sepulchre. The pilgrim Egeria reports that on Good Friday these relics were shown to the Christian community and the pilgrims present, to be venerated and kissed. She also mentions that on 14 September the discovery of the Cross was commemorated in Jerusalem.⁵⁹ Rabbula may have been present on one of these occasions or perhaps on both. Since the *vita* also reports that Rabbula was baptized in the Jordan and since baptisms mostly took place at Easter time, it seems not unlikely that Rabbula was in Jerusalem on Good Friday and participated in the ceremonies in the Church of the Holy Sepulchre in which the Cross played a central role. Anyhow, Rabbula must have known the legend of the discovery of the Cross as would any pilgrim who had visited Jerusalem. Apparently Rabbula had great veneration for the Cross as a Christian symbol. He considered it a life-bringing symbol and as a sign of victory, as can be concluded from a Hymn on the Cross which Rabbula composed.⁶⁰ The inclusion in the Syriac lectionary of the commemoration of the apparition of the luminous cross in the sky above Jerusalem may also have been an initiative of Rabbula and is another indication of Rabbula's reverence for the symbol of the Cross.⁶¹

It appears from the above that Rabbula was not the model bishop as presented by the *Vita Rabbulae*, but a fanatical Christian who persecuted all those who had other ideas, such as diophysites and other heretics, as well as Jews. There is a remarkable resemblance between Rabbula's monophysitism and anti-Judaism and the monophysite and anti-Jewish character of the Protonike legend. This can hardly be a coincidence. Furthermore, Rabbula knew the legend of the *inventio crucis* and held the symbol of the Cross in great veneration. It is not at all unlikely that Rabbula saw the opportunity which the legend offered to emphasize and advance his own ideas in his christological conflict with Hiba and the latter's diophysite adherents. Rabbula must also have recognized the possibility of employing the legend in his competition with the Jews in Edessa. The story about the discovery of the Christian sign which brought victory over dissenters, such as heretics and Jews, would also bring Rabbula his victory over Jews and over those who had ideas which were dissentient from his own. Rabbula, who must have been a shrewd politician, may also have understood the

power of the legend in advancing the status of Edessa as a Christian city by associating itself with Jerusalem as well as in establishing a link with the imperial government. I would therefore suggest that it was during the episcopacy of Rabbula—probably in the 430s when the conflict between monophysites and diophysites broke out in Edessa—that the traditions about the discovery of the Cross which first originated in Jerusalem were transformed into the Protonike legend.

The above implies that the Protonike legend was created to incorporate the traditions about the *inventio crucis* into the *Doctrina Addai* and that it was not an independent story before its inclusion, as contended by some.⁶² The adaptation of the original traditions about the discovery of the Cross to the first-century circumstances of the *Doctrina Addai*, which must have been quite a “tour de force,” can only have been done with the express purpose of making these traditions fit into the context of the *Doctrina*. Therefore the Protonike legend began as part of the *Doctrina* and was only at a second stage separated from it to circulate independently.⁶³

It is likely that the Protonike legend came into being on the initiative of bishop Rabbula and that it was his idea to make it part of the official foundation legend of the Edessene church, the *Doctrina Addai*. Insertion of the legend into the *Doctrina* was meant to establish connections between Edessa and Jerusalem and between Edessa and the imperial house. With respect to this the roles performed in the legend by the empress and the bishop of Jerusalem are to be noticed.⁶⁴ But Rabbula also employed the legend to propagate the right faith against the Jews and the diophysites in Edessa. The legend may especially be seen as a “weapon” in Rabbula’s christological conflict with Hiba in the first half of the 430s to promote monophysitism. By adding the legend of the *inventio crucis* to the *Doctrina Addai*, the most important document of the Edessene church, Rabbula gave his own ideas on the faith the aura of authority.⁶⁵

NOTES

¹ This is an elaborate version of a short paper presented at the Twelfth International Conference on Patristic Studies held at Oxford, 21-26 August 1995. See my “Protonike legend and the *Doctrina Addai*,” in: Elizabeth A. Livingstone (ed.), *Studia Patristica* vol. XXXIII (Louvain, 1997) 517-523.

² F. Winkelmann, *Untersuchungen zur Kirchengeschichte des Gelasios von Kaisareia* (Sitzungsberichte der deutschen Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Berlin 65, Nr. 3, Berlin, 1966); F. Winkelmann, “Charakter und Bedeutung der Kirchengeschichte des Gelasios von Kaisareia,” *Byzantinische Forschungen* 1 (1966) 346-385.

³ Rufinus, *Hist. Eccl.* 10,7-8.

⁴ S. Heid, "Der Ursprung der Helenallegende im Pilgerbetrieb Jerusalems," *JbAC* 32 (1989) 41-71, 63; Jan Willem Drijvers, *Helena Augusta. The Mother of Constantine the Great and her Finding of the True Cross* (Leiden 1992) 100-101.

⁵ Ambrose, *de ob. Theod.* 40-49; Paulinus of Nola, *Epist.* 31,4-5; Sulpicius Severus, *Chron.* 2,33-34; Socrates, *Hist. Eccl.* 1,17; Sozomen, *Hist. Eccl.* 2,1-2; Theodoret, *Hist. Eccl.* 1,18. Although these texts all go back to the version of Gelasius of Caesarea, Ambrose's text differs from the others since his main theme is not so much the discovery of the Cross as the matter of the *hereditas fidei*, a not unimportant issue on the death of the very Christian Theodosius the Great; see W. Steidle, "Die Leichenrede des Ambrosius für Kaiser Theodosius und die Helena-Legende," *Vig. Christ.* 32 (1978) 94-112; F.A. Consolino, "Il significato dell' Invenio Crucis nel De Obitu Theodosii," *Annali della Facoltà di Lettere e Filosofia* 5 (Firenze, 1984) 161-180. For a comparison of the texts of these authors, see Drijvers, *Helena Augusta*, 100-117, and S. Borgehammar, *How the Holy Cross was Found. From Event to Medieval Legend* (Stockholm, 1991) Ch. 3.

⁶ The best known version is probably the one in the *Legenda Aurea* (*Jacobus de Voragine, Legenda Aurea, De Inventione Sanctae Crucis*, Th. Graesse ed., 1890, 303-311). The original traditions about the discovery of the Cross did not contain anti-Jewish elements, but the legend's potential anti-Judaism was soon noticed and developed. For the Kyriakos version see e.g. Borgehammar, *How the Holy Cross was found*, 145 ff.; S. Heid, "Zur frühen Protonike- und Kyriakoslegende," *Analecta Bollandiana* 109 (1991) 73-108; Drijvers, *Helena Augusta*, 165 ff.; Han J.W. Drijvers & Jan Willem Drijvers, *The Finding of the True Cross. The Judas Kyriakos Legend in Syriac. Introduction, Text and Translation*, CSCO 565, Subs. 93 (Louvain, 1997).

⁷ See Drijvers, *Helena Augusta*, 159-160 for other differences as a consequence of adjusting the legend to first-century circumstances.

⁸ *DA* f.7b-f.11a. See for an English translation: G. Howard, *The Teaching of Addai* (Texts and Translations 16, Early Christian Literature Series 4, Chico, 1981) 21-33. The passages between quotation marks are derived from this edition.

⁹ Heid, "Zur frühen Protonike- und Kyriakoslegende," 79 is wrong in supposing that the Church Historian Socrates knew the legend. "Sokrates . . . kennt offensichtlich die Protonikelegende."

¹⁰ Nine mss. in Syriac are known which contain the (independent) Protonike story. For a list of these mss., see A. Desreumaux, *Histoire du roi Abgar et de Jésus. Présentation et traduction du texte syriaque intégral de La Doctrine d'Addai* (Turnhout, 1993) 47-48, and A. Desreumaux, "Les titres des oeuvres apocryphes chrétiennes et leurs corpus. Le cas de la <Doctrine d'Addai> Syriaque," in: M. Tardieu (ed.), *La formation des canons scripturaires* (Paris, 1993) 203-217, 212-214. The independent Protonike story includes in most mss. an additional paragraph where it is told that the cross found by Protonike was hidden again by the Jews in the time of the emperor Trajan. This addition is clearly meant to connect the Protonike story with the Judas Kyriakos version of the *inventio crucis*; see e.g. Drijvers, *Helena Augusta*, 165 ff. The Kyriakos version, the original language of which was Greek, was also known in Syriac. The Syriac texts of this version tell how the Cross was found for the second time—in the Syriac tradition the first discovery was made by Protonike—by the empress Helena with the help of the Jew Judas. After the discovery Judas converted and adopted the name Kyriakos; see Drijvers & Drijvers, *The Finding of the True Cross*.

¹¹ A. Holder, *Inventio Sanctae Crucis* (Leipzig, 1889) published a Latin manuscript (Paris BN 2769); E. Nestle, "Die Kreuzauffindungslegende. Nach einer Handschrift vom Sinai," *Byzantinische Zeitschrift* 4 (1895) 319-345, published a Greek manuscript (Sinai 493); E. Nestle, *De Sancta Cruce* (Berlin, 1889) has two Syriac manuscripts (Londin. BL Add. 12.174; Londin. BL Add. 14.644).

¹² Straubinger was the first to classify the various traditions of *inventio crucis* as Helena-Kyriakos- and Protonike legend.

¹³ Heid, "Der Ursprung der Helenalegende im Pilgerbetrieb Jerusalems"; Heid, "Zur frühen Protonike- und Kyriakoslegende"; Borgehammar, *How the Holy Cross was found*; Drijvers, *Helena Augusta*.

¹⁴ *Catechesis* IV 10 = PG 33, 470 ("... and already the whole world is filled with fragments of the wood of the Cross."); *Catechesis* X 19 = PG 33, 685-687 ("The holy wood of the Cross gives witness: it is here to be seen in this very day, and through those who take [pieces] from it in faith, it has from here already filled almost the whole world."); *Catechesis* XIII 4 = PG 33, 777 ("... the wood of the Cross which from this place is spread piecemeal all over the world.").

¹⁵ Heid, "Der Ursprung der Helenalegende"; Borgehammar, *How the Holy Cross was found*, 9 ff.; Drijvers, *Helena Augusta*, 95 ff. The view that the legend is of Latin origin is still contended in some recent publications; e.g. H. Busse & G. Kretschmar, *Jerusalem Heiligtumstraditionen in altkirchlicher und frühislamischer Zeit* (Wiesbaden, 1987); A. Demandt, *Die Spätantike. Römische Geschichte von Diocletian bis Justinian 284-565 n.Chr.* (Handbuch der Altertumswissenschaft III.6, München, 1989) 76 n. 75.

¹⁶ For a divergent view, see M. van Esbroeck, "L'opuscule *Sur la Croix* d'Alexandre Chypre et sa version Géorgienne," *Bedi Kartlisa* 37 (1979) 102-132, 111-121; M. van Esbroeck, "Jean II de Jérusalem et les cultes de S. Étienne, de la Sainte-Sion et de la Croix," *Analecta Bollandiana* 102 (1984) 99-134, 126 ff.; M. van Esbroeck, M., "La portée politico-religieuse des visions pour la conversion des peuples," *Revue de l'institut catholique de Paris* 53 (1995) 87-104, 99 ff.; A. Desreumaux, "La doctrine d'Addai. Essai de classement des témoins syriaques et grecs," *Augustinianum* 23 (1983) 181-186, 184 ff. Van Esbroeck, followed by Desreumaux, argues that the three versions of the legend of the discovery of the Cross all came into existence when the patriarch John II of Jerusalem (387-417) instituted the function of *staurophylox* in Jerusalem. In Van Esbroeck's opinion the three versions of the legend belong together and it is impossible to indicate a chronological priority. This theory has convincingly been refuted by Heid, "Zur frühen Protonike- und Kyriakoslegende," 74-76; see also Drijvers & Drijvers, *The Finding of the True Cross*, 19-20.

¹⁷ For the origin and development of the *Doctrina Addai*, see H.J.W. Drijvers, "Abgarsage," in: W. Schneemelcher (Hrsg.), *Neutestamentliche Apokryphen in deutscher Übersetzung*, Band 1, Evangelien (Tübingen, 1990) 389-395; Desreumaux, *Histoire du roi Abgar et de Jésus*, "Introduction." For the origin of the *Doctrina* as reaction to Manichaeism, see H.J.W. Drijvers, "Addai und Mani," *Orientalia Christiana Analecta* 221 (1983) 171-185.

¹⁸ The ms. Petersburg/Leningrad N.S. 4 of the *Doctrina Addai*, which is to be dated to the end of the fifth century, is generally assumed to be the final redaction of the *Doctrina Addai*. The ms. was first published and translated by G. Phillips, *The Doctrine of Addai, the Apostle. Now First Edited in a Complete Form in the Original Syriac* (London, 1876). For a new English translation see Howard, *The Teaching of Addai*. A French translation is offered by Desreumaux, *Histoire du roi Abgar et de Jésus*. The ms. is described by

M. van Esbroeck, "Le manuscrit syriaque nouvelle série 4 de Leningrad (V^e siècle)," *Mélanges Antoine Guillaumont. Contributions à l'étude des christianismes orientaux, Cahiers d'Orientalisme XX* (Geneva, 1988) 211-219. A photographic reproduction of the ms. as well as a Russian translation is given in Elena M. Meshtcherskaya, *Legenda ob Avgare. Rannesirijskij literaturnyj pamjatnik* (Moscow, 1984).

¹⁹ L.J. Tixeront, *Les origines de l'église d'Édesse et la légende d'Abgar* (Paris, 1888) 178; Straubinger, *Die Kreuzauffindungslegende*, 94; Van Esbroeck, "L'opuscule," 116; Desreumaux, "La Doctrine d'Addai," 184.

²⁰ R.A. Lipsius, *Die Edessenische Abgarsage* (Braunschweig, 1880) 69.

²¹ DA f.51 = Howard, *The Teaching of Addai*, 13; DA f.23b-f.25a = Howard, *The Teaching of Addai*, 75-81.

²² DA f.27a = Howard, *The Teaching of Addai*, 87. See also DA f.2a, f.3a, f.26b, f.30a = Howard, *The Teaching of Addai*, 5, 9, 85 and 97 for more anti-Jewish remarks.

²³ Drijvers, *Helena Augusta*, 161-162. In the Dutch edition (*Helena Augusta. Waarheid en Legende*, Groningen 1989, Ph.D. thesis) I propounded the view that the reason for inserting the Protonikelegend into the *Doctrina Addai* might have some connection with the *Doctrina* as an originally anti-Manichaeic or anti-gnostic text. This view cannot be held, as Heid, "Zur frühen Protonike- und Kyriakoslegende," 77-80 has also made clear.

²⁴ See also Heid, "Zur frühen Protonike- und Kyriakoslegende," 88-89.

²⁵ DA f.7b, f.10b = Howard, *The Teaching of Addai*, 21, 33.

²⁶ DA f.29a, f.33a = Howard, *The Teaching of Addai*, 93, 105.

²⁷ DA f.7b = Howard, *The Teaching of Addai*, 21.

²⁸ DA f.24b = Howard, *The Teaching of Addai*, 77-79. See also Heid, "Zur frühen Protonike- und Kyriakoslegende," 88-89.

²⁹ J.B. Segal, *Edessa. "The Blessed City"* (Oxford, 1970) 71; Heid, "Zur frühen Protonike- und Kyriakoslegende," 85; A. Desreumaux, "La *Doctrina Addai*: le chroniqueur et ses documents" in: *Apocrypha. Le champ des apocryphes* 1 (1990), *la fable apocryphe* I, 249-267, 258.

³⁰ DA f.3a = Howard, *The Teaching of Addai*, 7.

³¹ DA f.5b = Howard, *The Teaching of Addai*, 15.

³² Heid, "Zur frühen Protonike- und Kyriakoslegende," 86.

³³ Eusebius, *Hist. Eccl.* 1,13 mentions the correspondence between Jesus and Abgar. The pilgrim Egeria when visiting Edessa c. 384 was told about the correspondence; the original letters were read to her and she took copies of them home; *It. Eger.* 19,8-19.

³⁴ The name of Abgar's mother, Augustina, may also express the Edessene wish for good relations with the imperial house. Augustina is a name that does not occur in Syriac but immediately brings to mind the imperial title of *Augusta*.

³⁵ Cyril of Jerusalem's letter to Constantius II on the apparition of a luminous cross in the sky above Jerusalem on 7 May 351 clearly shows Jerusalem's (wish for a) good relationship with the imperial house. See for an edition of this letter: E. Bihain, "L'épître de Cyrille de Jérusalem à Constance sur la Vision de la Croix (BHG3 413)," *Byzantion* 43 (1973) 264-296. For a Syriac edition of this letter, see J.F. Coakley, "A Syriac version of the Letter of Cyril of Jerusalem on the Vision of the Cross," *Analecta Bollandiana* 102 (1984) 71-84.

³⁶ See Desreumaux, "La Doctrine d'Addai," 184-185; Heid, "Zur frühen Protonike- und Kyriakoslegende," 93.

³⁷ This aspect is especially emphasized by Heid, "Zur frühen Protonike- und Kyriakoslegende," 90 ff. According to Heid the Syrian Christians included the legend in the *Doctrina* to connect the Syrian church with the established church of the Roman Empire in the hope of being protected by the Roman emperor in case of hostilities by the Zoroastrian Persians. Interesting in this respect is also Ephraem Syrus' sometimes exalted view of the (Christian) Roman emperors, even of Jovian who, after the fatal Persian campaign of Julian the Apostate, had to give up Nisibis. As a consequence of this Ephraem had to leave Nisibis and settled in Edessa; see Sidney H. Griffith, "Ephraem, the Deacon of Edessa, and the Church of the Empire," in: Thomas H. Alton and Joseph P. Williman (eds.), *Diakonia. Studies in Honor of Robert T. Meyer* (Washington, 1986) 22-52, 31-35.

³⁸ *DA* f.5a-5b, f.11b, f.12b, f.17b = Howard, *The Teaching of Addai*, 13-15, 35, 39, 55.

³⁹ See A. Desreumaux, "La doctrine d'Addai, l'image du Christ et les monophysites," in: F. Boespflug, N. Lossky (eds.), *Nicée II, 787-1987. Douze siècles d'images religieuses* (Paris, s.a.) 73-79, 75 ff.; Desreumaux, *Histoire du roi Abgar et de Jésus*, 30-31, 35-36. Heid, "Zur frühen Protonike- und Kyriakoslegende," 78 also draws attention to the orthodox character of the *Doctrina*.

⁴⁰ *DA* f.8a, f.9a = Howard, *The Teaching of Addai*, 25, 29.

⁴¹ The *Vita* was published by J.J. Overbeck, *S. Ephraemi Syri, Rabulae Episcopi Edesseni, Balai aliorumque opera selecta* (Oxford, 1865); German translation in G. Bickell, *Ausgewählte Schriften der syrischen Kirchenväter Aphraates, Rabulas und Isaak von Ninive* (Kempten, 1874). See for Rabbula also P. Peeters, "La vie de Rabboula, évêque d'Édesse (mort 7 août 436)," *Mélanges de Grandmaison = Recherches de science religieuse* 18 (1928) 170-204 = P. Peeters *Recherches d'histoire et de philologie orientales* I (Subs. Hagiogr. 27, Brussels, 1951) 139-170; G.G. Blum, *Rabbula von Edessa. Der Christ, der Bischof, der Theologe* (CSCO, Subs. 31, Louvain, 1969).

⁴² See Han J.W. Drijvers, "The Man of God of Edessa, Bishop Rabbula, and the Urban Poor. Church and Society in the Fifth Century," *Journal of Early Christian Studies* 4 (1996) 235-248.

⁴³ The Syriac *Legend of the Man of God* alludes to Rabbula's building activities when it says that Rabbula "interrupted work on many buildings and ceased the occupy his time with perishable things"; see Drijvers, "The Man of God of Edessa," 241-242, who argues probably correctly that Rabbula was an active builder.

⁴⁴ See E.R. Hayes, *L'école d'Édesse* (Paris, 1930). Han J.W. Drijvers, "The School of Edessa: Greek Learning and Local Culture," in: Jan Willem Drijvers & Alasdair A. MacDonald, *Centres of Learning. Learning and Location in Pre-modern Europe and the Near East* (Leiden, 1995) 49-59.

⁴⁵ I follow here the view of Peeters, "La vie de Rabboula," 156-157. Blum, *Rabbula von Edessa*, 160 ff., although admitting that Rabbula's role at the council is not clear, thinks that the Edessene bishop had always been opposed to the Nestorian doctrines. There is, however, no indication that in the years before 431 Rabbula was an opponent of the Antiochene theology or spoke out against the ideas of Nestorius.

⁴⁶ Probably the treatise addressed to Theodosius II entitled *De recta in dominum nostrum Jesum Christum fide ad imperatorem Theodosium*. On the correspondence between Rabbula and Cyril, see Blum, *Rabbula von Edessa*, 174-179.

⁴⁷ *Vita Rabbulae* = Bickell, *Ausgewählte Schriften*, 199-203.

⁴⁸ See Blum, *Rabbula von Edessa*, 165 ff.

⁴⁹ On the conflict between Rabbula and Hiba, see R. Duval, *Histoire d'Édesse, politique, religieuse et littéraire* (Amsterdam 1975²) 172-175; Hayes, *L'école d'Édesse*, 191-203.

⁵⁰ The letter which was originally written in Syriac survives in a Greek and Latin translation; A. Schwarz, *ACO* II.1.3, 32-34 and II.3.3, 39-43. The extant Syriac version is based on the Greek translation; J. Flemming, *Akten der Ephesinischen Synode vom Jahre 449* (Abhandlungen der Akademie der Wissenschaften in Göttingen, Phil.-Hist. Klasse, Neue Folge 15.1, Berlin, 1917) 48-52.

⁵¹ Mar Barhadbsabba 'Arbaya, *Cause de la fondation des écoles*, PO IV.4.18, 1907, 380-381, tells that Rabbula was accused of physical violence towards his clerics. When he said in his defence that Jesus had done the same in the Temple at Jerusalem, Theodore had corrected him by saying that Jesus had not beaten up anybody but had only expelled all that sold and bought.

⁵² After Rabbula's death in 436 the conflict between the monophysites and the party of Hiba, who had become Rabbula's successor, continued and came to a climax in 449. At the Robber Synod of Ephesus which took place in this year the monophysites succeeded in getting Hiba condemned, after much violence and riots in Edessa. Order had to be restored by the imperial *comes* Flavius Chaireas. See Flemming, *Akten der Ephesinischen Synode*, 14-55.

⁵³ Overbeck, *S. Ephraemi Syri, Rabulae Episcopi Edesseni... opera selecta*, 193, ll. 14-194, l. 18; Bickell, *Ausgewählte Schriften*, 196-198. Rabbula's aggressiveness towards other believers showed itself already before he became bishop of Edessa. The *Vita Rabbulae* mentions that Rabbula once went to Heliopolis (Baalbek) with the intention of destroying a pagan temple.

⁵⁴ *Chronicum Edessenum*, ed. I. Guidi, *Chronica Minora I* (CSCO, Script. Syr. 1, Louvain, 1903) 6, sub LI.

⁵⁵ For the discovery of Stephen's relics, see E.D. Hunt, *Holy Land Pilgrimage in the Later Roman Empire A.D. 312-460* (Oxford, 1982) 212 ff.

⁵⁶ For Jews in Edessa, see Segal, *Edessa*, 100-104; H.J.W. Drijvers, "Jews and Christians at Edessa," *Journal of Jewish Studies* 36 (1985) 88-102; H.J.W. Drijvers, "Syrian Christianity and Judaism," in: Judith Lieu, John North and Tessa Rajak (eds.), *The Jews among Pagans and Christians in the Roman Empire* (London/New York, 1992) 124-146. It is interesting that according to the *Vita Rabbulae* the Jews of Edessa lamented for Rabbula's death. There is a resemblance here with the *Doctrina Addai* where it is said that the Edessene Jews mourned the death of Addai. In both cases the mentioning of the grief of the Jews must be considered Christian propaganda.

⁵⁷ Although the *vita* is not an historically trustworthy document, there is no doubt that Rabbula visited the Holy Land; see Peeters, "La vie de Rabboula," 143; Blum, *Rabbula von Edessa*, 22.

⁵⁸ Overbeck, 165, ll. 1-3 = Bickell, *Ausgewählte Schriften*, 171.

⁵⁹ *It. Eger.* 37,1-3 and 48,1.

⁶⁰ Bickell, *Ausgewählte Schriften*, 271: "Der Kaiser Konstantin bekämpfte den Irrthum mit dem Zeichen des Lebens, welches er in der Himmelshöhe gesehen hatte, und besiegte und beschämte so die Abgötterei. Durch dasselbe Zeichen sieht auch die Kirche mit ihren Kindern über die ganze linke Seite. Das Kreuz erschien oben im Himmel; das Kreuz ist erhöht worden auf Golgatha; das Kreuz möge auch den auf es vertrauenden Christen als Schussmauer dienen!"

⁶¹ F.C. Burkitt, "The early Syriac lectionary system," *Proceedings of the British Academy* (1921-1923) 301-338, 323-324. Considering Rabbula's veneration for the Cross, it seems not impossible that during his episcopate the letter of Cyril of Jerusalem to Constantius II, about the apparition of the celestial Cross in Jerusalem on 7 May 351, was translated into Syriac. Syriac edition of this letter: Coakley, "A Syriac version of the Letter of Cyril of Jerusalem."

⁶² E.g. Lipsius, *Die Edessenische Abgarsage*, 69; Desreumaux, "La Doctrine d'Addai," 184-185; Desreumaux, *Histoire de roi Abgar et de Jésus*, 22-23.

⁶³ See Nestle, *De Sancta Cruce*, 68-73 and Borgehammar, *How the Holy Cross was found*, 74-75. In composing the Protonike legend use was made of already existing Syriac documents. The occurrence of Simon Peter in the legend is based on a (monophysite) work entitled *Doctrine of Simon Képha in the city of Rome*; see W. Cureton, *Ancient Syriac Documents* (Amsterdam, 1967²) 35-41. The hiding of the Cross by the Jews is probably derived from the *Transitus Mariae* text; Cureton, *Ibid.*, 110-111. See also Desreumaux, "La *Doctrina Addai*: le chroniqueur et ses documents," 263-264.

⁶⁴ The correspondence between Abgar and Tiberius, which also at a later stage was added to the *Doctrina Addai*, may also have had the purpose of bringing Edessa and the imperial house closer together.

⁶⁵ It may even be that the *Doctrina Addai* got its monophysite nature on the initiative of Rabbula. It may be worthwhile to compare the (christological) ideas expressed in the *Doctrina* with those in Rabbula's *De recta in dominum nostrum Jesum Christum fide ad imperatorem Theodosium*.

Oude Kijk in 't Jatstraat 26
Postbus 716, 9700 AS Groningen