

# MEDIEVALIA ET HUMANISTICA

STUDIES IN MEDIEVAL & RENAISSANCE CULTURE

*Founded in 1943 by S. Harrison Thomson*

NEW SERIES

NUMBER 2

MEDIEVAL AND RENAISSANCE STUDIES IN REVIEW

Edited by Paul Maurice Clogan

CASE WESTERN RESERVE UNIVERSITY

The Press of  
Case Western Reserve University  
*Cleveland & London*  
1971

# *Byzantium and the Migration of Literary Works and Motifs*

## THE LEGEND OF THE LAST ROMAN EMPEROR\*

*Paul J. Alexander*

THE BYZANTINE EMPIRE, during the more than one thousand years of its existence, was not only the storehouse of classical Greek literature; it was also “the great clearing house of East and West,” in folk literature as well as in other branches.<sup>1</sup> Bulgarians, Russians, Armenians, and Georgians received their first literary stimuli from Byzantium, so much so that the early written monuments of these and other peoples are largely translations from Byzantine Greek originals. Furthermore, a considerable number of Byzantine literary works were translated in the Middle Ages into Latin and had a profound influence on the development of literature in western and central Europe.<sup>2</sup> All this is well known, but it is not always stressed sufficiently that Byzantium functioned not only as a literary donor but also frequently as the recipient of literary gifts. This process has so far been studied in its more general aspects only for one field of literature, hagiography, but influences of Syriac, Arabic, Armenian, Coptic, and even Far Eastern literatures upon that of Byzantium are also important in other genres.<sup>3</sup> Particularly interesting are the migrations of works which originated in the Far East and thence travelled via various intermediate stages including Byzantium to western or Slavic Europe. A case in point is the Indian story about Buddha extant in Greek in the guise of the *Romance of Barlaam and Joasaph* as well as in a Latin transla-

\*Several friends and colleagues have read an earlier draft of this paper and made valuable comments, especially Professors Fred Amory, Wolfgang Sauer, and Stephen J. Tonsor. Furthermore, I presented it orally to the Collegium Orientologicum at the University of California, Berkeley, and received many suggestions from various colleagues. I take this opportunity to express my sincere gratitude for all this help. I also wish to thank Mr. Stephen Benin, a graduate student in the Department of History at Berkeley, for checking my references, as well as two readers for *Medievalia et Humanistica* for good advice.

tion of the early eleventh century; or the Indian tale of the two jackals Calila and Dimna translated into Greek in the eleventh century and into various Slavic languages, at the latest, in the early thirteenth; or finally the Hebrew story of the wise Achikar which surfaced at Byzantium in the form of a *Life of Aesop* and thence reached the Slavs.<sup>4</sup> What constitutes the peculiar interest of these and of other instances of long-distance literary migration is not only the appeal of these works to the many cultures into whose languages they were translated, but also the fact that, once many philological and historical labors are completed, it should become possible to define more precisely the process of migration and to ascertain the reasons for their spread. In most cases, however, no such precision is as yet attainable, simply because the scholarly problems are too difficult and the work has just begun.

There is, however, one case of literary borrowing for which the process can be studied in some detail and certain conclusions reached: the legend or expectation of a Last Roman Emperor. The story of its spread is by no means typical, but it may serve to illustrate one type of appeal that facilitated long-distance migration: an appeal to religio-political ideology. This legend is not limited to one particular literary work but is a motif that appears in a variety of forms. Normally it emerges in contexts dealing with Christian expectations concerning the end of the world. At some point, during the course of events leading to the end, there emerges a Last Roman Emperor who defeats the national or religious enemy, journeys to Jerusalem, and resides there for a number of years. At the end of this period he hands over the insignia of his office to God. That act is usually followed immediately by a manifestation of Antichrist, who then seduces vast numbers of people but is finally liquidated by Jesus Christ at his Second Coming. The characteristic features of the legend, therefore, are a war of liberation and an imperial abdication.

What is the origin of this story? It will be advisable to begin at the end to define the circumstances under which this legend was first studied by modern scholars. This happened in nineteenth-century Germany.

The historical development of Germany and of much of Europe in the nineteenth century was determined by two series of events: the Napoleonic wars at the beginning of the century and the foundation of the German Empire towards its end. These happenings, separated though they were by a span of seven decades, were of course related.

The Bismarckian unification of the many German states under the authority of the Prussian dynasty owed a great deal to the nationalist feelings aroused or at least released by the foreign invasions. As a result not only political tracts, but also the philosophy, literature, and historiography of nineteenth-century Germany were permeated by the hope for a united effort of the German principalities and peoples against foreign domination and influence.

In Germany these hopes and dreams reinforced apocalyptic expectations of a restored empire current in eighteenth-century Europe. Characteristically, the legends of the medieval Empire had originated in the Late Middle Ages after the Great Interregnum, when the Empire was little more than an empty title and a nostalgic dream, and when sovereignty in Germany was parcelled out among a host of secular and ecclesiastical princes. In this political atmosphere the popular longing for peace, for freedom from oppression by local dynasts, and for the strengthening of the imperial power produced sagas such as that of Mount Kyffhäuser.<sup>5</sup> A Bavarian chronicle of the early fourteenth century, for example, spoke of an Emperor, buried but not dead, who would return with great military power. By 1434 this legend had gradually crystalized around an Emperor Frederick who was expected to await his reappearance in a castle on Mount Kyffhäuser.<sup>6</sup> After the Napoleonic wars had removed the last vestiges of German unity and demonstrated German impotence, the Romantic movement reinvigorated the medieval legends.

In the second decade of the nineteenth century Friedrich Rückert published his famous and influential poem "Barbarossa." Here, the sleeping Emperor with his fiery beard was described sitting in a subterranean castle to which he had descended, taking with him the Empire's glory. There he will sit, on an ivory chair at a marble table, as long as the ravens fly around Mount Kyffhäuser. But one day he will return to restore the Empire to its former splendor:

Er hat hinabgenommen  
Des Reiches Herrlichkeit  
Und wird einst wiederkommen  
Mit ihr, zu seiner Zeit.

The popular dream of freedom from foreign influences and interventions, and of national unification affected not only poets and publicists but also the world of scholarship and historiography. Characteristic in this respect is one of the outstanding and influential German works

on medieval history, Wilhelm von Giesebrecht's *Geschichte der deutschen Kaiserzeit*, of which the first volume was published in 1855. The preface to the first edition of the work is permeated by an awareness of the depth and intensity of national feeling; it stresses the author's "patriotic purpose" and expresses his fervent desire to provide for the best among the young, as he puts it, "the torch illuminating a brighter future for the German nation."<sup>7</sup> It is instructive to compare the preface of 1855 with that of the fourth edition of 1873. In the interval between the two editions Denmark and Austria had been defeated in battle, the Prussian and allied armies had laid siege to Paris, overthrown Napoleon III, and imposed a burdensome peace upon France. Above all, King William of Prussia had been proclaimed German Emperor at Versailles in January, 1871. This was heady wine indeed for German patriots, and Giesebrecht's preface of 1873 shows its effects very clearly. It speaks of "the most miraculous change of circumstances . . . which we have witnessed in wonder" and expresses the hope that a time "when the resurrected names of Emperor and Empire exert their magical power on millions of people" will generate an interest in the subject of medieval German history.<sup>8</sup>

The events of the 'sixties and 'seventies served not only as the justification for the historical study of the medieval Empire, but also seemed the fulfillment of medieval prophecies and oracles about its revival. Indeed, after these prophecies seemed validated on the battlefields of Europe and in the Hall of Mirrors at Versailles, the study of medieval oracular literature became an academically respectable, even a passionate, scholarly concern in Bismarckian Germany. It is, therefore, no accident that in 1871 the *Historische Zeitschrift*, founded and directed by Heinrich von Sybel, who had played an active role in Prussian politics and was later commissioned by Bismarck to write the official history of the foundation of the Empire, published Georg Voigt's important and influential article on "Die deutsche Kaisersage." In it the author defined his topic, somewhat narrowly, as "the legend of the old Emperor who would not die, who would some day return in order to refound the empire."

In the same *annus mirabilis* of 1871 there appeared a study informed by a different and independent spirit, the Roman Catholic theologian Johann Joseph Ignaz von Döllinger's essay entitled "Der Weissagungsglaube und das Prophetentum in der Christlichen Zeit."<sup>9</sup> In this article Döllinger did not join the chorus of nationalistic wonderment and intoxication over recent successes, nor did he, like his Ger-



*Byzantium and the Migration of Literary Works and Motifs*

man contemporaries, focus primarily on German prophecies. He cast his net wider, both geographically and typologically, distinguishing four types of medieval prophecy (purely religious, dynastic, national, and cosmopolitan) and emphasized in particular the religious and ecclesiastical component in medieval prophecy. German predictions are touched on only occasionally, and Döllinger discusses instead materials ranging from Portugal to England and from Byzantium to papal Rome. In fact, one gains the impression that with this profound essay Döllinger intended to provide a counterfoil to the prevalent exploitation of medieval prophecies for nationalist purposes. The net effect of the essay on the reader is the realization that medieval prophecy had its roots in early Christianity; was by no means a monopoly of the German nation; was very frequently inspired by political motivations; and miscarried as often as it succeeded in predicting later events. Characteristically, Döllinger concluded with a citation from Isaiah 55:8–9: “My thoughts are not your thoughts, neither are your ways my ways, says the Lord,” and remarked that this Biblical verse must have occurred to many a reader of his essay. One cannot escape the conclusion that this sceptical and broadminded study of medieval prophecy by a prominent and pious Roman Catholic churchman was meant to serve as a warning against the prevailing spirit of excitement over the military and political successes of the German nation. Döllinger seems to have felt that the excessive impressionability evidenced by German scholars with regard to recent developments required a learned refutation. Indirectly, therefore, even Döllinger’s sober and wide-ranging article offers powerful testimony to the widespread and intense fascination of German intellectuals with the legends surrounding the medieval empire.

In the years that followed the proclamation at Versailles German historians, philologists, and theologians vied with each other in attempting to elucidate the origin and development of the legends about the German Emperors. They were patriots as well as scholars, and occasionally interpreted medieval developments in the light of political programmes of the nineteenth century. It should be recognized, however, that, probably under the influence of Döllinger’s cosmopolitan approach, they were to a large extent free of another possible bias. With remarkable objectivity they traced the genesis of German imperial ideology to its roots in cultures far distant from either medieval or modern Germany in time, place, and cultural tradition. Indeed, it is no exaggeration to say that they rejoiced in discovering Biblical,

classical, or Oriental foundations to the imperial legends, and considered that such “exotic” origins strengthened and authenticated German expectations of imperial splendor, rather than providing an embarrassment for the German patriot.

The first scholar to connect explicitly the German imperial legends of the Middle Ages with foreign sources<sup>10</sup> was a Lutheran theologian at the University of Erlangen, Gerhard von Zezschwitz, in a book published in 1877 and indicating in its subtitle his claim that he had discovered Byzantine sources for the legends concerning the medieval German Emperors.<sup>11</sup> Zezschwitz’s point of departure was a play, the *Ludus de Antichristo*, written in the days of Frederick Barbarossa and embodying the far-reaching imperial claims of that period. He published this text from a twelfth-century manuscript and related the ideas contained therein to the realities and claims prevalent in twelfth-century Germany. In this play the stage is set in Jerusalem and shows the Temple and seven royal thrones: those of the kings of Jerusalem, of the Synagogue, the Roman Emperor, and of the German, French, Greek, and Babylonian kings. The Roman Emperor demands that the French king recognize his universal sovereignty. The latter refuses, is defeated in battle, and finally acknowledges the Emperor’s authority. The other kings follow suit, with one exception: the king of Babylon, as the spokesman for polytheism, decides to destroy Christianity and to attack it at its place of origin, Jerusalem. The Roman Emperor comes to the aid of the king of Jerusalem, defeats the king of Babylon in war, and enters the Temple. There he takes off his crown and offers it to God at the altar. This is followed by the entry of the Antichrist into the Temple, the establishment of his reign, and his final destruction.

Zezschwitz provided his edition of this play with a series of “introductory treatises.” The first of these, significantly entitled “The New and the Old Empire,” demonstrates, both by this heading and its content, how closely related in Zezschwitz’s view the medieval play and its subject matter were to the electrifying events of the Bismarckian era. He explained that it illustrated in lively colors the theory of universal monarchy as it had been entertained at the court of Frederick Barbarossa, and in its most extreme form by the Emperor’s chancellor Reinald von Dassel.<sup>12</sup> He then investigated in depth the political and religious ideas underlying this play and succeeded in relating them to the historical realities of Barbarossa’s Germany and to the vast body of historical and legendary materials surrounding the medieval Em-

*Byzantium and the Migration of Literary Works and Motifs*

pire. There was, however, one pivotal feature of the play which he was unable to explain in terms of the German tradition: the voluntary abdication of the Last Roman Emperor in the Temple at Jerusalem, followed by the entry of the Antichrist.<sup>13</sup> It is true that he found this trait in a treatise of the mid-tenth century by Adso, later abbot of Moustier-en-Der, in the diocese of Chalons-sur-Marne. In his *Epistola . . . de Ortu et Tempore Antichristi* Adso had mentioned a tradition according to which a last king of the Franks would journey to Jerusalem and would lay down scepter and crown on the Mount of Olives. Here too this act of abdication was followed by the coming of the Antichrist.<sup>14</sup> Clearly this was the same tradition of a ruler's abdication at Jerusalem as in the *Ludus de Antichristo*. Yet Zezschwitz pointed out that in the West this tradition was attested only in these two documents of the tenth and twelfth centuries respectively, as well as in a few texts dependent upon them, and that the act of abdication in particular was not derived from Adso's usual ninth-century source, Haymo of Halberstadt's Commentary on *Second Thessalonians*. Zezschwitz was thus driven to look beyond the Western tradition for the source of the notion, expressed by Adso and the *Ludus*, that a ruler would lay down his crown at Jerusalem.

He found this source in a Greek Apocalypse attributed to the "martyr" Methodius.<sup>15</sup> True, here the act of abdication at Jerusalem followed upon the Antichrist's first appearance, but it was clearly in all other respects the tradition underlying Adso and the *Ludus*.<sup>16</sup> Zezschwitz had thus discovered a new dimension for the Western legends about the Emperors and he therefore dedicated to the *Apocalypse* attributed to Methodius a lengthy and detailed section of his book.<sup>17</sup> His results were partly invalidated or refined by later research, but there can be no doubt that it was Zezschwitz who gave the new "orientation" to the further investigation of the Legend of the Last Emperor.

This dependence of all later work on that of Zezschwitz can be demonstrated in detail. The connecting link was a review of Zezschwitz's book by the great German classicist and orientalist Alfred von Gutschmid.<sup>18</sup> Zezschwitz's book and Gutschmid's review then provided the impetus for a series of further publications on the German imperial legends and their sources in ancient apocalyptic legends. In 1895 and 1896, respectively, when all Germany was celebrating the twenty-fifth anniversary of the Empire's founding, two important works on the subject appeared: the historian Franz Kamper's *Kaiser-*



## MEDIEVALIA ET HUMANISTICA

*prophetien und Kaisersagen im Mittelalter*<sup>19</sup> and the theologian Wilhelm Bousset's book *Der Antichrist in der Überlieferung des Judentums, des Neuen Testaments und der Alten Kirche*. Three years later was published Ernst Sackur's *Sibyllinische Texte und Forschungen* (1898). All of them show the impact of Zezschwitz's and Gutschmid's work in that they combine a study of the ancient apocalyptic tradition, as represented for example by Pseudo-Methodius' work, with that of German political legends. Wilhelm Bousset quoted the concluding sentence of Gutschmid's review in the preface of his book. Sackur in turn stated in his foreword that he found Gutschmid's remarks the best that had been written on Pseudo-Methodius and that he owed to him the idea of preparing a critical edition of the Latin text. Work on the subject continued with reduced intensity into the twentieth century, but these remarks must suffice to illustrate the close connection between German scholarly work on the legends concerning medieval Emperors and their origins in Early Christian and Byzantine apocalypses on the one hand and the emergence of German nationalism and the unification of the country on the other.

What was this *Apocalypse* of Pseudo-Methodius, which the German scholars of the nineteenth century, to their surprise, found had exerted a strong influence on the German legends concerning their medieval Emperors? The Greek text is a strange, indeed an enigmatic, document.<sup>20</sup> According to the Greek title, the author was Methodius, bishop of Patara, and the book deals with the kingdoms of the barbarians and the Last Times. The first part of the work (chaps. I–VII) is written in the past tense and contains an extremely fanciful history of the world from Adam to the Moslem invasions. It is based to some extent on the Bible, but the Biblical account is generously "improved" by apocryphal additions and combined with a legend about the founding of Byzantium by the hero Byzas, allegedly the second husband of Alexander the Great's mother, the Ethiopian princess Chuseth. In this part (chap. VII) the author quotes prominently II Thessalonians 2:1–8 and interprets the difficult phrase: "only he who now restrains it [the mystery of lawlessness] will do so until he is out of the way" to refer to the Roman or the Byzantine Empire. It followed from this interpretation that the Empire, destined to restrain the Antichrist, would last to the end of time. He also cited for the same purpose I Corinthians 15:24: "Then comes the end when he delivers the kingdom to God the Father."<sup>21</sup> This same objective of proving that the Byzantine Empire will endure to the last days is also evident in the

interpretation which the author gives to Psalms 68:31: “let Ethiopia hasten to stretch out her hands unto God,” for the author states that in accordance with the parahistorical genealogies developed by him the Byzantine Emperor is the descendant of an Ethiopian princess, and it is therefore a Byzantine Emperor, as the legitimate heir of Ethiopian royalty, who will “stretch out his hands to God.”<sup>22</sup> In this interpretation of the psalm the author reveals his purpose in writing the “historical” section and indeed the entire *Apocalypse*: to prove that the Byzantine Empire would last to the end of time and consequently be victorious over all its enemies, the Moslems included.

In the second part (chaps. VII–X), written in the future tense, the apocalypticist “prophesies” the Arab invasions and describes at great length and in lurid detail their destructiveness and cruelty. The third section of the work (chaps. XI and XII) is eschatological and therefore most interesting in the present context. Pseudo-Methodius predicts that at the time when the Moslems are at the height of their power, an Emperor of the Greeks and Romans will arise against them. He will, in the words of the psalmist (78:65), be “awakened as one out of sleep and like a man drinking wine,” whom men had considered dead and worthless. He will defeat the Moslems, drive them back into Arabia, and free the lands of the Empire that they had occupied. The Emperor will then proceed to Jerusalem, where he will reside for one year-week and a half (ten and a half years). The Antichrist will be born. Then the Emperor will ascend Golgotha, will take off his diadem, and depose it on the Cross. He will stretch out his hands to heaven and hand over his imperial power to God. Then the Antichrist will seduce many people, but in the end he will be slain by Jesus Christ at the Second Coming.

This very brief summary hardly gives an adequate impression of the strangeness of the document, and it is impossible in the present context to discuss all the many problems which it poses. Here it must suffice to say that the Greek text was written in the seventh or early eighth century, after Syria and Mesopotamia had been occupied by the Arabs, and is therefore half a millennium later than the church father Methodius to whom it was attributed.<sup>23</sup> The earlier parts of the *Apocalypse*, therefore, consist largely of *vaticinia post eventum*. It is also clear that the work, though strange, fanciful, and legendary, is inspired by the Byzantine ideology of empire which it makes the pivot of an impressive and coherent parahistorical construction culminating in the abdication scene on Golgotha — a point that Zezschwitz, once

again, was the first scholar to emphasize.<sup>24</sup> In the first place, the transfer of imperial authority from the Last Roman Emperor to God at the end of time reflects the Byzantine idea that the Emperor is God's vice-regent on earth.<sup>25</sup> From this basic concept it followed logically that successful completion of the divine mandate by the defeat of all non-Christian powers by the Last Roman Emperor meant the end of the mandatory's power, i.e., abdication. Secondly, the role of the Cross in the act of abdication is closely bound up with the Byzantine notion, already known to Eusebius, that God had bestowed universal power on the first Christian Emperor Constantine the Great by a vision of the Cross.<sup>26</sup> Finally, the abdication of the Last Roman Emperor on Golgotha is the visual representation and dramatization of Pseudo-Methodius' interpretation of II Thessalonians 2; I Corinthians 15:24; and Psalms 68:31. In this scene, the restraining influence, i.e., the Empire, is shown to be "out of the way" because by the act of abdication the Empire comes to an end. In this scene, also, it is imagined that Christ, represented by his mandatory the Emperor, "delivers the kingdom to God the Father." Finally, in this act of abdication, Ethiopia, i.e., the Byzantine Emperor descended from the Ethiopian princess Chuseth, quite literally is seen "to stretch out her hands to God." In turn this interpretation of Psalms 68:31 presupposes the entire series of parahistorical genealogies in the first part of the *Apocalypse*, for only if the Byzantine Emperor is descended from the Ethiopian rulers can it be maintained that he personifies the "Ethiopia" of the psalmist. It thus becomes clear that in this *Apocalypse* the abdication scene on Golgotha is deeply rooted in the eschatological, theological, and ideological conceptions of Byzantine Christianity. The scene is clearly an invention based on the three Biblical passages mentioned above, as is the parahistorical construction which buttresses it, but it is an invention which expresses in visual imagery the Byzantine theory of imperial power and Byzantine eschatological expectations.

Is the author of the Greek text responsible for this invention? This raises the question of the originality of the Greek text, and in this connection an important discovery was made about a generation ago. A Hungarian Orientalist, the late Michael Kmosko, proved not only that the Greek text was derived from an original written in the Syriac language, but that this critical text actually survives in a Vatican manuscript of the sixteenth century.<sup>27</sup> Kmosko had the intention of studying the Syriac text in detail but unfortunately was not able to carry out his project. I have, however, transcribed and translated the

manuscript, and there can be no doubt, for a variety of philological reasons, that the Syriac text is the original and the Greek text its translation.

By and large, the content of the Syriac is very similar to that of its Greek, Latin, and other translations. Like the Greek text, the Syriac original is attributed to Methodius, who is here called “bishop of Olympus and martyr.” Its subject matter is defined as “the succession of kings and concerning the end of times.” In the Syriac document the revelation properly speaking is introduced by a preamble according to which Methodius “asked God to learn concerning the generations and concerning the kingdoms, how they were handed down from Adam and until today.” God then sent to Methodius “one from among his hosts,” i.e., an angel, who showed him all the generations and kingdoms. From the point of view of literary history the most interesting detail in this preamble, all of which is missing in the Greek and all other translations, is the statement that the angel’s revelation took place on “the mountain of Shenāgar.”<sup>28</sup> This remark makes it highly probable, if not certain, that the text was composed in Mesopotamia, to be exact near Tour Shiggar, or Djabal Sindjar, a mountain range about one hundred miles west of modern Mosul on the slopes of which had been situated the ancient city of Singara. So far as the time of composition is concerned, there are rather clear indications that it cannot have been written prior to A.D. 644 or later than 678.<sup>29</sup>

As in the Greek translation, the first part of the Syriac apocalypse is “historical” and reaches from Adam to the Moslem invasions of “Rome,” that is of the Byzantine Empire. Here again there is the Biblical story generously expanded by fanciful data from Oriental history and legend; for example the marriage of the hero Byzas with the princess Chuseth, mother of Alexander the Great, as well as the citations from II Thessalonians 2 and Psalm 68. This parahistorical part is followed, again as in the Greek text, by “prophecies” of the Arab invasions and the terrible destruction and suffering inflicted by the enemy. In the third, or eschatological, section of the Syriac text, this mood of despair gives way to one of hope and triumph. Just as the Moslems are at the height of their power and proclaim blasphemously that “there is no deliverer for the Christians,” Pseudo-Methodius predicts that a king of the Greeks will defeat them and drive them back into the desert. This king will then proceed to Jerusalem, will deposit his diadem on the Holy Cross, will stretch out his hands to heaven, and surrender his kingship to God.<sup>30</sup>



In general layout, then, the Syriac original resembles closely the Greek translation. There exist, however, a great many differences in detail, such as the preamble omitted in the Greek version. Some of these differences shed light on obscurities in the translation; others, as is usually the case with newly discovered texts, pose new problems. A most revealing feature is the reference, in the parahistorical section of the Syriac text, to Psalms 68:31: "Let Ethiopia stretch out her hands unto God." Here the author attacks "many brethren of the clergy" who, not unnaturally, assumed that the psalmist meant the kingdom of Ethiopia. Not so, says the author, "the kingdom of Greece" was meant, because its ruler was descended from the Ethiopian princess Chuseth.<sup>31</sup> The first conclusion to follow from this passage in which the author calls his unknown opponents "brethren of the clergy" is that he himself must have been a member of the clergy, a priest, or a monk.

The passage allows a further inference. Why should Methodius' opponents, who were priests in Mesopotamia in the seventh century, have expected the Ethiopian kingdom to last until the end of time and the Ethiopian king to play so important a role in the eschatological events? In the distant past there had indeed been strong religious ties between Syriac-speaking Christianity and Ethiopia, and Syrian missionaries had played an important role in the Christianization of Ethiopia. Furthermore, for a short period in the first half of the sixth century Ethiopia had intervened militarily in the affairs of southern Arabia and even played a role in Mediterranean diplomacy. But in 570 the Persian conquest of Yemen had put an end to Ethiopia's role.<sup>32</sup> The only reason why in the seventh century Pseudo-Methodius' opponents could be so concerned to find a Biblical guarantee for the permanence of the Ethiopian kingdom was that Ethiopia was the only country in the world where Monophysitism was the official religion and the ruler himself a Monophysite.

There is one further inference to be drawn from Pseudo-Methodius' statement that "many brethren of the clergy" interpreted Psalms 68:31 to refer to the ruler of Ethiopia. For Mesopotamian Christians under Moslem rule, to rely in the seventh century for liberation upon the Monophysite monarch of Ethiopia was tantamount to saying that the time of delivery lay in the indefinite future and to permitting an interim accommodation with the conquerors. This, indeed, was the policy pursued by the Monophysite religious leader in that area, Marutha, the metropolitan bishop of Tagrit, who opened the gates of the



citadel of his city to the Moslems. His example was followed by many Christian individuals and communities. So successful was this policy that Marutha's biographer, his successor Denha of Tagrit (649–59), was able to describe in dithyrambic terms the security, prosperity, good ecclesiastical organization, and charitable activities of the Jacobite Church in Mesopotamia and its submission to the Arab authorities.<sup>33</sup> This description was approximately contemporaneous with the composition of the Syriac *Apocalypse* of Pseudo-Methodius. However, in contrast to his ecclesiastical superior Denha, the anonymous author of the *Apocalypse* paints in the darkest colors the ravages of the invaders and speaks with great bitterness of collaborators and apostates:

. . . a multitude of members of the clergy will deny the true faith of the Christians and the Holy Cross and the mysteries of power [the sacraments], and without compulsion and blows and harsh words they will deny Christ and will agree with the unbelievers. . . . They will separate themselves from the congregation of the Christians of their own accord. . . . their false words will find credence. And they will listen concerning something that was said to them and they will comply.<sup>34</sup>

Thus all the aspects of Pseudo-Methodius' pamphlet fit together: his terrifying picture of the Moslems' treatment of the Christian population in Mesopotamia, his bitter complaints over priests and laymen collaborating with the conquerors, his rejection of the "Ethiopian" interpretation of Psalms 68:31 as defeatist, or even treacherous, and finally his insistence on a "Byzantine" interpretation of the verse of the Psalmist and his reliance on help from the Byzantine emperor. Pseudo-Methodius' tract thus was a politico-religious manifesto, rejecting any kind of defeatism or collaboration with the Moslems, warning against reliance on the weak and distant ruler of Ethiopia as a will-o'-the-wisp, calling for war to the finish against the conquerors, and preaching that salvation from the Moslem yoke could come from only one source, the most powerful Christian monarch of the time, the *basileus* at Byzantium. In the end this hope of the author was to be disappointed, for Mesopotamia has remained under Moslem rule to the present day, but in the seventh century this outcome was by no means a foregone conclusion. Byzantine rulers had for centuries acted, and were to continue to act, as protectors of Christians everywhere, even of anti-Chalcedonians under foreign rule. There was thus nothing quixotic in Pseudo-Methodius' political doctrine.

It will now be convenient to retrace the course of this enquiry

which has led from Bismarckian Germany to seventh-century Mesopotamia. The legend of the Last Roman Emperor is first attested in the Syriac *Apocalypse* of Pseudo-Methodius, composed in northern Mesopotamia during the third quarter of the seventh century. It is impossible to say with certainty whether this first evidence represents at the same time the historical origin of the legend.<sup>35</sup> At any rate, it appears here as the visualization and culmination of an elaborate substructure of parahistory and Biblical exegesis designed to demonstrate the military superiority of the Byzantine Empire over all past, present, and future enemies and, as a result, the certainty of its survival to the end of time. Zezschwitz was therefore right in concluding that the *Apocalypse* of Pseudo-Methodius, such as he knew it, was based on Byzantine imperial ideology, but wrong in assuming that it must therefore have originated in the Byzantine Empire. This pointed formulation of Byzantine imperial claims was conceived, not on the soil of the Empire, but in an area not far removed from its eastern frontier that had only for relatively short periods formed part of the Roman or Byzantine Empires but which contained sizable Christian minorities looking to the Empire for protection and guidance.

It is not difficult to see why this Jacobite priest's call for resistance to the finish against the Moslem invaders of his country and reliance on the might of the Byzantine Emperor was quickly translated from Syriac into Byzantine Greek. In order to make his message palatable to his Mesopotamian coreligionaries the author of necessity ignored the doctrinal differences that separated his church from that of Byzantium. He gave a coherent, if fanciful and extreme, formulation to Byzantine confidence in the Empire's military superiority over all foreign peoples and in its universal Christian mission: the Byzantine Emperor, by virtue of his possession of the relic of the True Cross on which the Savior had suffered, would conquer all his enemies to the end of time and would then be able to hand over his Empire, made safe for Christ's kingdom and cleansed of its Moslem invaders, to God the Father. Pseudo-Methodius' Syriac tract expressed what every Byzantine recognized as the Byzantine ideology of Emperor and Empire. It buttressed with scriptural arguments and an elaborate parahistorical construction the Byzantine claim to a protectorate over Christians everywhere. Nobody can say in whose travel bag this powerful document of politico-religious irredentism crossed the Arab-Byzantine frontier, but it is easy to see why it appealed strongly to

*Byzantium and the Migration of Literary Works and Motifs*

the Byzantine public and was translated into Greek soon after its composition in the Syriac language.

And why was it translated into Latin, and why did it exert an influence on the Latin Middle Ages? The Latin manuscripts of Pseudo-Methodius' *Apocalypse* make it certain that the monk Peter did his translation during the late seventh or in the eighth century. He was probably of Eastern extraction and wrote in a monastery in Merovingian Gaul.<sup>36</sup> In his *praefaciuncula* he writes that he performed his labor of love for his brethren in his monastery "because they [Pseudo-Methodius' predictions] have been rather aptly prophesied for our time . . . so that by means of the happenings which we observe with our own eyes we may give credence to what has been predicted by our fathers."<sup>37</sup> Perhaps Peter was alarmed by the Moslem advance through Spain into Gaul that took place at the beginning of the eighth century and considered Pseudo-Methodius' apocalypse a tract for his times inasmuch as it seemed to describe in lively colors the destructiveness of the Arab invasion and held out a hope for delivery. However this may be, it was the monk Peter's Latin translation that first introduced into the Western political consciousness the notion of a "king of the Greeks or Romans" who would defeat the Moslems and surrender his empire to God.<sup>38</sup>

The later destiny of this motif in the West is well known and need only be summarized here. Directly or indirectly, the impact of Pseudo-Methodius' prediction of a Last Emperor is noticeable in the *Letter . . . on the Origin and Time of the Antichrist* composed in the middle of the tenth century by the monk Adso. As stated before (p. 53), Adso himself informs us that for this one particular feature he is departing from his normal source and is relying on another tradition. It is precisely the passage prophesying the coming of the Frankish king who would restore the Roman Empire and lay down scepter and crown on the Mount of Olives at Jerusalem. As Zezschwitz pointed out a century ago, Adso was here following the apocalypse of Pseudo-Methodius.<sup>39</sup> The only important innovation was that a prophecy originally referring to a Byzantine ruler was rewritten to fit a Frankish king.

This tradition about a future restorer of the Roman Empire who would defeat the Moslems, surrender his crown at Jerusalem, and usher in the reign of Antichrist was to play a powerful role in later German developments. Peter Munz has shown recently that "in the period immediately preceding the First Crusade, more and more peo-

ple began to identify the final emperor's journey to Jerusalem with a crusade for the reconquest of the Holy Sepulchre." He also has pointed out that in the early twelfth century, "by the time Frederick [Barbarossa] was a young man Antichrist speculation was the universal topic of conversation."<sup>40</sup> At least once in Frederick's lifetime, probably at his coronation in 1152, the *Ludus de Antichristo* was performed in his presence. At a climactic point in the play, at the very end of the first part, the Emperor, after having defeated in battle the last of his enemies, the king of Babylon, enters the Temple at Jerusalem, takes the crown from his head, holds it as well as his scepter and the other insignia before the altar and chants:

Receive what I offer, for with a kindly heart  
I resign the insignia to Thee, King of Kings  
Through Whom kings rule, Who alone mayst be called  
Emperor and Who art the ruler of all men.<sup>41</sup>

In the second half of the thirteenth century and later, these notions about the Last Emperor, ultimately of Eastern provenance, coalesced with legends concerning the return of Barbarossa's grandson Frederick II from death.<sup>42</sup> By the fifteenth century it was believed that Frederick II was living on in Mount Kyffhäuser, and early in the next century there is evidence that Frederick Barbarossa began to replace his grandson as the hero of the legend.<sup>43</sup> In this final form the motif of the Last Emperor exercised, as we have seen at the beginning of this paper, a profound effect on German literature and historiography in the nineteenth century.<sup>44</sup>

Thus the religio-political manifesto of a Monophysite churchman in Mesopotamia, alarmed by the Moslem occupation of his country, was, as it travelled westward, translated and transformed into a powerful and influential formulation of Byzantine imperial ideology and eschatology, then into an expression of Western hopes for an imperial restoration after a long period of Moslem threats, subsequently into an assertion of the medieval German Empire's claim to hegemony over Christendom, and finally into the gradual realization by German scholars of the nineteenth century that the roots of their nation's imperial legends lay to a considerable degree in Biblical and Oriental traditions.

## NOTES

1. Franz Dölger, "Byzantine Literature," in J. M. Hussey, ed., *The Cambridge Medieval History*, vol. IV, part II (Cambridge, 1967), p. 263.



2. See, for example, for patristic literature: A. Sigmund, *Die Überlieferung der Griechischen Christlichen Literatur in der Lateinischen Kirche bis zum 12. Jahrhundert* (Munich, 1949).
3. On hagiography, see Paul Peeters, *Orient et Byzance: Le Tréfonds Oriental de l'hagiographie byzantine*, Subsidia Hagiographica 26 (Brussels, 1950). This remarkable book touches on many instances of translations outside the hagiographical genre in the strict sense and raises many general problems concerning intercultural literary borrowings.
4. Dölger, p. 242.
5. Albrecht Timm, *Der Kyffhäuser im deutschen Geschichtsbild*, Historisch-Politische Hefte der Ranke-Gesellschaft, III (Göttingen, n.d. [1960–61?]). The author offers a useful collection and discussion of materials that I have used in the text. Recently F. Graus, "Die Herrschersagen des Mittelalters," *Archiv für Kulturgeschichte*, LI (1969), 65–93, esp. 80–82, made some interesting comments on the typology of royal legends in the Middle Ages, including that of Mount Kyffhäuser. After this paper had been submitted for publication, an anonymous reader for *Medievalia et Humanistica* called my attention to a recent book, Peter Munz' *Frederick Barbarossa: A Study in Medieval Politics* (London, 1969). The first and last chapters of this book contain an interesting discussion of the Kyffhäuser legend, of which I have made grateful use in the revision of this paper.
6. Georg Voigt, "Die deutsche Kaisersage," *Historische Zeitschrift*, 26 (1871), 131–87, esp. 161.
7. Wilhelm von Giesebrecht, *Geschichte der deutschen Kaiserzeit*, 5th ed. (Leipzig, 1881). The preface of 1855 is here reprinted, pp. v–xvi.
8. Giesebrecht, pp. xvii–xx.
9. Now most conveniently accessible in Döllinger's *Kleinere Schriften* (Stuttgart, 1890), pp. 451–557. At the time when he wrote this article, Döllinger was already deeply involved in his conflict with the Papacy over the issue of papal infallibility; see S. J. Tonsor, "Döllinger," *New Catholic Encyclopedia*, IV (New York, etc., 1967), 959 f. By letter Professor Tonsor calls my attention to the lively political and religious interest in Russia, Greece, and the Near East prevailing at Munich during the nineteenth century and suggests that Döllinger and other Munich savants may have hoped seriously to reverse at long last the tide of Islam.
10. In 1871 Döllinger (*op. cit.*; in *Kleinere Schriften*, esp. p. 497 ff.) had discussed Pseudo-Methodius' *Apocalypse* in some detail, but so far as I can see, he did not establish any connection with German imperial legends. As early as 1857 Adolf von Gutschmid, whose later publications were to make decisive contributions to the investigation of the genesis of the German imperial legends (see p. 65 and n. 18), had become acquainted with this *Apocalypse* through the casual use made of it by Franz C. Movers in his *History of the Phoenicians*. In his review of one volume of this work, Gutschmid inserted a lengthy footnote (now reprinted in his *Kleine Schriften*, II (Leipzig, 1890), 1–19, esp. 14–17, n. 1) on Pseudo-Methodius which ranged far beyond the purposes for which Movers had cited this text. He called the *Apocalypse* of Pseudo-Methodius "ein in mehrfacher Hinsicht interessantes und in einer gewissen Beziehung auch historisch wichtiges Doku-



- ment,” pointed out the medieval popularity of the Latin translation in the West, and urged a critical edition. These references to the historical importance of the text are vague, but the suggestion may not be far-fetched that he had guessed its connections with the legends about the medieval rulers of Germany.
11. Gerhard von Zezschwitz, *Vom Römischen Kaisertum Deutscher Nation: Ein mittelalterliches Drama, nebst Untersuchungen über die byzantinischen Quellen der deutschen Kaisersage* (Leipzig, 1877). At the end of the book (pp. 213–41) the author edits the Latin text of what he calls “das Drama vom Römischen Kaisertum Deutscher Nation und vom Antichristen” from the only manuscript of the twelfth century, formerly at Tegernsee. This Latin play was later published, under the more appropriate title of *Ludus de Antichristo* and with many improvements by Wilhelm Meyer, in *Sitzungsberichte der Kgl. Bayerischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, Philosophisch-Philologische und Historische Klasse* (1882), Heft 1, 17–40. There are several later editions, as well as an English translation by J. Wright, *The Play of Antichrist* (Toronto, 1967). See also Zezschwitz’s popular lecture “Der Kaisertraum des Mittelalters in seinen religiösen Motiven” (Leipzig, 1877).
  12. It is noteworthy that, in spite of all his enthusiasm for the achievement of German unity in 1871, Zezschwitz expresses some reservations with regard to these far-reaching claims of universal monarchy. He states that in the twelfth century the older notion of the Emperor’s protectorate (*Schirmherrschaft*) over Christendom was steadily transformed into the idea of universal monarchy (p. 20) and calls this change “the most serious political mistake perpetrated by the imperial government” (p. 23). He even believes that the author of the *Ludus* viewed these claims with some irony (p. 22).
  13. Zezschwitz, *Vom Römischen Kaisertum*, p. 37 and passim.
  14. The *Epistola* is available in a critical edition by Ernst Sackur, *Sibyllinische Texte und Forschungen* (Halle a.d.S., 1898; now reprinted Turin, 1963), 97–113. See p. 110: “*Quidam vero doctores nostri dicunt, quod unus ex regibus Francorum Romanum imperium ex integro tenebit, qui in novissimo tempore erit. et ipse erit maximus et omnium regum ultimus. qui postquam regnum feliciter gubernaverit, ad ultimum Ierosolimam veniet et in monte Oliveti sceptrum et coronam suam deponet. hic erit finis et consummatio Romanorum christianorumque imperii. statimque secundum predictam Pauli apostoli sententiam [II Thess. 2:3]. Antichristum dicunt mox affuturum. . .*” See Zezschwitz, *Vom Römischen Kaisertum*, pp. 18 and 37 ff. and the English translation of the *Epistola* by J. Wright (n. 11 above), pp. 100–10. The composition of Adso’s work may be connected with popular beliefs concerning the year 1000.
  15. Zezschwitz, *Vom Römischen Kaisertum*, pp. 43–84 and passim. He, as well as the other older scholars, could use only a most unsatisfactory edition in the anonymous publication *Monumenta S. Patrum Orthodoxographa*, 2nd ed. (Basel, 1569), 93 ff. The Latin translation was edited, after Zezschwitz’s publication, by Sackur, *Sibyllinische Texte*, pp. 57–69, and the Greek version by V. M. Istrin, in *Chteniia Obshchestvia Istorii i Drevnostei Rossiiskikh pri Moskovskom Universitete*, 193 (1897), pp. 4–50.

16. Sackur, *Sibyllinische Texte*, p. 93: "Et cum apparuerit filius perditionis, ascendit rex Romanorum sursum in Golgotha . . . et expandit manus suas in caelum et tradit regnum christianorum Deo et patri et adsumetur crux in caelum simul cum coronam regis . . ."
17. Zezschwitz, *Vom Römischen Kaisertum*, p. 43: "Aber eben von diesem Punkte aus eröffnet sich für jeden, der die einschlagenden morgenländischen Traditionen kennt, eine ganz neue Fernsicht." Pseudo-Methodius' *Apocalypse* is discussed on pp. 43–84.
18. The review is reprinted in Gutschmid's *Kleine Schriften*, V (Leipzig, 1894), 495–506.
19. A second edition of Kampers' book was entitled *Die Deutsche Kaiseridee in Prophetie und Sage* (Munich, 1896). Kampers continued to publish a great deal on this and related subjects, e.g., *Vom Werdegang der Abendländischen Kaisermystik* (Leipzig and Berlin, 1924).
20. There still exists no critical edition of the Greek text, but Istrin's edition (see n. 15, above) prints the Greek text from a Vatican manuscript of the sixteenth century and records the variants of several others. Sackur's edition of the Latin translation (n. 15, above) is frequently useful where the Greek text is in doubt, especially where the question of interpolations arises. The summary in the text is based on Istrin's edition.
21. Pseudo-Methodius' interpretation of II Thess. 2 and I Cor. 15:24, pp. 23–25 Istrin.
22. Pseudo-Methodius' interpretation of Psalms 68:31, p. 22 Istrin.
23. See, for example, G. Moravcsik, *Byzantino-Turcica*, 2nd ed., vol. I, Berliner Byzantinistische Arbeiten, X (1958), 426. For some remarks about the purpose of this work see my article "Medieval Apocalypses as Historical Sources," *American Historical Review*, LXXIII (1968) 997–1018.
24. *Vom Römischen Kaisertum*, p. 50 and passim.
25. On the Byzantine view of God as the source of imperial power see, for example, W. Ensslin, in *Cambridge Medieval History*, IV, Part II (Cambridge, 1967), p. 6 f.
26. Zezschwitz, *Vom Römischen Kaisertum*, p. 50.
27. "Das Rätsel des Pseudo-Methodius," *Byzantion*, VI (1931), 273–96; see also V (1929–30), 422–24. The manuscript referred to in the text is the *cod. Vat. Syrus* 58, fol. 118–36. Sackur, *Sibyllinische Texte*, pp. 53–55, had shown from internal evidence that the author of the Greek text had been a Syrian, but had been of the opinion that this Syrian author had written in the Greek language (p. 55).
28. *Cod. Vat. Syrus*, fol. 118 verso: "And the Lord sent to him [Methodius] one from among his hosts to the mountain of Shenāgar and he showed him all the generations. . . ."
29. *Terminus post*: allusion to an Arab navy, which was created between 644 and 649. *Terminus ante*: no reference to the Arab civil war (661–65) and particularly to the unsuccessful Arab siege of Constantinople (674–78). The author's silence on the latter event is all the more remarkable inasmuch as in connection with his general thesis that the Byzantine Empire is superior to all its enemies and will last to the end of the world he mentions several Roman-Byzantine victories down to the Persian-Avar siege

- of Constantinople in 626, but fails to mention the Arab failure before Constantinople in 678.
30. *Cod. Vat. Syrus* 58, fol. 135 recto: "And immediately the Son of Perdition [= Antichrist] is revealed. Then the king of the Greeks will go up and stand on Golgotha and the Holy Cross will be set in that place in which it was set up when it carried the Christ. And the king of the Greeks will place his diadem on top of the Holy Cross, and will stretch out his two hands to heaven and will hand over the kingship to God the Father."
  31. *Cod. Vat. Syrus* 58, fol. 126 recto: "However, many brethren of the clergy suppose that the blessed David spoke this word [Psalms 68:31] concerning the kingdom of the Ethiopians. And those who thought this erred concerning this, for it is the kingdom of Greece which is from the seed of Chuseth. . . ."
  32. On the history of Ethiopia to the seventh century see Carlo Conti Rossini, *Storia d'Etiopia*, I (Bergamo, 1928). On religious developments in particular: G. Lanczkowski, "Aethiopia," *Jahrbuch für Antike und Christentum*, I (1958), 134–53, esp. 143–45 (with bibliography).
  33. Denha of Tagrit, *Biography of Marutha*, ed. and trans. F. Nau, *Patrologia Orientalis*, III (Paris, 1909), pp. 81–83: "Quand je considère tous les biens que possèdent maintenant les fils de Tagrit (la ville) bénite, c'est à dire: leur foi orthodoxe, leur zèle pour elle et l'accomplissement des bonnes oeuvres qui lui conviennent; leurs offices spirituels et la célébration des divins mystères: le bel ordre des clercs; les rangs disciplinés des prêtres qui sont à leur tête, le beau maintien et la belle tenue des diacres au milieu d'eux dans le sanctuaire; leur station autour l'autel; le service des sous-diacres, des lecteurs et des chantres; les continuelles, louangeuses et louables psalmodies de l'esprit et d'intelligence; et tout le clergé, et les beaux vêtements qui les ornent ainsi que toute l'église et l'autel; le voile (du calice), les tentures, les patènes, les calices, les encensoirs, les tabernacles et leurs richesses avec le reste des ornements sacrés; de plus leur exultation et leur joie dans les fêtes du Seigneur et les mémoires des saints qu'ils fêtent et célèbrent joyeusement et ardemment avec attention et sans négligence; en même temps que leur amour et leur soumission les uns vers les autres et surtout envers leurs chefs et leurs gouverneurs ecclésiastiques et séculiers (litéralement: dans l'Eglise et dans la ville et le monde); quand je vois ce consentement et cette adhésion unanime au bien, je comprends que notre saint père a été pour eux la racine, la cause et le fondement de tout cela. . . . (il fut cause) aussi qu'avec amour (les habitants de Tagrit) honorèrent les Pères, les reçurent avec joie, participèrent à leurs honneurs et à leurs bénédictions, s'occupèrent des besoins des solitaires et des moines et de la construction des églises, des monastères et des saints couvents; répandirent des aumônes sur les pauvres; délivrèrent les captifs et les prisonniers. . . . En un mot Tagrit grandit tellement et acquit un si bon renom et une (telle) efflorescence de biens à son époque. . . ."
  34. *Cod. Vat. Syrus* 58, fol. 131 recto.
  35. Wilhelm Bousset, *Der Antichrist* . . . (Göttingen, 1895), p. 82, was of the opinion that probably the voluntary surrender by a Last Roman Emperor of his empire to God is implied in an apocalypse preserved in Latin

and attributed variously to St. Ephraem or St. Isidore. The relevant passage reads as follows: “. . . iam regnum Romanorum tollitur de medio, et Christianorum imperium traditur Deo et Patri; et tunc venit consummatio, cum coeperit consummari Romanorum regnum . . .” (ed. C. P. Caspari, *Briefe, Abhandlungen und Predigten aus den zwei letzten Jahrhunderten des kirchlichen Altertums und dem Anfang des Mittelalters* [Christiania, 1890], pp. 208–20, esp. 213 f.). In all probability the work dates from the late fourth century. The passage has indeed many similarities with the *Apocalypse* of Pseudo-Methodius. In particular it contains the same references to II Thess. 2:7 and I Cor. 15:24 and is immediately followed by a reference to the appearance of the Antichrist. It is noteworthy, however, that it lacks the most characteristic Biblical citation of Pseudo-Methodius, Psalms 68:31, and fails to mention the Last Roman Emperor as agent of the surrender, which is put in the passive voice (*traditur*). The most natural interpretation of the passage of Pseudo-Ephraem, therefore, is that the author is here simply following I Cor. 15:24 and thinking of Christ himself as surrendering the kingdom to God. In other words, Pseudo-Ephraem seems to be lacking precisely that element which is important in the present context, the figure of the Last Roman Emperor. Pseudo-Ephraem’s work originated, however, within the Syrian church (Johannes Dräseke, “Zu der eschatologischen Predigt Pseudo-Ephräms,” *Zeitschrift für Wissenschaftliche Theologie*, XXXV (1892), 177–84), and very probably represents a stage of Christian eschatology from which the legend of the Last Roman Emperor developed organically. Sackur, *Sibyllinische Texte*, 164–70, also was of the opinion that the legend of the *Last Roman Emperor* surrendering his power at Jerusalem originated in the fourth century. It is indeed mentioned in the Latin translation of the apocalypse attributed to the Tiburtine Sibyl (Sackur, p. 186, lines 7 ff.), but not in the Greek version of the same text (see my *Oracle of Baalbek*, *Dumbarton Oaks Studies X* [Washington, D.C. 1967], p. 116). Consequently it is unlikely to have formed part of the original (Theodosian) version of the Sibyl’s apocalypse (*Oracle of Baalbek*, p. 136). Its presence in the Latin translation probably represents a borrowing from Pseudo-Methodius.

36. Sackur, *Sibyllinische Texte*, p. 55 f. Four of the Latin manuscripts are no later than the eighth century.
37. *Ibid.*, p. 59 f.: “. . . quoniam nostris sunt aptius prophetata temporibus. . . . ut iam per ipsa que nostris cernimus oculis vera esset credamus ea quae praedicta sunt a patribus nostris.”
38. *Ibid.*, p. 89 f.: “. . . et exiliet super eos rex Gregorum siue Romanorum in furore magna et expergiscitur tamquam homo a somno vini, quem extimabant homines tamquam mortuum esse et in nihilo utilem profecisse. hic exiet super eos a mare Aethiopiae et mittit gladium et desolationem in Ethribum. . . .” P. 93: “. . . ascendit rex Romanorum sursum in Golgotha, in quo confixum est lignum sanctae crucis . . . et tollit rex coronam de capite suo et ponet eam super crucem, et expandit manus suas in caelum et tradit regnum christianorum Deo et patri.
39. See notes 15 and 17, above.
40. Peter Munz, *Frederick Barbarossa*, p. 376.
41. *Ludus de Antichristo*, ed. K. Langosch, *Geistliche Spiele* (Berlin, 1957),

p. 206: "Imperator cum suis intret templum et, postquam ibi adoraverit, tollens coronam de capite et tenens eam cum sceptro et imperio ante altare cantet:

Suscipe, quod offero!   nam corde benigno  
Tibi regi regum   imperium resigno  
Per quem reges regnant,   qui solus imperator  
Dici potes et es   cunctorum gubernator."

Cf. Munz, *Frederick Barbarossa*, p. 377.

42. Munz, *Frederick Barbarossa*, p. 8 f. See, for example, in the mid-fourteenth century the chronicler John of Winterthur's sceptical report on rumors concerning a return of Frederick II from the dead: "Post resumptum imperium iustius et gloriosius gubernatum quam ante cum exercitu copioso transfretabit et in monte Oliveti vel apud arborem aridam imperium resignabit" (ed. F. Baethgen and C. Brun, in *Monumenta Germaniae Historica, Scriptores Rerum Germanicarum*, N.S. 3 [Berlin, 1924], p. 280 f., *sub anno 1348*).
43. Munz, p. 14.
44. See also Munz, esp. pp. 19–21.