THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

BECAUSE IT IS NEW ROME: THE AUTHORITY OF THE PATRIARCHATE OF CONSTANTINOPLE, 379-553

A DISSERTATION SUBMITTED TO

THE FACULTY OF THE DIVISION OF THE SOCIAL SCIENCES

IN CANDIDACY FOR THE DEGREE OF

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

DEPARTMENT OF HISTORY

BY

JASON OSEQUEDA

CHICAGO, ILLINOIS

MARCH 2018

Table of Contents

Abbreviations

ACO = Acta Conciliorum Oecomenicorum

CA = Collectio Avellana

CIus = Codex Iustinianus

CT = Codex Theodosianus

EH = Ecclesiastical History (various authors)

PG = Patrologia Graeca

PL = Patrologia Latina

PLRE = Prosopography of the Later Roman Empire

PO = Patrologia Orientalis

Patriarchs of Constantinople 379-565

Gregory of Nazianzus	379-381
Nectarius	381-397
John Chrysostom	398-404
Arsacius	404-405
Atticus	406-425
Sisinnius	426-427
Nestorius	428-431
Maximian	431-434
Proclus	434-446
Flavian	446-449
Anatolius	449-458
Gennadius	458-471
Acacius	472-489
Fravitas	489-490
Euphemius	490-496
Macedonius II	496-511
Timothy	511-518
John II the Cappadocian	518-520
Epiphanius	520-535
Anthimus	535-536
Menas	536-552
Eutychius	552-565

Introduction

> *However we laughed at them wanting prerogative to be provided to Acacius because he was the bishop of the imperial city. Is it not well known that the emperor resided in Ravenna, in Milan, in Sirmium, and in Trier? Have the priests in those cities usurped anything to add their dignities beyond the measure handed down to them from antiquity?* [1] – Pope Gelasius, 1 February 496

Pope Gelasius' comment highlights two problems of the patriarchate of Constantinople: it relied upon the emperor for its position and it lacked apostolic succession from which it could claim transcendent authority. This was a problem because it implied that the patriarch's authority derived from the emperor instead of God, which compromised the perception of the patriarch's legitimacy as a metropolitan bishop. Gelasius saw no reason for allowing the civic position of a bishop's city to endow him with any higher authority or influence within the Church. Yet, by the time of Gelasius' letter in 496, such a criticism was an anachronistic polemic, because by then the patriarchate had established a basis of authority independent from the emperor, without having to construct a fictive history of apostolic succession.

All of the sees that would later become patriarchates could claim apostolic succession, except for Constantinople. Rome and Antioch claimed succession from Peter, Alexandria from Mark, and Jerusalem claimed succession from James. Constantinople could not claim descent from any apostle and in its early decades partly justified its position by virtue of the secular position of its see, New Rome. Yet, this was an insufficient justification in many ways, largely because it admitted that the patriarch relied upon the emperor for power. To mitigate this

[1] Gelasius, *Ad Dardanios*, *CA* 95.53, p. 387. *Risimus autem, quad praerogatiuam volunt Acacio conparari, quia episcopus fuerit regiae civitatis. Numquid apud Ravennam, apud Mediolanum, apud Sirmium, apud Triueros multis temporibus non constitit imperator? Numquidnam harum urbium sacerdotes ultra mensuram sibimet anitquitas deputa tam quippiam suis dignitatibus usurparunt?*

Note: All translations of foreign text into English are those of the author, unless otherwise noted

problem, patriarchs constructed and reinforced an authority autonomous from the emperor by connecting their office with orthodoxy. Further, they cultivated stories about their spiritual prowess, as evidenced by extant tales of miracles and the obtainment of relics. Finally, because patriarchs used imperial military and legal powers, the relationship of the patriarchate to the imperial office became obfuscated. Throughout the myriad challenges to its episcopal authority that the patriarchate faced, patriarchs nonetheless succeeded in claiming the highest ecclesiastical authority in the East and autonomy from the imperial office.

Authority in this study specifically refers to episcopal authority. Pertinent to this study is the fact that the patriarch's authority was greater than ordinary bishops by virtue of its hierarchical position that the Council of Nicaea established in 325. And although the patriarch of Constantinople seemed to operate within the framework offered at Nicaea, it had not yet come into existence. Officially, in ecclesiological terms, the patriarchate did not come into existence until the Council of Chalcedon instituted it in 451. Claudia Rapp, in her study of episcopal authority, notes that it is "a multifaceted and ever mutating construct…The main components that define episcopal authority, however, remained the same. What changed was the relative weight of these components, or in which way they were combined."[2] Here, Rapp is referring to her schema – the spiritual, ascetic, and pragmatic components of a bishop's authority. While using some of these notions to inform the interpretation of evidence in this study, it does not adhere to them strictly. More pertinent, Rapp brings up an important point, that there were some underlying notions about the episcopacy that remained fixed in Christianity.

[2] Rapp 2005, 16.

The first generation of Christians had already developed criteria for who could be a bishop and what their duties were. In his letters, Paul offers some guidelines for this. Among these are character qualifications, the episcopal candidate had to be "beyond reproach…hospitable, kindly," and as part of his duties he was to encourage sound doctrine and teach the wayward their error."[3] Such qualities again appear in 1 Timothy 3:1-7; good character with the ability to teach, with the addition that a candidate should have demonstrated he could manage the affairs of his own household properly before managing that of God's. Some decades later, *The Didache* offers standards for the selection of bishops using the similar criteria found in Paul's letters.[4] Here too, along with the ethical characteristics is the requirement of teaching.

As these early works show, from the beginning one of a bishop's primary roles was to teach doctrine and correct those in error. Such abilities, along with the requisite characteristics, were the qualifications for the office of bishop. Conversely, Christian communities came to expect these functions and traits in their bishops. The holder of any local bishopric then had the institutional authority to teach and correct doctrine and the Christians of the city accepted this, mostly.

This last point is of crucial interest for this dissertation. In teaching doctrine and correcting those with erroneous beliefs, patriarchs were fulfilling some of their office's oldest functions. And as bishops, they had the authority to teach doctrine. In turn, operating in a sort of feedback loop, when the teachings of the office became associated with the office itself, doctrine gave patriarchs even greater authority. Specifically, when the content of Christian belief became institutionally defined by a corporate body of these teachers (bishops) at the Council of Nicaea,

3 Titus 1:7-9.
4 *The Didache* 15.1-2.

many bishops became associated with the Nicene articulation of faith, such as Ambrose, Athanasius, and Basil of Caesarea. Of course, Constantinople, a subordinate see in 325, lacked a tradition of teaching Nicene doctrine, in addition to lacking apostolic succession. This is why, as this dissertation will show, patriarchs routinely cultivated an association with orthodoxy to bolster their office's authority.

Underpinning patriarchs' claims to religious authority were elements inextricably mixed with the Christian community. Conversely, these same elements enabled dissenting Christians to contest patriarch's authority. Among these elements were martyrs, persecution, orthodoxy, heresy, and miracle working. These could provide proof of a person's holiness and capabilities to teach doctrine; that is, they could demonstrate a man's worthiness for the patriarchate.

- *Terms, methods, and sources*

This dissertation uses the word "patriarch" as a term for the holder of the episcopal office in Constantinople. While this term is technically anachronistic for the period before 451,[5] because this study is diachronic in nature one term is used to refer to the holder of the office for sake of consistency and to mitigate any possible confusion for the reader. Ancient source material refers to patriarchs in various terms: bishop (ἐπίσκοπος)[6]; archbishop (ἀρχιεπίσκοπος)[7];

[5] See Dagron 1974, 456.
[6] Socrates, *EH*, 7.21: The bishop Atticus. ὁ ἐπίσκοπος Ἀττικὸς.
[7] Constantine VII, *De ceremoniis*, 1.90: Anatolius the archbishop of Constantinople. Ἀνατόλιος ὁ ἀρχιεπίσκοπος Κωνσταντινουπόλεως.

master (δέσποτα)[8]; president (πρόεδρος)[9]; chief priest (ἀρχιερεὺς)[10]; and, patriarch (πατριάρχης)[11]. While these terms continued to describe the patriarch of Constantinople in literature throughout Late Antiquity, in the sixth century the appellation ecumenical patriarch came into use (οἰκουμενικὸς πατριάρχης).[12] Today, Ecumenical Patriarch is the official title of the man occupying the office.

The scope of this study is roughly to 380 to 553 CE. For the beginning date, 380 was the year that the emperor Theodosius I made Christianity the state religion of the Roman Empire and also when he forced the heretical Arian Christians from Constantinople, resulting in the Nicaean Christians gaining control of the patriarchate. This was the beginning of Constantinople's deep sense of orthodoxy that permeated through the patriarchate and the city. As for 553, it is the last ecumenical council before the iconoclastic controversies and there are key documents from the council that show how the patriarchate became a doctrinal authority within the ecumenical community.

Because there is no constitutional document for the patriarchate that elaborates the source and scope of its authority, this study relies upon information derived from epistles, histories, sermons, and other written sources to piece together a general pattern. These are obviously

[8] *Life of Daniel* 19. To return to the archbishop and say to him, "Master, you have power over us…κατελθεῖν πρὸς τὸν ἀρχιεπίσκοπον καὶ λέγουσιν αὐτῷ· «Δέσποτα, ἐξουσίαν ἡμῶν ἔχεις…

[9] Evagrius Scholasticus, *EH*, 2.28: Anatolius the leader/president of Constantinople. Ἀνατόλιός τε ὁ τῆς Κωνσταντινουπόλεως πρόεδρος.

[10] Procopius, *History of the Wars*, 3.12: Epiphanius, the chief priest of the city, came… Ἐπιφάνιος ἀφικόμενος, ὁ τῆς πόλεως ἀρχιερεὺς,…

[11] Socrates, *EH*, 5.8: And then they established patriarchs in the metropolitans. καὶ πατριάρχας κατέστησαν διανειμάμενοι τὰς ἐπαρχίας.

[12] In what would be a large moment for the formation of Chalcedonian identity, in 518 during the ascension of Justin II to the throne, previous patriarchs (John II, Macedonius, Anthimius, and Menas) were remembered as "Our most Holy and Blessed Archbishop and Ecumenical Patriarch" (ὁ ἁγιώτατος καὶ μακαριώτατος ἡμῶν ἀρχιεπίσκοπος καὶ οἰκουμενικὸς πατριάρχης), in *ACO* 3.1. p.73.

disparate points of information derived from a multitude of sources. However, if these loosely connected points generally point in the same direction, then one can begin drawing some conclusions. This becomes especially true in the case of disinterested sources.

Prominent among source materials are the histories of Socrates Scholasticus and Sozomen. While those two ecclesiastical historians cover material from Eusebius left off on through their own time in the early fifth century, for the period of the late fifth through sixth centuries there are the histories of Evagrius Scholasticus and Ps.-Zachariah Rhetor, both of whom rely upon the lost Chronicle of Zachariah Rhetor and Procopius. Filling in much of the gaps of these histories are letters, laws, sermons, and other various writings. Of course, Eduard Schwartz's work, *Acta Conciliorum Oecomenicorum,* contains many key documents and transcriptions of council *acta*, which are invaluable for this study.[13]

The only time that sources speak of what the patriarch may do are references to privileges (πρέσβεια), an amorphous term that takes on different meanings depending on the context.[14] Christian leaders debated not only what constituted orthodoxy but their own hierarchy and basis of authority at councils as well. A particularly illuminating view comes from Brian Daley, "these early councils, bishops and emperors were struggling to define a structure of Church authority that would *not* simply rest on the personal charisms of individuals, or exhaust itself in ceremony alone."[15] This was precisely the challenge for the patriarchate: how could the holders of the office ensure that authority resided not in their own personhood, but in the office itself? The

[13] Schwartz, Edward. *Acta Conciliorum Oecomenicorum*. Berlin and Leipzig: Walter de Gruyter, 1914-1984.
[14] Clear mention of the privileges of Constantinople appear in Canon 3 of the Council of Constantinople (381). Specifically saying that Constantinople should have privileges of honor because it was New Rome (τὰ πρεσβεῖα τῆς τιμῆς). See Hefele-Leclerq 2.1.p. 24-27 for a discussion of the appearance of πρέσβεια in this canon, and the canon itself.
15 Daley 1993, 553

benefit for authority resting in the institution was that if ever a patriarch came under fire or discredited in some way, he could at least lean on the office itself to elicit support and influence. In ensuring the development of institutional authority, patriarchs fixed the basis of that authority on an indelible association with orthodoxy. This was a disparate process of persuasion, coercion, and engagement with extra-liturgical practices and beliefs.

At first, as the Council of Constantinople mentions, the term πρέσβεια appears without any further elaboration other than to explain that the privileges were honorary because Constantinople was New Rome. Most likely, the πρέσβεια here were the same as those that Canon 6 of Nicaea mentions.[16] At Nicaea, the bishops of Alexandria, Rome, and Antioch were recognized as having jurisdiction over episcopal ordinations in subordinate territories. So, in this sense, πρέσβεια referred to an authority for these metropolitan bishops over space and consecration.

[16] Gelasius of Cyzicus contains the canons of Nicaea, in *EH* 2.31. It should be noted that he wrote his history in the later fifth century, well after the council took place. Also, see Hefele-Leclerq 1.2.p. 552-569 and Chadwick 1960, 171-195 for a discussion of Canon 6 and its sources.

Canon 6: May the ancient customs in Egypt and Lybia and Pentapolis stand, as the Alexandrian bishop holds power of all those, since this is also customary for the Roman bishop. But similarly let the privileges for the churches in Antioch and in the other eparchates be preserved. Let this be universally understood, that if someone should become bishop without the approval of the metropolitan, then in such a case the great synod had ordained that he ought not be a bishop. Τὰ ἀρχαῖα ἤθη τὰ ἐν Αἰγύπτῳ καὶ Λιβύῃ καὶ Πενταπόλει, ὥστε τὸν Ἀλεξανδρείας ἐπίσκοπον πάντων τούτων ἔχειν τὴν ἐξουσίαν, ἐπειδὴ καὶ τῷ ἐν τῇ Ῥωμῃ ἐπισκόπῳ τοῦτο συνηθές ἐστιν. Ὁμοίως δὲ καὶ κατὰ Ἀντιόχειαν καὶ ἐν ταῖς ἄλλαις ἐπαρχίαις τὰ πρεσβεῖα σώζεσθαι ταῖς ἐκκλησίας. Καθόλου δὲ πρόδηλον ἐκεῖνο, ὅτι εἴ τις χωρὶς γνώμης τοῦ μητροπολίτου γένοιτο ἐπίσκοπος, τὸν τοιοῦτον ἡ μεγάλη σύνοδος ὥρισε μὴ δεῖν εἶναι ἐπίσκοπον.

- *Literature*

The chronological scope of this study is in the Late Antique period. Chief among the works focusing on this period – and what makes it distinct from the preceding Classical period and succeeding Middle Ages – are those of Peter Brown, who has amply investigated the religious movements, culture, and society of the newly Christianized Roman Empire. In works such as *Power and Persuasion* and "The Rise and Function of the Holy Man in Late Antiquity," Brown shows how bishops operated within their urban contexts.[17] From the fourth century onward, bishops took on the administrative duties of the decurial class and advocated for their local interests through channels leading to the emperor. As such, they served as spiritual and practical patrons for their communities, performing works that benefited cities' corporeal and religious needs. These studies provide much of the basic framework for scholars of Late Antiquity.

While this study does not exclusively focus on Constantine's reign, it does deal with its impact, namely the effects of the Christianization of the Roman Empire and the role of the religion's officials in a now public and licit religion. Among influential works on this topic is Harold Drake's *Constantine and the Bishops*.[18] Drake shows how bishops manipulated the civic government to secure their own interests, especially when they came under the impression that their position was becoming compromised.

[17] Peter Brown, "The Rise and Function of the Holy Man in Late Antiquity," *The Journal of Roman Studies*, Vol. 61. (1971):80-101; and, *Power and Persuasion in Late Antiquity: Towards a Christian Empire* (Madison: The University of Wisconsin Press), 1992.
[18] Harold Drake, *Constantine and the Bishops: The Politics of Intolerance* (Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press), 2000.

This manipulation was possible because during the fourth century, bishops replaced the traditional curial class that governed cities across the Empire: "the bishops would now assume the traditional duties of the civic elites in keeping the peace, and in return the emperor would protect their vital interests."[19] In his view, Nicene orthodoxy's eventual victory was one of a more militant sect of Christians who prodded a somewhat disinterested government into restricting their doctrinal opponents.[20]

Timothy D. Barnes has written much concerning bishops and their interactions with the imperial office in Late Antiquity. Among such works are *Constantine and Eusebius* and his 2011 book, *Constantine*, in which he offers many reflections and reappraisals of his work and scholarship on Emperor Constantine since his books on the emperor in the early 1980s.[21] Most importantly, in Barnes' 2011 work, he offers new evidence that Constantine pursued an intolerant agenda in support of Christianity from 324 onward, which he believes bolsters the same argument from 1981's *Constantine and Eusebius*.[22] This is contra the more recent opinion of other scholars, as Barnes notes, such as that in Raymond Van Dam's *The Roman Revolution of Constantine*,[23] who agrees more with Drake in stating that Constantine's apparent toleration stemmed from the fact that "his political needs repeatedly took priority over any religious preferences."[24]

These divergent views on the degree to which Constantine was prepared to intervene on behalf of particular groups of Christians have important ramifications for this study. The

[19] Drake 2000, 477.
[20] Drake 2000, 438-439.
[21] Timothy Barnes, *Constantine and Eusebius* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press), 1981; and, *Constantine: Dynasty, Religion and Power in the Later Roman Empire* (Malden, MA: Wiley-Blackwell), 2011.
[22] This is based upon a dramatic re-dating of the poems of Palladas. See Barnes 2011, 13-16.
[23] Raymond Van Dam, *The Roman Revolution of Constantine* (New York: Cambridge University Press), 2007.
[24] Van Dam 2007, 126.

precedent of Constantine both in how the emperor interacted with the Church and the increased privileges of bishops in the Roman Empire created new systems in which Christians settled disputes, arrived on doctrine, and debated authority for their communities. Chief among these were the ecumenical councils, which differed from local synods in that they included representatives from throughout the Christian world and in that the emperor initiated their gathering. Influential studies on councils and the various elements that constituted them include Ramsay MacMullen's *Voting About God in Early Church Councils*[25] and the collected volume *Chalcedon in Context. Church Councils 400-700*.[26]

Other works investigating matters of church and state, such as Richard Flower's *Emperors and Bishops in Late Roman Invective*,[27] show how bishops came to realize the potential of their power and attempt to influence the reception of an emperor's religious policies in public. Anthony Kaldellis has illuminated the emperor's function and role in *The Byzantine Republic*.[28] It is a reinterpretation suggesting that the emperor's power and life were subject to the consensus of sovereign Byzantine citizens. Kaldellis' work has particular impact for this study is in the reevaluation of the rhetoric of priesthood that Byzantine authors employed in describing the emperor. Claudia Rapp focuses broadly on the various elements that constituted bishops' authority in *Holy Bishops in Late Antiquity*.[29] Rapp's identification and exploration of different facets of a bishop's authority have given scholars a much firmer and nuanced

[25] Ramsay MacMullen, *Voting About God in Early Church Councils* (New Haven, Conn.: Yale University Press), 2006.
[26] Richard Price and Mary Whitby, editors, *Chalcedon in Context. Church Councils 400-700* (Liverpool: Liverpool University Press), 2009.
[27] Richard Flower, *Emperors and Bishops in Late Roman Invective* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press), 2013.
[28] Anthony Kaldellis, *The Byzantine Republic: People and Power in New Rome* (Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press), 2015.
[29] Claudia Rapp, *Holy Bishops in Late Antiquity* (Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press), 2005.

understanding of the episcopal office. Her objective, however, was to explore the authority of bishops in general, whereas this study focuses on one in particular. In fact, she avoids, as much as possible, using evidence from "big names" to draw general conclusions about the episcopacy.

While these works largely address the historical questions of the legacy of Constantine's Christianity and vision of church and state, they also deal in large part with how Christian bishops operated in the new religious environment of the Roman Empire, where Christianity had unexpectedly become a privileged religion. At the heart of such studies is an effort to understand the new larger and more public roles of bishops of the post-Constantine empire. In this context, the patriarchate of Constantinople developed.

Closer to the focus of the study are works that investigate the establishment of authority by bishops and their claims of apostolic succession and orthodoxy to bolster their positions. Recently, in *The Invention of Peter* by George Demacopoulos, the use of "Petrine discourse" becomes prominent in how the Roman bishops claimed a position of supremacy, beginning most loudly under Pope Leo I.[30] Earlier, Francis Dvornik demonstrated how similar claims of apostolicity functioned in Constantinople, although as he shows this did not occur for the period of focus here.[31] Regarding the confluence of orthodoxy and authority, Walter Bauer advanced the idea that Rome had extended its authority throughout the Mediterranean through orchestrating the acceptance of its doctrines and the bishops who agreed with them in various locales, as the letters of Clement indicate about the early conflict in the Corinthian church.[32]

[30] George Demacopoulos, *The Invention of Peter: Apostolic Discourse and Papal Authority in Late Antiquity* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press), 2013.
[31] Francis Dvornik, *The Idea of Apostolicity in Byzantium and the Legend of the Apostle Andrew* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press), 1958.
[32] Walter Bauer, *Orthodoxy and Heresy in Earliest Christianity*, translated by Robert A. Kraft and Gerhard Krodel, (Philadelphia: Fortress Press), 1971.

While this is a considerably older work, its ideas remain influential for scholars working on the early church, especially in the case of Bart Ehrman, who has further developed Bauer's arguments. Offering a good point of comparison is Neil McLynn's *Ambrose of Milan*.[33] Ambrose's career bears many similarities to the patriarchate of Constantinople. Arian Christians were the dominant group in late–fourth century Milan and Ambrose was a newcomer ecclesiastically with few credentials to bolster his episcopacy. Despite these factors, he succeeded in consolidating authority into his office and establishing Nicene Christianity as the orthodoxy of Milan.

While the above studies address the general culture and conditions in which bishops operated, the following studies are more specific to Constantinople and the patriarchate. Most pertinent to the interests of this dissertation are the works of Gilbert Dagron. In *Naissance d'une Capitale*, he explores the development of the patriarchate's jurisdictional expansion.[34] It observes ecclesiastical canon and its impact on that growth. Ultimately, Dagron's treatment of the patriarchate demonstrates how that office fit into the consolidation of central political authority in Constantinople. Another closely related study of Dagron's is *Emperor and Priest*, which clarifies the patriarch's role in Byzantium and more especially the emperor's role in ecclesiology.[35] While this study examines similar themes as Dagron does, his book focuses on the iconoclasms as a catalyst for the patriarchate's increase in power. More so, Dagron's book primarily investigates the relationship between patriarchs and emperors during this period,

[33] Neil McLynn, *Ambrose of Milan: Church and Court in a Christian Capital* (Berkeley: University of California Press), 1994.
[34] Gilbert Dagron, *Naissance d'une Capitale* (Paris: Presses Universitaires de France), 1974.
[35] Gilbert Dagron, *Emperor and Priest: The Imperial Office in Byzantium*, translated by Jean Birrell, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press), 2003.

whereas this study broadens the scope to observe the relationship of authority between patriarch and city, bishops, and ultimately historical memory.

There are a few publications specifically focusing on the patriarchate and the early Orthodox Church, though they differ from this study in scope and focus. *The Byzantine Patriarchate, 451-1204* by George Every uses Chalcedon as the beginning point, but its focus is ultimately the Great Schism.[36] Every treats the centuries prior to the eleventh as more of a survey rather than an in-depth investigation and is limited in that regard for the subject here. Deno Geanakoplos' *A Short History of the Ecumenical Patriarchate of Constantinople* raises some of the questions that this dissertation explores, such as the role of the second and fourth ecumenical councils in augmenting the patriarch's authority, but unfortunately the work is aptly titled and numbers only 28 pages.[37] For the period in concern here, Geanakoplos condensed the years of 33-843 into one chapter and considered those the "first phases" of the patriarchate's history.

In addition to the works above, there are several studies on specific patriarchs, although they do not focus on the patriarchate as an institution and usually advance arguments independent of the concerns in this dissertation. Susanna Elm's *Sons of Hellenism* deals extensively with the life and career of Gregory of Nazianzus, especially in his dealings with the effects of Julian the Apostate's reign.[38] John McGuckin has also produced an informative biography focusing on the development of Gregory's thought.[39] There are many influential and foundation studies about John Chrysostom, probably more than any other patriarch for this

[36] George Every, *The Byzantine Patriarchate, 451-1204* (London: S.P.C.K.), 1962.
[37] Deno Geanakoplos, *A Short History of the Ecumenical Patriarchate of Constantinople* (Brookline, MA: Holy Cross Orthodox Press), 1990.
[38] Susanna Elm, *Sons of Hellenism, Fathers of the Church: Emperor Julian, Gregory of Nazianzus, and the Vision of Rome* (Berkeley: University of California Press), 2012.
[39] John McGuckin, *St. Gregory of Nazianzus: An Intellectual Biography* (Crestwood, N.Y.: St. Vladimir's Seminary Press), 2001.

period, all ranging in scope and focus.[40] There has been a study about Proclus of Constantinople, though this work mostly investigates the development of his Marian theology and the imperial city's devotion to Mary.[41]

All of the above contribute to a contextual and theoretical background of Late Antique Constantinople and the episcopal office upon which this dissertation is based. This study departs from some of the opinions and arguments of these scholars in some cases and further develops them in other cases. The primary contribution of this dissertation, fitting into this niche of scholarship, is an exclusive focus on a religious office during its earliest development, of which there is a current scholarly gap. This dissertation builds upon and complements these works in that regard.

- *Chapters*

This dissertation will address and build on many of the points that the above scholars have made about bishops, Late Antique Christianity, and Constantinople, among others. In doing so, it will also illuminate these scholars' arguments. The following is a brief abstract of each of four total chapters (not including the conclusion).

The first chapter, "Orthodoxy and the Construction of Authority," shows the disparate processes of the patriarchate that began under the new regime of Gregory of Nazianzus in

[40] Chrysostomus Baur, *John Chrysostom and His Time*, translated by M. Gonzaga (Westminster: Newman Press), 1960; J.H.W.G. Liebeschuetz, *Barbarians and Bishops: Army, Church, and State in the Age of Arcadius and Chrysostom* (Oxford: Oxford University Press), 1990; John Kelly, *Golden Mouth: The Story of John Chrysostom: Ascetic, Preacher, Bishop* (London: Duckworth), 1995; and, Wendy Mayer and Pauline Allen, *John Chrysostom* (London: Routledge), 2000.
[41] Nicholas Constas, *Proclus of Constantinople and the Cult of the Virgin in Late Antiquity: Homilies 1-5, Texts and Translations* (Leiden: Brill), 2003.

establishing a basis of authority for Nicene patriarchs in Constantinople. In that process, Gregory faced numerous challenges to his authority, which exposed the vulnerabilities of the office and ultimately resulted in his resignation. The underlying problem was that the patriarchate had no great claim to high authority in a city where there were numerous competitors and patrons of other Christian confessions. However, as Constantinopolitans gradually became Nicene, the patriarchs had an easier time exercising their authority because of their confession of that creed since Gregory. The Fourth Ecumenical Council forever strengthened the connection of orthodoxy to the patriarchate and produced a canonical definition for its authority.

After several decades of cultivating an association between their office and Nicene orthodoxy, remarkably, patriarchs ushered in a new definition of orthodoxy. In Chapter Two, "Chalcedon: A New Orthodoxy", this study will show how and why the patriarch Anatolius pushed forth a new definition of orthodoxy and connected his office to that definition with Canon 28. Most importantly, Christians began recognizing that Chalcedon and the patriarchate of Constantinople had an indelible connection.

Chapter Three, "Relics and Miracles", shows how patriarchs strengthened their authority by becoming immersed in the lore and practices of Christians. It does so by demonstrating this in the imposition of orthodoxy, the working of miracles, and the association of the office with the relics of martyrs. The performance of these tasks enabled the patriarchate to gain greater religious authority in the imperial city. However, challenges to authority regularly arose and maintaining one's hold on it was its own process Patriarchs persistently had to assert their authority, and this chapter will demonstrate that sometimes the practices of the Christian community could do that for them.

The last chapter, "Emperor and Patriarch," deals with the emperor's role within the church. East Roman society frequently employed rhetoric placing the emperor in a position of honor within the church with the result that it obscured the patriarch's own position. However, as the head of the imperial city's church, the patriarch was in effect the religious authority of the Byzantine Empire, despite the appearance of constant imperial meddling in religious matters in the form of appointing and deposing patriarchs, attempting to influence doctrine, and possessing unique liturgical privileges. This meddling has misleadingly suggested that the emperor was the true head of the Byzantine church. Yet, the processes behind all of these imperial actions were vastly complicated and the actions themselves obfuscated the deeper machinations at work. So, while the emperor could summon an ecumenical council he could not speak at it and had to accept the council's decisions. In reality, the emperor's participation in religious matters was with the consent of the church, which ultimately denied him insider access. Ceremony and the patriarchate's sacerdotal status ensured that however much the emperor had a say in religion, it was as an outsider and with the Church's consent. By investigating these events, this chapter reveals not only the emperor's role in the church, but also how Byzantines perceived church and state as being distinct from one another.

At the conclusion of this dissertation, it will be clear on what basis the patriarchate justified its authority, how the institution propagated it, and how its authority operated. There was no linear path for the development of its authority. Instead, these developments occurred as organic responses or innovations to problems that the lack of a clear basis of authority presented and to alleviate crises of authority.

Orthodoxy and the Construction of Authority

- *Introduction*

The Gospels legitimized institutional authority for priests. Jesus instructed his disciples to heed the rabbis' teachings because "They sat in the cathedra of Moses."[1] Whoever, then, occupied the chair of the office attained the authority that came with it. For Christians, such an example provided Rome and Alexandria with sound explanations for the current bishop's authority current bishop in those respective cities. The current holders of the episcopacy were sitting in the same cathedra as the apostle who established the church in those cities, Peter and Mark respectively. However, in Constantinople, the justification for the patriarch's authority could not rely upon such an argument because no apostle had established the see.[2]

In its early decades, state power was fundamental to the patriarchs of Constantinople in securing whatever their ecclesiastical ambitions might be. Yet, the use of state power was ultimately inadequate in convincing Christians, especially those outside Constantinople, of the patriarchate's authority as a metropolitan bishop. In response, patriarchs distanced their office from the perception that its position was entirely due to the emperor by constructing an authority for their office that rested in the championing of orthodoxy, all the while still preserving the privileges of the emperor's benefactions. While the association with orthodoxy never alleviated the tension of the emperor's presence, it allowed the patriarch a greater level of autonomy and

[1] Matthew 23:2-3. λέγων, ἐπὶ τῆς Μωϋσέως καθέδρας ἐκάθισαν οἱ γραμματεῖς καὶ οἱ Φαρισαῖοι. πάντα οὖν ὅσα ἐὰν εἴπωσιν ὑμῖν ποιήσατε καὶ τηρεῖτε.
[2] Constantinople did claim founding by the apostle Andrew, however no documentation of this claim appears until the seventh century. See Dvornik 1958, 138ff.

legitimacy. This gave them the ability to decide on ecclesiastical and doctrinal matters within Constantinople and influence them in other dioceses. Christians complied with a patriarch's wishes when he held authority over them. This chapter investigates the patriarchate's hold on authority, its responses to challenges, and its solutions in overcoming its deficiencies.

The authority of a patriarch should be greater than that of ordinary bishops of metropolitan status. A patriarch's authority enabled him to see to the fulfillment of his own agenda. Modern understandings of the nature of authority can be instructive here. Bruce Lincoln defined authority as an effect of credibility in discourse between a speaker and their audience.[3] Authority allowed a speaker to have an audience accept their claims as true merely by making them. Challenges to authority elicited a spectrum of responses by the patriarch, either by attempting to convince the challenger(s) or use state power to force them into compliance. According to Lincoln, "authority is related to coercion and persuasion in symmetrical ways," because both are means to respond to a challenge.[4] Legitimate authority was convincing in itself without the need of force to coerce compliance or speech to persuade.

Inherent in the acceptance of authority is the holder's audience. A sympathetic audience obviously will be more likely than a hostile one to comply with the speaker's desires. For the patriarch, his message would resonate more so with Christians of similar confession. In Late Antique Constantinople, before the arrival of Gregory of Nazianzus in 379, the dominant Christian group confessed the *homoion* creed. As a result, the patriarch's authority resounded for only a limited number of Christians. To overcome this problem, one solution was to increase the number of Christians who were a part of the patriarch's group. Access to the imperial laws

[3] Lincoln 1994, 2-4 and 128-130.
[4] Lincoln 1994, 6. See his full discussion in 4-6.

enabled them to gradually exclude other sects from the city, homogenizing the population so that there was only one group.

Moving from the general model of authority that Lincoln offers, the term πρεσβεῖα (privileges) holds particular importance for analysis of episcopal authority. The term first comes into use regarding the patriarch of Constantinople in Canon 3 of the Council of Constantinople in 381, which explains that the patriarch holds "privileges of honor" (τὰ πρεσβεῖα τῆς τιμῆς) after Rome. This phrase, however, is vague, and it is especially difficult to discern the exact intent of it. Phillippe Blaudeau believes that it is strictly a symbolic honor.[5] However, Brian Daley has suggested that there were concrete ramifications in this phrase as regards the patriarch's authority, that the word τιμή (honor) instead had "clearly practical, even juridical implications."[6] However other bishops understood τιμή after the second ecumenical council, either as symbolic or concrete, the patriarch's exercise of his πρεσβεῖα in the decades leading up to the Council of Chalcedon eventually constituted an accepted custom for other bishops, which slowly augmented the office's authority.

Compounding the problems for the patriarchate of Constantinople is that in 379 a new ecclesiastical regime laid claim to leadership (under Gregory of Nazianzus) of Christians in the city. This prompted contestations of authority that largely contributed to Gregory's resignation in 381. For the next 70 years, patriarchs would weather challenges to their authority and reinforce it, to varying degrees of success and persistently rely on the emperor to overcome those contestations. A new basis for authority came at the Council of Chalcedon, where hundreds of

[5] In explaining the significance of Canon 28 of Chalcedon, he assumes that Constantinople's position would still be only honorary. Blaudeau 2006, 401 : *Constantinople est élevée à la seconde place dans l'Eglise, la première en Orient, sans que cette promotion soit limitée à la seule acception honorifique.*
[6] Daley 1993, 531.

bishops affirmed the patriarchate's position as a second to Rome. It also inextricably connected the office to the doctrine of that council. These developments provided the patriarchate with an authority rooted in Chalcedonian orthodoxy and thus a justification for the patriarchate's position autonomous from imperial power.

None of that happened on a linear path, though, and it was not a concerted, long-term project on the part of the patriarchate. However, new patriarchs likely evaluated their predecessor's difficulties or successes and avoided or replicated them in kind. The eventual elevation of the patriarch occurred because of repeated crises of authority from 379 to 449. The patriarch who did so most thoroughly was Anatolius, under whom the patriarchate made its elevation, as the next chapter will show. Anatolius responded to a patriarchal crisis of authority that had resulted in a third patriarch, Flavian, losing his office in a span of fifty years as a result of the interference of an outside see, Alexandria, manipulating the monks of Constantinople and the imperial government against the patriarch.

Late Antique society embedded specific notions and qualifications into the concept of authority generally as well as specific kinds of authority, such as the episcopal authority in play here. The Latin word for authority is *auctoritas*; for the Greek there was no cognate that carried the absolute weight of the Roman concept, but terms such as αὐθεντεία and ἐξουσία exist and authors utilized them.

One overwhelmingly important notion of Christian authority rested in the consensus opinion of bishops at an ecumenical council. The authority of the teachings of bishops who participated at ecumenical councils was particularly persuasive, as Emperor Justinian I asked a group of Alexandrian monks in a letter dating from 542-543, "who has such authority that they

can reject the teaching of the holy fathers?"[7] Bishops who played important roles in conciliar definitions of faith held strong authority because they determined orthodoxy. In a letter of Pope Damasus that Theodoret of Cyrrhus preserves, he speaks of the Council of Nicaea establishing its confession of faith upon "the authority of the apostles."[8] This was one of many articulations establishing Nicene orthodoxy as authoritative because it preserved the faith of the Apostles, which was a persistent preoccupation for bishops when debating doctrine. In fact, the notion of Nicaea possessing apostolic authority was so deeply ingrained in bishops' minds that they came to abjure any refining of the symbol of faith of the council. For example, one objection to the Tome of Leo was that "no one had such authority," to make a pronouncement such as that of the faith because the opposing bishop considered the Tome to be an amendment of something that could never be changed, the Nicene faith.[9] These concepts of authority for bishops and orthodoxy shaped the world that the patriarchate existed in and how it came to establish its own authority in Constantinople.

But beyond Constantinople, eventually, the patriarchate established itself as an ecumenical authority. Pope Felix II complained to Acacius that he did "not know how you claim to be the head of the church."[10] In Gelasius' criticism at the beginning of this dissertation,[11] he rejects Constantinople's claims to an elevated hierarchical position, which in turn repudiated the notion that ecclesiastical hierarchy rested in cities' civic hierarchy. Gelasius and Felix II argued

[7] Justinian, *Contra monophysitas*, 153.4: τίς ἄρα τοιαύτην ἔσχεν αὐθεντίαν, ὥστε τὴν τῶν ἁγίων πατέρων ἀποδοκιμάσαι διδασκαλίαν;
[8] Theodoret, *EH*, 2.17: Συνορᾷ οὖν ἡ ὑμετέρα καθαρότης ταύτην μόνην τὴν πίστιν, ἥτις ἐν Νικαίᾳ κατὰ τὴν αὐθεντίαν τῶν ἀποστόλων ἐθεμελιώθη.
[9] *ACO* 2.1.1.p. 85: Θαλάσσιος ὁ εὐλαβέστατος ἐπίσκοπος Καισαρείας Καππαδοκίας εἶπεν· Ἓν οἶδα ἐγὼ ὅτι οὔτε ἐκώλυσα οὔτε δὲ τοσαύτην αὐθεντίαν εἶχον.
[10]Pope Felix II, *Epistle 2.8*, in Thiel 1868, 237: *nescio quemadmodum te ecclesiae totius asseras esse principem*.
[11] See page 1 of this study.

that if the patriarchate assumed such authority because his city was where the emperor resided, then should not the bishops of other imperial residences have followed suit? Although Gelasius was facetious in tone, at Sirmium a group of bishops gained prestige and influence because of the patronage of Constantius II during his stays there throughout the 350s, namely Ursacius of Signidunum, Valens of Mursa, and Germinius of Sirmium.[12] However, after Theodosius I, the eastern emperor never lived in a city other than Constantinople again. In this manner, the elevation of the patriarch of Constantinople was the beneficiary of an unforeseeable historical chance.

Patriarchs did not simply say that they were orthodox and therefore their authority should stand unchallenged. Instead, they carefully communicated messages that both normalized their doctrine as orthodox and justified their position as the spiritual leader of Constantinople upon their faith. In circumventing their early limitations of authority, patriarchs employed imperial legal, financial, and military power to secure their position in Constantinople. Obtaining the use of military personnel, legal measures, or other imperial benefactions did not mean that the patriarchate, and hence the church, was simply a lackey for carrying out of the emperor's religious proclivities. Rather it was because the church lacked a formal apparatus itself for utilizing such powers. Using soldiers to force heretics out of a locale or church was a legitimate action for secular agents so far as the church and patriarch were concerned because heretics were not in communion with the church. None of this is to suggest that these men were simply power hungry individuals and religion was merely a means for them to attain it. Instead, it affirms that

[12] Arius was in exile in Illyricum and gained influence over these bishops in the region (Philostorgius 1.9c). These bishops then influenced and became advisors to Constantius II during this time and were allies of Eusebius of Nicomedia. See Fournier 2010, 26-27; Lenski 2002, 235-242; and, Barnes 1993, 138-145.

patriarchs deeply held their religious convictions, such that they were willing to take sometimes extraordinary measures to enforce them, which required they be in a position of authority.

This chapter builds on Gilbert Dagron's work on the patriarchate of Constantinople in *Naissance d'une Capitale*.[13] He sketches the office's growth and development from an institutional standpoint. However, where Dagron was interested in the privileges and growth of the patriarchate's jurisdiction in response to ecclesiastical canons that empowered the office, this study focuses on the underlying factors that made that possible. For Dagron, it becomes possible to speak of "the institution of the patriarchate" after the Council of Constantinople.[14] However, this is viewing the patriarchate as an almost purely canonical creation—instead of as a more organic development rising from decades of interaction between patriarch, emperor, city, and other sees. As will become clear, there were many factors born in terse discourse and action that gave rise to the circumstances that made such canons possible.

Claudia Rapp has shaped understandings of episcopal authority and the problem of orthodoxy. She identified the authority of bishops as resting in the intersection of ascetic, spiritual, and pragmatic authority. In Rapp's view, bishops' ascetic authority bridged the spiritual and pragmatic elements of their episcopal authority.[15] This essentially allowed the bishop to serve as a conduit of holiness in performing tasks beneficial for his congregation and community, whether that be negotiating tax relief with imperial authorities or managing almsgiving for the poor. Nearing the end of Antiquity, Rapp concluded, "a new understanding of the episcopate developed that privileged the bishop's pragmatic authority over his ascetic

[13] See Dagron 1974, 454-487.
[14] Dagron 1974, 454: *Aussi peut-on dire que le concile oecuménique de 381 est un premier pas vers l'institution du patriarcat byzantin.*
[15] Rapp 2005, 17.

authority."[16] While that might certainly be true for other cities, in Constantinople—because the emperor and senate were there—civic institutions were more robust and there was less need for the patriarch to take up curial responsibilities.

The English translation of Walter Bauer's *Rechtgläubigkeit und Ketzerei im ältesten Christentum* (1934) in 1971 under the title of *Orthodoxy and Heresy in Earliest Christianity* sparked scholarly attention to what constituted orthodoxy. Bauer's thesis was that most Christians were part of "divergent" sects in its early centuries and the "orthodox," such as Ignatius of Antioch, were the minority, contra Eusebius' history that presents a unified church that agreed on one doctrine from Apostolic times onward. Orthodoxy did not become dominant until the Church of Rome was able to impose its Christianity throughout the Mediterranean. Bauer's work received much attention for its innovative interpretation of early Christianity, with some considerable objections to his methodology and thesis.[17] Nevertheless, the debate surrounding his work has led scholars to reevaluate what orthodoxy was in Christianity's first centuries.

Harold Drake has analyzed the same sorts of problems that this study is, but for a slightly earlier time, early- to mid-fourth century, in *Constantine and the Bishops*. The central message in his work is to explain how and why Christians came to use state coercion to compel belief, especially when they had resented emperors using coercion against them. He identifies the

[16] Rapp 2005, 274.

[17] See Daniel Harrington "The Reception of Walter Bauer's 'Orthodoxy and Heresy in Earliest Christianity' during the Last Decade," (1980) for contemporary scholars' reactions to the translation. Among the criticisms leveled were: Bauer misreads 1 Clement, the Nag Hamadi corpus was not yet discovered and likely would change his interpretation of Alexandria, and during the Apostolic age divergent sects did show awareness of an orthodoxy.

More recently, Köstenberger and Kruger have re-examined the impact and argument of Bauer, refuting his thesis. See especially Köstenberger and Kruger 2010, 23-40. However, there have been defenders of Bauer's ideas in the last decade as well, notably Bart Ehrman, see Ehrman 2003 & Ehrman 2011.

actions of the emperor Julian the Apostate as creating destabilizing circumstances that prompted insecure Christians to turn against their more moderate members and attack traditional Roman religion.[18] Characterizing Christian use of imperial power as "intolerance, the use by Christians of the coercive powers of the state to compel belief,"[19] he also cautions, "the coercive Christian as normative is a modern construct—the worst sort of conceptual anachronism."[20]

Patriarchs continued justifying Constantinople's civic position as one basis for their authority, but they also imbued the city with numerous sacred qualities, ensuring that it was not only New Rome, but "New Jerusalem."[21] Of course, basing authority on orthodoxy proved challenging as well, because orthodoxy was itself a disputed construct. Despite these difficulties, over the course of the fifth century patriarchs could obtain authority distinct from the emperor. This eventually mitigated their recourse to imperial power because their particular brand of Christianity resonated with the city. But there were immense challenges in the beginning.

- *The Legacy of Athanasius and Nicene Orthodoxy*

The career of Athanasius ushered in a new era in both theology and ecclesiology. In becoming the eventual champion of Nicaea,[22] Athanasius represents a new direction from all that led up to the council itself. While his predecessors—Alexander of Alexandria, Eusebius of Caesarea, and Arius—all developed as churchmen and thinkers in the milieu of the Great

[18] Drake 2000, 431-440.
[19] Drake 2000, 402.
[20] Drake 2000, 405.
[21] Dagron 1974, 458.
[22] Weinandy 2007, 49-80; and, Young and Teal 2010, 49-52 and 69-71.

Persecution and the works of Origen, Athanasius initiated a new generation that went a different direction in thought and practice.[23] More specifically, in confronting Arius' theology, "Athanasius…abandon[ed] Origen's cosmotheological discourse in favor of a more anthropocentric vision," culminating in his incarnational theology.[24] It also led him to insist on the Holy Spirit's place in the Trinity, which influenced the Cappadocian Fathers and the Council of Constantinople in 381 affirmed.[25] Furthermore, Athanasius' employment of rhetoric in his pamphlets gradually came to persuade large bodies Christians about the orthodoxy of Nicaea, beginning in the West with a kindred spirit in Hilary of Poitiers and later in the East in Alexandria and in Syria through Basil of Caesarea's propagation of his works.

In many respects, Athanasius' success in convincing others of the orthodoxy of Nicene theology was due to his theology being "pioneering" by focusing the soteriological elements of the third century Origenism of his predecessors, which abstracted salvation to a cosmic level, into the Incarnation, making possible "a radical actualizing [experience], decisive for the believer, of that economy."[26] However, because the propagation of his theology occurred in the realm of public discourse with his opponents through their pamphlets and books, this gave rise to a situation in which Christians became firmly entrenched in groups of doctrinal conviction, who

[23] Charles Kannengiesser has argued this point in his scholarship. See Kannengiesser 1988, 70-73; and, Kannengiesser 1995, 6-8.
[24] Kannengiesser 1995, 7. For more on Athanasius' incarnational theology, see Weinandy 2007, 27-48 and 81-102; Young and Teal 2010, 52-56; and, Leithart 2011, 147-174.
[25] See Campbell 1974 for Athanasius' doctrine on the Holy Spirit. This insistence was in response to the assumption that the Holy Spirit was a creature and not *homoousios* with the Father and Son. The latter view developed from an understanding rooted in Origenism, "true to the hierarchical view of the Origenist tradition, [which was] denying the Holy Spirit's divinity, as being lower than the Logos if higher (in status though not ontology) than the angels," Young and Teal 2010, 67.
[26] Kannengiesser 1995, 7.

were willing to resort to drawing in the imperial government into their conflicts; this was something previously impossible in the third century.[27]

Christian "revulsion at the excesses created by Diocletian's persecution had led to repudiation of the state as a means for enforcing belief," and Constantine had "erode[d] the long-held Christian principle that belief could not be coerced, to restore the idea of the state as a means to create unity of belief."[28] Athanasius disparaged the Arians for using the "threats of the emperor" to force the acceptance of their doctrines. He calls their beliefs a "heresy" and that the Arians "persecute us," "us" being the Nicenes.[29] In Athanasius' claims, non-Nicene Christians resorted to coercive measures, while the Nicene, and hence orthodox, suffered persecution. Persecution thus confirmed orthodoxy.

While some Christian factions had access to state power for use against rival Christian groups or pagans, it was not necessarily part of their normal mode of operation to use that power to force their beliefs. In fact, as Drake explains, Christians preferred that a person accept belief on their own rather than someone forcing doctrine on them. One reason for this was the prominence of martyrdom in the Christian psyche; persecution confirmed that they professed the true faith, which scripture in fact told them would happen, "all those who are wishing to live piously in Christ Jesus will be persecuted."[30] Coercion could result in valid claims of persecution, which in turn would legitimize the coerced person's position. Later, anti-Chalcedonians used this logic to characterize themselves as suffering persecution because they

[27] The major exception to this was Emperor Aurelian's enforcement of Paul of Samosata's condemnation in the 270s, see Eusebius, *HE*, 7.30.
[28] Drake 2000, 439.
[29] Athanasius, *History of the Arians*, 1.1.
[30] 2 Timothy 3:12. καὶ πάντες δὲ οἱ θέλοντες εὐσεβῶς ζῆν ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ διωχθήσονται.

professed the true faith, as is particularly evident in John Rufus' *Plerophoriae*. Yet there were many instances where Christians resorted to state power to coerce another faith group, Christian or other. These instances usually arose when traditional avenues of persuasion failed and destabilizing factors had made Christians insecure about their own positions, or the status of their beliefs.

This highlights the most obvious tension for the patriarchate. The holders of that office similarly preferred persuasion to coercion and true authority stimulated its desired response without having to resort to coercion, let alone persuasion. However, because of their insecure possession of authority they relied upon imperial coercion to maintain their power. The traditional method of persuasion was through preaching and, in the case of an inter-ecclesiastical dispute, synods. Their ability to persuade their congregation on matters of orthodoxy confirmed their standing as a legitimate authority whose teachings were credible because of their source. Coercion, while not always just a last-ditch effort, came about in more precarious situations. That is when the elements of imperial power helped the patriarch accomplish what religious rhetoric alone could not.

As part of solving the complex problem of authority, Gregory of Nazianzus relied upon measures of coercion and rhetorical persuasion to secure his position. For the former, there are subtle hints of force in Gregory's works, which he hints at but does not explicate upon. And for the latter, the Cappadocian father used elegant theological arguments rooted in the thought of Athanasius, whom he specifically invoked as a predecessor in that regard. In fact, by the time of Gregory's tenure, he had erroneously, or creatively, inflated Athanasius' role at the Council of

Nicaea.[31] His exaggeration served a purpose, though, because it emphasized Athanasius as a defender of Nicene orthodoxy from the earliest moments of the Arian conflict. Whether this existed merely in discourse or reality did not matter as much as the fact that Christians assumed, or claimed, it to be true. Gregory would go on to position himself as an heir to Athanasius as a defender of Nicaea.

- *Orthodoxy in Constantinople and Gregory of Nazianzus's Nicene Revolution*

Gregory of Nazianzus's tenure is the beginning of this study because it reveals most clearly the patriarchate's difficulties in claiming authority. Gregory faced what proved an insurmountable problem because his message did not resonate with his audience, the Christians of Constantinople. Among the explanations for this are the facts that he did not hold the same profession of faith as they did and that he represented the displacement of their legitimate bishop, Demophilus.

The faith that the Council of Nicaea had proclaimed as orthodox in 325 faced challenges in large parts of the east, where Arian-spectrum beliefs prevailed through large swaths of territory, including Constantinople. When Gregory of Nazianzus arrived in Constantinople in 379, there was hardly a Nicene congregation. Yet, Gregory became patriarch of Constantinople anyhow. This was due in large part to a sympathetic emperor, Theodosius I, who provided Gregory and the Nicene congregation with military and legal resources to accomplish such a

[31] In *Oration* 21.14, Gregory depicts Athanasius as a major force against Arius, despite the Alexandrian not being a bishop.

feat. The Nicene ecclesiastical hierarchy in the city lacked authority because at that time it was not the dominant form of the Christian faith in Constantinople, and hence not orthodox.

To overcome this obstacle, Gregory and his successors constructed claims to orthodoxy and in turn authority as defenders of that orthodoxy. They also benefited from fortunate circumstances, namely an ecumenical council and a new emperor who shared their faith, which enabled them to lay stake to the patriarchate. In making their case, patriarchs used several vessels through which they cultivated and reinforced their spiritual authority.

Like all other bishops, orthodoxy was connected to the patriarchate. The patriarch by virtue of the office had to hold and teach correct belief. However, in fourth-century Constantinople the consensus of what orthodoxy was in the city was different from what Gregory thought. Gregory of Nazianzus and his allies undertook a project that could be understood as a revolution of faith. The establishment of Nicene orthodoxy in Constantinople was thus intertwined with the claims of religious authority by the patriarchate.

Anyone who claimed to be orthodox was implicitly claiming to preserve the pure faith of Jesus Christ as he had taught it to the Apostles. “Orthodox” excludes all other interpretations of the Christian faith because it maintains that it observes the true faith and there can be only one truth in such matters. However, because orthodoxy was subject to interpretation, there arose competing claims to the title. Church councils tried to settle the matter, but then the problem emerged of councils arriving at different conclusions as to what exactly constituted orthodoxy.

In 325, the Council of Nicaea decreed that the *homoousian* doctrine was orthodox and that the teaching of Arius, who held that the Son was of a different being than the Father, was heretical. However, in the ensuing decades several local synods convened and declared that

doctrines closer to Arius' teachings were orthodox, non-exhaustively: Tyre (335), Antioch (341 & 344), Ancyra (358), and Sirmium (351, 357, & 359). Several of these synods attempted to produce a doctrine that was a middle ground between Arius and Nicaea, such as the *homoiousian* and *anomean* positions. The result of Nicaea and the numerous synods afterward was that several groups of Christians made claim to holding the orthodox symbol of the faith, depending upon which synod(s) held authority for each particular group of Christians. By 361, in the east the work of numerous synods over the years had coalesced into the *homoioan* doctrine, while Nicene Christians, Basil of Caesarea and his allies, saw their *homoousian* understanding of orthodoxy challenged by these Christians and their imperial sympathizers.[32] The success of the *homoioan* creed benefited immensely from imperial support.

Gregory had to connect his Nicene faith with the Christian identity in Constantinople for the Nicene patriarchate to have authority there. Nicene leadership, including Basil of Caesarea, tasked Gregory with carrying out this mission. Gregory says this in his *Funeral Oration on Basil*: "I will remind you, not that you do not know, that I was working for the sake of the true doctrine, which I had been tasked with and forced away from him, according to the will of God and according to the judgment of that noble champion of the truth."[33] John McGuckin points out that Gregory made a particularly attractive candidate for this task because of his thoroughly Nicene pedigree, "Gregory was the one whose background was perfectly 'clean.' And from the very outset of his episcopal career he had declared himself for Nicaea in all its fullness, and for the

[32] For more on these developments during the mid-fourth century see Elm 2012a, 44-50; Lenski 2002 234-238; and, Barnes 1993 136-152.

[33] Gregory of Nazianzus, *Oration* 43.2: Ἔπειτα, οὐκ ἀγνοοῦντας μέν, ὑπομνήσω δ' οὖν ὅμως, ὧν μεταξὺ περὶ τὸν ἀληθῆ λόγον ἠσχολήμεθα κινδυνεύοντα, καλῶς βιασθέντες, καὶ κατὰ Θεὸν ἴσως ἔκδημοι γεγονότες, καὶ οὐδὲ ἀπὸ γνώμης ἐκείνῳ τῷ γενναίῳ τῆς ἀληθείας ἀγωνιστῇ…

Socrates indicates that a group of bishops, perhaps a small synod, voted to send Gregory to Constantinople. Among these was Basil of Caesarea, no doubt. See Socrates, *EH*, 5.6.

Trinitarian faith in its most radical form."[34] But this establishes that Gregory possessed authority for only one particular group: Nicene Christians.

Fostering a Nicene Christian identity and then establishing himself as the leader of that community, however, proved to be a far greater task than Gregory anticipated. In a greater sense, his project was to redefine a pre-existing Christian community. Membership in that community was on the basis of belief in a doctrine and initiation. One had to accept the *homoousian* doctrine to be Nicene. Nicene identity was hardened under Constantius II, Julian, and Valens. In the exiles of Athanasius, Nicene sympathizers found the confessor that justified their position on doctrine. The Nicenes found particular success in using the rhetoric of persecution to create unity among them; they were orthodox because they suffered for their beliefs. Ultimately, the death of the *homoian* Valens at the Battle of Adrianople in 378 confirmed for the Nicene Christians that their position was correct, because God had punished their persecutor.[35]

This last point presents an interesting turn. During Gregory of Nazianzus' brief tenure, the Nicenes began using the same apparatuses of coercion that non-Nicenes had used against them, which Athanasius himself complained of the Arians using against him. With Gregory, a new orthodoxy established itself with a new regime of clergy who professed the Nicene faith in Constantinople.

Gregory and the Nicene faithful saw the use of powers that they did not have access to being used by their Arian and semi-Arian opponents. The use of state power, previously beyond the purview of the church before Constantine, is evident in the non-Nicene control of Constantinople throughout the fourth century. In the synodical letter from the synod of

[34] McGuckin 2001, 235.
[35] Lenski 2002, 261-263.

Constantinople in 382, the bishops spoke of the "multitude of sufferings born against us by the power of the Arians."[36] They go on to tell of the Arian persecution of the Nicenes, the violence that the emperors Constantius II and Valens allowed Arians to perpetuate, and the deprivation of churches and property they experienced. Arians could do so because they had access to imperial legislative and military power. Until Theodosius I, the emperors in Constantinople sympathized with Arian-spectrum sects. These groups used the resources of their imperial patron to commit suppressive violence and enact legal disabilities in denying Nicene Christians a place to worship within the city. Ironically, it was by using these same resources that the Nicenes could later claim the mantle of orthodoxy in Constantinople, against the Arians.

When Gregory of Nazianzus arrived in Constantinople in 379, Nicene Christians had no control of the churches within the city and likely worshipped in private homes. Non-Nicene Christians had occupied the patriarchate for nearly four decades by that time. Sozomen offers a striking picture of the situation before the Second Ecumenical Council:

> Still the Arians, plentiful with the protection of Constantius and Valens, were fearlessly assembling and publicly discussing God and the οὐσία of God, were now trying to gain over the emperor to their party through the intervention of members of their sect who held court appointments. They had hopes of succeeding in this project, as they had succeeded with Constantius II. These machinations caused great anxiety and fear among the members of the Catholic [Nicene] Church. The cause of their fear was the speaking of Eunomius.[37]

[36] Letter in Theodoret, *EH,* 5.9: διηγεῖσθαι τῶν παθημάτων τὸ πλῆθος τῶν ἐπαχθέντων ἡμῖν παρὰ τῆς τῶν Ἀρειανῶν δυναστείας.

[37] Sozomen, *EH*, 7.6: Ἔτι δὲ οὗτοι, πλῆθος ὄντες ἐκ τῆς Κωνσταντίου καὶ Οὐάλεντος ῥοπῆς, ἀδεέστερον συνιόντες περὶ θεοῦ καὶ οὐσίας αὐτοῦ δημοσίᾳ διελέγοντο καὶ ἀποπειρᾶσθαι τοῦ βασιλέως ἔπειθον τοὺς ὁμόφρονας αὐτοῖς ἐν τοῖς βασιλείοις. ἡγοῦντο γὰρ ἐπιτεύξεσθαι τῆς ἐπιχειρήσεως τὰ ἐπὶ Κωνσταντίου συμβάντα σκοποῦντες. τοῦτο δὲ αὐτὸ καὶ τοῖς ἀπὸ τῆς καθόλου ἐκκλησίας φροντίδας καὶ φόβον ἐκίνει· οὐχ ἥκιστα δὲ περιδεεῖς ἦσαν λογιζόμενοι τὴν ἐν ταῖς διαλέξεσιν Εὐνομίου δεινότητα.

Both Sozomen and Socrates characterize Constantius II and Valens as the object of Arian manipulation to win imperial patronage.[38] Non-Nicene Christians enjoyed a good amount of imperial patronage in the East, especially in Constantinople, where the *homoian* bishop Eudoxius consecrated the Great Church in 360.[39] The patronage of two emperors in close succession had made them accustomed to practice their faith openly, because in Constantinople it was not a heresy, but orthodoxy.[40] Whatever inconveniences the First Ecumenical Council might have caused for Arian-spectrum believers in Constantinople, the ensuing anti-Nicene synods of the 350s-360s and sympathetic emperors ameliorated. Furthermore, there was good reason for them to think that their situation would continue perpetually, even with a new emperor coming to the imperial city. Their hopes rest in Eunomius to convince Theodosius I to accept the semi-Arian faith. And as Sozomen notes, even the Nicenes feared Eunomius' persuasiveness.

Noel Lenski observes a similar situation occurring during the time of Constantine in Alexandria: "the [Arian] dispute provided an arena within which intra- and inter-urban power dynamics were negotiated and renegotiated by ecclesiastics jockeying for position," noting also how they both used the authority of the emperor and challenged it.[41] So, with the new emperor Theodosius I arriving in Constantinople, a similar situation arose in which both groups were attempting to gain influence over the emperor for their own benefit. Constantinople was not an anomaly in that regard.

Yet, a historical fluke resulted in the dashing of non-Nicenes' hopes in Constantinople. In 378, Theodosius I was suffering from a serious ailment and, fearing death, sought baptism in

[38] Urbainczyk 1997, 152-156.
[39] *Chronicon Paschale* 360. On Eudoxius as bishop and his creedal affiliation, see Lenski 2002, 235-236.
[40] Flower 2013, 80-81; Elm 2012, 42-57; and, Barnes 1993, 165-175.
[41] Lenski 2016, 264.

Thessalonica, where a Nicene bishop performed the sacrament. The emperor came from a Nicene family, so it was likely that he held Nicene beliefs already anyhow.[42] But this near-death experience and subsequent baptism apparently sparked zeal for the Nicene faith in the emperor, who decided to enforce orthodoxy in Constantinople. The imperial college issued a decree on 27 February 380 announcing that the Roman Empire's legal religion was the faith that Saint Peter gave to the Romans, and which Damasus of Rome and Peter of Alexandria held. This effectively proclaimed the Nicene faith as the legal religion.[43] Drake says that this was moment the moment that Theodosius I "sealed the victory of Nicene orthodoxy in Constantinople."[44] Certainly it made their victory possible, but there was nothing guaranteed or sealed about it.

After issuing this law, Theodosius approached Demophilus, the non-Nicene bishop of Constantinople, and asked him if he would accept the *homoousian* creed in exchange for remaining in the see. Demophilus refused. After Theodosius I ousted the Arians and their bishop Demophilus from the city, Gregory of Nazianzus and the Nicenes entered the Church of the Holy Apostles. Gregory and his fledgling Nicence congregation observed all of the benefactions imperial patronage had brought to the Arian-spectrum groups in Constantinople and they learned from this.

Upon entering the city in 379, Gregory of Nazianzus established a chapel on the grounds of a family relative and named it Anastasia, signifying the "rebirth" of orthodoxy in Constantinople.[45] But it was not an easy task, as Gregory of Nazianzus explains that when he first became bishop of the city the orthodox flock "was small and poor, barely a flock in

[42] Sozomen, *EH*, 7.4.
[43] *CTh* 16.1.2.
[44] Drake 2000, 403.
[45] Socrates, *EH*, 5.6; Gregory of Nazianzus, *Oration* 42.26; Gregory of Nazianzus *Carmina de vita sua* 1079-1086.

appearances, nothing but a small trace and relic of a flock, unordered, without a bishop, and without boundaries."[46] Gregory is speaking here of the orthodox Nicene community, in contrast to the robust Arian congregation in Constantinople. At this time, in Constantinople, the Nicenes were effectively heretics. Gregory had no doctrinal basis for authority. He was an outsider armed with a heresy, seeking to impose false doctrine on the city—as non-Nicene Christians probably understood the situation. Indeed, on Easter 379 a mob of non-Nicene Christians and monks assaulted Gregory and his congregation with stones.[47]

Peter Brown identifies the perpetrators as the "poor of the church," likely engaging "in an exciting new form of local politics," which was the election of new bishop, an opportunity where the 'poor' of the city were able to make themselves heard as a special group."[48] The throwing of stones represents an explicit rejection of Gregory. Gregory recounts their accusation: "the city raged against me because I was introducing many gods against one [as they claimed]."[49] The faithful of the city were loyal to the doctrine of their bishop Demophilus, who possessed the legitimacy that Gregory lacked. The challenge for the Nicenes was to redefine orthodoxy in the imperial city and then base their authority on championing the new orthodoxy.

Gregory tried rhetorical persuasion to acquire legitimate religious authority in Constantinople. Orations, homilies, and sermons were the most direct way for a patriarch to influence his congregation. Preaching was a fulsome power. Gregory menacingly reminded Jerome of this fact: "I will tell you about that in church…and there, when all the people applaud

[46] Gregory of Nazianzus, *Oration* 42.2: Τοῦτο τὸ ποίμνιον ἦν, ὅτε μικρόν τε καὶ ἀτελὲς ἦν, ὅσον ἐπὶ τοῖς ὁρωμένοις, καὶ οὐδὲ ποίμνιον, ἀλλὰ ποίμνης τι μικρὸν ἴχνος, ἢ λείψανον, ἀσύντακτον, καὶ ἀνεπίσκοπον, καὶ ἀόριστον.
[47] Gregory of Nazianzus *Epistle 77* and in *Carmina de vita sua* 665.
[48] Brown 1992, 100-101.
[49] Gregory of Nazianzus, *Carmina de vita sua*, 654-655: Μὲν ἐξέζεσε καθ'ἡμῶν ἡ πόλις ὡς εἰσαγόντων ἀνθ'ένὸς πλείους θεούς.

me, you will be compelled to know what you do not know, or else, if you alone remain silent, everyone will consider you a fool."[50] Every bishop had the prerogative of speaking directly to his congregation; like any other rhetor in public, adept ones could influence their audience on a particular matter. This skill was vital to the patriarch's career in asserting his authority.

Gregory began his campaign of persuasion by giving an oration celebrating Athanasius in which he articulated the saint's succession as both in office and faith of Mark. In this oration, Gregory argues that despite a bishop's distance from the founder of his see, confessing the same faith bridged the time between the two and made the new bishop a direct successor. Speaking on Athanasius, Gregory says that:

> he is lifted up to the throne of Saint Mark, a successor no less in piety, than in rank; for in the latter he indeed is a successor at a great distance from him, in the former, following him closely, which is the right of succession. For unity shares the same throne, and a differing opinion sets up a rival throne; the former is truly a successor, the latter only in name…not the man of contrary opinions, but the man of the same faith.[51]

In this oration from early in Gregory's tenure, he suggests that he is a part of orthodox continuity through Athanasius. The importance of Athanasius for the Nicene-orthodox was immense, which reflected a dramatic rehabilitation of his reputation as a thug and bigot, but did not come around until later in his life, especially during the reign of Julian.[52] For Gregory, that Athanasius

---

[50] Jerome, *Epistle 52.8,* in *PL* 22.534-535.

[51] Gregory of Nazianzus, *Oration* 21.8: ἐπὶ τὸν Μάρκου θρόνον ἀνάγεται, οὐχ ἧττον τῆς εὐσεβείας, ἢ τῆς προεδρίας διάδοχος· τῇ μὲν γὰρ πολλοστὸς ἀπ'ἐκείνου, τῇ δὲ εὐθὺς μετ' ἐκεῖνον εὑρίσκεται· ἣν δὴ καὶ κυρίως ὑποληπτέον διαδοχήν. Τὸ μὲν γὰρ ὁμόγνωμον καὶ ὁμόθρονον, τὸ δὲ ἀντίδοξον καὶ ἀντίθρονον· καὶ ἡ μὲν προσηγορίαν, ἡ δὲ ἀλήθειαν ἔχει διαδοχῆς… οὐδὲ ὁ τἀναντία δοξάζων, ἀλλ' ὁ τῆς αὐτῆς πίστεως.

[52] Athanasius' exiles served to legitimate his position as a confessor, especially when Julian changed his mind and ordered troops to force him from Alexandria. Athanasius' connection to orthodoxy truly began much later after Nicaea, at which he probably had minimal participation, as Alexander was the bishop of Alexandria then and the chief opponent of Arius. *On the Decrees of the Council of Nicaea*, which he wrote in the 350s, marked the beginning of Athanasius' unrelenting advocacy of Nicaea as the orthodox faith. The succession of Athanasius' authority as an orthodox champion can be seen in the career of Epiphanius of Salamis, whom Rapp notes as one of the first bishops that a hagiographer celebrated as holy (Rapp 2005, 18), and who succeeded Athanasius as the next champion of orthodoxy. See Kim 2015, 104-140.

suffered exile was sufficient to make "him a martyr for the Orthodox cause."[53] T.D. Barnes notes that, "Athanasius was allowed to return to Alexandria as bishop of the city by a pagan emperor who soon turned to persecuting him—and thus established even more firmly his reputation as a steadfast defender of embattled orthodoxy."[54]

Later in 448 the heresiarch Eutyches, who in professing his orthodoxy, cited Athanasius as an authority that validated his beliefs. In rejecting the notion of Christ existing in two natures after union he says, "Order the reading of Saint Athanasius, so that you may know he says nothing such as that."[55] Eutyches maintained that he was following the faith as the Council of Nicaea had defined it and that the writings of Athanasius would defend his position. Here again, more than 75 years after his death, Athanasius' authority was still being invoked.

The invocation of a bishop's authority in justifying a doctrinal position was not limited to Athanasius, of course. Socrates writes of bishops who continued Eusebius of Nicomedia's theological platform after his death that "they succeeded in his authority."[56] So, not only was episcopal authority something that could live on after the holder's death, but it was transferable. If a bishop professed and taught as another deceased bishop had, the living one could say that he was the successor in faith and thus benefit from the authority of the decedent. Asserting virtual descent from Athanasius implied orthodoxy. For Gregory, this meant confessing the Nicene faith, and for later patriarchs it was the Chalcedonian faith.

---

[53] Rapp 2005, 297.
[54] Barnes 1993, 152.
[55] *ACO* 2.1.1. p.144: Εὐτυχὴς πρεσβύτερος εἶπεν· Ἀναγνωσθῆναι κελεύσατε τὰ τοῦ ἁγίου Ἀθανασίου, ἵνα γνῶτε ὅτι οὐδὲν τοιοῦτον λέγει.
[56] Socrates, *EH*, 2.1: Τοῦτο δὲ ἐποίησαν οἱ πρότερον μὲν Εὐσεβίῳ τῷ πάντα κυκῶντι συμπράττοντες, τότε δὴ τὴν ἐκείνου αὐθεντίαν διαδεξάμενοι.

Gregory gave his most systematic attempt to persuade Constantinopolitan Christians of the orthodoxy of his beliefs, and hence his own episcopal authority, in the *Five Theological Orations*, which he gave in the second of half 380, likely from the Anastasia Church. The orations argue against the theology of Arians (using the term as an umbrella) and Eunomius. They are the most thorough of Gregory's theological expositions on the Trinity. He delivered these orations to a mixed-faith audience; as he says, "Friends and brethren, which I still call you even though you are not acting brotherly."[57] Gregory makes the goal of his homilies, and his patriarchatw, clear at the end of *Oration* 31: "As much as I can, I will persuade all to worship the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit as one deity and power. For all glory, honor, and might are his, for ever and ever."[58] Convincing the populace of the truths of the Nicene faith, then, was the ultimate goal of these orations and of Gregory's position as patriarch. Despite the presence of dissidents in the audience, he hoped to convince them of the *homooousian* doctrine.

The first rhetorical goal of the *Orations* is to discredit the teachers of the Anomean doctrine. In *Oration* 27, Gregory derides them as "mere sophists, players of words and monstrous and unreasonable,"[59] and, "these showmen put on wrestling demonstrations in theaters."[60] As such, the words of the Eunomians or other Arian-spectrum groups are nothing more than those of hucksters attempting to deceive their audience—all flash and no content. By devaluing these preachers, Gregory no doubt intended for his audience to silently agree with him that they would not allow these "players of words" to trick them into undermining their faith. No

[57] Gregory of Nazianzus, *Oration* 27.5.1-2*:* Μηδαμῶς, ὦ φίλοι καὶ ἀδελφοί· ἀδελφοὺς γὰρ ὑμᾶς ἔτι καλῶ, καίπερ οὐκ ἀδελφικῶς ἔχοντας.
[58] Gregory of Nazianzus, *Oration* 31.33.15-17: τοὺς ἄλλους πείθειν εἰς δύναμιν προσκυνεῖν πατέρα, καὶ υἱόν, καὶ πνεῦμα ἅγιον, τὴν μίαν θεότητά τε καὶ δύναμιν· ὅτι αὐτῷ πᾶσα δόξα, τιμή, κράτος, εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας τῶν αἰώνων·
[59] Gregory of Nazianzus, *Oration* 27.1.12: ἴσως ἧττον ἂν ἦσαν σοφισταὶ καὶ κυβισταὶ λόγων ἄτοποι καὶ παράδοξοι
[60] Gregory of Nazianzus, *Oration* 27.2.3: ἐν τοῖς θεάτροις οἱ τὰ παλαίσματα δημοσιεύοντες.

one ever wants to be a fool, especially after receiving warning. Gregory's next step in undermining his theological opponents is to declare who had authority to speak and teach on theology. He first notes that, "It is not for everyone to philosophize about God,"[61] only those "who have been tested and have found a sound footing in study, and more importantly, have undergone or are undergoing purification of body and soul."[62]

Of course, Gregory is among those who can philosophize about God. Likening himself to Moses he says "Thus I ascended the mountain, I went through the cloud, becoming distant from material and material things, and concentrated on myself so far as possible."[63] This was his claim to authority that he possessed the theological credentials to expound on doctrine because he had undergone testing, studied, and purified himself, like Moses. Gregory's case, then, as to who is qualified for theological exposition, rested in the fact that "Such men—that is, Gregory—demonstrate the true understanding of the Trinity that flows from purified comprehension and thereby teach and guide others to the divine."[64] Gregory understood what the orthodox faith was; accordingly he was the true and exclusive episcopal authority who could lead his congregation to salvation.

Gregory's persuasiveness fell on deaf ears, though, as he failed to convince non-Nicenes, or loyalists of Demophilus, to accept the Nicene faith. The situation in Constantinople was contentious, and his sermons were doing nothing to convince non-Nicene Christians to accept his creed and his authority: "the whole city was rebelling with such violence, it was a strong and

[61] Gregory of Nazianzus, *Oration* 27.3.1: Οὐ παντός, ὦ οὗτοι, τὸ περὶ θεοῦ φιλοσοφεῖν, οὐ παντός.
[62] Gregory of Nazianzus, *Oration* 27.3.1: οὐ πάντων μέν, ὅτι τῶν ἐξητασμένων καὶ διαβεβηκότων ἐν θεωρίᾳ, καὶ πρὸ τούτων καὶ ψυχὴν καὶ σῶμα κεκαθαρμένων, ἢ καθαιρομένων, τὸ μετριώτατον.
[63] Gregory of Nazianzus, *Oration* 28.3.2-4: οὕτως ἀνῆλθον ἐπὶ τὸ ὄρος, καὶ τὴν νεφέλην διέσχον, εἴσω γενόμενος ἀπὸ τῆς ὕλης καὶ τῶν ὑλικῶν, καὶ εἰς ἐμαυτὸν ὡς οἷόν τε συστραφείς.
[64] Elm 2012a, 408.

terrible outburst of passion."[65] More than likely, it was not the "whole city" but a vocal group of anti-Nicene Christians. Gregory's autobiographical poem offers further insight into the events surrounding his entrance into the Church of the Holy Apostles, which came after the entrance of Theodosius I into the city.

Yet there is an apparent inconsistency in Gregory's account of this event, which highlights the problem of the patriarchate itself. Gregory praises Theodosius for his handling of Christians in the city: "he believed persuasion, not repression was right, particularly with regards to my position and to those whom I try to lead to God; for that which is forced to submit against its will, like an arrow held back by bowstring and hands…given the chance it defies the restraining force. But that which willingly submits stands firm forever."[66] This idealization depicts Theodosius as a wise emperor, because he understood "that persuasion (as practiced by Gregory) and not coercion were the way to deal with those of heretical opinion."[67] But this conflicts with Gregory's own report of Theodosius and his entrance in the Holy Apostles.

Shortly after this praise of Theodosius, Gregory recounts a scene in which the threat of force was clearly present. As the patriarch and emperor entered the church, "Armed soldiers held the church, secretly being stationed inside it. A growing mob rushed them…mixed between anger and entreaties, anger at me and entreaties at those in power."[68] Clearly, despite Gregory's praise of persuasion, coercion and the use of soldiers allowed Gregory's possession of the

---

[65] Gregory of Nazianzus, *Carmina de vita sua*, 1315-1316: οὕτως γὰρ ἦσαν ἡ πόλις κατὰ κράτος ἑστῶτες, ἡ πολλή τε καὶ δεινὴ ζέσις.

[66] Gregory of Nazianzus, *Carmina de vita sua*, 1293-1300: οὐ γὰρ κατείργειν, ἀλλὰ πείθειν ἔννομον εἶναι νομίζων, καὶ πρὸς ἡμῶν τι πλέον αὐτῶν τ' ἐκείνων, οὓς θεῷ προσάξομεν τὸ μὲν γὰρ ἀκούσιον κρατούμενον βίᾳ, ὥσπερ βέλος νευρᾷ τε καὶ χερσὶν δεθέν… καιροῦ διδόντος τὴν βίαν περιφρονεῖ. τὸ δ' ἑκούσιον βέβαιον εἰς πάντα χρόνον

[67] Elm 2012b, 242.

[68] Gregory of Nazianzus, *Carmina de vita sua*, 1325-1330: Παρῆν ὁ καιρός. τὸν νεὼν δ' εἶχε στρατός ξιφηφόρος, λαθραῖος ἐκτεταγμένος. ὁ δ' ἀντεπῄει δῆμος οἰδαίνων ἅπας… ὀργῇ καὶ λιταῖς μεμιγμένος, ὀργῇ καθ' ἡμῶν, πρὸς δὲ τὸ κράτος λιταῖς.

churches in Constantinople. That he needed them demonstrates the tenuous position he held as the patriarch of the Nicene Christians. His relationship with Theodosius I and access to imperial troops ensured that he could withstand the present mob. Gregory does not mention who had requested the troops, whether the emperor or even himself; regardless the intent was to protect him and whoever stationed them inside the church anticipated strife. The emperor had dispossessed the non-Nicenes of the church; obviously someone concluded (rightly) that there would be resistance.

Nearly ten months after proclaiming Nicene Christianity as the official religion of the Roman Empire, Theodosius I entered Constantinople on 24 November 380. A few days later, after Demophilus refused to accept the Nicene Creed, the emperor expelled all those who would not, including Demophilus, from the city. Soon after, Gregory abdicated his position, frustrated with his inability to convince the city of Nicene orthodoxy and despondent at his discovery of the conspiracy of the Alexandrians and Maximus the Cynic against him.[69]

Despite this dire picture, the Nicene Christians gained hold of the churches in Constantinople in quick order. After Theodosius I expelled Arian congregations from the churches of Constantinople, the Nicene congregations apparently could occupy the now vacant churches that the Arians were using. While this did not instantaneously win authority for Gregory, it was the beginning of a long, shaky process. Theodosius summoned an ecumenical council, which only an emperor could do, for the express purpose of establishing the Nicene Creed.[70] When the council gathered in Constantinople, it affirmed the Nicene Creed and ordained Nectarius the successor of Gregory.

[69] Sozomen, *EH*, 7.9.
[70] Socrates, *EH*, 5.8.

Theodosius' entry into Constantinople resembled a conquest in Gregory's account. And perhaps it felt that way to the non-Nicene Christians, as well. Theodosius came from the West and professed what was then in many Constantinopolitans' opinion, a heresy (Nicene Christianity). He forced out *their* bishop and installed his own. As always, it was dangerous to express direct anger at the emperor, but Gregory seemed to be a good alternative. After a probably ill-advised parade into the Holy Apostles, given how quickly after dispossessing the non-Nicenes they did so, Gregory claimed that members of his congregation caught a would-be assassin before he committed the crime, brought him in the middle of the night to the patriarch, and presented him, saying "This man, is your assassin."[71] However, of fourth and early fifth century sources, only Gregory mentions this assassin.

In all of Gregory's accounts of his tenure he uses a critical trope to underpin his time in Constantinople: the imitation of Jesus through persecution. In Gregory's accounts is the claim that because of his orthodox teachings, he suffers curses, stones, betrayal, and exile (which is self-imposed). Indeed, at one moment in his autobiography he exclaims "O my Christ, who summons to suffering those for whom you suffered, you were then leading me in me hardship…"[72] Susanna Elm notes that the influence of the martyrs likewise permeates Gregory's philosophical writings, who are present as "true philosophers."[73]

The actual extent of the non-Nicene harassment of Gregory is uncertain. Socrates and Sozomen mention nothing of the Easter stoning or riotous situation at the Holy Apostles.[74]

[71] Gregory, *Carmina* 1461-1462: „οὗτος," εἶπεν, „ὁ σφαγεύς σοῦ τοῦ τὸ φῶς βλέποντος ἐκ θεοῦ σκέπης.
[72] Gregory, *Carmina* 1321-1323: ὦ Χριστέ μου, ὃς οἷς πέπονθας εἰς τὸ πάσχειν ἐκκαλῇ, σὺ καὶ τότ' ἦσθα τῶν ἐμῶν πόνων βραβεύς
[73] Elm 2012a, 418-420.
[74] Socrates, *EH*, 5.6-8; Sozomen, *EH*, 7.5-7.

Sozomen does, however, say generally that Gregory "never complained of his many labors, or of the dangers he had incurred in the suppression of heresies."[75] So it seems that there was a general, if vague, knowledge of Gregory's alleged suffering. Whatever the true depths of that suffering were, Gregory obscures with his magnification and dramatization for rhetorical effect.

In contrast, no accounts report Nectarius suffering anything like Gregory reports. Even though Nectarius surely benefitted from an ecumenical council and Theodosius' support, as had Gregory, the decision of that council would not have immediately convinced Christians in Constantinople, if they were indeed the frothing and angry Arians Gregory depicts. True, as will become evident, Nectarius encountered resistance, but there is hardly mention of the pervasive stoning or riotous behavior that Gregory reported. Gregory's embellished account thus puts one foot into the genre of a martyr story, for good reason. He closed his farewell address to the bishops at the Council of Constantinople with the words, "Remember my stoning!"[76] Andrew Hofer shows that Gregory purposefully constructed his autobiographies to reflect the suffering of Jesus Christ.[77]

The allusion to suffering and persecution gave Gregory rhetorical legitimacy as a Christian. Gregory suggests that he has been suffering the same as all else who proclaimed the true faith, providential. Such a suggestion cultivates validity for his position as a Christian authority, at least in the memory of later Christians. Evidence for his success in doing so can be found in the fact that he is later cited as an orthodox authority at the Councils of Chalcedon and Constantinople II. His chapel, the Anastasia, also became associated with orthodoxy. His parting

[75] Sozomen, *EH*, 7.7.
[76] Gregory of Nazianzus, *Oration* 42.27: μέμνησθέ μου τῶν λιθασμῶν.
[77] Hoffer 2012, 152-155.

words to the chapel show both a reflection of his own accomplishments in Constantinople and a hope for what they would represent:

> Farewell my Anastasia, whose name is piety, for you have raised for us the doctrine which was despised. A place of our common victory, a modern Shiloh, where the tabernacle was first fixed… You grand and renowned temple, our new inheritance, whose greatness is due to the Word, what was once a Jebus has now been made by us a Jerusalem.[78]

In effect, the Anastasia was a symbol of Nicene triumph in a city of heresy. And as the example of Athanasius suggests, one could obtain authority through orthodox succession. However, explicitly identifying as Nicene limited his audience, as this argument would only be compelling to Nicene Christians. This is one reason Gregory never gained a solid hold of authority as patriarch.

- *Maintaining Authority: Nicene Successors and Growing Authority*

In a synodical letter to Rome summarizing the synod (not the ecumenical council) of Constantinople in 382, the bishops noted, "Then, if it is possible to say, in the newly established church in Constantinople, which, as though from the mouth of lion we recently snatched away from the blasphemy of the heretics with the mercy of God, we have ordained the most venerable and God loving Nectarius bishop."[79] They considered the church "newly established" only

[78] Gregory of Nazianzus, *Oration* 42.26: Χαίροις, Ἀναστασία μοι τῆς εὐσεβείας ἐπώνυμε. Σὺ γὰρ τὸν λόγον ἡμῖν ἐξανέστησας ἔτι καταφρονούμενον· τὸ τῆς κοινῆς νίκης χωρίον, ἡ νέα Σηλὼμ, ἐν ᾗ πρῶτον τὴν σκηνὴν ἐπήξαμεν, τεσσαράκοντα ἔτη περιφερομένην ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ καὶ πλανωμένην. Σύ τε ὁ μέγας ναὸς οὗτος καὶ περιβόητος, ἡ νέα κληρονομία, τὸ νῦν μέγας εἶναι παρὰ τοῦ Λόγου λαβὼν, ὃν Ἰεβοῦς πρότερον ὄντα, Ἱερουσαλὴμ πεποιήκαμεν

[79] Theodoret of Cyrrhus, *EH*, 5.9: ὅθεν τῆς μὲν ἐν Κωνσταντινουπόλει νεοπαγοῦς, ὡς ἂν εἴποι τις, ἐκκλησίας, ἣν ὥσπερ ἐκ στόματος λέον τος τῆς τῶν αἱρετικῶν βλασφημίας ὑπόγυον ἐξηρπάσαμεν διὰ τῶν οἰκτιρμῶν τοῦ θεοῦ τὸν αἰδεσιμώτατον καὶ θεοφιλέστατον Νεκτάριον ἐπίσκοπον κεχειροτονήκαμεν

because a different group of Christians had held it up until that point. They reframe it as a providential victory.

Not much is known about the life of Nectarius, Gregory's successor, other than that he was a Nicene Christian, a senator, and a former city prefect.[80] His tenure, with one important exception of a riot in 388, contains none of the turmoil of Gregory's. Gilbert Dagron observed that "there are few significant events in the episcopacy of Nectarius," and yet, "the Church of Constantinople is profoundly transformed," in no small part due to the patriarch's management, he was able to "achieve internal pacification."[81] As with the rest of Dagron's focus on the patriarchate, he quickly moves on to the patriarch's actions in outside provinces.[82] Importantly, though, Dagron's condensed observation of "internal pacification" is an achievement that is only possible because of Nectarius' careful actions.

Following the Council of Constantinople, there is no evidence for a sudden mass 'conversion' to Nicene Christianity, "although the vast majority of the city did not rally it is orthodoxy that triumphs, ultimately, over the Arians."[83] Perhaps it is better, then, to understand the Council of Constantinople and its effects not as a triumph of orthodoxy but a forced implementation of a new form of Christianity in the city. Any "triumph" must be understood to simply mean the removal of challenges to Nicene control of the patriarchate. Furthermore, it cemented Athanasius' role as a "Father of Orthodoxy" for this line of patriarchs, a virtual apostle

[80] See *PLRE* I, p. 621.
[81] Dagron 1974, 461: *De l'épiscopat de Nectaire ressortent peu d'événements marquants; et pourtant, à l'issue de ces quelques années, l'Eglise de Constantinople est profondément transformée. La diplomatie du nouvel évêque, dont la tolérance est parfois appelée « complaisance » a l'égard des hérétiques, parvient à réaliser une œuvre de pacification intérieur.*
[82] Dagron 1974, 461-463.
[83] Dagron 1974, 454: *même si la grande majorité de la population de la ville ne s'y rallie pas, c'est l'orthodoxie qui triomphe, en fin de compte, des particularismes ariens*

upon whom they could claim lineage, as Gregory had. Non-Nicenes simply left the walls of the city for worship. Eventually being de-centralized after the death of Demophilus, they became fractured and seem to have quickly lost a sense of organization.[84] Despite this, later there are some instances of non-Nicene dissent, but they become fewer and fewer throughout the decades. In fact, a policy of salutary neglect seems to have arisen amongst the emperor and patriarch. Even though there were numerous laws forbidding non-Nicene Christians from assembling in Constantinople, as late as the time of Nestorius Arians had a small chapel in the city.[85]

Nectarius seems to have been the better man for the job in establishing Nicene authority in Constantinople. The reason that "few significant events" enter the historical record during his tenure is not because he simply did not do anything; rather he likely managed to perform his job without causing any unnecessary strife. More germane, he could manage his see's affairs without significant challenge to his authority. As a senator, he probably had a good sense of negotiation and the subtlety required to push through an agenda. More importantly, he likely understood the mechanisms of imperial law, which he used to his benefit in neutering any potential challengers to his authority. He applied his wisdom in such matters soon after becoming patriarch.

Nectarius began his tenure as the chief beneficiary of law that Theodosius I decreed in support of the Council of Constantinople's decisions. The law defined those who were in communion with Nectarius and Timothy of Alexandria—specifically, Nicene Christians—as orthodox and restricted ownership of churches to them.[86] As such, bishops in other dioceses had

[84] After refusing to confirm the Nicene Creed, Demophilus agreed to leave Constantinople and held his assemblies outside the walls, see Socrates, *EH*, 5.7. After the death of Demophilus in 386, another bishop took his place, whom another supplanted in turn, pointing to a succession crisis. See Sozomen, *EH*, 7.14 and Socrates, *EH*, 5.12, both say that Demophilus died a year after Arcadius' first consulate (385).
[85] Socrates, *EH*, 7.32.
[86] *CTh* 16.1.3.

an incentive to commune with Nectarius and accept his confession. This law and its context encapsulate the nature of the patriarchate's authority in its early decades. Cooperation with him might come as the result as a legal incentive instead of obedience.

Gregory, however, continued to make his presence felt in Constantinople. In a letter from Gregory to Nectarius, from 383, he warns of the dangers of allowing Apollinarianism to continue unabated and reveals the exclusionary mindset of orthodoxy. He elaborates the position of the heresy and explains its faults. He then poses the significance of the problem in allowing the existence of the heresy and instructing Nectarius on how to solve it:

> Nature does not hold two contrary doctrines on the same subject to both be true. How could your noble and lofty mind suspend your usual courage in regards to correcting so great an evil? Even though there is no precedent for such a course, let your inimitable virtue stand up at a crisis such as the present and teach our most pious Emperor. No gain will come from his zeal for the Church on other points if he allows this evil to gain strength from *parrhesia* for the subversion of sound faith.[87]

Gregory makes clear there is no room for "two contrary doctrines on the same subject both being true," claiming that truth is objective and exclusionary. In this case the truth is the Nicene faith. Gregory intended Nectarius to conclude as much and understand the Nicene doctrine as true and the Apollinarian as false and unnatural. Gregory then poses a rhetorical question that praises Nectarius' character if only to compel him to fulfill his subsequent instruction. The stakes are raised to dramatic tones in the letter. Despite Gregory's claim that there was "no precedent for such a course," there are plentiful examples of bishops petitioning the emperor for suppression of a heresy, especially by 383. The last sentence was a strident reminder to Nectarius that he

[87] Gregory of Nazianzus, *Epistle* 202.20-22: Δύο γὰρ ἐναντίους λόγους περὶ τοῦ αὐτοῦ πράγματος ἀληθεῖς εἶναι φύσιν οὐκ ἔχει. Πῶς οὖν ὑπέμεινέ σου ἡ μεγαλοφυὴς καὶ ὑψηλὴ διάνοια μὴ χρήσασθαι τῇ συνήθει παρρησίᾳ εἰς διόρθωσιν τοῦ τοσούτου κακοῦ; Ἀλλ' εἰ καὶ μὴ πρότερον τοῦτο γέγονε, νῦν γοῦν διαναστήτω ἡ ἀμίμητός σου ἐπ' ἀρετῇ τελειότης καὶ διδαξάτω τὸν ὐσεβέστατον βασιλέα ὅτι οὐδὲν κέρδος ἔσται τῆς λοιπῆς αὐτοῦ περὶ τὰς Ἐκκλησίας σπουδῆς, εἰ τὸ τοιοῦτο κακὸν ἐπὶ καθαιρέσει τῆς ὑγιαινούσης πίστεως διὰ τῆς παρρησίας αὐτῶν κατισχύσει.

occupied a particularly advantageous position for someone seeking to impose their doctrine. More so, as the closest representative of the Nicene faithful to emperor, Nectarius could help their doctrine by ensuring the suppression of a rival group. This letter was a suggestion that Nectarius should persuade the emperor to suppress dissident Christians.

This letter reflects a key understanding of authority that Nectarius represented in his position. Simply having the ability to persuade an emperor to take a course of action convinced other people that the patriarch was worth obeying. If even the emperor followed the patriarch's advice, then surely that man had advice worth following. Bishops used this ability, *parrhesia*, increasingly in Late Antiquity. Gregory reminds Nectarius of this by saying that, in allowing the Apollinarians unfettered ability to petition the emperor, he is ceding his own *parrhesia*, specifically using the word. The patriarch of Constantinople occupied a particular advantageous position because of this, as Brown explains: "It was the flesh and bone of access to the imperial power that came to count in the fifth century."[88] Elm notes that Gregory in particular represents the "processes" by which bishops convinced their peers of their "legitimate authority."[89] So success on this front would affirm the patriarch as authoritative because even the emperor listened to him and in constructing orthodoxy.

The urgency in Gregory's letter reflects a concern that Theodosius was not enforcing the decisions of ecumenical councils regarding orthodoxy. Socrates notes that Theodosius was permissive and tolerant, allowing heretical groups to assemble, not persecuting any of them, except the Eunomians.[90] While this might reflect historical reality to a degree, such a depiction

[88] Brown 1992, 136.
[89] Elm 2012, 483.
[90] Socrates, *EH*, 5.20.

also fits into Socrates' theme that concord was the supreme virtue for Christians. In the same chapter as his praise of Theodosius he notes that the heretical groups, being separatists, descended into conflict amongst themselves. The already schismatic Novatians fell into another schism amongst themselves,[91] the Arians came into another conflict about the terminology of the Godhead,[92] and the Eunomians splintered into various sects.[93] Unity and concord thus held together the Church, whereas theological quibbling and persecution resulted in myriad decentralized and hostile groups, at least according to Socrates' sense of Christian history. Returning to Gregory's exhortations and Theodosius' leniency, there was a clear divergence of interests when it came to religion. The emperor wanted consensus, and the patriarch wanted only orthodox believers. Emperors were remarkably tolerant of heterodoxy, whereas the patriarchs were not. One explanation for this other than simple intolerance was that the patriarch was the head of an institution (the church) that professed the true faith, which was exclusive. Emperors, on the other hand—while no doubt having deep religious convictions themselves—hoped for universal concordance and would accept the presence of heretical groups provided there was relative peace in the ecclesiastical world. Even though the Nicenes clearly held privilege and power in Constantinople, the fact that so many heretical sects were going on unabated alarmed him. This is why he notified Nectarius, an elderly man who was not even baptized when he became patriarch, that he had better put a check to the situation. Nectarius seemingly followed through with Gregory's suggestions.

[91] Socrates, *EH*, 5.21.
[92] Socrates, *EH*, 5.23.
[93] Socrates, *EH*, 5.24.

Socrates, and Sozomen closely following him, tells of another synod in Constantinople following that of 382.[94] In June 383, the emperor, at Nectarius' suggestion, asked for a written profession of faith from the each sect in Constantinople. When Theodosius discovered that the non-Nicene sects did not subscribe to the *homoousian* creed, he issued a law on 25 July 383 barring them from assembling in the city.[95] Not among those sects, however, were the Apollinarians. It is likely then that after July 383 Gregory learned of the situation in his former see and wrote Nectarius to educate him on the danger of the Apollinarians so that he might likewise instruct the emperor on the heretics. This appears to have happened, as two laws came forth that prevented heretics, this time specifically naming the Apollinarians, from assembling in Constantinople or elsewhere, one on 3 December 383 and the other on 21 January 384.[96] Theodosius renewed these laws with a similar edict on 10 March 388 that also forbade the Apollinarians from appealing the prohibitions at the imperial court.[97] Presumably, they were entreating the emperor to rescind the restrictive laws of 383-384 to the point of annoyance of either Nectarius or Theodosius himself.

The result of these laws was that there were fewer sects in Constantinople that had the ability to compete with the Nicenes in drawing congregations. Together with the force of imperial law, the Nicenes had emerged as the dominant Christian faction in Constantinople. The circumstances of the promulgation of these laws, though nowhere explicitly evident, suggest that Nectarius' petitioning of Theodosius was successful, and he received the civic support necessary in physically removing his rivals. Of course, while Theodosius might not have enforced these

[94] Socrates, *EH*, 5.10; and Sozomen, *EH*, 7.12.
[95] *CTh* 16.5.11.
[96] *CTh* 16.5.12 and 16.5.13.
[97] *CTh* 16.5.14.

laws often, they contributed to the creation of a climate that discouraged non-Nicene Christianity and encouraged participation in the faith of the emperor. Furthermore, this removed potential challengers to Nectarius' authority. It was a brute and simple solution to a complex problem. Persuasion would clearly not work to bridge the gap between Nicene and non-Nicene, as the tenure of Gregory proved. Instead of attempting to negotiate with members of rival factions, Nectarius simply prevented them from worshiping in the city, leaving his congregation as the only choice for Christians to worship in the city.

Despite what appeared to be a successful collaboration between emperor and patriarch in the installation of the Nicene faith as the orthodox faith of Constantinople, the Nicenes' hold over the churches could slip at any moment in the right circumstances. During the usurpation of Maximus in 388, a rumor spread that Theodosius I had died in battle. Shortly after the rumor reached Constantinople, it galvanized the Arians into retaking their churches. They began their campaign by burning down the *episcopeion* adjacent to the Great Church, among other violent acts.[98] Possession of the churches of Constantinople, specifically the cathedral church, the Great Church, Hagia Eirine, and the Holy Apostles, signified ecclesiastical power. The holder of those churches was traditionally the dominant Christian faction and thereby the orthodox group in Constantinople. After eight years, the bitterness and hurt that the Arian groups felt after their dispossession still smoldered. Socrates and Sozomen attribute the Arian attack to their resentment: "then the Arians, who had been greatly distressed by those ruling the churches within the city who had before been the objects of their persecution."[99] They attacked the symbol

[98] Socrates, *EH*, 5.13 and Sozomen, *EH*, 7.14.
[99] Socrates, *EH*, 5.13: Τότε δὴ καὶ οἱ Ἀρειανίζοντες ἐκ πάθους κινούμενοι σφόδρα γὰρ ἠνιῶντο, ὅτι τῶν ἔνδον ἐκκλησιῶν ἐκράτουν οἱ παρ' αὐτῶν πρότερον διωκόμενοι. τὰς φήμας πολλαπλασίους εἰργάζοντο.

of their enemy, the house of the patriarch, who was the leader of the group that displaced them, "the Arians perceived the *episkopeion* as a prominent symbol of Nicene Christian authority."[100] This event is critical to analysis of the authority of the patriarch, because other than sitting on the patriarchal throne itself, residing in the *episkopeion* was one of the few tangible symbols of authority. Whoever resided in the *episkopeion* clearly held the authority of the patriarch's office.

Rumor of Theodosius' sudden defeat emboldened the Arians into action. With the death of that emperor, they hoped for a more agreeable ecclesiastical climate for themselves at the ascension of a new one. It was clear to them that Theodosius was at the ready to supply the Nicene patriarch with soldiers and confiscate properties on his behalf. Believing him to be dead, they did not fear any counter-strike from imperial troops. Despite the appearances of the Nicene patriarchate having established its authority within Constantinople—since an ecumenical council had declared its doctrine orthodox and gained control of the major churches in the city—in 388 it was still reliant upon the emperor for its position.

When the support of the emperor seemed to become compromised, or was in fact lost, dissident Christians saw an opportunity for themselves to gain authority. This Arian "rebellion" shows that it was one thing to gain authority and quite another to keep it. The latent threat of the soldiers' physical force was one way to maintain episcopal authority. That the Arians had attacked only after they believed that the threat of violent retaliation did not exist shows this. This was why the enforcement laws against heretics, which threatened oppression and physical coercion, seldom needed actual physical action. The threat was compelling enough. However,

---

Sozomen, *EH*, 7.14: They rushed and set the house of Nectarius the bishop on fire, being angry at the power that he had over the churches. καταδραμόντες Νεκταρίου τοῦ ἐπισκόπου τὴν οἰκίαν ἐνέπρησαν, χαλεπαίνοντες ὅτι τῶν ἐκκλησιῶν ἐκράτει.

[100] Mayer 2000, 51.

even though that threat always existed in the imperial city, patriarchs' goal was usually to use rhetoric through their preaching to convince others of their position as an orthodox authority.

Excepting the events of 388, Nectarius' tenure was considerably more successful compared to Gregory's. At the least, he died in office. Other than the brief riot in 388 and the continued assembly of Apollinarians, there appears to have been no other challenge to Nectarius' authority. Factors accounting for this include the settling of emotions on the part of Constantinopolitans from Theodosius and Gregory's first entry in to the Holy Apostles, a more experienced and informed appraisal of the religious situation in the city on the part of emperor and patriarch, and the fact that Nectarius seems to have purposefully avoided conflict.

Yet, in comparing the tenures of Gregory and Nectarius, it should be noted that the relative peace of Nectarius' patriarchate might have come at a cost. When John Chrysostom came to Constantinople, some of his first actions were reviewing his office's financial records.[101] Evidently, he found extravagant expenses paid out to various groups, and "Apparently slander was being directed against the church for 'selling Christ' at all levels. Chrysostom soon initiated reforms."[102] As part of the expenditures Chrysostom objected to, Nectarius had apportioned a large sum of the office's budget for entertaining and feeding guests.[103] The evidence for this is that one of the criticisms about Chrysostom was that he ate alone and severely cut the hospitality budget.[104] Nectarius probably used these meals to win good standing with various people and groups, perhaps sponsoring some of their activities in exchange for peaceful relations in the city amongst the various doctrinal rivals.

---

[101] Palladius, *Dialogue,* 5. The financial reforms of John were among many others listed in this chapter.
[102] Caner 2002, 174.
[103] J.N.D. Kelly elaborates on these in detail; see Kelly 1995, 118-123.
[104] Palladius, *Dialogue*, 12.

Whatever goodwill in Constantinople Nectarius had built up John Chrysostom quickly dashed. Despite the likelihood that most Constantinopolitans were not Nicene, at least in the beginning of his tenure, Nectarius managed to run the see with relative few incidents. (And perhaps it is worth the conjecture that given Nectarius was not even yet ordained a priest when he became patriarch, he might not have had strong views on doctrine anyhow.)

The troubles of Chrysostom's tenure are well known, and the reasons for his eventual removal from office are many. Scholars have identified many causes for his removal, such as the powerful influence of Theophilus of Alexandria upon Emperor Arcadius,[105] offending the Empress Eudoxia,[106] and installing his own bishops in sees outside his jurisdiction.[107] All of these factors certainly contributed to John's downfall. Yet, upon reviewing the sources, he never could secure a position of authority in Constantinople. Almost immediately, Chrysostom faced challenges to his authority from clergy and monastics, mostly from reactions to his reforms.

The monks of Constantinople were a unique urban phenomenon, which Dagron characterized as a "social class."[108] Dagron also suggests that the troubles Chrysostom experienced, in addition to those of Gregory and Nestorius, might be attributed to doctrinal differences between the patriarch and the monasteries, because these three patriarchs were ardently Nicene and the monks of Constantinople harbored *homoean* beliefs.[109]

---

[105] This argument is dated, but was popular long ago. It relies on the assumption that Arcadius was a "weak" emperor. See Baur 1960, v.2, pp.192-298.
[106] Holum 1982, 48-78.
[107] Liebeschuetz 1990, 195-197 and, Elm 1998, 74-75.
[108] See Dagron 1970, 253-257 for how urban monasticism in Constantinople was distinct from other major cities in the Empire. Dagron concludes about monks in the imperial city: *C'est à Constantinople seulement, et pendant moins d'un siècle, qu'un conflit spirituel et une opposition sociale, dont on trouve des exemples partout ailleurs en Orient et bien au-delà du concile de Chalcédoine, prennent les proportions et la permanence d'un problème historique. L'histoire de la capitale est en jeu.* Dagron 1970, 276.
[109] Dagron 1970, 257-270.

The context of Constantinopolitan monasticism and the unyielding nature of Chrysostom quickly created a mutually hostile situation. Early in his tenure, John began speaking against "false" monks, or those who simply collected alms, explaining that the work of monks was spiritual.[110] Paul's advice in 1 Thessalonians 4:11 guided John in his dealings with these monks. He implored them to perform manual labor as the Apostle had, exhorting them to "work with your hands."[111] The real fear of a man who had not only advocated for monastic lifestyles in *Adversus oppugnatores vitae monasticae*, but himself was an ascetic monk was that people would think monks who prayed instead of worked were nothing more than beggars trying to get undeserved charity. Probably there were a number of able-bodied beggars who passed themselves off as monks and sullied genuine monks' reputations, but it is impossible to verify how many of these sorts there were. These were not doubt the "Christmongers" that Chrysostom spoke of in his homily.

After his reformation of the clergy in Constantinople, Palladius next lists Chrysostom's reforms of monks, and it is clear that the patriarch was targeting alms-seeking: "he disturbed the numerous purse-worshippers, and then attended to their manner of life, urging them to be content with their own earnings, and not to be always dangling after the savory odors of the rich."[112] In

[110] See Caner 2002, 169-177 and 190-199 for Chrysostom and his dealings with monks in Constantinople.
[111] John Chrysostom, *In 1 Thess. IV, Homily* 6.1, in *PG* 62.429-430: Do not take and consume, work to give to others. For he is blessed, he says, who gives rather than takes. And work, he says, with your hands. Indeed, where are those who seek spiritual deeds? Do you see how he takes away every excuse from them, saying, with your hands…If there are those who are scandalized by this among us, much more than those outside who look for accusations and opportunities when they see a healthy man able to support himself begging and asking help from others. Because of this they, the outsiders, call us Christmongers. ὥστε μὴ λαμβάνειν μηδὲ ἀργεῖν, ἀλλ' ἐργαζόμενον ἑτέροις παρέχειν. Μακάριον γάρ ἐστι, φησὶ, διδόναι μᾶλλον, ἢ λαμβάνειν. Καὶ ἐργάζεσθαι, φησὶ, ταῖς χερσὶν ὑμῶν. Ποῦ τοίνυν εἰσὶν οἱ τὸ ἔργον ζητοῦντες τὸ πνευματικόν; Ὁρᾷς πῶς αὐτοῖς πᾶσαν πρόφασιν ἀνεῖλεν εἰπὼν, Ταῖς χερσὶν ὑμῶν… Εἰ γὰρ οἱ παρ' ἡμῖν σκανδαλίζονται τούτοις, πολλῷ μᾶλλον οἱ ἔξωθεν μυρίας εὑρίσκοντες κατηγορίας καὶ λαβὰς, ὅταν ἄνθρωπον ὑγιαίνοντα, καὶ ἑαυτῷ ἀρκέσαι δυνάμενον ὁρῶσιν ἐπαιτοῦντα, καὶ ἑτέρων δεόμενον. Διὸ καὶ Χριστεμπόρους καλοῦσιν ἡμᾶς.
[112] Palladius, *Dialogue*, 5.

Chrysostom's opinion, monks should remain within their monastery and not seek financial benefit in the outside world. Doubtless he formed this opinion through his own experience as an anchorite.

Further challenging the position of the monks of the city, Chrysostom next took control of hospitals as part of his larger program of subjecting religious activity to the patriarchate, which had traditionally been under the supervision of monasteries.[113] John did so by placing subordinates in charge of the hospitals:

> This brought to his attention another financial matter: the expenses of the episcopacy and he ordered the extravagance to be transferred to the hospital. He built more hospitals, appointing two pious priests over them, and doctors and cooks and useful workers from the celibate to help them.[114]

In doing so, the patriarchate claimed patronage over medical institutions, which monks previously operated. By appointing priests instead of monks to oversee the operation of the hospitals, Chrysostom ensured that he had within them agents who were directly under his control.

Such sudden ruptures in the operations of monastic communities in Constantinople no doubt angered the monks and made them happy to comply with Theophilus of Alexandria in his quest to depose John. While John exercised immense authority over these monks, he went too far in their eyes and turned against him. Wresting control of charitable operations from groups outside the hierarchy of the patriarchate, which monasteries were prior to the Council of Chalcedon,[115] ensured that these institutions were subordinate to the patriarch's authority.

---

[113] See Miller 1997, 118-140 for hospitals and orphanages during this period.

[114] Palladius, *Dialogue*, 5: Ἔρχεται εἰς τὸ μέρος τοῦ ἀναλώματος τοῦ ἐπισκοπείου καὶ εὑρίσκει δαψίλειαν οὐ τὴν τυχοῦσαν καὶ κελεύει μετενεχθῆναι τὴν πολυτέλειαν τούτων εἰς τὸ νοσοκομεῖον. Περιττευούσης δὲ τῆς χρείας, κτίζει πλείονα νοσοκομεῖα, προσκαταστήσας δύο τῶν εὐλαβῶν πρεσβυτέρων, ἔτι μὴν καὶ ἰατροὺς καὶ μαγείρους καὶ χρηστοὺς τῶν ἀγάμων ἐργάτας τούτοις εἰς ὑπηρεσίαν.

[115] The fourth canon of Chalcedon placed monks and monasteries under the jurisdiction of bishops.

Despite Chrysostom's sudden and dramatic exile, his tenure resonated deeply with a large number of vocal Christians in Constantinople. In fact, Chrysostom's supporters immediately remembered him as a martyr after his death in 407, as *The Funerary Speech for John Chrysostom* reveals. Upon his first return, the enemies of John "rushed to persecution,"[116] which resulted in the second exile of John and his eventual martyrdom.[117] Again, marginalized Christian groups or those who experienced a sudden loss of privileges employed claims of persecution to justify their own positions. More important for the focus of this study, "John's reputation as an orthodox bishop became the intense focus of a Johannite faction immediately after his death."[118] His loyalists invoked his memory as a Nicene-orthodox figure and then used that as a rallying point to portray their ecclesiastical foes as heretical persecutors whom Theophilus had manipulated.

Palladius—perhaps John's most vocal partisan—claimed that either John's successor, Atticus, or an imperial representative sent a messenger to him and other Johannites offering a cash bribe if they would accept communion with the patriarch, which they refused.[119] After John Chrysostom's exile from Constantinople, those loyal to him refused communion with whatever patriarch was in office: first with John's successor Arsacius (Nectarius' brother) and then Atticus after him. Palladius presents Arsacius as an ambitious, oath-breaking man.[120] Chrysostom's orthodoxy and thus authority was so striking to this group of Christians that there could be no adequate replacement for him, especially since he did not depart them willingly or by death. So

[116] *The Funerary Speech for John Chrysostom*, 96.
[117] *The Funerary Speech for John Chrysostom*, 133.
[118] Barry 2016, 397.
[119] Palladius, *Dialogue*, 4.
[120] Palladius, *Dialogue*, 11.

the Johannites' confidence in their spiritual leader proved correct when they themselves suffered for their beliefs, even if they embellished the extent of their suffering the effects of the stories remained the same.

In addition to financial incentives to join in communion with the Constantinopolitan church, Palladius alleges severe physical abuse, raising the specter of a "rumor" that the government was throwing friends of Chrysostom into the sea and that clergy were beating other followers of Chrysostom.[121] A flaying is also among his list of abuses: "Stephanus the ascetic was flogged at Constantinople, thrown into prison for ten months…he was offered his freedom, on condition of communion [with Atticus]. Upon his refusal his skin was most cruelly torn from his ribs and breast; I myself have seen the marks."[122] Palladius also gives lists of priests and bishops whom Atticus effectively exiled for being Johannites. While this would have been an effective, if cold and brutal strategy, Palladius' acrimony clouds the likely truth.

One such bishop he lists was Silvanus of Troas, and how he ended up in that city is different according to Socrates. Atticus first ordained Silvanus as bishop of Philippopolis, which is now Plovdiv in Bulgaria. However, Silvanus apparently was a sickly man who could not withstand the climate of that city. Atticus took mercy on the man and recalled him to Constantinople, but after the bishop of Troas died, Atticus consecrated Silvanus as bishop of that city.[123] Perhaps the most accurate of Palladius' claims, however, was that Atticus forced Christians into communion with him by obtaining a law that forbade Christians who claimed to be orthodox but rejected communion with "Arsacius, Theophilius, or Porphyrius" from

[121] Palladius, *Dialogue*, 20. Also reported in *The Funerary Speech for John Chrysostom*, 116.
[122] Palladius, *Dialogue*, 20.
[123] Socrates, *EH*, 7.37.

assembling, dated 18 November 404.[124] Ultimately, Atticus later resolved this small schism by inserting John's names into the diptychs, which prompted his followers to resume communion with the church of Constantinople.[125]

In this case, Chrysostom's authority was so convincing to his followers that they would not accept the authority of any person associated with his removal. Atticus' first attempt at compelling the Johannites to return to the Church through legal disabilities must have failed. However, his next attempt, honoring John in the liturgy, was successful because he essentially remedied their complaints and presented John's exile as the Church's error. A conciliatory, rather than a punitive, policy restored order and thus preserve the standing of Atticus' authority.

The intents and effects of such policies were diverse. One reason for patriarchs forbidding the assembly of their rivals was so that they could better control the reception of their authority by conditioning a receptive audience. Patriarchs could goad the emperor into enforcing legal disabilities of other Christian groups, limiting potential challengers to their authority. In another instance similar to Nectarius and Atticus (who benefited from laws that prevented the assembly groups not in communion with them), upon becoming patriarch Nestorius publicly requested that Theodosius II "purge the earth of heretics."[126] Nestorius could then enact a law renewing the suppression of these "heretics."[127]

Here, it must be understood that "heretics" refers to groups not in communion with the Church of Constantinople, of which Nestorius was patriarch. The patriarch claimed that he was

[124] *CTh* 16.4.6. Either there is a law that the *Codex* did not preserve that specifically mentions communion with Atticus that is now lost, or Palladius mistakenly believed the law meant Atticus instead of his predecessor Arsacius,
[125] See p.148-149 of this study.
[126] Socrates, *EH*, 7.29
[127] *CTh* 16.5.65; and, Nestorius, in Loofs, 1905, 205.

the author of the law: "I devised a law against those who say that Christ is pure man and against other heretics."[128] Scholars have not reached a consensus as to the accuracy of Nestorius' claim,[129] although the circumstantial evidence suggests as much. Nestorius was infamous for his intolerance of divergent Christian sects and the law is likewise intolerant.

Furthermore, Nestorius' probable involvement with the authorship of *Codex Theodosianus* 16.5.65 suggests an *ad hoc* involvement with the imperial consistory. The authorship of laws was traditionally the purview of the *quaestor sacri palatii*. This was an important office, which the *Notitia Dignitatum* lists as sixth in hierarchy. To be a *quaestor*, one had to be of *illustris* rank. Antiochus Chuzon was the quaestor (427-430) contemporary with Nestorius. These years of legal experience doubtless helped Chuzon later, when he contributed to the assembling of the *Codex Theodosianus*. Correspondence between the former *quaestor* and patriarch reveals that the two men had a genial, if not sympathetic, relationship.[130] While this is circumstantial, it suggests that even if the patriarch was never personally present in the consistory to present or debate on legislation, he could indirectly have a say through connections in the council.

Similarly, John Chrysostom used his close relationship with the imperial consistory to procure laws in exchange for cooperation in securing his objectives outside Constantinople. Chrysostom used both imperial law and financial resources from private donors in Constantinople to see to the destruction of pagan temples in Phoenecia.[131] He brokered imperial

[128] Nestorius, in Loofs, 1905, 205: *Tanquam ego Christum purum hominem definirem, qui certe legem inter ipsae meae ordinitationis initia contra eos, qui Christum purum hominem dicunt, et contra reliquas haereses innovavi.*
[129] Holum 1982, 150-1, agrees with Nestorius' claim here, but Rougé and Delmaire 2005, 336, hold serious reservations about the truth of this claim.
[130] Honoré 1998, 115-116.
[131] Theodoret, *EH*, 5.29.

edicts for his causes in other sees and in return for compliance with his wishes. In one instance, John obtained an edict for the bishop of Cyrrhus to expel Marcionites from his see.[132] In another, during the period in Asia where he deposed bishops who had committed simony, in exchange for their peaceful cooperation he offered them an imperial edict pardoning them from curial service.[133] Chrysostom's obtainment of edicts to sanction his projects illustrates well how the patriarch used imperial law and resources to achieve his visions of ecclesiastical order and incentivize cooperation with his agenda. This, however, points to the limitations of authority. Even if other bishops were willing to do as Chrysostom asked, there were practical consequences for their compliance that the patriarch had to mitigate in return. In this respect, patriarchs' authority could be reduced to a *quid pro quo* relationship in which both parties benefited.

- *Ecumenical Recognition of Authority: Evidence from Councils*

The patriarch's position at synods and ecumenical councils reveals the office's growing ecumenical authority. With no official bishop at the time, Constantinople technically had no person sitting at its Council, on which Meletius of Antioch presided at the beginning. However, after Meletius ordained Gregory of Nazianzus patriarch of Constantinople, the Antiochene died and the presidency of the council transferred to Gregory. Upon his resignation from the office, Nectarius took the presidency of the council after his ordination. The circumstances in 381 were unusual, and it is not clear if Meletius would have retained his presidency of the council if he had not died and which he held because Timothy of Alexandria had not yet arrived at the

[132] Theodoret, *EH*, 5.31.
[133] Palladius, *Dialogue*, 15.

commencement of the council. At Chalcedon the patriarch was seated second, after Pope Leo's representatives, and at Constantinople II, where the pope declined attendance, the patriarch sat first. Other than an outward sign of authority, the seating of bishop gave him considerable power, which is why at the Council of Chalcedon the assembled bishops loyal to the patriarch of Constantinople aired their grievances about the past treatment of Flavian.

During the reading of the acts of Ephesus II at Chalcedon, the assembled bishops complained about where the earlier synod had sat Flavian that "he was not seated in his proper place," and they questioned "why the bishop of Constantinople was placed fifth."[134] The order of seating reflected the bishop's hierarchical position, and there were honor and privileges that came along with that position. Nestorius, writing in exile about Ephesus II, noted that Dioscorus sat where Flavian should have, thus signifying that the Alexandrian "had the power of authority" in presiding over the council.[135] Indeed, because he sat in the presiding chair Dioscorus had the authority to allow only the bishops he wanted into the church for the council and Theodosius II had given him the manpower to back up his wishes, which included the prevention of Flavian's ally Eusebius of Dorylaeum from entering.[136] As president of the council, he controlled the agenda, and the "presentation of the issue for consideration was made by the president of the

[134] *ACO* 2.1.p.70-72 and 77-78: And Flavian of Constantinople [the acts showing that he was fifth in seating]. During the reading of this, the Oriental bishops and those with the most devout bishops cried out, "Flavian came in as already condemned! It is agreed that it was a false accusation. Why was Flavian not seated in his spot? Why was the bishop of Constantinople placed fifth?" And Paskasinus the most devout bishop said, "Look, we made lord Anatolius first, in accordance with the will of God. They placed the blessed Flavian fifth!" Καὶ Φλαβιανοῦ Κωνσταντινουπόλεως. Καὶ ἐν τῷ ἀναγινώσκεσθαι οἱ Ἀνατολικοὶ καὶ οἱ σὺν αὐτοῖς εὐλαβέστατοι ἐπίσκοποι ἐξεβόησαν• Φλαβιανὸς ὡς κατάκριτος εἰσῆλθεν. αὕτη ὁμολογουμένη συκοφαντία. Φλαβιανός ἐν τῷ ἰδίῳ τόπῳ διὰ τί οὐκ ἐκαθέσθη; τὸν Κωνσταντινουπόλεως ἐπίσκοπον διὰ τί πέμπτον ἔταξαν; Πασκασῖνος ὁ εὐλαβέστατος ἐπίσκοπος εἶπεν• Ἴδε ἡμεῖς θεοῦ θέλοντος τὸν κύριν Ἀνατόλιον πρῶτον ἔχομεν• οὗτοι πέμπτον ἔταξαν τὸν μακάριον Φλαβιανόν.
[135] Nestorius, *The Bazaar of Heracleides*, 2.2, p. 352.
[136] *ACO* 2.2. p.80.

session."[137] Further, Dioscorus directed the soldiers to prevent Flavian and Hilary (the Roman legate) from leaving the church.[138] The patriarch of Alexandria thus discovered and used the privileges normally available for the patriarch of Constantinople to enforce his authority upon his peers.

The ultimate consequence for a patriarch who failed to enforce and maintain his authority was the condemnation of a council and subsequent imperial removal from his see. The former enabled the latter, because anathematization removed that person from communion with the church and he lost his "sacerdotal authority."[139] While there were many tools available to patriarchs to ensure a successful tenure, the difficulty of maintaining authority and ending one's life in office proved to be overly so for some. In each of the following examples, there are myriad circumstances that distinguish the patriarch's loss of authority. Common to all, however, is the undermining of the patriarch's authority through the challenge of their orthodoxy.

Chrysostom's fall in 404 revealed his own failure to maintain cordial relations with the imperial family, who instead put their weight behind Theophilus' machinations.[140] Insulting and criticizing the empress Eudoxia in public turned the imperial family— and accordingly all of their resources—away from John. Theophilus succeeded in removing John by indirect

[137] Hess 2002, 27 and 62-69.
[138] Flavian in a letter to Pope Leo I, in *ACO* 2.2. p.78: *Statim me circumvallate multitude militaris et volentem me ad sanctum altare confugere non concessit, set nitebatur de ecclesia trahere*.
[139] Evagrius Scholasticus explains that this what John of Antioch suffered after the Council of Ephesus before the formula of reunion, in Evagrius, *EH*, 1.5.
[140] Socrates, *EH*, 6.15 & 18 recount how the empress procured bishops to convene synods to depose John, she even recruited Epiphanius to condemn John.

accusations of Origenistic ties.[141] When the synod condemned him, John was informed that if he did not peacefully leave the Great Church, imperial troops were in waiting to force him.[142]

The removal of Nestorius was under a different set of circumstances. With better maneuvering of the situation, Nestorius could have secured imperial enforcement of the anathematization of Cyril. Instead, another charismatic priest had usurped his authority in Constantinople, namely Proclus, who threw his weight behind Cyril's faction, which included a large monastic constituency and Rome. But what gave Proclus more authority was the fact that Constantinople had begun to doubt Nestorius' orthodoxy and looked to Proclus instead for spiritual guidance. Together they convinced Theodosius II to enforce the decisions of the synod that condemned Nestorius.

During the proceedings of the synod of Constantinople in 448 that examined the archimandrite Eutyches' beliefs, the patriarch Flavian's insistence that the truth of the orthodox faith persuade a person to believe it rather than coercive measures. Coming right to the point of the examination of faith, Flavian ask Eutyches if he believes in two natures, which the monk responds essentially that he will agree whatever it is the synod wants him to, even though he does not believe it. Flavian's response to this is where one can see that his interrogation had failed to convince the archimandrite, "so you only agree because of compulsion rather than disposition?"[143] Pressed further, Eutyches crumbles under pressure from the synod and exclaims, "now then because your Holiness teaches this, I say it and agree with the fathers."[144] Yet

[141] See Elm 1998, 78-83; noting that John's reception of the Nitrian monks constituted a challenge to Theophilus' authority to regulate matters in his own jurisdiction. She notes that while Theophilus never directly calls John's orthodoxy into question, he does point out that the patriarch of Constantinople had accepted Origenists into his see.
[142] Palladius, *Dialogue*, 10.
[143] *ACO* 2.1.1. p.142: Ὁ ἁγιώτατος ἀρχιεπίσκοπος εἶπεν· Οὐκοῦν κατὰ ἀνάγκην, οὐ κατὰ γνώμην τὴν ἀληθῆ πίστιν ὁμολογεῖς;
[144] *ACO* 2.1.1. p.143: νῦν δὲ ἐπειδὴ τοῦτο διδάσκει ἡ ὁσιότης ὑμῶν, λέγω καὶ ἀκολουθῶ τοῖς πατράσιν.

Flavian's insistence on the power of true faith and conviction to persuade others likely weakened his hold on his office.

After the synod in Constantinople in 448 that condemned Eutyches, the appeals of the archimandrite's allies prompted Theodosius II to ask for confirmation of Flavian's orthodoxy. This presents another remarkable challenge to the patriarch's authority. Not only were monks questioning his orthodox credentials, but their inquiry also led the emperor to begin to as well. Doubting and questioning credibility undermines authority. To secure his authority, Flavian resorted to persuasion, an indication that those challenges were indeed affecting his position.

In a letter to Theodosius II, Flavian explains that his two-natured Christology is orthodox.[145] But it begins with a key rhetorical device designed to reaffirm the authority of Flavian, "Therefore there is nothing more fitting for a priest of God than teaching the divine doctrines as to be prepared for the defense of his teachings to all those who are asking for such."[146] Flavian writes with the implication that he possesses the prerogative to teach "divine doctrine" because he held a patriarch's authority. The emperor's request was for Flavian to verify his orthodoxy. Instead Flavian used the opportunity to define and teach his doctrine, his use of the verb παιδεύω (to teach) signaling as much. In fact, παιδεύω is an invocation and reminder of an asymmetrical relationship; it also reverses the roles. Instead of the dynamic of emperor and subject, Flavian's letter establishes that of teacher and student. Patriarchs taught the faith, and the emperor as a layperson should listen and learn.

[145] *Flavian to Theodosius II*, in ACO 2.1.1.p.35-36.
[146] *Flavian to Theodosius II*, in ACO 2.1.1.p.35: Οὐδεν οὕτω ἱερεῖ θεοῦ καὶ τῷ τὰ θεῖα παιδεύντι δόγματα ὡς ἕτοιμον εἶναι πρὸς ἀπολογίαν παντὶ τῷ αἰτοῦντι αὐτὸν λόγον....

However, the limitations of persuasion to preserve authority are demonstrated by the events of 449, where the opponents of Flavian gained access to the tools of coercion that the patriarch himself should have used to maintain his authority. Again, the recourse to persuasive means already demonstrates a slipping grasp of authority. Why else would the highest priest of the imperial city have to justify his orthodoxy to the emperor if this was not the case? Flavian's attempt to persuade fits again into a model of challenged authority.

As this chapter has shown, that meant establishing the Nicene Creed as the orthodox faith of Constantinople. New challenges arose, however, when the definition of that faith began to change from 448 onward under Flavian's tenure.

- *Conclusion*

A patriarch had to possess legitimate authority in the eyes of Constantinopolitans for his tenure to be successful. While he could mitigate challenges to his authority through persuasion or coercion, ultimately he had to hold and teach orthodox doctrines. In late fourth century Constantinople, the challenge was that the orthodox faith was not the same as the incoming new political and religious regime. The patriarchate, beginning under Gregory of Nazianzus, imposed its Nicene orthodoxy and reinforced it through persuasive discourse, which they delivered through preaching. However, words were not often persuasive enough, and the emperor made available to the patriarch imperial military, economic, and legal powers to coerce uncooperative Christians into accepting the Nicene faith as orthodox and the patriarch as their legitimate leader.

In fact, this coercion could rightly fall into the Christian notion of charity. Sometimes a patriarch had to resort to force, if only for the good of the unwilling person's soul, or so they argued.

Authority could also be self-perpetuating. A source of authority included previous patriarchs, who passed down their authority in spirit to the current holder of the office, and which that current holder would persistently remind his congregation of during the reading of his predecessor's names in the diptychs. Much of this was based in the claims of spiritual descent in faith from orthodox champions. As Gregory's oration on Athanasius indicates, the idea that one could succeed a bishop in faith if not in direct succession was an important rhetorical assertion that bishops used to claim authority. Some patriarchs possessed almost a pedigree of sorts that helped to ensure their consecration and success in the office. Proclus was one such patriarch. He was fortunate to have close associations with three former patriarchs: John Chrysostom, Atticus, and Sissinius. His spiritual lineage no doubt had meaning in Constantinople, as after the fall of Nestorius many persons in the city wanted him to be the patriarch despite his lingering situation regarding Cyzicus.[147]

Whatever his probable feelings were regarding Nestorius becoming patriarch instead of a priest from Constantinople, the patriarch certainly offended Proclus' religious convictions about the Virgin Mary. Eusebius of Caesarea—later the bishop of Dorylaeum who played a key role at Ephesus II and Chalcedon—interrupted a sermon by Nestorius, galvanizing the congregation against the patriarch. Such a sudden public outburst is akin to the "corrosive discourse," Lincoln

[147] See Socrates, *EH*, 7.28. Sissinius ordained Proclus bishop of Cyzicus and the citizens of that city rejected him. The same technical problem existed for him that Gregory of Nazianzus faced: the canons of Nicaea prevented the transference of bishops from one see to another.

observed.[148] It drastically diminished Nestorius' authority to speak within his own church. After this incident, the doors were open for further criticism. On 25 December 430, the feast of the Virgin, Proclus delivered a sermon in the Great Church praising the Theotokos in direct challenge to Nestorius' teachings.[149]

The effects of Proclus' public preaching against Nestorius were deep. He challenged Nestorius' authority in a medium that was supposedly the Antiochene's strength: preaching.[150] Proclus also had the benefit of understanding the opinion of public piety as regarded the Virgin Mary, because he was a native Constantinopolitan. Nicholas Constas identified a phrase in Proclus' sermons that appear shortly after in a letter of Cyril of Alexandria and in a petition to the Council of Ephesus, which equated Nestorius with other heresiarchs: "Let Arius and Eunomius, Macedonius and Nestorius be ashamed, that four-horse chariot of the devil, those surging summits of heresy, those rocky reefs of blasphemy...."[151] The petition to the Council of Ephesus came later in 431 and Cyril's letter to the new patriarch Maximian was after the Council, obviously.

---

[148] Lincoln 1994, 78-87. He defines corrosive discourse as speech that is "antithetical to the construction of authority."

[149] See Constas 2003, 57-59 for the dating of this sermon.

[150] Among the reasons that Nestorius became patriarch was that his renowned speaking ability was considered necessary for preaching, especially in such a large and important city. See Socrates, *EH*, 7.25.

[151] See Constas 2003, 71, note 77. The passages Constas cites are:

Proclus, *Homily* 2.2.22-24. Translation by Constas in Constas 2003, 165: Αἰσχυνέσθωσαν Ἄρειος καὶ Εὐνόμιος, Μακεδόνιος καὶ Νεστόριος, τὸ τετράπωλον τοῦ διαβόλου ἅρμα, οἱ τῶν αἱρέσεων σκόπελοι, αἱ τῆς βλασφημίας σπιλάδες...

Cleri Constantinopolitani petitio, in *ACO* 1.1.3. p.50: Ἀρείωι καὶ Εὐνομίωι ἡ τῆς ὀρθοδοξίας ὑπόληψις, ἅτε Νεστορίου μὲν εὐλόγως διὰ τὴν δυσσεβῆ διδασκαλίαν καθηιρημένου.

Cyril of Alexandria, *Epistle* 31, in *PG* 77.152C: We anathematize, bearing in mind orthodoxy, Apollinarius and Arius, and Eunomius, and with them Nestorius. Ἀναθεματίζομεν δὲ, φρονοῦντες ὀρθῶς, Ἀπολινάριόν τε καὶ Ἄρειον, καὶ Εὐνόμιον, καὶ σὺν αὐτοῖς Νεστόριον. After the Council of Ephesus, in a letter to Emperor Theodosius II (*Epistle* 71), Cyril presents a genealogy of Nestorius' heresy originating with Diodore of Tarsus and Theodore of Mopsuestia.

The point of the polemic was to connect Nestorius to other heretics, even if their heresies did not all agree on doctrine; the point was also that "names locate: they fix a thing as good or bad, friend or foe. When something is given a name, that thing is given an identity, and with identity, significance."[152] Proclus labeled and connected Nestorius to other heresies and their namesake's. He discredited Nestorius as an orthodox authority and established himself as one instead. In doing so, he laid the groundwork for becoming patriarch. More so, he undercut Nestorius' authority. So the effects of Proclus' "corrosive discourse" were to erode Constantinopolitans' confidence in Nestorius' authority. Such a precarious position created the conditions in which a patriarch might turn to state power for support.

Enlisting the state's aid for support might include the use of soldiers. After Proclus' degradation of his authority, Nestorius' residence came under siege by a mob of monks, whom Proclus' speech had agitated into action.[153] Soldiers came to protect him and formed a defensive barrier around the patriarch's house:

> I had need to post soldiers around my house to guard me…not that they might do any wrong unto you but that they might hinder you from doing wrong unto me. From the fact that you reproach us with posting soldiers, it is clear that if they had not first been posted around me and been a wall for me, I should have been destroyed by violent men.[154]

In this case, Nestorius used imperial muscle for defensive purposes. But he could have used it to force his opponents into backing down. Since Constantine, it became acceptable for Christians in certain circumstances to resort to coercion to compel others to accept their doctrine. Drake suggests this: "Instead of seeing the coercion of the fourth century as the triumph of Christianity,

[152] Drake 2000, 436.
[153] The activity of monks figure deeply into the events leading to the Council of Ephesus. A story reported by John Rufus alleges that a monk's public denunciations of the imperial family and subsequent flogging served to convince Theodosius II to summon the Council of Ephesus, see *Plerophoriae* 34.
[154] Nestorius 1925, 135.

in other words, it can be seen as the triumph of a particular kind of Christianity, a militant wing or faction."[155] In the case of a patriarch using force, resorting to coercion was likely the result of their failure to lay stake to legitimate authority.

The challenges that patriarchs faced in 379-450 largely centered on convincing Constantinople of their authority as representatives of a specific doctrine. In the next chapter, this study will show how patriarchs faced those challenges in a new context. After the Council of Chalcedon in 451, it claimed a new authority that was ecumenical in scope, second only to Rome, and championed a new orthodoxy based on a Two Nature definition of Jesus Christ.

[155] Drake 2000, 438.

Chalcedon: A New Orthodoxy

- *Introduction*

In the decades between the second and fourth ecumenical councils, the patriarchate of Constantinople cultivated an association of its office with Nicene orthodoxy, while still relying upon imperial resources when its position became tenuous. To strengthen itself, the patriarchate pushed forth a new definition of orthodoxy at the Council of Chalcedon and connected itself to that definition with Canon 28. These factors enabled the patriarchate to claim greater and more secure authority independent of the emperor. The patriarch Anatolius (450-458) was directly responsible for these developments, which he deemed necessary in response to the history of the patriarchate in the 70 years before his tenure.

Coming into the office as the successor of Flavian and serving as a deacon for Dioscorus, Anatolius was well aware that Alexandria had successfully manipulated the imperial family, monastics, and people of Constantinople in deposing patriarchs. This pointed to Constantinople's relatively precarious position as compared to other sees, which possessed apostolic legitimacy as a basis for their authority. In response, Anatolius fortified Constantinople's authority at the Council of Chalcedon by pushing forward a new exposition of faith with the dyophysite (Two Nature) doctrine and elevating the patriarchate's status by linking it to the council and the status of Rome. In equating Constantinople's status to Rome's, Anatolius argued that both sees held a privileged position in ecclesiology because they were imperial cities, thus absolving the need of apostolicity for Constantinople.

But in the East, Constantinople was the bastion of Chalcedonianism, which it sought to implement over other sees. As for the West and Rome, the patriarch of Constantinople in Late Antiquity did not claim primacy above Rome, because New Rome argued for its privileges vis-à-vis Old Rome. Up to 451, the patriarch vested his authority in the defense of Nicene orthodoxy. As the previous chapter demonstrated, that included cultivating a sense of Nicene identity in Constantinople. This proved challenging because new doctrines emerged. They all claimed to be orthodox and upholding Nicaea's teachings, namely those of the archimandrite Eutyches and Nestorius. The creed of Chalcedon came forth as a definitive resolution to those claims. Under the patriarchate's leadership, Constantinople gradually came to identify itself as Chalcedonian. And by the time of Justinian I, Christians in Constantinople and the East associated the patriarchate with the faith of Chalcedon.

After Chalcedon, the patriarchate began asserting its authority at a far greater ecumenical level, all the while still facing persistent challenges to its episcopal authority and having to continually justify its position. Bishops invoked Nicaea as the litmus for orthodoxy throughout the fifth century, which is why they were hesitant, even unwilling, to allow any new or amended creed. At the Council of Chalcedon, when the emperor's representatives informed the bishops of Marcian's desire for a new creed many bishops resisted, acquiescing only after considerable efforts by Anatolius. But even after a new creed came forth, in the immediate decades after the Council of Chalcedon, many bishops still regarded Nicaea as the definition of the faith and the transition from a Nicene identity to Chalcedonian was slow.[1] The councils, patriarchs, and bishops always professed that they were doing nothing more than upholding the decisions of the

[1] Price 2009a, 307-325. Price suggests that Chalcedonian identity never took a very strong hold in Constantinople until Justin I, and even that did not reflect popular piety.

318 holy fathers gathered at Nicaea and occasionally invoking the 150 at Constantinople. They abhorred "innovations" of the faith, or doctrines that all differed from what the council of Nicaea had decreed, which by the fifth century was accepted as the correct and irreproachable explanation of the faith. The Council of Constantinople I merely defended that explanation against heresies that arose after Nicaea regarding the Holy Spirit.

As the previous chapter showed, the reception of the patriarchate's authority coincided with that of the Nicene faith. The same was true for Chalcedon and the patriarchate, because the holders of the office based their authority on the most recent council. As Aloys Grillmeier observed about Chalcedon, "The history of a dogma or a council does not end with its ratification by Church authority or by the Fathers of the council. It is only after this that process of 'ingrafting' in the Church begins, and that by way of 'reception' or the acceptance of the council."[2] This is likewise true for the patriarch's authority, and it is pertinent here because the reception of Chalcedon and the patriarch's authority became connected. The history of the doctrine of Chalcedon's reception coalesces, then, with that of the patriarchate's authority.

Under Anatolius, a Constantinopolitan Christianity emerged. While no one ever called the Chalcedonian formula 'Constantinopolitan,' it was in that city that the doctrine received support and from where it was evangelized. While Rome and Africa accepted and upheld the Chalcedonian doctrine, it was because of the Tome of Leo. In the East, deep support for the council appeared only in Constantinople, and it faced opposition in Syria, Palestine, and Egypt, where Christians resisted the Chalcedonian doctrine either because they were convinced of the orthodoxy of miaphysitism, as was the case in Egypt and Palestine, or they espoused a strict

[2] Grillmeier 1975, 2.1. p.6.

'Cyrilian' Christianity, as in Syria.[3] The tradition of 'Cyrilian' Christianity continued well through the sixth century where Cyril's legacy was invoked to defend various theological positions.[4]

Works that address the Council of Chalcedon and its aftermath vary in scope. Some focus on the 'imperial church' and its influence within the Roman Empire, while others highlight the reception of the council by Christians in other regions. The later works of G.E.M. de Ste. Croix explored martyrdom and persecution. One work addresses the means of control that the imperial government exercised at Chalcedon.[5] Ste. Croix demonstrates the subtleties of Marcian's manipulations of the council, through his imperial representatives there. Richard Price has written much on Chalcedon in articles, edited volumes, and his translation of the council *acta*.[6] Among his arguments is that he does not regard a Chalcedonian identity forming among Christians until the reign of Justin I, emphasizing instead a 'Nicene fundamentalism.' Finally, Philippe Blaudeau has written a long volume exploring his theory of "geo-ecclesiology" between Constantinople and Alexandria.[7] Blaudeau notes the nexus of regions and theologies in showing how Alexandria, Rome, and Constantinople all competed against one another in advancing their doctrines.

[3] While the anti-Chalcedonianism amongst miaphysites is fairly obvious, Andrew Louth suggests that the Syrian rejection of the council was because they considered the faith of Cyril to be the true exposition of the faith. See Louth 2009, 107-116.
[4] At the 532 synod in Constantinople, where the *libellus* of Pope Hormisdas was debated, non-Chalcedonians presented letters of Cyril to support their position. See Menze 2008, 58-67.
[5] Ste. Croix, *Christian Persecution, Martyrdom, and Orthodoxy,* (2006).
[6] Price, "The Development of a Chalcedonian Identity in Byzantium (451-553)," (2009a); "The Council of Chalcedon (451): A Narrative," (2009b); and, "Truth, Omission, and Fiction in the Acts of Chalcedon," 2009c. His translation with Michael Gaddis, *The Acts of the Council of Chalcedon,* (2010).
[7] Blaudeau, *Alexandrie et Constantinople (451-491): De l'Histoire à la Géo-Ecclésiologie,* (2006).

As for studies on the aftermath of the council, W.H.C. Frend's work on the development of the miaphysite "movement."[8] Frend shows how miaphysite Christians (using the now outdated term "monophysite") constructed a community outside the purview of the imperial Chalcedonian church, revealing their justifications and motivations for doing so. Their willingness to 'split' from the churches of Constantinople and Rome shows exactly what this study argues: authority lies in the nexus of community and orthodoxy. Miaphysites rejected the patriarch of Constantinople's authority because it embraced the Chalcedonian faith, as this study will show. In addition to the confessional creed of Chalcedon being divisive, another of the divisive results of the council was Canon 28. Rome approved of all that took place at the council but that canon, which it viewed as a threat to its own position. George Demacopoulos has recently explored the use of 'Petrine discourse' by popes who reasserted their claim to authority in the face of a challenge from the East.[9] His argument against the juridical enhancement of Constantinople's authority rested in their belief that it undermined Canon 6 of Nicaea by placing the imperial city above Alexandria and Antioch, both of which held Petrine connections.[10]

[8] Frend, *The Rise of the Monophysite Movement: Chapters in the History of the Church in the Fifth and Sixth Centuries*, (1972).
[9] Demacopoulos, *The Invention of Peter: Apostolic Discourse and Papal Authority in Late Antiquity*, (2013).
[10] Canon 6 of the Council of Nicaea, in Hefele-Leclerq, 1.2, p. 552: May the ancient customs in Egypt and Lybia and Pentapolis stand, as the Alexandrian bishop holds power of all those, since this is also customary for the Roman bishop. But similarly let the privileges for the churches in Antioch and in the other eparchates be preserved. Τὰ ἀρχαῖα ἤθη τὰ ἐν Αἰγύπτῳ καὶ Λιβύῃ καὶ Πενταπόλει, ὥστε τὸν Ἀλεξανδρείας ἐπίσκοπον πάντων τούτων ἔχειν τὴν ἐξουσίαν, ἐπειδὴ καὶ τῷ ἐν τῇ Ῥωμῃ ἐπισκόπῳ τοῦτο συνηθές ἐστιν. Ὁμοίως δὲ καὶ κατὰ Ἀντιόχειαν καὶ ἐν ταῖς ἄλλαις ἐπαρχίαις τὰ πρεσβεῖα σώζεσθαι ταῖς ἐκκλησίας.

- *Before the council*

Upon becoming patriarch, Anatolius likely reflected on the instability of the office itself, given that the entire reason he could occupy the office was because the previous patriarch, Flavian, had been deposed and possibly murdered. In fact, for the third time in fifty years a council had anathematized a patriarch: Chrysostom, Nestorius, and Flavian. Common to all three incidents was Alexandria's heavy involvement in ending the patriarch's career. Anatolius' background would have given him sufficient foresight to conclude that the patriarchate needed to elevate itself beyond the meddling of outside sees.

Anatolius began his ecclesiastical career as a deacon in Alexandria and went to Constantinople as the apocrisarius of Dioscorus.[11] His experience as an apocrisarius no doubt allowed him insights into the procurement of imperial powers for the benefaction of the patriarch's policies and how other sees, Alexandria in his case, attempted to achieve their agendas in the imperial court. In seeing his apocrisarius become patriarch of Constantinople, Dioscorus had achieved where Peter, Theophilus, and Cyril had all failed: installing a bishop in the imperial city that Alexandria could control.[12] Dioscorus' success for Alexandria, however, proved fleeting, as Anatolius quickly turned against his presumptive master.

Soon after becoming patriarch Anatolius succeeded in gaining the recognition of Canon Three of Constantinople I from Pope Leo, in a sudden turn against Dioscorus. Anatolius attained recognition in exchange for having the bishops under him sign Leo's Tome.[13] More so, in

[11] Liberatus, *Breviarium*, 12: *Anatolius diaconus, qui fuit Constantinopolim apocrisarius Dioscori…*
[12] See Blaudeau *Alexandrie et Constantinople* (2006) and Baynes "Alexandria and Constantinople: A Study in Ecclesiastical Diplomacy," (1926).
[13] See Chadwick 1955, 26-28.

elevating the patriarchate at Chalcedon, Anatolius collaborated with Emperor Marcian in using the imperial government's machinery more than any of his predecessors to secure greater authority for his office. In a nutshell, then, his tenure revealed the reliance of the office on the emperor but in doing so was able to shift it away from that need.

The sudden condemnation of Flavian roused the dyophysite movement in Constantinople. There did not appear to be any organized movement on behalf of the Two-Nature doctrine until the Eutychian controversy stimulated its emergence. Writing in exile, Nestorius labeled the removal of Flavian a "persecution," invoking the rhetorical power of martyrdom.[14] This is especially important in considering that Nestorius had arrived at this conclusion shortly after the events of Ephesus II, because he had died by 451. If immediately after Ephesus II Nestorius was already considering Flavian's death a martyrdom, likely others did too. Part of the proceedings of the Council of Chalcedon included a rehabilitation of Flavian, whom the assembled bishops considered a victim of "Dioscorus the murderer."[15] Both pro- and anti-Chalcedonians associated Flavian with the Two-Nature doctrine of Jesus Christ. The *Chronicle of Edessa* remembered Flavian as "great" for his defense of the Two-Doctrine creed at the synod of 448.[16] Similarly, Anti-Chalcedonians linked Flavian to Nestorius for espousing the same belief: "Nestorius, the champion of the two natures…Flavian, the partisan of the two natures."[17]

In this light, Chalcedon became Flavian's posthumous theological triumph. The doctrine that Chalcedon based its statement of faith on was derived from Flavian and Leo.[18] Price and

[14] Nestorius, *The Bazaar of Heracleides*, 2.2. p.342.
[15] *ACO* 2.1.1. p. 69. Διόσκορον τὸν φονέα ἔξω βάλε.
[16] *Chronicle of Edessa* 63. And there was assembled again at Ephesus another synod. This anathematized the great Flavianus bishop of Constantinople,
[17] John Rufus, *Plerophoria*, 59. In *PO* 8 (1911), edited and translated by F. Nau. p. 114-115.
[18] There are at least two instances of Flavian articulating his Two-Nature theology in Constantinople. Once in his letter to Theodosius II (*ACO* 2.1. p.35) and the other at the 448 Synod in Constantinople (*ACO* 2.1.p.113-114). More

Gaddis note this as well in their translation of the council *acta*: "The distinction that Flavian makes between 'two natures' and 'one hypostasis' was novel (since hitherto the two terms had not been distinguished in this way) and was adopted in the Chalcedonian Definition."[19] After the council Marcian formally rehabilitated the memory of Flavian with a law on 6 July 452.[20]

To begin, Marcian set the stage so that the council took place even closer to Constantinople. It was supposed to have convened in Nicaea, but Marcian ordered it to move to Chalcedon, a suburb directly across the sea from Constantinople that was visible from the imperial palace. Having changed the venue, the emperor then expressed his desired results. In his letter to the council at its original venue in Nicaea, dated 22 September 451, Marcian stressed that he expected the council to decide against Eutyches. The intimation of violence is present in this letter, in which Marcian warns that because there are "those who hold the teachings of Eutyches or others are trying to cause discord or confusion. Because of this, we order you [the bishops assembling for the council], having no need to fear at all of blame for the aforementioned, to come to the city of Chalcedon."[21] The disruption of monks who sympathized with Eutyches proved alarming to Marcian not only because they could threaten the proceedings, but also because, as de Ste. Croix argued, Marcian had already made up his mind about what he wanted the council to decide, namely the "Two-Nature" doctrine that Pope Leo I had lain out in

---

so, the definition of faith produced and ratified at the fifth session of the council purposefully imitated Flavian's statements of faith.

[19] Price and Gaddis 2010, p.187, n. 190.

[20] In *ACO* 2.3. p. 348-349.

[21] Marcian, *Third Letter to the Council*, in *ACO* 2.1.1.p.30: ἐπειδὴ δὲ Ἀττικοῦ τοῦ διακόνου τῆς κατὰ τὴν βασιλεύουσαν πόλιν ἁγιωτάτης καὶ καθολικῆς ἐκκλησίας ἀναγαγόντος τῆι ἡμετέραι γαληνότητι ἔγνωμεν ὑφορᾶσθαι τὴν ὑμετέραν ὁσιότητα μὴ τυχὸν τινὲς τῶν τὰ Εὐτυχοῦς φρονούντων ἢ ἕτερός τις στάσιν ἢ θόρυβόν τινα κατασκευάζειν ἐπιχειρήσοι, τούτου ἕνεκα δηλοῦμεν ὑμῖν ὥστε τὴν προειρημένην αἰτίαν μηδ' ὅλως εὐλαβουμένους εἰς τὴν Χαλκηδονέων παραγενέσθαι πόλιν.

his Tome.[22] Michael Whitby agrees with Ste. Croix on this point: "Chalcedon needs to be seen as a council whose key decisions had been determined in advance by Marcian and Pulcheria…."[23]

The emperor had already informed Leo in a letter dated 22 November 450 that the pope was welcome to preside over a council, but it would convene in the East. Marcian also declared the catholic faith "as [what] your holiness [Leo] had defined in accordance with the ecclesiastical canons."[24] This meant that the Tome of Leo would serve as the basis of the definition of the faith and was what the emperor desired for the council to confirm. The context of the emperor's desired outcome, however, was rooted in Constantinople.

Leo did not produce his Tome in a vacuum. Rather, he wrote in response to Flavian's reports of the troubles he was facing for his advocating of dyophysite doctrine against Eutyches. The Tome, then, affirmed and expounded Flavian's theological position, ultimately serving as the theological paradigm of Chalcedon. The pope and patriarch had both agreed to the same points of doctrine. Flavian's successor, Anatolius, took up the dyophysite cause in Constantinople soon after becoming patriarch. By November of 450, Anatolius had signed the Tome, agreeing with its doctrine.[25] Anatolius had evidently reached out to Leo before Marcian ascended the throne.

During the deliberations of the sixteenth session of the Council of Chalcedon, Eusebius of Dorylaeum, an ally of Flavian, testified that Leo had accepted the third canon of the Council of Constantinople I.[26] Immediately upon beginning his tenure, Anatolius clearly sought to obtain

[22] See Ste. Croix 2006, 279-280.
[23] Whitby 2009, 182-183.
[24] Marcian, *Letter to Pope Leo,* also extant as Leo Letter 76, in *ACO* 2.1. p.8.
[25]*Pulcheria to Leo,* also extant as Leo Letter 77, in *ACO* 2.3.p.18-19.
[26] *ACO* 2.1.3.p. 97: Eusebius the bishop of Dorylaeum said, "I subscribe willingly, and when I was in Rome I read this canon to the most holy pope in front of the priests of Constantinople and he accepted it. Εὐσέβιος ἐπίσκοπος

the pope's backing to assert himself against Alexandria. He had received recognition from Pope Leo and agreed to strike the names of Dioscorus, Juvenal, and Eustathius from the diptychs.[27] He thus attached himself to the doctrinal authority of both Flavian and Leo, becoming the holder of faith of a man whom Constantinopolitans were beginning to remember as a martyr and that martyr's ally in the West.[28] Anatolius constructed the base of his authority on those two pillars.

With Anatolius having accepted the dyophysite position, Pulcheria and Marcian threw their weight behind it as well.[29] While the correspondence between pope and emperor is more visible and suggests that Marcian had decided to back Rome's position, resting almost unseen in the historical record is that the patriarch of Constantinople was already advocating for the same position as his predecessor. Anatolius likely counseled the new emperor on the theological controversies broiling in the East and possibly convinced him of the orthodoxy of the dyophyite position. The 'unseen' nature of Anatolius' actions surrounding the Council of Chalcedon remains a constant.

Probably the greatest evidence for Anatolius' ability to manipulate situations to his benefit and his willingness to go to extraordinary lengths to do so rests in his securing Roman recognition. Henry Chadwick observed Anatolius' guile in becoming patriarch. He suggested that Anatolius might have had a large role in the death of his predecessor, Flavian, to secure

---

Δορυλαίου εἶπεν· Ἐκὼν ὑπέγραψα, ἐπειδὴ καὶ τὸν κανόνα τοῦτον τῶι ἁγιωτάτωι πάπαι ἐν Ῥώμηι ἐγὼ ἀνέγνων παρόντων τῶν κληρικῶν Κωνσταντινουπόλεως καὶ ἀπεδέξατο αὐτόν.

[27] Letter of Leo to Anatolius, *Ep.* 80 (13 April 451).

[28] During the Council of Chalcedon, the bishops repeatedly lament the death of Flavian as a murder by Dioscorus. In fact, shortly after the council Pope Leo calls Flavian a "confessor", in *ACO* 2.4. p.58: …Flavian's faith, modesty, and humility, which has raised him to a confessor's glory. *Flaviani fidem, Flaviani modestiam, Flaviani humilitatem, quae illum usque ad confessoris gloriam provexit.*

[29] For Pulcheria's renewed influence at court and her role in the Eutychian Controversy, see P. Goubert, "Le Rôle de Sainte Pulchérie et de l'eunuque Chrysaphios" in *Das Konzil von Chalkedon* vol.1, 303-321; and, Holum 1982, 207-209.

recognition from Rome.[30] Perhaps it necessitates a pessimistic interpretation for this possibility, but the circumstantial evidence at the least suggests that Anatolius benefited from the quick death of Flavian after the latter's exile.

Upon becoming patriarch, Anatolius recognized the reality of his situation, specifically that other metropolitan bishops might consider him Dioscorus' puppet unless he showed clear independence from him.[31] A solution would be gaining recognition from Rome, meaning that he would have to explicitly accept the Tome of Leo. However, this was the lesser of his problems in gaining Roman recognition. Pope Leo I expressly stated that he would recognize no other bishop of Constantinople so long as Flavian was living: "Whoever dares to take over the see of Bishop Flavian while he is still alive and healthy will never be in communion with us nor be counted amongst the bishops."[32] Anatolius, working with Empress Pulcheria to achieve unification with Rome, understood the grim course of action they would have to take in early 450: "they realized that his [Flavian's] survival was an absolutely fatal flaw in their plans. Nothing could have been easier than to arrange an unfortunate 'accident.' Nothing would have been more convenient to Pulcheria and the patriarch than his removal from the scene…Leo had signed Flavian's death-warrant."[33]

If such an interpretation of Flavian's death is at all likely and Anatolius indeed had a hand in it, then perhaps the same man would convince the emperor to provide him with the

[30] See Chadwick 1955, 33-34. He places Flavian's death in February 450.
[31] Ste. Croix interprets Anatolius' move away from Dioscorus as a pragmatic calculation: "Whether he saw an opportunity to throw off an unwelcome subservience to Alexandria, whether he simply recognized the doctrinal consequences of the change of ruler, or whether pressure had to be applied, Anatolius switched Christological sides…[he] will have known that anything less than enthusiastic commitment to the new ecclesiastical directions would leave [him] vulnerable at a future council;" in Ste. Croix 2006, 278-279.
[32] Leo, Letter 50, *ACO* 2.4.p.21: *quisque enim incolumi atque superstite Flaviano episcopo vestro sacerdotium eius fuerit ausus invadere, numquam in communione nostra habetitur nec inter episcopos poterit numerari.*
[33] Chadwick 1955, 33.

means to force the council to his will. The following will show the clear power he exercised by determining that the Tome of Leo accurately expressed the faith. That Marcian came in person to the council demonstrated that Anatolius had the emperor's explicit support in doing so. While the above interpretation of Anatolius' tenure seems bleak and cynical, his actions were crucial in establishing his office's authority. He quickly overcame many possible hurdles to establish the patriarchate as an authority at a new level and secure ecumenical approval of his doctrine. In this respect, Anatolius demonstrated a keen understanding of how the patriarchate could operate in establishing authority and collaborating with the imperial government to secure his agenda.

- *During the council*

At the Council of Chalcedon, Constantinople dominated the proceedings. This is most obvious in the seating order of bishops at the council. Those sitting in the first seats held presidency of the council, which vested them with certain privileges such as allowing persons to speak, as was the case with Dioscorus preventing Flavian from speaking at Ephesus II.[34] Anatolius held this position at Chalcedon because Pope Leo did not travel to the council and instead sent his legates, who sat in what would have been his seat but possessed none of the privileges. Wielding presidency of the council allowed control of the agenda and "any control

[34] *ACO* 2.2.p.77-79: Dioscorus…ordered that I and the bishops judging with me, and my notaries, should not be permitted to be heard or utter a word of defense. *Dioscorus hoc quidem fieri prohibuit, praecipiens autem mihi et his qui una mecum iudicaverunt episcopos, et meis pariter clericis, nihil penitus audiri permitti de nullo defensionis vocem emittere.*

over who spoke and in what order must have been vested in the presidents."[35] Anatolius used this control to great effect, not only because of the procedural rules that allowed as much but also because of the support he received from the emperor in exerting his authority over the council.

Anatolius thus achieved greater power for the patriarchate. And as great as Anatolius' successes were in achieving recognition from Rome and having the Council of Chalcedon approve his definition of the faith, which he presented as Flavian's and Leo's, Canon 28 was his hallmark, but not for the simple reason of achieving greater territorial jurisdiction. Canon 28 created a vested interest in the patriarchate for preserving Chalcedon. If the council ever came under danger of annulment, then the patriarch of Constantinople would have to come to its defense, because if anyone rescinded the council his office would lose the advancements of that canon and his position of being second after Old Rome and the adjoining prerogatives.[36] Canon 28 thus served as a sort of "poison pill" to force future patriarchs from trying to undo Chalcedon and come to its defense. Furthermore, these developments led Christians to associate the doctrine of Chalcedon with the patriarchate itself, especially those who were against the council.

By the time of the Three Chapters controversy of the sixth century, Canon 28 came to be seen as necessary to the preservation of the council itself. Ferrandus of Carthage argued that "If there is disapproval of any part of Chalcedon, then the approval of the whole council is endangered…The whole Chalcedonian council, because the whole is the Chalcedonian council, is true. No one holds fault with any part of it. Whatever was said, done, decided and confirmed there was done by the ineffable and secret power of the Holy Spirit."[37] If one part was

[35] Ste. Croix 2006, 307.
[36] Louth 2009, 114.
[37] Ferrandus of Carthage, Letter 6.3, in *PL* 67. p.23: *Si pars aliqua displicet in concilio Chalcedonensi, cum pericuko displicendi totum placet…Totum concilium Chalcedonense, verum est : nulla pars illius habet ullam*

condemned, then so was the whole. His argument was about the letter of Ibas, but in insisting on full-scale acceptance of all that was done at Chalcedon, consequently this meant accepting Canon 28.

At the second session of the council, the arrangement between Marcian and Anatolius becomes most obvious. After the roll call, the emperor's representative, Anatolius the patrician (not the patriarch), instructed bishops "to produce a pure exposition of the faith."[38] The secretaries record a mass of "devout bishops" suddenly protesting that they could not do so, because the fathers of Nicaea had already defined the faith and the seventh canon of Ephesus forbade new creeds, on the position that the current creed was entirely sufficient and that they could not produce another one.[39] A few bishops explained their case, such as Cecropius of Sebastopolis, Florentius of Sardis, and Eunomius of Nicomedia. They demanded that the secretary read out loud documents that explained the faith, believing these to be sufficient. Among these were the creeds of Nicaea and Constantinople, the letters of Cyril, and the Tome of Leo. The reading of the Tome instigated a favorable reaction for those who wanted a new exposition of the faith.

After the reading of the Tome of Leo, many bishops proclaimed the accuracy of the document in light of the canonical documents. Many other bishops, however, were hesitant to accept a document that they were unfamiliar with as defining doctrine. One of the bishops,

---

reprehensionem ; quiquid ibi dictum, gestum, judicatum novimus atque firmatum, sancti Spiritus operata est ineffabilis et secreta potentia.

[38] *ACO* 2.1.2.p. 78: τὴν πίστιν καθαρῶς ἐκθέσθαι.

Ste. Croix identifies the civic official Anatolius as the same who regularly corresponded with Theodoret of Cyrrhus, lends further support for the notion that the outcome of the council was pre-determined in favor of the Two-Nature position; see Ste. Croix 2006, 290-291.

[39] *ACO* 2.1.2. p. 78: Ἔκθεσιν ἄλλην οὐδεὶς ποιεῖ οὐδὲ ἐγχειροῦμεν οὐδὲ τολμῶμεν ἐκθέσθαι· ἐδίδαξαν γὰρ οἱ πατέρες καὶ ἐγγράφως σώιζεται τὰ παρ' ἐκείνων ἐκτεθέντα καὶ παρ' ἐκεῖνα λέγειν οὐ δυνάμεθα

Atticus of Nicopolis, requested an adjournment to discuss the request of the emperor and review the documents, which the officials allowed. However, they permitted this under a condition that no doubt influenced the direction of the meeting. The discussion would take place at the patriarch's house: "your Holinesses may meet at the house of the most holy Archbishop Anatolius and discuss the faith together, so that those who object might learn."[40] Anatolius received the task of assembling a group of bishops to scrutinize the Tome for its orthodoxy. Further, the patriarch chose whom he would invite for discussions.[41]

Despite the many cries of protest, the emperor got his wish for an exposition of the faith. The patriarch's collaboration made this possible, because he and Marcian both agreed on what the definition of faith should read beforehand. Anatolius' role suddenly magnifies in this light. The deliberation of the faith occurred at his residence and he selected the participants. Anatolius controlled both the stage and the actors. The patriarch did not need to remind the discussants that, immediately outside his residence, there was the imperial palace and the emperor with his soldiers. So, as Anatolius made possible Marcian's desire for a new creed, Marcian enabled Anatolius to manage the deliberations that defined the faith with this implicit support. Importantly, Marcian had a large contingent of soldiers mobilized around Constantinople for his campaigns against the Huns in Illyricum. All of this, again, suggests an advance plan. If the bishops had succeeded in refusing to come forth with a new creed, then the council might have devolved into a stalemate.

[40] *ACO* 2.1.2. p. 83: ἐν τῶι μεταξὺ συνελθεῖν τὴν ὑμετέραν ἁγιωσύνην εἰς τὰ τοῦ ἁγιωτάτου ἀρχιεπισκόπου Ἀνατολίου καὶ κοινῆι περὶ τῆς πίστεως βουλεύσασθαι, ἵνα οἱ ἀμφιβάλλοντες διδαχθῶσιν.
[41] *ACO* 2.1.2. p. 83: ὁ εὐλαβέστατος ἀρχιεπίσκοπος Ἀνατόλιος ἀπὸ τῶν ὑπογραψάντων ἐπισκόπων ἐπιλέξεται οὓς ἂν νομίσηι ἱκανοὺς εἶναι πρὸς διδασκαλίαν τῶν ἀμφιβαλλόντων.

Atticus' sudden proposal to adjourn proved to be prudent, but it is telling that the imperial officials immediately had a venue and host in mind, ready for such specific circumstances. Perhaps this merely came about as a contingency plan, which the imperial representatives and Anatolius ended up needing. But someone anticipated that there would be an uproar over production of a new statement of faith and planned accordingly.

The *acta* do not contain any information about what exactly Anatolius' committee discussed, possibly because the committee considered the meeting 'off-the-record' and had no secretary present. Richard Price notes that the *acta* of session five seems to omit much of the discussion regarding the new creed, saying that there are obvious "extensive omissions" on the parts of editors, who did so to obscure "theological disagreement" and give the appearance of unanimity.[42] At the beginning of the fifth session, Anatolius presented the results of his committee's findings. The imperial representatives then asked him to report what the committee had found. Anatolius replied that the Tome of Leo agreed with the councils of Nicaea, Constantinople, and Ephesus. After him, each bishop stood and declared their agreement with the Tome and signed it.[43]

While they all claimed that the Tome did nothing more than confirm the faith of the previous councils, by accepting it as a canonical document that defined Christian faith these bishops instituted a new normative declaration of the faith. Anatolius' suggestion that it merely accorded with and confirmed the faith deflected accusations of theological innovation in proposing a Two Nature Christological formula. Leo derived his formula from the writings of

[42] Price 2009c, 96. Similarly, Ste. Croix observes the meagerness of the *acta* for the fifth session and believed that this was because the compilers, wanting preserve a sense of respect for the Tome of Leo, edited out objections to it; see Ste. Croix 2006, 266.
[43] *ACO* 2.1.2. p. 94.

Cyril, the decisions of previous councils, and the letter of Flavian to Theodosius II, but he was also innovating upon their work with the integration of the *Theotokos* and the Two-Nature teachings.

After succeeding in having the council accept the Tome of Leo, Marcian made an appearance at the sixth session and delivered a speech that contained an explicit command for the bishops to "expound" upon the faith. He couches a threat in a denial. The point of his speech was to request formally that the council agree with the definition of faith and canons that Anatolius produced:

> Indeed, we wish to be present at the synod following the example of the pious *princeps* Constantine to confirm the faith, not to employ any power but so that everyone is not divided by perverse beliefs…that all people should become unified through the true and holy doctrine and return to the same faith and confess the true catholic faith, which you will expound it in accordance with the teachings of the fathers.[44]

Marcian justifies his presence at the council as doing no more than what Constantine had done. This was a safe and credible statement for a Christian emperor to make. An emperor's representatives, usually high-ranking civic officials, were typically present anyhow.

Yet, Marcian specifically invokes a threat by saying he is not there for that effect by using the term *potentia*, the raw power an emperor wielded to physically coerce. In fact, his statement "not to employ any power" suggests that the assembled bishops expected or feared precisely that power. As De Ste. Croix argued, "the machinery of compulsion was actually far more powerful at Chalcedon, so much so that actual force did not need to be used, or even visibly threatened, because everyone knew that resistance to the imperial will would result in his

[44] Marcian, *Address to the Council*, in *ACO* 2.2.2. p. 6: *nos enim ad fidem confirmandam, non ad potentiam aliquam exercendam exemplo religiosi principis Constantini synodo interesse voluimus ne vel ulterius populi pravis persuaionibus separentur…ut omnis populus per veram et sanctam doctrinam unim sentiens in eandem religionem redeat et veram fidem catholicam colat, quam secundum institutiones patrum exposueritis.*

ruin."[45] Indeed, nothing reminded everyone present at Chalcedon of this more than the term *potentia* itself. Marcian's denial of violence in fact was a veiled threat of it; he need not use such a loaded term unless he specifically wanted to evoke fear in his audience so that they comply. While the emperor's in-person address is probably among the more visibly threatening actions at Chacledon, the effects of perceived threats at the council are seen in the large number of bishops who had condemned Flavian at Ephesus II being among those who subsequently signed the Tome at Chalcedon. At one point the civic officials asked one of these bishops, Eustathius of Berytus, why he had condemned Flavian at Ephesus II but now proclaimed him orthodox, to which he meekly responded "I erred."[46]

All of this implies that Anatolius pushed through his theological and ecclesiastical agendas using imperial muscle. At every moment the presence of Marcian and his agents lurking in the background are evident. The sudden volte-face of so many bishops with their abandonment of the miaphysite position suggests something more fearful than a conversation had convinced them. Indeed, Ps.-Zachariah records the allegation that these bishops signed the Tome under duress: "those priests who had a short time earlier in the days of the blessed Theodosius assembled at the second council of Ephesus…were required under coercion to sign on [to the acts of the council]."[47] While this source is obviously hostile to Chalcedon, it explains why so many bishops suddenly changed their theological positions.

Going deeper than the "coercive" elements of securing his agenda at Chalcedon, Anatolius persuaded the other bishops to sign the Tome and adopt the Two-Nature Christology

[45] Ste. Croix 2006, 274.
[46] *ACO* 2.1.1. p. 113: Οἱ ἐνδοξότατοι ἄρχοντες καὶ ἡ ὑπερφυὴς σύγκλητος εἶπον· Διὰ τί τοίνυν Φλαβιανὸν τὸν τῆς εὐλαβοῦς μνήμης καθεῖλες; Εὐστάθιος ὁ εὐλαβέστατος ἐπίσκοπος Βηρυτοῦ εἶπεν· Ἐσφάλην.
[47] Ps.-Zachariah, *EH*, iii.1.f.

as orthodox. Anatolius possessed a level of authority early on in his tenure as patriarch. As president of the council he had the right to speak and control the floor, certainly at the private meeting in his residence he controlled the content and direction of the conversation. Already by the time of the council he had demonstrated a skill in fortifying his own position and persuading other bishops to support his causes when he turned his back on Dioscorus and sided with Pope Leo I, who in turn granted him recognition.

Ste. Croix notes that obedience to metropolitan bishops for their authority was common at councils.[48] Such obedience points to respect for institutional authority rather than for individual charisma. In fact, during the deliberations about Canon 28, some of the bishops responded that they had gladly signed the canon: "I am glad to be under the see of Constantinople, since it honored me and consecrated me."[49] Seleucus of Amaseia, Peter of Gangra, Marinianus of Synnada, and Critonianus of Aphrodisias all testified likewise.[50] Common to all is that they explained that they signed the canon because the patriarch of Constantinople had ordained them, as well as the bishops before them, and they respected this custom, even though they were all in cities outside Constantinople's own province of Europa and diocese of Thrace. Despite this, they were all happy to sign the canon because it recognized a custom that had clearly continued since Chrysostom began consecrating bishops in Asia at the beginning of the fifth century.[51] They clearly revered the authority of their de facto metropolitan, the patriarch of Constantinople, and his desires. In this regard, the patriarch's authority seems to derive from a

[48] Ste. Croix 2006, 304-305.
[49] *ACO* 2.1.3.p. 96: Ῥωμανὸς ἐπίσκοπος Μύρων εἶπεν· Οὐκ ἠναγκάσθην, ἐγὼ ἡδέως ἔχω ὑπὸ τὸν θρόνον Κωνσταντινουπόλεως εἶναι, ἐπειδὴ καὶ αὐτός με ἐτίμησεν καὶ αὐτός με ἐχειρο τόνησεν. ἐμοὶ δίκαιον φαίνεται καὶ ἀπὸ γνώμης ὑπέγραψα.
[50] *ACO* 2.1.3.p. 96-97.
[51] Chrysostom ordained the bishop of Ephesus (Socrates, *EH*, 6.11), Sissinius ordained Proclus as the bishop of Cyzicus (Socrates, *EH*, 7.28), and Atticus ordained Silvanus bishop of Troas (Socrates, *EH*, 7.37).

juridical patronage model, with a more rigid structure of an asymmetrical relationship between metropolitan and bishop. Bishops complied with the wishes of Anatolius, not just because there was a lurking threat of imperial force, but also because he had already become an authority for them.

Anatolius' rapid obtainment of authority was achieved through his shrewd association with bishops whom were already authoritative: Pope Leo and, ironically (if Chadwick's implication in his murder is correct), Flavian. Anatolius also took up his predecessor's plan: assembling an ecumenical council to correct the 'errors' from Ephesus II. In his letter of appeal to Leo, Flavian reports of his dire situation, calling on Rome to defend the faith that they both held (the Two-Nature Christology), and for Leo to urge the emperor to summon an ecumenical council to resolve the problems that Eutyches and Dioscorus had created.[52] Anatolius effectively carried out Flavian's agenda at the council by ensuring Dioscorus's demise and dyophysite theology's triumph. By the council declaring the orthodoxy of the recently deceased patriarch at session one, Anatolius effectively became the standard bearer of the "touchstone for orthodoxy," Flavian.[53]

Anatolius used the rhetoric of Leo to argue for the legitimacy of the patriarchate's elevation. Leo drafted the document supporting Flavian's theology (his Tome), gave justification for action against Dioscorus, and laid the groundwork for discrediting the second council of Ephesus as a "Robber Synod."[54] Even the language of Canon 28 appropriated the rhetoric of Rome's own justifications for ecumenical authority for Constantinople:

[52] Appeal of Flavian to Leo, in *ACO* 2.2.p.77-79.
[53] Ste. Croix 2006, 278.
[54] Leo to Pulcheria, *Ep.* 95: *non iudicium sed* ***latrocinium***

> The Fathers also gave privileges to the see of Old Rome because it was the imperial city, the 150 most God-beloved bishops gave equal privileges to the most holy see of New Rome, rightly judging that the city being the imperial city and having the senate should have equal privileges as Old Rome and should enjoy those privileges in ecclesiastical matters as well.[55]

If the Fathers had deemed that Old Rome should have privileges because of its civic standing in the Roman Empire then New Rome should likewise have such privileges. This logic seemed to prevail in the East, where ecclesiastical rank comfortably mirrored a city's civic standing. However, for Rome, the papacy had based its claims to privileges and highest ecumenical authority on succession from St. Peter, not its position as an imperial city.[56] Instead, in the East, ecclesiology mirrored civic structure with the rationale that the successes of Empire and the importance of cities within it were providential. Constantinople was obviously the most important city in the East, and likewise its bishop should have the greatest authority. The need for apostolic succession to justify authority became diminished in this light.

Anatolius latched onto the authority of vetted orthodox metropolitans to enhance his own authority. More so, at Chalcedon he rooted the "touchstone for orthodoxy" in the patriarch of Constantinople's office. This was accomplished not only by Canon 28 but also by re-emphasizing the role of Constantinople in prior theological conflict as a bastion of orthodoxy, mostly through bringing the Council of Constantinople I into a greater role. At the 431 Council of Ephesus, the second ecumenical council seemed to occupy little importance and was not mentioned. As a part of elevating the patriarchate, Anatolius also emphasized Constantinople's

[55] Canon 28, in *ACO* 2.1.3.p. 88-89: Καὶ γὰρ τῷ θρόνῳ τῆς πρεσβυτέρας Ῥώμης, διὰ τὸ βασιλεύειν τὴν πόλιν ἐκείνην, οἱ Πατέρες εἰκότως ἀποδεδώκασι τὰ πρεσβεῖα, καὶ τῷ αὐτῷ σκοπῷ κινούμενοι οἱ ἑκατὸν πεντήκοντα θεοφιλέστατοι ἐποσκοποι τὰ ἴσα πρεσβεῖα ἀπένειμαν τῷ τῆς νέας Ῥώμης ἁγιωτάτῳ θρόνῳ, εὐλόγως κρίναντες, τὴν βασιλεῖᾳ καὶ συγκλήτῳ τιμηθεῖσαν πόλιν καὶ τῶν ἴσων ἀπολαύουσαν πρεσβείων τῇ πρεσβυτέρᾳ βασιλίδι Ῥώμῃ, καὶ ἐν τοῖς ἐκκλησιαστικοῖς, ὡς ἐκείνην, μεγαλύνεσθαι πράγμασι…

[56] See Blaudeau 2012a & 2012b, and Demacopoulos 2013 (particularly p. 39-72).

sacredness, using the council of 381 to establish Constantinople's place in the landscape of Christian history.

During the Council of Chalcedon, the standing of the Council of Constantinople I grew. Twice, when the council asked itself what exactly was faith that they professed, the bishops proclaimed and said the Nicene creed and the Constantinopolitan creed. Both times they stressed that the creeds were the symbols of the faith of the 318 and 150 fathers, respectively referring to the first and second councils, and that those creeds defined orthodox Christianity.[57] However, the first mention of the 150 fathers, meaning Constantinople, is from the "most glorious officials and exalted senate" at the end of the first session. If Marcian had already predetermined the outcome of Chalcedon with Anatolius' input, no doubt his hand-selected civic representatives would have been on the same page, having also received counsel from the patriarch. Perhaps, then, this first mention of Constantinople I should be seen as part of Anatolius' agenda to demonstrate the imperial city's place in Christian tradition.

The growing frequency of the invocation of the 150 fathers as preserving the faith of Nicaea from Chalcedon onwards suggests a deliberate attempt to strengthen the memory of that council and its place in Christian tradition. Brian Daley argued for a stronger understanding of Canon 3 of Constantinople I: "in their original context, as having clearly practical, even juridical implications."[58] The privileges spoken of in 381 were not mere "honors" but real attributes vested in the patriarchate, which Constantinople was now taking the time to remind the rest of the Church about.[59] Of course, although Eusebius of Dorylaem claimed he had personally seen

[57] At the second session of Chalcedon (*ACO* 2.1.2. p. 79-80) and the fifth (*ACO* 2.3.2 p. 135-136).
[58] Daley 1993, 531.
[59] Daley 1993, 534.

the pope recognize Canon 3, Rome disputed the canon's validity during the discussions at Chalcedon.[60]

One of the Roman legates, Lucentius, denied that Canon 3 of Constantinople was canonical and that the patriarchate had any true privileges stemming from it.[61] But as the willing voices of bishops who signed Canon 28 indicate, bishops in the East had already been acquiescing to Constantinople's authority. In fact, Rome probably was well aware about the role Canon 3 would have at Chalcedon, but likely not the extent to which Anatolius would build upon it.[62] Regardless of the canonical status of Constantinople's privileges, the patriarchate was already ordaining bishops outside its province and diocese long before that privilege became canonical at Chalcedon. It was successful because bishops in the surrounding dioceses had accept the patriarchate's authority in doing so.[63]

Ste. Croix's assessment of these events is correct in noting that Marcian had already predetermined the outcome of the Council of Chalcedon, namely the suppression of the miaphysite doctrine and the approval of the dyophysite doctrine.[64] He emphasizes the role of the

[60] *ACO* 2.1.3. p. 97. It does not appear that Rome was deeply familiar with the proceedings of the Council of Constantinople I, although it certainly knew about Canon 3. See Gwynn 2009, 18-19.

[61] *ACO* 2.1.3. p. 94-95: It appears that what is being discussed is added to the definition of the 318 and the 150 who met after, and they say that this has been decreed despite no mention in the synodical canons. If they enjoyed these privileges as that time, why now are they seeking what they were enjoying against the canons? Φαίνεται προσσεσωρεῦσθαι τοῖς ὅροις τῶν τιη καὶ τοῖς μετὰ ταῦτα ρν τὰ νῦν μνημονευθέντα, μὴ ἐμφερόμενα δὲ ἐν τοῖς συνοδικοῖς κανόσιν ταῦτα φάσκουσιν ὡρίσθαι. εἰ τοίνυν τοῖς χρόνοις τούτοις τῶι βενιφικίωι ἐχρήσαντο, τί νῦν ζητοῦσιν ὧι μὴ [κανονικῶς] κατὰ κανόνας ἐχρήσαντο;

There are also discrepancies between the Greek and Latin editions of the council *acta* at this point. See Price 2009c, 100-101.

[62] Blaudeau 2012a, 258.

[63] Daley's observations on this shed more light on the reception in the East of Canon 3, in Daley 1993, 543: "For the Eastern bishops who had voted for the resolution [Canon 28]…these primatial rights or πρεσβεῖα of the see of Constantinople meant above all the right to *ordain bishops*…And the right to ordain clearly implied, for them, not simply a ceremonial custom, but the ability to act as a referee – as well as the duty to take unpopular decisions – in the struggles over episcopal succession that racked so many small Hellenistic cities."

[64] Ste. Croix 2006, 279.

patrician Anatolius, but the patriarch of the same name is hardly present in his assessment.[65] The patriarch's cooperation was essential to Marcian's control of the council. Should the council have broken down, as it was likely to do, and the western bishops left, it was far from certain that a new definition of faith would have come to fruition agreeable to Marcian. For Anatolius' part, there is no way that a council in the West would have allowed the approval of Canon 28. The imperial commissioners even challenged the bishops to go hold a council in the West if they could not agree on matters in Chalcedon.[66] Of course, this did not happen, but it could have. Both emperor and patriarch worked together to plan a council that would turn out just the way they wanted. Ultimately for the patriarchate, it resulted in an enhanced authority with greater autonomy than ever.

Anatolius' fundamental role is evident not only in the proceedings of the councils but their canons as well, especially Canon 28. If the proceedings of Chalcedon were chiefly the actions of Marcian, one would have to address the problem that Canon 28 considerably strengthened the patriarchate and detracted from its dependency on the imperial office. What advantage would it be for the emperor to have a strengthened patriarchate? True, it might make implementing his own religious policy more feasible with a cooperative patriarch by his side, but an adversarial patriarch might also hamper the emperor's religious policies, as Acacius did to Basiliscus. Anatolius probably convinced Marcian of the necessity of a strong patriarch to work alongside the emperor. This would be especially helpful if the emperor and Alexandria or Rome did not agree on matters of doctrine.

[65] Ste. Croix 2006, 287-294.
[66] *ACO* 2.1.p. 320-1.

Price, similarly to Ste. Croix, is short on the patriarch Anatolius' role at Chalcedon, saying that in 450 he along with Maximus of Antioch were "like weathercocks, followed the change of the wind; both pressed the bishops in their areas of authority to sign Leo's Tome."[67] Yet, the evidence suggests that Anatolius calculated his moves for a specific end and was not going along passively. Indeed, such passiveness would hardly have yielded the extraordinary privileges Anatolius obtained. It could also be that Leo was simply convincing in explaining the Two-Nature doctrine, which Anatolius was familiar with anyway. Regardless, Constantinople was not an "apostolic see," as Pope Leo complained, but it virtually attained status as one by asserting authority above Alexandria and Antioch.[68]

Anatolius clearly had a much more influential role at Chalcedon than is readily apparent in scholarship of the council. But as regards the authority of his office, the long-term project of having Christians in the East accept the patriarchate's authority rested in cultivating a Chalcedonian identity. In doing so, Chalcedonian Christians would look to the patriarch as an authority, because the council that had effectively redefined orthodoxy would forever be associated with the office whose interests lie in preserving it.

- *Post-Chalcedon*

There was no widespread and deep reception of Chalcedonian Christology in the years immediately after the council. However, a sense of Chalcedonian identity grew amongst

[67] Price 2009b, 72. He arrives at this conclusion by arguing that Marcian probably made clear his intent to back the dyophysite position.
[68] *Leo to Marcian*, Letter 104, in *ACO* 2.4. p. 56: Let him not scorn the imperial city, which he is not able to make into an apostolic see… *Non dedignetur regiam civitatem, quam apostolicam facere non potest sedem*…

Christians in the following decades and patriarchs began basing their authority on the Chalcedonian faith. They used it to protect their claims to enhanced ecclesiastical privileges. Of course, there were dissenters, especially outside Constantinople, who rejected the patriarchate's claims based on its association with Chalcedon.[69] Early legal measures taken by the emperor helped to shape Chalcedon's reception within Constantinople. Marcian issued an edict on 7 February 452 forbidding public debate on matters of faith, presumably aimed at anti-Chalcedonians. He declared that the decisions of Chalcedon had settled any questions of faith and therefore all must accept them, threatening ramifications "by the authority of the law and the judges" for those who did not.[70]

The reality was that the council's new formulation of faith was controversial. Constantinopolitan civic and church officials recognized this and consequently attempted to dissuade dissenters from sowing doubt in others. Powerful speakers could persuade persons uncertain of their convictions. The last thing the patriarch or the emperor would want after reaching ecclesiastical concord (ostensibly, at least) was for someone to convince others of another doctrine not in accordance with Chalcedon. Limiting people's ability to gather in public for the purpose of doctrinal debate reduced the chances of such happening. The emperor added three additional edicts to enforce more specific points about the council's findings shortly after.[71] These laws were intended to shape the direction of public discourse in Constantinople; as a hoped result, the Constantinopolitan church would be a normalizing force in defining

[69] See Frend 1972 for the development of miaphysite resistance in the East.
[70] *ACO* 2.2.2. p. 21-22.
[71] *ACO* 2.2.2. p. 23-27.

orthodoxy.[72] However, outside the imperial city the council's and the patriarch's authority were met with resistance.

Many reasons existed for rejecting the council in the East, mostly resting in theological differences. Anti-Chalcedonians associated the patriarch of Constantinople with Chalcedon and rejected his authority on that basis. As for Rome, while the West accepted Chalcedon's doctrinal conclusions, which Leo had significantly contributed to, the pope was much less enthusiastic about the sudden elevation of the patriarchate of Constantinople.

While Pope Leo saw his Tome become a "foundational articulation of Christological orthodoxy," with Canon 28 it also signaled that the East had not accepted Petrine authority as deeply as he would have liked.[73] In his objections, Leo maintains that the Council of Nicaea had permanently established the ecclesiastical hierarchy based on Apostolic succession, namely through Peter. Constantinople, as he reminded the emperor Marcian, was not an apostolic see, although he conceded it should receive some honor as the imperial city: "Let the city of Constantinople keep its glory, which we desire, and by the protection of God's right hand may it enjoy your clemency's rule for a long time. But secular affairs have a different reasoning than divine, no building can be stable apart from the rock that the Lord set as a foundation."[74] For Leo, Peter is the foundation of the Church itself. Peter established Rome as the "foundation" on which all other Christian communities should base themselves, reflecting the divine ordering of ecclesiology.

---

[72] Blaudeau 2006, 138-139.

[73] Demacopoulos 2013, 61.

[74] Leo sent three letters expressing his objections to Canon 28, one to Marcian (Leo Letter 104), one to Pulcheria (Leo Letter 105), and one to Anatolius (Leo Letter 106). In *ACO* 2.4. p. 55 – 62.

Leo to Marcian, in *ACO* 2.4. p. 56: *habeat, sicut optamus, Constantinopolitana civitas gloriam suam et protegente dei dextera diuturno clementiae vestrae fruator imperio: alia tamen ratio est rerum saecularium, alia divinarum, nec praeter illam petram quam dominus in fundamento posuit, stabilis erit ulla constructio.*

In the East, however, a city's civic importance factored strongly into ecclesiology; coincidently, Alexandria and Antioch were both Petrine sees.[75] Clearly at stake for Leo, and hardly at all for Constantinople, was Petrine authority.[76] While Leo was prepared to concede that Constantinople certainly should have some degree of ecclesiastical authority, this was because of respect for the city's secular position. However, it lacked the crucial claim to the "rock," Peter, of the Lord. It was not until March 453 that Leo sent ratification of Chalcedon to Constantinople. In his formal letter to the council, he reminds them of Canon 6 of Nicaea and berates Anatolius again, though not by name: "the observance of your Holinesses that the privileges of the churches must remain as they were laid down by the 318 divinely inspired fathers. Let ambition desire nothing else belonging to another, nor shall anyone seek his own increase through the injury of another."[77] So Rome grudgingly accepted Canon 28 as part of Chalcedon, with its own self-imposed declaration that Canon 6 of Nicaea took precedence. Of course, Constantinople did not yet exist in 325, which disqualified the city from Leo's vision of ecclesiastical order.

Leo's arguments ignore the Council of Constantinople I, which Anatolius invoked throughout the council and in a letter to him after the end of Chalcedon, in which he affirms that there were 150 bishops who decreed that the imperial city should have a place of honor.[78] Anatolius defended Canon 28 with the argument that in superseding Antioch and Alexandria in ecclesiastical hierarchy, Constantinople was following the precedence of the imperial city following Old Rome: "The see of Constantinople has your apostolic throne as its father."[79] This

[75] Grillmeier 1975, 2.1. p. 113.
[76] Demacopoulos 2013, 63-64.
[77] *ACO* 2.4.p. 70-71.
[78] *Anatolius to Leo*, in ACO 2.1.2.p. 52-54. Also extant as Letter 101 of Leo I.
[79] *Anatolius to Leo*, in ACO 2.1.2.p. 54: ὁ γὰρ θρόνος Κωνσταντινουπόλεως ἔχει πατέρα τὸν ἀποστολικὸν θρόνον ὑμῶν...

echoes Canon 28, which used the same argument that New Rome's position derived directly from Old Rome—also revealing Anatolius as the author of the canon. Anatolius' arguments shift the basis of Roman claims to power from Petrine to civic. Instead of Rome being a patriarchal see because Peter established it and died there, it held primacy because the emperor resided there at one point and was the center of the Roman Empire. This reasoning never completely absolved tensions between Rome and Constantinople on this matter, but it made clear that New Rome still regarded Old Rome as having undisputed ecumenical primacy.

As for the East, anti-Chalcedonians rejected the council for its theological position. They viewed it as the results of Satan's influence and the unjust persecution of the emperor:

> There will be an impious emperor, named Marcian, who will bring the bishops to affirm in writing that the one who was crucified is not God, they all obey him and shared in his opinion, only the bishop of Alexandria, speaking of Dioscorus, will not obey him, because of this he will be persecuted and condemned to exile where he will die.[80]

The prophecy centers orthodoxy in Alexandria and shows the events of Chalcedon as anti-Christian. Egyptian Christians in particular used polemics of satanic influence to disavow the dyophysite doctrine. At the council itself, the Egyptian bishops cried out "Give no place to Satan! Give Satan no room!"[81] The allegation of satanic influence colors the council's actions as illegitimate and justified discounting its findings.[82]

Discrediting the council as influenced by Satan permitted anti-Chalcedonians ascribing religious authority to men whom Chalcedon had condemned and to continue professing the doctrines of those men. The patriarchate's theological rivals saw spiritual authority as not

---

[80] John Rufus, *Plerophoria* 7, translation from Syriac into French by F. Nau: *il y aura un empereur impie, nommé Marcien, qui amènera les évêques à affirmer par écrit que celui qui a été crucifié n'est pas Dieu ; et, alors que tous lui obéiront et partageront son avis, il n'y aura que le seul évêque d'Alexandrie, je veux parler de Dioscore, qui ne lui obéira pas ; mais à cause de cela il sera persécuté et condamné à l'exil, où il mourra.*
[81] *ACO* 2.1.p. 111: ὁ σατανᾶς τόπον μὴ σχῆι. ὁ σατανᾶς χώραν μὴ σχῆι.
[82] MacMullen 2006, 44.

deriving from an institutional construct, but directly from God.[83] Legitimate leadership for anti-Chalcedonians could stand outside institutional ecclesiology.[84] For instance, the Palestinian monk Theodosius, before the council ended, returned to Jerusalem spreading news that the council had effectively endorsed Nestorianism through the acceptance of the Tome of Leo, claiming that Juvenal of Jerusalem was complicit in the approval of heresy.[85] Theodosius rallied the monasteries of Palestine against Juvenal and with their support supplanted him as patriarch of Jerusalem. Alternatively, their authorities could be a part of the traditional church hierarchy and still be legitimate in a way that excluded Chalcedonian churches, such as Timothy Aelurus and Severus of Antioch, both of whom anti-Chalcedonians regarded as their true patriarchs although they were technically expelled from their sees. In particular, Egypt served as the bastion of anti-Chalcedonian resistance, and Alexandria was an alternate center of orthodoxy from Constantinople.[86]

Throughout the *Plerophoria* of John Rufus and *Chronicle* of Ps.-Zachariah Rhetor, anti-Chalcedonians appear as the true Christians and suffer for their faith. In an account of the martyrs of Najran, a group of Arab tribesman asked a bishop what he would do, because "your Christ is rejected by the Romans, the Persians, and the Himyarites!"[87] The tribesmen understood orthodox Christianity to be the miaphysite articulation, intimating that Chalcedonians were not Christians at all. The story of the martyrs of Najran, then, shows that by the early sixth century anti-Chalcedonians had concluded that Constantinople (to which "Romans" referred) was the

[83] Steppa 2002, 135-141.
[84] Booth 2014, 36-43.
[85] Ps.-Zachariah Rhetor, *EH*, III.3.
[86] See Steppa 2002, 24-33; and, Blaudeau 2006, 276-301.
[87] Ps.Zachariah, *EH*, VIII.3.a.

nexus of Chalcedon, and hence not orthodox. Persecution at the hands of the imperial government and Himyarite king proved the orthodoxy of the miaphysite doctrine. Such accounts reaffirmed for these Christians that they were correct, and the church of Constantinople was in error.

Further, John of Ephesus makes clear that anti-Chalcedonians rejected the patriarch of Constantinople's authority because of the office's association with Chalcedon. Speaking of the miaphysites in Constantinople, he says:

> They naturally were looked upon with displeasure by the patriarchs of Constantinople, whose authority they disowned; for already their own organization was complete, from the death of Severus, patriarch of Antioch, A.D. 542, to the present day, there has been maintained in the East a succession of Monophysite patriarchs, to whom all the members of the party owe allegiance.[88]

As the earlier conflict between pro- and anti-Nicene Christians shows, a patriarch's authority resounded with an audience that held similar beliefs. This transcended ecclesiastical jurisdictions. In Constantinople, miaphysite Christians did not look to the patriarch there for leadership but to the miaphysite patriarchs of Antioch who succeeded Severus. The basis for their allegiance was confession, not locale. Audience limits the scope of authority, just as it did earlier for Gregory of Nazianzus and non-Nicene Christians in Constantinople.

These stories show that authority in Christian communities was tied to a community's conception of orthodoxy. In large swaths of the East, the patriarch of Constantinople was unauthoritative because of the office's profession of Chalcedonian doctrine. Conversely, as a Chalcedonian identity began to grow, the patriarch became even more authoritative for communities of that confession.

[88] John of Ephesus, *Ecclesiastical History*, I.1.

After the tumultuous events in Alexandria in March 457—which resulted in the murder of Proterius and the ordination of Timothy Aelurus—Emperor Leo I sent out a dossier of documents relating to Chalcedon, the so-called *Codex Encyclicus,* to metropolitan bishops soliciting their stance on Timothy's ordination and Chalcedon. This was done at Anatolius' suggestion.[89] Leo then instructed Anatolius to summon the standing synod in Constantinople to deliberate both the ordination of Timothy Aelurus and the Council of Chalcedon.[90] But as he had done at the 451 council, Anatolius had already secured a favorable outcome: The emperor received letters expressing unanimous support for Chalcedon in the replies to his *Codex*.

According to Liberatus, Anatolius sent his deacon Asclepiades to speak with the bishops about Emperor Leo's *Codex Encyclicus,* urging them to reject the ordination of Timothy Aelurus and support Chalcedon.[91] Liberatus does not elaborate on whom Asclepiades visited, but they were likely bishops that Anatolius suspected of lax support of Chalcedon. Ps.-Zachariah likewise reports that the metropolitans who reaffirmed Chalcedon were "influenced to write by the instigation of Anatolius and the letters [that he wrote] to them."[92] This suggests that he wanted to ensure that bishops reaffirmed their support of Chalcedon (which they did). It also shows that Anatolius had considerable influence in the East, as is evident by the unanimous, save for Amphilochius of Side, support given for Chalcedon at his request.[93]

---

[89] Theodore Lector, *EH,* 371-372.
[90] Evagrius Scholasticus, 2.9. See Blaudeau 2006, 156-161 for a reconstruction of the events surrounding this synod.
[91] Liberatus, 15: *mittit et Anatolius episcopus Aclepiadem diaconum suum, per quos omnes illi episcopi, qui Chalcedone fuerant congregati, pquid Alexandriae gestum fuit, agnoscerent.*
[92] Ps.-Zachariah, iv.7.a. The responding letters of the bishops are in *ACO* 2.5. p. 9-98
[93] Pope Simplicius records that the *Codex* was received with unanimous support. Simplicius, Letter 3.5, in *CA* 56.9. p.127. All of the bishops of the East responded with unanimous proclamation. *Totius Orientis episcopi de huius praedicationis consenione rescripserint*.

Metropolitans' compliance to Anatolius' letters and deacon very much appears to adhere a classical model of authority. Anatolius instructed metropolitans on a course of action and they complied. Of course, this does not distinguish whether they responded to Anatolius out of respect for his personal or institutional authority; likely it was a combination of both. Yet, because he was patriarch that gave him the sort of clout needed to exert such influence successfully, so respect for the position of the office contributed to the positive reception of his authority. Anatolius could issue commands with the *expectation of compliance* because of his office's authority. Only Amphilochius of Side and the bishops under him responded to Leo that they rejected the findings of Chalcedon and supported Timothy Aelurus.[94]

Ps.-Zachariah records Amphilochius rejecting Chalcedon because of the "coercion and the hypocrisy that took place there."[95] Although there is no evidence in the *acta* for any coercion, as Ste. Croix pointed out the mere threat could force compliance.[96] At any rate, Ps.-Zachariah goes further in the same chapter, claiming that the emperor was almost convinced by Amphilochius, but Anatolius convinced the other bishops to confirm Chalcedon and condemn Aelurus. The unknown in all this, though, is what Anatolius' deacon, Asclepiades, said to metropolitans in his personal visits with him. Similar to the side meeting at the patriarchate's residence during the Council of Chalcedon, there is no direct evidence to elucidate the discussions. The results, however, in both instances were unanimously in support of Anatolius' measures, likely because of authority, persuasion, and threats combined.

[94] Ps.-Zachariah, IV.7.
[95] Ps.-Zachariah, IV.7.
[96] Ste. Croix 2006, 274

Returning to the unanimous support for Chalcedon that came forth in response to the *Codex Encyclicus*, save for Amphilochius of Side, is the matter of how deeply these bishops, and to a greater extent Christians in general, were identifying Chalcedon as the basis of orthodoxy. If they were identifying as Chalcedonian in some respect, if not by name then at least by understanding the Chalcedonian creed as orthodox, then they *could* respect the authority of Anatolius and comply with his request.

Price does not regard the letters that constitute the *Codex Encyclicus* as showing any concrete support for Chalcedon.[97] His main point is that the bishops seemed to be affirming Nicaea, rather than anything that came forth at Chalcedon. While there is a clear affirmation of Nicaea underlying the logic of the letters, within the replies to the *Codex Encyclicus* lies a clear understanding that orthodoxy and Chalcedon were inextricably linked: "If we declare worthless that which the assembled Fathers established at Chalcedon, we would without a doubt also destroy what was decided at Nicaea."[98] The bonds of orthodoxy depended on maintaining the canons of Chalcedon. If one string was pulled, all of what the ecumenical councils had determined was orthodox would unravel.

One can also observe the patriarchate's authority and its relation to Chalcedonian orthodoxy during the events 475 and the *Encyclicon* of Basiliscus. With this document, the usurper signaled to anti-Chalcedonians that they would be able to "render effective for themselves the very same principles of the imperial Church which had been employed against them at and after the Council of Chalcedon."[99] Later that year, a synod convened in Ephesus

[97] Price 2009a, 308-309.
[98] *ACO* 2.5. p. 45.
[99] Grillmeier 1975, Vol.2, Pt.1, 241

under the presidency of Timothy Aelurus. There, the bishops there condemned the council of Chalcedon, restored the former bishop Paul to Ephesus and "returned to him the canonical rights of his see, which the assembly of Chalcedon had stripped from him, and had given in partiality to the throne of the imperial city."[100] In a synodical letter to Basiliscus afterwards, they called for the deposition of the "unsaintly bishop in the imperial city," Acacius.[101] For these non-Chalcedonians in Asia, the council's creed professed not only an error, but also wrongly allowed for the patriarch of Constantinople's usurpation of their rights. Unlike Rome, which saw the creed as valid but did not recognize Canon 28, non-Chalcedonians saw the two going hand-in-hand. Rejecting the doctrine of Chalcedon also meant rejecting the authority of the patriarch.

Acacius did not sign the *Encyclicon* because repudiating Chalcedon would of course mean an end to Canon 28. In the defense of his authority as patriarch and Chalcedon against the encroachments of the emperor, Acacius proclaimed a time of martyrdom had come to the church.[102] The rhetoric of his proclamation prodded the faithful of Constantinople into acting on his behalf. Acacius urged his congregation to "not betray our priesthood," reminding them of his office's connection with the faith of Chalcedon. His exhortations worked, and he had forced Basiliscus to rescind his *Encyclicon*.[103] Acacius' success and the anti-Chalcedonian's failure resulted from two factors: Constantinopolitans (1) had come to accept the Chalcedonian creed as orthodox and (2) saw the patriarchate as tied to the council: "In Constantinople orthodoxy had

[100] Ps.-Zachariah, v.4.b.
[101] Evagrius *EH*, 3.5.
[102] *Life of Daniel the Stylite*, 70. "Brothers and children, the time of martyrdom has arrived; let us fight for our faith and for the Holy Church, our mother, and let us not betray our priesthood." «Ἀδελφοὶ καὶ τέκνα, καιρὸς μαρτυρίου ἐνέστηκεν· ἀγωνισώμεθα οὖν ὑπὲρ τῆς πίστεως καὶ τῆς μητρὸς ἡμῶν τῆς ἁγίας ἐκκλησίας· καὶ τὴν ἱερωσύνην μὴ προδῶμεν.»
[103] Grillmeier 1975, 2.1, 242-244.

become synonymous with the acceptance of Chalcedon."[104] Acacius could marshal those sentiments for his defense because Constantinopolitans heeded his authority, which he explicitly based on Chalcedonian orthodoxy.

As with the *Codex Encyclicus*, Price rejects that the events of 475 confirm any deep support for Chalcedon in Constantinople, instead arguing that reaction against Basiliscus was more likely due to outrage at the murder of Proterius.[105] However, none of the ancient sources for these events suggest as much or even mention Proterius in context with the popular demonstrations against Basiliscus.[106] Ps.-Zachariah claims that partisans of Proterius welcomed Timothy Aelurus in Alexandria.[107] If there was as much mass outrage at the murder of Proterius, such that it destabilized the reign of an emperor, it is reasonable to expect more indication in the sources. Yet, even in sympathetic sources, the murder of Proterius receives no attribution as a cause for popular unrest. By 475, then, Constantinople had begun equating orthodoxy with Chalcedon. This becomes more evident early in the sixth century.

In early 518, the former patriarch Macedonius instigated a riot in Constantinople from exile in Euchaïta, based on the rumor that Anastasius and the new patriarch Timothy were inserting the phrase "who was crucified for us" (an anti-Chalcedonian slogan) into the Trisagion prayer.[108] The riot became so heated that Anastatius publicly offered to abdicate. The crowd, satisfied in seeing that he humbled himself, declined his offer. Two points are clear from this mob incident: (1) the people of Constantinople meant Chalcedon when they spoke of orthodoxy

[104] Frend 1972, 172.
[105] Price 2009a, 309.
[106] Neither Evagrius Scholasticus, *The Life of Daniel*, or Ps.-Zachariah mentions Proterius in this context.
[107] Ps.-Zachariah, v.4.c.
[108] Evagrius Scholasiticus, *EH*, 3.44.

and (2) the crowd did not recognize Timothy's authority and instead opted to follow the directions of the former patriarch. Macedonius still possessed authority because he held and defended Chalcedonianism. By the early sixth century, the patriarch was the leader of this identity, so long as he professed it. So having legitimate authority as patriarch was contingent upon professing the Chalcedonian faith.

John II's advancement to the patriarchate later in 518 shows that this contingency was true and that the creed of Chalcedon was orthodox for Constantinopolitans. As both the new emperor, Justin I, and patriarch entered the Great Church on 15 July 518, they were met with the cries of popular acclamation and demands:

> Many years to the patriarch! Many years to the Emperor! Many years to the Augusta! Many years to the patriarch! Why do we remain in excommunication? Why for so many years have we not had communion? We want communion by your hands…if you are orthodox, what do you fear, you who are worthy of the Trinity? Eject Severus the Manichee...protect the synod of Chalcedon![109]

The sudden frenzy of a mob demanding affirmation of Chalcedonian beliefs from the patriarch was similar to the days of Gregory coming under assault of stones during Easter by an anti-Nicene mob. Here again, a crowd of Constantinopolitans gathered in defense of orthodoxy, upon which their Christian identity rested. However, in this case the patriarch happily capitulated to the crowd, because both parties held the same definition of orthodox faith. The institution of the patriarchate always maintained that it championed orthodoxy and at that moment in 518 John II became the leader of an ecstatic and mobilized congregation. The next day, the Chalcedonian mob demanded the insertion of all four ecumenical councils, Pope Leo, and all patriarchs from

[109] Mansi, VIII.1058. πολλὰ τὰ ἔτη τοῦ πατριάχου, πολλὰ τὰ ἔτη τοῦ Βασιλέως, πολλὰ τὰ ἔτη τῆς Αὐγούστης, πολλὰ τὰ ἔτη τοῦ πατριάχου, ἀκοινώνητοι διὰ τί μένομεν; ἐπὶ τοσαῦτα ἔτη δια τὶ οὐ κοινωνοῦμεν; ἐκ τοὶς χειρῶν σου κοινωνῆσαι θέλομεν... ὀρθόδοξος εἶμ τίνα φοβῆσαι; ἄξιε τῆς τριάδος...Σεβῆρον τὸν Μανιχαῖον ἔξω βάλε…τὸν σύνοδον Χαλκηδόνος ἄρτι κήρυξον.

Acacius through Macedonius inserted into the diptychs (the previous patriarch Timothy, had removed his predecessor). John complied.[110]

The gathering of this mob suggests that during the years of the *Henoticon*, there was a large and zealous crowd of Chalcedonian faithful.[111] They were demanding a patriarch who would champion the Chalcedonian cause and be done with the ambiguous middle ground of the *Henoticon*. Christians in Constantinople had accepted Chalcedonianism as orthodox and expected the patriarch to profess that articulation of the faith. The final act the 518 mob resulted in the violent suppression of anti-Chalcedonians in Constantinople through the murder of a palace official.

The mob demanded the execution of Amantius, the *praepositus sacri cubiculi*.[112] According to Procopius, Justin I executed Amantius in 518 for "nothing other than saying something rash about John, the archpriest of the city."[113] While he might have slandered the patriarch, the Chalcedonian mob had resoundingly demanded Amantius' execution as condition for Justin's coronation. Ps.-Zachariah reports that Amantius spoke out against Chalcedon and the three patriarchs in the east who had signed it: Constantinople, Alexandria, and Antioch.[114] The *Chronicon Paschale* only says that Justin executed Amantius for attempting to install Theocritus as emperor after Anastasius' death, placing the event in 519. The author of the *Chronicon* held miaphysite or other anti-Chalcedonian sympathies,[115] so the absence of Amantius' anti-Chalcedonianism in this source is striking. Marcellinus Comes reports that Amantius held some

[110] Mansi VIII.1061.
[111] Menze notes that during the last years of Anastasius' rule Chalcedonians had become more vocal in their discontent. See Menze 2008, 26.
[112] Mansi VIII.1063-1066.
[113] Procopius¸ *The Secret History*, 6.26.
[114] Ps.-Zachariah, 8.1.b.
[115] See Whitby and Whitby 1989, xxvi for a list of passages that suggest the author of the *CP* was anti-Chalcedonian.

sort of miaphysite beliefs, using the anti-Miaphysite polemic "Manichaen" to describe the eunuch.[116] In all of these reports, Amantius' well-known and public disavowals of Chalcedon instigated the crowd to demand his death as part of a public showing of loyalty to Chalcedon by the new regime. Amantius had become a symbol of anti-Chalcedonianism in Constantinople, which the populace wanted destroyed.

The decades of the tepid Chalcedonianism under the policy of the *Henoticon*—which had its priorities in the East and willfully let communion with Rome rupture—came to an end.[117] Justin I's ascension and John II's tenure as patriarch mark for anti-Chalcedonians the start of a new persecution. In the Syriac *Chronicle of Zuqnīn*, the Chalcedonians "cunningly" advise the unintelligent and uneducated new emperor to abandon the *Henoticon* and strictly enforce the canons of Chalcedon.[118] Soon after, an "intense persecution" began at Justin's instigation throughout the east, in which Ps.-Dionysius of Tel Mahre offers a list of 54 "orthodox" bishops (meaning anti-Chalcedonian) whom the imperial persecution forced from their see.[119] For anti-Chalcedonian Christians, the execution of Amantius represented the end of unity and peace, even if it came as the result of a doctrinally unsatisfactory document. For Chalcedonians, especially those in Constantinople, Amantius' execution was the culmination of their frustrations boiling over after decades of dealing with theological stalemate.

During the reign of Justin and his nephew, Justinian, the definition of orthodox and Christian identity in Constantinople centered on the city itself. It was already intertwined with

[116] Marcellinus Comes 519.2. *Amantius palatii praepositus, Andreas, Misahel et Ardabur cubicularii Manichaeorum fautores et Iustini Augusti deprehensi sunt proditores.*
[117] See Frend 1972, 221-254 for a detailed analysis of Chalcedonian 'hardline' reaction and fight against the *Henoticon*.
[118] Ps.-Dionysius of Tel Mahre, *The Chronicle of Zuqnīn* pt. III, 517-518.
[119] Ps.-Dionysius of Tel Mahre, *The Chronicle of Zuqnīn* pt. III, 517-518.

the Council of Chalcedon, but increasingly deliberations of orthodoxy looked to Constantinople as a holy locale. This was because of the successful insertion of the second ecumenical council into the canon at the Council of Chalcedon and patriarchs who had shaped orthodox doctrine.

In the synod at Constantinople in 536, one of the reasons that the synod condemned the patriarch Anthimus was because it found that he was not orthodox. The synod, and Justinian in a follow-up law confirming the deposition of Anthimus, defined orthodoxy as the faith "of the 318 at Nicaea, the 150 in this fortunate city (Constantinople), the 200 assembled for the first time in Ephesus, and the 630 of the venerable fathers in Chalcedon."[120] The definition of orthodoxy rested in the four collective ecumenical councils, each necessary to that definition: "the Four Councils were now the religion of the empire."[121] Noteworthy is the explicit mention of Constantinople I, which Anatolius had advocated for in 451.[122] Like Nicaea, the Council of Constantinople I began occupying a fundamental place in the definition of orthodoxy.

While the fall of Anthimus might have been the result of Justinian orchestrating the removal of a patriarch who was not cooperative with Rome to gain the pope's support for his Italian campaign, the patriarch's position rested on his profession of Chalcedon. Anthimus' tepid defense of the doctrine resulted in his downfall.[123] In fact, Anti-Chalcedonians assumed that Anthimus was sympathetic to their cause: "Anthimus had learnt by the arguments of Severus the

[120] Justinian, *Imperial edict against Anthimus, Severus, Peter, and Zoara*, in *ACO* 3.p.120. Also, extant as Novel 42. προσποιούμενος μὲν ταῖς τέσσαρσιν ἁγίαις συνόδοις ἀκολουθεῖν, τῇι τε τῶν τριακοσίων δέκα καὶ ὀκτὼ πατέρων τῶν ἐν Νικαίαι τῇι τε τῶν πεντήκοντα καὶ ἑκατὸν τῶν ἐν ταύτηι τῇι εὐδαίμονι πόλει τῇι τε τῶν ἐν Ἐφέσωι τὸ πρῶτον συναχθέντων διακοσίων τῇι τε τῶν θεοφιλῶν πατέρων τῶν ἐν Χαλκηδόνι χλ, οὐ μὴν τοῖς τούτων δόγμασι κατακολουθῶν.
[121] Frend 1972, 275.
[122] This was not the first time that Constantinople I figured prominently into the definition of orthodoxy during the era of Justinian. See Price 2009a, 312.
[123] Richard Price argues that Justinian effectively "sacrificed" Anthimus to secure the support of Rome. See Price 2009a, 314-315.

unsoundness and erroneousness of the synod of Chalcedon, and the blasphemies of Leo in his letter.…"[124] Again, orthodoxy was necessary to the patriarch's authority, although it changed depending upon which specific Christian community was defining it. Like Timothy in 518, the patriarch held authority so long as he operated within a system that inhibited what beliefs he could publicly espouse. Anthimus' downfall highlights that authority was vested in the institution and that the office-holder's authority was contingent upon his acceptance of Chalcedon, at least in Constantinople.[125]

The further development of Constantinople and its role in the formation of Christian orthodoxy is evident at Council of Constantinople II in 553. The council laid out a canon of church fathers that defined orthodoxy, along with the four ecumenical councils. Those fathers were: Athanasius, Hilary, Basil, Gregory the Theologian, and Gregory of Nyssa, Ambrose, Augustine, Theophilus, John of Constantinople, Cyril, Leo, and Proclus.[126] Eight were archbishops of major sees or patriarchs (three from Constantinople), showing that patriarchs of

---

[124] John of Ephesus, *Ecclesiastical History* I.42.

[125] One should note that even after the synod of 536 many anti-Chalcedonian monks and clergy still occupied Constantinople, as John of Ephesus' *Lives of the Eastern Saints* testifies. Obviously a Chalcedonian patriarch held little authority for them. Their presence in the imperial city seems to have been part of Justinian's larger strategy of cultivating the consensus of all Christians in the Empire. See Frend 1972, 276-286; Menze 2008, 254-265; and, Price 2009a, 315-319.

[126] In letter of Justinian to the Council of Constantinople, Session 1, in *ACO* 4.1. p.12-13*: scire etenim vos volumus quod nos ea quae* ***a sanctis quattuor conciliis****, Nicaeno, Constantinopolitano, Epheseno primo et Calchedonensi, de una eademque fide exposita et definite sunt et de ecclesiastico statu regulariter disposita, servamus et defendimus et ea sequimur et omnia quae consonant istis, suscipimus et amplectimur… sequimur autem in omnibus* ***sanctos patres et doctores sanctae dei ecclesiae****, id est* ***Athanasium, Hilarium, Basilium, Gregorium theologum et Gregorium Nysenum, Amrosium, Theophilum, Iohannem Constantinopolitanum, Cyrillum Augustinum, Proculum, Leonem****, et omnia quae ab his de fide recta et ad condemnationem haereticorum conscripta et exposita sunt, suscipimus.*

The Council of Constantinople II gave a confession of faith in Session 3 that strongly mirrors that of Justinian I above, *ACO* 4.1. p. 3): *his ita se habentibus certum facimus quod omniaquae* ***a praedictis sanctis quattor conciliis****, sicut praedictum est, pro recta fide definite sunt et de statu eccleasiastico regulariter disposita, et servavimus et servamus…(lines 12-14) super haec sequimur per omnia et* ***sanctos patres et doctores ecclesiae****,* ***Athanasium, Hilarium, Basilium, Gregorium theologum et Gregorium Nysenum, Ambrosium, Augustinum, Theophilum, Iohannem Constantinopolitanum, Cyrillum, Leonem, Proculum,*** *et suscipimus omnia quae de recta fide et condemnatione haereticorum exposuerunt.*

Constantinople became part of the Christian historical memory of orthodoxy as authorities. Although two of the three patriarchs appearing in this list were exiled from Constantinople, the construction of Constantinople as a center of the orthodox past in turn reaffirms its own, and the patriarchate's, authority.

The reshaping of the orthodox past is most evident with John Chrysostom's appellation as "John of Constantinople." Even though he twice suffered exile from Constantinople, Justinian and the council specifically invoke his memory and connect it to the imperial city. Like the synod of 536, they also define orthodoxy to include the Council of Constantinople I. In doing so, the imperial city, through its connection as the site of ecumenical councils and patriarchs who defined orthodoxy, inserted itself into Christian topography as a sacred city. Conversely, the patriarch's position is augmented by virtue of being the bishop of that city.

- *Conclusion*

While a large part of this chapter has been concerned with the reception of Chalcedon, the underlying point is that the reception of the council was linked to the patriarchate. In little over a century, patriarchs had shaped orthodoxy in Constantinople from Nicene to Chalcedonian, which Christians within the city based their religious identity on, and claimed exclusive leadership of the community there as the center of orthodoxy. Chalcedon effectively became the creed of Constantinople. It established New Rome as New Jerusalem and the patriarchate vested its authority in the faith of that city, via Canon 28.

In the concluding letter of the Council of Chalcedon to Emperor Marcian, the bishops cited the exegeses and letters of influential and authoritative bishops to justify their findings. Among the florilegia that they cited were the works of former patriarchs: Gregory of Nazianzus, John Chrysostom, Proclus, and Atticus.[127] Chalcedon established a firm link between Constantinople and orthodoxy, which transformed the perception of the imperial city, and which was again echoed in the synods of the sixth century. With Alexandria refusing to accept the council as orthodox, Constantinople became "the undisputed centre of the Church of the East Roman world."[128] In the decades after Chalcedon Christians came to see the imperial city as a holy city: "Go to Byzantium and you will see a second Jerusalem, Constantinople."[129]

An imperial law highlights the growing rhetoric of Constantinople's claims. In an edict dated 17 December 476, after the failed usurpation of Basiliscus, Emperor Zeno wrote:

> The blessed and reverend Acacius, sustainer of our piety, is bishop and Patriarch…We order and ordain that at the holy church of this religious city, mother of our piety and the holy seat of all Christians of the orthodox faith, and the holy (ecclesiastical) see of the same city shall, in deference to the imperial city, in perpetuity firmly possess all privileges and honors in regard to the ordination of bishops, precedence of place and all others which they are known to have had before or during our reign.[130]

Constantinople clearly takes the position of the center of orthodoxy in this law. More so, Acacius' position is affirmed as the "sustainer of our piety." The patriarch of Constantinople then, is the head of an institution in which orthodoxy rests. Zeno declares that the patriarch is the leader of all Christians.[131] In doing so, it attempts to mitigate the conditions in which this was not the case during the years of 475-476. If a Christian is orthodox, then they should hold the faith of

[127] *Address to Marcian, ACO* 2.1. pp. 469-475.
[128] Baynes 1926, 115.
[129] *Life of Daniel*, 10: ἄπελθε εἰς τὸ Βυζάντιον καὶ βλέπεις δευτέραν Ἰερουσαλήμ, τὴν Κωνσταντινούπολιν
[130] *CIus* 1.2.16.
[131] Blaudeau 2012a, 158.

the Constantinopolitan church. Consequently, the patriarch of Constantinople is their bishop, no matter where they might be in the Empire.

In contrast, that Zeno issued this law highlights an uncomfortable truth for the patriarchate. The context of the law is that it was in response to the brief usurpation of Basiliscus, who along with a anti-Chalcedonian contingent attempted to undo Chalcedon. These Christians did not regard the faith of the Constantinopolitan church as orthodox, instead professing the faith of Alexandria as correct. In doing so, the limitations of the patriarchate's authority come to light; it did not have influence on Christians who professed a different orthodoxy, whether they be in the imperial city or in other dioceses. By pinning orthodoxy on the Constantinopolitan church's doctrine, whatever that might be, the law fixes a fluid definition onto an institution. This is because ultimately patriarchs derived their authority from the institution, not their own personage (although charisma could certainly enhance it).

In the events following this law, particularly those of 518 and 536 as well as the definition of orthodoxy at the fifth ecumenical council, bishops and emperors reassert the link between Constantinople and orthodoxy. As the head of the Constantinopolitan church, the patriarchate held the authority of a city that claimed to be the "holy seat of all Christians of the orthodox faith." Such a claim was part of a larger project of making Constantinople part of Christian tradition. As a see that did not exist during the Council of Nicaea, Constantinople had a tenuous claim to that tradition and was thus one of the early problems for the patriarchate in asserting and expanding its authority.

In this and the previous chapter, the patriarch of Constantinople's authority was shown to be at first reliant on the emperor for support in carrying out his duties. Through means of

rhetorical persuasion, legislation, clientele networks, and coercion, the patriarchate obtained greater autonomy. However, the evidence used in these chapters highlights the juridical aspect of the patriarch's authority—namely Canon 3 of Constantinople I and Canon 28 of Chalcedon, while hinting at more subtle change in Christian identity that allowed the patriarchate to take a place of central authority in the East. That process is the subject of the next chapter, which shows how that was accomplished through use of performance and myth.

Proving Holiness: Miracles and Relics

- *Introduction*

Patriarchs cultivated and strengthened their authority through existing extra-liturgical religious practices. Literature, ritual practices, and objects could serve the same functions as rhetoric and physical power in communicating authority.[1] In this case, relic translations, the circulation of miracle stories, and ritual affirmation of the institution's sacred characteristics augmented the patriarchate's authority. The patriarchate did not create these elements; rather they were Christians' contemporary religious practices in expressing their religiosity. As such, they created an atmosphere in which Constantinopolitans readily accepted patriarchs' claims of authority. In many cases, patriarchs used these elements to further a religious cause, in the process benefitting their claims to authority.

At the heart of relic veneration and miracle stories is a transcendent holiness on the part of the object(s) and actor(s). Patriarchs latched onto this holiness by connecting their institution to the actors through a common faith. For example, by translating the relics of martyrs—who shared the same specific confession as the patriarch—the institution shared in a common history of persecution that legitimized their confession. Part of Gregory of Nazianzus' trouble in successfully claiming religious authority was that Constantinopolitans, the majority non-Nicene at that time, did not perceive him as sharing in the same religious traditions. In staking hold to authority within the city, patriarchs—first under the Nicene and then the Chalcedonian faiths—

[1] Lincoln observed that non-verbal actions and objects could communicate or designate authority, which he termed "authorizing objects." These objects symbolized that the possessor was authorized to speak and, in turn, their speech carried the weight of authority. For instance, the scepters of kings in the *Illiad*. See Lincoln 1994, 7-10; and, 14-36.

cultivated a common sense of the past between themselves and their congregations. They thus constructed a community identity for Constantinopolitans that defined itself by a particular doctrine.

The construction of this identity, which had orthodoxy has it basis, rested on the promulgation of patriarchs' supernatural feats in literature and the legends associated with objects. This identity connected the office to an orthodox past, which existed more so in discourse than reality. Yet these stories they served a real function, as Averil Cameron has observed:

> The deployment of narrative form [was] to inculcate and confirm belief. If in some of its aspects Christian literature related to the prevailing mode of epideictic by its emphasis on performance, repetition, and proclamation, in others, and perhaps more fundamentally, it built up its own symbolic universe by exploiting the kind of stories that people liked to hear, and which in their turn provided a mechanism by which society at large and the real lives of individuals might be regulated.[2]

Here Cameron is speaking of the power of Christian literature, but the observation can be broadened to include the stories associated with the relics of martyrs, regardless of their form of dissemination. Even if the story did not come from an authority, an authority could take advantage of a pre-existing story circulating through a community. Ecclesiastical historians frequently make note of martyr stories circulating during their time, for example.

Underpinning these stories is the "cult of the saints" and the role martyrs had in Christian memory. Peter Brown described the relationship between holy men and a village as "bilateral."[3] Villagers had expectations for holy men's behavior and performance that demanded compliance from ascetics who aspired to be holy men. Their credibility and authority rested in their

[2] Cameron 1991, 92-93.
[3] Brown 1971, 86-90.

fulfillment of those expectations. In a similar manner, although patriarchs' authority did not exclusively rest in their conformation to such ideals, it enhanced their authority by gaining the title of holy. While noting elites' efforts to institute these factors because they were well-received modes of worship among general, what occurred in Constantinople does not fit into the "Two-Tiered" model of religion that Peter Brown has worked against.[4] Brown notes that the cult of saints had been subject to "vigorous appropriation…by the bishops and the ruling classes of the Roman Empire."[5] Thus, 'superstitious' religious practices were often not at all the product of a 'vulgar' and 'popular' piety, but that of the most educated and wealthy Christians.

For patriarchs, their association and participation with the cult of the saints proved their orthodoxy. With such manifest proof, their congregation might be more likely to accept their authority. Although this was never explicitly expressed, over time patriarchs began occupying such a large space in extra-liturgical religious practices that it becomes clear Constantinopolitans attached aspects of the cult of the saints to their memory of these men.

In the following, first there will be an exploration about the translation of relics into Constantinople and the dynamics the cult of saints played for the authority of the patriarchate. Second, an exploration of the miracle stories and supernatural feats of patriarchs that gave literary evidence for their holiness. Finally, there will be an observation of how Christian ritual itself reinforced the authority of the patriarchate.

- *Martyrs, relics, and the Christian past*

[4] This model relegates popular "superstitious" religious practices to the poor and/or uneducated, while the lofty ideals and philosophical practices of religion were the domain of the educated elite.
[5] Brown 2015, 33.

In cultivating a community, patriarchs linked themselves to the memory of martyrs and saints, fostering the patriarchate's association with Christian history. By interring relics in Constantinople, the city became a sacred space bridging the orthodox past and present. Patriarchs effectively presented themselves as the successor of martyrs. Even if these were tenuous assertions, or the orthodox past was but a fleeting moment, relics gave physical evidence to transcendent claims, perhaps if not always how the Constantinopolitan church intended. Relic translation, coincidently, gained widespread practice while the patriarchate was evolving in prominence. In fact, Cyril Mango described the practice of relic translation as a peculiarly eastern practice that developed from the late fourth through fifth centuries.[6] In Constantinople, then, the acquisition of relics was a contemporary and popular form of religious practice.

To begin, a few points about martyrdom will illuminate some of the reasons for the institutional collection of relics by the patriarchate of Constantinople and, to some extent, the imperial government. Tertullian famously wrote that "the blood of the martyrs is the seed of the Church."[7] Martyrs captivated the minds of early Christians, as the accounts of Polycarp, Justin, and Ignatius demonstrate. Proof of one's devotion to Christ came through a strict imitation of his life and death, even so far as consciously seeking martyrdom.[8] Relics were martyrs' physical remains. As physical objects of the martyr's devotion to Christ, they became immensely important. From the earliest times of the religion onward, Christians venerated martyrs' remains as relics and interred them in or near churches, where they celebrated the martyr's feast day. In

[6] Mango 1990, 51-52.
[7] *Apology* 50, in *PL* 1.p. 535: *Semen est sanguis Christianorum*.
[8] See Ste. Croix's chapter "Voluntary Martyrdom in the Early Church," in Ste. Croix 2006, 153-200.

this way, relics served as physical commemorations of the martyr's accomplishment, which in turn allowed the community participation in the deceased's imitation of Christ.

In the mid–second century, the church of Smyrna reported gathering up Polycarp's bones, which were "more valuable than precious stones and finer than refined gold," to them.[9] The church of Smyrna's veneration of Polycarp had two elements: he was the leader of their religious community and he died as a martyr. They proclaimed, "we love [him] as disciples and imitators of the Lord."[10] Brown observed that accordingly, relics functioned in an "imaginative dialectic" between viewer and object as a "linking of Heaven and Earth."[11] In venerating the relics, Christians could physically experience a transcendent moment via the object's holiness. More so, the venerator could share in the common faith between themselves and the martyr.

The experiential element was key in relic veneration. Gregory of Nyssa wrote about the relics of Theodore that: "For those who behold them embrace them as though the body were alive and flowering, and they apply all their senses: eyes, mouth, ears; then they pour tears for his piety and suffering and offer prayers of intercession to the martyr as though he was whole and apparent."[12] Relics elicited visceral emotions in venerators, who prayed to the saint directly as if physically present. Gregory mentions that they do so as if the martyr was "whole," acknowledging that the relic was likely to be only a piece of the saint's body. Nonetheless, only a fragment was necessary for such an experience to occur.

---

[9] Martyrdom of Polycarp, 18.2. οὕτως τε ἡμεῖς ὕστερον ἀνελόμενοι τὰ τιμιώτερα λίθων πολθτελῶν καὶ δοκιμώτερα ὑπὲρ ὀστᾶ αὐτοῦ.
[10] Martyrdom of Polycarp, 17.3.
[11] Brown 1981, 78-79.
[12] Gregory of Nyssa, *De sancto Theodoro,* in *PG* 46.740: Ὡς σῶμα γὰρ αὐτὸ ζῶν καὶ ἀνθοῦν οἱ βλέποντες κατασπάζονται, τοῖς ὀφθαλμοῖς, τῷ στόματι, ταῖς ἀκοαῖς, πάσαις προσάγοντες ταῖς αἰσθήσεσιν, εἶτα τὸ τῆς εὐλαβείας καὶ τὸ τοῦ πάθους ἐπιχέοντες δάκρυον, ὡς ὁλοκλήρῳ καὶ φαινομένῳ τῷ μάρτυρι τὴν τοῦ πρεσβεύειν ἱκεσίαν προσάγουσιν

Relics also served as physical confirmation of the martyr's orthodoxy (why else would they have suffered persecution, if not because they confessed the true articulation of the faith?). Accordingly, it in turn confirmed the orthodoxy of the venerator. The relics thus served as physical evidence for the venerator's orthodox identity and membership within an orthodox community.[13] Equally important, they served as a physical reminder of the martyr's story: "the martyr and his death became at once the enactment and the symbol of Christian perfection."[14] In this way, relics and the stories they embodied could construct and affirm Christian identity. Further, "The veneration of martyrs thus served to assure the Christians of a local church of its continuity with its own heroic, persecuted, past, and the universal Church of its continuity with the age of the martyrs."[15]

Pragmatically, this was of course useful for patriarchs in cultivating authority—though they likely never thought of it in such terms. But, relics *did* possess such capabilities, as Richard Payne observed about the practice in general: "To acquire a relic of a martyr was to possess a symbolic centre of the Christian church and to determine the role that symbol would play in the definition of its boundaries and hierarchies."[16] The relics of a martyr who held the same faith as the current patriarch inspired devotion to that faith. The shared faith between the martyr and the patron translating the relics was paramount. A Christian might suffer persecution and die for

[13] Sabine Van Den Eynde observed this within the martyrdom story of Perpetua. While Perpetua never elaborates on what exactly constitutes her Christian identity, she still "identifies herself as a Christian. This is her identity, irreversibly. Every word and deed will confirm this identity, whatever its price." (42) The martyrdom of Perpetua is of course long before the ecumenical councils that clarified the content of the faith; she is only identifying to the general appellation of Christian. However, the key aspect here is that in confessing their faith, martyrs served as part of a long tradition wherein they proclaimed their beliefs as an integral part of their very being. See Van Den Eynde 2005, 41-44.
[14] Cameron 1991, 51.
[15] Markus 1994, 270.
[16] Payne 2011, 92.

their faith, but this was not sufficient to warrant the veneration of their relics; they also had to be orthodox—which was relative to a specific community. No one, for example, would have venerated the bones of Nestorius in Alexandria.

The city's transformation into sacred space came as a result of the translation of relics to Constantinople. The movement of relics not only bridged a gap in time between the persecuted Church and the post-Constantinian Church, but it also built established tangible bridges to other sacred locales. For example, the transference of the relics of the apostles Timothy, Luke, and Andrew fulfilled this dual purpose by connecting the church of the Holy Apostles to the time of Jesus and spatially to Jerusalem.[17] The creation of a Christian sacred space was a novel practice that, like the translation of relics, grew during the fourth century.[18] When Constantine and his sons began translating relics to the imperial city, they addressed the problem that the Christian topography of early Constantinople was barren.[19] Unlike cities such as Rome, Antioch, or Smyrna, Constantinople possessed few martyria housing local saints and martyrs.[20] The only native martyrs that the city could claim were Mocius and Acacius.[21] The acquisition and interment of relics from other locales rectified Constantinople's dearth of martyr shrines, which in turn allowed an appropriation of a past it had not experienced: the persecution of Christians

[17] The author of the *Chronicon Paschale* correctly places these translations in the years 356 & 357. Paulinus of Nola mistakenly attributed these translations to Constantine rather than to his son Constantius: *Nam quia non totum pariter diffusa per orbem prima fides ierat, multis regionibus orbis Martyres abfuerant, et ob hoc, puto, munere magno id placitum Christo nunc inspirante potentes, ut Constantino primum sub Caesare factum est, nunc famulis retegente suis, ut sede priori martyras accitos transferrent in nova terrae hospitia* (Poem 19.317-324, in *PL* 61.530a). See Mango 1990, 52-53 on Paulinus of Nola's confusion. See also Delehaye 1912, 65 ff. for a discussion of the beginning of relic translations and Constantinople's role in that practice.
[18] As Markus shows, Constantine effectively created Christian sacred space. See Markus 1994, 265-271.
[19] See Dagron 1989, 1069-1085.
[20] Mayer and Allen 2000, 22.
[21] See Delehaye 1912, 267-271 for these martyrs and their cult in Constantinople and discussion of if these martyrs were amongst those that Constantine built a martyrium for that Eusebius describes in *Life of Constantine* 3.48. Also, Dagron 1974, 393-395.

during the apostolic age. By bringing in relics and establishing veneration of them in liturgical calendars, a patriarch could link himself to Christianity's most sacred history. Ultimately, the interment of relics in Constantinople created a sacred topography that had not existed before the fourth century.

- *Relic translations in Constantinople*

The first attempt at linking the present situation of the Constantinopolitan church to a specific articulation of faith was the translation of the remains of Paul the Confessor in 381. Paul had served as bishop of Constantinople and suffered exile from the city multiple times from 337-351 when non-Nicenes held dominance there. This translation signaled that the imperial government and church hierarchy now embraced Nicene Christianity. Theodosius I ordered the transference of Paul's remains from Ancyra to Constantinople, where he interred them at a church that Paul's Arian rival Macedonius had built, renaming it Hagios Paulos.[22] The return of Paul's remains symbolized a re-emergence for the Nicene community.

Paul supported and defended the Council of Nicaea in Constantinople early on, becoming a martyr in Cucusus when Arians murdered him after his exile. Athanasius secured Paul's role in Nicene history through his martyrdom account in his *History of the Arians*.[23] While the involvement of the emperor is prevalent here, the result benefited both Theodosius and the patriarch. With the interment of Paul, Nicene relics now rested in Constantinople, a crucial

[22] Socrates *EH* 5.9; Sozomen *EH* 7.10; and the Synodical Letter of 382 in Theodoret 5.9 mentions "others who had died in exile the relics were brought home," though this is not made explicitly clear that it is Paul the Confessor the synod is referring to.
[23] Athanasius, *History of the Arians*, 1.7.

development for the budding Nicene patriarchate's claims to legitimate authority in the 380s. Nectarius could then demonstrate with physical evidence his participation in Nicene-orthodox tradition. Paul's return and burial in an Arian church bolstered Nicene claims to orthodoxy in Constantinople because they now possessed the "relics of a martyr of orthodoxy."[24]

However, this is not what happened. No doubt the return of Paul's relics held importance for Nicene Christians in Constantinople, but the relic failed to establish a holding in most Constantinopolitans' minds. By the early fifth century, Constantinopolitans were confusing Paul the Confessor with the Apostle Paul, as Sozomen notes: "Many people ignorant of the truth supposed that Paul the Apostle was placed in there, especially women and the mass of people."[25] Seemingly, only the imperial government and church still made the distinction between Paul the former bishop of Constantinople and Paul the Apostle—possibly the former drifted into obscurity until forgotten. Paul the Confessor did not have a significant role in the Christian memory of Constantinople, at least among the laity. Perhaps Paul the Confessor occupied a larger role in the memory of Nicene loyalists but no longer held a prevalent fixture in the minds of Constantinople's larger Christian population. The intent of interring Paul's remains in his theological rival's own church did not lead to a connection of Nicene past with present. By and large, people did not recognize the spectacle and monument as a triumph of Nicene orthodoxy over Arianism. A relic of Paul the Apostle would of course be a magnificent artifact to house, but the implications would have been quite different from orthodoxy asserting victory over heresy.

[24] Liebeschuetz 1990, 164.
[25] Sozomen *EH*, 7.10.4-5. ὃ καὶ πολλοὺς ἀγνοοῦντας τὴν ἀλήθειαν ὑπονοεῖν ποιεῖ Παῦλον τὸν ἀπόστολον ἐνθάδε κεῖσθαι, μάλιστα δὲ τὰς γυναῖκας καὶ τοῦ δήμου τοὺς πλείους.

This confusion about relics shows the fluidity with which Christians ascribed meaning to them. The church and emperor had intended a triumphal celebration of Nicene Christianity. This triumph became lost to Constantinopolitans by the mid-fifth century, when Nicene Christianity was already normalized for them. Perhaps they did not even remember the struggle of Nicene Christianity in gaining a foothold in the city. Whatever the cause of their 'forgetfulness,' Constantinopolitans assumed that the relics held a broader and deeper meaning, as Paul the Apostle would have more universal appeal and transcend doctrinal divisions as a symbol for all Christians. More so, even if the persons translating a relic intended to champion the memory or cause of a particular doctrine, Phil Booth points out that "those opposed or indifferent to the official doctrinal position of a shrine could put into play various strategies of resistance through which to circumvent or subvert a shrine's particular confession."[26] Here, there is likely not some resistance at play but some degree of indifference or ignorance of the "official" doctrinal position. The case of Paul the Confessor, then, shows the limitations of relic translation in communicating authority via connection to martyrs. Sometimes the message became forgotten and the audience indifferent.

Still, relics need not be strictly situated in a discourse of orthodoxy to establish a connection of the relic translator to holiness. In another relic translation, instead of interring the relics of a martyr connected to a doctrinal debate, those of Jewish figures came to the imperial city. In 415, Atticus brought the relics of Joseph, the son of Jacob, and of Zachariah, the father of John the Baptist, into Constantinople and deposited them in the Great Church.[27] Atticus brought

[26] Booth 2011, 117.

[27] *Chronicon Paschale* 415. And the bodies of Joseph, son of Jacob, and Zachariah, father of Saint John the Baptist, were brought into Constantinople, going across the Chalcedonian jetty, in the month Gorpiaeos, on the sixth day before the Nones of September. These bodies were brought in two caskets carried in carriages by Atticus, patriarch

these relics to Constantinople to celebrate the Great Church's re-inauguration after the fire that destroyed the first church during the riot that ensued John Chrysostom's final exile.[28] In a procession that ended at the Great Church, the bodies were set upon carriages, taken inside, and interred there in the presence of the senate and other civic officials.

While the *Chronicon* does not mention who initiated the translation, the patriarch presided over the ceremony in his own cathedral church. The *Chronicon* does not specify why Atticus translated these men's relics. Theodosius I had earlier brought John the Baptist's head to Constantinople, so it might have been part of some impulse to complete a collection of the relics of a man the Gospels considered a forerunner of Christ, as in Luke 1:5-25.[29] But it is more likely that this was a symbolic interment of Old and New Testament figures to show the Great Church as being a typological fulfillment, as Christ fulfilled the Old Testament prophecies, embodying Jerusalem in the structure of the Great Church. Zachariah clearly was an antecedent to Joseph the father of Jesus, but Joseph the son of Jacob had a typological role as well. John Chrysostom spoke of Joseph's life as "a type of those things to come, a prophetic picture of the truth in the shadows," prefiguring that of Christ's.[30] Whichever the case, the translation, procession, and presence of the senate would show Atticus as possessing objects symbolizing the Great Church's role as part of providential history. The audience would not have to try too hard to see the

---

of Constantinople, and Moses bishop of Antarados in Phoenicia. They were laid to rest in the Great Church with Ursus the city prefect and all the senate there. καὶ ἐκομίσθη ἐν Κωνσταντινουπόλει διὰ τῆς Χαλκηδονησίας σκάλας λείψανα Ἰωσὴφ τοῦ υἱοῦ Ἰακὼβ καὶ Ζαχαρίου τοῦ πατρὸς τοῦ ἁγίου Ἰωάννου τοῦ βαπτιστοῦ μηνὶ γορπιαίῳ πρὸ ς΄ νωνῶν σεπτεμβρίων ἡμέρᾳ σαββάτῳ, βασταζόντων τὰ αὐτὰ λείψανα ἐν γλωσσοκόμοις δυσὶν Ἀττικοῦ πατριάρχου Κωνσταντινουπόλεως καὶ Μωσέως ἐπισκόπου Ἀνταράδου Φοινίκης, κα θεζομένων αὐτῶν ἐν βουριχαλίοις· ἅτινα ἀπέθεντο ἐν τῇ μεγάλῃ ἐκκλησίᾳ, προπέμποντος Οὔρσου ἐπάρχου πόλεως καὶ πάσης τῆς συγκλήτου.

[28] The Great Church became damaged in a fire during the tumult after John Chrysostom's second deposition and banishment in 404.

[29] Sozomen *EH* 7.21.

[30] John Chrysostom, *Homily on Genesis* 61.3 in *PG* 54.528: Ἐγίνετο δὲ καὶ τύπος τῶν ἔσεσθαι μελλόντων, καὶ ἐν τῇ σκιᾷ προδιεγράφετο τὰ τῆς ἀληθείας πράγματα.

patriarch as occupying an important role. Although in this case the patriarch likely derived benefit for his authority by his direct participation, he did not have to be present in a translation to profit from it.

Members of the imperial family, if not the emperor himself, were frequently involved in the translation and veneration of relics. In a homily that Chrysostom delivered after the transference of relics from the Great Church to a suburb, he praises the empress Eudoxia as a model of veneration and his congregation for a large turn-out of the procession. The patriarch was not there himself, but he delivered a homily afterward that defined the boundaries of veneration.

> Constantly reaching out and touching the remains, absorbing their blessing and teaching everyone else about this beautiful and spiritual merchandise; instructing everyone to draw from this fount that's constantly drained but is never emptied. After all, just as the waters that bubble forth from the springs aren't contained within their own hollows but well over and flow beyond, so too the grace of the Spirit that accompanies these bones and dwells with the saints both extends towards others who follow it with faith and flows from mind into body.…[31]

Chrysostom's account confirms what Gregory of Nyssa said about relic veneration: it was a visceral experience that affected the senses. Touch features strongly here. Eudoxia was "constantly reaching out and touching the remains," indicating that something to be gained in doing so. In fact, martyrs' relics were vessels of the Holy Spirit, which the faithful could draw

[31] John Chrysostom, *Homily Delivered After the Remains of the Martyrs,* in *PG* 63.469. English translation in Mayer and Allen 2000, 87-88. Διά τοι τοῦτο καὶ ἡ φιλόχριστος αὕτη παρείπετο τοῖς λειψάνοις, συνεχῶς ἐφαπτομένη, καὶ τὴν εὐλογίαν ἐπισπωμένη, καὶ τοῖς ἄλλοις πᾶσι διδάσκαλος γινομένη τῆς καλῆς ταύτης καὶ πνευματικῆς ἐμπορίας, καὶ διδάσκουσα πάντας ἀρύεσθαι ἀπὸ τῆς πηγῆς ταύτης τῆς ἀεὶ μὲν ἀντλουμένης, οὐδέποτε δὲ κενουμένης. Καθάπερ γὰρ τὰ νάματα τῶν πηγῶν βρύοντα, οὐκ εἴσω τῶν οἰκείων κόλπων κατέχεται, ἀλλ' ὑπερβλύζει καὶ ὑπερχεῖται· οὕτω δὴ καὶ ἡ τοῦ Πνεύματος χάρις ἡ τοῖς ὀστέοις παρακαθημένη καὶ τοῖς ἁγίοις συνοικοῦσα, καὶ εἰς ἑτέρους πρόεισι τοὺς μετὰ πίστεως ἐφεπομένους αὐτῇ, καὶ ἀπὸ ψυχῆς εἰς σώματα…

upon for whatever purpose by touching them. And, as Chrysostom says, the flowing of the Holy Spirit's grace from the martyr's relics is eternal, making veneration for perpetuity feasible. Mayer and Allen regarded this homily as an example of "imperial panegyric," which it certainly is in many respects.[32] More importantly, Chrysostom is also using the empress as a model of normative behavior for worshipers, demonstrating that Christians could express their spirituality outside the church, but within the scope of a sanctioned practice.[33] Thus the "deployment of narrative form," through a homily, coopted this practice and subtly implemented the rules and logic for carrying it out. Chrysostom communicates this with the caveat that the Holy Spirit will extend from the saint to the venerator "who follows it with faith," meaning that this benefit would only extend to those venerators who held the same faith as the martyr. In this way, the patriarch could guide his congregation's homogenization of belief.

During the tenure of Proclus, the martyr Thyrsus appeared to Empress Pulcheria in a vision, instructing her where to find the relics of 40 martyrs hidden outside Constantinople's walls.[34] It is obvious that they were not the relics of martyrs native to Constantinople. Sozomen does not relate how exactly the relics came to be in Constantinople; all he reports about their provenance is that a Novatian woman had herself buried with them near her house while still holding them. One of the underlying points, other than Eudoxia received the dream because she was pious, is that in a city whose sacred lore was growing, holy objects lay hidden awaiting discovery. Even if not immediately apparent, the holiness of Constantinople waited under the

[32] Mayer and Allen 2000, 85.
[33] Similarly, Chrysostom had realized early on in his career in Antioch the necessity of regulating his congregation's extra-liturgical visitation of shrines and how such practices should reflect their orthodoxy. See Shepardson 2014, 92ff.
[34] Sozomen, *EH*, 9.2.

surface, revealing its location to persons worthy enough to behold holiness—like much of divine knowledge itself, the true meaning remained hidden until just the right person could discern it. Such a story could reinforce the connection between empire and faith, and the interests of emperor and patriarch could be mutual in the acquisition or discovery of a relic. While these relics bolstered the emperor by furthering his position as a divinely chosen ruler, they also proved that Constantinople was a holy city. The possession of relics, then, could benefit persons other than the bishop.

Alternatively, as the practice of relic translation continued throughout Late Antiquity, the translation of relics could be the ultimate declaration of a bishop's power, similar to an emperor's adventus.[35] The discovery or translation of a relic could prove the holiness of a bishop, or his orthodoxy. Relics could also delineate boundaries between state and church. In 439 Proclus translated John Chrysostom's remains into the Church of the Holy Apostles. Socrates noted that a "solemn procession" happened as the body made its way to the Church of the Holy Apostles and when the procession ended there, they placed the body into the church with "much honor."[36] While the interment of relics in a church enhanced its status by bringing tangible sacred objects directly into it, in this case there was a separate point. Proclus made a statement about the role of the patriarch and emperor in sacred space, over which he claimed authority by interring Chrysostom's body in a church deeply connected to the imperial office.

[35] Kritzinger 2011, 43-48.

[36] Socrates, *Ecclesiastical History*, 7.45: Having the emperor's consent, he [Proclus] removed the body of John, which was buried in Comana, in the thirty-fifth year after his deposition and carried it in a solemn procession in to Constantinople and placed it with much honor in a church called the Apostles. Τὸ σῶμα Ἰωάννου ἐν Κομάνοις <τοῦ Εὐξείνου Πόντου> τεθαμμένον, βασιλέα πείσας, τριακοστῷ πέμπτῳ ἔτει μετὰ τὴν καθαίρεσιν εἰς τὴν Κωνσταντινούπολιν μετεκόμισεν. Καὶ μετὰ πολλῆς τιμῆς δημοσίᾳ πομπεύσας αὐτὸ εἰς τὴν ἐπώνυμον τῶν Ἀποστόλων ἐκκλησίαν ἀπέθετο.

The translation of John Chrysostom's relics thus took on particular significance. Immediately after his death, those loyal to John remembered him as a martyr, as the *Funerary Speech* in his honor identifies him.[37] Proclus' translation was of a martyr victim of imperial intrigue, even if he never directly mentioned this.[38] Proclus emphasized this by interring Chrysostom's remains above the tomb of Eudoxia. Constantine constructed the Holy Apostles as his mausoleum, though Constantius II might have made additions to it, such as the cruciform church.[39] Successive emperors and their families had themselves buried there as well.

There could be no mistaking the statement Proclus was making, though. The theme of victory come full-circle underlies the return of John's remains to Constantinople.[40] John, whom the emperor had exiled and the treacherous Alexandrians condemned, became a martyr and returned to the city in posthumous glory. Proclus made a subtle declaration about the nature of his authority by interring John's body in the Holy Apostles. In a city where the emperor sponsored many of the early churches—Holy Apostles being the most 'imperial' of all—and in a building that Constantine constructed for the purpose of proclaiming himself a thirteenth apostle, patriarchs held supreme authority in religious matters. It was a rejection of Constantine's intent that "his body would share the name of the apostles and after his death would share in the devotions of faith performed there in honor of them."[41]

---

[37] Barnes and Bevan 2013, 32-33.
[38] Theodoret of Cyrrhus somewhat pardons Arcadius and Eudoxia as "ignorant sinners" led astray by jealous clergy. See Theodoret *EH* 5.34 and 36.
[39] See Mango 1990, 51-61; Krautheimer 1983, 56-60; and, Dagron 1974, 401-409. Eusebius records the construction before Constantius II's additions, in *Life of Constantine*, 4.58-60. Conversely, Zosimus denies that Constantine or his sons built the church, but that Julian erected it as a pagan temple, in *New History* 3.11.
[40] Kelly 1995, 290.
[41] Eusebius, *Life of Constantine*, 4.60: αὐτὸς γοῦν αὐτῷ εἰς δέοντα καιρὸν τῆς αὐτοῦ τελευτῆς τὸν ἐνταυθοῖ τόπον ἐταμιεύσατο, τῆς τῶν ἀποστόλων προσρήσεως κοινωνὸν τὸ ἑαυτοῦ σκῆνος μετὰ θάνατον προνοῶν ὑπερβαλλούσῃ πίστεως προθυμίᾳ γεγενῆσθαι, ὡς ἂν καὶ μετὰ τελευτὴν ἀξιῶτο τῶν ἐνταυθοῖ μελλουσῶν ἐπὶ τιμῇ τῶν ἀποστόλων συντελεῖσθαι εὐχῶν.

Chrysostom would have considered the placement of his bones quite appropriate, as he himself noted that at the Holy Apostles even emperors were not buried "near the apostles, but out by the front doors."[42] A distinction between church and state remained even in death. While the emperors could receive burial in the same structure as the apostles, a proximal limitation existed because of their status as civic officials, regardless of their contributions to the Church, as in the case of Constantine. The patriarch's involvement in a relic translation effectively rendered the ceremony "liturgical," over which the authority of the patriarch dominated.[43] There could be no mistaking the reason for Proclus' involvement here or, presumably, his choice on where to inter Chrysostom's relics. The later interment of the patriarch Flavian in the Holy Apostles—again closer to the apostles than the emperors—made the resounding declaration that patriarchs were closer to Christ than emperors.

Relic translations made statements, and those of patriarchs' relics were particularly important. Shortly after his death, Flavian's relics were returned for burial at Holy Apostles.[44] This was a conscious effort to begin generating support for the Two-Nature doctrine of Flavian and Pope Leo in Constantinople.[45] Like the earlier interment of Paul the Confessor, Flavian's relics signified a post-mortem triumph over his theological foes. However, in Flavian's case this triumph signified the new imperial regime's adoption of his doctrine. In both cases, the

---

[42] John Chrysostom, *Contra Judaeos et gentiles* 9, in *PG* 48, p.825. And in Constantinople, they [the emperors] are not buried near the apostles, but their bodies are buried by the front doors, and the emperors become like gate-keepers for the remaining assembly, without dishonoring the priesthood. καὶ ἐν τῇ Κωνσταντινουπόλει δὲ οὐδὲ πρὸς τοὺς ἀποστόλους ἐγγὺς, ἀλλὰ παρ'αὐτὰ τὰ πρόθυρα ἔξω ἀγαπητὸν εἶναι ἐνόμισαν οἱ τὰ διαδήματα περικειμενοι τὰ σώματα αὐτῶν κατορύττεσθαι, καὶ γεγόνασι θυρωροὶ λοιπὸν τῶν ἀλιέων οἱ βασιλεῖς, καὶ ἐν τῇ τελετῇ οὐχ αἰσχύνονται.

[43] Kritzinger 2011, 45-46.

[44] Theodore Lector, *EH*, 357: Τὸ λείψανον Φλαβιανοῦ ἐξ αἰτήσεως τοῦ κλήρου καὶ τοῦ λαοῦ βασιλικοῖς δαπανήμασιν ἐκομίσθη καὶ εἰς τοὺς ἀποστόλους ἐτάφη· προφθάσας δὲ Ἀνατόλιος τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ ταῖς ἱεραῖς δέλτοις ἐνέγραψε.

[45] For the actions of Anatolius leading up to Chalcedon see p. 76-83 of this study.

translation communicated the orthodoxy of the current patriarch and the emperor's theological position. In this respect, the translations of Paul and Flavian represent institutional authorities attempting to place their beliefs into a broader religious context. Yet, translations did not always happen at the initiative of institutional authorities.

During the ascension of Justin I in 518, in the midst of the same incident in which the people of Constantinople filled the Great Church demanding confirmation of Chalcedon, they also demanded that the relics of Macedonius be returned.[46] Unlike the translations of Paul and Flavian, in this instance the translation occurred at the Great Church's initiative, instead of an ecclesiastical or civic official's. Rather than an authority trying to make a claim about the legitimacy of their beliefs to an audience through a relic, here the normal recipients of such a message instead demanded the translation of a relic as proof of the patriarch and emperor's commitment to orthodoxy. This shows the success of doctrine-specific identity cultivation. The congregation had grown accustomed to seeing proof of a patriarch's authority by his possession of an "authorizing object," and in 518, when the Chalcedonian congregation had grown weary of the ambiguous middle ground of the *Henoticon*, they insisted upon seeing that proof. The decades of the conciliatory policy under the *Henoticon* had compromised Chalcedonians' faith-based identity long enough, and they looked to a martyr as symbol of their faith who reaffirmed their identity.[47] Macedonius was that martyr and also became a symbol of the expectations of Constantinopolitans for the patriarch, which was that he be an orthodox Chalcedonian. Patriarch

[46] Mansi VIII.1057-1066.

[47] Drake observed the boundary defining capabilities of martyrs on Christian identity, too. Christian apologists often negotiated Christians' role in Roman society in ways that could compromise their identity. When this negotiation went too far, martyrs set the line, keeping "Christian identity intact," (98). See Drake 2000, 93-98.

John II proved his Chacledonian orthodoxy by bringing the relics of Macedonius back to Constantinople.

Relics played a prominent role in Late Antique Christian identity, but there was an even deeper connection between the Chalcedonian faithful and relics as a part of their faith identification rooted in the council itself. The council of Chalcedon's bishops emphasized the connection between the diophysite articulation of faith and the divine approval of the martyr Euphemia, who took on special significance for Constantinople and Chalcedonianism.[48] That the council took place in her namesake church is an obvious link; however that connection goes deeper. In his description of the church of St. Euphemia in Chalcedon, Evagrius Scholasticus explains that the relics of the saint still produced blood clots miraculously in his time. However the flowing of the sacred blood only occurred "when the governor [of the church] is a noble man and distinguished for virtues, the marvel occurs with peculiar frequency; but when such is not his character, such divine operations are rarely displayed."[49] Here the "governor" is the patriarch of Constantinople. The relics confirmed the patriarch's virtue by producing blood. More importantly, as the bishops of the council claimed, the martyr explicitly sanctioned their actions in determining their Christology.

Anatolius explained that the Council of Chalcedon occurred under the auspices of the martyr Euphemia, who protected the bishops during the course of the council.[50] Likewise, after the end of the council, the bishops of the council wrote to Pope Leo about all that had transpired, informing him that Euphemia approved the new confession of faith they developed:

---

[48] See Halkin 1965 and Schneider 1953 for legends of the martyr and the martyr's role at the council.
[49] Evagrius Scholasticus, *EH*, 2.3. Φασὶ δ' οὖν ὅτε μὲν τῶν εὐσχημόνων τις κυβερνῴη καὶ ταῖς ἀρεταῖς ἐπίσημος, τοῦτο τὸ θαῦμα καὶ μάλα συχνῶς γίγνεσθαι· ὅτε δὲ τῶν οὐ τοιούτων, σπανίως τὰς τοιαύτας θεοσημείας προϊέναι.
[50] Anatolius to Pope Leo I, in Leo, *Epistle* 101.3.

"Euphemia…accepting as her own a confession of faith from us…confirming the confession of the truth as welcome, and using her hand and tongue to set a seal on the decrees of all for the purpose of proof."[51] The council's definition of faith possessed the seal of approval of the martyr whose shrine the council took place in. The Chalcedonian bishops claimed divine approval for their doctrine. Of course, as a council it implicitly operated with the sanction of the Holy Spirit, so the addition of a martyr's approval provided further credentials to the dyophysite doctrine.

The legend of Euphemia's connection with Chalcedon continued in the ensuing centuries. In the *Chronicle of Edessa*, Emperor Anastasius ordered Euphemia's coffin opened so that he could burn a book that the council had placed in it. However, upon opening it, the hapless men whom the emperor sent to carry out the task fell victim to divine retribution: "there came forth fire from thence, and smote upon the faces of those who wished to bring it out."[52] The book in question might have been a tome of the dyophysite doctrine. An eleventh century synaxarion contains a legend in which the diophysite and miaphysite bishops allow Euphemia's relics to decide which group held the correct articulation of the faith. Each group of bishops placed a tome of their doctrine into the hands of the martyr to judge. Later, they opened the tomb and discovered that the martyr holding the tome of the diophysites over her heart while the tome of the miaphysites lay under her feet.[53] Whatever the true origin date of this legend, seven centuries later Christians associated the Chalcedonian creed with Euphemia's matronage.

That in 518 a crowd demanded the relics of a martyr associated with a specific doctrine shows that Christians in Constantinople identified themselves with Chalcedon. The dynamics

[51] *Letter of the Council Fathers to Pope Leo I*, in *ACO* 2.1.
[52] *Chronicle of Edessa*, 83.
[53] See Halkin 1965, 163-168 for the complete legend with notes and commentary.

between martyrs and community identity formation occurred for Chalcedonians just as in other Christian communities, such as Smyrna. The relics gave them tangible proof of their faith.

As a comparison, a brief observation of late–fourth century Milan illustrates the same disparate processes of the impact of relic translation upon a bishop's authority. Milan, like Constantinople, was "barren of martyrs," as Ambrose admitted, until he miraculously discovered two previously unknown ones: Gervasius and Protasius, in 385.[54] The discovery and subsequent translation of the relics into his basilica came during a pivotal time in Milan when Ambrose's authority faced challenges from Arian congregations in the city.[55] The accounts of Ambrose's relic translation contain many of the same elements as those that occurred in Constantinople. Miracles revealed the location and identity of martyrs' relics, the relics possessed healing powers, crowds gathered to touch them, and the bishop brought them to the church in ceremonial procession to inter them there.[56] Neil McLynn writes of these translations, "In Milan, it seemed, the age of the apostles had returned."[57] Relics bridged time back to when Jesus Christ walked the earth and performed healing miracles for venerators. By locating and interring them in Milan, Ambrose made possible a new age of miracles for the city. Peter Brown points out these relics' importance for Ambrose's position because the relics became "inseparably linked to the communal liturgy, in a church built by the bishop, in which the bishop would frequently preside."[58]

[54] Ambrose, Epistle 22.7, in *PL* 16.1021c: *qui sterilem martyribus Ecclesiam Mediolanensem*
[55] See McLynn 1994, 212-215.
[56] See the accounts of this translation in Ambrose, Epistile 22, in *PL* 16.1019a-1026b; Augustine, *Confessions*, 9.7.16; and, Paulinus of Milan, *Vita Ambrosii* 14.
[57] McLynn 1994, 212.
[58] Brown 2015, 37.

This was similar to the process that occurred multiple times in Constantinople. More so, as perhaps Theodosius I and Nectarius had hoped with the translation of Paul the Confessor, the relics of Gervasius and Protasius offered proof to Milanese Christians that the Nicene articulation of the faith had divine providence and the Arians did not. According to Paulinus of Milan, Ambrose's secretary, this tactic worked, "by the benefaction of the martyrs, as much as the faith of the Catholic Church grew, the perfidy of the Arians diminished."[59] Ambrose's discovery and translation galvanized his congregation, which saw divine objects verifying the holiness of their bishop and the doctrine that he confessed. Thus the relics' presence also solidified the holding of Nicene Christianity in Milan and, simultaneously, Ambrose's authority as the leader of that community.

Cultivating and demonstrating legitimate religious authority proved to be an unsteady process for both individual patriarchs and the patriarchate as an institution. The translation of relics proved an association with the divine or divine favor. In Constantinople, relics connected the patriarchate to a common past with the martyr, which in turn offered him an "authorizing object" that gave symbolic power to the patriarch in engaging in normalizing discourse with his congregation.[60] These relics imbued the landscape of Constantinople with a sacred history, which until the mid-fourth century could be described as a "vacuum of holiness."[61] The return of the relics of previous patriarchs (Paul, Chrysostom, Flavian, and Macedonius) gave the landscape of Constantinople a set of martyria specifically tied to the patriarchate. Viewers of these relics connected directly to the time of Jesus through them, especially by participating in the veneration

[59] Paulinus of Milan, *Vita Ambrosii* 14: *Sed iis beneficiis martyrum in quantum crescebat fides Ecclesiae catholicae, in tantum Arianorum perfidia minuebatur.*
[60] For a discussion of authorizing objects, see Lincoln 1994, 7-10.
[61] Mango 1990, 61.

of martyrs' relics.[62] All of these patriarchal martyrs suffered for their adherence to orthodoxy, whatever that might have been at that time. Although the definitions of orthodoxy for each might have differed, as a whole they represented orthodox doctrine. Together with hagiographical accounts of the patriarchs' actions, relics could reinforce the patriarchate's position as a holy institution, which was necessary for its implicit claims to authority.

- *Holy works, miracles, and supernatural events*

Martyr stories contextualize relic translations. Narrative "inculcated and confirmed belief," as Cameron pointed out.[63] Patriarchs occupied much space in Late Antique ecclesiastical histories, largely either in accounts about their ecclesiastical affairs or about miracles they performed. Here, the latter takes precedence. Miracle stories reinforced the patriarch's authority by giving testimony to deeds only feasible for a person who had direct access to the Holy Spirit, or through whom God worked. These stories cultivated and strengthened the patriarch's leadership in Constantinople.

Throughout the histories of Socrates Scholasticus and, to a larger degree, Sozomen, are tales of supernatural feats that patriarchs performed. They range in scope from healings to divine omens. Fundamentally, these stories represent a narrative discourse that permeated Constantinople about the patriarchate, namely that its office holders wielded divine powers in some way. These stories must be read with a distinction of genre in mind. While the works of

[62] For example, Georgia Frank notes the power of "visuality", the attachment of symbols, events, and myths to seeing, connected pilgrims to holy sites to biblical events. Thus beholding a holy object or site took on a deeper meaning than mere sight. See Frank 2000, 102-133.
[63] Cameron 1991, 92.

Socrates, Sozomen, and Evagrius are church histories, they are not hagiographies, which although prominently feature miracles stories, serve a different purpose: "The hagiographers of late antiquity tend to overemphasize miracles. Their accounts are carefully crafted literary productions with the purpose of lionizing a particular holy man."[64] True, miracle stories in historical works do "lionize" their performers, but they are different in their scope and purpose. Whereas Socrates wanted to show that ecclesiastical and civic situations mirrored one another, the author of the *Life of Daniel* used miracles to prove Daniel's holiness.[65] In historical texts, the reporting of miracles confirms a patriarch's conformity to a model in which holy men could prove their link to God through supernatural feats.

Miracles offered manifest evidence to the patriarch's spiritual power to all who witnessed. As a priest, they occupied a unique position to intervene on behalf of persons to God. The success of these interventions won the patriarchate credibility as both holy men and spiritual authorities. By performing miracles, a patriarch could serve as a conduit between a person and the divine. This in turn fostered and strengthened the connection between the patriarch and the faithful, who witnessed and gave testimony to the patriarch's spiritual power.

Constantinopolitans ascribed miraculous legends to locales and structures in explaining their name or origin, even if such an explanation already existed. For instance, despite the name of the Anastasia church clearly referring to the rebirth of orthodoxy in Constantinople, as Gregory of Nazianzus himself explained, an alternative legend began circulating to explain the appellation. As Sozomen reports, "one day, when the people were together for worship in this building, a pregnant woman fell from the highest gallery, and was found dead on the spot. But at

[64] Rapp 2005, 67.
[65] Urbainczyk 1997, 69-79.

the prayer of the whole congregation, she was brought back to life, and she and the infant were saved."[66] Sozomen explains that in his opinion the church was called Anastasia because of Nicene orthodoxy being reborn, but the legend of the woman and the birth of her child persisted to his own time.

Further confusing the situation, the church later became host to the relics of a St. Anastasia.[67] During Gennadius' tenure, the oikonomos Marcian interred Anastasia's relics in the church of the same name.[68] Like the relics of Paul the Confessor, the meaning behind a martyr's shrine could be fluid and still retain an aspect of holiness in the minds of Christians.

The legends surrounding Gregory of Nazianzus' Nicene church clearly show that Christians considered it a sacred space. More so, whatever reason Constantinopolitans ascribed to the church for its name—the establishment of Nicene orthodoxy or a martyr—it became a symbol of orthodoxy. Later, the enduring association of orthodoxy with the Anastasia church is demonstrated in the fact that on the inauguration of the rebuilt Great Church, now Hagia Sophia, (27 December 537), the procession began at the Anastasia church.[69] This shows how a building associated with the patriarchate gained status as sacred space.

More important than an indirect association with miraculous feats, however, were the circulation of stories in which patriarchs actually performed miracles. One medium through

---

[66] Sozomen, *EH*, 7.6.
[67] See *Bibliotheca Hagiographica Graeca* p. 12 for martyrdom accounts of St. Anastasias.
[68] Theodore Lector, 394: Μαρκιανὸς δὲ ὁ οἰκονόμος ἀνελθὼν εἰς τοὺς κεράμους τῆς ἁγίας Ἀναστασίας κατέχων τὰ εὐαγγέλια εὐχαῖς καὶ δάκρυσιν ἀπαθῆ τὸν οἶκον ἐφύλαξεν.
[69] Theophanes, 6030. γέγονε τὰ πρότερα ἐγκαίνια τῆς μεγάλης ἐκκλησίας· καὶ ἐξῆλθεν ἡ λιτὴ ἀπὸ τῆς ἁγίας Ἀναστασίας.
Rochelle Snee notes that the use of the Anastasia Church in this instance might have had a dual purpose: "Circumstances seem to suggest that this twofold [she also speaks of a procession from the Anastasia on the feast of Sts. Sergius and Bacchus] processional use of the Anastasia served as a symbolic confirmation of Justinian's orthodoxy, as well as celebration of the recent victory over the Arian Vandals," Snee 1998, 163.

which patriarchs did so was baptism. In one story, Socrates writes that Atticus personally catechized and baptized a paralytic Jew, thereby curing him of his paralysis: "The paralytic Jew received baptism with a sincere faith and as soon as he was taken out of the baptismal font found himself cured of his disease."[70] This story functions within the broader context of Socrates' history to show how Atticus' holiness persuaded non-Christians to join the faith.[71] Atticus had accessed the divine healing power of Christ, proving to even pagans that he could perform miracles. This proof manifested itself not only in the healing of a Jew, a person in the deepest of errors in the eyes of Christians, but also in his conversion to Christianity.[72]

Baptismal miracles varied in function. In a sermon of Augustine, he describes an event in which a revelation came to a civic official in Constantinople that God would send a cloud of fire to destroy the city should the people fail to repent for their sins. John Chrysostom[73] exhorted the people to begin making penance.[74] As the cloud of fire became visible to the inhabitants all fled to the church and demanded baptism.[75] This mass baptism appeased God and the fiery cloud went away. Through the rite of baptism, Chrysostom apparently saved the city from destruction. In another instance, an anonymous Jewish man goes around Constantinople to the churches of various sects (all schismatic or heretical) to be baptized for the purpose of obtaining baptismal

---

[70] Socrates, *EH* 7.4.
[71] Socrtates, *EH* 7.4: The power of Christ displayed itself in this miracle to men in our time, as He wanted, and because of this many Hellenes [Pagans] became baptized believers. Ταύτην τὴν θεραπείαν ἡ τοῦ Χριστοῦ δύναμις καὶ ἐπὶ τοῖς ἡμετέροις καιροῖς δεῖξαι τοῖς ἀνθρώποις ἠθέλησεν, δι' ἣν Ἕλληνες μὲν πολλοὶ πιστεύσαντες ἐβαπτίσθησαν.
[72] Anecdotes like this fit within the context of growing fifth century anti-Jewish sentiment among Christians and the imperial government. *CT* 16.8.18 is an early law (29 May 408) restricting Jewish practice. Other laws soon followed: *CT* 16.8.22 prohibited new synagogues, *Novel III* of Theodosius II forbade Jews from public office, and *CT* 16.8.29 levied the Jews the former tithe that they had paid their patriarch.
[73] O'Reilly 1955, 89; she places this event in the year 398.
[74] Augustine, *De excidio urbis Romae*, 7.8-10. *Dictum est; non contempsit episcopus, allocutus est populum; conversa est civitas in luctum paenitentiae, quemadmodum quondam illa antiqua Ninive.*
[75] Augustine, *De excidio urbis Romae*, 7.17-19.

donations. While the leader of the Novatian sect prepared to baptize him, the water twice mysteriously drained from the baptismal font. The Novatian leader exclaims that either the man is evil or had already been baptized, at which point a person in the audience said, "I witnessed this Jew baptized already by the bishop Atticus!"[76] The story implies that the baptism of the orthodox patriarch left a spiritual mark on a person's soul such that supernatural events occurred when the man tried to deceive others holding the same belief. The anonymous Jew succeeded in tricking non-Nicene Christians. When he came to the Novatians, who professed the *homoousian* belief, his deceit failed. Socrates did not consider the Novatians heretics and held a high opinion of them.[77] They were a schismatic sect that seemed to coexist with the Nicene church of Constantinople.

Sozomen reports a similar miracle during Chrysostom's tenure. In this instance, the giving of communion by clergy of the orthodox community revealed a false convert. A man who became convinced to abandon his Macedonian beliefs by Chrysostom's teachings gave an ultimatum to his wife that she do the same. She agreed but did not intend to actually accept orthodoxy. During a mass at the Great Church, she bowed her head to appear to be praying, and when communion came she kept the host given to her and switched it with a piece of bread that her servant brought for her. Upon biting it the bread turned to stone and the woman ran to Chrysostom and confessed her false conversion. The church kept the stone as proof of the miracle in the skeuophylakion of the Great Church.[78]

---

[76] Socrates, *Ecclesiastical History*, 7.17.7-8, 14-15. ἐπέγνω τις τὸν Ἰουδαῖον, ὃς ἤδει αὐτὸν ὑπὸ Ἀττικοῦ τοῦ ἐπισκόπου βεβαπτισμένο.
[77] For Socrates' opinions on the Novatians, see Urbainczyk 1997, 26-28.
[78] Sozomen, *EH*, 8.5.6.

Common to these stories is the supernatural power of an orthodox bishop's administration of sacraments. In Constantinople, that was the patriarch. And no matter how crafty a trickster might be in deceiving members of heretical sects, they could never succeed in cheating the orthodox. Non-orthodox Christians could not discern deceit. Being in error, they were susceptible to lies. In the churches of the orthodox, lies became exposed. The miraculous events in which the truth was revealed confirmed the undeceivable holiness of the orthodox church, its sacraments, and its bishop, the patriarch.

Bolstering these conclusions about a patriarch's miraculous abilities are stories in which they occur through prayer rather than sacrament. In the latter case, one might conclude that it the sacrament itself performed the miracle, rather than the patriarch, whereas through intercessory prayer it is clearly by the patriarch. Prayers are direct requests to God, who can fulfill them or not.

During Gennadius' tenure, an iconographer painted Jesus with the features of Zeus. After completing his painting, his hand immediately withered.[79] Distraught, he went to the patriarch and confessed his sin. Gennadius then prayed over the man's hand, which became restored. Whatever larger message the story communicates about the conventions of iconography, the patriarch's position as a holy man is confirmed by his healing a repentant sinner's hand through prayer. The intercessory prayer, as Rapp notes, "is of vital importance in joining a spiritual father to his followers and vice versa."[80] A miracle in response to such a prayer was proof of holiness.

[79] Theodore Lector, *EH*, 382. Ἐπὶ Γενναδίου ἡ χεὶρ τοῦ ζωγράφου ἐξηράνθη τοῦ ἐν τάξει Διὸς τὸν σωτῆρα γράψαι τολμήσαντος.
[80] Rapp 2005, 67. Rapp's point here is about ascetic *pneumatophoroi*; however, she connects the ability to make intercessory prayers to bishops as part of their episcopal duties, see Rapp 2005, 73-99.

Patriarchs should be able to have their prayers answered. That such stories exist testified to the patriarchs' holiness and further confirmed their authority.

In another story involving Gennadius, the patriarch learns of a lector, Charisius, at the shrine of Saint Eleutherius, living a corrupt life. The patriarch demanded that Charisius repent and reform himself, but the erring lector instead persisted in his ways. In response, Gennadius sent his apocrisarius to pray to Eleutherius that Charisius reform or die. The next day Charisius died at the shrine.[81] All present in the shrine "were amazed at the glory of God."[82] Whatever Charisius was doing violated the behavioral norms for clergy that Gennadius had established. The story confirms the validity of those norms and suggests that Gennadius could communicate divine will with the transgressor's sudden death. The onlookers understood this to be the work of God, which Gennadius invoked through the prayer of his agent. Certainly this is not a miraculous story in the sense of a human agent interceding on behalf of another to access divine healing, but it confirms the ability to access the divine (albeit to different ends). Most of all, the story confirms Gennadius' orthodoxy and orthopraxy.

Perhaps an earlier antecedent for such a story can be found in the accounts of confrontations between Peter and Simon Magus. In the account of Acts (8:9-25), Simon Magus attempts to buy the powers of Christ's priesthood. In later apostolic and patristic accounts, he teaches heretical beliefs. Many of these stories begin appearing in the second century and depict Magus as the source of Gnostic beliefs.[83] In one instance, Simon and Peter debate before the

[81] John Moschus, *Pratum spirituale* 145, in *PG* 87.3008-3009. A condensed version of these events in in Theodore Lector 383.
[82] John Moschus, *Pratum spirituale* 145, in *PG* 87. 3009: καὶ πάντες ἐκπλαγέντες ἐδόξασαντὸν Θεόν.
[83] Simon Magus appears in canon only in Acts (8:9-25). For apocryphal and patristic accounts of Magus, see Ferreiro 2005, 35-82.

Emperor Nero about Christianity. Simon employed trickery and deceit to lure people away Peter's church, and during a debate he fell "by the will of God."[84] Central to the Simon Magus stories is orthodoxy overcoming its contemporary proto-heterodox antagonists. The figures in the story, Peter and Simon, epitomize later literary depictions of orthodoxy's triumph over heresy and the orthodox figure being able to access the judgment of God, as in the case of Gennadius. Although it is not certain what exactly Charisius was doing, no doubt he violated the teachings of the Constantinopolitan church. Failure to heed the patriarch's authority thus could result in divine wrath.

The stories of patriarchs working miracles and performing other supernatural feats served two functions. First, it proved their mettle as holy men, in all the sense of the stylites and desert ascetics. Second, it reinforced the idea that holy men occupied the office and fostered an expectation that patriarchs would be able to perform healing feats, or otherwise have direct access to God. Both of these proved the patriarch's authority within the Christian community, in Constantinople and the Empire.

- *Diptychs*

In addition to narrative tales reinforcing authority through demonstrating the ability to perform supernatural feats, patriarchs' authority benefited from Christian ritual practice. The central ritual of Christianity is the liturgy. Within the liturgy of Constantinople were gestures, prayers, readings, and rituals that not only recreated the Eucharistic Last Supper but also defined

[84] *Liber Pontificalis* 1.4: *Et cum diutius altercarent, Simon divino nutu interemptus est*.

the congregation's place in the physical and spiritual world. Most importantly, it also showed the chief celebrant as re-enacting the sacrifice of Christ, thus taking on a divine performance.[85] As part of the liturgy, diptychs containing the names of the previous patriarchs were read.
The performative aspect of the reading of the diptychs during the liturgy reaffirmed that the current patriarch, whoever he might be at that moment, was the latest in a line of holy men who occupied the see of Constantinople. More so, the current patriarch occupied an office that had manifest proof of its holiness in the form of relics and reaffirmed through the circulation of miracle stories.

During the liturgy, a deacon would read the names of previous patriarchs and other persons worthy of commemoration from the diptychs. Liturgies in the East featured a reading of two diptychs, one of the living and one of the dead.[86] In each set of diptychs, the reader, often a deacon, named aloud persons worthy of mention. The former contained the names of civic officials, including the imperial family, and other prominent persons. The diptychs of the dead would contain the names of previous occupants of the see of Constantinople, among other Christian luminaries. Taft's opinion is that in Constantinople, "the diptychs, if they were originally ever before the anaphora (and we have no evidence for that), had, by the turn of the fourth-fifth century, already been delayed to coincide with the intercessions."[87] In this way, whoever the current patriarch was could both venerate his predecessors and remind the

[85] See McCall 2007, 41-105. While using aspects of performance theory to analyze the liturgy, McCall recognizes the danger of strictly equating performance with liturgy, because in the former there is an implicit suspension of disbelief while for the latter it attempts something very real. He is careful to point out that "without discerning the structural analogies between performance and liturgy, we would be left with liturgy as simply another subspecies of performance," (p. 58).
[86] In fact, this is the only distinction that the lists make. Even though there were various categories a person might occupy (monk, civic official, bishop), the only guiding characteristic into which the diptychs were organized was if the named person was living or not. See Taft 1991, 6-7.
[87] Taft 1991, 27.

congregation of his succession in a line of holy men. The diptychs showed that, link-by-link, the current patriarch was directly connected to those that had defined and defended, through the inspiration of the Holy Spirit, orthodoxy. Conversely, an absent name marked that bishop as heretical, schismatic, or otherwise ill-suited for commemoration.

The effect of the reading of the diptychs must be understood in their liturgical context. The deacon read the names after first announcing, "ἡ ἀναφορὰ τοῦ ὀνόματος."[88] This announcement signaled to the congregants to listen for the names of persons worthy enough for the Church to commemorate them during the liturgy. In turn, the congregation had expectations for whose names should be on the diptychs. Each time the list of patriarchs was read, it reminded everyone during the liturgy that the current patriarch stood in a long line of orthodox holy men. The earliest source for the reading of the diptychs in Constantinople comes from a homily of John Chrysostom. According to John, the reading of the diptychs was a divine work: "It is not the deacon who says this, but the Holy Spirit, through the charism…as long as the mysteries are present it is the greatest honor to be worthy of remembrance."[89] The Holy Spirit thus operated through the reader in honoring individuals during the liturgy.

For a name to appear on the diptychs was both an honor and a confirmation of the individual's standing in the church, alive or dead. This was an important distinction for Christians, as the turmoil after Chrysostom's final exile proved. John's successor, Atticus, worked to restore communion between the Johannites and the rest of the Constantinopolitan faithful by inserting Chrysostom's name into the diptychs. He specifically hoped "to induce them

[88] See the discussion in Taft 1991, 7-9 for the origins of this phrase.
[89] John Chrysostom, *In Acta apostolorum* 21.4, in *PG* 60.170 : οὐχ ὁ διάκονός ἐστιν ὁ ταύτην ἀφιεὶς τὴν φωνὴν, ἀλλὰ τὸ Πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον· τὸ δὲ χάρισμα λέγω… ἕως ἂν πρόκειται τὰ τῶν μυστηρίων, πᾶσι τιμὴ μεγίστη τὸ μνήμης ἀξιοῦσθαι.

[the Johannites] to return to the Church."[90] According to Theodoret, this strategy worked: "After he had frequently solicited peace, this was accomplished when he inserted the name [of John] in the roll."[91] The deep division between Johannites and other Christians presented a difficult problem for Atticus, because Chrysostom's partisans steadfastly refused communion with the new patriarch. By restoring John's name to the diptychs, Atticus mitigated a schismatic situation.

Pressure to insert Chrysostom's name in the diptychs did not come from the Johannites alone. Rome also demanded that Atticus do so to accept communion with him.[92] Further complicating Atticus' problem, he risked offending Cyril of Alexandria, the successor and nephew of Chrysostom's adversary Theophilus, by restoring Chrysostom's name. Atticus wrote Cyril to diffuse that situation, explaining that he restored John's name in the diptychs in the interest of peace: "The greatest of the cities, like the billows of the billowing sea, is controlled according to the opinions of the inhabitants and not as much by laws and arrangement as by judgments looking toward peace and concord."[93] Atticus feared the situation devolving into mob violence. Cyril exhorts Atticus to look at how the diptychs should read, Nectarius, then Arascius, then, eventually himself—no one should read John's name among those blessed men.[94]

Another conflict over a patriarch's name remaining in the diptychs came between Rome and Constantinople. As part of ongoing negotiations with Rome to restore communion, Pope Gelasius had requested the removal of Acacius' name from the diptychs in 494. Emperor Anastasius had informed him that this would not be possible because Constantinopolitans might

[90] Socrates, *EH* 7.25.
[91] Theodoret, *EH* 5.34.
[92] Pope Innocent, Letter 22, in *PL* 20.544B-546A.
[93] Atticus to Cyril, in Cyril, Letter 75.1.
[94] Cyril, Letter 76.8.

riot over it: "it is said that the name of scandal—that is Acacius—it is not possible for it to be removed."[95] Constantinopolitans clearly held some attachment to the veneration of Acacius' name. Despite his role in the authorship of the *Henoticon*, he had secured his place as a defender of orthodoxy, as his successful resistance against the miaphysite usurper Basiliscus and alliance with Daniel the Stylite demonstrated.

Finally, Constantinopolitans' demands not only for a clear affirmation of Chalcedon but also for the insertion of the patriarch Macedonius' name back into the diptychs shows how deeply they came to revere a specific doctrine—as well as the leaders of their faith community that upheld them.[96] More significantly, the events of 518 resulted in the permanent commemoration of Chalcedon in the calendar of the Constantinopolitan church as the feast of Chalcedon, celebrated on 16 July.[97] During the coronation of Justin I, the people of Constantinople demanded a "perfect feat for the Church" in celebration of Chalcedon.[98] This also marked the insertion of the Council of Chalcedon, along with the other three ecumenical councils, into the diptychs.

The insertion of John's name into the diptychs demonstrates that reading them during the liturgy held significance for the congregation, i.e. the audience. The congregation had expectations for men whom they revered to receive veneration during the liturgy. In Constantinople John's name was authoritative and augmented the current patriarch's authority by associating it with him during the liturgy. For an outsider in Alexandria, though, it detracted

[95] Gelasius, Epistle 12.10, in *Epistolae Romanorum Pontificum*, p. 357 : *Quodsi mihi populi Constantinopolitani persona proponitur, per quam dicatur nomen scandali, id est Acacii, non posse removeri…*
[96] See 107-109 of this study for a fuller analysis of this event.
[97] Grillmeier 2.1.p. 320-321.
[98] *ACO* 3.p. 75. τελείαν ἑορτὴν τῆι ἐκκλησίαι.

from the patriarch's authority. Failing to commemorate Acacius' name could have negative consequences for the current patriarch and city, as Anastasius feared, because patriarchs gained great presence in the collective memory of Constantinopolitans.

The frequent repetition of the names strengthened the memory of these patriarchs. Additionally, in Constantinople, as part of the local custom, the patriarch celebrated the mass at each of the city's churches at some point during the year, a custom which disseminated these names throughout the city. Mayer and Allen suggest that this "developed during the decades in which the churches had been under the possession of a succession of Arians, semi-Arians and Novatians as a means by which the bishop of the dominant Christian faction might periodically reinforce his claim over his territory within the city."[99] Assuming that the clergy or patriarch read the diptychs at these "visiting" celebrations, then the patriarch, in essence, reaffirmed his place in orthodox memory and hence justified his authority in each neighborhood church in Constantinople at each one of the 'visiting' liturgies.

As an audience, the congregation inside a Constantinopolitan church would hear the patriarchs' names during the liturgy and make the implicit connection that these were holy men deserving of their respect. More so, it implied that the current patriarch shared in his predecessors' authority. Gregory of Nazianzus explained that he could be a successor of Athanasius because he held the same faith, "unity shares the same throne…[he] is truly a successor…[who is] the man of the same faith."[100] The reading of the diptychs reinforced that

[99] Mayer and Allen 2000, 21.
[100] Gregory of Nazianzus, *Oration* 21.8: ἐπὶ τὸν Μάρκου θρόνον ἀνάγεται, οὐχ ἧττον τῆς εὐσεβείας, ἢ τῆς προεδρίας διάδοχος· τῇ μὲν γὰρ πολλοστὸς ἀπ'ἐκείνου, τῇ δὲ εὐθὺς μετ' ἐκεῖνον εὑρίσκεται· ἣν δὴ καὶ κυρίως ὑποληπτέον διαδοχήν. Τὸ μὲν γὰρ ὁμόγνωμον καὶ ὁμόθρονον, τὸ δὲ ἀντίδοξον καὶ ἀντίθρονον· καὶ ἡ μὲν προσηγορίαν, ἡ δὲ ἀλήθειαν ἔχει διαδοχῆς… οὐδὲ ὁ τἀναντία δοξάζων, ἀλλ' ὁ τῆς αὐτῆς πίστεως.

patriarchs shared their predecessors' faith. More so, they had the very real expectation that they would also share in their predecessors' authority. Patriarchs in effect sat in the "the cathedra of Moses," laying claim to their predecessors' cumulative authority, as did rabbis of the first century AD, which is why Jesus commanded his followers to obey them.[101]

- *Conclusion*

The circulation of miracle tales, translation of relics, and persistent reminder that authority succeeded through the bishop's cathedra worked in conjunction to reinforce the idea of Constantinople as a holy city. These practices—along with the laws, persuasive rhetoric, and councils that shaped the content of Christian belief—culminated in a community with a specific Chalcedonian identity in Constantinople, which the patriarchate led. The practices that this chapter touched on addressed the transcendental elements of the Christian religion that laws and conciliar definitions did not. While these religious practices did not necessarily indicate overt support for a particular identifying creed and hence acceptance of the patriarch's authority—e.g., Phil Booth has pointed out that it was not uncommon for "doctrinal apathy" to exist among worshipers at shrines[102]—they constituted a piece of a larger puzzle. Together, with persuasive

[101] Matthew 23:2-3. λέγων, ἐπὶ τῆς Μωϋσέως καθέδρας ἐκάθισαν οἱ γραμματεῖς καὶ οἱ Φαρισαῖοι. πάντα οὖν ὅσα ἐὰν εἴπωσιν ὑμῖν ποιήσατε καὶ τηρεῖτε.
[102] Booth 2011, 121.

rhetoric, canons, and civic laws, they reinforced adherence to the faith of the patriarch, and thus acceptance of his authority.

That Constantinopolitans considered some patriarchs martyrs and venerated their relics shows that holders of the office held importance in Constantinopolitans' collective memory. This of course does not prove that the office itself held the same prestige, but it is no coincidence that holders of the office occupied such a large space in orthodox memory. As such, when a new patriarch occupied the office he had access to authority vested in the institution, which his personage could augment, because of its strong associations with orthodoxy. Importantly, all of the diverse elements touched upon in this chapter show how the patriarchate became the head of a city entrenched in Christian tradition.

With the influx of relics and proliferation of miracle stories, it is easy to see why Constantinople became a holy land; the author of the *Life of Daniel*, likely writing at the beginning of the sixth century, referred to it as a "second Jerusalem."[103] Especially after the rise of Islam in the seventh century and subsequent loss of Palestinian, Syrian, and Egyptian territories, the center of the Christian world in the East became Constantinople, which remained the only "Jerusalem" within the borders of the Empire. Through the growing collection of miracle tales and statuses as martyrs, the men who occupied the patriarch's office stepped into not only a role in a clerical institution but also into that of a holy man who was at the head of a faith-based community and hence possessed legitimate authority to decide on normative practices and beliefs for that community.

[103] *Life of Daniel*, 10: ἄπελθε εἰς τὸ Βυζάντιον καὶ βλέπεις δευτέραν Ἰερουσαλήμ, τὴν Κωνσταντινούπολιν

While in this and previous chapters the patriarchate's authority was bolstered by their connection to orthodoxy—which they proved through councils, rhetoric, and relics— they benefited immensely from the emperor's presence. This created another problem for the authority of the patriarch: because the emperor was such a large presence in church matters, was it actually he that was the head of the church in Constantinople? The next chapter will address the complexities of this question and the problems patriarchs encountered in maintaining autonomy from the imperial office.

Boundaries of Authority between Emperor and Patriarch

- *Introduction*

The see of Constantinople was unlike any other in Late Antiquity because of the direct involvement of the imperial court. While other sees elected their bishops themselves, without imperial involvement, "the one exception was the see of Constantinople."[1] Such a level of imperial involvement in the church has led scholars to conclude that either the patriarchate of Constantinople lacked autonomy or that the church and state were intertwined.[2] Such conclusions, however, seem to rest in the assumption that state and religious institutions had no clear boundaries in Byzantium - that the emperor was so overwhelming that he dominated a sphere he really did not belong in - or that Byzantine society could not distinguish those boundaries. Interpretations that state and religious power were indistinguishable reduce the status of the church to little more than a department of the imperial government. This chapter will

[1] Jones 1964, Vol.2, 920.

[2] A brief survey:
"It may therefore be said that in the sphere of ecclesiastical polity the emperor was able to exercise complete authority over the church," Deno Geanakoplos 1965, 397;
"'Caesaro-Papism' [which] was simply the application of the ideas of Constantine, and was accepted in the east as the normal role of the emperor as divinely appointed protector of Christians," W.H.C. Frend 1972, 180, as well as his chapter in that book "The Emperor and His Church", 50-103. Although Frend's work is somewhat dated, Alan Cameron has recently cited that chapter specifically in a recent work of his as justification for his own conclusion below;
"As for the power of the state over both patriarchs and synods…Emperors and empresses made and unmade patriarchs, they controlled synods, and they set the program of theological choices… Theology in a political theocracy, such as Byzantium, was a matter that concerned the state," Speros Vryonis 2005, 117;
"As an institution the Byzantine Church enjoyed relatively little autonomy before the fourteenth century. The final choice of a patriarch lay with the emperor, who able to depose patriarchs at will." Michael Angold and Michael Whitby 2008, 576; and,
"While Constantine and his Christian successors did not (of course) directly invoke their pontifical authority, it was in effect in this capacity that they legislated about church affairs…" Alan Cameron 2011, 55 (citing the above chapter of Frend's).

show this was not the case. Gilbert Dagron, who really has been the only scholar to deal with the relationship of patriarch and emperor at length, wrote that only during the iconoclasms the Constantinopolitan church roused "the patriarchate from the somnolence to which it was condemned by its deep orthodoxy and relative powerlessness *vis-à-vis* the emperors."[3] While this agrees that the patriarchate did eventually assert its autonomy, it differs on the period in which this happened. Contrarily, a discernable sense of religious authority exclusive of the emperor was incipient in the patriarchate earlier. The patriarch resisted the emperor and asserted his will in religious matters, revealing that state and ecclesiastical authority were both distinct in Constantinople. This distinction is important in the conversation about the role of the emperor and how that office worked with the patriarch in religious matters.

Long before a supposed awakening during iconoclasm, a religious sphere was apparent as distinct from the secular to the Byzantines.[4] The religious sphere included the church, its clerics, monastic groups, laity, as well as doctrine, rites, and the sacred, all of which were presided over by the patriarch of Constantinople. The secular included the imperial government, military, foreign diplomacy, and taxation, which were presided over by the emperor. Despite the fact that both emperor and patriarch often worked together towards common religious objectives, at no point did they divest themselves of the characteristics that distinguished them each as an official of the religious or the secular sphere.

While this study rejects an intermingled interpretation of the secular and the religious, it is not simultaneously espousing a modern understanding of separation of church and state within

[3] Dagron 2003, 223.
[4] On this Dagron disagrees again about when this occurred, "the concept of a distinction between spiritual and temporal power which actually only later emerged as a way of limiting the influence of the emperor in doctrinal matters."Dagron 2003, 128.

Byzantium, which would be an anachronism. A complete separation of church and state implies a reality not present in the Byzantine world. While church and state frequently collaborated together within the empire, their partnership never coalesced into a mingling or absolute breakdown of the boundaries that distinguished them, as Paul Veyne suggests "we should not entertain too simplistic an idea of primitive times or believe that power and religion were then intermingled or that a mindset of such antiquity was still confused."[5] Indeed, the frequent partnership and cooperation of the Byzantine church and imperial government has probably caused many of the misunderstandings of the church and the state. This might in part be due to the fact that modern scholarship using social theories to claim that religion must be relegated to the private sphere has confusedly deduced that because religion shared public space with the secular in ancient societies and therefore subordinate or mixed into the former in Constantinople, because the emperor presided over all in the public sphere.

This chapter concentrates on the relationship between the patriarch and the emperor. It shows how these men interacted with one another to either secure or weaken their respective interests. These interests might include ecclesiastical jurisdiction, church endowments, and patronage of doctrinal statements for the patriarch and popular support, ecclesiastical consensus, and divine legitimization for the emperor. Of course it was not always necessarily the case that these men had a binary friend-or-foe relationship, but it is evident that they were both powerful enough in their respective spheres to help or hurt one another. Variables that affected this relationship include the personalities of the two men, for example if they were particularly headstrong or meek, grave crises, and the general situation of the empire. None of these are

[5] Veyne 2010, 136.

subject to any preponderance of influence, however, and thus contextual scrutiny is necessary to understand how those factors might have affected the relationship between patriarch and emperor. A general problem in observing this relationship is the position of the patriarchate, which this dissertation address as whole, and which notoriously "was ill defined in Byzantine ecclesiology."[6] Thus, perhaps the only guiding factors that were constant enough to permit investigation of the relations between the two offices were the exclusive definitions of the offices themselves: an emperor could not be patriarch and a patriarch could not be emperor.[7]

The present chapter begins with an investigation of the boundaries between the patriarch and the emperor, the criteria that distinguished them in matters of the church and defined what they were able to do within one another's spheres: the church and the state. The former's status as a priest guided the interactions of the patriarch with the emperor, which enabled him to administer sacraments. Ceremony revealed the distinguishing element of that characteristic, though it did not define them. Among these revealing ceremonies were the coronation ceremony, baptisms, and the liturgy. While an observer would be correct in noting that the emperor possessed a good amount of privileges in these ceremonies, nonetheless the sacerdotal trait restricted imperial religious rights. Being a layman, the emperor enjoyed unique privileges within the church that no other layperson could. This occasionally muddled the boundaries of the emperor's and patriarch's role, yet the distinction between sacred and secular remained. Next, this inquiry will demonstrate how this distinction affected the working relationship of the two men. In turn, the emperor could help or hinder the patriarch. Specific factors, however, which

[6] Dagron 2003, 310.
[7] Christian prohibition of violence had a part in this, "The military and juridical functions of an emperor constantly obligated to draw his sword were hardly compatible with Christian charity which, at that time, consisted of a doctrine of non-violence," Veyne 2010, 56.

their offices imposed upon them, restricted their ability to impact the other. This study will elucidate how the two offices functioned in practice with one another and thus reveal the boundaries of authority between them. In the end, this investigation will affirm the position of the patriarch as the holder of central religious authority within Constantinople.

- *The emperor and the church*

In exploring the role of the emperor in the imperial church one will encounter the problem of Caesaropapism in earlier scholarship. This was a concern in previous decades and really only mattered in the West.[8] While the argument of Caesaropapism attempted to clarify the role of the emperor in the church, it did so in terms alien to Byzantine culture, which essentially fused secular and religious power in one man. Really, it is better to evaluate the emperor's role in the church in light of the real religious authority and autonomy that the patriarch possessed and in terms emic to Byzantine society, and as careful series of negotiation between church and state. Although the emperor possessed the secular power of a Caesar he lacked the sacerdotal power of a pope, who had both administrative and priestly powers. Despite his frequent involvement in religion, even Justinian falls short of Caesaropapism as a descriptor for his reign. No emperor in Byzantium was ever a king-priest, à-la-David or even Charlemagne.[9] Even though they enjoyed

[8] John Meyendorff remarked that Caesaropapism "never became an accepted principle in Byzantium," see Meyendorff 1983, 6; Anthony Kaldellis dismisses the notion of Caesaropapism even mattering for Byzantium at all, see Kaldellis 2015, note 111, page 191.
[9] In contrast, in the West Charlemagne (800-814) had previously unheard of power over ecclesiastical matters. Dagron rightly pointed out that this western phenomenon has been too frequently used as a model to understand what occurred in Byzantium, see Dagron 2003, 310-312.

a privileged position among laypersons the fact is that no emperor ever administered sacraments – and what good is a priest who cannot administer sacraments?

Arguing against the notion of a theocracy Anthony Kaldellis objects to the full-scale acceptance of the Eusebian imperial ideal, "The ideology of the imperial idea operates in a theological space between God and the emperor and his subjects. One can bridge the gap by arguing that the emperor derived his legitimacy from his relationship with God and that the Byzantines accept this…But this theory fails the most basic test of verification: the Byzantines…seem to have had little compunction about rebelling against, deposing, and even killing their divinely appointed ruler."[10] In other words, if the emperor truly was a divine representative, then why did the populace seem to have no problem killing the direct appointee of God? Kaldellis articulates the problem of Christian rhetoric in Byzantine politics, "it is clear that we are dealing here with a political sphere whose fundamental and preexisting ideological framework was republican, onto which had been superimposed a theocratic rhetoric."[11] Despite the use of words such as "bishop" to describe the emperor, in actuality writers and speakers employed such rhetoric to present the political action as divinely valid, or in accordance with God's will. It emphasizes that whatever action the emperor took, he was not violating any religious ethic. Thus the "imperial ideal" was a form of rhetoric that emperors used to facilitate acceptance of their actions, rather than an argument for the basis of their rule in itself.

What emperors *could* do was participate in the election of a patriarch. Emperors could choose which of three candidates that assembled bishops presented to them should become

[10] Kaldellis 2015, 169.
[11] Kaldellis 2015, 179. It is his assertion that the Byzantine Empire was a republic in the Roman sense. The matter of the nature of the Byzantine government is not an emphasis of this work.

patriarch. If the emperor wanted a particular candidate not among the three choices of the bishops to become patriarch, then those bishops still had to approve of the choice.[12] A prudent emperor would chose a candidate that most closely held his own religious beliefs, so as to avoid any potential conflict. Additionally, this would help ensure that the church would harbor similar doctrinal opinions and thus enable a sort of back channel for the emperor to influence doctrine. If an emperor wanted to influence doctrine otherwise, it was necessary that the patriarch or a synod consented and went through the appropriate ecclesiastical channels, if he wanted to make a lasting and legitimate change. Any change he was able to effect was solely in the capacity of an outsider, the church never granted or acknowledged an insider status for the emperor and he needed the assent of the church. Thus any influence an emperor had on doctrine was through the mediation of an ecclesiastical official.

Despite the fact that subjects might praise an emperor as a 'priest',[13] this is the highest of rhetoric and did not imply or acknowledge that the imperial office wielded sacerdotal powers. It

---

[12] *De Ceremoniis* 2.14 records the procedure for the process of selecting a new patriarch. Presumably, there was probably some variation in the exact procedure in what Constantine VII has presented here and the three centuries or so prior, but the salient facts are that bishops no doubt had a large presence in the selection of the patriarch. *Text*: When the patriarch dies, the emperor tells the most God beloved metropolitans should decide by vote upon three men who they consider to be worthy of becoming patriarch. The metropolitans come together in the gallery of the holy Great Church and they vote for whomever they want and then the emperor summons them into the palace. When they stand before the emperor, they give him a written note with names of those they voted for. If the emperor agrees and is satisfied with one of the list, he consents. If he does not agree with any on the list, he says, "I want so-and-so to become patriarch." When the metropolitans agree with the emperor's judgement and decision, as is proper, if he is worthy, they all go away with the senate and archons of the Church and the priests and remaining clergy into the Magnaura. Τελευτῶντος τοῦ πατριάρχου, δηλοῖ ὁ βασιλεὺς τοῖς θεοφιλεστάτοις μητροπολίταις ψηφίσασθαι τρεῖς, οἳ καὶ αὐτοῖς δόξουσιν εἶναι ἄξιοι εἰς πατριάρχην. καὶ δὴ τούτων συναθροισθέντων ἐν τοῖς κατηχουμενίοις τῆς ἁγιωτάτης μεγάλης ἐκκλησίας, καὶ ψηφισάμενοι οὓς ἂν βουληθῶσι, ἀντιδηλοῦσι τῷ βασιλεῖ τούτους, καὶ κελεύει ὁ βασιλεὺς εἰσελθεῖν τούτους εἰς τὸ παλάτιον. καὶ δὴ τούτων εἰσελθόντων καὶ στάντων ἐνώπιον τοῦ βασιλέως, δίδουσιν ἐγγράφους οὕστινας ἐψηφίσαντο. ὁ δὲ βασιλεὺς εἰ μὲν συγκατατίθεται καὶ ἀρεσθῇ εἰς ὃν ἂν εὐδοκήσῃ· εἰ δὲ καὶ μήγε, λέγει· „ἐγὼ τὸν ὁ δεῖνα θέλω γενέσθαι."καὶ τῶν μητροπολιτῶν ἐπὶ τούτῳ συγκαταθεμένων καὶ τῇ βα σιλικῇ προστάξει καὶ κρίσει κατὰ τὸ δίκαιον ὑπεικόντων, εἰ ἄρα ἄξιος εἴη, γίνεται μεταστάσιμον, καὶ ἀπέρχεται ἐν τῇ μανναύρᾳ πᾶσα ἡ σύγκλητος καὶ οἱ μητροπολῖται πάντες καὶ πάντες οἱ τῆς ἐκκλησίας ἄρχοντες καὶ πρεσβύτεροι καὶ λοιποὶ ἱερεῖς.

[13] The Council of Ephesus II to Theodosius II, in *ACO* 2.1.1, page 138 "Long live the High-Priest [or bishop] emperor!" τῷ ἀρχιερεῖ βασιλεῖ, the intent of the acclamation is made clear by the ending phrase, "we give thanks for

is telling that it was the victors of councils or those who happen to agree with the emperor's opinion that call him 'priest'. Dissenters and losers of councils might instead voice more polemical views about the emperor's piety. It is true that an emperor's opinion on matters of doctrine could be influential with the Church; it was because of his position as *autokrator* and the respect for that office rather than any recognition of sacerdotal power. Dagron points out the difficulty of assessing the language of praising an emperor as a priest, "We are in the realm of rhetoric, but that does not mean that anything could be said or that taboos could be violated. Even if the words had a metaphorical and an incantatory meaning, and even if their association was not without an element of provocation, there was nothing abnormal in asserting that the ideal emperor was also a priest."[14] It was possible for an emperor to be a priest, but only in rhetorical praise and to for the purpose of expressing an ideal.

Much of the ambiguity concerning the role of the emperor in the Church began with Constantine, who summoned the Council of Nicaea in 325.[15] Yet, since Constantine, the office of the emperor also lost an important element of its power: the sacerdotal functions of the *Pontifex Maximus*. Even if the emperors retained the nominal use of *pontifex* for a time after Constantine, the fact was that the imperial office had then divested itself of its priestly functions, which it possessed for centuries when the office practiced the pagan rites. Thus the role of the emperor in religious practice and doctrine had radically changed in the fourth century. While Christian

orthodox emperors," εὐχαριστοῦμεν τοῖς ὀρθοδόξοις βασιλεῦσιν, this is praiseful rhetoric; The Council of Chalcedon to Marcian, in *ACO* 2.2.2, page 102, "You are priest and emperor," *tu sacerdos, tu imperator*; Agapetus of Rhodes to Emperor Leo I, *Codex Encyclius* in *ACO* 2.V, page 64, "truly you exist as priest and by nature emperor," *vere sacerdos et natura imperator existis*.

[14] Dagron 2003, 306.

[15] In fact, Constantine is the source of the greatest change of the Roman state's imperial religious practices. As Paul Veyne says, "Augustus did not serve Apollo; he simply turned to him for help…In contrast, throughout the twenty-five years that followed, Constantine repeatedly declared that he was simply the servant of Christ." Veyne 2010, 6.

bishops often considered the religious opinions of the emperor they just as frequently resisted them on those points. The emperor was to protect it from attack, which included heresy and schism. Such a role inevitably led to broad interpretations of it by the emperor, which also included the acknowledgement of ecclesiastical leadership that he had legitimate say in the administration of the church. In that capacity the emperor had the most influence.

Inevitably, any such conversation must address the claim of Constantine, "I am the bishop of those outside the church."[16] But one should not interpret this strictly; Constantine was not even baptized at the time of this claim let alone ever consecrated as a priest. He was not claiming a sacerdotal role and that limited severely what influence an emperor could have on the church. Constantine acknowledged that actual bishops oversaw what happened within the church, meaning the ritual duties of a priest to celebrate the Eucharist and other sacraments such as the consecration of priests. At Nicaea and the years after, Constantine consistently sought solutions that would keep the peace and unity of the church intact. He was constantly trying to persuade dissenters to accept the findings of the council and the church to accept them back into communion. In analyzing his participation in those events as deeply vested in the doctrinal controversies of Arius, one "measure[s] the emperor according to a theological yardstick, assuming that his agenda was identical to the church."[17] Harold Drake's assessment of Constantine's participation in the council gets to the heart of his motive, which was obtaining consensus, "that was, to him, as important as the ideological purity sought by both Athanasius

[16] Eusebius, *Vita Constantinii,* 4.24. ἐγὼ δὲ τῶν ἐκτὸς ὑπὸ θεοῦ καθεσταμένος ἐπίσκοπος ἂν εἴην. Cameron and Hall suggest that this statement not be taken seriously, as it was at a dinner party, see Cameron and Hall 1999, 320. Alan Cameron agrees, "Constantine once jokingly referred to himself as 'bishop of those outside the church,'" Cameron 2007, 360.
[17] Drake 2000, 263.

and Arius."[18] Whatever dissenting opinion a bishop might believe deep down, it was better for him not to express it and agree with the findings of the church, in the opinion of Constantine, as the emperor himself advised Arius, "You, O Arius, have opposed Alexander with something that ought not to be considered to begin with, or if considered anyhow, should be buried in silence."[19] While Constantine recognized that he could not control what a person believed in private, he balked at public expression of dissenting belief. At the heart of this advice was the notion of church unity.

The true role of the emperor in religious matters, both in Constantinople and throughout the empire, was ensuring the unity of the church, which he could achieve through administrative machinations. Two words expressed the notion of unity: ὁμόνοια (unanimity/concord)[20] and ἕνωσις (union/unity).[21] Within the Gospels the concept of a unified body of followers is present. Jesus Christ himself prayed that his followers "may all be one that they too may be one in us, as you, Father, are in me, and I in you; so that the world may come to believe that it is you who has sent me."[22] Proof of Christ's membership in the Godhead was manifest in a unified church. This sentiment of unity is evident in Christian cosmology too, "The sun and the moon and the choirs of stars circle in harmony within the courses assigned to them, according to his direction, without any deviation at all."[23] God set the universe in unity and it was a part of nature. Ignatius of Antioch echoed this thought, urging Christians to follow their bishops and doing so in language

[18] Drake 2000, 268. He devotes a whole chapter to Constantine's efforts for consensus, see 235-272.
[19] Eusebius, *Vita Constantinii*, 2.69.1. σύ τε, ὦ Ἄρειε, τοῦθ', ὅπερ ἢ μηδὲ τὴν ἀρχὴν ἐνθυμηθῆναι ἢ ἐνθυμηθέντα σιωπῇ παραδοῦναι προσῆκον ἦν, ἀπροόπτως ἀντέθηκας.
[20] Lampe, 958.
[21] Lampe, 486-487.
[22] John 17:21. ἵνα πάντες **ἓν ὦσιν**, καθὼς σύ πάτερ **ἐν** ἐμοὶ κἀγὼ **ἐν** σοί, ἵνα καὶ αὐτοὶ **ἐν** ἡμῖν **ὦσιν**, ἵνα ὁ κόσμος πιστεύῃ ὅτι σύ με ἀπέστειλας.
[23] 1 Clement 20.3, in *Apostolic Fathers*. ἥλιός τε καὶ σελήνη ἀστέρων τε χοροὶ κατὰ τὴν διαταγὴν αὐτοῦ ἐν **ὁμονοίᾳ** δίχα πάσης παρεκβάσεως ἐξελίσσουσιν τοὺς ἐπιτεταγμένους αὐτοῖς ὁρισμούς.

that situates unity as divinely ordered, like nature itself, but placing it in the discourse of ecclesiology and apostolicity. He explains that priests are connected to their bishops "like strings to a harp,"[24] and this ordering enables congregations in "concord and harmonious love…to become a choir…[and] with one voice sing to the Father through Jesus Christ, so that He may both hear you, and perceive by your works that you are indeed the members of His Son. It is profitable, therefore, that you should live in an unblameable unity."[25] God heard the voice of his worshipers when they sang as one. Ignatius' implication is that He did not recognize the cacophony of separate and disparate voices as being members of His Son, the Church. These exhortations of unity connected the belief of one God to only one legitimate church.[26] Cyprian of Carthage furthered the call for obedience to the bishop, "We ought to hold and defend this unity firmly, especially those who preside in the Church, so that we may also prove that the episcopate itself is one and undivided."[27] Harmony and union were evident in the cosmos, as Clement shows, and thus a part of God's original, pre-Fall design of nature.

From Constantine onward, emperors used this same language in communicating their desires of ecclesiastical policy to the church. Even after the Council of Nicaea in 325,

---

[24] Ignatius of Antioch, *Epistle to the Ephesiasians*, 4.1. Τὸ γὰρ ἀξιονόμαστον ὑμῶν πρεσβυτέριον τοῦ θεοῦ ἄξιον, οὕτως συνήρμοσται τῷ ἐπισκόπῳ, ὡς χορδαὶ κιθάρᾳ.

[25] Ignatius of Antioch, *Epistle to the Ephesians*, 4.1-2. Διὰ τοῦτο ἐν τῇ **ὁμονοίᾳ** ὑμῶν καὶ συμφώνῳ ἀγάπῃ Ἰησοῦς Χριστὸς ᾄδεται. Καὶ οἱ κατ' ἄνδρα δὲ χορὸς γίνεσθε, ἵνα σύμφωνοι ὄντες ἐν **ὁμονοίᾳ**, χρῶμα θεοῦ λαβόντες ἐν **ἑνότητι**, ᾄδητε ἐν φωνῇ μιᾷ διὰ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ τῷ πατρί, ἵνα ὑμῶν καὶ ἀκούσῃ καὶ ἐπιγινώσκῃ δι' ὧν εὖ πράσσετε, μέλη ὄντας τοῦ υἱοῦ αὐτοῦ. Χρήσιμον οὖν ἐστὶν ὑμᾶς ἐν ἀμώμῳ **ἑνότητι** εἶναι, ἵνα καὶ θεοῦ πάντοτε μετέχητε.

[26] Of course, numerous sects arose that all claimed to be the true Church and reject communion with those they perceived as untrue, but that it is a separate matter. Furthermore, it is fair to point out that Ignatius, perhaps, had an unusual vision for his time of a monarchical episcopacy.

[27] Cyprian, *On the Unity of the Church*, Chapter 5. *Quam **unitatem** firmiter tenere et vindicare debemus, maxime episcopi, qui in Ecclesia praesidemus, ut episcopatum quoque ipsum **unum** atque **indivisum** probemus.*

In fact Cyprian is a good point here, as Paul Veyne notes, "Cyprian presents a picture of the strict and meticulous government of the Church that is not very attractive, except, that is, to a reader with faith and who himself possesses the same sense of authority and unity as that clearly possessed by Cyprian and that constantly demonstrated by Constantine in his manoeuvres for or against Arius and against the Donatists." Veyne 2010, 63.

Constantine urged Alexander of Alexandria to accept Arius back into communion for the sake of church unity, "Come to the aid of unity. Share the goodness of friendship with those who are not separated from the faith. Make sure that I hear a report of peace and unity between all of you, for which I hope and even long."[28] Even the "victors" of a synod should embrace a heresiarch, in the opinion of the emperor, for the sake of unity. Theodosius I, the emperor who decreed Christianity as the state religion, also articulated his desire for unity. After Gregory of Nazianzus abruptly resigned from the patriarchate, Theodosius had to find another patriarch and settle the reemerging discord between Nicaeans and Arians, "Indeed, when the emperor found the church in this state, he began to consider by what means he could make peace, effect a union, and enlarge the churches."[29] Consequently, he reached out to the Arian bishop, Demophilus, to ask if he would accept the Nicene Creed in order to become patriarch, which he refused to do. That refusal justified Theodosius' banishment of Demophilus from the city, because he rejected "peace and harmony,"[30] as opposed to his beliefs. Theodosius II implored John of Antioch to reestablish communion with Cyril of Alexandria after the Council of Ephesus (431), "turn such strong discord into a source of harmony."[31] Even Zeno's ill-fated *Henoticon* was born in the spirit of unity. Literally meaning "Instrument of Unity," this document proposed a doctrinal formula that was in the middle-ground between Chalcedonianism and Miaphysitism, in

[28] Gelasius Church History 3.15.5. ἐπικουρήσατε οὖν, παρακαλῶ, τῇ **ὁμονίᾳ**, συνεισενέγκατε τὰ τῆς φιλίας καλὰ πρὸς τοὺς τὰ τῆς πίστεως μὴ διακρινομένος, ποιήσατέ με ἀκοῦσαι ταῦτα, ἅπερ βούλομαι καὶ ἐπιθυμῶ, τὴν τῶν πάντων ὑμῶν εἰρήνην καὶ **ὁμόνοιαν**.
[29] Socrates 5.7.3. Ὁ μέντοι βασιλεὺς ἐν τοιαύτῃ καταστάσει τὴν ἐκκλησίαν εὑρὼν φροντίδα ἐτίθετο, ὅπως ἂν εἰρήνην ποιήσας **ὁμόνοιαν** κατεργάσηται καὶ τὰς ἐκκλησίας αὐξήσειεν.
[30] Socrates 5.7.
[31] Theodosius II, *Letter to John of Antioch, PG*1461B-C. καὶ τὴν πηγὴν τῆς **ὁμονοίας** εἰς τοσοῦτον διχονοίας τραπῆναι.

accordance with what the patriarch Acacius suggested.[32] In fact, Zeno offers as justification for the document the pleas for unity from the laity.[33]

The theological details seemed to matter less in these instances than a unified church, unity "was an end in itself."[34] Emperors' main concern was ecclesiastical concordance and harmony and they were willing to serve as peace-makers between sects to achieve that goal. This pattern persisted in the interactions between the emperor and imperial church, showing the true nature of the emperor's role, which was to serve as a sort of outside monitor whose main concern was that the interior of the church arrived at a concordant consensus. "In so far as the emperors did intervene in episcopal elections it was either to secure zealous pastors for their capital or to promote the doctrinal views which they thought to be true."[35] Emperors, for the most part, adhered to that role, though the degree to which they did oscillated, particularly in the case of Justinian. Despite any variation, there were pervasive constants that emperors adhered to in their dealings with the patriarch. These constants included the necessity of a council to remove patriarchs and alter doctrine, but mostly the patriarch's status as priest that prohibited complete imperial intrusions into the sacred. On the same note, Veyne remarks about Constantine's involvement in the Church, "politics and religion were separate…Constantine did not force the altar into serving the throne, but put his throne at the service of the altar."[36]

---

[32] Evagrius Scholasticus, *EH*, 3.13. This instrument, constructed according to the advice of the bishop of the imperial city Acacius… Ταύτην τὴν οἰκονομίαν γνώμῃ συντεθειμένην Ἀκακίου τοῦ τῆς βασιλευούσης ἐπισκόπου…
[33] Evagrius Scholasticus preserves it in its entirety in *EH* 3.14. Since then, the unblemished faith that preserves us and the Roman state, pious archimandrites and hermits and other venerable persons brought petitions to us, beseeching us with tears to bring the holy churches together in unity… Οὕτως οὖν τῆς ἀμωμήτου πίστεως ἡμᾶς τε καὶ τὰ Ῥωμαϊκὰ περισωζούσης πράγματα, δεήσεις ἡμῖν προσεκομίσθησαν παρὰ θεοσεβῶν ἀρχιμανδριτῶν καὶ ἐρημιτῶν καὶ ἑτέρων αἰδεσίμων ἀνδρῶν, μετὰ δακρύων ἱκετευόντων ἕνωσιν γενέσθαι ταῖς ἁγιωτάταις ἐκκλησίαις συναφθῆναί…
[34] Veyne 2010, 80.
[35] Jones 1964, Volume 2, 920.
[36] Veyne 2010, 64.

- *Boundaries*

The fact that the emperor and patriarch lived and worked within sight of one another and often could be dealing with the same issue has confused understandings of the purpose of those offices for religious matters. In fact, such an environment could be almost claustrophobic: the Great Palace and Hagia Sophia were less than 100 meters apart and processions to the church from the palace that began at the scholae increased the route to about 200 meters. They could practically see each other all day and the activities of their respective buildings, who entered and left, what was carried in, and any large assemblies. The reader might take a moment to imagine the patriarch John Chrysostom in his quarters on the southeast of the Great Church, looking south across the Augustaion towards the palace, wondering what would happen next after publicly rebuking the empress Eudoxia, watching as officials and guards walked in and out of the neighboring complex, listening for the sound of any commotion or synchronized march of soldiers, all the while reading and writing letters and sermons. Despite any anxiety he might have been feeling, John Chrysostom could expect that the imperial government would have to adhere to well-defined boundaries that buffered what it could do in religious matters.

At the risk of presenting the relationship between patriarch and emperor as continuously fraught with tension between the two, they did frequently work together in collegiality. In fact, such close proximity to the emperor gave the patriarch significant access to the wealthiest patron in the empire. As Peter Brown explains, “it was the flesh and bone of access to the imperial

power that came to count in the fifth century."[37] The patronage of the most powerful and richest man in the empire meant a lot for the imperial church and undoubtedly created a sense of obligation in it, but there were still clear demarcations of influence and space that the emperor had to respect. The most clear and obvious distinction was that the patriarch was a priest. Ceremonies and sacraments persistently conveyed this message to the emperor and perhaps none so more than the coronation.

Ceremony played a large part in the functioning of the Byzantine state. Through the elaborate choreography and staging of a ceremony a person's place within the empire became evident to the spectators. Perhaps the most defining element of the patriarchate's relationship with the emperor became clear during the coronation ceremony. In this ceremony the secular and the divine spheres came into direct contact, both in the physical realm through the men who represented each sphere and the abstract through the symbolic actions of the ceremony itself. It is through this ceremony that each man acknowledged what the other represented and God, through the patriarch, recognized the legitimacy of the new emperor. In 457 Anatolius crowned Leo during the emperor's coronation ceremony. This is the earliest certain point that a patriarch placed a crown upon the emperor's head.[38] In *De ceremoniis*, which preserves a large number of imperial ceremonies, Constantine VII[39] describes the coronation ceremony of an unnamed emperor:[40]

---

[37] Brown 1992, 136.
[38] Theophanes the Confessor mentions that Marcian received his crown from the patriarch, although it is not clear from what source he derived this information. See Theophanes, *Chronographia*, A.M. 5942.
[39] Emperor under regency and then co-emperor from 913-959. Aside from being an emperor, he is notable for his scholarly activity.
[40] While this description might be accurate for the ceremony that took place from the fifth century on, it should be noted that it was written in the tenth century and that some of the garments described here do not appear until the eighth century, such as the *tzitzakion*.

> And they [the emperor] move off through the schools into the church, the demes are standing in their proper place only making the sign of the cross. When the emperor comes into the Horologion, the curtain comes up and then he goes into the *mētatorion* and puts on the *divētēsion* and the *tzitzakion* and throws them over the *sagion*. He enters with the patriarch and lights the candles on the silver doors, entering into the shrine he goes into the *sōlaian* and holding the candles he prays before the holy gate. After this the emperor returns to the pulpit with the patriarch. The patriarch makes a prayer over the cloak and when he completes the blessing the attendants of the cubiculum take it and give it to the emperor. And after he makes the prayer over the crown and completes the blessing, the patriarch himself takes the crown and places it upon the head of the emperor.[41]

Several ritual elements are clear in the text, each one suggesting a transformation of the emperor: concealment and revelation of divine knowledge through the raising of curtains and lighting of candles, the blessing of both cloak and crown and putting on the new sacred garments as the assumption of a divine mandate. All of these individual gestures and elements of the ceremony worked in conjunction to bestow the recognition of God upon the emperor as the ruler of a Christian people, formally. It also mitigated the inherent violence of the emperor's ascension, which at the coronation's beginning resembled a military conquest, it was like "the rape of the city by a conqueror…at each stage of his 'entry', the conqueror lost a little more of his warlike ferocity…at the end of his journey, [he] was careful to humble himself before the one true King, who reigned in Heaven."[42]

Despite the overt religious component of the coronation, Constantine VII classified it as a civil ceremony. Even though much of the ceremony took place within the imperial church and the highest ecclesiastical official of the imperial city presided over it, its purpose was secular as

[41]Constantine VII, *De ceremoniis* I.38. Καὶ ἀποκινοῦσιν εἰς τὴν ἐκκλησίαν διὰ τῶν Σχολῶν, τὰ δὲ μέρη ἵστανται ἐν τοῖς τόποις αὐτῶν ἠλλαγμένα, σφραγίζοντες καὶ μόνον. Καὶ ὅτε εἰσέλθῃ ὁ βασιλεὺς εἰς τὸ Ὡρολόγιον, σηκοῦται τὸ βῆλον, καὶ εἰσέρχεται ἐν τῷ μητατωρίῳ καὶ ἀλλάσσει τὸ διβητήσιον καὶ τὸ τζιτζάκιν καὶ βάλλει ἐπάνω τὸ σαγίον καὶ εἰσοδεύει μετὰ τοῦ πατριάρχου καὶ ἅπτει κηροὺς εἰς τὰς ἀργυρᾶς πύλας καὶ εἰσοδεύει ἐν τῷ ναῷ καὶ εἰσέρχεται εἰς τὴν σωλαίαν καὶ εὔχεται εἰς τὰ ἅγια θυρία, ἅψας κηρούς, καὶ ἀνέρχεται εἰς τὸν ἄμβωνα ἅμα τοῦ πατριάρχου. Καὶ ποιεῖ τὴν εὐχὴν ὁ πατριάρχης ἐπὶ τῆς χλαμύδος, καὶ ὅταν πληρώσῃ τὴν εὐχήν, ἐπαίρουσιν αὐτὴν οἱ τοῦ κουβουκλείου καὶ ἐνδύουσι τῷ δεσπότῃ. Καὶ πάλιν ποιεῖ εὐχὴν ἐπὶ τοῦ στέμματος αὐτοῦ, καὶ πληρώσας, λαμβάνει αὐτὸς ὁ πατριάρχης τὸ στέμμα, καὶ τίθησιν αὐτὸ εἰς τὴν κεφαλὴν τοῦ δεσπότου.
[42] Dagron 2003, 65.

was the central figure. Dagron noted the secular nature of the ceremony, "The coronation occupies a surprising place within the structure of the Book of Ceremonies, that is, at the head of a section devoted to civil ceremonies (I, 47-72 [38-63]) – as opposed to religious ceremonies (I, 1-46 [1-37]) – and the promotion of dignitaries."[43] Given the venue and officiant one could reasonably expect that Constantine VII would have considered the coronation ceremony religious. Yet this was not the case. Perhaps it was because Constantine VII, an emperor himself, did not consider the imperial office to be religious in nature or did not heed religious approbation.

The function of the coronation ceremony was not to confer divine power upon the new emperor, which he already had, but divine recognition of secular power. As Dagron says, "by asking God in a spellbinding scene to approve the choice of men, the unanimity of the army, the senate, the palace, the law and the people were evoked; the torque soon became a crown and the newly elected emperor was raised on a dais, rather than on a shield."[44] In reality, the new emperor had already gained all the political power he needed to rule, but still needed the approval of the divine to make his reign legitimate in a Christian empire.

Constantine VII also described the ceremony of Leo I in 457. Unlike the description above, the patriarch plays a much smaller role here and he appears only briefly, "If the emperor wishes he receives communions and retires, after the bishop has placed the crown on him, as is customary in church processions he gives a donation to the clergy and goes into the palace,

[43] Dagron 2003, 57.
[44] Dagron 2003, 63.

afterwards all the senators meet him in the *Regia*."[45] According to Constantine VII, this was the "ancient custom,"[46] which he derived from a text of Peter the Patrician.[47] Aside from the diminished role the patriarch plays here, as opposed to in *De ceremoniis* 1.38, this coronation ceremony uses the word ἐπίσκοπος (bishop) instead of πατριάρχης (patriarch).

Nonetheless, the importance the patriarch plays in the coronation ceremony is striking. Dagron explains that this is the one instance where an emperor meets resistance to his role as the viceroy of God on earth and that part of the ceremony is a reminder for the emperor that though he wields ultimate worldly power, he does not wield supreme religious power. Essentially, the religious, liturgical aspects of the coronation serve to remind the emperor that:

> You are emperor and priest, but only in appearance and for a while. You are David *redivivus*, but according to the Old Law which is dead. You enter the church, but without your crown. You pass through the Imperial Doors which lead you to God, but only after asking pardon for your sins from the priests, who alone have the power to bind and to loose. You enter the sanctuary, but only to present gifts, because you do not really belong, or only a little, to the priestly order.[48]

The coronation ceremony thus made clear the spheres of power; the patriarch is asserting his authority in the religious while simultaneously acknowledging the emperor's secular power. Yet while doing so the patriarch is taking part in a ceremony secular in nature and pushes against any perceivable encroachment against the patriarch's religious authority on the part of the emperor. The most salient distinction between patriarch and emperor rested on the fact that the former was a priest. And this was why the emperor could only be the steward of the empire's church, for he

[45] Constantine VII, *De ceremoniis* 1.91. ἐὰν δὲ θέλει, καὶ συνάγεται, καὶ ἀναχωρεῖ, ἐπιτιθέντος αὐτῷ τὸν στέφανον τοῦ ἐπισκόπου, κατὰ τὸ ἔθος τῶν προκέσσων τῆς ἐκκλησίας ῥογεύει τοῖς κληρικοῖς, καὶ ἔρχεται ἐπὶ τὸ παλάτιον, καὶ ἀπαντῶσιν αὐτῷ πάντες οἱ συγκλητικοὶ ἔσω τῆς ῥηγίας.
[46] Constantine VII, *De ceremoniis* 1.91.
[47] The longtime *magister officiorum* of Justinian, d.565.
[48] Dagron 2003, 113.

did not have the power to bind and loose sin. Even Dagron's elaboration on the ceremony wherein he says that the emperor is also priest, but "only in appearance and for a while" is somewhat of a stretch. No emperor ever administered a Christian sacrament or celebrated the liturgy, which is what a Christian priest did. And as he noted in the above quote, the lack of priestly status restricted every gesture of the emperor.

While all who witnessed the coronation ceremony understood that it implied that it was God who was approving the imperial candidate for office, the patriarch clearly served as an agent of God in this process. Indeed, John II the Cappadocian, a different person than the later praetorian prefect of the same name, pointed out that fact. In a letter to the pope, Hormisdas, he makes this explicit, "and all the people at the time of his annunciation [the emperor Justin's] with a great voice glorified God the ruler of all, because with my hands He adorned such a head with such a crown."[49] John put into words what one of the primary roles of the patriarch was for the coronation ceremony: a proxy of God to facilitate divine approval and thus recognize the legitimacy of the new ruler. The patriarch was therefore paramount in the ceremony of an emperor's ascension because the agency of the patriarch permitted divine acceptance of the new emperor.

Imperial baptisms served as both a reminder to the public of the unique status of the imperial family and as well as affirming the patriarch's status as head of the imperial church. The patriarch performed imperial baptisms in the no longer extant large baptistery on the north side of the Hagia Sophia (not the smaller still-standing one on the south end). Venue and officiant

[49] Letter from John, patriarch of Constantinople, to pope Hormisdas. *Hormisdas Epistle 67*. In *CA* 161.2. *Omnesque annuntiationis eius tempore cum magna voce deum omnium principem glorificaverunt, quoniam, talem verticam meis manibus tali corona decoravit.*

distinguished the imperial family. The patriarch might also remind the imperial family of this fact. During his feud with the empress Eudoxia, John Chrysostom publically reminded her in a sermon that it was he who baptized their children, including Theodosius II, "Remember, and remember the baptism of your children. I recall that through my hands your children were baptized and saved."[50] This sermon was after his return from his brief first exile. Chrysostom was essentially saying "your heirs, and potential future rulers of the empire, became Christian at my hands and their salvation is thanks to me!" In his tenuous position, Chrysostom had to remind the emperor who made them Christian and was responsible for his salvation and the salvation of his family. The patriarch thus served as a sort of gate keeper in performing a rite for making one imperial; it was absolutely necessary after Theodosius I that an emperor be Christian. When the pagan Athenaïs became betrothed to Theodosius II, she needed to become Christian to proceed with the marriage. The patriarch Atticus baptized her and christened her Eudocia.[51]

The liturgy gives evidence of the priestly distinction too. Theodoret of Cyrrhus records one particular instance that makes this clear. After Ambrose of Milan made Theodosius I do penance for the massacre at Thessalonica before entering the basilica in Milan, a conflict of the emperor's role in the liturgy arose.[52] After Ambrose allowed him back in the church, and after the gifts had been brought to the altar, Theodosius, "as he was wont to do, remained within the rail [the sanctuary]," to which Ambrose responded by sending a deacon to tell him that "the inner

[50] John Chrysostom, *Post reditum a priore exsilio*; in Migne *PG*, 52.445.49-52. Ἐμέμνητο, ἐμέμνητο καὶ τῶν παιδίων καὶ τοῦ βαπτίσματος. Μέμνημαι ὅτι διὰ τῶν χειρῶν τῶν σῶν τὰ παιδία τὰ ἐμὰ ἐβαπτίσθη.
[51] Socrates, *EH*, 7.21: Ταύτην ἡνίκα ὁ βασιλεὺς ἔμελλεν ἄγεσθαι, Χριστιανὴν ὁ ἐπίσκοπος Ἀττικὸς ποιήσας ἐν τῷ βαπτίζειν ἀντὶ Ἀθηναΐδος Εὐδοκίαν ὠνόμασεν.
[52] In 390 Theodosius I had massacred several thousand residents of Thessalonica in response to a riot over the arrest of a popular charioteer. In response to this brutal suppression, Ambrose wrote a letter to the emperor advising him that he could not allow him to set foot in the cathedral at Milan unless Theodosius I did penance.

sanctuary, Emperor, is accessible for priests alone, for all others it is forbidden and cannot be touched. Therefore go out and join the others who are standing, the purple makes emperors, not priests."[53] Theodosius was surprised to hear this and acquiesced to the command, explaining that it was the custom in Constantinople for the emperor to be within the sanctuary for communion.

When Theodosius I arrived back in Constantinople from Milan, on the celebration of a feast day, the Mass was underway and after bringing the gifts to the altar, he left the sanctuary. The patriarch, Nectarius, was puzzled and asked him why he had so suddenly left, to which Theodosius replied "I have learned with great toil the differences between an emperor and a priest."[54] It is clear that in Constantinople the emperor had unheard of and special privileges in the liturgy. Despite Theodosius' departure from the sanctuary, it is likely that the practice continued. Canon 69 of the Council in Trullo (692) explicitly bars lay persons from entering the sanctuary; however, it does allow for the emperor to be present in it to bear gifts. The canon cites an "ancient tradition" for permitting a lay person, which the emperor was, into the sanctuary. In the context of imperial-episcopal relations, it is telling that the author was Theodoret, whom Theodosius II ordered confined to Cyrrhus in the years after the Council of Ephesus for his support of Nestorius. Theodoret took particular care in pointing out how the current emperor's grandfather acknowledged the religious power of bishops and the text serves to remind his readers of that fact.[55] It was at the discretion of the patriarch that he was allowed into the

[53] Theodoret, *EH*, 5.17. «τὰ ἔνδον, ὦ βασιλεῦ, μόνοις ἐστὶν ἱερεῦσι βατά,τοῖς δὲ ἄλλοις ἅπασιν ἄδυτά τε καὶ ἄψαυστα. ἔξιθι τοίνυν καὶ τοῖς ἄλλοις κοινώνει τῆς στάσεως ἁλουργὶς γὰρ βασιλέας, οὐχ ἱερέας ποιεῖ».
[54] Theodoret, *EH*, 5.17. «μόγις», ἔφη, «βασιλέως καὶ ἱερέως ἐδιδάχθην διαφοράν».
[55] Theodoret of Cyrrhus was a staunch supporter of the patriarch Nestorius, whom the Council of Ephesus (431) had condemned. Theodosius II had ordered that Theodoret not leave his city and prohibited assembling of "Nestorian" allied churches in the aftermath of Ephesus. Reflecting on this in later letter to Alexander of Hierapolis, Theodoret tells him about a conversation that he and Theodosius II had where the emperor exclaimed, "I am not able to

sanctuary. Similar to the coronation ceremony, the patriarch escorted the emperor into the sanctuary. Dagron invites a comparison of the emperor entering the sanctuary in the company of the patriarch to Moses and Aaron, and noting that this "demonstrates better than any constitution the limits and the true nature of imperial power."[56] In the eyes of observers, by advancing into the sanctuary the emperor was closer than any other layperson to apotheosis. For the patriarch, he made this possible as the officiant of the liturgy and the sacerdotal hierarch of the imperial church.

These ritual practices highlight the salient distinctions between the head of the religious sphere and the head of the secular sphere in Constantinople by reaffirming the necessary qualification of the former: his sacerdotal status. From here, several incidents (not an exhaustive list) show that distinction in action as a boundary that defines what both actors were able to do in their capacity.

- *Boundaries in action: cooperation and conflict*

The patriarch's status as a priest distinguished him as the head of the Constantinopolitan church and thus the religious sphere. This fact greatly influenced the relationship between the emperor and the patriarch and how they functioned. Patriarchs could utilize their religious

command bishops!" πρὸς ταῦτα ἔφη ὅτι ἐγὼ προστάσσειν ἐπισκόπῳ οὐ δύναμαι (ACO I.1.7.80.32-33; *Collectio Atheniensis* 69.5). Theodoret clearly believed that the emperor should not meddle in church affairs and this incident in his history, together with his purported conversation with Theodosius II, reinforce such a belief.

[56] Dagron 2003, 5.

authority on behalf of the emperor and the emperor could likewise with his secular authority assist the patriarch. This becomes particularly evident when one of these men was in some sort of peril or their position was otherwise uncertain. The events that led up to the massacre of the Goths in Constantinople in 400 show that the patriarch was able to support the emperor in his time of crisis by utilizing his religious power.[57]

At the turn of the fourth to the fifth century, Theodosius' I son Arcadius was ruling in Constantinople. His *magister militum* Gaïnas[58] for his successful campaigns on behalf of the East, had gained considerable influence and power. As other powerful military men had in his generation, such as Stilicho[59] and Rufinus[60], he began to assert his power over the imperial government. Despite mention in many fifth century sources (Sozomen, Theodoret, Socrates)[61], the events leading up to this revolt, however, are convoluted and even A.H.M. Jones found them "highly involved and most obscure."[62] More recently the works of Alan Cameron and Jacqueline Long, and J.H.W.G. Liebeschuetz have dealt with this event in depth.[63] Gaïnas conspired with another Gothic general, Tribigild, in 399 instructing him to ravage Phrygia and in turn made

[57] The populace of Constantinople had already become agitated and unnerved at the presence of the Gothic military force. When a rumor swirled about during this tense time that there were Goths in the city planning a coup, the populace panicked and turned to mob violence, murdering Goths wherever they could find them in the city.
[58] Led a force of Theodosius I's against the western usurper Eugenius in 394 and became the *magister militum* beginning 399. Gaïnas was one of many Gothic military commanders who gained a great deal of power and influence at the end of the fourth century. Like many of his fellow Goths, he too was Arian in faith. His foreign origin and heretical faith stirred resentment in the populace of Constantinople, resulting in a massacre of the Goths in the city by the populace of the city in 400, though Gaïnas survived that massacre, but was killed later in 400.
[59] *Magister militum* of the West 395-408. Many scholars consider him the de facto ruler of the west due to his behind the scenes control of the imperial government, exerting undue influence over the emperor Honorius.
[60] *Magister officiorum* 388-392 and praetorian prefect. Briefly regent of Arcadius after Theodosius I died, Stilicho orchestrated his assassination after it became clear Rufinus had aspirations to control the throne.
[61] Socrates' account in 6.6 is the exception among these, because he does not mention any involvement of John Chrysostom. He does report that he used epic poetry about Gaïnas among his own sources, *The Gaïnead* of Eusebius Scholasticus and an unnamed one of the poet Ammonius.
[62] Jones 1964, 178.
[63] See Cameron, Long, & Sherry 1993, 199-236; and, Liebeschuetz 1990, 109-125 and 189-194.

demands of the emperor Arcadius to appease what he claimed Tribigild's wishes (in fact, Gaïnas') were, including the removal of the eunuch Eutropius. At any rate, the relevant facets of Gaïnas' revolt in this study have to do with his Arian religion.[64] At some point during his revolt, he asked Arcadius for the construction of an Arian church in Constantinople. Theodosius I had expelled the Arians in 380 in favor of the Nicene church, although a large contingent of Arians remained in the suburbs outside the walls and drew worshipers out of the city with hymns and processions. The situation with Gaïnas perhaps rekindled latent tensions between Arians and Nicenes because, generally, the Gothic soldiers were Arian.

Theodoret of Cyrrhus provides a particularly detailed account of John Chrysostom's role in the events of 399-400, even reporting the words of the patriarch, in 5.32 of his *Ecclesiastical History*.[65] In this account, Arcadius feared that Gaïnas had ambitions to usurp, so the emperor informed the patriarch, John Chrysostom, about Gaïnas' request for an Arian church and subtly communicated his suspicions about the Goth's ambitions. John Chrysostom assured the emperor that he need not worry and that he would dissuade Gaïnas. Theodoret then reports that Chrysostom confronted Gaïnas, asking him why he insisted that he have his church, "every church is open for you and no one stops you from praying there if you like," to which Gaïnas had to admit that he was "part of another group [of Christians]."[66] Essentially, he had to confess that he was a practicing heretic seeking to reintroduce the sect into Constantinople.

---

[64] A thorough reconstruction of the events of the revolt and massacre of the Goths is in Cameron, Long, & Sherry 1993, 199-252.

[65] Alan Cameron considers Theodoret's account of Chrysostom to be convincing, for the reason that Theodoret had written a now lost biography on him. See Cameron, Long, & Sherry 1993, note 76, 327.

[66] Theodoret, *EH*, 5.32. «ἅπας σοι», ἔφη ὁ μέγας Ἰωάννης, «θεῖος οἶκος ἀνέῳκται καὶ οὐδείς σε εἴργει προσεύξασθαι προθυμούμενον». «ἀλλ' ἐγώ», ἔφη ὁ Γαϊνάς, «ἑτέρας ὑπάρχω συμμορίας καὶ σὺν ἐκείνοις ἕνα θεῖον ἔχειν οἶκον αἰτῶ.

In Sozomen's account, Gaïnas has already made clear his intent by pillaging cities in Phrygia and moving his forces outside of Chalcedon[67] before asking for an Arian church in Constantinople. Sozomen reports similarly to Theodoret that Gaïnas justified his request on the grounds that his rank of general should grant him the privilege of praying within the city walls, even though it was clear he knew Arianism was a heresy.[68] In this account the confrontation between Gaïnas and Chrysostom takes place in the palace before the emperor. The patriarch makes essentially the same argument as in Theodoret, reminding Gaïnas of the loyalty he swore to the emperor and that he should appreciate the prosperity that service to the Romans had brought him. Sozomen does add that Chrysostom actually produced a law of Theodosius I forbidding heterodox Christians from being within city walls.[69] Chrysostom then exhorted the emperor that it "would be better to lose an empire than pollute the house of God,"[70] making clear to Gaïnas that his hopes for an Arian church were null.

In this incident, the highest official of the religious sphere comes to the aid of his ally in the secular sphere. Chrysostom argued the point to Gaïnas that he enjoyed tangible benefits because of the temporal power of the Theodosian dynasty. Gaïnas' request for an Arian church, however, fell within the ecclesiastical polity of the patriarch, who denied it. In this respect, the

[67] A suburb directly across the Bosphorus and visible from the imperial palace. Thus the assemble of a force there was a clear threat.
[68] Sozomen *EH,* 8.4.
[69] Sozomen *EH* 8.4.9. τάδε λέγων ἐδείκνυ τὸν νόμον, ὃν Θεοδόσιος ἔθετο τοὺς ἑτεροδόξους εἴργων ἔνδον τειχῶν ἐκκλησιάζειν. This was most likely a law from 388, which is similar in language to the law Sozomen described, "We order that Apollinarians and followers of other heresies be prohibited from all places, from the walls of cities..." in *CTh* 16.5.14, *Apollinarianos ceterosque diversarum haeresum sectatores ab omnibus locis iubemus inhiberi, a moenibus urbium*. Neither Sozomen nor the 388 law specifically mentions Arians, though by that time there were plenty of laws and church canons that defined Arianism as a heresy. Further, the law in Sozomen and 388 both specifically ban heretics from being within the walls of cities. The law from 388 is the only one of Theodosius I that says so in such terms.
[70] Sozomen *EH* 8.4.9. ἐκ τούτου δὲ πρὸς τὸν βασιλέα τρέψας τὸν λόγον ἔπεισε τὸν τεθέντα νόμον κατὰ τῶν ἄλλων αἱρέσεων κύριον φυλάττειν, ἄμεινον εἶναι συμβουλεύων τῆς βασιλείας παραχωρεῖν ἢ προδότην οἴκου θεοῦ γενόμενον ἀσεβεῖν.

enforcement of such laws was turned over to the official whose jurisdiction the matter fell under; because this was a matter of religion it came to the patriarch. Why did Arcadius turn to Chrysostom? Surely the emperor knew the same anti-Arian laws that Chrysostom cited and could have reminded Gaïnas of them himself. The reason rests in the fact that Gaïnas had been able to challenge the secular authority of the emperor, via his military record, but he could not challenge the religious authority of the patriarch. While Gaïnas might have had the support of the Gothic military regiments and was aspiring for the support of the people (doubtful as that aspiration was), he clearly lacked the requisite religious beliefs for a successful vie at the throne, which the patriarch pointed out to him.

The involvement of Chrysostom in this affair marks a benchmark in the history of the patriarchate and Roman Empire, which was the involvement of the patriarch in a secular matter. Liebeschuetz noted this as well, "Intervention by a bishop of the capital in the secular affairs of the Roman Empire was of course something new. It was bound to be extremely controversial, and it remained exceptional."[71] It was made more exceptional by the fact that the chief secular officer of the empire, the emperor, requested the involvement of the patriarch, it was not an intrusion by Chrysostom, "It would be a mistake to see Chrysostom's influence at this time as that of an ecclesiastical magnate who was extending his power into the secular sphere."[72] While Chrysostom was not asserting secular power or "extending into" it, he was using his ecclesiastical authority to influence the secular sphere. His refusal of a thoroughly religious request, the use of an Arian church within Constantinople, had an impact on a secular affair by

[71] Liebeschuetz 1990, 110.
[72] Liebeschuetz 1990, 110.

rendering a potential challenger for the imperial throne illegitimate for rule because of religious heterodoxy.

While Chrysostom helped the emperor in an internal conflict, Nestorius famously promised help with an enemy outside the empire. At his consecration as patriarch he proclaimed, "Give me, O Emperor, the earth pure of heretics, and I will repay you heaven. Help me destroy the heretics and I will help you destroy the Persians!"[73] His enticement for imperial assistance was the promise to destroy an ancient enemy of the Roman Empire, which was strange because at the time of this speech in 428 both empires had been at peace after the war of 421-423. His promise was to channel divine assistance in any military venture against the Persians. So then, as for the fulfillment of the request to purify the earth of heretics, Theodosius II could not change the beliefs of the heterodox, but he could take away their property through legislation. Included in their property was their churches. This was a fairly common tactic against heretical groups and well within the emperor's rights to deprive groups and individuals of their property. In essence, control over objects within their respective spheres became commodities of exchange for these officials. The patriarch offered to provide divine assistance, rooted in his spiritual authority, in exchange for the emperor's ability to deprive individuals of real property, which lay in the imperial government's secular authority.

It appears that Nestorius also got his wish, as a law dating to 428 seems to indicate. Furthermore, he might have actually authored the law, which is an unusually broad and comprehensive law pertaining to heresies.[74] The patriarch claimed that he was the author of the

[73] Socrates, *EH*, 7.29. Δός μοι" φηςίν, "ὦ βασιλεῦ, καθαρὰν τὴν γῆν τῶν αἱρετικών, κἀγὼ σοι τὸν οὐρανὸν ἀντιδώσω · συγκάθελέ μοι τοὺς αἱρετικούς, κἀγὼ συγκαθελῶ σοι τοὺς Πέρσας.
[74] *CTh* 16.5.65.

law, "I devised a law against those who say that Christ is pure man and against other heretics."[75] Scholars have not reached a consensus as to the accuracy of Nestorius' claim.[76] Nonetheless, even if Nestorius was not the direct author of this law, it is not far-fetched to consider that he might have had a good deal of input in the authorship of it. Nestorius became patriarch on 10 April 428 and the law is dated 30 May 428. It is likely that with such personal involvement in selecting Nestorius, Theodosius II probably would have listened to Nestorius' suggestions. As Millar notes, Theodosius II took "the initiative in identifying, bringing to Constantinople, and having elected as bishop a presbyter from Antioch, and former monk, from the small city of Germanicia, Nestorius."[77] The harsh and thorough character of the law seems to reflect more so the personality of Nestorius, a man whom was derisively called "Firebrand"[78], than the more lenient Theodosius II. The thorough and methodical nature of the law combined with Nestorius' request for the emperor's help in "purifying the earth of heretics" lend support to the position that the patriarch had a good deal of input into the law.

The collaborative effort of legislation is evident in both the secular law and canon law, which might both address the same issue to different effects. Such a practice is clear in the case of heretics. While the canon law denied a heretic communion with the Church the secular law prohibited property possession, thus preventing heretical sects from assembly. Thus both sets of laws affirmed one another in their own capacity. The canon law, the realm of the religious, came as the result of the deliberation of bishops and presided over spiritual prohibitions and ritual

[75] Nestorius, in Loofs, 1905, 205. *Tanquam ego Christum purum hominem definirem, qui certe legem inter ipsae meae ordinitationis initia contra eos, qui Christum purum hominem dicunt, et contra reliquas haereses innovavi.*
[76] Holum 1982, 150-1, agrees with Nestorius' claim here, but Rougé and Delmaire 2005, 336, hold serious reservations about the truth of this claim.
[77] Millar 2006, 152.
[78] See Socrates *EH* 7.29, in which the historian reports how Nestorius earned this nickname.

practice. The secular law came from the rescripts and edicts of the emperor and presided over structures and lay persons, when it dealt with religious matters. Indeed, during the synod at Constantinople Justinian issued two laws, in *Codex Iustinianus* 1.1.6 & 7, dated 15 and 26 March 533, respectively. These laws, the first of which Justinian addressed to the people of Constantinople and the second to the patriarch Epiphanius, affirmed the doctrine of the Chalcedonian faith. Concurrently as the legislating of those laws, the synod at Constantinople was reaffirming the findings of the Council of Chalcedon and the law of Justinian ends with a general condemnation of all those that previous four ecumenical councils condemned.[79] In fact, the law makes clear the emperor refused to do anything, if he actually could, contrary to the findings of those four councils, "Therefore let no one uselessly bother us with the vain hope that we will do anything contrary to the holy synods."[80] This was entirely consistent with the policy of other emperors and reflective of an understanding of the legislative procedure that, for matters of religion, went first through canon law and then to the secular law. This was because as the official religion of the Empire, the emperor privileged the opinion and status of orthodox Christian officials.

Endowments and property acquisitions seemed to be the chief concern of secular legislation that affected the church. Leo I issued the first law forbidding the sale of church lands and limited the terms of lease of church land in 470, found in *Codex Iustinianus* 1.2.14. [81] This

[79] *CIus* 1.1.7.22.
[80] *CIus* 1.1.7.22: Μηδεὶς τοίνυν μάτην ἡμᾶς ταραξάτω ἐλπίδι ματαίᾳ κρατούμενος, ὅτι ἡμεῖς ἐναντίον τι τῶν εἰρημένων ἁγίων δ΄συνόδων ἐπράξαμεν.
[81] *CIus* 1.2.14.2: It is proper that the property of the blessed church, or which is given to it hereafter, should, just as the holy and sacred church itself, be reverently kept intact, so that as she is the external mother of religion and faith, her property should perpetually remain unimpaired. *Ea enim, quae ad beatissimae ecclesiae iura pertinent vel posthac forte pervenerint, tamquam ipsam sacrosanctam et religiosam ecclesiam intacta convenit venerabiliter custodiri, ut, sicut ipsa religionis et fidei mater perpetua est, ita eius patrimonium iugiter servetur illaesum.*

law specifically applied to Constantinople and protected both the clergy and the secular government. The multitude of wealthy, powerful persons in Constantinople was a threat to the estates of the church, which enabled self-sufficiency so that it was not completely dependent on imperial or private patronage. Wealthy individuals were keen to acquire more property and the church's estates were appealing. These same individuals could be great friends or foes to individual bishops or priests, especially within Constantinople. Thus such a law preserved the integrity of the church from the pressures to please such individuals through the sale of land. Simultaneously, the law also prevented these potent individuals from becoming a threat to the current emperor. If one of these individuals did have aspirations to the throne, then at least they would not have additional resources available to them from church lands or even leverage of church officials. Leo's law demonstrates how imperial legislation could affect the church, but only in exterior matters, not rituals or beliefs.

In fact, imperial restrictions or allowances of property rights reveals the role of emperor as a steward of the church. The benefaction of wealth and power from the emperor, however, did not indebt the church to give him insider status in a sacerdotal role. T.D. Barnes notes that this patronage was one of Constantine's more groundbreaking innovations, "Where Constantine did institute radical change was in the sphere of religion. He gave the Christian church and its clergy a privileged position in Roman society, he financed his subsidies to the Christian church…"[82] Despite the great privilege and wealth the emperor gave to the church, the members of the religious sphere might still rebuke or ignore his positions. In Constantinople, as elsewhere, a patriarch might resist the power of the emperor for his doctrinal proclivities. Unlike members of

[82] Barnes 2009, 382.

the imperial council or private citizens, such resistance, depending upon the degree of vitriol, did not necessarily endanger the career of the patriarch. A patriarch standing firm on a point of religion in opposition to the emperor could also rally the people of Constantinople in support of the archbishop, pitting him as foil to the emperor's control of the city. For if an emperor could not claim supreme authority in the imperial city, how could he claim authority throughout the empire?

Upon his usurpation in January 475, Basiliscus[83] championed the miaphysite doctrine and immediately recalled Timothy Aelurus[84] from exile. Basiliscus then authored and sent an encyclical addressed to Timothy that upheld the first three ecumenical councils and anathematized the Council of Chalcedon, emphasizing the unity of a church whose doctrine derived from the first three ecumenical councils.[85] However, the patriarch of Constantinople, Acacius, was a firm Chalcedonian at this time and immediately came into conflict with the usurper emperor, who also actively attempted to undermine the patriarch's authority in the dioceses that went under him at Chalcedon: Pontus, Asia, and Thrace. Acacius responded to the attack on his jurisdiction and doctrinal stance by stirring up the monks and clergy to flock to him in the Great Church, rallying around the cause of the Chalcedonian faith.[86] The *Life of Daniel* relates that Acacius ordered all the churches to be draped in mourning, a dramatic action signaling the perceived doom that those faithful to Chalcedon felt; he then sought the support of

[83] Usurper emperor January 475- August 476. He served as a military commander under Leo I and Zeno, whom he revolted against, frequently in Thrace. He led several successful expeditions.
[84] Formerly the patriarch of Alexandria (457-460, 475-477). He was the leader of the miaphysites in Alexandria and led resistance to the imperial government installing Peter Mongus as the patriarch. As a result, the imperial government exiled him.
[85] Evagrius Scholasticus preserves the text of the letter in *EH* 3.4.
[86] Evagrius Scholasticus, *EH*, 3.7; *Life of Daniel the Stylite*, 70.

Daniel.[87] Acacius sent a counter encyclical claiming that Basiliscus was a heretic and championing the doctrine of Chalcedon. Acacius' resistance appeared to have worked; Basiliscus issued a new encyclical that restored to the patriarch of Constantinople his rights to ordain metropolitans, nullified his previous encyclical of faith, reaffirmed his condemnation of heretics including Nestorius and Eutyches, but made no explicit mention of Chalcedon.[88] Zeno soon after reclaimed his throne in 476.

Basiliscus clearly underestimated the popularity of the patriarch and the doctrine of Chalcedon within Constantinople. It seems that he never had and was never able to gain popular support; only aristocrats, such as Verina[89], backed him. In other words, he had support at the top of society but lacked the crucial support of the population that would have legitimized his rule. [90] In contrast, Acacius had the support of the population of Constantinople. Thus when Basiliscus became immediately hostile to Acacius, the people became polarized against him.

If the imperial office was indeed connected to the religious sphere as an authority, it is reasonable to expect that in some fashion either the church or populace would have deferred to the new emperor's religious policy. Yet, there is no evidence for that. Zeno was in such a precarious situation enough that he had to flee and abdicate the throne, leaving it for Basiliscus,

[87] *Life of Daniel the Stylite,* 70. The author of the hagiography calls Basiliscus a "name of ill-omen", "ὁ δυσώνυμος".
[88] Evagrius Scholasticus, *EH,* 3.7.
[89] Wife of Emperor Leo I and Basiliscus' sister, mother of Zeno's wife Ariadne. She still possessed tremendous wealth and influence at the time of Zeno's ascension and was dissatisfied enough with him that she supported Basiliscus' usurpation.
[90] Richard Price believes that Basiliscus' strong association with Timothy Aelurus significantly harmed his popularity within Constantinople, see Price 2009, 309. He explains this by arguing that Timothy Aelurus' reappearance in Constantinople would have led people to assume that Basiliscus tacitly approved of the murder of the patriarch of Alexandria Proterius, who was a Chalcedonian; many bishops believed that Timothy Aelurus had instigated and encouraged the murder. Thus Price concludes, ""the appearance in Constantinople of Timothy Aelurus, who was considered responsible for Proterius' murder, plus Basiliscus' personal unpopularity, provides a more plausible explanation than any positive enthusiasm for Chalcedon." This view, however, severely diminishes popular piety, which was clearly a salient factor in these events and contributed towards the security of Acacius.

so the public animus towards Basiliscus' anti-Chalcedonianism probably did not come as a form of support for him. Instead, religious hostility towards Basiliscus on the part of the faithful of the city resulted when the authority of the religious sphere, Acacius, roused their sentiment against a secular heretic who was attempting to suppress orthodoxy. Basiliscus' mistake was essentially appearing as the member of one sphere attempting to intrude *into* the other, rather than using influence and negotiation to achieve his platform.

Perhaps the most resounding indication of the Acacius' popular support was that he won the allegiance of the charismatic pillar-monk Daniel the Stylite, from whom Basiliscus had attempted to gain support.[91] Daniel firmly rejected the usurper's overtures, explaining that he had had disrupted the Church and its priests. Even better for Acacius, Daniel agreed to come down from his pillar and join the patriarch at the Great Church, where the congregants witnessed the unexpected sight of patriarch and stylite saint praying together.[92] Thus the patriarch was able to demonstrate that he had the support and endorsement of an extremely influential and charismatic holy man. [93] The charismatic and institutional authority of the religious sphere was sufficient to overwhelm intrusion by the secular.

Peter Brown points out the political advantage of having Daniel speak on behalf of Acacius, when the saint tells a woman who asked for a blessing from him to name a son yet to be born with the name Zeno, interpreting it as the saint "discreetly setting the pace of negotiations between Basiliscus and the patriarch by a sleight of hand…Zeno, the fallen emperor, was

[91] *Life of Daniel the Stylite*, 71.
[92] *Life of Daniel the Stylite*, 72-73.
[93] Peter Brown points out that Daniel's influence in Constantinople was due to his status as an outsider, "it was solidly based on a dogged defence of his status as a total stranger in a faction ridden city. To begin with, he had the advantage of speaking only Syriac – his orthodoxy, therefore, was impenetrable" in Brown 1971, 92.

rallying his forces in the east. Only a holy man could thus mention the unmentionable."[94] Yet, even before this happens in the *Life of Daniel*, an ambassador of Basiliscus, the chamberlain (κουβικουλάριος) who goes to Daniel and says that Acacius "has roused the city against me and turned the army from me…"[95] The rupture between Acacius and usurper occurred quickly, within the first months of Basiliscus' reign and before the involvement of Daniel who was still on top of his pillar at the time of the usurper's overtures. During the brief usurpation of Basiliscus, everything happened in quick succession; nevertheless even the biographer of Daniel records that Acacius had already mounted effective resistance to the would-be emperor. By the time Daniel became involved his role was that of a peace-maker, eventually reconciling the usurper and Acacius, at least until Zeno made his triumphant return.[96] Furthermore, while Daniel's hagiographer places him at the center of this controversy, another holy person takes a place of honor for the triumphant returning Zeno: Saint Thecla, who came to Zeno in visions and encouraged him while in exile, promising him victory for persevering back to Constantinople.[97] And it is to St. Thecla that Zeno dedicated a shrine, not Daniel, in gratitude.

In the face of an imperial threat – all hostile action by the secular state was a threat, really, because it held a monopoly on legitimate violence – to his religious authority, Acacius held his ground and won, not surprisingly. In the eyes of Constantinopolitans, Basiliscus' attempts were illegitimate, he did not belong in the religious sphere and was attempting to usurp not only an earthly crown but a spiritual one too. Basiliscus should have remembered an important part of the emperor's worship at the Eucharist, true he entered into the sanctuary, but

[94] Brown 1971, 92-3. The passage is from *Life of Daniel*, 82.
[95] *Life of Daniel the Stylite*, 71. ὃς διήγειρεν τὴν πόλιν κατ'ἐμοῦ καὶ τὸν στρατὸν διέστρεψεν.
[96] *Life of Daniel*, 83.
[97] Evagrius Scholasticus, *EH*, 3.8.

he always removed his crown and was always escorted by the patriarch, because he was not the sovereign of the sacred and he did not really belong in the realm of the divine. The liturgy consistently reminded all worshipers of the emperor's outsider status. The support of a charismatic and renowned holy man, Daniel, for the patriarch confirmed Acacius' course of action. Ironically, this usurpation ended with Basiliscus taking refuge in the baptistery of the Great Church while Zeno made his triumphant return to Constantinople.[98]

In the aftermath of the failed usurpation, it is possible that Zeno interpreted Acacius' resistance as loyalty to himself. Zeno issued a law in December 477 to the praetorian prefect Sebastianos in which he officially annulled all of the religious decrees of Basiliscus and reaffirmed all prerogatives of the patriarchate. Within that law, Zeno specifically states that Acacius was the "father [or guardian] of our piety."[99] Zeno probably was using hyperbole to express his gratitude to the patriarch, but there is an element of truth to the epithet. The patriarch was the protector of the orthodox faith, or at least the faith of the emperor. [100] More importantly, this epithet also affirms the patriarch's role for the empire. He was the priest on whom the capital depended for the observation of proper ritual worship. This is confirmed by additional language of the law that decrees the church of Constantinople as the church of the empire, as Zeno calls it the "mother of our piety and the holy seat of all Christians of the orthodox faith."[101] A pious empire should have a pious center, requiring observant sacerdotal figures to carry out the ritual

[98] John Malalas, *Chronicle*, 15.5. λαβὼν οὖν Βασιλίσκος τὴν γυναῖκα αὐτοῦ καὶ τὰ τέκνα ἔφυγεν εἰς τὴν μεγάλην ἐκκλησίαν Κωνσταντινουπόλεως εἰς τὸ μέγα φωτιστήριον.
[99] *CIus* 1.2.16. *His, quae contra haec tempore tyrannidis innovata sunt tam contra venerabiles ecclesias, quarum sacerdotium gerit beatissimus ac religiosissimus episcopus patriarcha nostrae pietatis pater acacius*.
[100] Rome claimed the latter; in a complaint about Acacius Pope Simplicius wrote, "He is, however, more partial to the emperor than to the faith," in Evagrius Scholasticus, *EH,* 3.21.
[101] *CIus* 1.2.16.1. *civitatis ecclesiam matrem nostrae pietatis et christianorum orthodoxae religionis omnium.*

ceremonies of the faith. Thus the patriarch was not only the chief office of the religious sphere in Constantinople, but the Byzantine Empire.

Evident in this law too is the beneficial and mutually assuring partnership of the "father of the church" and the emperor. The religious authority of Acacius supported the political claims of Zeno. The affairs of 475-477 AD demonstrate how the patriarch and emperor could ensure one another's position and that if one desired to usurp the throne, even if the current emperor was waning in popularity as Zeno was, it would be to the aspirant's benefit if he at least feigned agreement with the patriarch's doctrine. Furthermore, Acacius had a deep understanding of the popular faith of Constantinople, which he accepted and championed. Acacius better understood the demands of his constituents, the acclaim of the people of the city for particular doctrine. This was no easy task, as the popular opinion on what was orthodox could change more quickly than one anticipated, which is what Basiliscus was probably hoping for to begin with – that he might tap into some large unexpressed miaphysite contingent within the city for support.

Even outside observers interpreted that the patriarch had the power to assert his own doctrine against the opinion of the emperor. Pope Gelasius recognized, disdainfully, that the patriarch was autonomous in promoting religious belief. In a letter to the bishops of Dardania at the beginning of 496, Gelasius complains that Acacius was unwilling to dissuade Zeno from the position he expressed in the *Henoticon*. In an incredulous tone he points out that Acacius was able to resist Basiliscus, but was now claiming that he could not resist Zeno:

> Do they think that their argument should be considered by us, who tried to spread his crimes to the imperial person? Why then, when he wanted to, did he stop Basiliscus, truly a tyrant and a very violent and heretical one? It is well known that he did not want communion with Peter of Antioch [Peter the Fuller], why then, did he not stop himself

> from submitting to the will of the emperor Zeno? Behold, he had been able to do otherwise and it would have resulted differently, if he were willing.[102]

Gelasius observes that Acacius was indeed able to prevent Basiliscus from effecting doctrinal innovation, as was his prerogative. On the other hand, and to the pope's ire, supporters of Acacius claimed that the patriarch was unable to resist the will of the emperor, Zeno. This was not true and Gelasius uses the example of Basiliscus to point out that Acacius in fact could have prevented the authorship of the *Henoticon,* if he wanted to, but the truth was that he was complicit in the authorship of it. [103] Gelasius rightly assumed that the patriarch could resist the emperor, especially on matters of doctrine. The pope's description of Basiliscus as a violent and heretical tyrant serves to point out that Acacius was able to maintain his religious authority despite outright imperial hostility that aggressively attempted to undermine the position of the patriarch.

Within the scope of this study, perhaps no other reign offers as many examples of mutual hostility between patriarch and emperor as that of Anastasius. The relationship between the

---

[102] Gelasius, *Epistle* 26: *ad episcopos Dardiniae*. In *CA* 95.43-44.p. 384-385. *An illud ipsius argumentum nobis aestimant opponendum, quo facinora sua in imperialem nisus est iactare personam? Cur igitur, quando voluit, obstitit Basilisco, tyranno certe et haeretico vehementer infesto? Cur ipsi imperatori Zenoni, quia palam Antiocheno Petro noluit communicare, suam non subdidit voluntatem? Ecce potuit et in aliis resultare, si vellet.*

Theil has the shorter form of this letter in *Epistola Romanorum pontificum genuinae*. He gives two versions from different manuscripts. The language in those versions is much more condensed but expresses the same sentiment. In *Epistle 26.13,* page 410. *Sed inquiunt: Acacius principi obviare non potuit. Cur Basilisco, quia voluit, obviavit? Cur ipsi Zenoni, ne palam Petro Antiocheno, quamvis latenter hoc fecerit, communicare videretur, non commodavit assensum? Ecce resultant non institit imperator, ecce vim nolent non intulit, ecce refugienti contagia manifesta concessit!*

[103] Acacius advised Zeno on the *Henoticon*, which he circulated on 28 July 482. See Evagrius 3.13-14; Ps.-Zachariah 5.8. The document defined the orthodox faith according to what the first three ecumenical councils decreed and the Twelve Anathemas of Cyril. What it did not do was make an affirmative statement on the doctrine of Chalcedon and the Tome of Leo, opting instead to uphold the punitive anathemas of the fourth council. The hope was that by only making affirmative statements about the earlier councils and avoiding any statement at all on the controversial fourth, all would be in agreement with document and the empire could have its churches in concordance. This was not what happened and immediate resistance arose within Constantinople itself from the Akoimetai monks, who thoroughly repudiated the document's lack of support for Chalcedon.

patriarchate and that emperor was frequently tense and full of animosity, conflicts arose between successive patriarchs and Anastasius centering on Chalcedonianism. In the course of their disagreements, one can see the boundaries of authority between the religious and the secular, which resulted in terse negotiations between the two offices as far as course of actions in religious matters. Additionally, these conflicts reveal the limitations of the emperor's power in affecting the patriarchate.

After the Council of Chalcedon, the Tome of Leo, and the *Henoticon* all had adversely charged the ecumenical environment throughout the capital and empire, the emperor Anastasius was reluctant to even mention anything to do with the matter of the nature of Christ. One explanation for Anastasius being so hesitant was that he realized "disunity in ecclesiastical affairs would quickly lead to disunity in secular affairs; and in particular, that the interests of the empire, in terms of security and economic prosperity, lay in the east."[104] While many suspected Anastasius of harboring miaphysite sympathies, he held fast to the precedent of Constantine I and avoided divisive tactics over doctrine and called for harmony from the Church. These facts made his relationship with the patriarch Euphemius tumultuous. Indeed, the two men had never been on friendly, or even polite, terms with one another.

A story circulated that when Anastasius was a *silentiarios*[105] he was teaching miaphysite doctrines in the Great Church. Upon learning about this Euphemius threw him out of a chair he was sitting on and forced him into the street, threatening "to tonsure his head and parade him

[104] Haarer 2006, 125.
[105] A palace official under the *praepositus sacri cubiculi* that was responsible for procedural matters during ceremonies and audiences with the emperor.

through the streets."[106] The patriarch enforced his rule as master of the Great Church; Euphemius' actions made clear that it was his domain. Euphemius dictated what was permitted and what was forbidden in terms of religious discourse in the church. What is more, as *silentiarios* Anastasius had already attained high-rank in the civil administration; to physically remove him from the church reveals that civic rank gave a person no authority in the Great Church, least of all saving him from the patriarch's wrath. As *silentiarios,* Anastasius was willing to engage in ecclesiastical controversy, this changed upon becoming emperor. One explanation could be that this was a learning experience for him and he decided to refrain from taking an overt position in doctrine. Another is that given such a discrepancy, this account is mere rumor. Although if it did genuinely occur, and Anastasius was sincere about being discrete with his beliefs, it helps to confirm that he held animus towards Euphemius.

Bolstering this account is the fact that when it seemed likely that Anastasius would become the next emperor, Euphemius compelled him to sign document of orthodoxy secured by oath. As Theodoret Lector reported, the document essentially had Anastasius swearing that he would introduce no new doctrine.[107] This was consistent with the acclamations of the people in the Hippodrome, imploring Ariadne for an orthodox emperor.[108] Euphemius ensured that the

---

[106] Theodoret Lector, *EH,* 441. Euphemius was living a Εὐφήμιος ζηλωτὴς ἦν τῆς ὀρθοδόξου πίστεως καὶ τοὺς ἐναντίους ἐδίωκεν, ὢν πρῶτος ἦν Ἀναστάσιος ὁ τότε σιλεντιάριος, ὕστερον δὲ βασιλεὺς γενόμενος. ὃν τὰ Εὐτυχοῦς μαθὼν φρονοῦντα καὶ ὀχλοποιοῦντα ἰδὼν τὴν καθέδραν αὐτοῦ τὴν ἐν τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ ἀνέτρεψε καὶ αὐτῷ χαλεπῶς ἀπειλῶν ἐδήλωσεν ὡς, εἰ μὴ τὰ τῆς ἡσυχίας ἄγει, τὴν κεφαλὴν αὐτοῦ ἀποκείρει καὶ τοῖς δήμοις θριαμβεύει. καὶ βασιλεῖ δὲ τὰ κατ' αὐτὸν ἐγνώρισε καὶ ἐξουσίαν τὴν κατ' αὐτοῦ ἔλαβεν.

[107] Theodore Lector, *EH*, 446. περὶ οὗ ἀντέστη Εὐφήμιος ὁ ἐπίσκοπος αἱρετικὸν καλῶν καὶ τῶν Χριστιανῶν ἀνάξιον. Ἀριάδνης δὲ καὶ τῶν τῆς συγκλήτου συναινεῖν ἀναγκαζόντων Εὐφήμιον, οὐκ ἄλλως τοῦτο ποιῆσαι ἠνέσχετο, εἰ μὴ ὁμολογίαν ἔγγραφον παρ' αὐτοῦ ἐκομίσατο, ὡς εἰς ὅρον πίστεως δέχεται τὰ ἐν Χαλκηδόνι δογματισθέντα· ὃ καὶ πεποίηκεν.

[108] Constantine VII, *De Ceremoniis* 1.92. When the empress appeared to the people, everyone cried out, "Ariadne, empress, may you be victorious! Holy Lord, long live the empress! Lord have mercy! Many years for the empress! Give the empire an orthodox emperor!" αἰ ὡς ἔστη ἡ αὐγούστα καὶ ἐφάνη τῷ δήμῳ, πάντες ἔκραξαν· „Ἀριάδνη αὐγούστα, σὺ νικᾷς· εὐσεβῆ Κύριε, ζωὴν αὐτῇ·" καὶ πολλάκις τὸ „Κύριε, ἐλέησον" εἶπον, „πολλὰ τὰ ἔτη τῆς αὐγούστης· ὀρθόδοξον βασιλέα τῇ οἰκουμένῃ.

populace received what it asked for, a sworn orthodox emperor. Knowing that Anastasius espoused, at least previously, miaphysite beliefs, he confirmed that Anastasius, should he actually become emperor, would not alter the position of Chalcedonianism in Constantinople. Evagrius Scholasticus reports a similar story about the signing of this document, however he suggests that it was because Anastasius was involved in an even more heretical doctrine, "[Euphemius] did this because many knew that Anastasius held the doctrine of the Manichee faith."[109] This allegation comes from the fact that members of Anastasius's family, including his mother, were supposedly Manichees. Additionally, his uncle was a known Arian, as Theodore Lector claims.[110] However, the charge of Manicheanism was polemical, designed to make clear to the reader that the non-Chalcedonian faith was tantamount to a most vile heresy via association. Both Theodore and Evagrius were ardent Chalcedonians, writing in the sixth century, and these authors clearly viewed miaphysites with contempt.[111]

Euphemius was wary of the possible influence Anastasius might have upon the church. As patriarch it was his duty to protect orthodoxy. This duty gave him authority to make a broad manner of actions to maintain the faith of the city, including the physical reproach of civic officials. Not certain is if this authority would have permitted the patriarch to force the emperor

[109]Evagrius Scholasticus, *EH*, 3.32. Ἐδεδράκει δὲ ταῦτα διότι γε ὁ Ἀναστάσιος δόξαν μανιχαϊκῆς νομίσεως παρὰ τοῖς πολλοῖς εἶχεν.

[110] Theodore Lector, *EH*, 448: Manichees and Arians rejoiced for Anastasius, on the one hand because his mother was a member of the Manichees, and on the other Clearchos, his uncle on his mother's side, held the same belief. Μανιχαῖοι καὶ Ἀρειανοὶ ἔχαιρον Ἀναστασίῳ, Μανιχαῖοι μὲν ὡς τῆς μητρὸς αὐτοῦ ζηλωτρίας οὔσης αὐτῶν, Ἀρειανοὶ δὲ ὡς Κλέαρχον τὸν θεῖον πρὸς μητρὸς Ἀναστασίου ὁμόδοξον ἔχοντες.

[111] Legislation against Manichees was in abundance and included penalties ranging from loss of private property to expulsion from the city. Since the time of Diocletian, who ordered execution for Manichees, the imperial government had repeatedly renewed its persecution of the religion. It seems unlikely that a person would reach the rank of silentiarios while also being part of a faith that the government had condemned time after time. Making this accusation stranger is that Anastasius was probably the author of a law that reintroduced the death penalty for Manichees in 510, "We order that those who embrace the pernicious error of the Manichaeans shall have neither opportunity nor permission to stay in any place in the empire, and if they appear or are found anywhere, the punishment is death," in *CIus* 1.5.11.

to sign an oath of orthodoxy, as the account at hand is clear to point out that this took place before Anastasius obtained the purple. In fact, Evagrius presents Euphemius as withholding his approval of the *silentiarios*' ascension until Anastasius signed the document, "Euphemius, who managed the archepiscopal chair, did not agree."[112] Theodore Lector reports likewise.[113] It seems then that his consent was significant. Having the popular acclamation of the people, senate, and army, the emperor still needed the recognition of the church through the coronation ceremony. No confusion should exist on the following: the ceremony only demonstrated that it was God who legitimized the emperor's power. Nonetheless, the patriarch, as John the Cappadocian would later point out, was the agent through whom God acted.[114] This divine legitimization was necessary. Sheer power without it would be, in terms more ancient than the late fifth century, *potestas*.[115] A legitimate emperor had to have *auctoritas*, which did not need to rely on brute force. Without legitimacy, an emperor risked the accusation of *potentia*, the brute power of a tyrant. To refine this point further, to be emperor one needed both popular acclamation of the people (which included the senate) and the support of the troops. The coronation ceremony formally acknowledged to God that the new emperor had both and was no despot, thus confirming that ascension as legitimate.

This whole incident detracts from the notion of the emperor as the "viceroy of God" on earth. If the emperor was a divine appointee, then should he not by virtue of the title itself be orthodox? Yet Anastasius had to sign an oath swearing that he was orthodox. The rhetoric of

[112]Evagrius Scholasticus, *EH*, 3.32. οὐκ ἄλλως ὁ Εὐφήμιος τὴν ἀρχιερατικὴν διέπων καθέδραν συνετίθετο.
[113] Theodore Lector, *EH*, 446.
[114] Hormisdas, *Epistle* 67, in Thiel 1868, Vol. 1, p. 862-864.
[115] Gelasius, before he was pope, linked *potestas* to the secular: *habet privilegia potestatis suae, quae administrandis publicis rebus*. See Gelasius *Epistle I.10*, in Thiel 1868, Vol. 1, p. 292-293.

"viceroy of God" proves to be akin to a reverential title and one of respect, but better understood as respectful rhetoric than referring to an actual function of the imperial office. Any notion that the emperor was the head of the church in an actual real sense is unfounded by this example. How could the "head of the church" allow a subordinate to compel him to prove his orthodoxy? That is because the emperor was not and could not actually be the head of a church, especially when he could not even be a priest. An emperor was the head of state and served the political interests of his subjects, which of course on occasion concerned religious matters, but this also fell within the secular sphere. Perhaps this entire incident was a product of unique circumstances that never reoccurred, nevertheless, it does not diminish the fact that person who was the "Appointee of God" had to prove his orthodoxy first.

Even though Euphemius effectively responded to the public's call for an orthodox emperor, it is clear that Anastasius would have a legitimate grudge against Euphemius and probably was not enthusiastic about the prospect of possibly living the rest of his life working in close proximity to a man who had publicly embarrassed him twice, especially given his new position. It is not a stretch to imagine that Anastasius wanted to depose Euphemius, but it was not such a simple matter as it was subject to imperial will. The emperor could not arbitrarily depose a patriarch and the events of Anastasius' reign demonstrate exactly that fact. An emperor required legitimate cause to summon a synod, which would hopefully condemn him, and then he could exile the patriarch. Failure to do so risked popular disaffection. Fortunately for Anastasius, Euphemius gave him reason enough.

During the Isaurian War[116] in 495 Euphemius absent-mindedly passed along confidential information from the emperor to an ally of the Isaurians, Athenodorus, father-in-law of a rebel leader.[117] The information itself was not strategically important, Anastasius merely expressed his weariness over the conflict to the patriarch and asked him to pray for peace. Anastasius expected, however, that his comment was to remain confidential. The nature of it was sensitive, the rebels could not have hope of weathering the empire's desire for war. The revelation of this information undoubtedly was good news for the Isaurians and most likely justified their continued efforts in the face of the vast resources of the empire, it proved that their tactics were working and that the empire was growing tired of waging war against them.[118] Probably not coincidentally, soon after an assassination attempt occurred against Euphemius; although Theodore Lector vaguely describes the instigators of the plot as "Οἱ ἐπίβουλοι" (the plotters) most likely someone in the imperial administration had some part in the plan.[119] Whether or not Anastasius himself was involved in the plan directly is not known for certain. Nevertheless, the plot failed and Euphemius lived.

Following the assassination attempt, Anastasius appears to have decided to use the accusations of a group of Syrian bishops in his favor and summoned a synod to examine Euphemius in November 496.[120] The synod found Euphemius guilty of Nestorianism, which was

[116] Lasting from 492-497, although alternative dating places it at 491-496. Even though this war lasted five years, it was probably due to the Isaurians utilizing their mountainous terrain to wage a war of attrition than any tactical superiority.
[117] Theodore Lector, *EH*, 449.
[118] Interpreting this incident has proved difficult, though, because in actuality the suppression was going quite well for the Empire, despite the length of the war and the apparent viability of the Isaurians attrition tactics.
[119] Theodore Lector, *EH*, 453.
[120] Theodore Lector, *EH*, 455.

a polemical term of the miaphysites for Chalcedonians,[121] and he was exiled to Euchaita in Pontus. Pseudo-Zachariah Rhetor claimed that Euphemius' downfall was due to his writing letters to Pope Gelasius in order to bolster support for the removal of the patriarch of Alexandria Athanasius II, who was a miaphysite.[122] Even though these letters were probably a source of annoyance to the emperor, they were not cause alone for the removal of a patriarch from his see. Furthermore the events as Ps.-Zachariah describe them took place years earlier than November 496, which is when the synod that resulted in the exile of Euphemius took place. Ps.-Zachariah simply seems to have concluded that the events of years earlier were still cause for exile.[123]

Instead, the reason for the exile of Euphemius was his wayward handling of events in the secular sphere, which was the disclosure of the emperor's desire for peace. Although ultimately that was more of a final straw, Euphemius betrayed his outsider status in the secular realm by failing to recognize the necessity of discreet communication. He did not understand the requisite

[121] Succinctly, Nestorius maintained that Jesus Christ was composed of two natures, human and divine with two hypostases. Although he emphasized the human nature to such a degree that it suggested that Christ's divine nature merely dwelt within a human person.

[122] Ps.-Zachariah Rhetor 7.1.

[123] Fiona Haarer notes that it was more likely that Euphemius' championing the "Chalcedonian cause, his opposition to the monophysite version of the Trishagion, and his possession of the document containing the emperor's profession of faith, were the main reasons for his deposition in 496," see Fiona Haarer 2006, 137. Haarer is correct in asserting that those factors were central to the removal of Euphemius, however, she does not give enough weight to what Anastasius himself claimed: the disclosure of his desire for peace to the enemy, calling that justification merely "pretext." Blaudeau 2006, pages 236-9, also agrees that cooperation between Euphemius and the pope was not a factor.

Jitse Dijkstra and Geoffrey Greatrex offer the suggestion that the entire incident was a trap, "Anastasius in effect asked Euphemius to feign sympathy for the rebels' cause… He had been caught in a double bind: he had either to be seen to be supporting the rebels or, in order to find out what was going on, betray the emperor's confidence," in Dijkstra and Greatrex 2009, 230. However, this argument presumes a somewhat elaborate scheme that seems better situated in legend. The fact remains that it would have been reckless for the emperor to pass on information that might potentially rally the rebels all as a ruse for a trap. This view also neglects some fundamental aspects about these offices. To begin with, both men worked and lived within sight of one another and worshipped in the same church, they would have seen each other frequently. Despite the very real mutual animosity, working in such close space for nearly five years they probably did have some candid discussions. Perhaps on one such time Anastasius, weary with the suppression of the rebels, expressed his desire to see the whole matter over with. Euphemius' disclosure to John the patrician would still be a betrayal of trust, just not in the context of a trap.

nuances and delicate mannerisms for the minutest of political action, even gossip. This event was within the secular sphere and the patriarch fumbled the handling of the situation. After unintentionally revealing a classified communique, it seemed that the emperor had good cause to depose Euphemius, but he still needed a synod to condemn the patriarch for it to be legimate.

Despite a synod's condemnation of Euphemius, he remained popular in Constantinople. After the patriarch fled to sanctuary, the people of the city caused a disturbance, perhaps on the scale of a riot as Theodore Lector reports, "indeed the people were in discord on account of Euphemius."[124] This is precisely why an emperor could not dismiss the patriarch on a whim: often they possessed the popular support of the people of the city. An emperor needed to justify the exile of a patriarch, which would be legitimate with the desacralizing effects of a council's anathema. If the church had condemned the man, then the emperor must follow suit and respond with appropriate physical action.

Anastasius' trouble with patriarchs did not come to an end with Euphemius, who gave the signed oath of Anastasius to the *skeuophylax* at the time, Macedonius. After the same Macedonius became patriarch, succeeding Euphemius, Anastasius demanded the document returned to him. Macedonius refused and there was little direct recourse the emperor could take. Here again Anastasius devised a plan to remove a patriarch from power.

The emperor drudged up supposed victims of the patriarch's alleged sexual abuses to force him out of the see and thus gain possession of the document. As in the case of Euphemius some years before, the emperor could not simply remove a patriarch from his office as he liked, he had to have a good reason. Try as he might, Anastasius' attempt to eject another patriarch

[124] Theodore Lector, *EH*, 455: ὁ μέντοι λαὸς δι' Εὐφήμιον ἐστασίαζον· ἐν οἷς εἰς τὸ ἱπποδρόμιον ἔδραμον λιτανεύοντες· ἀλλ' οὐδὲν ὤνησαν· τοῦ γὰρ βασιλέως ἐνίκα ἡ ἔνστασις.

failed. As it turned out, the sexual abuse allegations fell apart when Macedonius revealed himself to be "emasculate".[125] After this accusation in 511 Celer,[126] a magister officiorum,[127] made the suggestion to Macedonius that it would be best if he simply resigned, which is how Evagrius reports the matter. However, like the events surrounding the downfall of Euphemius, the sources are muddled on the exit of Macedonius too.

The tenures of Euphemius and Macedonius demonstrated that emperors could not force patriarchs to accept their decrees on faith. Dijkstra and Greatrex observe similarly on the matter of popular faith and the popularity of the patriarch during the reign of Anastasius, "Once patriarch and people were united in upholding the council of Chalcedon, the position of the emperor was seriously endangered."[128] It was an overstatement to say that the emperor was "seriously endangered", because Anastasius did reign for many years after and died peacefully, but it is true that the emperor had to deal with the patriarch more delicately. This was particularly true if the emperor had heterodox sympathies. The underlying factors accounting for that situation were the people of Constantinople's support for the doctrine of Chalcedon and the popularity of the patriarch.

Unlike Anastasius, Justinian I seemed to make successful interventions in ecclesiastical affairs. However, like Anastasius, the boundaries between the secular and the religious restricted his forays. Throughout his entire reign Justinian demonstrated a keen interest in ecclesiastical affairs and theology. His involvement at times was so overwhelming that he seemingly

[125] Evagrius Scholasticus, *EH*, 3.32.
[126] Led a force against Persia in 503 and was a key negotiator for a truce in 506.
[127] During this time the *magister officiorum* had control over many imperial offices and was one of the most powerful and central figures in the empire next to the emperor. Had oversight over roads, weapons factories, and imperial agents.
[128] Dijkstra and Greatrex 2009, 225.

marginalized the patriarchate. As Fergus Millar notes "no inhabitant of Justinian's Empire could have been left in any doubt as to the Emperor's preparedness to intervene in the life of the Church at every level."[129] Justinian also possessed true theological acumen. He was fully capable of understanding the nuances of various Christian doctrines on his own. He was also a careful politician, which accounts for his long reign, and played both sides of the Chalcedonian controversy.

Theodora famously housed known miaphysites in her own palace, the Hormisdas, in which Justinian had resided during the reign of his uncle. This was not without Justinian's knowledge. This was purposeful design, as Price notes, "It was in Justinian's interests that the non-Chalcedonians should continue to look for patronage at the court, and it protected him from charges of duplicity if Theodora acted with apparent independence."[130] Thus regardless of one's confessional conviction on the matter, one still believed that they had a champion in the imperial court. Procopius reports that any difference between the two "had been deliberately fostered to make sure that their subjects did not put their differences aside and rebel against them…by creating a division between the Christians, and by pretending to take opposite sides in religious disputes they split the whole body in two."[131] Of course the only matter of refinement to Procopius' point is that the Christian division of which he speaks existed long before Justinian was even born, the emperor just exploited it.

---

[129] Millar 2008, 68.

[130] Price 2009, 315-316. Here he agrees with Evagrius Scholasticus 4.10, "by mutual understanding, that he should uphold those who maintained the two natures in Christ our God after the union; and she those who alleged the single nature." See note 32 in Price 2009, 316.

[131] Procopius, *Anecdota*, 10.14-15: ὕστερον μέντοι ἐξεπίτηδες αὐτοῖν ξυμπεπλάσθαι ἡ δόκησις αὕτη ἐγνώσθη, τοῦ μὴ ξυμφρονήσαντας τοὺς κατηκόους σφίσιν ἐπαναστῆναι, ἀλλὰ διεστάναι τὰς γνώμας ἐπ' αὐτοὺς ἅπασι. Πρῶτα μὲν οὖν τοὺς Χριστιανοὺς διαναστήσαντε καὶ τὴν ἐναντίαν ἔν γε τοῖς ἀντιλεγομένοις σκηπτομένω ἀλλήλοιν ἰέναι ιεσπάσαντο οὕτως ἅπαντας.

In conjunction with his political project of a re-unified Roman Empire that spanned the Mediterranean as it had in centuries past, Justinian envisioned a single Christian *oikoumenē* within it. Millar identified that as one of three primary goals of Justinian's reign, "the reunification of the Church, along with, and through, the imposition of correct doctrine."[132] The imposition of "correct doctrine" meant the suppression of heretical and dissident Christian sects.[133] But this too was all in concordance with the Church established doctrines of orthodoxy. As the beginning of this section shows, often secular law served to impose physical restrictions where canon law could not. And again, Justinian's "reunification of the Church" was no deviation at all from the precedent of Constantine. The confluence of the restoration of the Roman Empire and the reunification of the church is evident in a law from 1 August 535. The publication of this law came after the conquest of Vandal Africa. The Vandals were mostly Arian and Nicene Christians claimed to suffer as a result. The law thus states that "neither Arians, nor Donatists, nor Jews, nor any other who are not orthodox" shall have a church to worship in or perform Christian rites."[134] Thus the newly reconquered North Africa received an edict that forbade the religion of the former ruling class, which the Church within the political boundaries of Justinian's empire had condemned for centuries, leaving only the faith of Constantinople as the legal Christianity.

Justinian's reconquest projected prioritized the unification of the church. Rome had held a grudge against Constantinople since the Acacian Schism (484-519) while Alexandria and

[132] Millar 2008, 62.
[133] Meyendorff 1968, 45-46.
[134] *Novella* 37.5. *Curae autem erit tuae sublimitati, quatenus neque Arianis neque Donatistis nec Iudaeis nec aliis qui orthodoxam religionem minime colere noscuntur aliqua detur communio penitus ad ecclesiasticos ritus, sed omnimodo excludantur a sacris et templis nefandi, et nulla eis licentia concedatur penitus ordinare vel episcopos vel clericos aut baptizare quascumque personas et ad suum furorem trahere, quia huiusmodi sectae non solum a nobis, sed etiam ab anterioribus legibus condemnatae sunt et a sceleratissimis nec non inquinatis coluntur hominibus.*

Antioch still refused to accept the Christological doctrine of Chalcedon. Robert Browning describes the religious problem of reunification with the west in terms of two disparate Christologies that were alien to one another and the resulting challenge it posed for the emperor, "monophysite views had never taken root in the Latin world, where the mass of the Roman population was solidly Chalcedonian…If Justinian wished to reconquer and hold the lost western provinces, he must be seen to be the champion of Chalcedonian orthodoxy."[135] This would in turn cause him problems with the miaphysite churches.

One of Justinian's first actions of religious policy occurred at the beginning of the reign of his uncle, Justin I, who rejected the *Henoticon* of Zeno, most likely at the advice of Justinian himself. Probably the best known religious policy of Justinian was the "Three Chapters" edict that instigated the Second Council of Constantinople in 553.[136] This edict was the result of Justinian's efforts to entice miaphysites back into communion with the Constantinopolitan church by explicitly condemning what they found objectionable. Reconciling the miaphysites with the Chalcedonian church became increasingly a larger priority for the emperor during the course of his reign and it colored his relationships with the patriarchs who served during those years. Along with the "Three Chapters", Dagron identified the encyclical of Basiliscus and the *Henoticon* of Zeno as "caesaropapist deviations" from normal procedure.[137] As the above sections have shown, however, even if these policies were truly unilateral 'deviations' on the part of emperors, the involvement of the church complicates that interpretation.

[135] Browning 1987, 143.
[136] The edict was called the "Three Chapters" for the idiosyncratic reason that in three successive chapters Justinian condemned works of Ibas of Edessa and Theodoret of Cyrrhus, and the person of Theodore of Mopsuestia.
[137] Dagron 2003, 297.

The brief tenure of Anthimus (535-536) demonstrates how Justinian's desires for ecclesiastical union affected the patriarchate. In an attempt to bring the miaphysites back into the imperial church, Justinian attempted to find a formula that would appease all. Anthimus suggested a Christological formula in a letter to Severus of Antioch that used the Cyrilian mandate "one incarnate nature" but also maintained that Christ:

> is the same [being] from two natures: one son, one Lord, and one Christ; one nature [which is] that of the Word itself, which, becoming flesh, became a human being While each one of the natures remained perfect and without confusion, as a [single] word of signification, out of these was gathered an undivided unity.[138]

In this letter Anthimus also upheld the *Henoticon* and rejected Chalcedon and the Tome of Leo, although Richard Price believes that these rejections are interpolations on the part of Syrians to protect Severus from charges that he "accepted communion with a Chalcedonian."[139] Essentially, it was an agreement that union of the churches was best and although concessions were necessary, it was probably better if one appeared not to have made any. Ultimately, this failed to win over either Constantinopolitans or Syrians, just as prior attempts, like the *Henoticon* itself, had failed.

Pope Agapetus, who was in Constantinople on a diplomatic mission at the command of Theodahad,[140] was not happy with the patriarch's formula. Although Rome had rejected the twenty-eighth canon of Chalcedon it firmly accepted the doctrinal findings of the council and since 451 had continually defended the Chalcedonian definition of faith. This, understandably,

[138] For the letter to Severus and the reply to Anthimius, see Ps.-Zachariah 9.21-22. For the letter to Theodosius of Alexandria and the reply see Ps.-Zachariah 9.25-26.
[139] Price 2009, 314-315.
[140] Ostrogothic ruler of Italy 534-536. Theodahad was attempting to dissuade Justinian from invading Italy and sent Agapetus to Constantinople on a diplomatic mission, under the threat that he would harm the families of the Roman senate if he refused to.

made Justinian's reunification project of the miaphysite churches, Constantinople, and the west difficult. The tension between the churches was evident during the pope's visit to the capital city, Agapetus "scorned the presence of Anthimus and did not wish to receive his greetings,"[141] presumably for his eschewment of Chalcedon or support of the *Henoticon*. Anthimus' beliefs came under the review of a synod in 536 and the gathering of bishops condemned him; Justinian exiled the patriarch as a result. However, Anthimus evaded exile and went into hiding at this point, later reappearing in 548 to make amends with Justinian after the death of Theodora, who supposedly was hiding him in the Hormisdas palace for all those years. At any rate, it is important to reiterate why the patriarch had suffered such a quick demise. An outside archbishop, the pope, had come into the very city of the patriarch and influenced the emperor to remove him. Anthimus' weak support of Chalcedon resulted in slippage of support for him from Constantinopolitans; again, orthodox confession was necessary to maintain authority. After Justinian deposed Anthimus, he allowed Agapetus to ordain Menas as patriarch of Constantinople on 13 March 536. This was an anomalous event that did not become procedure for the consecration of patriarchs.

Within the course of these events one factor in the dynamics of the two offices remained constant: Justinian still needed a synod to convict Anthimus. A synod's anathematization of a priest or bishop removed them from the church. Crucial for an emperor eager to depose or exile that person, the synod's condemnation transformed the essence of that person. No longer was the patriarch a churchman, subject to the rule and protection of ecclesiastical canon afforded to priests, he was a layman subject to secular law. Thus synods functioned in a punitive manner to

[141] Liberatus, *Brevarium*, 21, in *ACO* II.5. p. 135-136 (complete text in same volume p.98-141). *Sprevit tamen Anthimi praesentiam eumque ad salutandum suscipere noluit*.

change the very nature of a person. As the laying of hands made a man bishop, an anathematization proclaimed that the church had removed their hands and that the condemned was no longer a member of the episcopacy.[142] The expectation of synods that deposed a bishop was that the imperial government would follow through with the physical removal of that person, "Constantine's respect for bishops as theological experts…allowed Church councils to depose bishops in the confidence that the emperor would ensure that the deposition was carried into effect by exile."[143] The deposed, which a council pushed out of the realm of the higher-law, became subject to the penalties of the lower-law (the secular law). This person was spiritually stained and needed to be removed from orthodox society.

The synod itself did not need to be large, as in the case of the Council of Ephesus that condemned Nestorius, there was always the so-called "standing synod" of bishops present in Constantinople. More so, only a council could make official alterations to doctrine. Imperial law was an insufficient or inappropriate means with which to alter or create religious doctrine, "problems of religious faith proved to be *irreducible* to the legal structure of the state."[144] If it was, surely Justinian would have solved his theological problems himself, which he probably would have preferred. This was not the case and even he acknowledged a demarcation in the religious and secular realm in the famous preface to his sixth Novel addressed to the patriarch Epiphanius, "The greatest gifts God, by His celestial clemency, has given man are the priesthood and the empire, the former ministers divine matters and the latter presides over and directs

[142] Rapp 2005, 94-95 points out that ordination was like a "second baptism…the imposition of hands at their ordinations had had the same purifying effect as baptism…Ordination also transferred onto the bishop the same Spirit that Christ had given the apostles." Condemnation and excommunication removed that spirit from the former bishop.
[143] Barnes 1981, 225.
[144] Meyendorff 1968, 59. Meyendorff's emphasis on "irreducible".

human; and both proceeding from the same principal embellish the life of mankind."[145] Each "gift" had its own responsibilities to mankind, one the spiritual well-being of man and the other good governance and protection.

Furthermore, on the matter of Agapetus' involvement in Constantinopolitan ecclesiastical affairs, one should not interpret this as Justinian subordinating Constantinople to the will of Rome. Firstly, Agapetus was in the awkward position of being on a (coerced) diplomatic mission on behalf of the Ostrogothic kingdom, which Justinian was invading. Justinian was not acquiescing to Roman ecclesiastical demands because of the authority of the pope, but because he rightly assumed that upon conquering Italy it would be better to be in concordance on religious matters with the leader of that diocese's church, similar to his attempts at reconciling with the Alexandrians. Additionally, any suggestion that Justinian was somehow more deferential to the Roman See is dashed by the emperor's arrest of Pope Vigilius in 551.[146] In this case it was the reverse, Justinian was acting on behalf of the Constantinopolitan see against Rome. As a matter of fact, the emperor's actions suggest no preference for either see, rather a strong desire for continuous peace and doctrinal agreement between sees and an intolerance for those who would disrupt that.

- *Conclusion*

[145] Justinian, *Novella* 6: *Maxima quidem in hominibus sunt dona dei a superna collata clementia sacerdotium et imperium, illud quidem divinis ministrans, hoc autem humanis praesidens ac diligentiam exhibens; ex uno eodemque principio utraque procedentia humanam exornant vitam.*
[146] John Malalas, *Chronicle*, 18.111.

Towards the end of his life, in exile in the Great Oasis, Nestorius bitterly characterized his relationship with Theodosius II as a "sham friendship."[147] The reason for such a harsh description, despite the fact that the emperor had supported the patriarch until an ecumenical council condemned him, was that as early as Nestorius' tenure patriarchs could expect the full weight of imperial patronage in support of their causes. There was an expectation that, much like Arcadius and Chrysostom earlier, both would help the other. In Constantinople, it was common for the representatives of the secular sphere and the religious sphere, the emperor and the patriarch, to collaborate, although this did not imply that either sphere ever mingled with or penetrated into the other. Both spheres touched and occasionally the representative of one sphere might invite the representative from the other sphere to participate in the former's peculiar activities, but the latter was a guest and there were boundaries that defined them as a member of the other sphere, which never dissolved and always distinguished them as an outsider. The actions of the emperor and the patriarch confirmed as much.

Gilbert Dagron favored quasi-constitutional documents that asserted the patriarchate as a 'counter-power' to the imperial office,[148] but even he acknowledged that ritual and action better demonstrated the nature of each office.[149] This is because the working relationship between emperor and patriarch revealed the limitations of each official's offices. Although a particularly strong emperor who did not agree with the teachings of the patriarch could be difficult for him to work with, nevertheless there were limits to what an emperor could do as far as his own vision of ecclesiastical policy was concerned and he could not inordinately hinder the patriarch. This was

[147] Nestorius 1925, 375.
[148] Dagron 2003, 7. Of course, these do not emerge until the ninth century.
[149] Dagron 2003, 5.

quite true for Anastasius, who had considerable difficulty removing patriarchs with whom he disagreed and especially with the would-be emperor Basiliscus. Justinian gradually moved from a conciliatory position to staunch Chalcedonianism and his choices in patriarchs reflected that development. In fact, the most congenial relationships were those where the emperor's and the patriarch's religious beliefs closely matched or were otherwise compatible. The failure of Basiliscus and Gaïnas to secure the throne for themselves was in part due to them not being in communion with the Constantinopolitan church. Contrast their failures with the success of Anastasius, who despite his heterodox opinions publicly agreed in writing to cause no troubles with the church, thus gaining the consent of the patriarch and consequently his flock, the inhabitants of the city, who first and foremost demanded an "orthodox emperor."[150] Zeno certainly found Acacius a helpful ally and, not coincidentally, they held concordant beliefs. Thus it was beneficial for both officials, and probably the city, for patriarch and emperor to have genuine friendship between them.

As regards the emperor's extraordinary ecclesiastical privileges, there were clearly defined limitations. His subjects might address him with the reverential title of "Viceroy of God" or even call him a priest. While these epithets acknowledged his special position as the sovereign of God's *oikoumenē,* there were equal reminders to the emperor that his rule was over the lesser worldly kingdom and that rule was temporary and at the consent of God. Such a reminder was evident in his own coronation ceremony during his entrance into the Great Church, where he removed his crown before going into the nave. Even the emperor's liturgical privilege of entering the sanctuary during the Eucharist was at the invitation of the patriarch, who opened the

[150] Constantine VII, *De Ceremoniis,* 1.92.

gate for him and who always chaperoned the emperor while he was in the sanctuary, thus positioning the emperor as a guest within the sacred. Indeed, the patriarch took his position as a gatekeeper very seriously, as John Chrysostom reminded the emperor, "If anyone does not want to follow this order, I forbid, with word like a trumpet's blast, that man from setting foot over the entrance of the church, even if he is a prince, even if he has a diadem upon his head."[151]

A good example of the emperor's role in relation to the church was his handling of heretics, which demonstrates his capabilities and limitations in the religious sphere. He could physically confine heretics, but really had no impact on their beliefs, and usually physical action was not taken against them (mostly property confiscation and exile) until a synod had condemned the beliefs of a group or person. The emperor was the head of the secular sphere and thus the physical bodies of the laity, which the church turned to the emperor for in the cases of heretics. The church could renounce a person as a heretic and thus affect their soul, the emperor could excise that person from the community. As Constantine I acknowledged, he presided over exterior matters, but it was really the bishops who presided over the interior life of the church. In the Constantinopolitan Church, it was the patriarch who held authority over the spiritual inner life.

[151] John Chrysostom, *Homily 8 on the Acts of the Apostles*, *Homily* 8.3, in *PG* 60.74: Εἴ τις μὴ βούλεται κατορθῶσαι τοῦτο τὸ ἐπίταγμα, ὥσπερ σάλπιγγί τινι διὰ τοῦ λόγου ἀπαγορεύω τῶν οὐδῶν μὴ ἐπιβαίνειν τῶν ἐκκλησιαστικῶν τῷ τοιούτῳ, κἂν ἄρχων ᾖ, κἂν αὐτὸς ὁ τὸ διάδημα περικείμενος.

Conclusion

Early in the patriarchate's development, crises of authority prompted responses of various measures, including the legal marginalization of dissident groups, discursive persuasion, and consensus building through synods. These crises showed that what the patriarchate had been basing its claims of authority on—the head of an orthodox faith group—was somehow deficient. That deficiency's origins stemmed not from the basis itself (being the head of a faith-based community) but in what constituted orthodoxy. The Nicene faith had developed outside the influence of the Constantinopolitan church, which did not yet exist in a proper sense. Thus the Nicene faith had other champions, particularly in Alexandria. In the middle of the fifth century, the circumstances were such that a solution could be reached to help overcome that deficiency, which came at the Council of Chalcedon.

In contrast to Nicaea, Chalcedon was endemic to Constantinople. During the Council of Chalcedon, Anatolius ensured that a new definition of orthodoxy emerged that was overtly tied to the office of Constantinople. This placed the patriarchate at the head of the Christian community both in Constantinople and in large parts of the East. They proved their orthodoxy in various ways: through rhetoric, acquiring relics, and the councils' decisions. This helped develop a new form of Christian identity in the process.

The authority of the patriarchs of Constantinople rested in the institution itself. But for a patriarch to claim hold of that institutional authority successfully, he had to show that he belonged in the office. Essentially, this meant that he confessed the faith of his predecessors. This can be seen in Nestorius, John II, and Anthimus. Each one of these patriarchs faced an

examination in some way of their orthodoxy, and only John II emerged with his authority intact because he readily confessed the same doctrine that Constantinopolitans held as orthodox in their faith community.

This institutional authority protected the office holder and allowed them, in turn, to protect whatever beliefs and traditions constituted orthodoxy. As Gilbert Dagron observed about the later middle period of the Byzantine Empire, "The patriarchs…gave no real cause for concern [to the emperor]; but the patriarchate as an institution had become a threat."[1] John Meyendorff concluded similarly about these issues, "The bishops of Constantinople and their staffs, however were still able to defend explicit theological convictions, even against the imperial will.…"[2] Acacius, Euphemius, and Macedonius II challenged emperors on the grounds of doctrine. This was possible because of the nexus of institutional authority and orthodox leadership of a faith community.

Throughout much of this study, most evidence derived from examples depicting Constantinople's internal situation, especially in the pre-Chalcedonian decades. As such, it has focused on the development of Nicene and Chalcedonian identities in conjunction with that of the patriarchate as the authoritative leader of those communities in Constantinople, for the most part. It will be fruitful to briefly observe instances that display the patriarchate's authority and influence outside of Constantinople. These examples show how the office holders conceived of their own authority, especially in jurisdictional matters, before Chalcedon clarified it.

Even before Chalcedon, Christians outside Constantinople turned to patriarchs for various purposes, for example seeking clarification doctrine or assistance with selecting new

[1] Dagron 2003, 7.
[2] Meyendorff 1983, 19.

bishops. While these consultations or solicitations do not necessarily reveal any deep recognition of the patriarchate's authority, they do indicate that its authority began to hold influence.

Shortly after the beginning of his tenure as patriarch, John Chrysostom became involved in the affairs of sees that were not yet under Constantinople's ecclesiastical jurisdiction. Among Theophilus of Alexandria's charges against John was that he had unjustly deposed sixteen bishops in a province outside Constantinople's jurisdiction after only a day of investigation.[3] According to Palladius, the whole affair began when bishops from outside Constantinople had come to the imperial city to sell priesthoods.[4] Soon after an invitation came to Chrysostom from the clergy of Ephesus to help them sort out all the mess that resulted from the acts of simony, further explaining that their church was in disarray because of the Arian heresy and nominal priests who used their position for financial gain.[5]

In his report of these events, Theodoret of Cyrrhus wrote that Chrysostom "acted with this consideration for the church not only in his city, but throughout the whole of Thrace, which is divided into six provinces, and likewise of Asia, which is governed by eleven governors. Pontica too, which has a like number of rulers with Asia, he ordered under the same discipline."[6]

---

[3] Palladius, *Dialogue*, 13: The full charges were: he melted down Church plate and gave the proceeds to his sons, used marble from the baptistery for his own bathroom, took pillars from the church and installed them in his house, was aware that a man in his service was a murderer and still employed him, sold land bequeathed to the church by the empress Basilina (Julian's mother) and kept the money for himself, he had separated from his wife but then returned to her and had children with her, and that he had sold consecrations of the episcopacy.

[4] Palladius, *Dialogue*, 13: The full charges were: he melted down Church plate and gave the proceeds to his sons, used marble from the baptistery for his own bathroom, took pillars from the church and installed them in his house, was aware that a man in his service was a murderer and still employed him, sold land bequeathed to the church by the empress Basilina (Julian's mother) and kept the money for himself, he had separated from his wife but then returned to her and had children with her, and that he had sold consecrations of the episcopacy.

[5] Palladius, *Dialogue*, 14.

[6] Theodoret, *EH*, 5.28.

Sozomen reports this incident as well, explaining that "John learned about unworthy persons running the churches all around in Asia and that for gifts and bribes they sold the priesthood."[7]

All three accounts portray Chrysostom as an arbitrator settling a dispute in churches normally outside the authority of Constantinople—perhaps not coincidentally, those dioceses were the same that came under Constantinople's official ecclesiastical jurisdiction at the Council of Chalcedon, Chrysostom's settlement of the Asian dispute occurred in 402.[8] While it was his responsibility as bishop to ensure that clergy followed those canons in his own city, his efforts to reform Thrace, Pontus, and Asia went beyond his normal boundaries. And if the favorable accounts of Palladius, Theodoret, and Sozomen are to be believed, then just a couple of decades after the establishment of the Nicene patriarchate in Constantinople, outside sees would look to the patriarch as a deciding figure in their affairs without obligation to do so.

Liebeschuetz characterizes these events as Chrysostom striving "to realize the primacy of Constantinople over Churches in other provinces which had been proclaimed—in a purely honorary sense—at the Council of Constantinople in 381."[9] In this analysis, Chrysostom seems to have had a different interpretation of the third canon from what his predecessors had. Clerical discipline was the prerogative of the bishop presiding in a city, who himself was subject to the metropolitan of a diocese. Chrysostom superseded those dioceses' metropolitans and took the responsibility for himself, in an act of "primacy." Contrarily, Gilbert Dagron did not think that this was necessarily the case here and rather than interpret these events as expanding

[7] Sozomen, *EH*, 8.6.1.
[8] Alan Cameron has proved that these events actually took place then, not in 401 as many scholars believed beforehand. See Cameron 1987, 350. Incidentally, this dating vindicates Palladius' claim against Theophilus of Alexandria that the investigation lasted two years.
[9] Liebeschuetz 1990, 171.

Constantinople's jurisdiction, this was an anomalous event.[10] Somewhat between these two opinions, J.N.D. Kelly assessed John's involvement in Asia as "in conformity with the Council of Constantinople," while minimizing the scope of the third canon of that council.[11] This means that John had not violated Canon 2, which prohibited bishops from acting outside their diocese, because he was invited, and that Canon 3, the "primacy of honor" accorded to Constantinople, really had no force of "executive action."[12] However, Brian Daley argued that the use of the word τιμή in Canon 3 had "clearly practical, even juridical implications."[13]

In evaluating the scholarly opinions on Chrysostom's actions, one sees that his ordinations in Asia and Pontus remained effective. The communities there accepted his ordinations as valid, so far as the evidence suggests. In fact, Chrysostom consecrated and installed bishops who were close to him, among whom were Heraclides in Ephesus and Pansophius in Nicomedia. These were men who were loyal to him and compliant to his requests. Furthermore, the patriarch's consecration and installation of bishops into outside sees created a clear line of authority and access to that authority on the part of its subordinates. The former was one of Chrysostom's deacons and the latter was a teacher of Empress Eudoxia.[14] Aside from the very real possibility of military force securing these ordinations, perhaps this speaks to the scale of acceptance of the patriarch's authority already by 401-402.[15]

---

[10] Dagron 1974, 469. *Faut-il comprendre que la juridiction de Constantinople sur l'Asie et le Pont est déjà tacitement admise? Certainement pas, puisque la tradition, même favorable à Jean, relève le caractère anormal de son invtervention.*
[11] Kelly 1995, 178-179.
[12] Kelly 1995, 178.
[13] Daley 1993, 531.
[14] Socrates, *EH*, 6.11; and, Sozomen, *EH*, 8.6.
[15] The possibility of violence being used to settle the situation in Asia and Pontus is quite real. One of the complaints against Chrysostom at the Synod of the Oak was of "the violence he had exercised in Asia and Lydia," see Socrates, *EH*, 6.19. Michael Gaddis also points out that the patriarch possessed the use of legitimate violence in the enforcement of his policies through the availability of imperial military forces; see Gaddis 2005, 73.

One of his homilies gives some weight to the opinions that Chrysostom was interpreting Canon 3 as granting practical and juridical privileges. He envisioned Constantinople as a candle from which others drew their flame. In speaking about the church of Constantinople, he said that "assuredly others will emulate you, assuredly you will be a candle set upon a candlestick."[16] John assumed that Constantinople was a precedence maker and that the church's policies and practices there would be adopted by bishops in other sees. In Asia and Pontus, he installed men who would ensure precisely that vision.

In another example of the patriarch intervening in other province's affairs before Chalcedon, in the town of Synada, the Nicene and Macedonian churches were embroiled in conflict. The Nicene bishop, Theodosius, was harassing non-Nicene sects and requesting that the local governor use force to punish the Macedonians and their bishop, Agapetus.[17] When the governor refused his request by explaining that he did not have the authority to do so, Theodosius pursued the matter in Constantinople and sought help from the Praetorian Prefect. While Theodosius was in the imperial city, Agapetus shrewdly decided to abandon the Macedonian sect and adopt the *homoousian* creed, convincing his parish to do so as well. He also claimed the episcopacy of the entire city, which included the Nicene congregation. When Theodosius discovered this, he turned to Atticus for help. Atticus decided that because Agapetus had successfully united the Macedonians and Nicene in Synada, it would be better if he remained as bishop. Agapetus probably guessed that he would have Atticus' support, and thus the emperor's, if he converted to the Nicene faith. This turned out to be correct.

[16] John Chrysostom, *Homily 8 on the Acts of the Apostles,* in *PG* 60.74.
[17] Socrates, *EH*, 7.3.

There seemed to be little other reason for Agapetus to convert himself and his congregation to the faith of their 'persecutor' other than the clear advantage of obtaining legitimacy from Constantinople. Two points about the authority of the patriarchate here: bishops in dioceses outside the patriarch's strict canonical jurisdiction sought his assistance as a mediator, and its confession of faith influenced the outside bishops' decisions. The latter point is important in considering that authority is vested in an audience's reception. It is easier to exert influence and exercise authority over a group that holds the same convictions as the speaker. In this case, a bishop of an outside see abandoned his sect for that of the patriarch's in a calculated move to preserve his own position and authority. He effectively latched on to the patriarch's authority by creating a link through the Nicene faith, as Gregory had earlier done with the memory of Athanasius.

While this case points to the influence of the patriarch's confessional creed, his practices could be influential as well. Nestorius' persecution of heretics within the imperial city prompted the bishop of Germa, Anthony, to imitate him and do likewise against the Macedonians in his city. So great was Anthony's persecution that it culminated with members of the sect assassinating him; they claimed he was "carrying out the intentions of the patriarch [Nestorius]."[18] Whatever Anthony's intentions, he justified his actions on the precedence that Nestorius had established in Constantinople. Fittingly enough, Nestorius finished Anthony's task and ensured that the Macedonian sect was rooted out of the province of Hellespontus.

In looking to Constantinople as an example of how to administer his see, in terms of how to deal with heretics, Anthony's actions acknowledged that the imperial city served as a

[18] Socrates, *EH*, 7.31.

normalizing force in that regard—just like Chrysostom had predicted. Hellespontus was in the diocese of Asia, which had the bishop of Ephesus as its metropolitan. Instead of referring to his own metropolitan as an example, Anthony adopted the policy of Constantinople's patriarch. While there is no indication that Nestorius ever encouraged other bishops to use force against non-Nicene Christians, his actions inspired at least one to imitate him. For Anthony, then, Nestorius' authority justified coercive measures. Furthermore, those coercive measures worked. Many of the persecuted Macedonians joined the Nicene church.[19]

In 435, the Armenian Church wrote Proclus seeking clarification of a doctrinal matter, to which he responded with his *Tome to the Armenians*.[20] Sahak, the Catholicos of Armenia, to condemn Theodore of Mopsuestia and burn his books. Unsure, Sahak sent monks to Constantinople to consult on the problem. With the *Tome to the Armenians,* Proclus further enhanced not only his own reputation as an orthodox authority but also that of the patriarchate. The *Tome* resulted from the still-unsettled Christological dispute that the Council of Ephesus had attempted to resolve. Rabbula of Edessa and Acacius of Meletene were trying to persuade Sahak. So Christians outside the empire's boundaries were seeking resolution of theological disputes from Constantinople. Compounding the problem, as Proclus was aware, was that the condemnation of Theodore of Mopsuestia would likely result in a disruption of the Union of 433 that the Antiochenes had agreed to with the Alexandrians. Proclus had to present a statement of the faith that carefully avoided pitfalls endangering the harmony of the Church. The *Tome* also marks the beginning of Constantinople's innovation of doctrine. Proclus' work offered a middle

[19] Socrates, *EH*, 7.31.
[20] See the *Tome to the Armenians*, in *ACO* IV.2.p. 187-195. Zachariah of Mitylene preserves a copy of it, too. In *Syriac Chronicle*, 2.5.

ground between the "Antiochene" and "Alexandrian" Christological positions, somewhat anticipating what Chalcedon arrived at.[21]

Like all bishops, Proclus was concerned with ensuring that all corners of the world held an orthodox understanding of the faith. Other factors played into his *Tome,* too. Nicholas Constas concluded that "Proclus' interest in promoting the authority and jurisdiction of the church of Constantinople, his concern to arrest the growth of Nestorianism, and his commitment to the pro-Constantinopolitan faction of the Armenian Church,"[22] were motivations for his writing the document, too. At this point in the patriarchate's history, its reputation was easy to attack for outside critics. The imperial city had run Gregory of Nazianzus out of town, exiled John Chrysostom, and opened its doors to Nestorius. Orthodoxy seemed to have a difficult time there. So it was a welcome opportunity for the patriarch to receive a request to assist in the discernment of orthodoxy and vital to the long term reputation of the see for such a document not only to come into existence but for it to have a good reception. In writing his *Tome,* Proclus established that the see of Constantinople was, in fact, a stronghold of orthodoxy and one that others should consult if they had any confusion on doctrinal matters.[23]

These incidents show that patriarchs were already acting as a high-authority in provinces nominally outside their jurisdiction prior to Chalcedon. In some respects, then, the 28th canon seemed to affirm what was already happening, rather than instituting something new.

---

[21] Constas 2003, 108-112.
[22] Constas 2003, 104.
[23] Frend regards the Tome to the Armenians as an outward sign of the growing influence (at least) of the patriarchate, too: "Proclus' *Tome* to the Armenian church in 435 answering a number of important doctrinal questions showed how the patriarch's influence was making itself felt beyond Rome's eastern frontiers. New Rome was regarded as an acceptable resort, if not of appeal, at least for receiving considered doctrinal advice," in Frend 1971, 92.

This study began with the patriarchate of Gregory of Nazianzus to show how the holders of the office gradually linked their authority to particular doctrines and thus presented themselves as orthodox champions. During Gregory's tenure, the patriarchate effectively began espousing a new form of Christianity that was not widespread in Constantinople: Nicene Christianity. He also circumvented the lack of apostolic succession in Constantinople by claiming succession of faith from Athanasius. The overt Nicene identity, however, effectively rendered Gregory as unorthodox in Constantinople, and his tenure was marred by unrest, which revealed a problematic truth of the patriarchate during these decades: it was heavily reliant upon the emperor for his position. However, in basing the office's authority on orthodoxy, the patriarchate became less reliant on imperial resources to maintain its position. This became especially true at the Council of Chalcedon.

Chalcedon accelerated the association of orthodoxy with the patriarchate. Anatolius ensured that council adopted the two-nature doctrine of his predecessor Flavian and Pope Leo I. Presciently, he then attached greater privileges and a wider jurisdiction to the office with Canon 28. As a result, future patriarchs had a vested interest in protecting the council, creating a direct link between the council's doctrine and the patriarchate of Constantinople. The latter clearly worked, as non-Chalcedonian Christians stated specifically that they did not recognize the patriarchate of Constantinople's authority because of its explicit association with Chalcedon.[24] Chalcedon thus tied a specific doctrine to the institution such that even patriarchs potentially

[24] See John of Ephesus, *EH*, 1.1.

hostile to the two-nature teaching would be hesitant to do anything to abrogate the council's canons because of Canon 28.[25]

The success of the patriarchate's integration into orthodox memory can be found in the prevalence of patriarchs in miracle stories and their roles as martyrs whose relics Christians venerated. These factors proved a patriarch's place in orthodox memory and bolstered the office's authority. Every patriarch was at least the successor of martyrs, which their congregations were reminded of during the reading of their names from the diptychs during the liturgy. All of this contributed to the practices of a Chalcedonian community whose identity was reaffirmed through them and the narratives that developed about its members.

In investigating the patriarchate's authority, the emperor's looming presence becomes apparent in ecclesiastical activities. As the earlier chapters noted, patriarchs made frequent recourse to imperial apparatuses for various purposes. This gives the appearance that the patriarchate's authority was actually rooted in the emperor. However, even in Constantinople—where the emperor "was nothing if he was not everything"—patriarchs managed to lay claim to autonomous authority in religious practice.[26] Very often, emperors appeared to be the head of the Constantinopolitan church, because they deposed patriarchs and had a say in selecting new ones, as well as possessing a loud voice in doctrinal matters. However, there were exceptions and rules that restricted emperors in these practices. Upon examination, these practices, such as the liturgy and coronation ceremony, reveal that the emperor's participation in religious ritual or

[25] Ps.-Zachariah and Theodore Lector both suggest that Acacius was actually against the doctrine; see iv.11.c. and *EH* 406, respectively. However, these attributions likely rest in the fact that Acacius drafted the *Henoticon*. The authors viewed the *Henoticon* as anti-Chalcedonian and thus concluded its author was as well, then projecting this attitude back to the beginning of his tenure as patriarch. However, this is a false assumption, because even a cursory reading shows that the *Henoticon* is not strictly anti-Chalcedonian, which an even more careful reading confirms.
[26] Dagron 2003, 113.

ecclesiastical disputes was as an outsider. As such, these practices constitute boundaries of authority between the imperial office and the patriarchate.

Some further directions for the study of the patriarchate's authority might include a study dedicated to the institution's interactions with monastic communities. As the conflict that many patriarchs experienced in the fifth century between themselves and monks suggests, Constantinopolitan monasteries possessed considerable authority and frequently challenged that of the patriarchates. Another direction would be more focus on the development of neo-Chalcedonian doctrine during the sixth century. After the decades of the *Henoticon*, Chalcedon itself experienced a revitalization and reinterpretation early in the sixth century. The influence of Leontius of Byzantium and John Maxentius upon Constantinople eventually culminated in the Fifth Ecumenical Council in 553. Accordingly, the patriarchs who occupied the office at this time were, like their predecessors a century earlier, dealing with the ramifications of a new articulation of faith.

In addition to the primary objective of investigating the patriarchate, this dissertation has focused on fundamental aspects of early Christianity, including apostolicity, martyrdom, holy men, ecumenical councils, Christology, Trinitarian controversies, Christian identity, and ecclesiology. This study has shown how these factors affected patriarchs' authority. The understanding of the patriarchate in this study reaffirms some traditional notions of the institution's basis of authority while shedding light on new factors. It was dependent on the emperor for its position, especially early on, but it developed in such a way that this element became a tool rather than a crutch. Many of the developments of the patriarchate were organic

responses to crises of authority. Eventually, the institution was able to shift the basis of its authority away from its see merely being New Rome to being the center of New Jerusalem.

Bibliography

Primary Sources

Athanasius. *Historia Arianorum ad Monachos*. Edited by H. Opitz. Athanasius Werke, Volume 2.1., 183-230. Berlin, 1936.

Augustine. *De Excidio Urbis Romae Sermo: A Critical Text and Translation With Introduction and Commentary*. Edited and translated by Marie Vianney O'Reilly. Washington, DC: Catholic University of America Press, 1955.

Barḥadbeshabbā Arbāyā. *La Seconde Partie de L'Histoire de Barhadbešabba 'Arbaïa: Et Controverse de Théodore de Mopsueste avec Les Macédoniens*. Edited and translated by François Nau. Patrologia Orientalis Volume 9, Number 5. Paris: Firmin-Didot, 1913.

Chronicon Paschale. Edited by Ludwig Dindorf. Volumes 1 & 2. Corpus scriptorum historiae Byzantinae 16, 17. Bonn: Weber, 1832

Codex Iustinianus. In Corpus Iuris Civilis, edited by T. Mommsen, P. Krüger, R. Scholl, and G. Kroll. 13th Edition, 3 volumes. Berlin, 1920-1928.

———. Translated by S.P. Scott, *The Civil Law*. 17 Volumes, reprinted in 7, 1932. New York: 1973.

Coleman-Norton, P.R. *Roman State & Christian Church*. 3 volumes. Translated by P.R. Coleman-Norton. London: SPCK, 1966.

Constantine VII. *The Book of Ceremonies*. Edited and translated by Ann Moffatt and Maxeme Tall. Canberra: Australian Association for Byzantine Studies, 2012.

———. *De cerimoniis aulae Byzantinae*. Edited by J.J. Reiske. Corpus Scriptorum Historiae Byzantinae. Bonn: Weber, 1829.

Corpus Scriptorum Christianorum Orientalium. Université catholique de Louvain, 1903.

Cyril of Alexandria. *Letters 51-110*. Translated by John I. McEnerney. Washington, DC: Catholic University of America Press, 2007.

Cyprian. *L'unité de L'église*. Edited by M. Bévenot and translated by M. Poirier. Sources Chrétiennes 500. Paris: Éditions du Cerf, 2006.

Dawes, Elizabeth and Norman H. Baynes. *Three Byzantine Saints: Contemporary Biographies of St. Daniel the Stylite, St. Theodore of Sykeon and St. John the Almsgiver*. Translated by Elizabeth Dawes and Norman H. Baynes. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1977.

Delehaye, Hippolyte. *Les Saints Stylites*. Brussels: Société des bollandistes, 1923.

Didache. In *The Apostolic Fathers: Greek Texts and English Translations*. Edited by Michael Holmes. Grand Rapids, Mich.: Baker Academic, 2007. 334-369.

Eusebius of Caesarea. *Histoire Ecclésiastique*. Edited and translated by Gustave Bardy and Pierre Périchon. Sources Chrétiennes no. 31, 41, 55, 73. Paris: Éditions du Cerf, 1986.

———. *Life of Constantine*. Edited and translated by Averil Cameron, and Stuart George Hall. Oxford: New York: Clarendon Press; Oxford University Press, 1999.

———. *Vie de Constantin*. Edited and translated by Friedhelm Winkelmann, Luce Pietri, and Marie-Josèphe Rondeau. Sources Chrétiennes 559. Paris: Éditions du Cerf, 2013.

Evagrius Scholasticus. *Histoire Ecclésiastique*. Edited and translated by Joseph Bidez, Léon Parmentier, Guy Sabbah, Laurent Angliviel de La Beaumelle, A. J. Festugière, and Bernard Grillet. Sources Chrétiennes no. 542 and 546. Paris: Éditions du Cerf, 2011-2014.

Gelasius of Cyzicus. *Anonyme Kirchengeschichte.* Edited by Günther Christian Hansen. Berlin: De Gruyter, 2002.

Georgios. *Vie de Théodore de Sykéôn*. Edited by André-Jean Festugière. Brussels: Société des Bollandistes, 1970.

Gregory of Nazianzus. *Discours 27-31*. Edited and translated by P. Gallay. Sources Chrétiennes 250. Paris: Éditions du Cerf, 1978.

———. *Discours 20-23*. Edited and translated by J. Mossay. Sources Chrétiennes 270. Paris: Éditions du Cerf, 1980.

———. *Discours 42-43*. Edited and translated by J. Bernardi. Sources Chrétiennes 384. Paris: Éditions du Cerf, 1992.

———. *Gregory of Nazianzus, Autobiographical Poems*. Edited and translated by Carolinne White. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996.

Günther, Otto. *Epistulae Imperatorum Pontificum Aliorum Inde Ab A. CCCLXVII Usque Ad A. DLIII Datae Avellana Qvae Dicitur Collectio*. Vienna: F. Tempsky, 1895.

Grumel, Venance. *Les Regestes des Actes du Patriarcat de Constantinople*. Vol. 1, Fasc. I. Constantinople: Socii Assumptionistae Chalcedonenses, 1932.

Harrak, Amir. *The Chronicle of Zuqnīn, Parts III and IV: A.D. 488-775: Translated From Syriac With Notes and Introduction*. Toronto: Pontifical Institute of Mediaeval Studies, 1999.

Hefele, Charles Joseph. *Histoire des Conciles d'après les documents originaux*. Translated by Henri Leclercq. 11 Volumes. Paris: Letouzey et Ané. 1907-1952.

Holmes, Michael. *The Apostolic Fathers: Greek Texts and English Translations*. Grand Rapids, Mich.: Baker Academic, 2007.

Ignatius of Antioch. *Letters*. In *The Apostolic Fathers: Greek Texts and English Translations*. Edited by Michael Holmes. Grand Rapids, Mich.: Baker Academic, 2007. 166-271.

John of Antioch. *Chronicle*. In Fragmenta Historicorum Graecorum 4. Edited by K. Müller. Paris: Firmin-Didot, 1841-1870: 538-622

John of Ephesus. *Lives of the Eastern Saints*. In Patrologia Orientalis 17, 18, 19. Edited and translated by E. W. Brooks. Paris: Firmin-Didot, 1923-1925.

———. *Ecclesiastical History*. Translated by R. Payne Smith. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1860.

John Rufus, *Plerophoria*. Edited and translated by F. Nau. In Patrologia Orientalis 8. Paris: Firmin-Didot, 1911.

Leo I. *Epistolae*. Edited by J. P. Migne. Patrologia Latina 54. Paris, 1846.

———. *Sermones*. Edited by Antonius Chavasse. *Corpus Christianorum Latina*. 138-138a. Turnholt: Brepols, 1973.

Liberatus. *Breviarium*. In Acta Conciliorum Oecomenicorum 2.5.pp. 98-141.

Liber Pontificalis. Published under title *Le Liber Pontificalis*. Edited with notes by L. Duchesne. Paris: E. Thorin, 1886.

———. *The Book of Pontiffs: The Ancient Biographies of the First Ninety Roman Bishops to AD 715*. Edited and translated by Raymond Davis. Liverpool: Liverpool University Press, 1989.

Malalas, John. *Ioannis Malalae Chronographia*. Edited by Hans Thurn. Berlin: De Gruyter, 2000.

Mansi, G.D. *Sacrorum Conciliorum Nova et Amplissima Collectio*. 54 volumes. Paris, 1901-1927

Marcellinus Comes. *Chronicle*. Edited by T. Mommsen. In *Monumenta Germaniae historica*, Volume 11, 37-108. Berlin, 1894.

Nestle, Eberhard and Kurt Aland. *Novum Testamentum Graece*. Edited by Eberhard Nestle, Kurt Aland, et al. 28th Edition. Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 2012.

Nestorius. *Nestoriana: Die Fragmente des Nestorius*. Edited by Friedrich Loofs. Halle: Max Niemeyer, 1905.

———. *The Bazaar of Heracleides*. Translated and edited by G.R. Driver and Leonard Hodgson. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1925.

Palladius. *Dialogus de vita Iohannis Chrysostomi*. Edited and translated by Anne-Marie Malingery and Philippe Leclercq. Sources Chrétiennes 341 and 342. Paris: Éditions du Cerf, 1988.

Patrologia Graeca. Edited by Jacques Migne et al. *Patrologia Cursus Completus* Series Graeca, 161 Volumes. Paris, 1857-1912.

Patrologia Latina. Edited by Jacques Migne et al. *Patrologia Cursus Completus* Series Latina, 221 Volumes. Paris, 1844-1900.

Paulinus of Milan. *Paolino di Milano: Vita di Ambrogio*. Edited by M. Pellegrino. Verba Seniorum, 1. Rome, 1961.

Price, Richard and Michael Gaddis. *The Acts of the Council of Chalcedon*. 3 Volumes, second edition. Liverpool: Liverpool University Press, 2010.

Proclus of Constantinople. *L'homilétique de Proclus de Constantinople; tradition manuscrite, inédits, études connexes*. Translated by François Joseph Leroy. Biblioteca Vaticana: Studi e Testi 247. Vatican City: Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, 1967.

Procopius. *De Bellis*. Edited by J. Haury and G. Wirth. *Procopii Caesariensis opera omnia*. 2 volumes. Leipzig: Teubner, 1962-1963.

Pseudo-Martyrius. *The Funerary Speech for John Chrysostom*. Edited and translated by Timothy David Barnes and George Bevan. Liverpool: Liverpool University Press, 2013.

Pseudo-Zachariah Rhetor. *The Chronicle of Pseudo-Zachariah Rhetor: Church and War in Late Antiquity*. Edited and translated by Geoffrey Greatrex, Robert R. Phenix, Cornelia B. Horn, Sebastian P. Brock, and Witold Witakowski. Liverpool: Liverpool University Press, 2011.

———. *The Syriac Chronicle Known as That of Zachariah of Mitylene*. Edited and translated by Frederick John Hamilton and Ernest Walter Brooks. London: Methuen & Co., 1899.

Schwartz, Edward. *Acta Conciliorum Oecomenicorum*. Berlin and Leipzig: Walter de Gruyter, 1914-1984.

Socrates Scholasticus. *Kirchengeschichte*. Edited by Günther Christian Hansen. Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1995.

Sozomen. *Histoire Ecclesiastique*. Edited by Joseph Bidez, Bernard Grillet, Guy Sabbah. French translation by André Jean Festugière. Sources Chrétiennes no. 306, 418, 495, 516. Paris: Éditions du Cerf, 1983.

The Martyrdom of Polycarp. In *The Apostolic Fathers: Greek Texts and English Translations*. Edited by Michael Holmes. Grand Rapids, Mich.: Baker Academic, 2007. 298-333.

Thiel, Andreas. *Epistolae Romanorum Pontificum Genuinae Et Quae Ad Eos Scriptae Sunt A.S. Hilaro Usque Ad Pelagium II*. Brunsberg, 1868.

Theodore Lector. *Theodoros Anagnostes Kirchengeschichte*. Edited by Günther Christian - Hansen. Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1995.

Theodoret of Cyrrhus. *Ecclesiastical History*. Edited by L. Parmentier and F. Scheidweiler, 2nd edition. Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1954.

———.Epistulae: Collectio Sirmondiana. Y. Azéma, *Théodoret de Cyr. Correspondance II*. Sources chrétiennes no. 98. Paris: Éditions du Cerf, 1964

Theodosiani libri XVI cum Constitutionibus Sirmondianis. Edited by T. Mommsen. Berlin, 1905.

———. *The Theodosian Code and Novels and the Sirmondian Constitutions.* Translated by Clyde Pharr. Princeton: Princeton University Press. 1952.

———. Rougé, J. and Delmaire, R. *Les Lois religieuses des empereurs romains de Constantin à Théodose II (312-438). Volume I: Code Théodosien livre xvi*, Sources Chrétiennes 497. Paris: 2005.

Theophanes the Confessor. *The Chronicle of Theophanes Confessor: Byzantine and Near Eastern History, A.D. 284-813*. Translated by Cyril A. Mango, Roger Scott, and Geoffrey Greatrex Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1997.

Victor of Tunnuna. *Chronicle*. Edited by Theodor Mommsen and Johannes Lucas. In *Chronica Minora Saec. IV. V. VI. VII*, 178-206. Berlin: Weidmann, 1892.

Vita Alexandri. Edited and translated by E. de Stroop. Patrologia Orientalis 6. Paris: Firmin-Didot, 1911.

Vita Dalmatii. Edited by Anselmo Banduri. In *Imperium Orientale: Sive, Antiquitates Constantinopolitanæ in Quatuor Partes Distributatæ*. Volume 2. Paris: J.B. Coignard, 1711. 697-710.

Zosimus. *Histoire nouvelle*. Edited by F. Paschoud. 3 volumes. Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 2000.

Secondary Sources

Angold, Michael and Michael Whitby. "Church Structures and Administration," in *The Oxford Handbook of Byzantine Studies*, edited by Elizabeth Jeffreys, John F. Haldon, and Robin Cormack, 571-582. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008.

Asad, Talal. *Formations of the Secular: Christianity, Islam, Modernity*. Stanford, Calif.: Stanford University Press, 2003.

Barker, Ernest. *Social and Political Thought in Byzantium: From Justinian I to the Last Palaeologus*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1957.

Barnes, Timothy David. *Constantine and Eusebius*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1981.

———. *Athanasius and Constantius: Theology and Politics in the Constantinian Empire*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1993.

———. "Was there a Constantinian Revolution?" *The Journal of Late Antiquity* Volume 2, Number 2 (2009): 374-384.

———. *Constantine: Dynasty, Religion and Power in the Later Roman Empire*. Malden, MA: Wiley-Blackwell, 2011.

Barry, Jennifer. "Diagnosing Heresy: Ps.Martryrius's Funerary Speech for John Chrysostom," in *The Journal of Early Christian Studies* Volume 24, Number 3 (2016): 395-418.

Bauer, Walter. *Orthodoxy and Heresy in Earliest Christianity*. Translated by Robert A. Kraft and Gerhard Krodel. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1971.

Baur, Chrysostomus. *John Chrysostom and His Time*. Translated by M. Gonzaga. Westminster: Newman Press, 1960.

Baynes, Norman. “Alexandria and Constantinople: A Study in Ecclesiastical Diplomacy.” *The Journal of Egyptian Archaeology* Volume 12, Number ¾ (1926): 145-156.

Blaudeau, Philippe. *Alexandrie et Constantinople (451-491): De l’Histoire à la Géo-Ecclésiologie*. Rome: École française de Rome, 2006.

———. *Le Siège de Rome et L’Orient (448-536): Étude Géo-Ecclésiologique*. Rome: École française de Rome, 2012a.

———. “Between Petrine Ideology and Realpolitik: The See of Constantinople in Roman Geo-Ecclesiology (440-536).” In *Two Romes: Rome and Constantinople in Late Antiquity*, edited by Lucy Grig and Gavin Kelly, 364-386. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012b.

Boak, A.E.R. “Imperial Coronation Ceremonies of the Fifth and Sixth Centuries.” *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology* Volume 30 (1919): 37-47.

Booth, Phil. “Orthodox and Heretic in The Early Byzantine Cult(s) Of Saints Cosmas And Damian.” In *An Age of Saints?: Power, Conflict, and Dissent in Early Medieval Christianity*, edited by Peter Sarris, Matthew Dal Santo, and Phil Booth, 114-128. Leiden: Brill, 2011.

———. *Crisis of Empire: Doctrine and Dissent at the End of Late Antiquity*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 2014.

Brown, Peter. “The Rise and Function of the Holy Man in Late Antiquity.” *The Journal of Roman Studies* Volume 61 (1971): 80-101.

———. *The Cult of the Saints: Its rise and Function in Latin Christianity*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1981.

———. *Power and Persuasion in Late Antiquity: Towards a Christian Empire*. Madison: The University of Wisconsin Press, 1992.

———. *Authority and the Sacred: Aspects of the Christianisation of the Roman World.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995.

———. *The Body and Society: Men, Women, and Sexual Renunciation in Early Christianity*. New York: Columbia University Press, 2008.

Browning, Robert. *Justinian and Theodora*. Revised edition. New York, NY: Thames and Hudson, 1987.

Cameron, Alan. “Earthquake 400.” *Chiron*, Volume 17 (1987): 332-350.

———. *The Last Pagans of Rome*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2011.

Cameron, Alan, Jacqueline Long, and Lee Sherry. *Barbarians and Politics at the Court of Arcadius*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1993.

Cameron, Averil. *Christianity and the Rhetoric of Empire: The Development of Christian Discourse*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1991.

———. *Byzantine Matters*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2014.

Campbell, Theodore. "The Doctrine of the Holy Spirit in the Theology of Athanasius." *Scottish Journal of Theology* Volume 27, Issue 4, (1974): 408-440.

Caner, Daniel. *Wandering, Begging Monks: Spiritual Authority and the Promotion of Monasticism in Late Antiquity*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 2002.

Chadwick, Henry. "The Exile and Death of Flavian of Constantinople: A Prologue to the Council of Chalcedon." *Journal of Theological Studies* Volume 6 (1955): 17-34.

———. "Faith and Order at the Council of Nicaea: A Note on the Background of the Sixth Canon." *The Harvard Theological Review* Volume 53, Number 3 (1960): 171-195.

———. "Position and Patronage in the Early Church: The Original Meaning of 'Primacy and Honour'." *The Journal of Theological Studies* Volume 44, Number 2 (1993): 529-553.

Constas, Nicholas. *Proclus of Constantinople and the Cult of the Virgin in Late Antiquity: Homilies 1-5, Texts and Translations.* Leiden: Brill, 2003.

Croke, Brian. "Dating Theodoret's Church History and Commentary on the Psalms." *Byzantion* Volume 54 (1984): 59-74.

———. "Justinian, Theodora, and the Church of Saints Sergius and Bacchus." *Dumbarton Oaks Papers* Volume 60 (2006): 25-63.

Daley, Brian. "Position and Patronage in the Early Church: The Original Meaning of 'Primacy of Honour'. *The Journal of Theological Studies* Volume 44, Number 2 (1993): 529-553.

Dagron, Gilbert. "Les moines et la ville. Le monachisme Constantinople jusqu'au concile de Chalcédoine (451)." *Travaux et mémoires*, Volume 4. Paris: Editions E. de Boccard, 1970. 229-276.

———. *Naissance d'une Capitale*. Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 1974.

———. “Constantinople: Les Sanctuaires et l’Organisation de la Vie Religieuse.” In *Actes du XIe Congrès International d'archéologie Chrétienne: Lyon, Vienne, Grenoble, Genève Et Aoste (21-28 Septembre 1986)*, Volume 2, edited by Noël Duval Lyon, Françoise Baritel, Philippe Pergola, 1069-1085. Rome: Ecole française de Rome; Pontificio Istituto di Archeologia cristiana, 1989.

———. *Emperor and Priest: The Imperial Office in Byzantium*. Translated by Jean Birrell. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003.

Delehaye, Hippolyte. *Les Origines du Culte des Martyrs*. Brussels: Société des Bollandistes, 1912.

Demacopoulos, George. *The Invention of Peter: Apostolic Discourse and Papal Authority in Late Antiquity*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2013.

De Ste. Croix, G. E. M. (Geoffrey Ernest Maurice), Joseph Streeter, Michael Whitby, and Joseph Streeter. *Christian Persecution, Martyrdom, and Orthodoxy*. Oxford; New York: Oxford University Press, 2006.

Dijksta, Jiste & Geoffrey Greatrex. “Patriarchs and Politics in Constantinople in the Reign of Anastasius.” *Millennium* Volume 6 (2009): 223-264.

Dix, Gregory. *The Shape of the Liturgy.* London: Dacre Press, second edition 1945, reprint 2007.

Drake, H.A. *Constantine and the Bishops: The Politics of Intolerance*. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 2000.

———. “Speaking of Power: Christian Redefinition of the Imperial Role in the Fourth Century.” In *Contested Monarchy: Integrating the Roman Empire in the Fourth Century AD*, edited by Johannes Wienand, 291-308. New York, NY: Oxford University Press, 2015.

Dvornik, Francis. *The Idea of Apostolicity in Byzantium and the Legend of the Apostle Andrew*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1958.

Ehrman, Bart D. *The Orthodox Corruption of Scripture: The Effect of Early Christological Controversies on the Text of the New Testament*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2011.

———. *Lost Christianities: The Battles for Scripture and the Faiths We Never Knew*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2003.

Elm, Susanna. *Sons of Hellenism, Fathers of the Church: Emperor Julian, Gregory of Nazianzus, and the Vision of Rome*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 2012a.

———. “Emperors and Priests: Gregory’s Theodosius and the Macedonians,” in *Re-reading Gregory of Nazianzus: Essays on History, Theology, and Culture*, edited by Christopher Beeley, 220-235. Washington, DC: Catholic University Press. 2012b.

———. “The Dog That Did Not Bark: Doctrine and Patriarchal Authority in Conflict between Theophilus of Alexandria and John Chrysostom of Constantinople,” in *Christian Origins: Theology, Rhetoric, and Community*, edited by Lewis Ayres and Gareth Jones, 68-93. New York: Routledge, 1998.

Every, George. *The Byzantine Patriarchate, 451-1204*. London: S.P.C.K., 1962.

Ferreiro, Alberto. *Simon Magus in Patristic, Medieval and Early Modern Traditions*. Leiden; Boston: Brill, 2005.

Flower, Richard. *Emperors and Bishops in Late Roman Invective*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2013.

Fournier, Eric. “The *Adventus* of Julian at Sirmium: The Literary Construction of Historical Reality in Ammianus Marcellinus.” In *The Rhetoric of Power in Late Antiquity: Religion and Politics in Byzantium, Europe and the Early Islamic World*, edited by Elizabeth DePalma Digeser, Robert Frakes, and Justin Stephens, 13-46. New York: Tauris Academic Studies, 2010.

Fox, Robin Lane. “The Life of Daniel,” in *Portraits: Biographical Representation in the Greek and Latin Literature of the Roman Empire*, edited by Simon Swain, et al., 175-226. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1997.

Frank, Georgia. *The Memory of the Eyes: Pilgrims to Living Saints in Christian Late Antiquity*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 2000.

Frazee, Charles. “Late Roman and Byzantine Legislation on the Monastic Life from the Fourth the Eighth Centuries.” *Church History* Volume 51 (1982): 272-74.

Frend, W. H. C. *The Rise of the Monophysite Movement: Chapters in the History of the Church in the Fifth and Sixth Centuries*. Cambridge: University Press, 1972.

———. *Martyrdom and Persecution in the Early Church: A Study of a Conflict From the Maccabees to Donatus*. Garden City, NY: Anchor Books, 1967.

Gaddis, Michael. *There Is No Crime for Those Who Have Christ: Religious Violence in the Christian Roman Empire*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 2005.

Geanakoplos, Deno. “Church and State in the Byzantine Empire: A Reconsideration of the Problem of Caesaropapism.” *Church History* Volume 34, Number 4 (1965): 381-403.

———. *A Short History of the Ecumenical Patriarchate of Constantinople*. Brookline, MA: Holy Cross Orthodox Press, 1990.

Grillmeier, Aloys. *Christ in Christian Tradition*. Translated by Pauline Allen and John Cawte. London: Mowbray, 1975.

Goubert, P. "Le Rôle de Sainte Pulchérie et de l'eunuque Chrysaphios" in *Das Konzil von Chalkedon*, edited by Aloys Grillmeier and Heinrich Bacht, Volume 1, 303-321. Würzburg: Echter, 1953.

Gwynn, David. "The Council of Chalcedon and the Definition of Christian Tradition." in *Chalcedon in Context*, edited by Richard Price and Mary Whitby, 7-26. Liverpool: Liverpool University Press, 2009.

Haarer, Fiona K. *Anastasius I: Politics and Empire in the Late Roman World*. Leeds: Francis Cairns, 2006.

Halkin, François. *Euphémie De Chalcédoine: Légendes Byzantines*. Brussels: Société des Bollandistes, 1965.

———. *Bibliotheca Hagiographica Graeca*. Brussels: Société des Bollandistes, 1969.

Harrington, Daniel J. "The Reception of Walter Bauer's 'Orthodoxy and Heresy in Earliest Christianity' during the Last Decade." *The Harvard Theological Review* Volume 73, Number 1/2 (1980): 289-98.

Hess, Hamilton. *The Early Development of Canon Law and the Council of Serdica*. Oxford ; New York: Oxford University Press, 2002.

Hofer, Andrew. "The Stoning of Christ and Gregory of Nazianzus," in *Re-reading Gregory of Nazianzus: Essays on History, Theology, and Culture*, edited by Christopher Beeley, 143-158. Washington, DC: Catholic University Press. 2012.

Holum, Kenneth. *Theodosian Empresses: Women and Imperial Dominion in Late Antiquity*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1982.

———. "Pulcheria's Crusade A.D. 421-22 and the Ideology of Imperial Victory." *Greek, Roman, and Byzantine Studies* Volume 18, Number 2 (1977): 153-172.

Honoré, Tony. *Law in the Crisis of Empire, 379-455 AD: The Theodosian Dynasty and Its Quaestors : With a Palingenesia of Laws of the Dynasty*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1998.

Hussey, Joan Mervyn. *The Orthodox Church in the Byzantine Empire*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1986.

Jones, A.H.M. *The Later Roman Empire, 284-602. A Social, Economic, and Administrative Survey*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1964.

———. *The Prosopography of the Later Roman Empire*. 2 volumes. J.R. Martindale and J. Morris, editors. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1971.

Kaldellis, Anthony. *The Byzantine Republic: People and Power in New Rome*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2015.

Kannengiesser, Charles. "St. Athanasius of Alexandria Rediscovered: His Political and Pastoral Achievement." *Coptic Church Review* Volume 9, Number 3 (1988): 68-74.

———. "Antony, Athanasius, Evagrius: The Egyptian Fate of Origenism," *Coptic Church Review* Volume 16, Number 1 (1995): 9-8.

Kelly, Christopher, Editor. *Theodosius II: Rethinking the Roman Empire in late Antiquity*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2013.

Kelly, John. *Golden Mouth: The Story of John Chrysostom: Ascetic, Preacher, Bishop*. London: Duckworth, 1995.

Kim, Young Richard. *Epiphanius of Cyprus: Imagining an Orthodox World*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 2015.

Köstenberger, Andreas J., and Michael J. Kruger. *The Heresy of Orthodoxy: How Contemporary Culture's Fascination With Diversity Has Reshaped Our Understanding of Early Christianity*. Wheaton, Ill.: Crossway, 2010.

Krautheimer, Richard. *Three Christian Capitals: Topography and Politics*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1983.

Kritzinger, Peter. "The Cult of Saints And Religious Processions In Late Antiquity And The Early Middle Ages." In *An Age of Saints?: Power, Conflict, and Dissent in Early Medieval Christianity,* Edited by Peter Sarris, Matthew Dal Santo, and Phil Booth, 36-48. Leiden; Boston: Brill, 2011.

Leithart, Peter. A*thanasius*. Grand Rapids, Mich.: Baker Academic, 2011.

Lenski, Noel Emmanuel. *Failure of Empire: Valens and the Roman State in the Fourth Century A.D.* Berkeley: University of California Press, 2002.

———. *Constantine and the Cities: Imperial Authority and Civic Politics*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2016.

Liebeschuetz, J.H.W.G. *Antioch: City and Imperial Administration in the Later Roman Empire*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1972.

———. "Friends and Enemies of John Chrysostom," in *Maistor: Classical, Byzantine, and Renaissance Studies for Robert Browning*, edited by Ann Moffat, 85-111. Byzantina Australiensia 5. Canberra: Australian National University, 1984.

———. *Barbarians and Bishops: Army, Church, and State in the Age of Arcadius and Chrysostom*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1990.

Lincoln, Bruce. *Authority: Construction and Corrosion*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1994.

Louth, Andrew. "Why Did the Syrians reject the Council of Chalcedon?" in *Chalcedon in Context*, edited by Richard Price and Mary Whitby, 107-116. Liverpool: Liverpool University Press, 2009.

MacMullen, Ramsay. *Voting About God in Early Church Councils*. New Haven, Connecticut: Yale University Press, 2006.

Mango, Cyril. "Constantine's Mausoleum and the Translation of Relics." *Byzantinische Zeitschrift* Volume 83. Munich: C. H. Beck'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung, (1990): 51-61.

Markus, R.A. "How on Earth Could Places Become Holy?: Origins of the Christian Idea of Holy Places." *Journal of Early Christian Studies* Volume 2, Number 3 (1994): 257-271.

Mathews, Thomas F. *The Early Churches of Constantinople: Architecture and Liturgy*. University Park: Pennsylvania State University Press, 1971.

Mayer, Wendy. "Cathedral Church or Cathedral Churches? The Situation at Constantinople." in *Orientalia Christiana Periodica* Volume 66 (2000): 49-68.

Mayer, Wendy and Pauline Allen. *John Chrysostom*. New York: Routledge, 2000.

McCall, Richard D. *Do This: Liturgy As Performance*. Notre Dame, Ind.: University of Notre Dame Press, 2007.

Meyendorff, John. "Justinian, the Empire and the Church." *Dumbarton Oaks Papers* Volume 22 (1968): 43-60.

———. *Byzantine Theology: Historical Trends and Doctrinal Themes*. Revised, second edition. New York: Fordham University Press, 1983.

McGuckin, John. "Nestorius and the Political Factions of Fifth-Century Byzantium: Factors in his Personal Downfall." *Bulletin of the John Rylands Library* Volume 78, Number 3 (1996): 7-21.

———. *St. Gregory of Nazianzus: An Intellectual Biography*. Crestwood, NY: St. Vladimir's Seminary Press, 2001.

———. *St. Cyril of Alexandria: the Christological Controversy: Its History, Theology and Texts*. Crestwood, NY: St. Vladimir's Seminary Press, 2004.

McLynn, Neil. *Ambrose of Milan: Church and Court in a Christian Capital*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1994.

Menze, Volker-Lorenz. *Justinian and the Making of the Syrian Orthodox Church*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008.

Millar, Fergus. *A Greek Roman Empire: Power and Belief under Theodosius II (408-450)*. Berkeley & Los Angeles: University of California Press, 2006.

———. "Rome, Constantinople and the Near Eastern Church under Justinian: Two Synods of C.E. 536." *The Journal of Roman Studies*, Volume 98 (2008): 62-82.

Miller, Timothy. *The Birth of the Hospital in the Byzantine Empire*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1997.

———. *The Orphans of Byzantium: Child Welfare in the Christian Empire*. Washington, DC: Catholic University of America Press, 2003.

Mitchell, Stephen. *A History of the Later Roman Empire*. Second Edition. Chichester, West Sussex, UK: Wiley Blackwell, 2015.

Otten, Willemein. "Early Christianity between Divine Promise and Earthly Politics." *Religious Identity and the Invention of Tradition: Papers Read at a NOSTER Conference in Soesterberg, January 4-6, 1999*. Assen, The Netherlands: Royal Van Gorcum, 2001. 60-83.

Payne, Richard. "The Emergence of Martyrs' Shrines In Late Antique Iran: Conflict, Consensus And Communal Institutions." In *An Age of Saints?: Power, Conflict, and Dissent in Early Medieval Christianity,* edited by Peter Sarris, Matthew Dal Santo, and Phil Booth, 89-113. Leiden: Brill, 2011.

Price, Richard. “The Development of a Chalcedonian Identity in Byzantium (451-553).” *Church History and Religious Culture* Volume 89, Number 1/3 (2009a): 307-325.

———. “The Council of Chalcedon (451): A Narrative.” In *Chalcedon in Context. Church Councils 400-700* Liverpool: Liverpool University Press, 2009b. 70-91.

———. “Truth, Omission, and Fiction in the Acts of Chalcedon.” In *Chalcedon in Context. Church Councils 400-700* Liverpool: Liverpool University Press, 2009c. 92-106.

Price, Richard and Mary Whitby, editors. *Chalcedon in Context. Church Councils 400-700.* Liverpool: Liverpool University Press, 2009.

Prostko-Prostyński, Jan. “Ein in Rom anerkannter Usurpator”, *Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik* Volume 133 (2000): 259-265.

Rapp, Claudia. *Holy Bishops in Late Antiquity.* Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press. 2005.

Redies, Michael. “Die Usurpation des Basiliskos (475-476) im Kontext der aufsteigenden Monophystischen Kirche.” *L’argenterie romaine de l’antiquité tardive*, Volume 5 (1997): 211-221.

Schneider, Alfons M. “Sankt Euphemia und das Konzil von Chalkedon.” In *Das Konzil von Chalkedon*, edited by Aloys Grillmeier and Heingrich Bacht, Volume 1, 291-302. Würzburg: Echter, 1953.

Schor, Adam. *Theodoret’s People: Social Networks and Religious Conflict in Late Roman Syria*. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 2011.

Schwartz, Eduard. *Cyrill und der Mönch Viktor*. Vienna, Leipzig: Hölder-Pichler-Tempsky, 1928.

Shepardson, Christine. *Controlling Contested Places: Late Antique Antioch and the Spatial Politics of Religious Controversy*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 2014.

Snee, Rochelle. “Gregory Nazianzen's Anastasia Church: Arianism, the Goths, and Hagiography.” *Dumbarton Oaks Papers* Volume 52 (1998): 157-186.

Steppa, Jan-Eric. *John Rufus and the World Vision of Anti-Chalcedonian Culture*. Piscataway: Gorgias Press, 2002.

Taft, Robert F. *The Great Entrance: A History of the Transfer of Gifts and Other Preanaphoral Rites of the Liturgy of St. John Chrysostom*. Rome: Pontificium Institutum Studiorum Orientalium, 1975.

———. “Towards the Origins of the Offertory Procession in the Syro-Byzantine East.” *Orientalia Christiana Periodica* Volume 36 (1970): 73-107.

———. *The Diptychs*. Rome: Pontificium Institutum Studiorum Orientalium, 1991

———. “*Quaestiones disputatae*: the skeuophylakion of Hagia Sophia and the entrances of the liturgy revisited—part I”. *Oriens Christianus* 81. Wiesbaden, 1997.

———. “*Quaestiones disputatae*: the skeuophylakion of Hagia Sophia and the entrances of the liturgy revisited—part II”. *Oriens Christianus* 82. Wiesbaden, 1998.

———. *Divine Liturgies—Human Problems in Byzantium, Armenia, Syria, and Palestine*. Burlington, Vt.: Ashgate, 2001.

Thomas, John. *Private Religious Foundations in the Byzantine Empire*. Washington, DC: Dumbarton Oaks, 1987.

Ueding, Leo. “Die Kanones von Chalkedon in ihrer Bedeutung für Mönchtum und Klerus.” In *Das Konzil von Chalkedon*, edited by Aloys Grillmeier and Heinrich Bacht, Volume 2, 596-676. Würzburg: Echter, 1953.

Urbainczyk, Theresa. *Socrates of Constantinople: Historian of Church and State*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1997.

Van Dam, Raymond. *The Roman Revolution of Constantine*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2007.

Van Den Eynde, Sabine. “‘A Testimony to the Non-Believers, a Blessing to the Believers: The *Passio Perpetuae* and the Construction of a Christian Identity.” In *More Than a Memory: The Discourse of Martyrdom and the Construction of Christian Identity in the History of Christianity*, edited by Johan Leemans, 23-44. Leuven: Peeters, 2005.

Veyne, Paul. *When Our World Became Christian, 312-394*. Translated by Janet Lloyd. Cambridge; Malden, MA: Polity, 2010.

Vivian, Miriam Raub “The World of St. Daniel the Stylite: Rhetoric, *Religio*, and Relationships in the *Life* of the Pillar Saint.” In *The Rhetoric of Power in Late Antiquity*, edited by Robert Frakes, Elizabeth DePalma Digeser, and Justin Stephens, 147-165. New York: Tauris Academic Studies, 2010.

Vryonis, Speros. “The Patriarchate of Constantinople and the State.” In *Orthodoxy & Western Culture: A Collection of Essays Honoring Jaroslav Pelikan On His Eightieth Birthday*,

Edited by V. Hotchkiss and P. Henry, 109-125. Crestwood, NY: St. Vladimir's Seminary Press, 2005.

Weinandy, Thomas. *Athanasius: A Theological Introduction*. Burlington, VT: Ashgate, 2007.

Whitby, Michael. "An Unholy Crew? Bishops Behaving Badly at Church Councils," in *Chalcedon in Context: Church Councils 400-700*. Liverpool: Liverpool University Press, 2009. 178-196.

Young, Frances and Andrew Teal. *From Nicaea to Chalcedon: A Guide to the Literature and Its Background*. Second Edition. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic, 2010.