The period from the deposition of Nestorius in 431 to the second Council of Ephesus in 449 produced a disturbing series of events in Constantinople.¹ In military affairs, these years were dominated by difficulties on three fronts: sporadic, but generally successful war against the Persians; two desultory campaigns against the Vandals in North Africa; and the increasing pressure brought by Attila in the north.² The latter difficulty was of the most immediate concern for residents of Constantinople, since the Huns threatened not only to attack the city itself, but managed to secure an immense tribute from the emperor: in 443, (or 447), for example, he demanded and received an immediate payment of 6,000 pounds of gold and an annual subsidy of 2,100 pounds.³ The burden of taxation to support these payments was considerable, and it engendered much resentment:

The Romans pretended that they made these payments voluntarily, but they really did so because of necessity and the overwhelming fear which oppressed their rulers. . . . And they sent the very heavy amount of tribute, even though their personal funds and the imperial treasuries had been exhausted—not for necessities, but for improper spectacles, unrestrained ambitions, pleasures, and uncontrolled feasts—things which no one in his right mind should do, even in normal times, unless he gives no thought to defense. . . . [The emperor] forced everyone to contribute to the sum of money which he sent to the Huns, both those who paid the tribute and those who for a time had been freed from the heavy burden of the land tax, either by the decision of the judges or by the liberality of the emperors. Those enrolled in the senate paid an amount of gold according to their rank. For many their outstanding fortune caused a change in their life; for after undergoing torture, they paid what those sent by the
emperor demanded of them. Thus, men who were formerly prosperous displayed their wives' jewelry and their furniture in the marketplace. After the war this misfortune fell upon the Romans, so that many either starved themselves to death or hanged themselves.

Meanwhile, the forces of nature seem to have conspired against the empire, and earthquakes, plague, famine, and severe cold were unusually common during these years, especially in the period after 444. Later writers, and undoubtedly many contemporaries, attributed these disasters to the wrath of God directed against blasphemy and heresy in the city. The mood of the city is well characterized by the actions of the bishop Proclus who reacted to a severe earthquake by assembling all of the faithful in the Campus of the Hebdomon to beseech God with the Kyrie eleison.

In religious affairs, the situation was still confused. The Council of Ephesus had condemned Nestorius and any teaching which diminished the divinity of Christ, but it left many questions unanswered. Exactly what role, for example, remained for Christ's humanity? Did he have a single nature—divine—or was it still possible to speak of a human nature joined in some way to the divine? Nestorius was still alive, and from his exile he continued to speak about the injustices he felt had been committed against him. Few people were willing to agree with the deposed bishop, but some thought that Cyril had gone too far in his emphasis on the divinity of Christ. Still the supporters of Cyril, especially the monk Eutyches—who had assumed the leadership of the monastic community of Constantinople after the death of Dalmatius—maintained an ascendancy over Theodosius. Thus, in 435 the emperor issued a law forbidding the Nestorians from calling themselves Christians and ordering all of their books to be burned. The Nestorians, including both those who actually followed Nestorius and those who simply felt that Cyril and Eutyches had gone too far, resurrected the books of the older teachers of the school of Antioch, and the works of Diodore of Tarsus and Theodore of Mopsuestia began to circulate again with considerable effect.

Reaction to this was not slow in coming. Proclus of Constantinople quickly condemned the revival of Nestorian tendencies, and Cyril of Alexandria followed with a treatise against Diodore and Theodore. John of Antioch and the other oriental bishops agreed to subscribe to the definition of faith suggested by Proclus, but they refused to condemn the writings of the forerunners of Nestorius. The diplomatic maneuverings were subtle and no schism emerged, but the underlying difference of opinion remained, ready to erupt at any moment.

Nor were these difficulties restricted to the theologians. At about this time, a small band of Armenian monks, fanatic supporters of the theology of Alexandria, again focused public attention on the complex theological
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problems left unsolved by the deposition of Nestorius.\textsuperscript{13} They roamed the cities of the East, displaying quotations they alleged to have taken from the works of Theodore of Mopsuestia. In Constantinople they were particularly successful in causing a disturbance (\textit{multorum sordidantes auditum calliditate sua omnia perturbabant}), and the emperor became concerned and requested Proclus to conduct an investigation into the matter.\textsuperscript{14}

In response to these attacks on Antiochene theology, Theodoret, bishop of Cyrrhus, published his \textit{Eranistes}, in 447.\textsuperscript{15} Although this work did not mention his opponents by name, it clearly condemned the teachings which were then being accepted by the emperor and his court. At about the same time, Domnus, the new bishop of Antioch, wrote a letter to the emperor accusing the archimandrite Eutyches of Apollinarianism in attributing the sufferings of Christ to the divinity.\textsuperscript{16} These attacks had little effect, however, and the emperor issued an edict in February of 448 which again condemned Nestorius and all his adherents, declaring them deprived of ecclesiastical rank and encouraging any person to denounce such heretics without fear of retaliation. Further, the new decree went beyond the law of 435 by ordering the destruction of all writings which in any way supported the teachings of the deposed bishop (meaning, of course, the works of Theodore of Mopsuestia and Diodore of Tarsus).\textsuperscript{17}

\textit{The Council of 448}

Matters finally came to a head at a local council called by Flavian, who had succeeded Proclus as bishop of Constantinople in 448.\textsuperscript{18} Flavian had been a priest in Proclus' administration, but for one reason or another he encountered the antagonism of the eunuch Chrysaphius, an important adviser and confidant of the emperor.\textsuperscript{19} Flavian had apparently taken an independent line in his dealings with Chrysaphius, and he had allied himself with Pulcheria against the eunuch's successful manipulation of court intrigue. This was important for the present issue since Chrysaphius was the godson of Eutyches and presumably a supporter of his theology from an early date.

On November 8, 448, Flavian summoned the bishops who happened to be in the capital to a meeting of the \textit{syndos endemousa}. The reason for this council was a local dispute in the area of Sardis, about which we know almost nothing. This business was concluded quickly, but before Flavian could end the session Eusebius—the former accuser of Nestorius and now bishop of Dorylaeum in Phrygia—presented a written complaint against the teachings of Eutyches.\textsuperscript{20} Regardless of Flavian's theological predilections, he was left with no choice but to investigate the matter. The members of the council decided to send the priest John and the deacon
Andreas to Eutyches to inform the archimandrite of the charges against him and to ask him to appear before the assembly. The synod then adjourned.21

The bishops met again to consider the issue on Monday, November 15. Eusebius opened the proceedings by remarking on the absence of Eutyches from the assembly. In reply, Flavian asked for the report of those sent to bring the archimandrite. The priest John told the synod that Eutyches had refused to accompany them, saying that he looked upon the monastery as his tomb. The deacon Andreas and another deacon, Athanasius, verified this report.22 The synod then addressed a letter to Eutyches, again asking him to appear and make his apology. The task of delivering this summons was entrusted to the priests Mamas and Theophilus.23

While the bishops were awaiting the reply of Eutyches, Eusebius raised another matter for their consideration. He had received information that Eutyches sent a tract (tomos) to all the monasteries of the capital with the intention of raising insurrection (stasis) among the monks. To substantiate this charge, Eusebius brought forward the priest Abramios from a monastery in the Hebdomon, and he told how Eutyches had sent the tract to his archimandrite Manoulios and persuaded him to sign it. Not fully convinced by this evidence, Flavian ordered various clerics to go around to the monasteries in and near Constantinople to determine what harm Eutyches had actually done.24

Just at that moment, an official of the council announced the return of Mamas and Theophilus. The two priests presented a very interesting report. Upon their arrival at the monastery of Eutyches, they found several monks guarding the gate; these monks escorted the emissaries into the monastery. Once inside the precinct, they found themselves face to face with the archimandrite. After he had read the letter from the council, Eutyches replied that he could not possibly come since he had taken an oath not to leave his monastery “except for moral necessity.” When Mamas and Theophilus pressed their demand, the monk protested that he was old and feeble.25 Flavian heard this report and delegated three of his own clerics as a third and final embassy to Eutyches. The council addressed yet another summons to the archimandrite and set the following Tuesday—November 17—as the date by which Eutyches must make his appearance.26

When the synod met again, on November 16, an archimandrite and three monks from the monastery of Eutyches appeared before the doors of the episkopeion. They announced that Eutyches had sent them because he himself was sick. Flavian rejected this excuse and reminded the ambassadors that the archimandrite had managed to leave his cell at the time of the Nestorian controversy.27 At the beginning of the session on the following day, Memnon, the leader of the most recent delegation sent to
Eutyches, reported that the archimandrite had finally agreed to appear personally on the following day, "God willing." Flavian then proceeded to examine the clerics who had been sent to investigate the disturbances Eutyches had caused in the monasteries of Constantinople. They reported that they had found a general confusion among the monks. Some were disturbed by Eutyches’ theology, some thought it was the same as that of Cyril of Alexandria and the Fathers at Ephesus, while still others had not received the tract. The clerics apparently found no evidence that Eutyches had resorted to violence and Eusebius' charge of insurrection was allowed to lapse.

Finally the day of the confrontation arrived. An official of the council announced that the formidable party of Eutyches waited outside the doors of the episcopal residence. Along with the archimandrite were “a large number of soldiers and monks and dignitaries from the staff of the praetorian prefect.” At the head of the delegation was the silentiarius Magnus, who had undoubtedly been sent by the imperial court. While Eutyches’ other supporters waited outside, Magnus entered the assembly and read a letter from the emperor. In this letter, Theodosius reminded the bishops of his concern for the faith as established at Nicaea and Ephesus:

Thus we wish no scandal to arise in the aforesaid orthodoxy. And since we know that the most honorable Patrician Florentius is a faithful man and one who bears witness to the correct position, we wish him to be present at the investigation of the synod, since the matter is one which concerns the faith.

The bishops agreed that Florentius should be admitted to the debate, and they all cried out in praise of the emperor. From that time, Florentius assumed a leading role in the deliberations of the council.

Eutyches finally made his long-delayed appearance, and Flavian and Eusebius quickly brought the interrogation to the point where the two parties differed. Eutyches confessed that he held the person of Christ to be of the same substance (homousios) as the Father; and the Virgin was of the same substance as all mankind. But he denied that Christ was of the same substance as man. Flavian and Eusebius, along with Florentius, pressed the archimandrite concerning his belief in the two natures (φύσεως) of Christ. Eutyches replied: “I confess our Lord to have been born from two natures (ἐκ δύο φύσεων) before the union; but after the union I confess one nature.” Eutyches appealed to the writings of Athanasius and Cyril for support, but his fate was decided. Florentius cried out: “Do you confess two natures after the union? Speak! If you do not speak, you must be deposed!” A formula had been devised—“one nature—or two—after the union”—which clearly separated the parties in the conflict. When Eutyches refused to admit the two natures after the union, Florentius declared that the archimandrite did not believe
The bishops cried out in praise of the emperor. Flavian then prepared a formal statement declaring Eutyches guilty of the heresy of Apollinarius and Valentinian and announcing that he was deprived of all ecclesiastical rank. Thirty bishops and twenty-three archimandrites signed this statement.

The role of the court in this affair is not easy to understand. Chrysaphius, the godson of Eutyches, presumably controlled imperial policy at this time, and it is certain that he supported the archimandrite vigorously. The intervention of Magnus and the courtiers would seem to be an indication of imperial favor toward Eutyches, and Nestorius, from his distant exile, complained that the blasphemy of Eutyches was carried out with the support of the emperor. But the position of Florentius is not at all clear. At first he appeared familiar with Eutyches, calling him papa, and as the representative of Theodosius he would presumably have reflected the will of the emperor. Yet he joined freely in the interrogation of Eutyches and eventually decreed that he must be declared a heretic; it would be surprising if this had been done in direct contradiction of the wishes of the emperor.

We should probably expect Eutyches to have had the full support of the monastic community of Constantinople. He was the generally accepted leader of the monks and he had played an important part in the struggle against Nestorius. Moreover, the two events we have examined so far suggest that it was common for opposition to the bishop of Constantinople to center in the monasteries of the city. Further, Eutyches had a large number of monks under his personal control, in his own house, and he went to some pains to disseminate his teachings among the other monasteries.

Nevertheless, the evidence suggests that the affair of Eutyches caused a significant division of opinion among the monks of Constantinople and that Eutyches was not able to mobilize the whole of the monastic tagma in his defense. In the first place, Eutyches apparently did not convince all the other archimandrites of his orthodoxy, as the testimony given at the Synod of 448 clearly shows. Whether this was a result of the weakness of Eutyches’ propaganda or the actions of his enemies is unclear. Flavian certainly realized the importance of monastic opinion, and he did whatever he could to encourage differences among the monks. Eutyches, in a letter to Pope Leo written probably in the summer of 449, complained about the activities of the bishop, adding that such episcopal meddling in the affairs of the monasteries was unprecedented.

Furthermore, twenty-three heads of monasteries, or their representatives, had signed the deposition of Eutyches in 448, and others were later encouraged to do the same. One of the most important of these monastic opponents of Eutyches was the archimandrite Faustos, who was probably the son of Dalmatius born before the latter entered the monastic
life. Dalmatius, it will be remembered, had been an important adversary of Nestorius, and his intervention had helped convince the emperor to abandon his support of the bishop. In 431, Dalmatius had worked closely with Eutyches, but by 448 his son Faustos had become an enemy of the archimandrite. We do not know the reason for this development; it may simply have been that Faustos disagreed with the religious policy of his father or that he saw the teachings of Eutyches as an unreasonable extension of the doctrine of Ephesus. Political reasons might, however, have played a role in the disagreement. Eutyches had succeeded Dalmatius as leader of the monastic community, and Faustos may well have considered that position rightfully his own.

Even in his own monastery, it appears that Eutyches found some who disagreed with him. In 449, the monks of his house wrote to the council in Ephesus to complain about the injustice done to their archimandrite. Although the letter mentioned that there were three hundred monks in the monastery, the complaint was signed by only thirty-five. That some of the other two hundred sixty-five monks had agreed to the condemnation of Eutyches is confirmed by another passage in the letter where the monks who remained faithful to Eutyches reported that they had dealt with those who had participated in the “impious act.”

Ultimately it seems impossible fully to disentangle the events and motives which characterized the monastic community during late 448 and early 449. It is clear, however, that the situation was in many ways a new one. During the past fifty years, monastic leaders had frequently opposed the bishop of Constantinople, usually with considerable success, but they had always relied on the unified support of the monks of the city. Now, for the first time, the monastic community was fragmented, and many archimandrites openly supported Flavian against their leader Eutyches. This was significant in itself, but it also must have had important repercussions for imperial policy and popular opinion, both of which were extremely sensitive to monastic leadership.

Unfortunately, we are poorly informed about crowd reaction to the deposition of Eutyches and the events subsequent to it. The testimony of Nestorius, however, suggests that the people of Constantinople were divided in their opinion and that, in fact, this division was the cause of Flavian’s original involvement in the controversy:

Flavian had heard that the churches were disturbed over these things and the monasteries were divided and the people were rising up in division, and that already the fire was kindling in all the world owing to those who were going and coming were preaching various things that were full of impiety.

During the course of the Synod of 448 Flavian, perhaps at that time an impartial observer, noted that both high and low had been offended by the teaching of Eutyches:
Many heard [his doctrines] and were scandalized... and many of the important people were scandalized also.\textsuperscript{45}

The most interesting evidence concerning popular feeling and involvement is supplied by the archimandrite himself. In a letter which he wrote to Pope Leo soon after his condemnation, Eutyches said:

But when they had disregarded what I had said and closed the council with haste, they published the sentence of excommunication which had been drawn up against me before the trial. Relying on their faction (\textit{sua factione confidentes}), they spread around so many lies that I was in danger of my life, had not some soldiers snatched me from the trap through the aid of God and your prayers.\textsuperscript{46}

Later, in testimony before the Council of Ephesus in 449, Eutyches complained that Flavian had excommunicated him and forbade him from entering any monastery. Thus, he delivered me to the crowd (\textit{plethos}) which had been prepared for this, both at the \textit{episcopeion} and in the \textit{agora}, to be killed as a heretic, a blasphemer, and a Manichaean, but the providence of God saved me.\textsuperscript{47}

According to Eutyches, then, the supporters of Flavian made an attempt to influence public opinion against the archimandrite by calling him a Manichaean; recall from the testimony of Nestorius that supporters of the theology of Alexandria were frequently called Manichaens by their enemies. They were so successful in this that on at least two occasions the crowd tried to lynch him, and he had to be rescued by imperial soldiers. The latter passage suggests that the followers of the bishop did not hesitate to organize a mob to set upon Eutyches, but we should suppose that in general they used more subtle means. Particularly significant was the attempt to separate the archimandrite from the rest of the monastic community and to close the churches of the city to his followers. The result was that any sermon given between the Synod of 448 and the meeting of Council in 449 must have reflected the theology of Flavian.

In his letter to Pope Leo, Eutyches provides further information about the attempts to influence public opinion by both sides of the controversy.

And the \textit{contestationes} which I wished to display as an explanation to the Christian people (\textit{ad satisfationem populi Christiani}), they would not permit to be published or brought to public attention. In short, those people who through faction (\textit{factio}) and deliberate calumny wished everyone to think me a heretic by the removal of my defense took them down.\textsuperscript{48}

Just what were these \textit{contestationes} by which Eutyches hoped to convince the people of Constantinople of his orthodoxy? Generally speaking, the term refers to a statement or testimony, especially as given in a court of law.\textsuperscript{49} But the \textit{contestationes} of Eutyches can hardly have been prepared speeches; they must have been short statements of his beliefs and an
The statement went on to affirm that Eutyches had received from his parents the faith of Nicaea which, as confirmed by the Council of Ephesus, he had maintained until the present moment. In particular, he said, he condemned those "who say that the flesh of our Lord Jesus Christ came down from heaven and was not made incarnate from the Virgin Mary and the Holy Spirit." This latter statement gives us an important insight into the propaganda used by the supporters of Flavian. Obviously they had accused the archimandrite of believing that the humanity of Christ "came down from heaven," a doctrine which might be considered Manichaean or at best Apollinarian and which, notably, diminished the role of the Virgin in the economy of salvation.

Eutyches concluded his appeal:

And I pray that their deceit and frauds and rumors will not cause the faithful to be scandalized in me—who have always worked for the catholic faith. Moreover, you religious people should know that I brought these things forward once before as an explanation to you. But certain people from that faction took down the contestationes I had presented, so that they deprived you of the ability to learn the truth of my teachings.

This statement of Eutyches shows that his enemies not only deprived the archimandrite of an opportunity to speak in church, but that they went about the city tearing down the statements he had posted in his defense. All of this suggests that public opinion in Constantinople was generally against Eutyches. People must have accepted the "frauds and rumors" about him or he would not have taken the effort to deny them. Furthermore, the violence used against him may have been manipulated by his enemies, but if people had been convinced that he was a heretic, opposition to Eutyches may have been widespread.

Despite the canonical condemnation of his godfather, Chrysaphius did not abandon his support of Eutyches, and he appears only to have redoubled his efforts in his behalf. But, at about this time, the eunuch had other pressing matters to occupy him. In late 448 or early 449, Edeco, a lieutenant of Attila, arrived in Constantinople with a complaint that the Romans had violated the terms of the recent peace. While the Hunnic
leader was being entertained by members of the court, Chrysaphius approached him with a proposal. Swearing Edeco to secrecy, the eunuch promised him a life of luxury and ease if he would return to the camp of the Huns and kill Attila. Edeco agreed willingly and Chrysaphius informed Theodosius and Martialis, the magister officiorum. The plot was set in motion and the embassy—which included the historian Priscus—set off for the Danube. Priscus described for us in remarkable detail the misfortunes of the venture, which resulted eventually in the betrayal of the plot to Attila by Edeco himself.\footnote{52}

The failure of this enterprise was disastrous for Chrysaphius, since he was rightly considered its instigator. Attila wrote an insulting letter to Theodosius, berating him for acting so treacherously toward his master (meaning himself). He promised to forgive the emperor only if Chrysaphius were handed over to the Huns for punishment.\footnote{53} It was improbable that Theodosius would have surrendered his adviser to Attila, but the position of the eunuch had become doubly insecure, since he had earned the enmity of Flavius Zeno, the powerful Isaurian commander, and he too demanded Chrysaphius' death.

Paul Goubert and, following him, Luibheid suggest that these events had considerable effect on the development of the religious situation in Constantinople.\footnote{54} They maintain that Chrysaphius, in difficulty because of the failure of his plot against Attila, wished to do something to divert public attention away from himself. For this reason, the eunuch did not let the affair of Eutyches die, but, even after the condemnation of the archimandrite, he continued to press for his restoration, hoping that people would turn their attention from the recent diplomatic fiasco to doctrinal controversy. There is much to recommend this theory, and it would both explain why the decision of the synodos endemousa was subject to so much official opposition and provide another example of the importance of popular opinion.

Unfortunately, there are two fundamental objections to this interpretation. First, the reconstruction of Goubert implies that popular sentiment was already decidedly in favor of Eutyches—which we have seen it was not. Chrysaphius' connection with Eutyches was well known in Constantinople. If the position of the archimandrite was unpopular, it is difficult to understand why the eunuch would wish to use the religious controversy to divert public censure from himself. The unpopularity of Eutyches would hardly enhance the popularity of Chrysaphius.

An even more important objection is a fundamental chronological inconsistency in the theory of Goubert. The embassy of Edeco arrived in Constantinople at the earliest in the fall of 448 and made its return in late spring or early summer of the following year, long after the council of Ephesus had been summoned by Theodosius.\footnote{55} Considering the time involved in the trip to and from the camp of Attila and the long
negotiations described by Priscus, it is all but impossible that news of the
disaster could have been known in Constantinople before the assembly of
the second Council of Ephesus in August of 449. It is much more likely
that the discomfiture of Chrysaphius occurred later in 449 or even in early
450. This must lend support to the statement of Theophanes that in 450
Theodosius decided that he had been deceived by Chrysaphius and had
him exiled to “a certain island.”

Chrysaphius' opposition to the
deposition of Eutyches was not a response to his other difficulties; it must
be assigned to the more obvious motives already mentioned—his attach­
ment to his godfather, enmity with Flavian, as well as probable
sympathy for Alexandrian theology.

Meanwhile the archimandrite wrote several letters to the emperor,
complaining of irregularity in the decision against him and calling for the
meeting of a general council. As already mentioned, Eutyches also wrote
to Rome for support, and at this same time he sent a letter to Alexandria,
hoping to involve the bishop of that city, Dioscorus, in the controversy.

Chrysaphius secured the support of Eudocia, and he importuned the
emperor to summon a general council to deal with the controversy.

As Easter of 449 (March 27) approached, expectations ran high among
the monks devoted to Eutyches. During the Easter season, it was
customary for the emperor to grant amnesty to condemned persons, and
the monks hoped that Theodosius would take this opportunity to reverse
the sentence against Eutyches. In anticipation of this, the supporters of
the archimandrite said, “every house and every agora was filled with just
pleasure,” perhaps indicating some public support for Eutyches or even a
demonstration in his behalf. Nevertheless, Easter passed, and the
emperor did not announce a suspension of the sentence against Eutyches.

Yet, perhaps in part because of this exhibition of support, Theodosius
began to consider more active aid for the archimandrite. According to
Nestorius, the emperor undertook a persecution of the clergy and nobility
who had opposed the aged monk:

And prelates were openly seized and rebuked before the crowds, and every
bishop who was not of the party of Eutyches was seized; and he commanded
every tax upon the possessions of their churches which had been remitted unto
them by him and by the emperors before him, even the tax of all these years, to
be exacted of them at one time; and of those who were nobles or of the family
of noble persons he exacted openly, in return for the honor which was theirs, a
quantity of gold—by which every means he commanded vengeance to be
exactd of Eusebius, the accuser of Eutyches, without mercy.

Sometime during the Easter season Theodosius visited Hagia Sophia,
and Flavian approached him as though no difficulty existed. The em­
peror, however, acted insulted and, despite the protests of the assembled
clergy and laity, he resolved to have no more communion with the
bishop. Then, on March 30, only three days after Easter, Theodosius
dispatched a letter to Dioscorus, summoning him and twenty of his bishops, to appear on the first of August in Ephesus for the opening of an ecumenical council. From the tone of the letter, it was clear that the emperor had already decided the issue in favor of Eutyches.

Furthermore, on April 8, less than two weeks after Easter, the emperor decided to investigate Eutyches' charge that the proceedings taken against him were irregular. Macedonius, a *referendarius* and tribune of the notaries, brought this matter before a group of twenty-eight bishops assembled in the baptistry of Hagia Sophia, under the presidency of Thessalios of Caesarea in Cappadocia. These bishops could not find anything amiss in the condemnation of Eutyches and so adjourned. On April 13, a greater assembly of bishops met under the direction of Flavian in the "greater stoa of the holy church" (Hagia Sophia), to investigate the charge that the records of the *synodos endemousa* had been falsified. The patrician Florentius and the *comes* Mamas accompanied Macedonius as representatives of the emperor. Even more than in the earlier council, Florentius assumed the initiative in this investigation. Macedonius was decidedly committed to the acquittal of Eutyches. Eutyches himself, as an excommunicated person, was not allowed to attend, but he was represented by three of his monks. The acts of the synod of November were read to the bishops, section by section, and the representatives of Eutyches duly registered their complaints. Since the monks could not substantiate their points, however, Florentius declared the notaries of Flavian innocent of any wrongdoing.

Eutyches continued his protest, and he dispatched another letter to the emperor, complaining that Flavian had drawn up the sentence against him even before the proceedings had begun. Theodosius instituted yet another commission to investigate this charge, this time under the direction of Martialis, the *magister officiorum*. The body met on April 27 in the presence of the *comes* Carterius, Macedonius, the *silentarius* Magnus, and Constantine, a monk of Eutyches' monastery. Again, no basis for the charge could be found, and the accusation was allowed to lapse. Even after all this, the emperor forced Flavian to draw up a statement of his faith, sign it, and present it to the court for its inspection.

One obvious question arises from the series of events which followed the deposition of Eutyches: why did the imperial court refuse to step in forcefully to insure the rehabilitation of the controversial archimandrite? Eudocia, Chrysaphius, and probably Theodosius himself favored such an outcome. The supporters of Eutyches presented the emperor with several occasions which would have been suitable for the renewal of the decree against Eutyches, and a careful selection of the members of the investigating bodies should have been enough to assure this. And even should "canonical" procedures fail, the emperor could easily have resorted to
force to secure his will—as happened later in Ephesus. Why, then, did Theodosius display such hesitancy?

The answer, of course, may lie partly within the court itself. Not all of its members supported Eutyches with the ardor of Chrysaphius. Pulcheria harbored great resentment against Chrysaphius and Eutyches. She was, it was true, in temporary retirement in the Hebdomon, but her influence was undoubtedly still felt in the palace. Among the imperial officials who became directly involved in the controversy, too, there appears to have been some difference of feeling. While the comes Mamas and the tribune Macedonius supported Eutyches faithfully, Florentius, by far the most important dignitary commissioned by the emperor, remained properly neutral and pronounced the sentence against the archimandrite on two different occasions.

Although one must not underestimate the importance of this “domestic” disagreement in the indecision of Theodosius, it seems that there was another serious factor at work. As pointed out above, the situation in Constantinople in these years was all but calm. Court intrigues and earthquakes, storms and plagues combined with the threat of imminent attack by the Huns to produce a feeling of despair in the city. One need only cite the joyful reception of the Trisagion as the salvation of the city during an earthquake to realize how unstable the situation was. As we have seen, heavy taxation, necessitated by the demands of Attila, angered the wealthy inhabitants of Constantinople, and restrictive measures against the Jews must have made this segment of the population unhappy with imperial policy. In these circumstances, it is not surprising that Theodosius did not wish further to aggravate religious dissension in the city. Had all the people of Constantinople—or an overwhelming number of them—supported Eutyches, the emperor might have dealt with the matter quickly and firmly in whatever way was expedient. As it was, however, some people strongly opposed Eutyches, and the use of force to restore the hated archimandrite would have led to alienation and perhaps even violence in the capital. On the other hand, Theodosius had to satisfy Chrysaphius and the others demanding action in behalf of Eutyches. A vacillating policy and an ecumenical council in another city were the best ways to handle the difficulty.

As we have seen, the sources do not allow us to make clear distinctions between the supporters and the enemies of Eutyches. The latter were probably greater in number, or they were at least able to make their numbers more effectively felt, since the archimandrite went about in fear of his life.

There is, however, reason to think that some of the division of opinion may have run along economic or political lines. Perhaps some individuals or groups viewed the religious issues according to whether they approved or disapproved of the general policies of the government. Members of the
imperial administration risked the displeasure of Chrysaphius for any support of Flavian, but the bishop himself tells us that many important people (πολλοὶ τῶν μεγάλων) were scandalized by Eutyches' teaching, and the testimony of Nestorius bears this out. Indeed, the direction of the government since the rise of Chrysaphius was bound to alienate the established members of society. Chrysaphius himself, as a eunuch and an individual who was ruthless in his treatment of the aristocracy—the fall of Cyrus of Panopolis is the best example—was certainly hated by many. And the wealthy were not pleased by the heavy taxes placed upon them to pay the tribute to the Huns. In fact, if we are to believe the testimony of Nestorius, the harsh measures used in collecting taxes from the rich were connected with the persecution of the followers of Flavian.

On the other hand, the poor of Constantinople must have appreciated a government which had expended huge sums in a series of building campaigns during the past ten years. As mentioned earlier, construction projects, along with the bread dole, were an important source of income for the urban poor, and the popularity of the prefect Cyrus clearly shows the effect of such expenditures in shaping public opinion. Thus, some of the urban poor may have had reason to support the policy of the government on behalf of Eutyches. Further, as we would in any case expect, there is specific evidence that Eutyches' monastery devoted some of its wealth to the poor, and the archimandrite—along with the heads of other philanthropic houses—probably earned the devotion of some of the poor as a result of this.

After carefully studying the individual monks who were involved in this dispute, Heinrich Bacht concluded that a social or economic division lay behind the schism in the monastic community. The monks who supported Flavian represented a group with greater resources and social standing, while Eutyches maintained the loyalty of the more humble monks, especially those who lived outside the regular monastic houses, in the *martyria* and tombs of the city.

In addition, it might be argued that the difference in religious policy was reflected in the division between the Green and the Blue circus factions. Theodosius II, and even more Chrysaphius, were ardent supporters of the Greens, and it would not be surprising if those who opposed the government—for political or religious reasons—grouped around the faction of the Blues. Nevertheless, as reasonable as this might be, there is no evidence that such an identification and alliance actually took place, and we must admit our ignorance of any involvement of the factions in this dispute. In general, secular considerations probably played a role in the shaping of public opinion during the affair of Eutyches, but they were not the determining factor. Again, what seems to have been crucial was the control which the supporters of Flavian maintained over the churches and the pulpits of the city. Despite serious challenge and many defections,
they remained the accepted spokesmen of orthodoxy, and their view of the controversy had the opportunity for greater public exposure.79

The Second Council of Ephesus

Theodosius had summoned the bishops of the empire to assemble in Ephesus at the end of the summer of 449. The emperor and his court obviously anticipated some difficulties at the council, and at an early date they began to take measures against any possible opposition. On May 14, Theodosius wrote to Barsumas, the famous Syrian archimandrite, inviting him to attend the forthcoming synod.80 Some Eastern bishops, the emperor claimed, had been advocating Nestorian sentiments, and it was only right that one who had always opposed this heresy should join the council as the representative of oriental monasticism. Despite this official protestation, the real motive for Barsumas' invitation must have been clear to all, for he was already known throughout the East as leader of a band of terrorist monks who roamed Syria and Palestine burning synagogues and violently opposing all they thought guilty of corrupting the faith with pagan or Judaizing tendencies.81 Barsumas could not have been expected to contribute to the theological discussion: he had not been trained in the subtleties of current religious thought, and he could not even speak Greek.82 But he and his monks would surely provide an intimidating force to the opponents of Eutyches.

On the day after writing to Barsumas, Theodosius sent a letter to Dioscorus of Alexandria, asking him to receive the archimandrite graciously and grant him a seat in the council,83 thus showing that Theodosius had designated the bishop of Alexandria as president of the council.84

At about the same time, the emperor nominated Elpidius, the comes sacri consistorii, and Eulogius, the tribune and praetorian notary, as his representatives at the council. In a letter to Elpidius, the emperor outlined their duties. The previous council of Ephesus, he said, had condemned the heresy of Nestorius, but now these same teachings were appearing once again. The forthcoming synod would end this difficulty once and for all. Elpidius and Eulogius were to assist in this undertaking by seeing that all was done as the emperor wished and, most importantly, by taking care that no disturbance distract the deliberations of the bishops:

You are to allow no disturbance (thorybos) to occur, but if you should see someone causing disruptions and disturbances (tarachai kai thoryboi) to the harm of the holy faith, you must report him to me.85

Furthermore, the imperial representatives were to prevent those who had participated in the synodos endemousa in Constantinople from voting at the council in Ephesus.

Because of the nature of their assignment, we should expect that
Elpidius and Eulogius were provided with soldiers. In fact, Theophanes said that Eudocia sent “a large army” to Ephesus and that this was put at the disposal of Dioscorus. We know also that the emperor made further arrangements for the maintenance of order at the council. Immediately after he wrote to Elpidius, Theodosius sent a letter to Proclus, the proconsul of Asia who resided in Ephesus, ordering him to support the efforts to prevent insurrection at the synod. This letter was typical in its recital of the reasons for the council, but it concluded with a thinly veiled threat. Apparently the emperor had reason to fear that Proclus, either through sloth—as he says—or for some more substantial reason, might be slow to suppress any disturbance in the city. Accordingly, he warned the proconsul that his actions would be closely watched by imperial representatives. Thus, when we encounter the soldiers of the proconsul of Asia, we should expect them to be under the effective command of Elpidius and acting in accord with the wishes of Dioscorus.

It is not surprising that we are relatively poorly informed about the Robber Synod. Its decisions were later reversed and its leaders deposed; it received only passing notice in the accounts of the ecclesiastical historians, and its acts almost perished. Fortunately, the desire for revenge on the part of the “orthodox” bishops at Chalcedon demanded that the compromising statements made by their opponents at Ephesus be read into the record of the later council. Accordingly, we have preserved—albeit imperfectly—large parts of the acta of the first session of the Robber Synod and various other extracts referring to what went on at the council. Syriac translators, who would be more interested in their contents, have preserved the records of the subsequent sessions of the council.

Sometime during the spring, Flavian sent Pope Leo two letters which fully explained his position in the affair of Eutyches. On May 21, Leo answered these letters, reversing his earlier stand against Flavian and promising to send him a full doctrinal statement in the future. On May 13, Leo received the imperial summons to attend the council in Ephesus. The pope, however, waited until June 13 to reply, stating that he would not come himself, but that he would send representatives to the council: Julius, the bishop of Puteoli, the priest Rentaus, and the deacon Hilarus, who was later to succeed Leo as pope. At the same time, he dispatched a letter to Pulcheria and another to Flavian. The latter was the famous “Tome” of Leo, in which the pope put forward his definitive dyophysite theology of the Incarnation, eventually accepted at the Council of Chalcedon. Thus, Flavian could count on whatever support the delegates of the pope could give.

In late summer of 449, the bishops began to arrive in Ephesus, and there is reason to believe that the city was once again the scene of party
strife. For example, Eusebius of Dorylaeum later complained about the cortege of Dioscorus as it arrived in Ephesus:

> The goodly Dioscorus...of the same opinion and mind as Eutyches, the empty-headed heretic, ignoring the majority of the people (λανθάνων δὲ τούς πολλούς) as he later showed himself to do...gathering a number of the disorderly rabble (πλήθος ἄτακτων διχων) and securing power for himself through money...he enforced the evil doctrine of Eutyches.96

Other sources repeated the charge that many parabalani and monks accompanied the “Pharoah” to his new test of strength with the bishop of Constantinople.97

As soon as they arrived in Ephesus, the followers of Flavian went to the episcopal residence of Stephanos, the bishop of the city, to pay their respects. Stephanos received them warmly and held communion with them—or at least so he claimed at the Council of Chalcedon. His position, as bishop of the conciliar city, was an important one, for he controlled the local churches and had the opportunity to influence popular opinion greatly. One need only remember the role played by Memnon at the earlier Council of Ephesus.

At Chalcedon, Stephanos testified that violence had been used to secure his support of Eutyches in the summer of 449:

> Elpidius and Eulogius, soldiers, and the monks of Eutyches—three hundred in number—came upon me in the episcopeion. And they were about to kill me, saying that since I had received the enemies of the emperor, I was an enemy of the emperor. I replied, “But I am a hospitable man (έγώ ξενοδόχος ειμί). I did not have communion over this matter [that is, Stephanos’ reception of Flavian had nothing to do with the theological controversy]; I was not able to refuse communion to those coming in communion.” And thus everything happened through force and necessity (και ούτω βία και ανάγκη γέγονεν πάντα).

The archontes at Chalcedon inquired whether Dioscorus had forced him to support Eutyches. Stephanos replied:

> All of his men and the comites. They did not permit me to leave the secretum of the church until I gave my consent to the opinions of Dioscorus...98

These protestations of Stephanos may be suspect because of the circumstances in which they were made, but they have a ring of truth about them. At the Council of Chalcedon, Dioscorus frequently interrupted his accusers to deny the truth of their testimony, but he allowed the statements of Stephanos to pass uncontested.

The position of Stephanos may be further clarified by testimony that was given during the twelfth session of the Council of Chalcedon.99 At that time, Bassianos, an elderly member of the clergy of Ephesus, accused Stephanos of irregularity in his election and consecration as bishop.
Bassianos claimed that under the episcopacy of Memnon he had himself gained a certain amount of popularity because of his concern for the poor and sick. In order to rid the city of a dangerous rival, Memnon had Bassianos consecrated bishop of Evagae. Bassianos refused to leave Ephesus, however, and Memnon had him beaten. Basil, the successor of Memnon, consecrated another bishop for Evagae and left Bassianos in his episcopal dignity. After the death of Basil, Bassianos said, “the faithful (laos) and the clergy and the bishops enthroned me, with much force and necessity, in the city of Ephesus.”

Later, Bassianos was suddenly interrupted while officiating at the Easter liturgy. “Certain people in the ranks of the clergy and certain others who were near-by” set upon him and dragged him to the agora where they beat him. Later they imprisoned him and threatened him with death; some of his supporters were killed, and his property was confiscated. Stephanos, who had been a priest of Bassianos, was the leader (ἀρχηγός) of this group, and he succeeded as bishop.

Another priest who supported Bassianos substantiated this story. He told further how the enemies of Bassianos had tried to induce him to betray his master. He refused and so was forced to leave Ephesus. He told the council—in late October of 451—that he had been a beggar in Constantinople for four years. Thus, we should place the deposition of Bassianos in the spring of 447.

Surely, we should keep these disturbances in mind when considering the situation in Ephesus in the summer of 449. In the best of conditions, the bishop of Ephesus could never be secure; but it is clear that the episcopacy of Stephanos was on particularly shaky ground. In 449, Stephanos had been bishop only two years, and Bassianos undoubtedly still had many friends in the city. His charity certainly would be remembered by the poor of the city, who had supported him enthusiastically in the past. Thus, when Stephanos was confronted with the controversy concerning Eutyches and the forthcoming council in his own city, he must have hesitated. Were he to take the side of one of the disputants, his enemies would surely use the occasion to sow dissension in the city and call for his deposition. On the other hand, Stephanos probably had real preferences in the doctrinal controversy, and he may have regarded Flavian, as bishop of Constantinople, with considerable suspicion.

On the whole, however, it appears that Stephanos remained largely neutral in the days preceding the second Council of Ephesus. Some of his clergy may have reminded the faithful that the “heresy” of Flavian was a revival of Nestorianism, and the followers of Dioscorus certainly seized the churches of Ephesus for this purpose after they imprisoned Stephanos. But the great assistance which Memnon gave to Cyril of Alexandria at the first Council of Ephesus was probably withheld from
Dioscorus at the second. It would be interesting to know how long Stephanos “held out” before he subscribed to the theology of Eutyches. If he did this immediately, and the council was still some time off, Dioscorus undoubtedly used the opportunity to have the bishop influence public opinion in favor of Eutyches. In any case, the absence of Stephanos from the forefront of the battle must have cost the supporters of Dioscorus some expected popular support.104

Finally, on August 8 the bishops assembled in the church of Mary to begin the second Council of Ephesus.105 One hundred thirty-five bishops or their representatives (plus the two representatives of the pope who were below episcopal dignity) attended the opening of the first session of the council.106 Dioscorus held the place of honor, while Julius, the emissary of Pope Leo, was second. Flavian was relegated to the fifth place.107

John, the primicerius notariorum and a priest of the church of Alexandria,108 began the proceedings by reading the letter of invitation sent by Theodosius to Dioscorus. Julius and Hilarus explained—through an interpreter—the circumstances of their presence. Hilarus then gave to the notary John the letter which Leo had prepared to be read to the council, outlining his doctrinal position on the controversy. John received the communication, but ignored it completely, passing on to read the second letter of Theodosius to Dioscorus. After being invited by the president of the assembly, the comes Elpidius gave a short exhortation to the bishops and reminded them of his official position by reading his letter of commission from the emperor.109

These preliminaries completed, Dioscorus turned the attention of the fathers to a consideration of the matter at hand. Eutyches entered the church and gave his account of the synod in Constantinople, adding a summary of his theological position. Stephanos of Ephesus was one of the first to declare his theology orthodox.110 When the archimandrite had concluded his defense, Flavian asked if Eusebius of Dorylaeum might also be heard, since he had been the primary accuser of Eutyches. The comes Elpidius replied that this was not possible because the emperor had declared that all those who had condemned Eutyches were now themselves to be judged. As Nestorius was to write: “And then the counts, who had been charged with this, restrained the bishops who were assembled and wanted to speak for him [Flavian].”111

Dioscorus suggested that they turn to a consideration of the sentence against Eutyches. Many of the bishops voiced their agreement.112 The Roman legates, however, again asked that the letter of Pope Leo be read. Eutyches protested, saying that the representatives of the pope had been openly associating with Flavian so that their bias might prejudice the case against him.113 The notary John began reading the acta of the synod in Constantinople of 448. This was carried out without incident, except for several exclamations from the bishops when a particular idea disturbed
them: "No one says that the Lord is two after the union! Don't divide the indivisible! Nestorius thinks that way." At one point Dioscorus had to intervene: "Be quiet a little! We shall hear other impieties. Why do we blame Nestorius alone? There are many Nestorii! (πολλοί Νεστοριοί εἰσιν)."

After reading the acta of the synodos endemousa and those of the imperial commissions established to investigate its decisions, Dioscorus requested that all the bishops give their opinion regarding the orthodoxy of Eutyches. Seven or eight of the more important bishops, together with Barsumas, pronounced short statements, indicating their approval of Eutyches' theology. Another ninety-three bishops merely gave their assent without any additional comment. The notary John read the letter which the monks of Eutyches' monastery wrote to the council, and Dioscorus, after examining their faith, declared them all restored to communion.

The work of the council seemed accomplished. The sentence of the council in Constantinople had been revoked and Eutyches had recovered all of his ecclesiastical dignity. But Dioscorus had further plans in mind. He asked the bishops to give him their opinion of anyone who taught otherwise than the Council of Nicaea. Thalissius of Caesarea immediately exclaimed that anyone who went beyond the teachings of Nicaea could not be received as orthodox. Several bishops made similar statements, and finally an acclamation made the agreement universal. The proposition seemed harmless enough in itself.

Dioscorus now had the mandate he wanted. Since Flavian and Eusebius—by insisting on the two natures after the union—had obviously taught things beyond the doctrine of Nicaea, he said, "we declare them deprived of every priestly and episcopal dignity." He asked each of the bishops to communicate his opinion on this matter, and he added, as a threat, that all of this would quickly be made known to the emperor.

This proceeding came as a shock to many of the bishops. Flavian cried out in protest, and the deacon Hilarus, forgetting his need for an interpreter, shouted "contradicitur!" The acta of the council, drawn up by the notaries of Dioscorus, told of no further disturbance at this point. They continued only with the vote on the condemnation of Flavian. Again, the more important bishops presented short statements agreeing with Dioscorus, while the less distinguished members of the council (about 140 in all) merely signed their names to the document drawn up by the Egyptian notaries.

Fortunately, we know something of the proceedings of the council from sources not dependent upon the good will of the bishop of Alexandria. From these, we see why few bishops openly opposed the actions of Dioscorus, although many later claimed that they really supported Flavian. In the words of Theodore of Claudiopolis, "What were we to do?
They made sport of murdering us. (τί εἶχομεν ποιήσαι; εἶς τὸ αἷμα ἠμῶν ἐπαιξάν σῶται).120

Indeed, the violence which Dioscorus had at his disposal appears to have intimidated his opponents completely. Onesophoros of Iconium reported that when he and his fellow bishops heard Dioscorus announce the deposition of Flavian, they could hardly believe their ears:

I, taking some other bishops with me, stood up and besought him [Dioscorus], saying, “Don’t! I beg of you. He does not deserve to be deposed. But if he deserves to be censured, let him be censured.” He [Dioscorus] rose from his throne and, standing on his footstool, he said, “Do you threaten me with violence? (στάσιν ὑ,οτ κινείτε;) Bring in the counts!” And thus fearing we signed.121

Basil of Seleucia, attempting to justify his failure to defend Flavian at the Latrocinium, accused Dioscorus:

You imposed much force (πολλῇ ἀνάγκῃ) upon us, both from outside [the church] and from inside, as well as from the church and the monks—both those with Barsumas and the parabalani—rose up, along with another great crowd.123 After the deposition of the blessed Flavian you forced us into such a crime by the threats of the great crowd.124

Marianos of Sunadoi confirmed the story of Basil and Onesophoros:

Thus a crowd assembled and we remained hanging on his [Dioscorus’] knees and beseeching him. And he shouted out, “Where are the counts?” I say this as a lover of the truth. The counts came in and brought along the proconsul who had with him chains and a great crowd. Finally, each one of us signed.125

Certainly, we must regard the testimony of these bishops with some suspicion. It was given at the Council of Chalcedon, and the prelates were anxious to explain their actions in the best possible light. Nevertheless, the agreement of their accounts suggests veracity, and they accurately reflect the situation in Ephesus as we know it to have been from other sources: Dioscorus was clearly in control, and he could rely on the soldiers of the comites and the proconsul, as well as the monks of Barsumas and the parabalani, for active support. The bishops, however, several times mentioned a great crowd (plethos) which participated in the intimidation of the supporters of Flavian. It is tempting to identify this as an angry group of laymen, such as had gathered in Ephesus during the council of 431. This suggestion is supported by the report of Nestorius that the people of Ephesus cooperated with the monks of Eutyches in a campaign of terrorism directed at their opponents:

All of those with Eutyches—they were monks—were in the enjoyment of great liberty and authority . . . so that they delivered unto the chiefs themselves and unto the inhabitants of the city all those who were indicated unto them. For
every man was made subject to them. And they were carrying off men, some from the ships, some from the streets and houses, and others while they were praying from the churches. They pursued those who fled. And with all zeal they sought out and dug up those who were hiding in caves and in holes of the earth. And it was a matter of great fear and danger for a man to speak with the adherents of Flavian on account of those who were dwelling in the neighborhood and keeping watch as spies to see who entered in unto them.\textsuperscript{136}

This graphic description is clear evidence that some of the people of Ephesus actively cooperated with the forces of Dioscorus: only natives could have acted as "spies" in the neighborhoods of the city. Further, by noting that the monks of Eutyches delivered their enemies to "the chiefs" and "the inhabitants of the city," we should infer that popular sentiment in Ephesus was generally opposed to Flavian and in accord with the teaching of Dioscorus. Finally, and perhaps most remarkably, this passage reveals something of the careful organization which the bishop of Alexandria had established in the city: contact was maintained with supporters at the local level to the point that no one could be certain he was not speaking with an agent of Dioscorus.

As a result of all this, the legates of Pope Leo fled from Ephesus in fear of their lives, leaving their property behind them. Obviously, they were considered men who spoke "with the adherents of Flavian."\textsuperscript{127}

Flavian himself died a short time after his deposition. Most of the ancient sources say this happened on his way to exile, as a result of the ill treatment he had received at the council.\textsuperscript{128} In this connection, the acta of the Council of Chalcedon preserve some interesting testimony. Diogenes, the bishop of Cyzicus, said: "Barsumas, who is among them, killed the blessed Flavian. He stood up and said, 'Kill him!'" (σφάξον) All the reverend bishops cried out: "Barsumas destroyed all Syria! (πασαν Συρίαν Βαρσουμᾶς ήφάνεν). He brought down upon us a thousand monks... Throw the murderer Barsumas out! To the stadium with the murderer! Anathema to Barsumas. Exile him!"\textsuperscript{129} Scholars have doubted this testimony, unquestionably given in a moment of anger and emotion, and it is unlikely that Barsumas himself actually killed Flavian. But open violence obviously characterized the deposition of the bishop, and it is likely that the monks of Barsumas played a role in his death.

The second Council of Ephesus—less some of its more important members—assembled again on August 22. At this session, the bishops deposed Ibas, his nephew Daniel, Iraneus of Tyre (the former comes and friend of Nestorius), Aquilinios of Byblos, Theodoret, and Domnus of Antioch.\textsuperscript{130} This session was conducted quietly and without incident, so it need not detain us further.

\textbf{The Aftermath in Constantinople}

The emperor Theodosius naturally was pleased with the outcome of the
council, and he issued a law confirming its enactments.\textsuperscript{131} He wrote to Valentinian III, Galla Placidia, and Licinia Eudoxia, saying that all was well in the East; ecclesiastical harmony had been restored with no damage to the faith.\textsuperscript{132}

Yet, there is evidence that all was not as peaceful in the church of Constantinople as Theodosius claimed. The empress Pulcheria certainly opposed the action of the council, as she was soon to demonstrate,\textsuperscript{133} and Pope Leo kept up a continuous correspondence with a wide range of people in the capital. In October of 449, he wrote to the “honorable clergy and people (\textit{plebs})\textsuperscript{134} living in Constantinople.” The pope advised his readers that he had good hope for the future. He realized, however, that at present their church was in difficulty through the impiety of treacherous men (\textit{nunc quia ecclesiam vestram hac ratione cognovimus dissipatam . . . ut pro catholicae fidei defensione perfidorum nequitiae resistatis}).\textsuperscript{135}

On the same day, the pope wrote another letter, similar in content, to the priests and archimandrites Faustus, Martinus, Petrus, and Emmanuel.\textsuperscript{136} This letter shows that the same monastic sentiment which had favored Flavian before the Latrocinium continued after the council. This was all the more significant because the victors at the Latrocinium were surprisingly slow in following up their advantage in Constantinople. In particular, the emperor and his ecclesiastical advisers hesitated in the election of a new bishop, and the vacant see was not filled until March or April of 450, some seven or eight months after the deposition of Flavian. The new bishop Anatolius wrote to Pope Leo, indicating the confusion in the city which caused the long delay in his appointment:

\begin{quote}
Thus there arose boundless division of opinion on these matters and all were divided there concerning many ideas.\textsuperscript{137}
\end{quote}

As a result of this situation, the supporters of Flavian must have maintained their control of the churches in Constantinople for a number of months after the Latrocinium. These priests and bishops undoubtedly lost no opportunity to condemn the council and praise the memory of Flavian. Further, the letters of Pope Leo and other similarly minded prelates were frequently read to the assembled crowds. In December of 449, Leo wrote again “to the citizens of Constantinople,” this time congratulating them specifically for resisting heresy and maintaining the truth faith.\textsuperscript{138}

A final indication that there was considerable, if passive, opposition to the second Council of Ephesus among the inhabitants of Constantinople is provided by another letter of Leo, addressed to Theodosius and dated October 17, 449.\textsuperscript{139} This letter is remarkable in its apparent approval of the actions of the emperor and the decisions of the Robber Synod. Silva-Tarouca noted this divergence from the normal position taken by the
pope, and he pointed to the similarities between this letter and another written to Theodosius on the same date. From this evidence, Silva-Tarouca suggested that the first letter—favorable to the Latrocinium—was a falsification of the second letter, carried out at the court under the direction of Chrysaphius.\(^1\) As we have seen, letters were frequently used as propaganda to influence popular opinion one way or another. That Chrysaphius took the trouble to alter the letter of Leo to conform with the decisions of the Robber Synod suggests that there were people who needed to be convinced. Certainly there can have been little resistance to the decisions of the Latrocinium at the court, so opponents must have been found in the houses of the rich or throughout the city as a whole.

The Latrocinium, of all the events selected for discussion in this study, allows us the least certainty in attempting to define and understand popular feeling and action. In part, at least, this is a result of the nature of the sources. But it is possible that popular involvement, both in Constantinople and Ephesus, was much less intense than it had been in 431 or would be—at least in Egypt—in 451. We hear of few incidents of popular action, and these were generally not of a spontaneous nature.

Some differences in the reactions of the crowd in each city are, however, discernible. Support for Flavian was certainly greater in Constantinople than it was in Ephesus. At first this is surprising, since in 431 popular opinion in Constantinople almost universally condemned Nestorius. Flavian and Nestorius—as the latter frequently pointed out—adhered to similar theological positions. Why should people condemn Nestorius and support Flavian if both men taught the same doctrines?\(^2\) The reason for this seems to lie in the differences in the ecclesiastical and political situations at the time of the two controversies.

Flavian was probably a native of Constantinople, and he had many friends among the clergy of the city. Nestorius, on the other hand, had been a stranger in the capital, and he quickly earned the enmity of his clerical subordinates. In 428, despite the support of the emperor, Nestorius gained the reputation of a heretic and a madman. His enemies controlled the pulpits of many churches, and from these they inveighed against the bishop, comparing his theology with that of known heretics. Flavian, although he was without favor at the court, had just presided over a local council which had condemned his opponent. Imperial investigations failed to reveal any impropriety in the bishop's actions, and he maintained control over all the churches of the city. The followers of Eutyches claimed that Flavian represented a revival of Nestorian sentiments, but they were not able to mount a successful campaign to convince people of that charge. Without a church from which to preach his doctrines, Eutyches tried to influence popular opinion by posting public notices, but these were torn down by the followers of Flavian, and the archimandrite himself was threatened with violence. Further, no emo-
tional issue, such as the controversy over the theotokos, came to the surface to galvanize public opinion firmly on one side or another.

The attitude of the monastic community was crucial in both events. In 431, the solidarity of the monks had been an important factor in the overwhelming popular feeling against Nestorius. In 448-49, however, a considerable segment of the monastic community supported Flavian. This is important not only in its own right and in the history of Constantinopolitan monasticism, but it must have had a significant effect in the minds of simple believers. Had Eutyches been able to command the loyalty of all the monks of the capital, he might have been able to rally popular feeling on his behalf.

In both 431 and 449, the emperor espoused causes which might be called “unpopular” in Constantinople, and in both cases we have seen the emperor go to some lengths in an attempt to change that situation. In 448-49, this was represented by the several imperial investigations into the decisions of the synodos endemousa, which apparently had little effect.

It appears that many of the wealthier inhabitants of Constantinople, who were just then heavily burdened by the tribute paid to the Huns, opposed Eutyches—and thus the official religious policy of the emperor. This is not to suggest that these people had no interest in religious matters. Rather, since secular and religious concerns were inextricably bound together, the ill-treatment they received from the government was probably seen as a divine indication of the falseness of Eutyches’ teaching.142

The situation in Ephesus is easier to understand, although we have much less information about crowd involvement there. In 431, the people of Ephesus had united to oppose the bishop of Constantinople (Nestorius) and in 449 they opposed Flavian. They consistently rejected the theology of Antioch for that of Alexandria, and they reacted strongly against the person of the bishop of Constantinople. But there were important differences between the circumstances in 431 and those in 449. While in 431 one has the impression that all the city rose up in anger against Nestorius, in 449 it is not clear that popular involvement was so widespread or so enthusiastic. In part this may have been a result of the position of the bishop of Ephesus. In 431, Memnon had been secure in his own see, and he stood firmly behind the actions of Cyril of Alexandria. In 449, Stephanos had just recently seized the episcopal throne from Bassianos, who continued in active opposition. Moreover, Stephanos was at best a reluctant supporter of Dioscorus. Memnon had closed the churches of Ephesus to the followers of Nestorius and allowed the Egyptian and his company to harangue the faithful concerning the importance of the doctrinal dispute. In 449, the bishop of Ephesus could not be used to rally the people behind any particular doctrinal position. Instead, organization, unity, and enthusiasm had to be imposed from
without, by the monks of Eutyches and Barsamidas and the cortege of Dioscorus of Alexandria. These were efficient in their work, and they enforced their views with a campaign of terrorism and violence.

In fact, violence was the most characteristic feature of the Latrocinium. While one cannot always draw firm conclusions about the role of the crowd in this controversy, it is easy to discern the part that violence played. In Constantinople, of course, we have seen that both sides resorted to violence, the emperor being restrained by popular support of Flavian. At Ephesus, however, careful plans were laid for the intimidation of the enemies of Eutyches, both in the city and in the conciliar church itself. This strategy was successful in that no popular support arose in behalf of Flavian, and the actual outcome of the second Council of Ephesus was determined by the soldiers and monks acting under the orders of Dioscorus.

1. On events during this period see Bury, _Later Roman Empire_, vol. 1, pp. 225-35; Stein, _Histoire_, vol. 1, pp. 285-98; Jones, _Later Roman Empire_, pp. 193-204; J. O. Maenchen-Helfen, _The World of the Huns_; E. A. Thompson, _A History of Attila and the Huns_. Unfortunately, the histories of Socrates and Sozomen, our primary sources for the two previous chapters and eyewitnesses to much of what they reported, end before most of the events discussed in this chapter. For ecclesiastical developments we must turn to the chronicles of Malalas and Theophanes, the so-called _Paschal Chronicle_ and the sixth-century _Ecclesiastical History_ of Evagrius. No secular history of the period survives, but the fragments of Priscus (_FHG_, IV, 71–110) illuminate several important areas. Of the greatest importance for this study are the letters and _acta_ of the first session of the second Council of Ephesus, read into the proceedings at Chalcedon two years later ( _Acta Conciliorum Oecumenicorum [ACO]_ ed. Eduard Schwartz, vol. 2, i [Berlin, 1933]). The acts of subsequent sessions have survived in a Syriac translation (Samuel Perry, _The Second Synod of Ephesus_ [Dartford, 1881]; J. Flemming, _Akten des ephesischen Synode vom Jahre 449_ [Berlin, 1917]). The letters of Pope Leo are edited by Schwartz in _ACO_ and by C. Silva-Tarouca, _S. Leonis Magni epistulae contra Eutychis haeresim_ (Rome, 1934-35). On the ecclesiastical situation in general see P. Batiffol, _La siège apostolique_; Bardy, _Histoire_, pp. 211–24; Duchesne, _Early History of the Christian Church_, vol. 3; A. Grillmeier and H. Bacht, eds., _Das Konzil von Chalkedon_, 3 Vols. (Würzburg, 1951–54).


5. Evagrius, _Historia Ecclesiastica_ 2.14 taken from Priscus, frg. 43 (earthquakes); Marcellinus Comes, pp. 81–82.


8. A. Julicher, "Eutyches (no. 5)," RE 6 (1909). Nothing is known of his early life, except that he claimed in 448 to have been in his monastery for seventy years. If this is accurate, he entered the monastery in 378, undoubtedly at a very early age. To enter the monastery as a child or young man was unusual in this period; he thus had a different experience from the other great monastic leaders of the time. Julicher suggests that he was dedicated to the monastic life at birth. In 448 he also claimed that he had been archimandrite of his monastery for thirty years. What monastery this was we do now know—certainly it could not have been Dalmatou or Rufianae, as these had been ruled by Dalmatius and Hypatius respectively during the previous thirty years.

9. C. Th. 16.5, 66. The Nestorians were to be called Simonians.

10. Synodicon 196-200; Liberatus Breviarium (ACO, II, v) 10. Much of the Nestorian agitation centered outside the empire, particularly in Persian Armenia. It is the central theme in the literature growing out of the affair of the Three Chapters. See the collections on the second Council of Constantinople in J. D. Mansi, Sacrum conciliorum nova et amplissima collectio, 31 vols. [Florence and Venice, 1759-98], and Schwartz, ACO and L. Abramowski, "Der Streit um Diodor und Theodor zwischen den beiden ephesischen Konzilen." Zeitchrift für Kirchengeschichte 57 (1956), 252-87.

11. See the "Tome" of Proclus, ACO. IV, ii, pp. 187-95; the treatise of Cyril is now lost. Cf. Liberatus, Breviarium (ACO, II, v, p. 111).


14. Theophanes Chronographia, A.M. 5933 (ed. de Boor). According to this account Proclus wrote to the eastern bishops about the matter and when John of Antioch answered that Theodore was orthodox the matter was allowed to drop.


17. ACO, I, i, 4, pp. 66. The same decree commands Ireneus, the supporter of Nestorius at Ephesus, to relinquish his seat as bishop of Tyre. Cf. Codex Justinianus 1.1, 3.

18. Theophanes Chronographia, A.M. 5939 (ed. de Boor), p. 97, says that Flavian had been "priest and treasurer" of the Church of Constantinople; also he was "a most holy and virtuous man." The exact date of Flavian's accession is uncertain; Theophanes and the Patria imply that it was late in 447. Proclus had been preceded in death by Dalmatius (440). John of Antioch (441 or 442) and Cyril (444).

19. Theophanes Chronographia, A.M. 5940, (ed. de Boor), p. 98; Nicephorus Callistus Xanthopoulos Historia Ecclesiastica (PG 145-47), col. 1221. Evagrius says that Flavian sent Chrysaphius the sacred vessels of the church (Historia Ecclesiastica 3.3). Despite this explanation for the outbreak of the quarrel, it seems to me likely that the enmity between Flavian and Chrysaphius began even earlier and for more substantial reasons. If later events give any indication, the bond between Eutyches and Chrysaphius was very strong, and the eunuch may have had contact with Dioscorus—or at least Alexandrian theology—before 448. As an official in the administration of Proclus, Flavian would have had an opportunity to make known his theological leanings at an early date. Thus the enmity may have been theological, or at least ecclesiastical, from the beginning. Chrysaphius may even have opposed the election of Flavian. In this connection, it is possible that Chrysaphius had something to do with the "visit" of the monophysite Armenian monks to Constantinople. On Chrysaphius see the article by O. Seeck, RE 3, and P. Goubert, "Le rôle de Sainte Pulchérie et l'eunuque Chrysaphios," in Das Konzil von Chalkedon. On eunuchs and their place in the politics of the period, see J. E. Dunlap, The Office of the Grand Chamberlain in the Later Roman and Byzantine Empires (New York, 1929); R. Guillard, " Fonctions et dignité des eunuques," Études Byzantines 2 (1944), 185-244, and 3 (1945), 179-214; and Jones, Later Roman Empire, pp. 566-72. For an interesting approach to the phenomenon see K. Hopkins, "Eunuchs in Politics in the Later Roman Empire," Proceedings of the Cambridge Philological Society 189 (1963), 62-80.
20. The record of this synod was read, in part, into the *acta* of the first session of the Robber Council of 449, which was in turn read into the *acta* of the first session of the Council of Chalcedon (*ACO*, II, i, 1, pp. 100 ff.). The accusations of Eusebius are found in *ACO*, II, i, 1, pp. 100-01. Cf. Liberatus *Breviarium* (*ACO*, II, v, pp. 113-17). The whole affair of Eutyches is discussed in detail by Eduard Schwartz, “Der Prozess des Eutyches,” *Sitzungsberichte der bayerischen Akademie der Wissenschaften* 5 (1929), 1-93.


23. *ACO*, II, i, 1, p. 126.


29. *ACO*, II, i, 1, pp. 132-34. It could be argued that Eusebius' charge of *stasis* referred only to Eutyches' obvious attempt to win supporters among the monastic community. Yet, if that had been the case, Eusebius would surely have pushed his point, since there was clear evidence that Eutyches had circulated his *tomas* among the monasteries of the capital. Instead, it seems that Eusebius had actually meant to accuse the archimandrite of stirring up open rebellion against Flavian. Another session of the council met on Saturday, the twentieth of November. It concerned itself with an investigation of the theology of Eutyches, as reported by the priest Mamas.

30. *ACO*, II, i, 1, p. 138: “Eutyches with a great crowd of soldiers and monks and officials of . . . the praetorian prefect.”

31. Later Eutyches wrote that Magnus came “for my protection.” On the role of the *silentiarii* see Jones, *Later Roman Empire* pp. 571-72 and 1234. They were under the control of the *praepositus sacri cubiculi*, so Magnus was presumably an underling of Chrisaphius.

32. *ACO*, II, i, 1, p. 138, 21-24. On Flavius Florentius see Seeck's article s.v. “Florentius (13)” *RE* 6. He was praetorian prefect of the East in 428-29, consul in 429, praetorian prefect again in 438-39, and *praefectus urbi* in 442. Sometime between 444 and 448, he attained the rank of patrician. (He is to be distinguished from the Florentius who was a tribune in Ephesus in 431. Between 300 and 450, at least thirteen Florentii are known to have risen to prominence in the imperial service. Another Flavius Florentius, a *comes* of Constantius II, was a correspondent of Athanasius.) The role of Florentius at the synodos *endemousa* is particularly interesting and forms a striking contrast with the position of Candidianus at Ephesus. In 431, the representative of the emperor was not to participate in the discussion—and the council condemned the emperor's bishop. In 448, the representative of Theodosius was to dominate the discussion. This makes the condemnation of Eutyches despite imperial favor all the more difficult to understand.

33. *ACO*, II, i, 1, p. 143, 10-11.

34. *ACO*, II, i, 1, p. 144, 22-23.

35. *ACO*, II, i, 1, p. 145.


37. Nestorius *Bazaar*, pp. 336-40: “But apart (from this) he (Eutyches) was making use of the authority of the emperor . . . Thus, while he was confirming and preparing these things by the authority and by the commands of (his) majesty, all the East was disturbed . . .”

38. E. Schwartz, “Prozess,” 85 ff., suggests that Florentius was a supporter of the party of Eutyches and that he attempted to redeem himself at the *cognitio* the following April (*ACO*, II, i, 1, pp. 172-73): “I did not give this order for I am not one to speak out about theology.” What then caused him not only to accept the deposition of Eutyches in 448 but actually to encourage it? With the soldiers near at hand he certainly cannot have feared to oppose the bishops. See Sellers, *Chalcedon*, p. 69, n.4.

40. *Leo Epistula 21.*

41. Zachariah of Mitylene *Hist. Eccl* 2.2, speaks of thirty-one bishops and twenty-two archimandrites and the Latin translation of the acts (*ACO* II, ii, 1, pp. 20-21) records 31 bishops and 18 archimandrites. See also Bacht, “Die Rolle,” pp. 216, n. 107. Seven of the twenty-three in the Greek text signed through representatives. Marcellus, the last to sign, apparently noticed this and added that his signature was “in my own hand.” It is possible that absent archimandrites supported Eutyches and that members of their houses were persuaded to sign for their leaders. Eutyches speaks of pressure being put upon the monks to sign statements condemning him, but it is unclear whether he meant at the synod or afterwards (probably the latter).

42. Bacht (“Die Rolle,” 218), following U. Chevalier (Répertoire des sources historiques du Moyen Age, vol. I [Paris, 1905], p. 1464) points out that the sources make no mention of the connection between this Faustus and Dalmatius, so he suggests that there were two important monks of the same name. I find his reasoning on this point unconvincing. In fact, the subsequent action of Faustus seems very much in keeping with a son who had been deprived of his father’s position.


45. *ACO*, II, i, 1, p. 130.


47. *ACO*, II, i, 1, p. 95. Eutyches described how Flavian had published the sentence against him “in various chapels and in the monuments of the saints.”


51. anathematizans eos qui dicunt carmem domini nostri Jesu Christi de caelo descendisse et non ex Maria virgine et ex spiritu sancto incarnation, et omnes haeresim usque Simonem magnum.

52. Priscus, frg. 8, *FHG*, IV, pp. 77-95; Thompson, *Attila*, pp. 97-120.


55. Priscus, frg. 8; Thompson, *Attila*, pp. 98 and 102.


59. Theophanes, A.M. 5941, p. 100; Nicephorus Callistus 47, 1225.

60. *ACO*, II, i, 1, p. 187.18.

61. It is difficult to know what this evidence says about popular attitudes. If those crowds who witnessed the punishment of the bishops supported Flavian, the emperor’s actions were meant to serve as a lesson and a warning. It is also possible, of course, that these crowds supported Eutyches and that they joined in the ridicule of the unfortunate churchmen.

62. *Nestorius Bazaar*, p. 341. Cf. Priscus, note 4 above. Nestorius may have confused the motivation for this increase in taxation; it may have been a result of the increased tribute demanded by the Huns rather than a punishment for the supporters of Flavian. See note 64 below.

63. It was shortly after the service on Holy Saturday, since the newly-baptized were all assembled in their white garments.

64. *Nestorius Bazaar*, pp. 431-32. Nestorius then continued with a story which sounds very much like that related by Theophanes about the dispute between Chrysaphius and
Flavian over the eulogiae Theophanes placed this incident at the beginning of Flavian's episcopate, but Nestorius set it early in 449 and he connected it with the heavy taxation placed upon the opponents of Eutyches. According to Nestorius, Theodosius said that "whatever was due" from the church of Constantinople would be exacted "with insult" and without respite. Flavian, then, because he was poor, sent word to the emperor that he could not send the required gold unless he melted down the gifts earlier emperors had made to the church. Theodosius paid no attention to this and Flavian "took out the vessels of the church and they were melted down openly, so that there was weeping and outcry among all those who took part in these exactions that were being made, as though (they were being) subject to persecution." It is difficult to know whether Theophanes or Nestorius is correct in his dating of the event, although Nestorius is the closest in time of any authority. But it is possible that Nestorius and the ecclesiastical historians have misplaced the motivation of the attack on the wealth of the church; it may have been a search for funds to pay the tribute demanded by the Huns, as Priscus says.

65. ACO, II, i, 1, pp. 68-69.

66. Theodosius made the attendance of Theodoret—a strong opponent of Eutyches—dependent upon a special invitation from the council.

67. ACO, II, i, 1, pp. 149-50.

68. ACO, II, i, l, pp. 148-59.

69. Among other things, he demanded that all bishops who had participated in the deposition of Eutyches be made to swear an oath that they would tell the truth. Florentius did not approve this suggestion. ACO, II, i, 1, p. 152.

70. ACO, II, i, 1, pp. 156-76.

71. ACO, II, i, 1, pp. 177-78.

72. ACO, II, i, 1, p. 177

73. Liberatus Breviarium ch. 11. ACO, v, pp. 113-17.

74. Theophanes, A.M. 5930 (ed. de Boor), p. 93.

75. Nestorius Bazaar, p. 341; ACO, II, i, 1, p. 130.

76. Besides his work on the walls of the city, the prefect Cyrus had carried out a restoration of much of the city. In 443, for example, the baths of Achilles, which had burned sometime earlier, were rededicated. See Demetrios J. Constantelos, "Kyros Panopolites, Rebuilder of Constantinople," GRBS, 12 (1971), 451-64.


78. The alliance of the court with the Greens seems to fall in with G. Manojlović's suggestion about the identification of the Greens with the poor and the Blues with the rich. On this, however, see the persuasive work of A. Cameron, Circus Factions, pp. 126-56.

79. It is unfortunate we know so little about the involvement of the Jews in this affair. Francois Nau suggests that the Roman government initiated restrictive measures against the Jews because of a prophecy that they were to assemble in Jerusalem about 440 to form a separate state, "Deux épisodes de l'histoire juive sous Théodose II (432 et 438) d'après la vie de Barsauma le Syrien," Revue des Études Juives 83 (1927), 184-206. Affairs were then brought to a climax by the violence of Barsauma and his monks. It is interesting to note that Jewish hopes in 423 and afterward seem to have been encouraged by Eudocia and her uncle Aselepiodotus, and that the time of the new restrictive measures corresponded with the rise of Chrysaphius, who may be regarded as their instigator. It would thus be reasonable to assume that Jews joined the opposition to Eutyches for three reasons—a general dissatisfaction with recent imperial religious policy, hatred of Chrysaphius, who may have been a persecutor of the Jews, and the closer affinity of Antiochene theology to Jewish beliefs.

80. ACO, II, i, 1, p. 71.


82. ACO, II, i, 1, p. 186. He had to address the council through an interpreter. It is, of course, true that he was not the only member of the council who had to resort to an
The Latrocinium

The representatives of the pope could not speak Greek, and there were several Eastern bishops who also had had a language difficulty.

83. ACO, II, i, 1, p. 71.

84. Cf. Theophanes Chronographia A. M. 5940 (ed. de Boor), p. 100; Nicephorus Callistus, 47, 1225.

85. ACO, II, i, 1, p. 72.

86. Theophanes Chronographie, A. M. 5940, p. 100; Liberatus Breviarium (ACO II, v, p. 117): "Dioscorus vero habebat secum fortissimos milites rei publicae cum monachis Barsumae." Although E lipidius and Proclus must have retained their individual commands, it seemed to the supporters of Flavian that all was done at the instigation of Dioscorus.

87. ACO, II, i, 1, p. 73.

88. The soldiers of Proclus should not be confused with the regular troops of a province, which since the reforms of Diocletian and Constantine, were under the command of the dux. Nor were they probably comitatenses. Instead, they were probably the troops—perhaps "militia" is a better word—used by the governor of a province to preserve order in his capital city. See Jones, Later Roman Empire, p. 374.

89. The term latrocinium was first applied to the council by Pope Leo (Epistula 95) in 451.

90. S. Perry, The Second Synod of Ephesus; J. Flemming, Akten des ephesischen Synoden.


92. Leo Epistula 27 (ACO II, iv, p. 9). C. Silva-Tarouca, S. Leonis Magni Epistolae, considers this letter suspect.


94. Leo Epistula 29 (ACO, II, iv, pp. 9-10); also see Epistula 28.

95. Leo Epistulae 30 (or 31) and 28: (ACO, II, ii, pp. 24-33); Greek, II, i, 1, p. 10-11. The question as to which letter was actually sent to Pulcheria is disputed.

96. ACO, II, i, 1, pp. 66-67.


98. ACO, II, i, 1, p. 75.

99. ACO, II, i, 2, pp. 42-53.

100. ACO, II, i, 1, p. 46.

101. ACO, II, i, 1, p. 46.

102. ACO, II, i, 3, p. 45.

103. ACO, II, i, 3, p. 50. At the council of Chalcedon the bishops accepted the testimony of Bassianos and ordered that he be restored and Stephanos declared deposed. The reasoning for this was that Bassianos had been accepted by Proclus, who was then bishop of Constantinople. Too much weight should not be placed on the decision at Chalcedon, however, for the bishops there were undoubtedly more interested in punishing Stephanos for his alliance with Dioscorus than in establishing the truth about events in Ephesus four years earlier. The officials of the council, moreover, declared both now deposed.

104. It is significant that the notaries of Stephanos, who probably represented the views of their bishop, had to be forced to sign blank papers concerning the events at the council and the condemnation of Flavian. The notaries were kept locked in a church, guarded by soldiers and monks, and no relief was allowed when some of them became sick. Such actions would have been unnecessary had Stephanos supported Dioscorus completely (ACO II, i, 1, p. 88).

105. ACO, II, i, 1, p. 77. This was, of course, the same church in which the first Council of Ephesus had been held. On the Latrocinium in general, see Hefele-Leclercq, Histoire des conciles, vol. 2, pp. 584-606; Duchesne, Early History of the Christian Church, vol. 3, pp. 288-94; Bardy Histoire pp. 220-24.
106. There is some debate as to which of the papal legates were actually present at the council. The primary problem is that while Renatus was named by Leo as one of his ambassadors, his name does not appear in the acts. But Theodoret (Epistula 116) addressed a letter to him after the council, commending him for his actions there. See the discussion of this problem in Hefele-Leclercq, Histoire des conciles, vol. 2, pp. 617-21.

One hundred thirty-five was a small number of bishops to attend an ecumenical council. One hundred fifty-five bishops attended the first session of Ephesus I, excluding the large number of oriental bishops absent at the time; three hundred forty-three attended the first session at Chalcedon. The poor attendance at the Robber Synod may be explained partly by the exclusion of forty-two bishops who had participated in the synod of 448. There were some notable absences at the Latrocinium as well, including Anthemi of Thessalonica.

107. Flavian was seated fifth despite the decree of the Council of Constantinople (381) which placed the bishop of Constantinople second in honor only to the pope. When the list of bishops was read to the fathers at Chalcedon they cried out at this injustice. Stephanos of Ephesos was placed sixth (Memnon had been third at Ephesus I), a further indication that he was not as helpful to Dioscorus as he might have been.

108. The notarii of Dioscorus, of course, recorded the minutes of the council, and we may suspect them of suppressing things which did not redound to the glory of the bishop of Alexandria. They may also have restricted their activities to note-taking. At the council of Chalcedon Theodorus, the bishop of Claudiopolis in Isauria, said: "The notarii of Dioscorus are crying out!" Dioscorus replied, "I have only two notarii. How can they cause a disturbance (θόρυβος) ?" At Ephesus the notarii of Stephanos began to take notes for themselves. When the secretaries of Dioscorus saw this, they ran to the offenders and snatched away their tablets, almost breaking their fingers in the process.

109. ACO, II, i, 1, p. 85.
110. ACO, II, i, 1, pp. 85-86.
111. Nestorius Bazaar, p. 351.
112. ACO, II, i, 1, pp. 97-99.
113. ACO, II, i, 1, p. 99.
114. ACO, II, i, 1, p. 118.
115. ACO, II, i, 1, pp. 182-86. It is interesting that Basil of Seleucia, Aethericus of Smyrna, and Seleucus of Amasia were allowed to vote for Eutyches, even though they should have been excluded because they had participated in the council in Constantinople the previous fall.

116. ACO, II, i, 1, pp. 186-91. Hilarus, the papal legate, again asked that the letter of Leo be read and again his request was ignored.

117. ACO, II, i, 1, p. 191.
118. ACO, II, i, 1, p. 191.
119. ACO, II, i, 1, p. 191. 29-31; II, iii, 1, p. 238.
120. ACO, II, i, 1, p. 76. Theodore said that Dioscorus had a "crowd . . . of disorderly individuals, many of them crying out and causing disturbance and condemning the council." He claimed that one hundred thirty-five bishops originally supported Flavian, while Dioscorus controlled only forty-two. After the disturbance, however, the supporters of Flavian numbered only fifteen.

121. ACO, II, i, 1, p. 180. The other bishops who cooperated with Onesiphoros were Marinos of Synadee, Nounechios of Laodicia "and others."

122. τὴν δὲ ἐνδοθεν does not occur in all of the manuscripts, but Schwartz puts it into his text. I understand τὴν δὲ ἐνδοθεν to refer to the threats of Dioscorus.

123. ACO, II, i, 1, p. 179. εἰσέτρεχον γὰρ εἰς τὴν ἐκκλησίαν στρατιώται μετὰ διπλον καὶ εἰσήγαγον αὐτὸν μετὰ παραβαλανείς καὶ πλῆθος άλλο πολύ. Εἰς τὴν δὲ ἐνδοθεν δέ γε γίγαιναι παρεννείται μετὰ τε διπλον καὶ πλῆθος άλλο πολύ.

124. ACO, II, i, 1, p. 179: τὰς ἀπελαίς τοῦ πολλοῦ πλήθους.

125. ACO, II, i, 1, p. 180. εἰσήγαγον αὐτὸν καὶ εἰσήγαγον τὸν ἀνδρόπατον μετὰ


127. Prosper of Aquitaine (I, 304) says that Hilarus feared the military. Leo Epistula 50 (ACO, II, iv. p. 21): “Hilarus fugiens”; Leo Epistula 46 (ACO, II, iv, pp. 27–28); “omnia in Epheso contra canones per tumultus et odia seculatia a Dioscoro episcopo gesta sunt.”

128. Liberatus, Breviarium (ACO, II, vi. p. 118); Prosper says that the violence was done by those carrying him into exile; the Breviculum Historiae Eutychianistarum says that he died in Epipa and admits that it may have been from natural causes. Nicephorus Callistus dates his death three days after his condemnation (14, 47). Theophanes gives the same date and says that Dioscorus actually inflicted the wounds himself (A.M. 5941, p. 100). See, however, H. Chadwick, “The Exile and Death of Flavian of Constantinople: A Prologue to the Council of Chalcedon,” JTS n.s. 6 (1955), 17–34.

129. ACO, II, i. 2. p. 116


132. Leo Epistulae 55–58 (letters from the West); Epistulae 62–64 (replies of Theodosius).

133. Cf. Leo Epistula 60.

134. The Greek translation of this letter renders plebs as laos.

135. Leo Epistula 50 (ACO, II, iv, p. 21).

136. Leo Epistula 51 (ACO, II, iv, pp. 25–26); Greek translation in ACO, II, i, 1, pp. 51–52. The archimandrites never received this letter. Note that Faustus and Martianos had signed the condemnation of Eutyches at the council in Constantinople the preceding November (ACO, II, i, 1, p. 146, nos. 32 and 33). See Bacht, “Die Rolle;” p. 233.

137. Leo Epistula 53 (ACO, II, iv, p. xxxvi).


141. Of course, the theological positions of Flavian and Nestorius were not identical; see A. Grillmeier, Christ in Christian Tradition, pp. 457–58. But nearly any of the charges made against Nestorius (with the important exception of the theotokos) could be made against Flavian, and we must presume that the supporters of Eutyches used these same arguments against Flavian.

142. The fact that Chrysaphius strongly supported Eutyches must have been known to all. This connection of the archimandrite with the powerful eunuch must not have endeared the former in the eyes of the upper classes in Constantinople. See K. Hopkins, “Eunuchs in Politics,” pp. 62–80.