THE COUNCIL OF CHALCEDON: CONSTANTINOPLE AND ALEXANDRIA

Toward a New Policy

The episcopal throne of Constantinople stood vacant for some time after the deposition and death of Flavian.¹ Probably in March or April of 450, Theodosius II called together a number of clerics who elected Anatolius, an Egyptian deacon and apocrisiarius, as bishop.² Someone less loyal to the decisions of the Latrocinium might not have been trusted to deal with affairs in the capital.

In the letter he sent to the pope, Anatolius made no profession of faith. In July of 450, Leo wrote to the orthodox archimandrites and clerics of Constantinople, saying that he was surprised by the lack of candor on the part of the new bishop. Not only had he failed to give an account of his own beliefs, but he had not even mentioned the scandal which had infected the church of Constantinople. Accordingly, Leo informed the archimandrites, he was sending the bishops Abundius and Aetius and the presbyters Basil and Senator to Constantinople, armed with a collection of appropriate texts from the Fathers. These men, together with the archimandrites themselves, would attempt to correct all those who had been led astray through force or their own simplicity.³ The pope expressed similar sentiments in contemporary letters addressed to Pulcheria and Theodosius.⁴

The letter destined for the emperor was never delivered. For on July 26, 450, Theodosius fell from his horse while hunting near the River Lycus. He suffered a serious injury, and two days later he died.⁵ Valentinian III was the sole living Augustus, and in constitutional theory the rule of the entire empire should have devolved upon him. But Pulcheria, the elder sister of Theodosius, was in a position to seize power in Constantinople; according to one tradition, the emperor had entrusted the affairs of state
to her just before he died.\(^6\) Realizing that she would need the aid of a man in maintaining her power, Pulcheria called upon Marcian, a distinguished Illyrian (or Thracian) army officer and senator.\(^7\) The empress agreed to marry him, on condition that he honor her vow of perpetual virginity, and on August 25 she crowned him *augustus* in the palace of Hebdomon.\(^8\)

Not long after his succession, Marcian summoned the Council of Chalcedon, which ultimately reversed the decisions made at the Robber Synod. Scholars usually assign this drastic change in imperial religious policy to the sudden death of Theodosius and the coronation of Marcian: Theodosius was a monophysite while Marcian supported the theology of the two natures.\(^9\) There is undoubtedly some truth in this reconstruction, at least as it applies to Marcian. Yet, there is evidence which suggests that the change in imperial policy began even before the death of Theodosius and that Marcian only carried out a design that his predecessor had envisioned late in his life.

Our principal authority for this view is Theophanes. In 450, he reports that Theodosius “reconsidered” (ἐπιλογισάμενος) the events of the past few years and came to the conclusion that Chrysaphius had deceived him “concerning the impiety of Flavian.” Accordingly, he had the eunuch exiled to a certain island. He further decided that Eudocia was the cause of all the evils besetting him, and especially of the disgrace of Pulcheria, and he ordered his wife to retire to Jerusalem.\(^10\) Theodosius then recalled Pulcheria from her retreat in the Hebdomon and she arranged a solemn procession to honor the remains of Flavian, which were deposited in the church of the Holy Apostles.\(^11\)

Paul Goubert has discussed at some length the evidence for these events. In the end, he concluded that the account of Theophanes is probably correct, although he was a little disturbed by the failure of any contemporary source (such as Leo or Liberatus) to mention the change in the emperor’s theological position. Such a silence is, however, not surprising. Since the recall of Pulcheria occurred only a short time before the death of Theodosius, the pope probably did not hear of it until after the accession of Marcian. After that event, the wisest course for the orthodox was to impute the change to the ruling emperor. The story—which is found in Malalas and those who follow him—that Theodosius called his sister to his bedside indicates that an account of Pulcheria’s early return (and hence a change in imperial religious policy) was known at least as early as the mid-sixth century.\(^13\)

The recall of Pulcheria must be seen as part of a fundamental change in imperial policy, and we must ask ourselves what caused Theodosius to contemplate such a turnabout. In the first place, we should observe that this change was not unprecedented in the reign of Theodosius II—we have already discussed several similar examples which are usually inter-
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interpreted as evidence of the weak will of the emperor. As Goubert observed, it is unlikely that the news of the scandalous activities at Ephesus and the death of Flavian were enough to change the emperor's mind. Several letters from the imperial chancery, still controlled by Chrysaphius, show that at least as late as spring of 450 Theodosius continued to support the actions of the Robber Synod. Goubert suggested that Pulcheria, strengthened by the resolve of the papacy and the Western court and encouraged by dissident army officers in Constantinople itself, forced her will upon the weak resolve of her brother.14

In fact, one need not refer to the weakness of Theodosius to explain his change of policy. He merely had to “reconsider”—Theophanes’ ἑπιλογισάμενος—the ecclesiastical and political situation in Constantinople to arrive at this conclusion. For, in the months following the Latrocinium, the foreign and domestic situation of the Eastern empire had deteriorated dramatically. This, of course, strengthened the position of those who opposed imperial policy—both secular and religious—and it must have caused the emperor to review that policy. According to Theophanes, early in 450 the East was again seriously threatened by incursions of both the Huns and the Vandals.15 In the spring of that year, the government of Theodosius negotiated a surprisingly favorable peace with Attila, and this danger seemed alleviated.16

But, at about the same time, a more serious threat arose to frighten the emperor. It will be remembered that the magister militum Zeno had joined with Attila in demanding the life of Chrysaphius. By 450 the ambitions of the Isaurian had reached a higher plane: Theodosius suspected him of seeking the throne for himself. As John of Antioch tells us, Theodosius was always willing to forgive any other fault, but he was an implacable enemy of anyone who plotted revolution. In his wrath against Zeno, the emperor dispatched land and sea forces to Isauria; unfortunately, we are ignorant of the outcome of this expedition, although Daniel and Baudon, otherwise unknown to us, were implicated in the revolt and killed by the agents of the emperor.17 Finally, to complete the demoralizing picture, severe natural disasters again struck Constantinople in the twelve months following the Latrocinium.18

As we have seen, the dyophysite opposition in Constantinople was well organized around the clergy and monks of the capital, and it included many wealthy individuals. In the aggravated conditions of late spring and early summer of 450, Theodosius must have feared a repetition of the disturbances which had followed the deposition of Eutyches in 448, and he may have turned a more receptive ear to the followers of Flavian. As he had done two years earlier—and at many other times during his reign—the emperor undermined the coalition of his enemies by acceding to the demands of some of them. The opponents of the Robber Synod
may not have favored the revolt of Zeno, but their resistance to imperial religious policy made them dangerous natural allies of the usurper.

The rehabilitation of Flavian eliminated one source of dissatisfaction and allowed Theodosius to devote his attention to other problems. Of course, it is impossible to be certain what the emperor would have done had he lived. But one might speculate that his policy would have included the "restoration" of Flavian to a place of honor and the condemnation of Eutyches—which most of the later monophysites accepted. However, he probably would not have called another ecumenical council and imposed a strict dyophysite theology. Nevertheless, it would seem that Theodosius did abandon his support of the decisions of the Robber Synod, and his characterization as a monophysite emperor must be seriously questioned. Further, it is interesting to speculate on the changes in the fate of the empire had Theodosius been successful in imposing a compromise instead of the divisive theology of Chalcedon.

Marcian was well aware of the forces which had disturbed the reign of Theodosius, and immediately after his coronation he set about to deal with them. As indicated above, discontent in Constantinople—in both religious and secular matters—was greatest among the upper classes. The senators and wealthy landowners complained most bitterly about the financial exactions of the state, and they were most active in leading the opposition to the decrees of the Robber Synod. Marcian was himself of senatorial rank, and we should expect him naturally to sympathize with the interests of his peers, but the fear of opposition must also have induced the new emperor to follow a policy more consistently favorable to the wealthy of the empire.

Marcian clearly realized what the heart of such a policy must be: a return to orthodoxy and a reduction of the huge tribute paid yearly to Attila. With the determination (or rashness?) which characterized his whole reign, Marcian dispatched a message to Attila, informing him that the empire would no longer pay any of the tribute demanded. The removal of this huge drain on the imperial treasury made possible several other measures designed to win the support of the upper classes. Perhaps the most important of these were the remission of all tax arrears for the years 437–47 and the abolition of the tax on the property of senators (the *collatio glebalis* or *follis*), which had been collected since the time of Constantine. The execution of Chrysaphius, which Marcian ordered almost immediately, also pleased these same individuals.

As part of this general policy, Marcian openly demonstrated his opposition to the decisions of the Robber Synod. He recalled those who had been exiled for their support of Flavian, and Pulcheria prepared a grand reception for some of them in Constantinople. Late in 450, both the emperor and the empress wrote to Pope Leo, reporting the arrival of
his legates and offering to hold a new council in the East. Pulcheria described the ceremonial return she had arranged for the remains of Flavian and informed the pope that Anatolius had finally agreed to sign the Tome and accept the theology of Leo.

Efforts must have been made to convert the Eutychians, and in June of 451, Leo was able to write to Pulcheria rejoicing in the catholic faith of the priests and people of Constantinople. In the same letter, the pope requested that Eutyches be removed from his position as archimandrite and that he be replaced by a monk of correct theological views. Given the ecclesiastical situation in Constantinople, this was a perfectly reasonable request, and one might wonder why this had not been done much earlier. But the reasons the pope gave for his request are particularly interesting, and they provide us with our first piece of evidence since the Latrocinium about the supporters of Eutyches.

Concerning Eutyches, the author of all scandal and perversity, may your clemency [Pulcheria] order that he be taken away from that place [his monastery], which is too close to the city of Constantinople. For it is to be feared that he will make use (utatur) of his heretical disciples who come often to console him (frequentioribus solatius).

The meaning of this statement is clear. The pope feared that the supporters of Eutyches—presumably his monks—would spread heretical ideas throughout the city, nullifying the efforts he and the empress had been making among the inhabitants of the capital. In order to avoid such difficulties, the pope advised Pulcheria to remove Eutyches from his monastery, which was "too close to the city of Constantinople."

At about the same time eighteen orthodox archimandrites presented a petition to the emperor, requesting him to allow them to deal with the heretics in whatever way they should see fit. Presumably the monks wished to use persuasion and argumentation in hopes of converting the ordinary adherents of the theology of Eutyches. But there was a class of heretics whom the archimandrites considered more dangerous. These were the memoritai—hermits who lived in the shrines of martyrs (martyria) rather than in regular coenobitic monasteries. Either because the churches and monasteries of Constantinople had been closed to them, or because the hermits of the capital generally supported Eutyches, these martyria had become the centers of Eutychianism in Constantinople. In particular, there was one "cave" (σπηλαΐον) where these "savage men live and every day blaspheme Christ, the savior of all." The monks asked the emperor to close this place immediately.

The Eutychian monks, in the meantime, had not been idle. They also presented a petition to the emperor, which was later read into the acta of the Council of Chalcedon. In this document, they complained that while
there was dissension among the Christians of Constantinople, Jews and pagans were left in peace. It was the duty of the emperor, they claimed, to secure harmony and agreement among all Christians. Such a solution would surely result from the forthcoming ecumenical council, but until that body met, the emperor should take measures against those who were persecuting the Eutychians. Their enemies, the monks contended, were inciting disturbances (stases) and forcing them to sign anti-Eutychian statements. They closed their petition with an appeal that no one be driven “either from monastery, or church, or martyr’s shrine” until the council could settle the matter once and for all.

Apparently, force was being used against the supporters of Eutyches in Constantinople. This petition, and that of the orthodox monks discussed above, provide us with no evidence with which to identify the persecutors. It is likely that the orthodox ecclesiastical party—made up primarily of monks, but by this time including the bishop of the city and the emissaries of the pope—would have been most concerned to secure signatures to an anti-Eutychian creed. And it is not impossible that the officials of the court had begun to persecute the “heretics.” But the terrorism directed against the Eutychian monks may also have been a reaction on the part of the faithful of Constantinople. Most of the clergy of the city had remained loyal to Flavian and now, with the emperor and the bishop on their side, they were freely able to use their position to condemn the Eutychians. Spontaneous crowd action against the heretics may well have followed.

At Chalcedon, the Eutychian monks delivered their petition in person; they were accompanied by the eunuch Kalopodias and the Syrian archimandrite Barsumas. The fathers of the council had some doubt about the status of the Eutychians, and they called upon the orthodox monks to identify their adversaries. The orthodox agreed that three of the Eutychians were archimandrites as they had claimed. Seven of them they could not identify, and another seven they declared to be memoritai rather than regular monks. The charge that these men were the inhabitants of martyria rather than ordinary monasteries was obviously meant to detract from the testimony of the Eutychians.

One must suppose from this testimony that monastic organization in Constantinople had become firm and regularized in the second quarter of the fifth century. A certain number of would-be monks either refused to join the regular establishments or were excluded from them, and the regular monks looked with scorn on their more independent colleagues. It is significant that this split in the monastic movement corresponded to the division of opinion which we witnessed in the beginning of the Eutychian controversy. It is also interesting that the focus of this more independent monastic tradition was the martyrium. Tombs of the martyrs had, of course, been important points of Christian assembly from an early period,
and great ascetics such as Hypatius and Daniel the Stylite had inhabited tombs in more recent times. Nevertheless, there was always the danger of excess, and Gregory of Nazianzus complained that the *martyria* had become places of banqueting and merrymaking:

> At one time those who wished to gain the favor of demons celebrated impure banquets for them. We Christians abolished this practice and established spiritual assemblies for our martyrs. But now a certain dread has seized me. Listen, you who love banquets! You desert us for the rites of demons.  

> I bear witness, prize-winners and martyrs, the belly-lovers (φιλογαστορίδαι) have converted your honors into licentiousness. You do not desire a sweet-smelling table or cooks; but they honor you with belching rather than righteousness.

Thus those associated with the *martyria* were accused of excess and scandal; further, if one accepts the testimony of Gregory, the shrines of the martyrs had become centers for the continuation of openly pagan practices.

H. Bacht has stressed a social distinction between the *memoritai* and the rest of the monastic community of the capital, suggesting that the *memoritai* were poor and generally of the lower classes. Certainly, the social status of the latter cannot be compared to that of the leaders of the regular monasteries, such as Faustos; one of the *memoritai* was identified as a former bear trainer—the same lowly occupation as that practiced by the empress Theodora’s father. Yet, we should be careful of such an assessment where there is simply very little evidence. Further, it is difficult to know what to make of the information that three of the *memoritai* had several “names,” either in the Xylokerkos or in the Philippou, two of the racecourses in the city; thus, Hypses had “two or three ‘names’ in the Xylokerkos,” while Kallinikos had “ten ‘names’ in a martyr’s shrine in the Xylokerkos.” Hefele-Leclercq translated the former of these as “celui-ci habite au cirque de bois avec deux ou trois compagnons qui il appelle ses moines.” The names may therefore refer simply to the monks which each of these *memoritai* had under his authority. Even so, it is certainly surprising to find monks living in two of the racecourses of the capital, which were regarded as the centers of much of the disreputable activity in the city.

Everything considered, no one would claim that popular opinion was the determining factor in the summoning of the Council of Chalcedon. Pulcheria and Marcian were both personally committed to a reversal of the decisions of the Latrocinium, and they acted accordingly. Nevertheless, the strong feelings which had divided the capital in 449 and 450 may well have played a role in the changes in policy made by Theodosius just before his death—changes which led to the recall of Pulcheria and the
ultimate elevation of Marcian. Further, there was no popular outcry against the religious policies of the new emperor, and popular sentiment in Constantinople can only have strengthened Marcian in his resolve.

Supporters of Eutyches, and even the archimandrite himself, continued to live in the city, and there was some concern that they would spread their doctrines among the population. The leadership of Anatolius, however, was half-hearted, and the supporters of Flavian undoubtedly retained their positions within the urban hierarchy. This control of the public voice of the church and the opposition of the monasteries to the Latrocinium must have been important factors in the failure of the Eutychians to generate any favorable climate of opinion in Constantinople. Not only did the monasteries add prestige to the cause of Pulcheria and Marcian, but they and their supporters actively and violently persecuted the Eutychian monks whom they regarded not only as heretics, but also as renegades who had divorced themselves from the proper traditions of the monastic movement.

The Meeting of the Council

On May 23, 451, Marcian sent a letter to all the bishops of the empire, asking them to assemble before the first of September in Nicaea to attend an ecumenical council. The emperor promised to appear in person unless the necessities of war prevented him from doing so.

During the late summer of 451, the bishops began to assemble in Nicaea, but the Hunnic raids in Illyria demanded the attention of the emperor and he did not appear on the appointed date. The bishops did not dare to begin the council without him—the papal legates were also still in Constantinople. But they wrote to him, complaining that the delay was difficult, especially for the aged and sickly among them. Marcian replied, asking them to wait until he should be able to come to Nicaea.

Probably at about the same time Pulcheria wrote to a military commander in Bithynia, instructing him concerning the situation in Nicaea. It had come to the attention of the court, she remarked, that certain clerics, monks, and laymen intent on creating a disturbance were mingling with the bishops. Pulcheria ordered that

with all firmness you shall cast out of the city, and all the area around it, those [who are there] without our summons or the permission of their own bishops, whether these be clerics who live there (αυτόθι ενδημούντες κληρικοί), both those of a regular rank and those who are not in communion with their bishops, or monks, or laymen who have no business at a council.

In closing, the empress warned the imperial official that he would be held responsible should any of the local troublemakers (τίς τοῦ λοιποῦ τῶν θρονοποιῶν ενδημίων) make an appearance.
It seems reasonable to assume that those who were threatening to disturb the council were supporters of Dioscorus and Eutyches. It is interesting, therefore, to note that some of the lower clergy of Nicaea and the surrounding territory appear to have supported Eutyches. Remembering the care taken by Theodosius II to secure order at his councils, and anticipating the importance of the imperial officials at Chalcedon, it hardly seems likely that the letter of Pulcheria represents the first thought the court gave to security at the forthcoming council. It may be that the letter to the military official in Nicaea was either a "reminder" to him or an indication that events in the city had already progressed beyond a point at which an ordinary show of force was enough to control the discontented crowd. In fact, the unstable conditions in Nicaea may have had something to do with the emperor's decision not to come to the city and to move the council to nearby Chalcedon, where the unruly crowd might be controlled more easily. Atticus, a deacon of the church of Constantinople, however, reported to the emperor that the bishops were unwilling to go to Chalcedon, since they feared some violence from the partisans of Eutyches:

Marcian replied in a longer letter, pleading with the bishops and assuring them that they need fear no violence even though they would be close to Constantinople. "For we hope . . . that each of you will be able to return without any disturbance or riot" (tarache or thorybos). Unfortunately, we have no information as to the identity of these supporters of Eutyches, whose reputation for violence reached even the bishops assembled in Nicaea. But it is probable that they were—or were led by—the monks and memoritai mentioned above.

On October 8, 451, the Council of Chalcedon opened in the church of St. Euphemia. Representing the emperor were a large number of imperial officials (archontes), including the patrician and ex-consul Anatolius, the praetorian prefect Palladius, the prefect of the city Tatianos, Vincomalus the magister officiorum, and Sporacius the comes domesticorum. Representing the Senate were a number of other illustrious men, including the patricians Florentius and Nomus, several ex-prefects, and two former praepositi sacri cubiculi. Bishop Paschasinus of Lilybaeum, in Sicily, represented Pope Leo and, together with the imperial officials, he presided over the council.

From the beginning, the assembly was divided into two hostile camps: those who supported Dioscorus, and those who accepted the theology of Leo and Flavian. Since Marcian had made clear his own position, the Eutychians were on the defensive. At the first meeting, the opposing sides hurled violent invectives at one another, each side accusing the other of
illegality, either at the Latrocinium or at the present council. The reading of the minutes of the synod in Constantinople (448) and the Robber Council occupied most of the day. When the officials closed the assembly with the Trisagion, it was already dark.

The second meeting of the council, held on October 10, concerned itself more fully with matters of doctrine, but no agreement could be reached. The officials suggested that the council adjourn for five days, during which the more important bishops would gather in an attempt to find some grounds for reconciliation.

The synod met again on October 13 in the martyrion of the church of St. Euphemia. Dioscorus and the imperial representatives were absent. Aetius, the archdeacon of Constantinople, effectively directed the session, although Paschasinus still held the place of greatest honor. Eusebius of Dorylaeum, appearing in his familiar role of accuser, brought forward a complaint against Dioscorus. Although he mentioned the alleged heresy of the bishop's views, the emphasis of his statement concerned the violence and illegality Dioscorus had perpetrated at the second Council of Ephesus. Eusebius demanded that he be allowed to confront Dioscorus personally, and Paschasinus sent clerics to summon the bishop. Dioscorus, however, had an excuse ready for every occasion, and he refused to make an appearance.

When the canonical three summonses had failed to bring Dioscorus to the assembly, several of the bishops declared that he should be deposed because of his unjust and illegal actions. The papal legates accordingly declared Dioscorus deprived of his ecclesiastical rank, and over three hundred bishops indicated their agreement by placing their signatures at the end of the minutes of the session.

The council then sent a brief notice to Dioscorus, informing him that he had been deposed because of his action “against the divine canons” and his refusal to obey the summons to appear before the council. The bishops made no mention of his heretical theology. They sent a similar note to the clergy of the church of Alexandria who were then in Chalcedon, mentioning by name the oikonomos Charmosynus who was presumably then regarded as the leader of the delegation. The council advised the Egyptians of the deposition of their bishop—again without mentioning any doctrinal difficulty—and warned them to take care of the property of the church, as they would be required to give account for it to a new bishop.

Soon after this, the council learned that Dioscorus was spreading a rumor throughout Chalcedon and Constantinople. He claimed that his deposition was a mistake and predicted that he would soon be reinstated. Dioscorus' purpose in circulating this rumor must have been to encourage his supporters and perhaps even to incite them to his active
assistance. Although we do not hear of them at Chalcedon, there is no reason to think that the bishop failed to bring along his parabalani and other monastic attendants. Further, word of the presence of Eutychians in Chalcedon had reached the bishops of Nicaea, and the action of Dioscorus is probably an indication that he was prepared to repeat the violence he had perpetrated at Ephesus just two years earlier. The members of the council took this threat seriously and, to counter the rumors spread by Dioscorus, they drew up a number of public notices addressed to “all the Christ-loving faithful (laos, populus in the Latin translation) of Constantinople and Chalcedon.” In these documents, the bishops denied the truth of the rumor, but again they did not mention the heretical teachings of their deposed colleague, stating only that he had been deprived of office because of his misbehavior. Many members of the council undoubtedly hesitated to condemn Dioscorus for a theology which they themselves had been willing to accept at Ephesus only two years before, but perhaps the bishops also feared that any mention of the theology of Dioscorus would only serve to increase his popularity among the faithful. In any case, it is significant that Dioscorus was concerned to create a rumor and that the fathers of the council took pains to counteract it. This incident is also a measure of the unreliability of “news” in the ancient world. Dioscorus was able simply to manufacture a statement which was directly contradicted by the facts, and many people undoubtedly believed him.

At the sixth session of the council, Marcian suggested that the bishops take measures against the monks who invaded the cities and caused disturbances in both ecclesiastical and secular matters. When they formulated the canons of the council, the fathers included several regulations which contained and expanded the suggestions of the emperor. The fourth canon ran as follows:

Some people have become monks only as a pretext and they confuse the matters of the church with those of the world, going about indiscriminately in the cities and wishing to found monasteries for themselves. No one shall build or set up a monastery or chapel without the consent of the bishop of the city. The monks in each city and territory shall be subject to the bishop and they shall strive after quiet (ἡσυχία), occupying themselves only with fasting and praying, remaining in the places to which they had been assigned. Nor should they concern themselves with ecclesiastical or secular affairs or take part in them, leaving their own monasteries only upon some necessity or at the order of the bishop of the city.

The eighth canon was similar in content:

The clergy of the poorhouses, monasteries, and martyria shall remain under the control of the bishop of each city... and they shall not act insolently or disobediently toward their own bishop.
The twenty-third canon is more specific in citing the reasons why the bishops were concerned about disobedient monks and clerics:

It has come to the attention of the holy synod that certain clerics and monks, either without the consent of their own bishop or even after having been excommunicated by him, have descended upon the imperial city of Constantinople. They have remained there a long time and have stirred up disturbances (ταραχή), throwing into confusion certain people, upsetting the ecclesiastical situation and even disturbing the houses of certain people (θορυβούντες τὴν ἐκκλησιαστικὴν κατάστασιν ἀνατρέπουσι τε ὀίκους πινών). 71

The council decreed that the ekdikos of the church of Constantinople should first warn these unruly clerics to leave the city. If they refused to obey, the official had the authority to expel them from the capital.

These canons were part of a larger program aimed at the control of disobedient clergy and the regularization of monasticism. 72 But these measures, and the knowledge that they were first proposed by the emperor, do indicate something of the danger posed by itinerant monks and other clerics. Constantinople was considered a haven for rebellious clergy, and the emperor, probably rightly, accused these fugitives of being responsible for many of the disturbances which upset the capital. We should suppose further that the individuals who frightened the fathers by gathering illegally at Nicaea and those who were rumored to be causing difficulties in Constantinople and Chalcedon during the council itself gave the bishops a specific incentive for the formulation of these canons. In addition, it is likely that many of these troublesome monks and clerics were Eutychian in sentiment; we have already seen that irregular monks were viewed as the core of Eutychianism in Constantinople.

Despite the action of the Council of Chalcedon and the strenuous opposition of the pope, the leadership of the Monophysite party in Constantinople after 451 remained much as it had been in the past. The fathers of the council allowed the Eutychian monks thirty days to reconsider their error. 73 Either because of the good will of the bishop Anatolius—who, it will be remembered, was from Alexandria—or because they finally gave their formal assent to the theology of Leo, many of their party managed to retain their ecclesiastical positions in the capital. Carosus and Dorotheus, leaders of the Eutychians at the council, retained control of their monasteries until at least 455. 74 If the distress of the pope is any measure, they continued their agitation for a Monophysite theology, 75 and even Eutyches himself still lived in the vicinity of Constantinople at least until 454. 76 We have no information concerning the less important supporters of Eutyches in these years, but, considering the generosity shown to their leaders, we may doubt that they—including the memoritai and the former bear trainers—were seriously threatened by the civil or ecclesiastical authorities. 77
Throughout all this, however, popular opinion in Constantinople remained predominantly Chalcedonian in sentiment. The reason for this, as we have seen, was the success of Flavian and his followers in establishing and maintaining the view that their theology was orthodox, while the agreement of most of the monks of the capital counted for much. The threat of violence at the Council of Chalcedon was an ever-present concern—especially after the events at Ephesus two years earlier—but this was apparently a phenomenon without wide popular support, and the emperor was able to control the recalcitrant monks and other individuals with a proper show of force, for there is no evidence that the bishops of the council were ever subject to real physical danger.

**Opposition to Dioscorus**

Alexandria, long the “second city” of the empire, was notorious in antiquity for the unruliness of its inhabitants, and many of the events we have already investigated had violent consequences there. The affair of the Tall Brothers, which played an important role in the difficulties of John Chrysostom, began when a body of Egyptian monks came to Alexandria intent on murdering Theophilus for his opposition to anthropomorphism. Early in the episcopate of Cyril, open warfare broke out between Christians and Jews, which resulted in the expulsion of the latter from Alexandria and the expropriation of their property by the mob. This led to a confrontation between the bishop and the Augustal prefect, Orestes, and the brutal murder of the pagan philosopher Hypatia. The death of Cyril and the elevation of Dioscorus appears also to have caused some disorder in the city.

Dioscorus brought with him to the Council of Chalcedon nineteen Egyptian bishops and a large body of clerics and monks. Of these nineteen bishops, four—Athanasius of Bousiris, Ausonius of Bebennytos, Nestorius of Phragonis, and Makarios of Kabasa—deserted Dioscorus during the first session and sat with his accusers. It is unlikely that these bishops abandoned their superior out of fear of the power of the council, for the majority of their colleagues remained faithful to Dioscorus. Instead, it appears that these bishops represented a fairly large number of Egyptians who were, for one reason or another, displeased with the rule of Dioscorus. Nestorius of Phragonis had earlier disagreed with his bishop, and he was roughly treated by the agents of Dioscorus at the Robber Synod. It is possible that some of these discontented bishops had formed an alliance against their superior before they left Egypt for the council, and they may represent a larger movement of opposition to the episcopacy of Dioscorus.

At Chalcedon, while the fathers of the council were awaiting the response of Dioscorus to their summons, they heard the complaints of
several members of the church of Alexandria. The first evidence was brought forward by the deacon Theodore, who must have been an old man at the time of the council. He claimed that he had served for twenty-two years in the ranks of the *agentes in rebus* when Cyril—at about the time of the first Council of Ephesus—had made him a member of the clergy of Alexandria. When Dioscorus came to the episcopal throne, he dismissed Theodore, allegedly for no reason and without notice, and threatened to exile him from the city. The anger of Dioscorus was not capricious, however, since Theodore was an important man who had been associated with the administration of Cyril. When Dioscorus came to the episcopal throne, he ended the domination of the family of Theophilus, and he took particular care to purge the administration of the relatives and supporters of his predecessor. Theodore added that the new bishop did not hesitate to murder and exile some of these individuals.

In addition, Theodore accused Dioscorus of insulting the Holy Trinity and destroying the property of his enemies by fire and by cutting down their trees (δενδροκοπιών). When Dioscorus arrived in Chalcedon, Theodore charged, he forced the bishops who had come with him to sign a statement deposing Pope Leo. In explaining why only “ten bishops, more or less,” had signed this document, Theodore said that many Egyptian bishops did not dare to come with Dioscorus to Chalcedon because they remembered the lawlessness he had perpetrated at Ephesus, evidence that the bishop’s reputation for violence was resented and feared by some of his subordinates. As proof of his allegations, Theodore suggested that the council call on Agorastos, Dorotheus, Eusebius, and the notary John.

The second complaint was made by Ischyrion, another deacon of the church of Alexandria. He also accused Dioscorus of ruining the estates of his enemies by cutting down their trees or destroying their homes. That the bishop was guilty of such crimes “not only the great and the famous men knew, but also the whole great city of Alexandria.” Everyone—clergy and laity alike—knew that Dioscorus had insulted the Trinity. When the emperor sent grain to Alexandria, destined for the poor churches of Libya which did not even have bread for the Eucharist, Dioscorus seized the shipment so that he could resell it later, during a shortage, at higher prices. No one, Ischyrion claimed, was ignorant of the affair of Peristeria. She gave a large amount of gold to be used in building monasteries and places of refuge for strangers and the poor of Egypt. Dioscorus, however, confiscated the money and spent it on people associated with the theatre.

Ischyrion complained further that “impious women” came often to the *episcopelion* and even to the bishop’s private bath. A particularly frequent visitor was the notorious (περιβοητής) Pansophia Oreine. So well known
was her relationship with Dioscorus that the common people of Alexandria made up a song about the couple, which they spread throughout the countryside.91

Ischyryon then turned to an elaboration of his own personal complaints against Dioscorus. He explained the animosity of the bishop toward him as a result of his own loyal service to Cyril. Dioscorus had, he alleged, “sent monks and some other people against our own humble possessions,” so that by the destruction of his livelihood he might be reduced to penury. The monks burned his buildings and chopped down all of his fruit trees. On another occasion, Dioscorus sent against him an “ecclesiastical phalanx,” directed by the deacon Peter, Harpokration, and the priest Mennas. They wanted to put Ischyryon to death, but he managed to escape. Harpokration, however, later seized him and kept him prisoner for some time in a xenodocheion. Harpokration and Peter, Ischyryon remarked, were the most violent supporters of Dioscorus, “as they demonstrated in Ephesus against Flavian . . . and many others, including Nestorius, who is now a bishop but was then oikonomos of the church of the great city of Alexandria.”92 Ischyryon closed his petition begging for mercy and asking that the council interrogate some of the confidants of Dioscorus, including the keeper of the episcopal bath.

The third complaint was made by the priest Athanasius, who was a nephew of Cyril.93 According to him, Cyril had made a statement just before his death, requiring his successor to honor his family. But Dioscorus, in his general mismanagement of office, ignored the wish of the dead bishop and began a persecution of Cyril’s family. This persecution later spread throughout the diocese. Athanasius and his brother Paul fled from Alexandria to Constantinople where they hoped to find protection and help. But Dioscorus wrote to Chrysaphius and Nomus and they had the fugitives beaten and tortured so that Paul died. For years, Athanasius wandered from place to place, not being permitted to stay even in churches or monasteries.94 Finally, he returned to Metanoia, a suburb of Alexandria, which was formally called Kamps.95 When Dioscorus learned of this, he decreed that the priest could not use the public bath there nor receive bread from the city dole, claiming that there was a shortage of space and a famine. All the money Athanasius was able to save or borrow—some 1,400 pounds gold—was confiscated by Nomus, who sent the magistrianos Severus to collect it. This reduced the priest to such poverty that he had only two or three slaves left in his possession.

The complaint of Sophronios was in many ways different from the three which had preceded it.96 In the first place, Sophronios appears to have been a layman, as he identified himself simply as Christianos. He did not mention the reason why Dioscorus turned his anger against him, nor did he imply that he had any connection with the family or administration
of Cyril. For apparently no reason, Dioscorus deprived him of all of his property and forced him to make his living as a teacher. When a certain Makarios\(^7\) stole away his wife, Sophronios complained to the emperor and the prefects. The emperor responded by sending the venerable Theodorus to investigate the case.\(^8\) Dioscorus protested that the affair was his concern rather than that of the "rulers," and he sent the wild-eyed deacon Isidorus and a band of country robbers against Sophronios. These ruffians drove Theodorus away and would have killed Sophronios had not a certain deacon disobeyed the orders of Dioscorus and helped him.

In the final plea to the council, Sophronios declared that Dioscorus had attempted to hinder the proclamation of Marcian's elevation in Alexandria.

When the divine laurels,\(^9\) after universal prayer, came to Alexandria, he [Dioscorus] did not hesitate to distribute bribes to the common people through the agency of Agorastos and Timotheos and some others. Thus he prepared to have them [those wishing to proclaim Marcian] driven away. For he was ill-disposed toward those who would proclaim such a ruler of the world, since he wished to rule Egypt himself.\(^10\)

Affairs in Egypt, he assured the council, would have been in desperate condition had it not been for the efforts of Theodorus. In conclusion, Sophronios informed the fathers that he was not the only one with complaints against Dioscorus. There were many others who had experienced the wrath of the bishop, but who were prevented by poverty or fear from bringing their case before the council.

From these complaints, it appears that in Egypt there was already considerable opposition to Dioscorus before the Council of Chalcedon. All the complaints mentioned some heretical teaching of the bishop, usually an "insult" to the Trinity—probably a reference to his monophysite theology, which may be viewed as a denial of the Trinity. But it is clear that the primary concern of each individual was some physical or financial injustice suffered at the hands of Dioscorus.

The family of Theophilus had controlled the church of Alexandria for over fifty years, and it is not surprising that many relatives of the bishop found their way into important offices. Further, it was not uncommon for a new bishop to mistreat the friends and relatives of his predecessor, especially if he considered them hostile or incompetent. Indeed, more than one of those who complained against Dioscorus claimed that they had earned the bishop's displeasure simply because of their connection with Cyril. Yet, there seems to be more behind the actions of Dioscorus than simple antagonism toward the family and friends of Cyril. All of those who complained about Dioscorus—including Sophronios, who was apparently not connected with Cyril—were very wealthy men. The deacon Ischyryon complained that Dioscorus had destroyed his buildings...
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and “all his fruit trees.” We can only speculate what kind of trees Dioscorus is alleged to have cut down, but they were undoubtedly designed to produce a cash crop. Perhaps they were grown on land which had once belonged to the church of Alexandria. The priest Athanasius alleged that he had been robbed of 1,400 pounds of gold. This amount was thirty-five times the annual salary of the dux and Augustal prefect of Egypt in the sixth century and roughly equal to the amount Cyril is supposed to have spent on bribes in the affair of Nestorius. Athanasius complained that after Dioscorus had finished with him, he had only two or three slaves left—hardly an indication of extreme poverty even then.

Thus, the “persecution” of Dioscorus appears directed as much against the wealthy of Alexandria as against the friends and relatives of Cyril. Perhaps the actions of Dioscorus were the result of a general reform of the episcopal administration—such as that carried out by John Chrysostom: those who had taken over the wealth of the church through graft or nepotism had to be dispossessed. It is possible, also, that the bishop’s actions may be assigned to simple rapacity, either to increase his own fortune or that of the church of Alexandria. In any case, Dioscorus used excessive force in this program, and he earned considerable enmity long before the Council of Chalcedon.

As is often the case, we have little information as to how the poor people of the city felt about their bishop. It is true that Sophronois assured the fathers of the council that more people would have presented their complaints against Dioscorus had they not been hindered by poverty. If the allegation of Ischyrion was true—that Dioscorus had stolen money destined to build places of refuge for the poor—one might expect these people to join in opposition to the bishop. But the complainants do not present any positive evidence that the ordinary inhabitants of Alexandria were personally ill treated by Dioscorus, and they seem to try too hard to convince the fathers of the council that they (the wealthy) were not the only ones who disliked the bishop. Indeed, the inhabitants of Alexandria seem rather to have enjoyed the affair of the bishop with the notorious Pansophia. If one attributes the persecution and confiscations of Dioscorus to an attempt to attain justice or punish wrongdoers, one may suspect that he enjoyed a greater popularity than his enemies would imply.

As we have mentioned, four Egyptian bishops deserted Dioscorus almost at the beginning of the council. During the fourth session, after the deposition of Dioscorus, the officials of the council announced that a group of thirteen Egyptian bishops had presented a statement of faith to the emperor. These bishops, who had not agreed to the condemnation of their superior, asked that this be read before the full council. The synod gave its approval and a secretary read the short statement in which the
Egyptians affirmed their orthodoxy and denounced all heretics from Arius to Nestorius. As they made no mention of Eutyches and the current controversy, several bishops demanded that they explain their position more fully, and the papal legates asked whether they would subscribe to the Tome of Leo. Ierakis, the leader of the Egyptians, answered evasively, saying that anyone who disagreed with what they had stated should be anathema. As for the Tome of Leo, he replied that the Council of Nicaea had placed all of Egypt under the authority of the bishop of Alexandria and no single bishop could speak without his approval. Accordingly, he besought the council to allow the bishops to await the decision of their archbishop.

When the other bishops refused to accept this statement, the Egyptians finally agreed to condemn Eutyches specifically. But they still balked at the prospect of signing the Tome. They reminded the council that there were “very many bishops in Egypt,” and they could not speak for all of them—even though they had earlier claimed to do so. If they should act without the approval of their archbishop, all of Egypt would oppose them as having done something uncanonical. They appealed to the council to have mercy on their old age and not force them to endanger their lives. Kekropios of Sebastopolis demanded that the Egyptians give their assent to the doctrine of Leo. They objected:

Then we shall no longer be able to live in the province! Have mercy on us! Lucentius, the papal envoy, again tried to persuade them, but they cried out:

We shall be murdered! Have mercy on us. We shall die. We would rather die by your hands, and not there. Let a new archbishop be appointed now and we shall sign and agree... Anatolius [the bishop of Constantinople] knows that in Egypt all the bishops must obey the archbishop of Alexandria.

Finally, the officials of the council suggested that the Egyptians remain in Constantinople for some time, since they could not act without the approval of their superior. Paschasinus agreed to this, with the stipulation that they give some security that they would not leave the city until a new bishop was chosen.

Why did the Egyptian bishops so strongly refuse to accept the dyophysite theology of Leo and the deposition of Dioscorus? The primary reason may have been theological—they may simply have believed that the theology of the council was in error. But this was not the reason they gave their opponents. Instead, they claimed that they would face real physical danger in Egypt if they acted without the approval of their ecclesiastical superior—who, of course, had been deposed. But why was this? Whom did they fear in Egypt? One finds it hard to believe that it was the other bishops of Egypt. According to the deacon Theodore, many
Egyptians disliked Dioscorus and had refused to come with him to the council. Further, had the thirteen bishops agreed to subscribe the Tome—as did four of their colleagues—they would have found themselves in control of the ecclesiastical situation in Alexandria and in a position to help select the new bishop. As we have seen, it is unlikely that the bishops would have experienced any opposition from the wealthy of Alexandria had they approved of the deposition of Dioscorus.

If we are to accept the statement of the Egyptian bishops, we must conclude that their betrayal of Dioscorus would meet with the disapproval of an important and violent segment of the population of Alexandria and all Egypt. Presumably this included members of the ecclesiastical “establishment” built up by Dioscorus and the monastic community, but it probably also referred to the ordinary inhabitants of Alexandria and the Egyptian countryside. Also, it is particularly revealing that the bishops said nothing about the theological issue. Apparently they felt that, in the eyes of their countrymen, the betrayal of Dioscorus and the contravention of long-standing local tradition—acting without the approval of the bishop of Alexandria—were more serious than the abandonment of Eutychian theology. Events were to confirm their judgment.

**Revolt in Alexandria**

After the Council of Chalcedon, Dioscorus went into exile—first to Cyzicus, then to Heraclea, and finally to Gangra in Paphlagonia, where he died. Proterius, the archpriest left in charge of the city during the council, succeeded him as bishop of Alexandria. Despite the requirement that the Egyptians not leave Constantinople until a new bishop was selected, the election and consecration seems to have taken place in Alexandria. In the words of Liberatus:

Those bishops and clerics who had come with him [Dioscorus], but who had sat together in Chalcedon and by signing the letter of Leo agreed to the condemnation of Eutyches and Dioscorus—Athanasius . . . Nestorius . . . Ausonius . . . and Makarios—returned to Alexandria. According to the wish of all the citizens (*cum omnium civium voluntate*), they set about the election of a new archbishop to be ordained. Letters from the emperor (*sacrae litterae*) had already been sent to the *Augustalis* Theodorus for this purpose. Accordingly, the *nobiles* of the city gathered together to select him whose life and speech were worthy of a bishop. This, indeed, had been ordered by the imperial commands. Much uncertainty (*multa dubitatio*) developed about this, as the citizens (*cives*) did not wish to ordain anyone at all, lest they appear as patricides (*volentibus civibus neminem penitus ordinare, ne patralyae videntur*) since Dioscorus was still alive. Finally, the opinion of all (*universorum sententia*) settled upon Proterius . . . Proterius was therefore consecrated in the presence of the aforementioned bishops.
The distinction between the wishes of the *nobiles* and those of the *cives* is noteworthy. From the account of Liberatus, it is clear that the *nobiles*, together with the four “orthodox” bishops, actually selected Proterius, while the rest of the population felt that no election should be held while Dioscorus still lived.112 This is not surprising in view of what we have suggested about the attitude of many wealthy individuals in Alexandria: they were more than happy to provide a replacement for the hated bishop. Among the majority of the inhabitants of the city, however, Dioscorus had developed a fanatical following, and this was not diminished by his deposition. Indeed, the council lost authority in the eyes of the Alexandrians when it condemned the bishop; its actions and decisions were suspect because of its treatment of Dioscorus, who was the standard of correct belief and practice. This is further confirmation of the view of the Egyptian bishops at Chalcedon: in Alexandria, at least, the issue was not so much theological as it was canonical or, more accurately, personal. To accept a new bishop while Dioscorus still lived was tantamount to *parricide.*

So it is not surprising that Proterius had difficulty in establishing himself as bishop of Alexandria. In the words of Liberatus:

> When he had been installed on the episcopal throne, there arose division and disagreement among the people (*divisio et discissio populi facta est*), because Dioscorus still lived and was in exile. Proterius, therefore, endured considerable danger, so that during much of his episcopate he was in need of protection from the military.114

Evagrius drew his information for these difficulties from the eyewitness account of Priscus of Panium, who had just come into Alexandria from the Thebaid when the violence erupted. Both Liberatus and Evagrius (Priscus) agree that there were two sides in the confrontation and that Proterius had some support, but the Dioscorans were apparently very much the stronger, and they were restrained only by the military intervention of the government. According to Evagrius:

> When he had seized his throne a great and irresistible disturbance (*tarachos*) arose among the people (*demos*) who were swept along like a wave by different opinions. As is usual in such situations, some supported Dioscorus, while others valiantly held out in behalf of Proterius. The result was much irreparable damage.

Apparently the followers of Dioscorus had the better of the situation and just as Priscus came into the city he saw

> the people (*demos*) advancing together against the officials (*archontes*). When the soldiers tried to put a stop to the insurrection (*stasis*) they threw stones at them.115

The officials and the soldiers took to flight and secured themselves in the
old temple of Serapis. This provided only a temporary respite, however, for the crowd besieged the building and finally set fire to it. All within were burned alive.

The Serapeum was in the quarter of Rhakotis, an area of Alexandria traditionally regarded as “Egyptian”—as opposed to those quarters inhabited by Greeks and Jews—and it had been the scene of embattled conflict between Christians and pagans some half a century before. That the officials and soldiers encountered difficulty in this area suggests that resistance to the election of Proterius was strong among the native population. Indeed, this resistance was greater than the officials had expected, and they lost their lives as a result.

One should view this event in its simplest terms as the violent rejection of the deposition of Dioscorus, yet it is tempting to find larger ramifications. Was this perhaps a reflection of growing hostility between Greeks and Egyptians or a symptom of Egyptian nationalism? Tensions were always present among the various ethnic groups in Alexandria, but there is no evidence that nationalism was in any way an issue in this event. Instead, we might suggest that the historical growth of Christianity in Egypt and, more recently, the influence of the monks, particularly such figures as Schenute of Atripe, had led to a focus on the distinction between pagan and Christian and a general identification of the local aristocracy and the officials sent from Constantinople as pagans. This was demonstrably not always true, and the theologians of the church of Alexandria were every bit as steeped in Hellenic culture as were the philosophers and sophists. Nevertheless, recent events such as the brutal murder of Hypatia had hardened the line between pagan and Christian in Alexandria. And, if we are to read anything more than simple opposition to Proterius into the violence at the Serapeum, we must view this as popular opposition to the wealthy archontes, who revealed their true sympathies by taking refuge in the old pagan sanctuary, just as their “pagan predecessors” had done in 391.

The leaders of the disturbance—whoever they may have been—apparently were unprepared for their success. As a result of the confrontation, they had the city at their disposal for a period of at least two weeks, but they made no attempt to oust Proterius or to establish any kind of ecclesiastical or political autonomy. Perhaps the authority of Proterius—he was, after all, a priest of Alexandria, and he must have had strong local connections—saved the situation; but the indecision of the rioters who probably had no firm program or organization must have played a part. One is reminded of the sudden collapse of the riot in Antioch (A.D. 387) just when the demonstrators had gained a tactical victory.

When the emperor learned of the massacre in Alexandria, he im-
mediate dispatched 2,000 newly enlisted soldiers for Egypt. They made such a good voyage that they arrived in Alexandria on the sixth day. This show of force subdued the Alexandrians for a time; but when the soldiers began to molest the wives and daughters of the citizens, "even greater violence" broke out.

Later, the people (demos) assembled in the hippodrome and petitioned Florus, who was both the military commander and the civil governor. They asked him to restore to them the distribution of grain, of which he had deprived them, as well as the baths and the spectacles and other such things as had been denied them because of the disturbance (ataxia). And thus at his own suggestion, Florus appeared before the people (demos) and, by promising them these things, he quickly put a stop to the insurrection.

According to Evagrius, the dispute began because of different "opinions." This may be the only reference we have to the role of the doctrinal dispute in the violence in Alexandria, although these "opinions" may have referred simply to the question of who should be bishop of Alexandria. In any case, Evagrius, too, stressed the importance of the person of Dioscorus. Each party used its bishop as symbol and focus, and even if a theological question lay at the heart of the dispute, the combatants openly disagreed only about the correctness of the consecration of Proterius.

From the account of Evagrius (or Priscus), we can see that the military force at the disposal of the officials of Alexandria, even when increased by reinforcements, was quite unequal to the violence of the crowd. We hear nothing about any violence carried out by the supporters of Proterius, and Evagrius implies that the Alexandrian demos was virtually united in its loyalty to Dioscorus. Another interesting aspect of the report concerns the soldiers sent to Alexandria. The troops were "newly enlisted," and it is likely that they were barbarians. Marcian probably selected them to deal with the explosive situation in Egypt because they had not formed opinions concerning the decisions of the Council of Chalcedon and because they had no ties to the people of Alexandria. Thus, they would obey the orders of Florus and the emperor without question, just as newly enlisted barbarians had been used to deal with the troublesome supporters of John Chrysostom. Nevertheless, these soldiers only worsened the situation, as their treatment of the women of Alexandria brought on further violence. Brutality or overreaction increased the polarization of the community and may have brought many into the camp of Dioscorus who had no quarrel with the theology or canonical standing of Proterius.

During the violence, the prefect Florus suspended the distribution of bread, the use of the public baths, and the spectacles. This achieved what military force could not, and the city was temporarily pacified. One might be tempted to call the Alexandrians fickle in their attachment to a religious cause when they agreed to abandon their opposition to Proterius
in exchange for the notorious "bread and circuses." Yet, we should remember that the supporters of Dioscorus were the cives of Alexandria (as opposed to the nobiles). Closure of the public baths and spectacles may have been only an inconvenience to the Alexandrians, but the suspension of the bread dole would mean hunger and starvation for many. In this measure, the state had a weapon whose power should not be underestimated.

The account of these events written by Zachariah of Mitylene is in many ways similar to that of Evagrius. In tone, however—for Zachariah was a monophysite—as well as in several details, it is quite different. In the first place, Zachariah informs us that some time elapsed between the enthronement of Proterius and the outbreak of violence. Originally, he claimed, Proterius vigorously opposed the decisions of the council, but he quickly changed his position when he found he might seize the episcopal throne for himself. After his consecration, he persecuted those who opposed him, exiling some and confiscating their property "by means of the 'governors' who obeyed him in consequence of the emperor's command."

Whereupon, indeed, the priests and the monks and many of the people, perceiving that the faith had been polluted both by the unjust deposition of Dioscorus and the oppressive conduct of Proterius and his wickedness, assembled themselves in the monasteries and severed themselves from his communion. And they proclaimed Dioscorus and wrote his name in the book of life as a chosen and faithful priest of God. And Proterius was very indignant and he gave gifts into the hands of the Romans, and he armed them against the people and he filled their hands with the blood of believers, who were slain; for they also strengthened themselves and made war. And many died at the very altar and in the baptistry, who had fled and taken refuge there.

According to Zachariah, opposition to Proterius developed for three reasons: pollution of the faith, the deposition of Dioscorus, and the ill treatment accorded many Alexandrians by the new bishop. Zachariah placed considerable emphasis on this last factor, and it is unfortunate that we do not know more about it. We do not know exactly who was persecuted, although they presumably included some of those involved in the episcopal administration of Dioscorus. Zachariah also stressed the simple loyalty of many people to their deposed bishop, and he mentions no theological motivation for this. By "pollution" of the faith, Zachariah may have meant the doctrinal decisions of Chalcedon, although the text seems to confuse this with the deposition of Dioscorus and the bishop's mistreatment of his subjects. In another passage, however, Zachariah made himself a little clearer: "The whole city of Alexandria hated Proterius, some in consequence of their zeal for the faith, others, because they had been plundered and persecuted by him." This "zeal for the faith" must refer to the theological decisions of Chalcedon, although we
might be surprised that a Monophysite author cannot clearly stress the doctrinal nature of the conflict. We should probably conclude that even Zachariah realized that concern for Monophysite theology was not the primary motivation for most of the supporters of Dioscorus.

We have seen that the soldiers stationed in or near Alexandria—at first perhaps only the city guard under the command of the prefect Theodorus—had received orders to assist Proterius in his attempt to defend his see. From the account of Zachariah, we learn—what we did not find in the orthodox sources—that the soldiers inflicted some casualties on the people of Alexandria before they found themselves besieged in the Serapeum. It is, however, difficult to understand why Proterius gave gifts to the soldiers and armed them against the crowd—unless this testimony represents only an attempt by the author to discredit the bishop. As Zachariah had said earlier, the soldiers were under the emperor’s order to defend Proterius. Perhaps the soldiers shared some of the sentiments of the Alexandrians, and the bishop used the wealth of the church to encourage them in the performance of their duty.

According to Zachariah, the supporters of Dioscorus gathered in the monasteries to decide what action they should take. The protest focused on the uncanonical consecration of Proterius while Dioscorus was still alive. Whatever their disagreements with Proterius might have been—theological, personal, financial—all were able to embrace a program whose basis was the simple “illegal” action of the new bishop. The monks of Alexandria, perhaps already under the influence of Timothy Aelurus and Peter Mongus, were in the forefront of the opposition, and it was probably under monastic leadership that many of the inhabitants of the city demonstrated their disapproval of Proterius.

Theophanes has preserved further information concerning events in Egypt after the Council of Chalcedon:

Dioscorus then went into exile and Proterius was put forward [as bishop]. Those who agreed with Dioscorus and Eutyches made a great insurrection and threatened to prevent the transport of grain [to Constantinople]. Marcian learned of this and gave orders for the grain of Egypt to be brought down the Nile to Pelusium, rather than to Alexandria. From there it was conveyed by ship to the imperial city. The people of Alexandria then, suffering from famine, asked Proterius to intercede for them with the emperor. And thus they refrained from the disturbance.

The significance of this account lies in the reference to the interference with the shipment of grain from Egypt. Certainly, one must question the reliability of Theophenes’ story, but there is some circumstantial evidence which suggests its plausibility. In the first place, we know from Evagrius that about this time there was a drought, with attendant
destruction of crops and famine, throughout Asia Minor and in other areas of the East. The loss of grain from these areas certainly had important repercussions in Constantinople, which must then have become almost totally dependent upon the grain of Egypt. This would account for the hasty action of Marcian in rerouting the grain transport when it was threatened by disturbances in Alexandria. It may also help to explain the action of those who wished to halt the shipment; they realized that this was a critical time in which such action would have the greatest effect.

Although one must assume that the grain supply of Alexandria came from the same sources as that destined for Constantinople, it is surprising that the diversion of the grain transport away from the city would cause a famine there—unless food was already in short supply in Alexandria. The testimony of the priest Athanasius at the Council of Chalcedon indicated that this was indeed the case. He complained that Dioscorus had not allowed him to participate in the free distribution of bread because there was a famine in the city.

It is unclear how the supporters of Dioscorus were able to disrupt the grain shipment from Egypt. Since all the evidence we have suggests that the wealthy landowners were prominent among the enemies of the deposed bishop, and since they would in any case have been unwilling to injure themselves financially, it is unlikely that the grain was withheld by the producers. Perhaps the violence and unrest in Alexandria prevented the regular shipments; it is improbable that there was a strike at the docks.

Sometime shortly after his consecration, Proterius wrote to Pope Leo, including a short profession of faith. The pope did not consider this statement satisfactory, and he demanded another from the new bishop. Proterius complied and sent another letter by the hands of Bishop Nestorius of Phragonis. At the same time, probably late in 453, Proterius sent a petition to the emperor. These letters have been lost, but their contents can be inferred from the surviving letters of the pope. The concern of Proterius was twofold: he wanted the emperor to continue to send him military support, so that he could deal with his enemies; and he asked the pope to grant him official recognition, so that he could maintain the support of the Chalcedonian bishops of Egypt.

The supporters of Dioscorus, he informed Leo, had made a translation of the Tome. This translation, Proterius alleged, was intentionally incorrect, and it was designed to prove that the Chalcedonians were really Nestorians who divided the person of Christ. The Dioscorans took great care to circulate this forgery and to point out the difficulties in the theology of Leo; one of their primary points was that Proterius and his
followers were introducing something new into the faith. From all we can tell, this campaign was successful in eliciting popular support and introducing real doctrinal differences into the controversy.

Leo replied to Proterius that he must guard against those who deceived simple people (simplex plebs) by a teaching which, while heretical, contained some semblance of truth. The error of the Dioscorans, he observed, lay hidden in very small corruptions and changes in the faith, and this was not evident to all. He encouraged Proterius to show the people and clergy (plebs et clericus) that he was not teaching anything new. He should try to do this by reading extracts from the Fathers which agreed with the teaching of Chalcedon:

Wherefore, after the statements of the above-mentioned prelates have been read, let also my letter be read, so that the ears of the faithful may believe that we teach nothing other than that which we received from our predecessors. And let those who are less experienced in understanding these matters (qui ad haec discernenda minus exercitatos habeant sensus) at least learn from the Fathers’ words how ancient is this evil... Leo further advised Proterius to make use of the traditional power of the bishop of Alexandria to maintain his authority over the provincial bishops of Egypt. He assured Proterius that he would not attempt to interfere with his authority at home.

The pope sent a similar letter to Marcian. In this, he asked the emperor to help Proterius against the “ignorant disagreement (imperita dissensio) of those whom stupidity and the instigation of a few heretics have made harmful (quos paucorum haereticorum instigationibus ignorantia facit obnoxios).” He advised “that which they are unable to understand through their own efforts should be suggested within their hearing at appropriate times.” Leo then requested that the emperor use his authority to order the appropriate readings in Alexandria, so that no one would think that Proterius had introduced anything new into orthodox theology.

From these letters we can see that reports of conditions in Alexandria reaching Rome described the followers of Dioscorus as simple, ignorant people who had been deceived into opposition to the decision of Chalcedon. If they were presented with a correct picture of Chalcedonian belief, the pope thought, the faithful of Alexandria would quickly see the error of their ways and abandon their support of Dioscorus. As events were to show, Leo was much mistaken in his expectations. Nevertheless, it is interesting to note the methods proposed by the pope: florilegia were to be prepared and read to the people. This acknowledged the centrality of the theological controversy, although even here the dispute was to be settled by appeal to authority rather than argumentation.

On September 4, 454, Dioscorus died in exile in Gangra. Immediately
upon the arrival of this news, disturbances broke out once again in Alexandria.

On account of the love that they had for him [Dioscorus], they [the Alexandrians] proclaimed him as a living man, and his name was set in the diptych . . . but the believing party [the supporters of Dioscorus] were desirous of appointing a bishop in place of Dioscorus. However, they were afraid of the threats of Marcian the emperor; for he was sending letters in every direction and fulminating against all who would not agree to the Synod and receive the Tome. For so it was that when he heard the men of Alexandria and of their intention to appoint a new bishop for themselves after the death of Dioscorus, he sent John, the chief of the silentarii, with a letter from himself exhorting the Alexandrians to be united to Proterius.\textsuperscript{141}

In this letter to the inhabitants of Alexandria, the emperor followed the advice of Leo and identified the faith of Chalcedon with that of the Fathers and that of Dioscorus with the heretic Eutyches.\textsuperscript{142} He also accused the monks of Egypt of being responsible for the disorders in Alexandria. The silentarius John returned to Constantinople with a petition in behalf of the Dioscorans. Nevertheless, his mission must have been at least a partial success, for the schismatics did not at that time elect a rival to Proterius.\textsuperscript{143}

This was not the end of difficulties in Alexandria. If anything, the situation became worse in the years which followed the death of the emperor Marcian. In 457, the supporters of Timothy Aelurus took advantage of the change of imperial administration and the absence of the military governor to consecrate their leader as bishop. They murdered the hapless Proterius and dragged his body through the streets.\textsuperscript{144} The government finally managed to oust Timothy, after a great massacre, and the Proterians again elected an orthodox bishop.\textsuperscript{145} During the troubles surrounding the revolt of Basiliscus, Timothy once again ascended the throne of St. Mark, amid great popular rejoicing.\textsuperscript{146}

Despite the intrinsic interest of these events and their importance in ecclesiastical and political history, we need not proceed further in our study of the urban crowd at Alexandria. By 454 the division of the population into "parties" was already set and fixed. A small, but important, section of the populace supported the successors of Proterius and accepted Chalcedonian theology. These were, in general, the potenti\textiores, who possessed some wealth and who often had interests outside Egypt. The majority of the population, however, strongly supported the party of Dioscorus and violently opposed the efforts of the government to impose orthodoxy on Alexandria. From the time of the death of Dioscorus, theology clearly divided the two parties: the Dioscorans were Monophysites, and the Proterians were Chalcedonians.\textsuperscript{147}

Scholars have adduced various reasons for the violent cleavage of religious sentiment in Alexandria following the Council of Chalcedon.
Some have seen these disturbances as evidence of a growing Egyptian nationalism, which regarded Chalcedonian orthodoxy as an “excuse” for opposing the hated Roman government. Others have argued that the situation can be explained only in religious terms: the supporters of Dioscorus were not Egyptian nationalists, they merely regarded his Monophysite theology as correct. Our study of the evidence for this question does not support either of these hypotheses.

There is almost nothing in the sources which would lead one to believe that the supporters of Dioscorus regarded themselves as Egyptian nationalists. It is true that they resented and opposed the efforts of the Roman government to impose orthodoxy in Alexandria. But, so far as we are able to tell, this opposition was concerned only with ecclesiastical matters. It was a direct result of the armed support the emperor gave to Proterius. The evidence nowhere suggests that, at this time at least the Dioscorans had any political program.

The population of Alexandria was, however, divided roughly along class lines. The rich of the city generally supported Proterius, while the majority of the population remained loyal to Dioscorus. One might see this as evidence of Egyptian nationalism, since the rich of Alexandria were presumably Greeks who had interests throughout the empire, while the poor were largely native Egyptians. This may be true, but the preponderance of “foreigners” among the upper classes in Alexandria at this time must be proven rather than assumed. In fact, we know that many native Egyptians had risen to positions of great importance under the later empire. In any case, there still is no evidence that the poor of Alexandria supported Dioscorus because of enmity toward the Roman state.

If the division of the population of Alexandria was not nationalist in origin, might it not be described as a kind of economic or social struggle? We can say almost certainly that such was not the case. In the first place, as with the other incidents we have studied, the sources have not recorded any indication of class consciousness or action on the part of the poor. The supporters of Dioscorus did not, so far as we know, direct any violence against the persons or property of the rich. The wealthy of Alexandria, it is true, may have supported Proterius as the representative of the faith of the emperor. Some of them were imperial officials and many depended upon trade with other parts of the empire. Their interests were in the wider world, and they could be expected to oppose a bishop officially deposed by a council called and presided over by the emperor. But the motive of these individuals was probably not so simple. Their disagreement with Dioscorus dated from the very beginning of his episcopate, and the persecutions and confiscations carried out by the bishop presumably made the wealthy willing to support a rival candidate.
at any time. The rich may have acted to protect their economic standing, but simple hatred for Dioscorus undoubtedly influenced their position. Thus, the division of the population of Alexandria was not primarily political or social. On the other hand, the disturbances in Egypt cannot be explained simply by theological considerations. As we have seen, the sources say nothing certain about theological differences in the early stages of the violence in Alexandria. It was not until just before, and especially after, the death of Dioscorus that the theological question came to the forefront of the controversy. Until then, the sources tell us, the issue dividing the two sides was canonical: the deposition of Dioscorus, and the consecration of Proterius while the former bishop was still alive.

Many people who did not understand the subtle distinctions between the conflicting theologies realized only that their bishop had been deposed and another put in his place. This was undoubtedly connected with the unique position of the bishop of Alexandria: probably more than any other prelate of the ancient church, he exercised absolute control over the ecclesiastical establishment of his diocese; local priests were closely supervised; and the people of Egypt came to look upon their archbishop as the embodiment of the will of God. Furthermore, a bishop of Alexandria was rarely deposed. The most notorious example, other than that of Dioscorus, was that of Athanasius. In the fourth century, as in the fifth, the inhabitants of Alexandria reacted violently to the interference of the government in the affairs of the church of Egypt. Loyalty—and enmity—to Dioscorus is probably the best explanation for the initial division of the population of Alexandria and the violence which followed the Council of Chalcedon.

This is not to say that theological considerations were unimportant, but they were clearly not the crux of the matter at the outset. As time went on, and especially after 454, the anti-Chalcedonian faction needed more than the memory of the unfortunate bishop to hold their party together. Timothy Aelurus and his followers lost one opportunity when they failed to consecrate a successor to Dioscorus in 454. From that point, however, the canonical distinction became less of an issue, since the episcopal succession of the Dioscorans had been broken.

From at least as early as 453, each side of the controversy began to make a concerted effort to convince the Alexandrians of the correctness of their position. They did this in a way which has become familiar from earlier examples. Both the Monophysites and the Chalcedonians sought to convince the faithful that their theology was identical with that of the Fathers. The doctrine of their enemies was either a complete innovation or was identified with that of some notorious heretic. The leaders of both parties devised elaborate procedures to convey this point. The Monophysites mistranslated and falsified the Tome of Leo so that the Chal-
Vox Populi

cedonians would appear to be Nestorians. The Chalcedonians, on the other hand, with the help of the emperor, staged public readings of excerpts from the works of the Fathers. The faithful were then to see for themselves that the theology of the council was that which the church had always taught. The Chalcedonians thought that the majority of the Monophysites—"who [in Pope Leo's words] are less experienced in understanding these matters"—had been deceived into opposition to the council. The Monophysite leadership, however, controlled most of the churches of Alexandria, and the memory of Dioscorus remained strong among the faithful, who never accepted the decisions of the Council of Chalcedon.

As usual, it is difficult to assess the ultimate significance of popular feeling in Alexandria. Clearly these events were different in many respects from the others we have examined. In part, this is because the political and religious decisions had already been made, and the lines were clearly drawn at the council in distant Chalcedon. Yet, we have seen how the decisions of the Latrocinium—and some would argue those of the first Council of Ephesus—were set aside, and years of wrangling over Mono­physitism and Monotheletism were in store for the church of the East. It is true that the overwhelming Dioscoranism of the people of Alexandria had little immediate effect on the political or ecclesiastical situation in Constantinople or in Egypt. Marcian and Leo I did not waver significantly in their Chalcedonianism, and a bishop of Alexandria continued to be appointed with the approval of the court for many years.

Nevertheless, the division of opinion which developed in Alexandria after the deposition of Dioscorus remained the primary fact of life for the church of Alexandria until the Arab conquest and beyond. The population of Alexandria, with some notable exceptions, agreed with the inhabitants of the Egyptian countryside in opposing the decisions of the Council of Chalcedon—again, first in personal terms and later in theological terms. Against such unanimity of opinion fixed and hardened into a system of belief, the Chalcedonian prelates could make but little headway. This was symbolized by the fate of the unfortunate Proterius.

Such acts of violence, however, were not the ultimate weapons of the supporters of Dioscorus in Alexandria. In fact, throughout the fifth century, the government was generally able to impose its will by means of superior force. But violence only served to drive the opposition underground. When used early in a controversy to intimidate minority groups and deny them access to media for the expression of their views, violence could be effective. But more frequently violence, especially that organized by the state, was simply a last resort and a sign of failure: when confronted with sizeable and well-organized public opinion, as it was in Egypt, violence as a basis of policy was doomed to failure.
1. The date of the election of Anatolius is controversial. See R. V. Sellers, The Council of Chalcedon, p. 94, n. 4. The bibliography on the Council of Chalcedon and attendant events is much the same as that for the Latrocinium. For political events, see Bury, Later Roman Empire, vol. 1, pp. 235–29; Stein, Histoire, vol. 1, pp. 311–15; Jones, Later Roman Empire, pp. 217–21; Thompson, Attila; and O. Seeck, Geschichte des Untergangs, vol. 6.

The Council of Chalcedon itself has been the subject of numerous works, especially at the time of the fifteen-hundredth anniversary of the event. Most important of these is A. Grillmeier and H. Bacht, eds., Das Konzil von Chalcedon, which besides learned articles on the history and theology of Chalcedon contains a bibliography of 922 items. This work also examines the influence of the theology of Chalcedon on modern Christianity. In addition, see R. V. Sellers, The Council of Chalcedon; Hefele-Leclercq, Histoire des conciles, vol. 2, pp. 649–880; Duchesne, Early History of the Christian Church, vol. 3, pp. 299–315; and Bury, Histoire, vol. 4, pp. 228–67. The theology is discussed by Grillmeier, Christ in Christian Tradition, pp. 479–95. The most important collection of primary material is edited by E. Schwartz in the Acta Conciliorum Oecumenicorum [ACO], vol. 2, which contains the acta of the council and many letters and other documents pertaining to it. Also important are the letters of Pope Leo (ACO and S. Leonis Magni Epistulae, ed. C. Silva-Tarouca). The fragments of Priscus contain some significant materials for this period, but we must rely on the ecclesiastical history of Evagrius and the later chronicles of Theophanes, Malalas, Prosper, and the author of the Paschal Chronicle. Zachariah of Mytilene presents the Monophysite’s point of view of these events, and his chronicle (Historia Ecclesiastica) has survived in a Syriac translation (ed. and trans., E. W. Brooks, CSCO, Scriptores Syri III, 5 and 6 [Paris/Louvain, 1919–24]; Eng. trans., F. J. Hamilton and E. W. Brooks [London, 1899]).

2. Liberatus Breviarium (ACO, II, v, p. 118). The Robber Synod may have recommended that Anatolius be the next bishop of Constantinople and the opposition may have been to that decision. See Zachariah of Mytilene Historia Ecclesiastica. Anatolius says specifically that he was elected by the synodos endemousa of Constantinople.


5. Liberatus Breviarium (ACO, II, v, p. 119); Theophanes p. 103 (de Boor); Malalas, p. 366 (Bonn); Chronicon Paschale, p. 589 (Bonn); Theodore Lector, PG 86, 1, p. 165.


reports that Theodosius went to Ephesus, to the church of St. John the Theologian, to learn who was to succeed him. Goubert suggests that this journey was intended to announce a return to orthodoxy, but that the emperor died on the way and the announcement was never made. This reconstruction is ingenious and it is tempting to see something significant in Theodosius’ visit to the city where the previous two councils had been held, but the Lycus is not on the way to Ephesus. Further, Malalas says specifically that Theodosius reached his destination in Ephesus and learned the name of his successor in a dream.

13. Malalas, pp. 366-67; Chronicon Paschale, pp. 589-90. Malalas may have taken this account of these events from a source he calls “the most wise Nestorian the chronographer [who wrote] up to the reign of Leo II” (p. 324, 12 and 376, 19). Presumably this indicates that the source presented Nestorian views.


16. Priscus, frg. 14; E. A. Thompson, Attila, pp. 123–24. That Nomos was a member of the embassy to Attila shows that the supporters of Chrysaphius and the Robber Synod were still in power at that date. It might be argued that the favorable settlement of this matter would relieve the pressure on the government of Theodosius and thus counteract the other disturbing events at that time. This may be true, but one should remember how unstable a truce with the Huns might be, especially one which did not grant them all they desired. The attempt of Theodosius to secure more favorable terms from the Huns is probably an indication of the pressure put on his government by those who opposed his policies. Thus it is parallel to his restoration of Flavian just before his death.


19. The traditional evaluation of Theodosius clearly needs to be revised (see Thompson, Attila, pp. 200–203 and Luibheid, “Theodosius II,” p. 39). Theodosius may have been a weak man personally, but some of his apparent weakness was really a vacillation made necessary by the conflict of goals.

20. Whereas the policies of Theodosius changed to suit the political situation, Marcian appears to have “believed” in one position, which he maintained throughout his reign. Thus, he is much more understandable to us—and to the later Byzantine historians—than the “unstable” Theodosius II. Stein suggests that the dominant concern of the new emperor was the desire to be recognized by the court of Valentinian III—and thus by the papacy, which had considerable influence in Ravenna (Histoire, vol. 1, p. 312).

21. Priscus, frg. 15.

22. Novella of Marcian, 2 (Codex Theodosianus, ed. Theodore Mommsen and Paul Meyer, vol. 2 [Berlin, 1905]), issued sometime between October 11, 450, and January 18, 451. Although the novel is issued in the names of the two Augusti, it is significant that it was directed to Palladius, the praetorian prefect of the East. The effect of the remission of overdue taxes was felt primarily in the East.

23. C. J. 12.2, 2. In 450 Marcian confined the burdens of the praetorship to senators actually residing in Constantinople (C. J. 12.2, 1). In 452 the emperor declared that the various consuls of the year should contribute to the repair of the aqueducts of the city instead of distributing money to the poor of the capital (Marcellinus Comes, s.a. 452, p. 84). He also annulled the law forbidding the marriage of a senator and a woman of low estate; from this time on, a senator could marry any woman of good character (Novella of Marcian, 4). See Bury, Later Roman Empire, vol. 1, pp. 236–27.

24. Marcellinus Comes, s.a. 450, p. 83; Prosper, p. 481; Theodore Lector, PG 86, 1, 165; Chronicon Paschale, p. 590; Theophanes Chronographia, A.M. 5942 (ed. de Boor), p. 101. The place and the circumstances of the death of Chrysaphius are obscure. Some of the sources say that Pulcheria actually gave the order. This may reflect confusion regarding the time of her return to power. See P. Goubert, “Pulcherie et Chrysaphios,” pp. 315–18.

25. Theophanes Chronographia, A.M. 5942 (ed. de Boor), p. 103. Of course, as many authorities have pointed out, Marcian had considerable interest in the West and this

26. Leo Epistulae 76-77. The pope was naturally not anxious to have another council. With the accession of Marcian, if not before, his theology was accepted in the East and he had all he wanted. Another council might only raise new issues of difficulty (which it did). However, if another council were to be held, he wished it to meet in Italy.

27. The official acceptance of the theology of Leo probably took place at a local synod held in Constantinople late in 450. See Leo Epistula 80; P. Moutarde, "Fragmentes d'actes d'un synode tenu à Constantinople en 450," *Mélanges de l'Université St. Joseph Beyrouth* 15 (1930), 35-50. This is another indication that many of the clergy of Constantinople still supported Flavian.

28. Leo Epistula 84 (ACO, II, iv, p. 43): "sacerdos et populos catholicæ puritatis fidem iam tenere cognoscitur."

29. Leo Epistula 84 (ACO, II, iv, p. 44). *Frequentioribus solatiiis* may mean "who came in droves to console him," rather than "who came often . . . ."


32. ACO, II, i, 2, p. 120.

33. ACO II, i, 2, pp. 115-16. The petition was from eighteen monks (listed by name) and "the entire synod in Christ and the rest of the clergy and monks and laity." One might wish further information about these people, especially the laymen, and how many supporters Eutyches could then claim in Constantinople.

34. It is difficult to interpret this piece of evidence. The orthodox monks obviously meant to imply that these men were either strangers in Constantinople or that they were completely unknown to the monastic community there. We might expect some dishonesty here, except that the Eutychians presumably had ample time to prove their identity to the council; apparently they could not do so.


37. Palatine Anthology 8.269. Poems 166-70 and 174 repeat the same sentiment. Poem 172 suggests that those who feasted in the tombs of martyrs constructed the shrines from the stones of older tombs. Poem 170 says that some martyrs were buried alongside pagan priests.

38. It is interesting that the *memoritae* were Eutychians (thus protonomophysites). Those who see Monophysitism as a survival of paganism might make much of this.

39. ACO II, i, 2, p. 115.

40. A third monk had five "names" in the Philippou.


42. It may be significant that the adherents of John Chrysostom, when they met in open opposition to the court, assembled in the Xylokerkos. Perhaps it was a safe place to meet. It was located just outside the old walls of Constantine and may not have been used as a circus at this time. The site of the Philippou is unknown. Janin, *Constantinople byzantine*, 2nd ed., pp. 410-11. It is possible, of course, that the *martyria* of these monks were not located in the structures of the circus; they may have only been in the locality.

43. ACO II, i, 1, p. 27-28; ACO II, iii, 1, pp. 19-20 (Latin). In some copies, the letter is dated May 17.

44. ACO II, iii, 1, pp. 20-21 (preserved only in Latin).
45. The Latin text reads only clericos, without indicating where they were from.

46. ACO II, i, 1, p. 29; ACO II, iii, 1, p. 21 (Latin).

47. Again, the Latin text makes no mention of where the troublemakers lived.

48. ACO II, i, 1, pp. 28–29.

49. ACO II, i, 1, pp. 30, 24–25.

50. ACO II, i, 1, p. 30.


52. There were nineteen of these archontes in all. The acta list them before the bishops (ACO, II, i, 1, pp. 55–56). For their role in the council, see Hefele-Leclercq, Histoire des conciles, vol. 2, pp. 650–51.

53. The bishops of Palestine and Illyricum, besides those of Egypt, originally supported Dioscorus. Why was this? One might understand Egyptian influence in Palestine, but how can we explain the action of the bishops of Illyricum, whose leader, the bishop of Thessalonica, was a staunch supporter of Flavian (he did not attend the council of 449)? Perhaps political and ecclesiastical disputes concerning Illyricum may explain this. Illyricum had, for the previous fifty years, been disputed between the Eastern and the Western empires, and the contention of the pope and the patriarch of Constantinople over this territory was to last much longer. Perhaps the bishops of Illyricum wished to assert their own independence and used the theological issue to dramatize this.

54. At one point the archontes had to remind the bishops that such “vulgar outcries” were not appropriate for men of their station (ACO II, i, 1, p. 70, 29–30).

55. ACO II, i, 1, pp. 195–96.

56. The numbering of the sessions of the Council of Chalcedon is a notorious problem. At question here is the reversal of the second and third sessions in some manuscripts. See Hefele–Leclercq, Histoire des conciles, vol. 2, pp. 649–58, for a discussion of this difficulty. Each important bishop—as well as the imperial officials—probably had his own staff of notaries. This would explain why there is no official text of the acta. Latin translations were made very early (some items, e.g., imperial letters, were composed in Latin)—some by the council itself. Only the records concerning the affair of Carosus and Dorotheus (Fourth Session) remained to be translated in 1608 by the Roman editors. Julian of Cos (?) may have been responsible for some of the early translations; others were made in the sixth century during the controversy over the Three Chapters. See Hefele–Leclercq, Histoire des conciles, vol. 2, pp. 658–65, and E. Schwartz, “Über die Reichskonzilien von Theodosius bis Justinian,” Gesammelte Schriften, vol. 2 (Berlin, 1960), pp. 111–58.

57. ACO II, i, 2, pp. 69–84.

58. ACO II, i, 2, pp. 3–42.

59. ACO II, i, 2, pp. 8–9.

60. ACO II, i, 2, pp. 10–14, 26–27. Dioscorus at first claimed that he was willing to come to the council, but that he was being kept prisoner and that the magistriani (agentes in rebus) and the scholarii prevented his appearance. The emissaries from the council were carrying this report back to the bishops when they encountered Elesinios, the assistant of the magister officiorum, who commanded the functionaries by whom Dioscorus claimed he was imprisoned. Elesinios denied that his men were in any way hindering the movement of the bishop of Alexandria. The emissaries then returned to Dioscorus, who changed his story and made other protestations. It is probable that some of the forces of the magister officiorum were guarding the quarters of Dioscorus (see the discussion in Chapter 4 regarding the soldiers who were guarding Nestorius’ house in Ephesus in 431), but it is unlikely that they prevented his response to the summons of the council.

61. ACO II, i, 2, pp. 27–28.

62. ACO II, i, 2, pp. 28–41. The Latin acts (ACO, II, iii, 2, pp. 45–83) are probably correct when they report that 192 bishops gave vocal approval to the sentence, followed by the signature of 308 bishops. About 350 bishops attended the first session of the council; the
supporters of Dioscorus apparently did not attend the session in which he was deposed. On the names and number of bishops at the council see E. Honigmann, "The Original Lists of the Members of the Council of Nicaea, the Robber Synod and the Council of Chalcedon," Byzantion 16 (1944), 20–80; and V. Laurent, "Le nomber des Pères au concile de Chalcedoine 451," Academia Romana Bulletin, Setiunea istorica 26 (1945), pp. 33–46.

63. ACO II, i, 2, pp. 41–42.

64. ACO II, i, 2, p. 42. Dioscorus thus had, as we might expect, a large number of clerics with him in Chalcedon and the vicinity. We can only speculate on their activities. They may have cooperated with the followers of Eutyches to spread rumors about their bishop's reinstatement. Or perhaps Dioscorus had lost his influence over some of them. When it became clear that Dioscorus was doomed, they may have thrown their lot in with the supporters of Proterius in hope of future rewards.

65. ACO II, i, 2, p. 42, 27: Dioscorus prepared "to spread a report that he had recovered his priesthood."

66. ACO II, i, 2, p. 42.

67. In their letters to Marcian (ACO, II, iii, 2, pp. 83–84) and Pulcheria (ACO, II, iii, 2, pp. 86–87), preserved only in Latin, the bishops were also hesitant to mention any doctrinal error on the part of Dioscorus. In fact, in the letter to Pulcheria they cited Dioscorus' refusal to read the Tome of Leo at Ephesus as the only reason for his deposition.

68. ACO II, i, 2, p. 157.

69. ACO II, i, 2, p. 159. This is taken almost verbatim from the text proposed by Marcian (cited above, note 68). On the significance of the canons of Chalcedon for clerics, see Leo Ueding, "Die Kanones von Chalkedon in ihrer Bedeutung für Mönchtum und Klerus," in Das Konzil von Chalkdeon, ed. A. Grillmeier and H. Bacht, vol. 2 (Würzburg, 1953), pp. 569–76.

70. ACO II, i, 2, pp. 159–60.

71. ACO II, i, 2, p. 162.

72. G. Dagron, "Les moines et la ville."

73. ACO II, i, 2, p. 120.

74. Part of the difficulty in this whole affair lay in the disagreement between the pope and the bishop of Constantinople over the twenty-eighth canon. Leo had never liked Anatolius and he always suspected him of Monophysite sympathies. The affair of the twenty-eighth canon and the presence of Carosus and Dorotheus in Constantinople confirmed his enmity. Cf. Leo Epistulae 132 and 135.

75. Leo Epistulae 136, 141–43 (ACO, II, iv, pp. 87, 94–95).

76. Leo Epistulae 134 (ACO, II, iv, pp. 87–88).

77. See, however, the law of July 8, 453, which was directed largely against the monastic supporters of Eutyches: ACO, II, i, 3, pp. 122. There is no evidence that it was ever effectively enforced.

78. As mentioned in chapter two, there is no fully satisfactory study of Alexandria in this period. The most recent survey is the article by W. Schubert, s.v. "Alexandria," RAC, vol. 1 (1950). H. I. Bell, Jews and Christians, illustrates the conflict among the various groups in the city. See also E. L. Woodward, Christianity and Nationalism; E. R. Hardy, Christian Egypt; and H. Musurillo, The Acts of the Pagan Martyrs: Acta Alexandrinorum (Oxford, 1954), which illustrates the anti-Roman feeling in Alexandria during the first and second centuries. For an earlier period see P. M. Fraser, Ptolemaic Alexandria. Perhaps the best insight into the working of the church of Alexandria is to be found in the Vita Johannis Beemosynarius, Anal. Bolland. 45 (1927), 19–73.

79. See above, chapter 3.


81. Theophanes Chronographia, A.M. 5940 (ed. de Boor), p. 98; Liberatus Breviarium (ACO, II, v, p. 113).
82. *ACO II*, i, 1, pp. 59–60, numbers 140–58. Most commentators, for some reason, ignore the bishops of Tisilas and Hermopolis. See also Honigmann, “The Original Lists,” *Byzantion* 16 (1944), pp. 20–80.


85. οδε γαρ πλειους τετολμασιν δεξηθειν αμα δια τα παρ’ αδυνατα κατα την Εφεσιου παρανομηθεντα.

86. These men were apparently officials of the church of Alexandria. Because their names are common and Theodore gives us no further information, it is impossible to identify Dorotheus and Eusebius. Agorastos was a syncellus of Dioscorus (*ACO*, II, i, 2, p. 24, 22) and Sophronios accused him and Timotheos of carrying out violence against him. John was presumably the notary who presided at the Latrocinium. The other complainants also called upon the clergy of Dioscorus to support their statements.

87. *ACO II*, i, 2, pp. 17–18.

88. τοοτό μεγάλοι τε και περιφανεσις άνδρες Ιασιν, ου μην δε αλλα και τασα ἐκενή ἢ μεγάλη πόλις Ἀλεξανδρεια. This statement suggests that the hostility of the “great and famous men” toward Dioscorus was well known; Ischyron, however, alleged that “the whole city” knew of the bishop’s misdeeds.

89. ἀπας μέν το της περιωνύμου πόλεως ἐκενης λαθς ου μην δε αλλα κατ ζ . . . κλήρος κατ οι . . . μναζοντες ἐπιστανται.

90. It is probable that this grain was originally from Egypt and was diverted by the emperor from Constantinople or its regular market to the disaster area in Libya. Perhaps the grain was grown or transported by the agents of the bishop of Alexandria, a practice seen later in the *Vita Johannis of Eleemosynarii*. See also J. L. Teall, “Grain Supply of the Byzantine Empire,” pp. 87–139, for a general treatment of this question.


92. *ACO II*, i, 2, p. 17. The text is confusing here. The Greek manuscript reads προτεριου, but this is clearly impossible, since Dioscorus was still the bishop when Ischyron delivered this statement. Προτεριου must be the interpolation of a later reader who thought the reference was to the successor of Dioscorus. The Latin text (certainly translated before the corruption in the Greek text) gives Nestorius, and this would seem to be the original reading, since he was then (νυν μεν) bishop of Phragonis, but in any case we must still wonder why Dioscorus made Nestorius a bishop shortly after their disagreement at Ephesus and then brought him along to Chalcedon.

93. *ACO II*, i, 2, pp. 20–21.

94. He claimed that Dioscorus had converted all the houses of Cyril’s relatives into churches.

95. This was probably Canopus, which possessed a monastery called Metanoia. Paul van Cauwenburgh, *Étude sur les moines d’Égypte* (Paris, 1914), p. 77, n. 8.

96. *ACO II*, i, 2, pp. 23–24.

97. Sophronius called Makarios δ πολιτευόμενος της μεγάλης Ἀλεξανδρείας, “a decurio of the great city of Alexandria.” Πολιτευόμενος can in this period mean πολιτης, i.e., “citizen.” But I think it is more likely that Makarios was a member of the curia of Alexandria and thus an important citizen.

98. Theodorus was the *Augustalis praefectus Aegypti*. Almost nothing else is known of him. See W. Ensslin, s.v. “Theodorus (81),” *RE*, series 2, vol. 5, part 2 (1934). Sophronios suggests that Theodorus arrived in Alexandria only to deal with this case, but this seems unlikely. Is it possible that the arrival of Theodorus was a result of the accession of Marcian? The previous prefect, perhaps an appointee of Chrysaphius, might not fit in with the new emperor’s policies.

99. *Theia laurata*. This was the imago laureata, the official presence of the emperor outside of the imperial court. See E. Kitzinger, “The Cult of Images in the Age before Iconoclasm,” *DOP* 7 (1954), 83–150.
100. ACO II, i, 2, p. 24.
102. In these persecutions Chrysaphius and Nomus had been the accomplices of Dioscorus, and Nomus sent his agents to deprive Athanasius of his property. We cannot be certain of the chronology of these events, but Dioscorus and Chrysaphius appear to have been in league before 448. Then, too, it is possible that Dioscorus was cooperating with Chrysaphius and his agents in an attempt to secure the full revenue from Egypt that was necessary to make the heavy payments due to the Huns. If this was the case, the attitude of the wealthy of Alexandria toward Marcian and his policies would be more easily understandable.

103. ACO II, i, 2, p. 110. They claimed to represent “all the bishops of your diocese of Egypt.”
104. ACO II, i, 2, p. 111. Did he mean the new bishop who would shortly be selected or Dioscorus? Eusebius of Dorylaeum listened to the statement of Ierakis and the protestations of the Egyptians and replied simply, “they’re lying.”
105. ACO II, i, 2, pp. 112–13.
106. ACO II, i, 2, p. 113.
107. Of course they could hardly have been expected to say that they supported Eutyches’ theology, condemned by nearly everyone.
112. The local aristocracy normally played an important role in the episcopal elections by the fifth century. See Jones, Later Roman Empire, pp. 918 and 1384. Evagrius says that Proterius “was chosen as bishop by the common vote of the synod of Alexandria.” This presumably relates to an “election” conducted by the four orthodox bishops after their return to Egypt.
113. This does not explain Liberatus’ statement that the election was held cum omnium civium voluntate. Perhaps this is an error, or it may reflect confusion when news of the actions of the council first reached Alexandria. Presumably this came by means of the emperor’s letters or through the four “orthodox” Egyptian bishops, who would have made a one-sided case for the election of a new bishop. When the followers of Dioscorus returned to Egypt, however, they would have had a different tale to tell and this may have turned popular opinion against the election.
114. ACO II, v, p. 123.
115. Evagrius Historia Ecclesiastica 2.5; FHG IV, p. 101. See also Theophanes, p. 106.
116. The Serapaeum had been destroyed in 391, but was quickly converted into a church and named after the emperor Arcadius (Sozomen Hist. Eccl 7.15; Socrates Hist. Eccl. 5. 16).
118. J. Leipolt, Scheunte von Atripe, pp. 24–26, and 177.
119. Evagrius Hist. Eccl. 2. 5.
120. On the position of praefectus Augustalis see M. Gelzer, Studien, pp. 17–19; O. Seeck, “Florus (6),” RE, vol. 6, col. 2761. Theodorus, the Augustal prefect as late as the time of the election of Proterus, was perhaps still in office, but if so, he was unable to deal with the violence. Florus may have come along with the delegates returning from the council or, more likely, he may have been the commander of the two thousand fresh troops sent by the emperor. In any case, he appears to have been dispatched with extraordinary powers to deal specifically with these difficulties in Alexandria, although he later commanded maneuvers against the Blemmyes and Nobadi in Upper Egypt.
121. Evagrius Hist. Eccl. 2.5.

122. This does not explicitly contradict Evagrius, who says nothing of the time elapsed between the consecration of Proterius and the eruption of violence. But most modern accounts have assumed that Priscus arrived in Alexandria about the same time as the consecration of Proterius, while from Zacharia's account it would appear that he came sometime later when opposition to the new bishop had had time to develop.

123. Zacharia Hist. Eccl. 3.2. Unfortunately, we do not know Zacharia's source for these events. As mentioned earlier, Zacharia's work represents a Monophysite's point of view, but his account of the course of events does not deviate drastically from that of the orthodox historians. It is possible that he drew on orthodox sources and does not here reflect a Monophysite tradition.

124. By "Romans" Zacharia clearly means Roman soldiers (see Hist. Eccl. 3.9).

125. Zacharia Hist. Eccl. 3.2.


127. Zacharia Hist. Eccl. 3.2. On the monasteries of Alexandria see Paul Van Cauwenbergh, Étude sur les Moines d'Égypte, pp. 72-76. We do not know which monasteries Zacharia had in mind in this passage and indeed we know little about the role of the monasteries of the city itself during the christological controversy. We have more information about the monasteries a short distance west; in this area most of the monks, led by Longinus of the Ennaton (i.e., the monks of the Oktokaidekaton and the Eikosten), strongly opposed Chalcedon and Proterius. See Cauwenbergh Étude, pp. 66-69; 78-80.

128. As we have seen, it was common to accuse an enemy of uncanonical action instead of theological error. A person whose enmity toward Proterius was personal or financial might not have participated in a program whose orientation was strictly theological. John Chrysostom, Nestorius, and Dioscorus himself were all deposed for violating canons rather than for holding any heretical opinions.

129. On this very interesting figure, see H. G. Opitz, s.v. "Timothéos (24)," RE, series 2, vol. 6, part 2; J. Lebon, Le monophysisme sévérien (Louvain, 1909), pp. 16 ff. Little is known of Timothéos' life before 451.

130. See Thomas Niggl, s.v. "Petrus III Mongus," Lexikon fur Theologie und Kirche, vol. 8, (1963), pp. 370-371; Wm Bright, s.v. "Petrus (6)," Dictionary of Christian Biography, vol. 4 (1887). He had been ordained deacon by Dioscorus and was reputed to have been a leader in the violence against Flavian at Ephesus (Mansi, VI. 1017). See also Liberatus Breviarium (ACO, II, v, pp. 123-24).


132. It had become customary to accuse one's enemies in Alexandria of plotting to shut off the grain supply from Egypt; the Arians, for example, accused Athanasius of attempting this (Socrates Hist. Eccl. 1.35).

133. Evagrius Historia Ecclesiastica 2.6. The drought struck Phrygia, Galatia, Cappadocia, Cilicia, and "many other areas." I have been unable to ascertain whether such conditions in Asia Minor and Palestine would indicate a drought in the Abysinnian plateau—and thus a low Nile and famine in Egypt. See H. G. Lyons, The Physiography of the River Nile and its Basin (Cairo, 1906), pp. 350-87, who discusses the variation of the Nile flood and its causes. From his data it would appear that a long period of drought in Egypt (e.g., seven years—or the period from the return of the priest Athanasius to Metanoia to 453) was very unlikely.


135. ACO II, i, 2, p. 20.

136. See W. H. Buckler, "Labour Disputes in the Province of Asia," in Anatolian Studies Presented to Sir William Mitchell Ramsay (Manchester, 1923), pp. 27-50; Ramsay MacMullen, "A Note on Roman Strikes," Classical Journal 58 (1963), 269-71. Of course, it is also possible that the shipment of grain was hindered by rural supporters of Dioscorus, before it ever reached Alexandria.
137. Leo Epistulae 127 (ACO II, iv, pp. 82-83 [January 9, 454]).
138. Leo Epistulae 129 (ACO II, iv, pp. 84-86), and 130 (pp. 83-84), dated March 10, 454.
139. Leo Epistulae 129 (ACO II, iv, p. 85). There may be some rationale behind Leo's use of plebs rather than populus in this context. He believed that only the simple people of Alexandria were being deceived by the propaganda of the Dioscorans.
140. Leo Epistulae 130 (ACO II, iv, p. 83).
141. Zachariah Hist. Eccl. 3. 2.
142. ACO II, i, 3, pp. 129-30; the Latin text of this letter (ACO II, v, pp. 3-4) is more complete than the Greek and mentions the mission of John.
144. Zachariah Hist. Eccl. 4. 1-3; Evagrius Hist. Eccl. 2. 8; ACO, II, v, pp. 11-22; Duchesne Early History of the Christian Church, vol. 3, pp. 221-33; Bardy, Histoire, p. 280.
145. Zachariah Hist. Eccl. 4. 9, claims that ten thousand perished, and the Proterians aided the forces of the government.
146. Zachariah Hist. Eccl. 5.2-4; Evagrius Hist. Eccl. 3.4-5.
150. For an excellent discussion of this question, again see A. H. M. Jones, "Ancient Heresies."
151. See, for example, the Egyptian family Apion, which attained consular dignity in the fifth and sixth centuries, in Oxyrhynchus. E. R. Hardy, The Large Estates of Byzantine Egypt (New York, 1931), pp. 25-38.