

RAFAŁ KOSIŃSKI

Euphemios, Patriarch of Constantinople in the Years 490–496

Abstract: The article aims to reconstruct the activity of Euphemios beginning from his appointment to bishop of Constantinople until his death in exile, with regard to broader political and religious aspects of the period. In its reconstruction of the events, it draws primarily on the work of Theodore Lector, the best-informed and closest to the relevant facts, as well as on the associated tradition, and confronts it with other sources. Euphemios' elevation to metropolitan in 490 took place with the emperor Zeno's approval, with no pressure from the pro-Chalcedonian circles at the capital. Despite his efforts, the bishop failed to put an end to the schism with Rome and consolidate the Chalcedonian movement in the Empire. From the beginning, Euphemios had not maintained friendly relations with Anastasius, the emperor Zeno's successor, yet the actual conflict between the bishop and the emperor, which would result in the deposition of Euphemios in 496, had erupted shortly before that event and had been preceded by several years of their peaceful co-existence. The bishop's deposition was caused primarily by political reasons in connection with the accusations of Euphemios' collaboration with the Isaurian rebels, not any religious considerations. It was linked to the defeat of the Isaurian forces in the civil war and, most probably, Anastasius' acquisition of some documents compromising the bishop's loyalty. The accusations of Euphemios' alleged Nestorian sympathies would only come to serve as the formal justification of his deposition carried through by a synod.

The latter half of the fifth century witnessed a number of significant developments in the history of the Church. In 451, the bishops convened at Chalcedon undertook to put an end to the ongoing Christological controversy. The outcome of the Council was a Christological definition that was soon to cause much resistance in some sections of the Church in the Eastern part of the Empire. The close of the fifth century saw an increasing hiatus between the adherents and opponents of the Council. The Church at Constantinople continued in its consistent support of the decisions of Chalcedon, yet the situation was much more complicated in the provinces, especially in Egypt, whereas the influence of the anti-Chalcedonian movement had been steadily growing. In 482, the emperor Zeno addressed the Church in Egypt in a document known as *Henotikon*, which was an attempt to reconcile the moderate opponents of the Council with the pro-Chalcedonian Church supported by the imperial authority. Despite some initial success, this particular endeavour would end in failure and the anti-Chalcedonian attitudes in Egypt would become even stronger. The popes were staunch advocates of the decrees of Chalcedon, although the bishops of Constantinople could not have relied on receiving any support from the See of Rome. In 484, Rome ceased to be in communion with Constantinople, and the so-called Acacian schism was to continue until as late as 519.¹

To date, the contemporary episcopate of Euphemios has not been treated with much historiographical interest. Except for some brief encyclopaedic notes, the sole more extensive essay dedicated to this figure was written several centuries ago.² Although recent years have brought a few publications showing some more attention to Euphemios, they tend to focus almost exclusively on the conflict between the bishop and the emperor Anastasius, with very little concern for other aspects of Euphemios' episcopate.³ Something of a notable exception are the works of Phillippe Blaudéau,

¹ For more on the subject, see R. KOSIŃSKI, *The Emperor Zeno. Religion and Politics (Byzantina et Slavica Cracoviensia VI)*. Cracow 2010.

² S. LENAIN DE TILLEMONT, *Mémoires pour servir à l'histoire ecclésiastique des six premiers siècles*, XVI. Venise 1732, 632–662. Cf. R. JANIN, *Euphémios*. *DHGE XV* 1410–1411.

³ The most significant works dealing with the conflict between Anastasius and Euphemios are F. K. HAARER, *Anastasius I. Politics and Empire in the Late Roman World (ARCA. Classical and Medieval Texts, Papers and Monographs 46)*. Cambridge 2006; M. MEIER, *Anastasios I. Die Entstehung des Byzantinischen Reiches*. Stuttgart 2009 and J. DIJKSTRA – G. GREATREX, *Patriarchs and Politics in Constantinople in the Reign of Anastasius (with a Reedition of O.Mon.Epiph. 59)*. *Mill 6* (2009)

investigating the circumstances of Euphemios' accession to the See of Constantinople towards the close of Zeno's reign and the bishop's relations with Rome.⁴ It is nonetheless worth discussing the significance of this particular figure in more detail, as he is the first bishop of Constantinople – after John Chrysostom – deposed in consequence of the emperor's explicit demand. The circumstances of his deposition may thus signify an important shift in the status of the relationship between the imperial and episcopal powers at Constantinople during the fifth century. The facts of Euphemios' episcopate also shed some more light on the contemporary factors instrumental in appointing a new metropolitan of Constantinople as well as in his actual influence on the local Churches in the early Byzantine period.

The present article aims to depict the activity of Euphemios from his appointment as Patriarch of Constantinople to his death in exile, with broader political and religious contexts of the period. Contrary to the currently prevailing view, I would like to point out that Euphemios' accession to the metropolitan rank took place on the strength of the emperor Zeno's consent, not in consequence of any pressure exerted on the latter. Besides, with no support from the emperor, the bishop of Constantinople would not have had any actual influence on the development of the situation in the other Churches in the East. Euphemios failed in preventing Anastasius' elevation to the throne, yet a dramatic conflict between the bishop and the new ruler would only break out shortly before the deposition of the former in 496, following several years of relatively peaceful mutual relations. Therefore, Euphemios' removal from office was due to political, rather than religious, reasons.

1. SOURCES

The body of the source information relating to Euphemios is not very extensive and consists, for the most part, of more or less perfunctory notes on his deposition.

1.1. PRO-CHALCEDONIAN SOURCES

The most important source-based tradition on the life and activity of Euphemios is Theodore Lector's Ecclesiastical History and the later works drawing thereon. Theodore was closely associated with Patriarch Makedonios of Constantinople, whom he accompanied after the bishop's banishment to Euchaïta, in 511, where his work was composed. The author had been therefore writing his work after merely fifteen years following Euphemios' deposition and may have been a witness to the events in Constantinople he had described. As a Constantinopolitan cleric closely associated with the Patriarch he had first-hand information connected with the metropolitan Church. Theodore was a declared Chalcedonian and his dogmatic views make him glorify the fervent defenders of Chalcedon, including Euphemios, in his work. On the contrary, opponents of the Council are depicted in very critical terms, at times even bordering on caricature depiction; he is also clearly averse to the emperor Anastasius. In Theodore's view, the ideal ruler was to obey the orthodox bishops, under whose auspices he ought to act in defence of the Chalcedonian teachings, but he should not interfere in internal affairs of the Church. The History comprised the entire history of the Church and was composed of three parts, of which the last one constitutes his proper work, in four books, extending until the death

223–264. Let us also take note of the following earlier publications: P. CHARANIS, *Church and State in the Later Roman Empire, The Religious Policy of Anastasius the First, 491–518*. Thessalonike 1974 and C. CAPIZZI, *L'imperatore Anastasio I (491–518)*. Studio sulla sua vita, la sua opera e la sua personalità (*OCA* 184). Roma 1969.

⁴ PH. BLAUDEAU, *Alexandrie et Constantinople (451–491)*. De l'histoire à la géo-ecclésiologie (*Bibliothèque des Écoles françaises d'Athènes et de Rome* 327). Roma 2006 and PH. BLAUDEAU, *Vice mea*. Remarques sur les représentations pontificales auprès de l'empereur d'orient dans la seconde moitié du V^e siècle (452–496). *MEFRA* 113 (2001) 1059–1123.

of Anastasius in 518. Theodore's History has survived only in fragments, in the form of extracts from the Epitome, an abridged version of Theodore's work written in 610–615, and the church histories by Eusebius, Gelasius of Caesarea, and John Diakrinomenos.⁵

Theodore Lector's work was much used by later authors, whose accounts do not so much provide any new details as they permit a fuller reconstruction of Theodore's account. As early as in the sixth century, a Latin chronicle was composed by Victor of Tunnuna, one of the African bishops summoned to Constantinople by the emperor Justinian. Because, as a consistent Chalcedonian, he refused to condemn the so-called Three Chapters in 544, the emperor had him confined to a monastery in Egypt, later at Constantinople. During his presence at the capital, he had composed a Latin chronicle from the Creation to the year 566, of which the last part, beginning from 444, has survived to modern times. The information concerning Euphemios is apparently completely dependent on Theodore Lector's History, hence the evaluations of Euphemios and Anastasius coincide with Theodore's views.⁶

A much later author, Theophanes (d. 817/818), wrote a chronicle encompassing a period from 285 to 813. Likewise, his account of Euphemios' episcopate is based on Theodore's History, which is often cited almost verbatim. However, the author had incorporated some additions, giving Theodore's original content a somewhat sharper edge and offering a more critical judgement of Anastasius' conduct.⁷ Another ninth-century writer just as dependent on Theodore Lector's work is George the Monk, the author of the Chronikon syntomon, which was composed, most likely, in the mid-840s. It was a universal history from the Creation to 842. There is no detailed information on the author. His work is focused on the matters relating to the history of the Church; it is definitely biased and very critical of religious opponents.⁸

Another work to have used, either directly or through Theophanes, Theodore's history is the Synodicon Vetus, which is an anonymous concise history of the church synods spanning a period from the Apostolic times to 886, ending with the final deposition of Patriarch Photios of Constantinople. In all probability, the Synodicon was written not much later, at the turn of the ninth and tenth centuries.⁹ Theodore Lector's work is most probably the source of a brief passage in the Souda, concerning the conflict between Euphemios and the future Emperor Anastasius.¹⁰

Among the Chalcedonian sources, the most extensive body of information concerning Euphemios is the tradition connected with Theodore Lector; however, some works independent of that tradition have also survived to modern times. The most significant source of the latter group is the Ecclesiastical History by Evagrius, the author from Epiphania in Syria II. His work, in six books, was written in

⁵ Cf. G. CH. HANSEN, Einleitung, in: Theodoros Anagnostes, Kirchengeschichte, ed. G. CH. HANSEN (GCS, N.F. 3). Berlin 1971, IX–XXXIX; P. NAUTIN, Théodore Lecteur et sa «Réunion de différentes histoire» de l'Église. *REB* 52 (1994) 213–243; M. WHITBY, The Church Historians and Chalcedon, in: Greek and Roman Historiography in Late Antiquity. Fourth to Sixth Century A. D., ed. G. Marasco. Leiden – Boston 2003, 467–472; BLAUDEAU, Alexandrie et Constantinople (451–491) 549–552 and 622–648; W. TREADGOLD, The Early Byzantine Historians. New York 2007, 169–173.

⁶ Cf. A. PLACANICA, Da Cartagine a Bisanzio: per la biografia di Vittore Tunnunense. *Vetera Christianorum* 26 (1989) 327–336 and IDEM, Introduzione, in: Vittore da Tunnuna, Chronica. Chiesa e impero nell'età di Giustiniano, a cura di A. PLACANICA (*Per verba* 4). Firenze 1997, XI–XXXI.

⁷ Cf. C. MANGO – R. SCOTT, Introduction, in: The Chronicle of Theophanes Confessor. Byzantine and Near Eastern History AD 284–813, translated with introduction and commentary by C. MANGO and R. SCOTT with the assistance of G. GREATREX. Oxford 1997, LII–C.

⁸ Cf. S. SHESTAKOV, O proizhozdenii i sostave chroniki Georgija Monacha. Kazan 1891 and D. AFINOGENOV, The Date of Georgios Monachos Reconsidered. *BZ* 92 (1999) 437–447.

⁹ Cf. J. DUFFY – J. PARKER, Introduction, in: The Synodicon Vetus, Text, Translation, and Notes by J. DUFFY and J. PARKER (*CFHB* XV). Washington, D.C. 1979, XIII–XV.

¹⁰ Cf. C. DE BOOR, Zu Suidas. *Hermes* 52 (1917) 314–316. On the lexicon, see A. KAZHDAN, Souda. *ODB* III 1930–1931.

the years 592–594. The author died shortly afterwards.¹¹ Unlike Theodore, his opinion of the emperor Anastasius is much more favourable, whilst his appraisal of the Patriarch of Constantinople is a less positive one. This may have been due to the nature of the sources used by Evagrius, some of which were anti-Chalcedonian. Besides, Evagrius had worked amid neo-Chalcedonian circles; he did not belong to the radical movement of the Council supporters, which was to have an impact on how the events would be represented in his work.¹²

Among the hagiographic sources, the most notable one is *The Life of Daniel Stylites*, composed by an anonymous disciple of the saint, still during Euphemios' episcopate, ca. 494. It is therefore the earliest of the extant sources; its evaluations of the Patriarch and the emperor are not burdened with the later conflict that was to lead, eventually, to the deposition of the bishop. As a result, the author very clearly commends both the emperor Anastasius and Euphemios.¹³

In turn, *The Life of Sabas*' relevant account by Cyril of Scythopolis, a Palestinian monk, is clearly favourable to Euphemios and critical of Anastasius. The author, an ardent Chalcedonian, had written his work towards the end of the 550s, more than half a century after the deposition of the metropolitan of Constantinople, depicting, in his account of St Sabas' activity, the events that had led to the triumph of the orthodoxy in the Holy Land.¹⁴

Furthermore, brief mentions pertaining to Euphemios can be found in some other sources of Chalcedonian provenance, e.g., by Marcellinus Comes, Liberatus, John Moschos, or *De cerimoniis* by Constantine Porphyrogenitus.¹⁵ Let us also note a small body of the epistolographic evidence from the period of Euphemios' episcopate, as part of the correspondence between the bishops of Rome and Constantinople.¹⁶

¹¹ Cf. P. ALLEN, Evagrius Scholasticus the Church Historian (*Spicilegium sacrum Lovaniense* 41). Louvain 1981, 1–4; M. WHITBY, Introduction, in: *The Ecclesiastical History of Evagrius Scholasticus*, translated with an introduction by M. WHITBY (*Translated Texts for Historians* 33). Liverpool 2000, XIII–XX; TREADGOLD, *The Early Byzantine Historians* 299–303.

¹² Cf. P. ALLEN, Zachariah Scholasticus and the *Historia Ecclesiastica* of Evagrius Scholasticus. *Journal of Theological Studies* 31 (1980) 471–488; EADEM, Evagrius Scholasticus the Church Historian, *passim*; WHITBY, Introduction XX–LX; IDEM, *The Church Historians and Chalcedon* 480–492; TREADGOLD, *The Early Byzantine Historians* 303–307.

¹³ Cf. H. DELEHAYE, *De fontibus Vitae S. Danielis stylitae*. *AnBoll* 32 (1913) 225; H. DELEHAYE, *Les Saints Stylites (Subsidia Hagiographica* 14). Bruxelles – Paris 1923, XXXV and LIV–LV; R. LANE FOX, *The Life of Daniel*, in: *Portraits: Biographical Representation in the Greek and Latin Literature of the Roman Empire*, ed. by M. J. EDWARDS – S. SWAIN. Oxford 1997, esp. 202–210, and R. KOSIŃSKI, ΑΓΙΩΣΥΝΗ ΚΑΙ ΕΞΟΥΣΙΑ. Konstantynopolitańscy święci mężowie i władza w V wieku po Chr. (*Archiwum Filologiczne* 56). Warszawa 2006, 116–119.

¹⁴ Cf. J. BINNS, *Ascetics and Ambassadors of Christ. The Monasteries of Palestine* 314–631. Oxford 1994, 33; D. HOMBERGEN, *The Second Origenist Controversy. A New Perspective on Cyril of Scythopolis' Monastic Biographies as Historical Sources for Sixth-Century Origenism (Studia Anselmiana* 132). Roma 2001, 39.

¹⁵ On Marcellinus Comes' chronicle written ca. 534, see B. CROKE, *Count Marcellinus and his Chronicle*. Oxford 2001. On Liberatus' work, composed near the end of Justinian's reign, see esp. *Zeitschrift für Antikes Christentum* 14 (2010), which is a collection of articles on this author. On *The Pratum Spirituale* of John Moschos, see N. H. BAYNES, *The Pratum Spirituale*. *OCP* 13 (1947) 404–414. For the question of the mid-tenth century *De cerimoniis* of Constantine Porphyrogenitus, see M. FEATHERSTONE, *Preliminary Remarks on the Leipzig Manuscript of De Cerimoniis*. *BZ* 95 (2002) 457–479; IDEM, *Further Remarks on the De Cerimoniis*. *BZ* 97 (2004) 113–121, and C. SODE, *Die Krönungsprotokolle des Petros Patrikius im Zeremonienbuch Konstantins VII. Porphyrogenetos*. Jena 2004.

¹⁶ Of the above-mentioned correspondence, we have only one extant letter of Pope Gelasius I addressed to Euphemios (E. SCHWARTZ, *Publizistische Sammlungen zum acacianischen Schisma [Abhandlungen der Bayerischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, Philosophisch-philologische Klasse, N.F.* 10]. München 1934, 49–55). From various mentions in other sources, we also know of a certain, now lost, letter of Pope Felix III to Euphemios (cf. P. NAUTIN, *Felix III [II]*. *DHGE* XVI 893–894) and of most probably four, also lost, Euphemios' letters to Rome: two to Pope Felix III and two to Pope Gelasius I, cf. V. GRUMEL, *Les registres des actes du patriarcat de Constantinople, tome I, Les actes des patriarches, fasc. I, Les registres de 381 à 715*. Paris 1972, 132–136, who holds, however, that Euphemios had sent only one letter to Pope Felix, identifying the synodal letter of 490, with a notification of his election to the See of Constantinople, with a different epistle, mentioned by Pseudo-Zacharias VII 1 (*Historia Ecclesiastica Zachariae Rhetori vulgo adscripta, interpretatus est E. W. BROOKS [CSCO*

1.2. ANTI-CHALCEDONIAN SOURCES

The anti-Chalcedonian tradition does not pay much attention to Euphemios, focusing primarily on the causes of his deposition and exile. Zacharias Rhetor's *Ecclesiastical History* was written in the 490s, yet we only have it in its Syriac version in the work, dated 568/569, by an anonymous author called Pseudo-Zacharias, contained in the books III–VI of his own history. Pseudo-Zacharias was a monk living at Amida, where he had access to important historical sources collected at the local cathedral library by the anti-Chalcedonian bishop Mara.¹⁷ We do not know, however, if Rhetor's work had been translated by Pseudo-Zacharias himself, or he made use of a previously existing rendition. It is not known, either, if the Syriac version is an accurate translation of the *Ecclesiastical History*, or it is only an abridged version. We know from the later work by Evagrius Scholasticus that there were some passages in the original Greek version which are missing in Pseudo-Zacharias.¹⁸ The anonymous author had constructed his chronicle on the earlier work by the Gaza-born Zacharias Rhetor, who had known the events from the reign of Anastasius first-hand and from witnesses' oral accounts; he provides the otherwise unknown information on the conflict between the bishop of Constantinople and the Patriarch Athanasios II of Alexandria.¹⁹ Another, and more extensive, depiction of Euphemios' case in anti-Chalcedonian literature was written by John of Nikiu, the author of a chronicle encompassing a period from the Creation to the Arab conquest of Egypt. John was a bishop of the Egyptian city of Nikiu in the south-western part of the Delta and the general superior of monasteries under Patriarch Simon (693–700). The chronicle only survives in an Ethiopian translation (1602) of the Arabic version.²⁰

The later works of anti-Chalcedonian provenance (the chronicles by Pseudo-Dionysios of Tel Mahre, Michael the Syrian, Jacob of Edessa; *Chronicle of Edessa* and *Chronicle to the Year 846*) are

Scriptores Syri, series III, tomus VII]. Louvain 1924, 13,8–9). However, since the letter mentioned in Pseudo-Zacharias' work was concerned with Patriarch Athanasios II of Alexandria, elected towards the end of 490, and his anathematization of the Council of Chalcedon, which the Bishop of Constantinople may not have probably known until the beginning of 491, this particular letter could not have been Euphemios' synodal letter of 490. In turn, NAUTIN, Felix III (II) 893–894, argues that Euphemios had sent the notification of his election with a proposal to restore the communion only after Anastasius I's accession to the Imperial throne. Considering, however, Euphemios' views, his re-insertion of the Pope's name in the diptychs, and the Emperor Zeno's wish to normalize the relations between Constantinople and Rome, it would have been difficult to account for more than a year-long delay in the dispatch of the Bishop of Constantinople's letter to Felix, cf. KOSIŃSKI, *The Emperor Zeno 192–193*.

¹⁷ Cf. G. GREATREX, *Le Pseudo-Zacharie de Mytilène et l'historiographie syriaque au sixième siècle*, in: *L'historiographie syriaque*, édité par M. Debié (*Études syriaques* 6). Paris 2009, 33–37 and G. GREATREX, Introduction, in: *The Chronicle of Pseudo-Zachariah Rhetor. Church and War in Late Antiquity*, edited by G. GREATREX, translated by R. R. PHENIX and C. HORN, with contributions by S. P. BROCK and W. WITAKOWSKI (*Translated Texts for Historians* 55). Liverpool 2011, 32–33.

¹⁸ Cf. ALLEN, *Zachariah Scholasticus and the Historia Ecclesiastica of Evagrius Scholasticus 471–488*; G. GREATREX, *Pseudo-Zachariah of Mytilene. The Context and Nature of his Work*. *Journal of the Canadian Society for Syriac Studies* 6 (2006) 40–43; GREATREX, *Le Pseudo-Zacharie de Mytilène et l'historiographie syriaque au sixième siècle* 39–42.

¹⁹ Cf. ALLEN, *Zachariah Scholasticus and the Historia Ecclesiastica of Evagrius Scholasticus 471–488*; WHITBY, *The Church Historians and Chalcedon 459–466*; BLAUDEAU, *Alexandrie et Constantinople (451–491)* 544–549; GREATREX, *Le Pseudo-Zacharie de Mytilène et l'historiographie syriaque au sixième siècle* 37–38; GREATREX, Introduction 3–31, and *Prosopographie chrétienne du Bas-Empire*, 3: S. DESTEPHEN, *Prosopographie du Diocèse d'Asie (325–641)*. Paris 2008, 960–973 (Zacharias I).

²⁰ Cf. H. ZOTENBERG, *Avertissement*, in: *Chronique de Jean, évêque de Nikiou, texte éthiopien publié et traduit par H. ZOTENBERG*. Paris 1883, 5–10; R. H. CHARLES, Introduction, in: *The Chronicle of John, Bishop of Nikiu, translated from Zotenberg's Ethiopic text by R. H. CHARLES*. Oxford 1916, IV–V; A. CARILE, *Giovanni di Nikius, cronista bizantino-copto del VII secolo*. *Felix Ravenna* 121–122 (1981) 103–155, and recently PH. BOOTH, *Shades of Blues and Greens in the Chronicle of John of Nikiou*. *BZ* 104 (2011) 555–602.

much more laconic, only stating that Euphemios had been deposed in connection with accusations of the Nestorian heresy.²¹ John Malalas' information is limited to a terse note only.²²

2. THE EARLY PERIOD OF EUPHEMIOS' EPISCOPATE

In March of 490, Patriarch Fravitas died after only three and a half months of his episcopate.²³ Euphemios became a new bishop of Constantinople. According to Pseudo-Zacharias of Mytilene, he came from Apameia and was to have been educated at Alexandria.²⁴ On the other hand, Liberatus of Carthage notes that his birth-place was Alexandria.²⁵ This information is most probably false, as Liberatus must have confused the details found in Pseudo-Zacharias. The apparently best-informed source, Theodore Lector's History, does not mention the Patriarch's place of birth, only noting that Euphemios had been a presbyter at the time of his appointment.²⁶ Theophanes and George the Monk add that Euphemios had been in charge of assistance for the poor at Constantinople.²⁷ It may be assumed that these two later authors had drawn on a more complete version of Theodore Lector's work.

Eduard Schwartz suggests that Euphemios' election to the metropolitan see was carried through as a result of the campaigning of Constantinople's monks, who were relentless adherents of Chalcedon. However, as there are no reasons suggesting that it met with any kind of objection from Zeno, it should be assumed that Euphemios had obtained the emperor's acceptance.²⁸ Moreover, according to Theodore Lector's testimony, the emperor collaborated with the new metropolitan in connection with the affair of *silentarios* Anastasius, who had placed his own pulpit at the Cathedral of Constantinople and preached explicitly anti-Chalcedonian homilies. Euphemios appealed to the emperor with a complaint against the *silentarios*. In any case, Zeno did not undertake to defend the incrim-

²¹ On the shorter Syriac chronicles, see A. PALMER, *Les chroniques brèves syriaques*, in: *L'historiographie syriaque* 57–87, esp. 58, 63–65, 71. On Pseudo-Dionysios and his work, see W. WITAKOWSKI, *The Syriac Chronicle of Pseudo-Dionysius of Tel-Mahrē. A Study in the History of Historiography (Studia Semitica Upsaliensia 9)*. Uppsala 1987. On Michael the Syrian's work, see esp. J.-B. CHABOT, Introduction, in: *Chronique de Michel le Syrien: Patriarche Jacobite d'Antioche (1166–1198)*, éditée pour la première fois et traduite en français par J.-B. CHABOT, I (livre I–VII). Paris 1899, II–XXXVII; D. WELTECKE, *Les trois grandes chroniques syro-orthodoxes des XII^e et XIII^e siècles*, in: *L'historiographie syriaque* 111–116.

²² On John Malalas and his work, see: *Studies in John Malalas*, ed. E. Jeffreys with B. Croke and R. Scott (*Byzantina Australiensia* 6). Sydney 1990, and *Recherches sur la chronique de Jean Malalas*, I–II, ed. J. Beaucamp, avec la collaboration de S. Agusta-Boularot – A.-M. Bernardi – B. Cabouret et E. Caire. Paris 2004–2006; also TREADGOLD, *The Early Byzantine Historians 235–252* and W. TREADGOLD, *The Byzantine World Histories of John Malalas and Eustathius of Epiphania. The International History Review* 29 (2007) 709–745.

²³ Theodore Lector, *Epitome* 440 (Theodoros Anagnostes, *Kirchengeschichte*, herausgegeben von G. CH. HANSEN [GCS, N.F. 3]. Berlin 1971, 122, 21). Evagrius III 23 (*The Ecclesiastical History of Evagrius with the scholia*, edited with introduction, critical notes, and indices by J. BIDEZ and L. PARMENTIER. London 1898, 121, 6) mentions, in turn, four months of Fravitas' episcopate. Cf. SCHWARTZ, *Publizistische Sammlungen zum acacianischen Schisma* 213, esp. note 2; B. SCHWARK, *Die Kirchenpolitik Kaiser Zenos*. (Diss.) Würzburg 1950, 58; BLAUDEAU, *Alexandrie et Constantinople (451–491)* 234. For more on Fravitas, see P. NAUTIN, *Fravita. DHGE XVIII (1977) 1128–1129* and KOSIŃSKI, *The Emperor Zeno 188–191*.

²⁴ Pseudo-Zacharias VI 4 (5, 24–25 BROOKS): *Euphemius quidam apamenus qui Alexandriae educatus est*.

²⁵ Liberatus XVIII 127 (*ACO* II 5, 132, 7): *Eufimius genere Alexandrinus*.

²⁶ Theodore Lector, *Epitome* 440 (122, 21–22 HANSEN): *Εὐφήμιος τις πρεσβύτερος*.

²⁷ Theophanes AM 5981 (*Theophanis Chronographia*, I, recensuit C. DE BOOR. Lipsiae 1883, 133, 14–15): *Εὐφήμιος, πρεσβύτερος καὶ πτωχοτρόφος Νεαπόλεως*; George the Monk IX 15 (*Georgii Monachi Chronicon*, II, edidit C. DE BOOR. Lipsiae 1904, 623, 14–15): *Εὐφήμιος, πρεσβύτερος καὶ πτωχοτρόφος Νεαπόλεως τῆς κειμένης ἐν τῷ Ἀνάπλῳ*. JANIN, *Euphémios* 1410, falsely states that Euphemios was in charge of an orphanage (*orphelinat*). A ptocheion, which Euphemios had administered, was situated in the Constantinopolitan district of Neapolis; on the location, see R. JANIN, *La géographie ecclésiastique de l'Empire Byzantin*, première partie, *Le siège de Constantinople et le patriarcat oecuménique*, III, *Les églises et les monastères*. Paris 1969, 569.

²⁸ Cf. SCHWARTZ, *Publizistische Sammlungen zum acacianischen Schisma* 214. Although this opinion has no justification in the sources, it is supported by BLAUDEAU, *Vice mea* 1099 and IDEM, *Alexandrie et Constantinople (451–491)* 235, who even states that the election of Euphemios was carried out under pressure from the Constantinopolitan monks.

inated official, but turned him over to the bishop's authority.²⁹ Blaudeau dismisses this co-operation between the ruler and the bishop of Constantinople with a comment that the emperor was guided in this particular matter by his personal considerations, as Anastasius was allegedly the empress Ariadne's lover. However, Theodore and Theophanes (the latter having drawn on Theodore's account) expressly state that religious issues were the axis of the controversy, and do not mention anywhere the alleged love affair between Zeno's wife and the future emperor.³⁰

The new bishop of Constantinople decided to undertake more resolute steps aiming to consolidate the Chalcedonian movement in the East.³¹ Euphemios also counted on renewing the alliance with Rome, yet he was to face a certain disappointment in that regard. In his reply to Fravita's synodal letter, Felix III appreciated his declarations seeking reconciliation and recognized his faith as orthodox, still he demanded uncompromisingly that both Peter Mongos and Akakios, the latter of whom was also anathematized by the Roman synod, be removed from the diptychs. As long as the bishop of Constantinople remained in communion with the condemned Akakios, he could not count on Rome's recognition, either.³² In a similar manner, the Pope addressed the emperor, who, as we can see from Felix III's letter, firmly supported the efforts for re-establishing the communion between Rome and Constantinople.³³ Perhaps, Zeno had counted on the Pope's support in his efforts to submit Italy to imperial authority.³⁴ Nonetheless, Euphemios could fulfil the Pope's demands only in part, by erasing Peter's name from the diptychs.³⁵ Peter's ambiguous stance, manoeuvring between the opponents and supporters of the Council, had caused that the bishop of Constantinople was ready to sacrifice Peter in favour of restoring the communion with Rome. However, Akakios' popularity at the capital and the fact that he implemented the policy of the reigning Emperor did not allow such a move against him. Most likely, Euphemios was reluctant to take such a measure as he had been firmly associated with Akakios, who ordained him as presbyter and whom he considered to be a truly orthodox Chalcedonian.

In spite of that, a synodal letter was sent to Rome through deacon Sincretius, informing Felix III of the election of a new bishop, in which Euphemios' adherence to the decrees of Chalcedon was clearly stated, and also explaining why it was not possible to remove the name of Akakios from the diptychs of the Church of Constantinople. At the same time, the bishop of Constantinople restored

²⁹ Theodore Lector, *Epitome* 441 (123, 12–17 HANSEN) = George the Monk IX 15 (623, 20 – 624, 3 DE BOOR); Theophanes AM 5982 (134, 19–25 DE BOOR), and also the Souda Φ 136 (Suida Lexicon, edidit A. ADLER, IV, Π–Ψ. Lipsiae 1935, 704, 14–20). Theodore Lector writes that Anastasius was to preach “the teachings of Eutyches” at the Cathedral: Εὐτυχοῦς μαθῶν.

³⁰ Cf. BLAUDEAU, *Alexandrie et Constantinople (451–491)* 239, esp. note 810. The alleged love affair between Ariadne and Anastasius in the Emperor Zeno's lifetime is only based on a very casual interpretation of the passage from Pseudo-Zacharias VII 1 (12, 9–11 BROOKS): *Habebat autem, cum ipse miles esset, apud Ariadnem reginam παρρησίαν, quae eum regem facere voluit idque perfecit.* and should be rejected, cf. CAPIZZI, *L'imperatore Anastasio I (491–518)* 74, note 16; K. TWARDOWSKA, *Cesarzowe bizantyjskie 2 poł. V w. Kobiety a władza (Mediterraneum III)*. Kraków 2006, 95, and HAARER, *Anastasius I 4. On the conflict between Euphemios and Anastasius*, see also CHARANIS, *Church and State in the Later Roman Empire 40–41*; CAPIZZI, *L'imperatore Anastasio I (491–518)* 69–70; A. GRILLMEIER, *Christ in Christian Tradition*, vol. II, part I. From Chalcedon to Justinian I, translated by P. Allen, J. Cawte. Atlanta 1987, 264; HAARER, *Anastasius I 2*.

³¹ Theodore Lector, *Epitome* 440 (122, 21–23 HANSEN); Pseudo-Zacharias VI 4 (5, 29 – 6, 1 BROOKS); Evagrius III 23 (121 BIDEZ – PARMENTIER); Theophanes AM 5981 (133, 14–18 DE BOOR); George the Monk IX 15 (623, 16–19 DE BOOR).

³² Felix III's letter to Fravitas of early 490 (SCHWARTZ, *Publizistische Sammlungen zum acacianischen Schisma* 111–113). Cf. SCHWARK, *Die Kirchenpolitik Kaiser Zenos* 57–58; BLAUDEAU, *Alexandrie et Constantinople (451–491)* 234, 237–238.

³³ Felix III's letter to Zeno of early 490 (SCHWARTZ, *Publizistische Sammlungen zum acacianischen Schisma* 82–85).

³⁴ On the deal between the Emperor Zeno and Theoderic, which would enable the latter to take over Italy, cf. J. PROSTKO-PROSTYŃSKI, *Utraeque res publicae. The Emperor Anastasius I's Gothic Policy (491–518)*. Poznań 1994, 103–129.

³⁵ Theodore Lector, *Epitome* 440 (122, 21–23 HANSEN); George the Monk IX 15 (623, 16–19 DE BOOR); Theophanes AM 5981 (133, 14–18 DE BOOR); Pseudo-Zacharias VI 4 (5, 29–30 BROOKS); Evagrius III 23 (121, 9–11 BIDEZ – PARMENTIER). W. BARTH, *Kaiser Zeno*. Basel 1894, 115 states that Zeno would not give his consent for removing from the diptychs not only the name of Akakios but also of Peter Mongos, yet he does not offer any arguments to support it.

the Pope's name in the diptychs, still without formal establishment of communion with Rome.³⁶ In response to Euphemios' synodal letter, Felix III recognized his faith as orthodox, yet none the less he stated once again that he could not acknowledge him as legitimate and orthodox bishop of Constantinople and establish communion with him as long as the name of Akakios was still in the diptychs.³⁷

The removal of Peter's name from the diptychs of the Church of Constantinople was not followed by his deposition. Such a solution may have been considered at Constantinople, as related by Pseudo-Zacharias,³⁸ but on October 29, 490, the Patriarch of Alexandria died.³⁹ His successor was Athanasios II, who, in the words of Severos of Antioch and Liberatus, was to return to a more compromise-oriented course set out by the Henotikon and maintain the communion with Constantinople and Antioch, by which he wanted to secure the emperor's approval, yet simultaneously risked a new conflict with the Aposchists, radical adversaries of the Council of Chalcedon (Greek: ἀποσχιστάι, i.e., schismatics).⁴⁰ However, the full picture of Athanasios' actual views is not entirely clear. It appears, on the basis of the not fully clear passage from Pseudo-Zacharias⁴¹ and the Palestinian monks' letter to Alkison,⁴² that Athanasios broke with the compromise course of his predecessor, and even wanted to remove his name from the diptychs, whereas in his synodal letter he had also condemned

³⁶ Cf. JANIN, Euphémios 1410. The text of Euphemios' synodal letter to Felix III has not survived, cf. GRUMEL, Les registes des actes du patriarcat de Constantinople 132. Mentions in: Theodore Lector, Epitome 442 (123, 18–23 HANSEN), recreated from Theophanes AM 5983 (135, 17–20 DE BOOR); Synodicon Vetus 108 (92 DUFFY – PARKER). On the restoration of the Pope's name in the diptychs: Theophanes AM 5981 (133, 17–18 DE BOOR). See also Gelasius' letter to Euphemios of 492 (51 SCHWARTZ). P. NAUTIN, La lettre de Félix III à André de Thessalonique et sa doctrine sur l'Église et l'empire. *Revue d'Histoire Ecclésiastique* 77 (1982) 9–10, note 3, states that Euphemios' synodal letter could not have been sent while Zeno was still alive, as he would not have wanted to risk another humiliation from the Pope, cf. also BLAUDEAU, Alexandrie et Constantinople (451–491) 238, note 808. However, this thesis seems to be wrong. On the one hand, there is no mention in the sources suggesting the existence of differences between Zeno and Euphemios; on the other, Zeno himself had backed Fravitas' attempts to restore the communion with Rome, and therefore there is no reason why he should not have done the same thing several months later, especially as after the split with Peter Mongos he could expect a more favourable position of Pope Felix. The Constantinopolitan monks had already written about the election of Euphemios to the Pope, assuring him of the new Bishop's orthodoxy, cf. Felix III's letter to monk Thalassios of May 1, 490 (SCHWARTZ, *Publizistische Sammlungen zum acacianischen Schisma* 78–79). See also SCHWARK, *Die Kirchenpolitik Kaiser Zenos* 59–60 and BLAUDEAU, *Vice mea* 1099, note 178.

³⁷ Theodore Lector, Epitome 442 (123, 18–23 HANSEN), recreated from Theophanes AM 5983 (135, 17–20 DE BOOR); Synodicon Vetus 108 (92 DUFFY – PARKER). GRILLMEIER, *Christ in Christian Tradition* II/2, 265, dates the Pope's reply to the autumn of 490 or early 491.

³⁸ Pseudo-Zacharias VI 4 (5, 29–30 BROOKS) and VII 1 (12, 33–13, 4 BROOKS). Cf. SCHWARTZ, *Publizistische Sammlungen zum acacianischen Schisma* 214; SCHWARK, *Die Kirchenpolitik Kaiser Zenos* 59; CH. HAAS, *Alexandria in Late Antiquity. Topography and Social Conflict*. Baltimore – London 1997, 330; BLAUDEAU, *Alexandrie et Constantinople (451–491)* 236.

³⁹ The Jacobite Synaxarion, 2 hatour = 29 October (Le Synaxaire arabe jacobite [rédaction copte], II, Les mois de Hatour et de Kihak, Texte arabe publié, traduit et annoté par R. BASSET, in: *PO* III. Paris 1909, 246). The dating of Peter's death in: SCHWARTZ, *Publizistische Sammlungen zum acacianischen Schisma* 213. Cf. A. ELLI, *Storia della Chiesa copta, I. L'Egitto romano-bizantino e cristiano* [*Studia Orientalia Christiana. Monographiae* 12]. Cairo – Jerusalem 2003, 285, who dates this event to October 29, 489).

⁴⁰ Severos of Antioch's letter to Ammonios, presbyter at Alexandria in the years 513–516 (The Sixth Book of the Select Letters of Severus Patriarch of Antioch in the Syriac Version of Athanasius of Nisibis, ed. E. W. BROOKS, vol. II, part 2. London 1904, 255); Liberatus XVIII 127 (132, 9–19 SCHWARTZ). Severos' testimony is accepted by H. BACHT, *Die Rolle des orientalischen Mönchtums in den kirchenpolitischen Auseinandersetzungen um Chalkedon (431–519)*, in: *Das Konzil von Chalkedon. Geschichte und Gegenwart*, ed. A. Grillmeier und H. Bacht, II. Entscheidung um Chalkedon. Würzburg 1953, 275 and BLAUDEAU, *Alexandrie et Constantinople (451–491)* 236–237.

⁴¹ Pseudo-Zacharias VI 4 (6 9–12 BROOKS): *Hic* [Athanasius], *cum monachos ἀποσχιστάς ecclesiae concordere reddere vellet ac studeret, cursu orationis suae cum populum adloqueretur Dioscori et Timothei nomen fecit et Petri nomen sinit, populum tentans.*

⁴² Evagrius III 31 (127, 8 – 129, 30 BIDEZ – PARMENTIER). The letter of the pro-Chalcedonian Palestinian monks to Alkison, included in Evagrius' work, is a source independent of Pseudo-Zacharias (cf. ALLEN, *Evagrius Scholasticus the Church Historian* 147–149). The letter states that after Peter's death Alexandria broke off the communion with the rest of the Church: Πέτρου δὲ κεκοιμημένου, πάλιν εἰς αὐτοῦς ἀποσχίσθησαν Ἀλεξανδρεῖά τε καὶ Αἴγυπτος

the decisions of Chalcedon and Pope Leo's Tome.⁴³ Athanasios' openly anti-Chalcedonian attitude had very soon led him into a conflict with Euphemios, who, according to Pseudo-Zacharias, endeavoured to depose the Patriarch of Alexandria.⁴⁴ Yet those events ought to be dated to the beginning of the emperor Anastasius' reign.

3. EUPHEMIOS AND THE EMPEROR ANASTASIUS

The Emperor Zeno died on April 9, 491⁴⁵. He was succeeded by silentiarios Anastasius, handpicked by the widow-empress Ariadne. There are different accounts as to Euphemios' role in the event. De cerimoniis relates only his ceremonial role, whereas other sources stress the bishop's efforts to secure the orthodoxy in the Church upon the new Emperor's accession to the throne. Anastasius' coronation was described by Peter the Patrician, who had served as *magister officiorum* in the years 539–565. He is the author of a work on the history of this office, into which he had also incorporated a number of the earlier documents containing, among other things, accounts of the ceremonies of proclaiming new Emperors.⁴⁶

The account in De cerimoniis emphasizes Euphemios' substantial role both in the course of the election and during the solemn coronation of the new ruler.⁴⁷ In the evening, on the day of Zeno's death, imperial officials, senators, and Patriarch Euphemios met at the palace in order to discuss the question of his successor.⁴⁸ Next, Euphemios accompanied the empress Ariadne, who proceeded to appear at the Hippodrome, where the people of the city had gathered *en masse*.⁴⁹ The empress ordered the senators and officials to convene in the presence of the Patriarch and the Gospel book, to elect a new ruler, whose imperial proclamation was to take place at Easter.⁵⁰ As the proceedings had failed to elect any candidate, *cubicularius* Urbikios was to propose that the participants leave the

⁴³ Pseudo-Zacharias VI 4 (6, 8–13 BROOKS), VI 6 (9, 28–30 BROOKS) and VII 1 (13, 4–9 BROOKS), and also Evagrius III 31 (127, 9–13 BIDEZ – PARMENTIER). On the unresolved problem of the break-up or continuity of the communion between Alexandria and Constantinople during Euphemios' episcopate, see L. PERRONE, *La chiesa di Palestina e le controversie cristologiche. Dal concilio di Efeso (431) al secondo concilio di Costantinopoli (553) (Testi e ricerche di scienze religiose 18)*. Brescia 1980, 142–143, note 2.

⁴⁴ Pseudo-Zacharias VII 1 (13, 7–9 BROOKS).

⁴⁵ John Malalas XV 16 (Ioannis Malalae Chronographia, recensuit I. THURN [CFHB 35]. Berlin 2000, 318, 92–94); Marcellinus Comes s.a. 491.1 (The Chronicle of Marcellinus, translation and commentary by B. CROKE [Byzantina Australiensia 7]. Sydney 1995, 30); Victor of Tunnum s.a. 491.1 (20 PLACANICA); Pseudo-Zacharias VI 6 (10, 12–13 BROOKS) oratio VII 1 (12, 4–7 BROOKS); Chronicon paschale s.a. 491 (Chronicon Paschale ad exemplar Vaticanum, recensuit L. DINDORFIUS, I [CSHB]. Bonnæ 1832, 607,3–4); Michael the Syrian IX 6 (Chronique de Michel le Syrien: Patriarche Jacobite d'Antioche (1166–1198), éditée et traduite par J.-B. CHABOT, II. Paris 1901, 149).

⁴⁶ Peter the Patrician studied law, and subsequently worked as an attorney at Constantinople. In the years 534–536 he served, for several times, as the Emperor Justinian's delegate to Italy, where he was imprisoned. It was only the Emperor's intervention that led to his release in 539. After his return to Constantinople, he was appointed *magister officiorum*, and also received the titles of patrician and honorary consul. Later on, he travelled to the East as an envoy on a mission to end the war with Persia. He died most probably in 565. According to Ernest Stein, his work on the office of *magister officiorum* was written in the years 549–552, cf. E. STEIN, *Histoire du Bas-Empire*, II. Paris – Bruxelles – Amsterdam 1949, 723–729; PLRE III 994–998 (Petrus 6), and P. ANTONOPOULOS, *Petros Patrikios*. Athens 1990.

⁴⁷ Constantine Porphyrogenitus, De cerimoniis, I, 92 (Constantini Porphyrogeniti de cerimoniis aulae byzantinae libri duo. Graece e latine e rec. I. I. REISKE cum eiusdem commentariis integris [CSHB]. Bonnæ 1829, 417,13 – 425,21).

⁴⁸ Constantine Porphyrogenitus, De cerimoniis, I, 92 (417, 17 – 418, 2 REISKE): ἐν τῇ νυκτὶ τῇ ἐξῆς συνήχθησαν οἱ ἄρχοντες καὶ οἱ συγκλητικοὶ καὶ ὁ ἐπίσκοπος ἐν τῷ πορτικῷ τῷ πρὸ τοῦ μεγάλου τρικλίνου.

⁴⁹ Constantine Porphyrogenitus, De cerimoniis, I, 92 (418, 10–13 REISKE): συνεισηλθόν δὲ ἐν τῷ ἵππικῷ καὶ κουβουκλάριοι ὀλίγοι τοῦ μέρους αὐτῆς, οὐ μὴν ἀλλὰ καὶ ὁ ἀρχιεπίσκοπος Κωνσταντινουπόλεως, Εὐφήμιος.

⁵⁰ Constantine Porphyrogenitus, De cerimoniis, I, 92 (419, 18 – 420, 1 REISKE): ἐκελεύσαμεν τοὺς ἐνδοξοτάτους ἄρχοντας καὶ τὴν ἱερὰν σύγκλητον, συντρεχούσης καὶ τῆς τῶν γενναιοτάτων ἐξερκίτων ψήφου, προκειμένων καὶ τῶν ἁγίων εὐαγγελίων, παρόντος τοῦ ὁσιωτάτου καὶ ἀγιωτάτου τῆς βασιλίδος ταύτης πόλεως πατριάρχου.

choice to the empress and ask Euphemios to inform her of the attendees' wish.⁵¹ Ariadne handpicked silentiarios Anastasius. On the following day, the ceremony of Zeno's funeral took place, while on April 11, Anastasius welcomed the highest officials at the *consistorium*, whence they all went together to the portico of the Grand Triklinos (πρὸ τοῦ μεγάλου τρικλίνου),⁵² where the emperor pledged to rule in righteousness and refrain from persecuting his enemies. Anastasius donned the imperial tunic, the belt, and shoes, and afterwards went to the Hippodrome's kathisma, where he was acclaimed by the people and the army, and was then raised on the shield. Subsequently, he returned to the Triklinos, where Euphemios put the imperial chlamys on his shoulders and the crown on his head.⁵³ The conclusion of the whole ceremony took place at the Church of the Hagia Sophia.⁵⁴

The above account makes us wonder why Anastasius had been crowned by the Patriarch of Constantinople, not the empress Ariadne. Mischa Meier ponders the question if that may have had anything to do with a possible bad association between the widow-empress crowning the successor and Verina, who had herself crowned two usurpers during Zeno's reign, yet the scholar recognizes, first of all, the increasing role of Christianity in Constantinople's daily affairs. In his view, the coronation by the bishop underscores the conviction that the sovereign is chosen by God and is not constrained by human laws.⁵⁵ The account certainly points to the bishop's significant position at the capital city of the Empire. Euphemios becomes one of the key figures during the entire process of choosing the candidate for the throne, and his subsequent approval and coronation. As he was himself a newly appointed bishop, he had not managed yet to consolidate sufficiently his personal authority in the Constantinopolitan circles of power, which apparently is not indicative of Euphemios' own exceptional characteristics as of the growth in the importance of the institution of the patriarchate as such. In the whole account there is much emphasis on a number of Christian aspects: the proposal to perform the imperial proclamation at Easter, the meeting of the senators and officials (with the Gospel on display), the conclusion of the ceremony at the church, the Patriarch's presence during all the significant moments of the ceremonial, such as when he had accompanied the empress at the Hippodrome, intermediated between her and the senators, and invested the new Emperor with the chlamys and the crown.⁵⁶

This conclusion is further corroborated by other accounts, throwing some more light on the events related to the election of the new ruler. On the other hand, the tradition derived from Theodore Lector stresses yet another aspect of the events leading to the accession of Anastasius, which is overlooked in *De cerimoniis*.⁵⁷ Theodore recounts that Euphemios was to oppose Anastasius' candidacy for the

⁵¹ Constantine Porphyrogenitus, *De cerimoniis*, I, 92 (422, 1–2 REISKE): ἤτησεν ὡς ἡ σύγκλητος τὸν ἐπίσκοπον εἰσελθεῖν καὶ παρακαλέσαι αὐτήν, ἵνα αὐτῇ, ὃν βούλεται, ἐπιλέξηται.

⁵² On the identification and location of the Grand Triklinos, see R. GUILLAND, *Études de topographie de Constantinople byzantine*, I (*BBA* 37). Amsterdam 1969, 73–76.

⁵³ Constantine Porphyrogenitus, *De cerimoniis*, I, 92 (423, 11–15 REISKE): καὶ εἰσῆλθεν πάλιν ἐν τῷ τρικλίνω, ἐνθα ἐφόρεσεν τὰ βασιλικά καὶ ἐκεῖ ὁ ἐπίσκοπος ἐποίησεν εὐχήν, καὶ τὸ “Κύριε, ἐλέησον” ἐλέχθη, καὶ περιέθηκεν αὐτῷ τὴν χλαμύδα τὴν βασιλικήν, καὶ τὸν στέφανον τὸν διάλιθον. Cf. G. DAGRON, *Empereur et Prêtre. Étude sur le “Césaropapisme” byzantin*. Paris 1996, 103, who argues that Anastasius' coronation at the hands of Euphemios was not, in actual fact, an official coronation, only a personal benediction not conferred in public.

⁵⁴ On the election and crowning of Anastasius, cf. DAGRON, *Empereur et Prêtre* 85–88; R.-J. LILIE, *Die Krönung des Kaisers Anastasios I. (491)*. *BSI* 56 (1995) 3–12 and HAARER, *Anastasios I* 1–5.

⁵⁵ MEIER, *Anastasios I*. 74–75.

⁵⁶ Cf. DAGRON, *Empereur et Prêtre* 87–88, who is of the opinion that the Christianization of the ceremonial did not entail the recognition of the institutional role of the Church that was primarily to guarantee orthodoxy of the new ruler suspected of Monophysite sympathies.

⁵⁷ Cf. MEIER, *Anastasios I*. 74. The silence of Peter the Patrician (or the source he had used) as to the declaration of maintaining the Chalcedonian decisions in force is a somewhat puzzling question. It may be due to either the circumstances of the declaration being in connection with the day of Zeno's funeral, which the author was not much concerned with, or with their intentional omission due to his Christological views. It appears as justified that the account of the coronation written during

throne, even calling him a heretic unworthy of Christians.⁵⁸ Euphemios had found himself, however, under pressure from the empress and the senators, who had proposed a compromise consisting in the emperor's written pledge,⁵⁹ and affirmed by his solemn oath,⁶⁰ in which he undertook not to act against the faith and the Church.

The accurate content of the obligation is not known. Theodore Lector and Theophanes state that it concerned preservation of the dogmatic definition decreed by the Council of Chalcedon.⁶¹ According to Victor of Tunnuna, the emperor had promised not to act against the Apostolic faith and the Council of Chalcedon,⁶² whereas Evagrius relates that the pledge concerned preserving the faith intact and introducing no novelties into the Church.⁶³ It can be assumed, as based on the above-mentioned evidence, that Anastasius had pledged to refrain from introducing any alterations into the existing definitions of faith, in particular with regard to the Christological formula of Chalcedon. It is still difficult to ascertain the nature of the emperor's obligation.⁶⁴ In view of all the extant accounts, it did not constitute a law, as it concerned the ruler, not the people of the Empire; besides, it had been undertaken before Anastasius formally became Emperor. Considering the relation in *De cerimoniis*, it seems possible that it had taken place on the day of Zeno's funeral, whose more detailed description was omitted by the source, or along with the emperor's obligation to rule in righteousness and refrain from persecuting his personal enemies made in the portico of the Triklinos just before the coronation.

Anastasius' religious obligations, even if incurred in the presence of the imperial dignitaries, were directed to the bishop of Constantinople, who, in Evagrius' words,⁶⁵ gave them to Makedonios for safekeeping. The latter had served in the Church of Constantinople as a sacristan responsible for liturgical vessels (σκευοφύλαξ).⁶⁶ More plausible is apparently the account left by Victor of Tunnuna, who writes that the document had been deposited in the church archives.⁶⁷ However, we cannot rule out the possibility of Makedonios' dual function as both sacristan and the person responsible for the archives of the Patriarchate, as can be exemplified by George of Pisidia, whom the sources of the first

Anastasius' reign passed over such a sensitive issue. But it is difficult to suspect Peter the Patrician of having censored the text himself, even though there is evidence in the sources indicating his sympathy for the anti-Chalcedonian cause, cf., for instance, Pseudo-Zacharias XII 6 (136, 26 – 137, 7 BROOKS), with an account of his intervention in defence of the Monophysite monks persecuted at Amida.

⁵⁸ Theodore Lector, *Epitome* 446 (125, 27 HANSEN): αἰρετικὸν κἀλῶν καὶ τῶν Χριστιανῶν ἀνάξιον. This passage from Theodore is reiterated verbatim by George the Monk IX 15 (624, 6–7 DE BOOR). In turn, Theophanes AM 5983 (136, 8–9 DE BOOR) writes that Euphemios had called Anastasius a heretic unworthy of Christians and the Empire: ἀνάξιον αὐτὸν ἀποκαλῶν τῶν Χριστιανῶν καὶ τῆς βασιλείας.

⁵⁹ Theodore Lector, *Epitome* 446 (126, 13 HANSEN) and George the Monk IX 15 (624, 9 DE BOOR): ὁμολογίαν ἔγγραφο; Victor of Tunnuna s. a. 491.1 (22 PLACANICA): *scripto promittere*; Theophanes AM 5983 (136, 10 DE BOOR): τὸ ἰδίῳ χειρὸν.

⁶⁰ Evagrius III 32 (130, 5–6 BIDEZ – PARMENTIER): ἐγγράφων καὶ ὄρκων δεινῶν ὁμολογίαν αὐτόγραπτον.

⁶¹ Theodore Lector, *Epitome* 446 (126, 13–14 HANSEN) = George the Monk IX 15 (624, 9–11 DE BOOR): παρ' αὐτοῦ ἐκομίσαστο, ὡς εἰς ὄρον πίστεως δέχεται τὰ ἐν Χαλκηδόνι δογματισθέντα. And somewhat differently in Theophanes AM 5983 (136, 10–11 DE BOOR): ἀποδέχεται εἰς ὄρον πίστεως τὰ δόγματα τῆς ἐν Χαλκηδόνι συνόδου.

⁶² Victor of Tunnuna s. a. 491.1 (22 PLACANICA): *nihil sinistrum contra apostolicam fidem et synodum Chalcedonensem agere*.

⁶³ Evagrius III 32 (130, 7–8 BIDEZ – PARMENTIER): ἀκέραιον φυλάξαι τὴν πίστιν καὶ μηδὲν καινουργῆς ἐσαγαγεῖν τῇ ἁγίᾳ τοῦ θεοῦ ἐκκλησίᾳ. Cf. SCHWARTZ, *Publizistische Sammlungen zum acacianischen Schisma* 219, note 2, who considers Evagrius' account to be more credible than the one of Theodore Lector. Cf. also DIJKSTRA – GREATREX, *Patriarchs and Politics in Constantinople in the Reign of Anastasius* 227.

⁶⁴ Cf. GRUMEL, *Les registres des actes du patriarcat de Constantinople* 133–134.

⁶⁵ Evagrius III 32 (130, 9–10 BIDEZ – PARMENTIER).

⁶⁶ Evagrius III 32 (130, 9–10 BIDEZ – PARMENTIER); Theodore Lector, *Epitome* 455 (128, 18 HANSEN); Theophanes AM 5988 (140, 12 DE BOOR); George the Monk IX 15 (625, 12 DE BOOR). Skeuophylax held a high position in the church hierarchy of Constantinople, right after the patriarch and the oikonomos, cf. P. MAGDALINO – A.-M. TALBOT, *Skeuophylax*. *ODB* III 1909–1910.

⁶⁷ Victor of Tunnuna s. a. 491.1 (22 PLACANICA): *in archivo ecclesiae reponit*.

half of the seventh century name as both σκευοφύλαξ and χαρτοφύλαξ in charge of the archives.⁶⁸ Nonetheless, it should be assumed that the said document had been ultimately deposited at the cathedral archive, due to its official character.⁶⁹

The reason for Euphemios' resistance was his suspicion as to the orthodoxy of the candidate for the throne. In view of the aforementioned conflict between the bishop and Anastasius, even before the latter ascended the throne, it seems to be justified. In any case, the sources charge the ruler (or his family) with a whole range of heresies: according to Evagrius, the emperor was to have been regarded as a follower of the Manichaean views,⁷⁰ whereas, in Theodore Lector's words, Anastasius' mother was to have been a Manichaean. Theodore also tells us that Anastasius' uncle, Klearchos, had been an Arian.⁷¹ In turn, Victor of Tunnuna ascribed the Arian confession to his mother.⁷² In addition, the tradition associated with Theodore ascribes the Eutychian views to Anastasius.⁷³

Euphemios was not satisfied with the emperor's pledge. He did not hesitate to convene a synod that affirmed the validity of the decisions of Chalcedon.⁷⁴ Victor of Tunnuna dates this synod to 492. Victor's dates tend to be fairly accurate, and since Theophanes dates it to 491/492 as well, it should be assumed that these two authors had drawn on Theodore Lector's work. This particular synod must not be confused with the above-mentioned synod of 490, which had also affirmed the decisions of Chalcedon. There are thus two synods within a short period of time that validate the decrees of the Council: the first one at the beginning of Euphemios' episcopate, and the other several months after Anastasius' imperial coronation.⁷⁵ According to Theodore Lector (= Theophanes), this second affirmation of Chalcedon was performed by the endemousa synod that had assembled the bishops then present at Constantinople.⁷⁶

The beginning of Anastasius' reign seemed to confirm that the measures undertaken by Euphemios had secured the adherents of the Council against any change in the religious policy instituted during the final years of Zeno's reign. According to Evagrius, Anastasius had attempted to maintain the *status quo* in various regions of his Empire and tended to support the bishops whose views had concurred with those which prevailed in a given area, without any anti-Chalcedonian policy being pursued.⁷⁷ Likewise, the Life of Daniel Stylites depicts how much Anastasius and Euphemios had

⁶⁸ Cf. J. HOWARD-JOHNSTON, *Witnesses to a World Crisis. Historians and Histories of the Middle East in the Seventh Century*. Oxford 2010, 17–18. The chartophylax was responsible for the patriarchal archives; this office was first confirmed in the sources in 530, cf. V. LAURENT, *Le Corpus des sceaux de l'empire byzantin, I. L'Église de Constantinople*. Paris 1963, 67–68.

⁶⁹ Cf. LÉNAIN DE TILLEMONT, *Mémoires pour servir à l'histoire ecclésiastique des six premiers siècles XVI* 634 and CHARANIS, *Church and State in the Later Roman Empire* 38.

⁷⁰ Evagrius III 32 (130, 11–12 BIDEZ – PARMENTIER): ὁ Ἀναστάσιος δόξαν μανιχαϊκῆς νομίσεως παρὰ τοῖς πολλοῖς εἶχεν.

⁷¹ Theodore Lector, *Epitome* 448 (126, 18–20 HANSEN) = George the Monk IX 15 (624, 12–15 DE BOOR): Μανιχαῖοι καὶ Ἀρειανοὶ ἔχαιρον Ἀναστασίῳ, Μανιχαῖοι μὴν ὡς τῆς μητρὸς αὐτοῦ ζηλωτρίας οὐσης αὐτῶν, Ἀρειανοὶ δὲ ὡς Κλέαρχον τὸν θεῖον πρὸς μητρὸς Ἀναστασίου ὁμόδοξον ἔχοντες. This information is also repeated, with some minor modifications, by Theophanes AM 5983 (136, 13–16 DE BOOR).

⁷² Victor of Tunnuna s. a. 491.1 (22 PLACANICA): *matre Arriana*.

⁷³ Theodore Lector, *Epitome* 441 (123, 13–14 HANSEN) = George the Monk IX 15 (623, 23 DE BOOR): τὰ Εὐτυχοῦς μαθὼν; Theophanes AM 5982 (134, 21 DE BOOR): αἰρετικὸν καὶ ὁμόφρονά Εὐτυχοῦς; Souda Φ 136 (704, 19–20 ADLER): ἀντεῖχτο γὰρ τῆς Εὐτυχοῦς δόξης.

⁷⁴ Theodore Lector, *Epitome* 451 (127, 18–19 HANSEN), recreated from Theophanes AM 5984 (137, 11–13 DE BOOR); Victor of Tunnuna s. a. 492.2 (22 PLACANICA); Cyril of Scythopolis, *Vita Sabae* 50 (Kyrillos von Skythopolis, herausgegeben von E. SCHWARTZ [TU 49]. Leipzig 1939, 140, 13–15). Cf. SCHWARTZ, *Publizistische Sammlungen zum acacianischen Schisma* 219.

⁷⁵ Cf. GRUMEL, *Les registres des actes du patriarcat de Constantinople* 132–134.

⁷⁶ Theodore Lector, *Epitome* 451 (127, 18–19 HANSEN) = Theophanes AM 5984 (137, 11–13 DE BOOR): Εὐφῆμιος δὲ ὁ Κωνσταντινουπόλεως συναγαγὼν τοὺς ἐνδημοῦντας ἐπισκόπους.

⁷⁷ Evagrius III 30 (125, 32 – 126, 4 BIDEZ – PARMENTIER). Cf. CHARANIS, *Church and State in the Later Roman Empire* 54. In turn, LÉNAIN DE TILLEMONT, *Mémoires pour servir à l'histoire ecclésiastique des six premiers siècles XVI* 636–637 questions Evagrius' account, pointing to the fact that this author only mentions the Chalcedonians among the bishops who had been

venerated the holy stylite; both of them are thus represented in positive terms by the anonymous author of the work.⁷⁸ It does not mean, however, that the views and aims of the emperor and the bishop of Constantinople had coincided in their entirety. For instance, let us here recall Euphemios' attempt to depose Patriarch Athanasios of Alexandria.⁷⁹ According to Pseudo-Zacharias' account, Euphemios had hated Athanasios for his open condemnation of Chalcedon and Pope Leo's Tome. The bishop of Constantinople was to make preparations for his deposition, unsuccessfully attempting to secure Pope Felix III's support.⁸⁰ If Pseudo-Zacharias is correct here in citing Pope Felix, the conflict must have taken place early into Euphemios' episcopate, most probably still in 491, as Felix died on February 25, 492.⁸¹ Since Pseudo-Zacharias does not mention the Pope's response, it is possible that Euphemios' letter reached him shortly before his death, or reached Rome afterwards. I also think that the sending of the letter mentioned by Pseudo-Zacharias can be linked with the endemousa synod, which had affirmed the validity of the decisions of Chalcedon.

The both events seem to constitute the successive stages in Euphemios' attempt to consolidate the Chalcedonian movement in the Churches of the Eastern part of the Empire. The letter to Felix was, in all probability, a synodal letter in which the bishop of Constantinople informed the Pope of the synod, at the same time requesting his support in resolving the controversy over Athanasios. Pope Felix III's death meant that the letter remained unanswered, while the style of the Eastern policy pursued by his successor, Gelasius I, first cooled off and then completely froze further relations between Rome and Constantinople.

The significance that Euphemios had attached to Rome's support in his attempt to depose Athanasios of Alexandria was probably due to the lack of such assistance on the emperor's part. Anastasius, like Zeno before him, did not have any interest in aggravating the precarious situation in Egypt, a very important province particularly in the face of the emperor's conflict with Isaurians, which had erupted in 491⁸². It seems, therefore, that he had not taken any action in the dispute between Athanasios and Euphemios. Pseudo-Zacharias notes that the emperor had sided with the Patriarch of Alexandria, which was reflected in the bishop's deposition in 496 as a result of the accusations of heresy made by Athanasios and Patriarch Salustios of Jerusalem, yet this account combines two different events. We will return to Pseudo-Zacharias' version further on.

deposed by the Emperor, but does not mention the same fate befalling any opponent of Chalcedon. According to the French scholar, Anastasius had actively supported the Monophysite movement from the beginning.

⁷⁸ Vita Danielis Stylitae 91–92; 96; 99–100 (H. DELEHAYE, *Les Saints Stylites* [*Subsidia Hagiographica* 14]. Bruxelles – Paris 1923, 85, 22–87, 27; 90, 1–9; 91, 23–92, 17). It should be emphasized, however, that in spite of the regards expressed by both the Emperor and the Bishop, the Vita never mentions them standing together by the column at Anaplis, and Daniel's funeral was attended by Euphemios only. The statement by DIJKSTRA – GREATREX, *Patriarchs and Politics in Constantinople in the Reign of Anastasius 229*, note 24, to the effect that the Vita Danielis is "lukewarm in its attitude to the patriarch" is obviously an outright misinterpretation. The author of the Vita depicts Euphemios in very favourable terms in all the passages where the figure is featured. The bishop is said to have surpassed everybody else in showing his veneration of the saint, calling the latter ἀγιώτατος, ὀσιώτατος, θεοφιλέστατος. He is the most important and highest-ranking figure there, as the Emperor and his consort had not attended the funeral. He gives orders and instructions regarding the details of the ceremony, undertakes to carry the coffin with the holy man's body on his shoulders, all in homage to Daniel. In general, he is represented as an exceptionally pious bishop, solicitous about the patron of the City, cf. KOSIŃSKI, *ΑΓΙΩΣΥΝΗ ΚΑΙ ΕΞΟΥΣΙΑ* 155–157 and 192–194.

⁷⁹ CHARANIS, *Church and State in the Later Roman Empire* 55, notes that Euphemios' excessive activity in favour of the consolidation of the Chalcedonian movement had irritated the Emperor.

⁸⁰ Pseudo-Zacharias VII 1 (13, 9–12 BROOKS).

⁸¹ Cf. NAUTIN, *Felix III* (II) 895.

⁸² Egypt was a province of strategic importance. It supplied grain to the capital and its location facilitated maintaining control of the Eastern part of the Mediterranean. The latter was of particular importance in view of the fact that the Isaurian rebels would receive their supplies thanks to the fleet of Longinos of Selinus. It was only the destruction of that fleet by a storm that would make it possible to subdue the revolted province, cf. Priscianus 103–117 (Procope de Gaza, Priscien de Césarée, Panégryques de l'empereur Anastase Ier, textes traduits et commentés par A. CHAUVOT. Bonn 1986, 61).

The lack of the Pope's support in Euphemios' efforts to reinforce the standing of the Chalcedonian movement in the Churches of the Eastern Roman Empire was a tremendous disappointment to the bishop of Constantinople, although the Pope, despite his animated correspondence with the Eastern episcopate, had not been in a position to offer any real assistance in this endeavour. Apparently, therefore, as far as Euphemios is concerned, restoration of the communion between Constantinople and Rome was not associated with any expectations of actual gains, either in his relations with the other patriarchs in the East or the emperor, rather with the need to obtain moral support in his efforts to consolidate the acceptance of Chalcedon in the East and unify the Churches on the issue of the conciliar decisions. The situation in the Churches of the East had not been as dire to the defenders of Chalcedon as Pseudo-Zacharias' account might suggest in his statement that both Athanasios of Alexandria and Salustios of Jerusalem had acted in opposition to Euphemios.⁸³

Salustios' Christological views are not as unambiguous as it may seem in view of the above. Although Cyril of Scythopolis refers to the bishop of Jerusalem only in passing, without making his views more specific, he calls him holy (*ἅγιος*) twice, which he most likely would not have done if he had harboured any doubt as to his Chalcedonian orthodoxy.⁸⁴ Besides, this Patriarch is also the one who had appointed the ascetics Theodosios and Sabas as leaders of the pro-Chalcedonian Palestinian monks.⁸⁵ Pseudo-Zacharias' account is also contradicted by the Palestinian monks' letter to Alkison of Nikopolis, which is cited by Evagrius. The letter states that the bishops of Antioch, Constantinople, and Jerusalem did not affirm the anathema in Athanasios' synodal letter and did not establish communion with him.⁸⁶ Pseudo-Zacharias' inclusion of Salustios among the clearly anti-Chalcedonian bishops may have been due to his intention to cleanse Peter Mongos of the accusation of remaining in communion with the bishops who had not explicitly condemned the decisions of Chalcedon and Pope Leo's Tome, or who had even defended them.⁸⁷

It is just as difficult to determine the attitude of Patriarch Palladios of Antioch, on whose views we have almost no information. Only the sources of Chalcedonian provenance attempt to cast some light upon this question, yet unfortunately they contradict one another. The above-mentioned letter of the Palestinian monks to Alkison also says that a certain unidentified Patriarch of Antioch was among the bishops who had not approved of the anathema against the Council of Chalcedon, which was expressed in Athanasios' synodal letter.⁸⁸ In turn, Cyril of Scythopolis states, in the Life of Sabas, that Palladios anathematized the Council of Chalcedon and established communion with Athanasios of Alexandria in order to ingratiate himself with the emperor Anastasios.⁸⁹ Both of these mentions may be true, but they pertain to two different periods of Palladios' episcopate: early on, he had defended the decrees of Chalcedon, whereas in the later period he aligned himself with the opponents of the

⁸³ Cf. DIJKSTRA – GREATREX, *Patriarchs and Politics in Constantinople in the Reign of Anastasios 227* and MEIER, *Anastasios I*, 109, who are of the opinion that Euphemios had been increasingly isolated during Anastasios' reign.

⁸⁴ Cyril of Scythopolis, *Vita Sabae* 30 (114, 24 SCHWARTZ) and 65 (166, 18 SCHWARTZ).

⁸⁵ Cyril of Scythopolis, *Vita Sabae* 30 (115, 14–20 SCHWARTZ). Cf. PERRONE, *La chiesa di Palestina e le controversie cristologiche 142–144*, who holds that the indicator of Salustios' policy was to ensure the reception of the Henotikon and the ultimate absorption of the anti-Chalcedonian opposition.

⁸⁶ Evagrius III 31 (127, 8–14 BIDEZ – PARMENTIER): Πέτρον δὲ κεκοιμημένου, πάλιν εἰς αὐτοὺς ἀπεσχίσθησαν Ἀλεξάνδρειά τε καὶ Αἴγυπτος, Ἀθανασίου τοῦ μετὰ Πέτρον καταστάντος ἀναθεματισμὸν τῇ συνόδῳ ἀποστείλαντος ἔγγραφον ἐν τοῖς συνοδικοῖς τῷ τε Κωνσταντινουπόλεως καὶ τῷ Ἀντιοχείας καὶ τῷ Ἱεροσολύμων· καὶ μὴ δεχθέντος ἐξ ἐκείνου Ἀλεξάνδρειά τε καὶ Αἴγυπτος καὶ Λιβύη καθ' ἑαυτὰς διετέλεσαν. The letter was written towards the close of Anastasios' reign, cf. E. SCHWARTZ, *Bemerkungen*, in: *Kyriillos von Skythopolis 384* and ALLEN, *Evagrius Scholasticus the Church Historian 147*, who date the letter to ca. 515.

⁸⁷ Cf. KOSIŃSKI, *The Emperor Zeno 195* and *The Chronicle of Pseudo-Zachariah Rhetor. Church and War in Late Antiquity 230*, note 16. However, Pseudo-Zacharias' account is considered to be credible by DIJKSTRA – GREATREX, *Patriarchs and Politics in Constantinople in the Reign of Anastasios 227*.

⁸⁸ Evagrius III 31 (127, 13 BIDEZ – PARMENTIER).

⁸⁹ Cyril of Scythopolis, *Vita Sabae* 50 (140, 8–12 SCHWARTZ).

Chalcedon. If we assumed that Evagrius' account was reliable and truly reflecting Palladius' position in the early 490s, it would turn out that Athanasios had found himself at that time in a much more difficult situation than Euphemios; moreover, on July 23, 494, Salustios died and was succeeded by Elias, who openly gave his support to Euphemios, breaking with the bishops who had opposed the decisions of Chalcedon.⁹⁰

4. RELATIONS WITH ROME

We have only one extant letter of Pope Gelasius to Euphemios and one letter of the same Pope to the emperor Anastasius.⁹¹ Unfortunately, no letters from Euphemios and Anastasius to Rome have survived. However, these two letters sufficiently characterize Gelasius' priorities in his relations with Constantinople as well as the position held by Euphemios, whose letter is cited several times by the Pope. In his correspondence sent to Rome, the bishop of Constantinople complained that the Pope had not notified him of his election, which was an evident sign of the ongoing schism between the two Sees; above all, however, he expressed his wish to re-establish the disrupted communion, stating once again his unconditional recognition of Chalcedon and affirming that the Pope is the only one who can restore peace within the Church.⁹² At the same time, Euphemios stated his position on the conditions for re-establishing the broken bonds set out in Felix III's letter, focusing primarily on the defence of Akakios' orthodoxy. In Euphemios' view, his predecessor had not been a heretic;⁹³ he was not even formally condemned by an imperial synod. Thus, there should be no demanding that his name be erased from the diptychs.⁹⁴ The Patriarch also noted that the Pope's demand is difficult to fulfil on account of the sentiment that the people of Constantinople had for Akakios.⁹⁵

On his part, Gelasius rejected all the suggestions of compromise made by the bishop of Constantinople. In reference to Euphemios' remark on his own apprehensions as to how the people might react should the name of Akakios be removed from the diptychs, he sarcastically told him it was

⁹⁰ Cyril of Scythopolis, *Vita Sabae* 31 (115, 27–116, 4 SCHWARTZ). Cf. F. DIEKAMP, *Die origenistischen Streitigkeiten im sechsten Jahrhundert und das fünfte allgemeine Concil. Münster 1899*, 16; D. J. CHITTY, *Jerusalem after Chalcedon, A.D. 451–518. The Christian East, vol. 2, new series*, 1 (1952) 27; PERRONE, *La chiesa di Palestina e le controversie cristologiche* 145–146.

⁹¹ Also, Pope Gelasius' letter to Faustus of 493 (SCHWARTZ, *Publizistische Sammlungen zum acacianischen Schisma* 16–19), touches on the question of the relations between the bishoprics of Rome and Constantinople, uncompromisingly rejecting Constantinople's charges concerning the rightness of the condemnation of Akakios and the demand to remove his name from the diptychs, cf. F. HOFMANN, *Der Kampf der Päpste um Konzil und Dogma von Chalkedon von Leo dem Großen bis Hormisdas (451–519)*, in: *Das Konzil von Chalkedon II* 53–54 and W. ULLMANN, *Gelasius I. (492–496). Das Papsttum an der Wende der Spätantike zum Mittelalter (Päpste und Papsttum 18)*. Stuttgart 1981, 174–178. Although W. HAACKE, *Die Glaubensformel des Papstes Hormisdas im Acacianischen Schisma (Analecta Gregoriana 20)*. Roma 1939, 37–38, suggested that it was a forgery, it is now commonly held to be authentic, as convincingly argued by BLAUDEAU, *Vice mea* 1105–1106, note 200. Cf. also J. RICHARDS, *The Popes and the Papacy in the Early Middle Ages. 476–752*. London 1979, 65. Faustus was Theoderic's envoy, in 490/492–494, to the Emperor Anastasius, with whom he negotiated on the matters relating to Italy, cf. *PLRE II* 454–456 (Fl. Anicius Probus Faustus iunior Niger 9) and *Prosopographie chrétienne du Bas-Empire, tome 2. Prosopographie de l'Italie chrétienne (313–604), sous la direction de Ch. Pietri et L. Pietri par J. Desmulliez – Ch. Fraisse-Coué – É. Paoli-Lafaye – Ch. Pietri – L. Pietri – C. Sotinel, vol. 1*. Roma 1999, 756–759 (Fl. Anicius Probus Faustus Iunior Niger 4).

⁹² Pope Gelasius' letter to Euphemios of 492 (49–55 SCHWARTZ). Cf. LENAIN DE TILLEMONT, *Mémoires pour servir à l'histoire ecclésiastique des six premiers siècles XVI* 639–640 and SCHWARTZ, *Publizistische Sammlungen zum acacianischen Schisma* 219–220.

⁹³ Pope Gelasius' letter to Euphemios of 492 (52, 6–7 SCHWARTZ): *Sed Acacius, inquis, nihil contra fidem, sicut Eutyches et successor eius, legitur ubicumque dixisse*.

⁹⁴ Pope Gelasius' letter to Euphemios of 492 (52, 15–16 SCHWARTZ): *immo et adhuc queritis quando fuerit damnatus Acacius ...*

⁹⁵ Pope Gelasius' letter to Euphemios of 492 (55, 2–4 SCHWARTZ): *quae etiam vos rationabiliter inventes creditis opponendum populum Constantinopolitanum non permittere submoveri nomina perfidorum*. Cf. LENAIN DE TILLEMONT, *Mémoires pour servir à l'histoire ecclésiastique des six premiers siècles XVI* 640–641 and GRILLMEIER, *Christ in Christian Tradition II/1*, 265.

the herd that should conform to their shepherd, not the shepherd to the herd.⁹⁶ It was a humiliating questioning of Euphemios' episcopal qualifications. He also noted that since Eutyches had been condemned by the Council of Chalcedon, whose decisions were affirmed by both the Pope and the bishop of Constantinople, the condemnation also extends to his later followers, including Peter Mongos and Akakios, who had favoured the same views.⁹⁷ Moreover, Akakios' fault is more serious in that he had known the truth and, nonetheless, allied with the enemies thereof. Pope Gelasius thought that it was arrogant of Euphemios to expect receiving a notification of his election. There existed, indeed, such a custom but it applied solely to those bishops who had remained within the Apostolic and catholic communion from which Euphemios had chosen to depart.⁹⁸ Gelasius had thus not just maintained but even radicalized his attitude towards Constantinople.⁹⁹

5. EUPHEMIOS' DEPOSITION

After an initial period of peaceful coexistence, the relations between Anastasius and Euphemios began to get worse. Theodore Lector and the associated tradition asserted that the reason had been the emperor's growing distrust and his increasing doubt in the metropolitan's loyalty. The author notes that Anastasius, weary of the protracted war against the Isaurian rebels, told Euphemios in confidence to summon the bishops who were then present in Constantinople to intercede for the Isaurians. The Patriarch divulged his conversation with the emperor to patrician John, the father-in-law of Athenodoros, one of the Isaurian leaders.¹⁰⁰ Very soon, however, John went to see the emperor and

⁹⁶ Pope Gelasius' letter to Euphemios of 492 (55, 4–7 SCHWARTZ): *quisnam hoc in ecclesia dei, quaeso te, possit audire, cum utique pastorem sequi grex debeat ad pascua salutaria reuocantem, non per deuia gregem pastor errantem? dic mihi, rogo te, grex pro te an tu pro grege redditurus es rationem?*

⁹⁷ Pope Gelasius' letter to Euphemios of 492 (52, 20–28 SCHWARTZ): *miramur tamen quomodo duo ista simul profertis, hoc est ut et synodum Chalcedonensem uos suscipere pro fide catholica profiteamini et eos quos damnauit, sectantium communicatores non pariter generaliterque putetis fuisse damnatos. ostendite ergo quae synodus in unaquaque haeresi non cum erroris auctoribus successores eorum hisque communicantes simulque omnes damnarit et complices. itaque ille uester Acacius, qui Eutycheian hereditibus detestabili communionem factus est particeps, ab eadem synodo sine dubitatione damnatus est, quae Eutychem Dioscorumque cum successoribus eorum hisque communicantes synodico tenore prostrauit, sicut sequaces illorum Timotheum Petrumque simili definitione deiecit. Cf. HOFMANN, Der Kampf der Päpste um Konzil und Dogma von Chalkedon 52–56; MEIER, Anastasios I. 107–108.*

⁹⁸ Pope Gelasius' letter to Euphemios of 492 (49, 15–23 SCHWARTZ): *quod si, ut magis opinamur, quasi sociis quibus praeesse Christi munere delegata est, apostolicam sedem institutum sibi nouiter sacerdotem praeuentibus oportuisse dixisti litteris indicare, fuit quondam ecclesiastica uetus haec regula apud patres nostros, quibus una illa catholica apostolicaque communicatio ab omni praeuaricatorum libera pollutione constabat; nunc autem cum societatem praeferre malitis extraneam quam ad beati Petri purum redire illibatumque consortium, quomodo cantabimus canticum domini in terra aliena, id est quomodo dispositionis apostolicae antiqua foedera praebeamus hominibus communionis externae? quemammodum uobis ordinationem suam renuntiatum est, cui uestro etiam testimonio haereticos damnatosque praeponitis?*

⁹⁹ Cf. MEIER, Anastasios I. 106; also SCHWARTZ, Publizistische Sammlungen zum acacianischen Schisma 219. Gelasius' foremost objective was to give prominence to the primacy of Rome in his letters to the Emperor, Euphemios, and especially the bishops of Dardania; he ignored the so-called 28th canon of Chalcedon, put the bishoprics of Alexandria and Antioch in precedence over Constantinople, pointedly referred to the See of Rome as "Apostolic," insultingly reminded Euphemios that Constantinople had been under the jurisdiction of the Bishop of Heraklaea. In the Pope's view, Constantinople did not possess a greater right to primacy than other residential sees: Ravenna, Milan, Sirmium, and Trier. Gelasius also asserted that the patriarchs and bishops can be judged by the Pope only, as his jurisdiction extends over the entire Church, see, e.g., the letter to the bishops of Dardania of February 1, 496 (Epistulae imperatorum pontificum aliorum inde ab a. CCCLXVII usque ad a. DLIII datae, Avellana quae dicitur collectio, ed. O. GÜNTHER [Corpus Scriptorum Ecclesiasticorum Latinorum 35]. Vindobonae 1895, 369–398, esp. 376 and 387–388). Cf. W. H. C. FREND, The Rise of the Monophysite Movement. Chapters in the History of the Church in the Fifth and Sixth Century. Oxford 1972, 195; P. NAUTIN, Gélase I^{er}. DHGE XX 287–289; MEIER, Anastasios I. 106 and HAARER, Anastasios I 129–130.

¹⁰⁰ John, Athenodoros' father-in-law is only known from the above-mentioned account of Theodore Lector and the dependent sources, cf. PLRE II 604 (Ioannes 43). Athenodoros was a senator and one of the Isaurians who had achieved considerable political

told him of Euphemios' indiscretion, which was to arouse Anastasius' hatred of the bishop,¹⁰¹ whom he came to identify with the Isaurian rebels.¹⁰² The author goes on to describe two failed attempts on the bishop's life, not attributing them directly to the emperor, but to "certain individuals plotting against Euphemios."¹⁰³ They were to hire an assassin to kill Euphemios with a sword. The bishop was saved thanks only to the timely intervention of the *ekdikos* Paul, who killed the assassin with a bolt (σέρα). Euphemios survived another assassination attempt by escaping from the ambush in a layman's clothes.¹⁰⁴ Next, the emperor used force to reclaim from Euphemios his declaration to refrain from making any modification to the existing confession of faith, which he had been pressured to subscribe at his coronation.¹⁰⁵

The above sequence of the events is derived from Theophanes, who collects Theodore's information under one year and dates it to the year 5987 from the Creation, which corresponds to 494/495 A.D., whereas Theodore Lector and George the Monk mention the fifth year of the war (τοῦ δὲ πολέμου ἐπὶ ε. ἔτη κρατήσαντος), which would set the date of the events in 495/496.¹⁰⁶ The description of the events and their context point out that they had happened towards the close of Euphemios' episcopate, i.e., most probably, in accordance with Theodore's account, in the latter half of 495 or the first half of 496.¹⁰⁷

In Theophanes' account, two different issues are referred to and linked with each other: Anastasius' accusations of treason levelled against Euphemios and the question of the imperial declaration. The former issue is a strictly political one, while the latter is related to religion. Theophanes may have possibly linked the two different events connected with the conflict between the bishop and the Emperor under one and the same year (AM 5987), although they did not have to transpire at the same time. On the other hand, George the Monk relates a completely different sequence of the events, with Anastasius' recovery of his declaration of faith given as a complement to the information on Euphemios' pressure on the emperor to make it in 491, without setting down when it had happened. In any case, Theodore holds that the only cause of the Emperor's hatred of the bishop was Euphemios'

influence at the capital during Zeno's reign, but were banished from Constantinople to Isauria in 491/492. He was one of the leaders of the Isaurian rebellion against Anastasius; in 497, he was captured and executed, cf. *PLRE* II 178–179 (Athenodorus 2).

¹⁰¹ Theodore Lector, *Epitome* 449 (126, 24–27, 14 HANSEN); Theophanes AM 5987 (139, 6–20 DE BOOR); George the Monk IX 15 (624, 20–625, 3 DE BOOR).

¹⁰² Theodore Lector, *Epitome* 455 (128, 14 HANSEN); Theophanes AM 5987 (139, 12–13 DE BOOR); George the Monk IX 15 (625, 6–7 DE BOOR). Cf. MEIER, Anastasios I. 89, who regards Theodore Lector's account as credible, despite the historian's clearly negative attitude towards the Emperor. In a similar vein: DIJKSTRA – GREATREX, Patriarchs and Politics in Constantinople in the Reign of Anastasius 229–230, who nevertheless perceive the Emperor's confidential request to be a trap against the Patriarch to discredit him and thus neutralize the popular support he had enjoyed.

¹⁰³ Theodore Lector, *Epitome* 453 (127, 26 HANSEN): Οἱ ἐπιβουλοὶ Εὐφημίου τινὶ. Theophanes AM 5987 (139, 13–14 DE BOOR): Εὐφημίῳ δὲ τινες ἐπιβουλεύοντες. In his chronicle, George the Monk does not mention any attempts on Euphemios' life.

¹⁰⁴ Theodore Lector, *Epitome* 454 (128, 11–13 HANSEN); Theophanes AM 5987 (139, 17–19 DE BOOR).

¹⁰⁵ Theodore Lector, *Epitome* 447 (126, 16–17 HANSEN); Theophanes AM 5987 (139, 19–20 DE BOOR); Victor of Tunnuna s.a. 491.1 (22 PLACANICA).

¹⁰⁶ John of Antioch fr. 308 (Ioannis Antiocheni *Fragmenta ex Historia chronica*. Introduzione, edizione critica e traduzione a cura di U. ROBERTO [TU 154]. Berlin 2005, 530, 21–24), points out that the Isaurian rebellion had broken out upon the news of Anastasius' accession to the throne, not as late as 492 (Κρίνων δὲ εικότως ἐκ τῆς τῶν ἐνδημούντων Ἰσαύρων ἐπιβουλῆς διεσκευάσθαι ταῦτα, ἀποχωρεῖν τούτους τῆς βασιλίδος ἐκέλευεν οὐδ' ἀξιωματῶν ἀφαιρούμενός τινα αὐτῶν οὐδὲ χρημάτων, καὶ ταῦτα ἤδη ἀγγελθείσης τῆς κατὰ τὴν χώραν αὐτῶν ἀποστάσεως.). Cf. HAARER, Anastasios I 23–24.

¹⁰⁷ Chronologically speaking, Theophanes dates the second attempt on Euphemios' life "ἐν τῇ συνάξει τοῦ ὄρους," which may be identified with the feast of the Transfiguration on August 6, cf. Theodoros Anagnostes, *Kirchengeschichte* 128 (apparatus), while The Chronicle of Theophanes Confessor. Byzantine and Near Eastern History AD 284–813 214, note 4, suggests the Ascension day. In such case, the second attempt may be dated, with a certain likelihood, to May 23, 496, i.e., shortly before his deposition.

questionable political stance, not the religious differences. The author does not state that the emperor had been responsible for the assassination attempts, but we cannot rule out such a possibility.¹⁰⁸

Before long, the emperor decided to remove the troublesome Patriarch from his office. The sources composed in the Eastern regions of the Empire, mostly of Monophysite origin, beginning from the above passage in Pseudo-Zacharias' work, state that Euphemios had been deposed and exiled because of his Nestorian heresy.¹⁰⁹ Likewise, Evagrius' passage referring to the matter of Euphemios' deposition suggests that it was based solely on religious issues, and he does not even mention political considerations.¹¹⁰ The account in the Synodicon Vetus clearly links the cause of Euphemios' deposition with religious issues, stating that the Emperor blamed the bishop for "countless slanders" because of Chalcedon.¹¹¹ In a similar way, Marcellinus Comes ascribes the sources of the conflict between the emperor and the bishop to religious questions,¹¹² but his account of the deposition does not specify the charge levelled against Euphemios.¹¹³ In his Life of Sabas, Cyril of Scythopolis notes that the Bishop had to relinquish his office as a result of "false accusations," even though the context implies that the deposition was caused by the issues related to the Council of Chalcedon.¹¹⁴ In turn, John Moschos makes a clear connection between the deposition of Euphemios and the Christological controversy.¹¹⁵

The fundamental question asked in historiography with respect to Euphemios' deposition is why Anastasius had taken so long, after the Nestorian accusations against the bishop levelled by Athanasios of Alexandria, before he finally decided to have him deposed.¹¹⁶ There have been a number of proposed answers to this question: the emperor's reluctance to aggravate the relations with his wife, who had most evidently supported Euphemios, or his wish to regain the solemn declaration of faith he had been coerced to sign prior to his imperial coronation.¹¹⁷

¹⁰⁸ HAARER, Anastasius I 137, says that the assassin acted on the orders of Anastasius or wanted to ingratiate himself with the Emperor. A similar suggestion was made earlier in LENAINE DE TILLEMONT, Mémoires pour servir à l'histoire ecclésiastique des six premiers siècles XVI 660. More caution can be seen in DIJKSTRA – GREATREX, Patriarchs and Politics in Constantinople in the Reign of Anastasius 228 and MEIER, Anastasios I. 90.

¹⁰⁹ John Malalas XVI 11 (327, 62–64 THURN), states laconically: Ἐν δὲ τῇ αὐτοῦ βασιλείᾳ καθηρέθη Εὐφήμιος ὁ πατριάρχης Κωνσταντινουπόλεως· καὶ ἐξώρισεν αὐτὸν εἰς Εὐχάϊταν ἐπὶ τὸν Πόντον ὡς Νεστοριανόν. The later Monophysite tradition repeats this statement: Pseudo-Dionysios of Tel-Mahre s.a. 809 (Pseudo-Dionysios of Tel-Mahre, Chronicle [known also as the Chronicle of Zuqnin]. Part III, translated with notes and introduction by W. WITAKOWSKI [Translated Texts for Historians 22]. Liverpool 1996, 2): Euphemios of Constantinople went into exile because he was found to be a Nestorian. The Chronicle to the Year 846 (Chronicon ad annum Domini 846 pertinens, edidit E. W. BROOKS, interpretatus est J.-B. CHABOT in: Chronica minora, interpretati sunt I. GUIDI – E. W. BROOKS – J.-B. CHABOT [CSCO Scriptores Syri, series III, tomus IV]. Parisiis – Lipsiae 1903, 167, 17–18): *Hunc [Euphemios] eiecit imperator in exilium Euchaita Ponti quia laborabat haeresi nestoriana*; Michael the Syrian IX 7 (154 CHABOT): Euphemios, patriarche de Constantinople, fut chassé parce qu'il fut constaté qu'il était nestorien; whereas John of Nikiu 89, 46 (The Chronicle of John, Bishop of Nikiu, translated from Zotenberg's Ethiopic text by R. H. CHARLES. Oxford 1916, 126), recounts that Anastasius had removed Euphemios from his See; he does not specify the reasons behind the deposition, but the context clearly points to religious causes. The tradition associated with Edessa states only that Euphemios was deposed and replaced by Makedonios, without giving any reasons for the deposition, cf. The Chronicle of Edessa 77 (Chronicon Edessenum, edidit et interpretatus est I. GUIDI, in: Chronica minora 8, 23–24) and The Chronicle of Jacob of Edessa (Chronicon Iacobi Edesseni, interpretatus est E. W. BROOKS, in: Chronica minora 236).

¹¹⁰ Evagrius III 30 (126, 30 – 127, 4 BIDEZ – PARMENTIER).

¹¹¹ Synodicon Vetus 109 (92 DUFFY – PARKER): διὰ τὴν ἀγίας ἐν Χαλκηδόνι σύνοδον μυριάς συκοφαντίας ὑποβάλων.

¹¹² Marcellinus Comes s.a. 494.1 (31 CROKE).

¹¹³ Marcellinus Comes s.a. 495 (31 CROKE): *Eufemius augustae civitatis antistes, de quo superius fecimus mentionem, falso ab Anastasio principe accusatus atque damnatus in exilium ductus est.*

¹¹⁴ Cyril of Scythopolis, Vita Sabae 50 (140, 13–15 SCHWARTZ): τότε τοίνυν Εὐφήμιον τὸν Κωνσταντινουπόλεως ἐπίσκοπον τὰ ἐν Χαλκηδόνι δογματισθέντα συνοδικῶς κυρώσαντα καθεῖλεν τῆς ἐπισκοπῆς συκοφαντία περιβαλόν. In turn, in chapter 52 of his work, Cyril cited Anastasius' words spoken to Sabas: the Emperor referred to Euphemios as "Nestorian."

¹¹⁵ John Moschos, Pratum Spirituale 38 (PG 87/3, 2888–2890).

¹¹⁶ Cf. DIJKSTRA – GREATREX, Patriarchs and Politics in Constantinople in the Reign of Anastasius 228.

¹¹⁷ Cf. STEIN, Histoire du Bas-Empire II 165; DIJKSTRA – GREATREX, Patriarchs and Politics in Constantinople in the Reign of Anastasius 228.

None of the above options is fully satisfactory. Ariadne, Anastasius' wife, died in 515; it does not explain, therefore, why Euphemios had been deposed in 496, not two years before.¹¹⁸ The question of the declaration is similar. Although Evagrius' information that Anastasius failed to reclaim it from Euphemios and tried to take it away from his successor does not agree with the tradition derived from Theodore Lector and is probably erroneous,¹¹⁹ the other sources that recount the dispute over the declaration (Theodore Lector, Theophanes, George the Monk) do not make it possible to determine exactly when the emperor had reclaimed it.¹²⁰ We should also remember that the emperor had affirmed his declaration with a publicly made oath, which was just as (if not more) important as the written document. Early into his reign, the emperor had probably felt bound to respect it.

On the other hand, the chronicler closest to the events, Theodore Lector, and the associated tradition emphasize the significance of the political factor.¹²¹ He relates that the reason for Euphemios' deposition had been the accusation of his treacherous complicity in the Isaurian rebellion, which was levelled by the emperor. After his victory over the rebels, Anastasius was to send the *magister officiorum* Eusebius to the bishop with the following words: "Your prayers, Eminence, have besmeared your friends."¹²² The emperor attributed the Isaurians' treachery to the bishop, as the latter was to maintain correspondence with them. In consequence, Anastasius got the bishops to convene at Constantinople; they put Euphemios on trial and deposed him, appointing the aforementioned Makedonios in his place.¹²³ Subsequently, the emperor condemned the Patriarch to exile at Euchaita in Pontus.¹²⁴

¹¹⁸ Cf. TWARDOWSKA, *Cesarzowie bizantyjskie* 2 pol. V w. 175.

¹¹⁹ Evagrius III 32 (130, 12–15 BIDEZ – PARMENTIER). Cf. CHARANIS, *Church and State in the Later Roman Empire* 56, note 74. However, Evagrius' account is considered to be credible by B. E. DALEY, *Apollo as a Chalcedonian. A New Fragment of a Controversial Work from Early Sixth-Century Constantinople. Traditio* 50 (1995) 36.

¹²⁰ George the Monk IX 15 (624, 11–12 DE BOOR). Cf. DIJKSTRA – GREATREX, *Patriarchs and Politics in Constantinople in the Reign of Anastasius 227*, note 12, who hold that the Emperor had recovered his declaration some time prior to Euphemios' deposition.

¹²¹ Among the sources within the tradition associated with Theodore Lector, only Victor of Tunnuna s.a. 496 (24 PLACANICA), links Euphemios' deposition with his defence of the decrees of Chalcedon: *Anastasius imperator, haereticorum synodum faciens, henoticum Zenonis confirmat et Euphemium episcopum Constantinopolitanum, Chalcedonensis synodi defensorem, deponit*.

¹²² Theodore Lector, *Epitome* 450 (127, 15–17 HANSEN): Ἀναστάσιος βασιλικώτερον λοιπὸν κινήθεισ κατὰ τῶν Ἰσαύρων τοῦτους κατὰ κράτος ἐνίκησεν· καὶ πέμψας πρὸς Εὐφήμειον Εὐσέβιον τὸν μάγιστρον δηλοῖ πρὸς αὐτόν· <<αἰ εὐχαὶ σου, [ὁ μέγας, τοὺς φίλους σου ἡσβόλωσαν.>>]. Eusebius' words were recreated from the chronicles of Theophanes AM 5988 (140, 8 DE BOOR) and George the Monk IX 15 (625, 5–6 DE BOOR), as in Theodore's text contained in the *Codex Baroccianus* gr. 142, the words are missing. Cf. Theodoros Anagnostes, *Kirchengeschichte* 127 (apparatus). Eusebius served as consul twice, for the first time in 489, and then again in 493. In the years 492–497, he also served as *magister officiorum*, cf. *PLRE* II 433 (Fl. Eusebius 28), with a suggestion to identify him with Eusebius (431 (Eusebius 19), Zeno's envoy to Persian king Peroz.

¹²³ Theodore Lector, *Epitome* 455 (128, 14–17 HANSEN) = George the Monk IX 15 (625, 6–10 DE BOOR): Ἀναστάσιος ὁ βασιλεὺς τὰς ἐπιβουλὰς τῶν Ἰσαύρων ἐπιγράψας Εὐφημίῳ, καὶ ὡς γράμματα πεπομφότος τοῖς τυράννοις, συνήγαγε τοὺς ἐνδημοῦντας ἐπισκόπους· οἵτινες βασιλεῖ χαρίζόμενοι ἀκοινωνησίᾳ καὶ καθαρῆσει τὸν ἄνδρα ἡμίψαντο. See Theophanes AM 5988 (140, 7–8 DE BOOR), who does not mention Anastasius' accusation of the Bishop's involvement in the Isaurian conspiracy. The synod which had condemned Euphemios was dated by Eduard Schwartz, as based on the information given by Cyril of Scythopolis, *Vita Sabae* 50 (140, 13–15 SCHWARTZ) to late June or early July of 496, cf. SCHWARTZ, *Publizistische Sammlungen zum acacianischen Schisma* 222, note 1. The synod was already dated to July of 496 by LENAIN DE TILLEMONT, *Mémoires pour servir à l'histoire ecclésiastique des six premiers siècles XVI 660–661 and 806* (as based on the accounts of Theophanes and Victor of Tunnuna). Drawing on this dating, the event is believed to have taken place generally during the summer of 496, see W. H. C. FRENDE, *The Fall of Makedonios in 511 – a Suggestion*, in: *Kerygma und Logos. Beiträge zu den geistesgeschichtlichen Beziehungen zwischen Antike und Christentum. Festschrift für Carl Andresen zum 70. Geburtstag*, heraus. A. M. Ritter. Göttingen 1979, 184, while the mid-year has been specified by K. FELD, *Barbarische Bürger. Die Isaurier und das Römische Reich (Millennium Studies in the culture and history of the first millennium C.E. 8)*. Berlin – New York 2005, 335. Cf., however, HAARER, *Anastasius I* 137, who dates the Bishop's deposition to November of 496 (but she does not offer any arguments to support this dating) and CHARANIS, *Church and State in the Later Roman Empire* 56, who falsely dates the said synod to November of 495. This date is also assumed by JANIN, *Euphémios* 1410. In turn, G. WIRTH, *Anastasius, Christen und Perser. JbAC* 33 (1990) 114, shifts the date of the synod ahead by two years, to 498.

¹²⁴ Theodore Lector, *Epitome* 457 (128, 22 HANSEN) = George the Monk IX 15 (625, 15–16 DE BOOR); Theophanes AM 5989 (140, 19–20 DE BOOR). Euchaita, where a number of important figures were exiled, was situated in Pontus, west of Amasea;

Nonetheless, Theophanes' account contains some disputable points as regards the actual timeline of the events. The author associates Euphemios' deposition with the victory of Anastasius' army over the Isaurian rebellion, the latter event resulting in the capture and execution of the rebel leaders, Longinos of Kardala and at least one man named Athenodoros. The question is that these events are commonly dated to 497, not 496.¹²⁵ In any case, the chronology of the Isaurian war remains a fairly debatable issue. Marcellinus Comes' Chronicle is the only source which dates the end of the war to 497,¹²⁶ while the generally fairly accurate Chronicle of Victor of Tunnuna refers to the year 495.¹²⁷

The earlier dating of these events is also favoured by other representatives of the tradition associated with Theodore Lector. However, the Epitome of Theodore's work and the Chronicle of George the Monk are not very precise on this point. Both of these sources claim that "after five years of the war" (i.e., in 496) the emperor Anastasius, weary of the protracted conflict, wished to put an end to the hostilities.¹²⁸ Therefore, he sets the beginning of the conflict between the emperor and Euphemios, not the decisive victory of Anastasius, in that year, even though the ensuing account of the Isaurian defeat, just like Theophanes' account, imply a proximity between the two events. According to Theophanes, the war came to a close three years after the battle of Kotyaion, which took place in late 492.¹²⁹ In consequence, the tradition connected with Theodore dates both the beginning of the conflict between the Emperor and bishop Euphemios and the victory in the civil war to 495/496, most likely to early 496.

Marcellinus' dating seems to be validated by the Imperial army commander-in-chief John the Scythian's appointment as consul in 498, apparently in recognition of his success of the previous year. It should be noted, however, that Anastasius himself had held the consulship in 497, which may also attest to the acknowledgement of his triumph over the rebels.¹³⁰ Thus, Marcellinus' dating may probably pertain to the final suppression of the Isaurian revolt, which would become possible only in a year or two after the capture of Longinos of Kardala, whereas the accounts provided by the sources close to Theodore regard the defeat of the main rebel forces as the actual end of the conflict. On that occasion, Anastasius had likely come into possession of Euphemios' correspondence, which would explain the emperor's sudden retaliatory reaction.

I think that Theodore's strict association of Euphemios' deposition with the victories in the Isaurian war clearly explains why the bishop was removed from his office in 496, when the scales of the confrontation had been tipped definitely in favour of the emperor, who was gaining the upper hand over his enemies. The military success helped him to consolidate his position, thus allowing him to

the Emperor Anastasius raised it to the status of the city, cf. H. GRÉGOIRE, *Géographie byzantine*. *BZ* 19 (1913) 59–61 and C. FOSS, Euchaita. *ODB* II 737.

¹²⁵ Cf. STEIN, *Histoire du Bas-Empire* II 84; CAPIZZI, *L'imperatore Anastasio I (491–518)* 98–99; Procope de Gaza, Priscien de Césarée, *Panegyriques de l'empereur Anastase Ier* 127; FELD, *Barbarische Bürger* 333–334; HAARER, *Anastasius I* 26; MEIER, *Anastasios I*. 82. However, Haarer states that the precise chronology of the final stage of the civil war is difficult to determine.

¹²⁶ Marcellinus Comes s. a. 497.2 (31 CROKE): *Bellumque Isaucum hoc sexto anno sedatum*. Marcellinus' account is corroborated in JORDANES, *Romana* 355 (*Jordanis Romana et Getica*, ed. TH. MOMMSEN, in: *MGH. Auctores antiquissimi* V/1. Berolini 1882, 46): *consertoque proelio iuxta Cotizaium Frygiae civitatem castra metati pene per sex continuos annos rei publicae adversatur*. Both of these authors had probably drawn on the same Latin source of Constantinopolitan origin, cf. CROKE, *Count Marcellinus* 178.

¹²⁷ Victor of Tunnuna s.a. 495 (22 PLACANICA): *Bellum Isauricum exardescit. Athenodorus et Longinus tyranni occiduntur*.

¹²⁸ Theodore Lector, *Epitome* 449 (126, 24–27 HANSEN): τοῦ δὲ πολέμου ἐπὶ πέντε ἔτη Another passage, Theodore Lector, *Epitome* 450 (127, 15–16 HANSEN), refers to Anastasius' final victory over the Isaurians, but, similarly to Theophanes' work, it does not offer any additional chronological hints; cf. George the Monk IX 15 (625, 3–4 DE BOOR).

¹²⁹ Theophanes AM 5985 (138, 15–18 DE BOOR). F. HILD – H. HELLENKEMPER, *Kilikien und Isaurien (TTB 5)*. Wien 1990, I 41.

¹³⁰ R. S. BAGNALL – A. CAMERON – S. R. SCHWARTZ – K. A. WORP, *Consuls of the Later Roman Empire*. Atlanta 1987, 529–533. In the successive years, the victorious commanders of the Imperial army, John the Scythian and John the Hunchback, would become consuls.

crack down on the unfriendly and disloyal Patriarch. Besides, revealing the connections between Euphemios and the Isaurians was meant to have a further impact on his popularity at the capital, where they were commonly detested. An earlier deposition of the Patriarch would have caused much turmoil among the people of Constantinople attached to their bishop, as Theodore Lector makes it clear that after the deposition the people rioted and headed into the Hippodrome, where their earnest imploring (λιτανεία) on behalf of Euphemios was most probably directed to the emperor, not to God.¹³¹ The above passage confirms that the decision to send Euphemios into exile was motivated by political considerations. Even though Theodore's words referred to a revolt (ὁ μέντοι λαὸς δι' Εὐφήμιον ἔστασίαζον), the people assembled at the Hippodrome seemed to beg forgiveness for the incriminated bishop rather than rise in protest against his deposition. Anastasius did not yield to the pressure from the people. He did not revoke his decision and the crowds were soon dispersed.¹³² Perhaps, the Isaurian defeat provided the emperor with the proof of the Patriarch's treason, such as Euphemios' letter to the rebels, mentioned by Theodore in his work.¹³³ It should also be emphasized that Theodore Lector, who was ill-disposed towards Anastasius and prompt to bring up the cases of the persecution of Chalcedonian bishops, would have had no reason to pass over the religious causes of Euphemios' deposition. From the perspective of a defender of orthodoxy, accusations of high treason were more shameful than accusations of Nestorianism (as the latter would have aligned Euphemios with the figures suffering for the truth¹³⁴). Apparently, therefore, the religious causes were of secondary importance to the emperor and the question of Nestorianism was rather a pretext to have the Patriarch deposed, not the other way round.¹³⁵ At the close of the fifth century, the Patriarch of Constantinople, usually appointed from among the circles of the Constantinopolitan clergy, held a very prominent position at the capital and enjoyed much popular support, hence the emperor would have run a great risk had he chosen to act openly against the bishop.¹³⁶ Anastasius had to be very well prepared for his confrontation with the bishop, in particular as regards the necessity to buttress his own position at the capital, where he was not very popular. The consolidation of his authority and the military success in the Isaurian rebellion made it possible for the emperor to come into open conflict with Euphemios.¹³⁷

¹³¹ On how this phrase is interpreted, see DIJKSTRA – GREATREX, *Patriarchs and Politics in Constantinople in the Reign of Anastasius 230*, note 26.

¹³² Theodore Lector, *Epitome 455* (128, 18–20 HANSEN) = *George the Monk IX 15* (625, 12–15 DE BOOR); Theophanes AM 5988 (140, 13–15 DE BOOR).

¹³³ CHARANIS, *Church and State in the Later Roman Empire* 55, also holds that the Patriarch maintained close relations with the rebels and suggests that the riots aimed against Anastasius, which broke out at Constantinople in 491, may have been instigated by Euphemios. A similar opinion can be found in MEIER, *Anastasios I.* 88 and 109. It should be stressed, however, that this is a mere speculation, without evidence in the sources. It is therefore rightly rejected by DIJKSTRA – GREATREX, *Patriarchs and Politics in Constantinople in the Reign of Anastasius 230*, note 26.

¹³⁴ It is probably the reason why Theophanes, several centuries later, in his retelling of Theodore Lector's account of Euphemios' deposition, does not mention the accusations concerning the Bishop's involvement in the Isaurian conspiracy.

¹³⁵ For different opinions on the matter, see LENAIN DE TILLEMONT, *Mémoires pour servir à l'histoire ecclésiastique des six premiers siècles XVI* 660; FRIEND, *The Fall of Macedonius in 511 – a Suggestion* 184–185; FELD, *Barbarische Bürger* 335; DIJKSTRA – GREATREX, *Patriarchs and Politics in Constantinople in the Reign of Anastasius 230*; HAARER, *Anastasios I* 136–137 and MEIER, *Anastasios I.* 89–90, who assert that Euphemios' uncompromising pro-Chalcedonian attitude was the cause of his deposition, whereas the accusation of high treason was only a pretext which the Emperor had used to remove the troublesome Patriarch. Nonetheless, SCHWARTZ, *Publizistische Sammlungen zum acacianischen Schisma* 222, puts the emphasis on the political causes of the deposition.

¹³⁶ Cf. DIJKSTRA – GREATREX, *Patriarchs and Politics in Constantinople in the Reign of Anastasius 223–225 and 255–257*; cf. MEIER, *Anastasios I.* 91.

¹³⁷ On the other hand, Meier argues that Euphemios' deposition cannot be explained only in terms of a personal conflict between the Emperor and the Bishop. In his view, the rivalry between the two figures was caused by the intertwining of the imperial and ecclesiastical scopes of authority and the absence of a clear definition of the limits of those authorities, which led to the situation of constant overlapping of the two spheres of authority, i.e., of the Church and the state, particularly in Constanti-

The tradition associated with Theodore Lector relates that Euphemios had been afraid he would be assassinated upon his deposition or at the place of his exile. He had taken refuge at the baptistery and requested a warranty of safety through Makedonios. The emperor agreed to grant it. The new Patriarch, on his part, also furnished Euphemios with some money he had obtained, so that the fugitive could be able to sustain himself and those who were together with him.¹³⁸ As regards Euphemios' later fate, we have practically no reliable information. We only know that he had been exiled first to Euchaita, then to Ancyra, where he died in 515.¹³⁹ Although the Synodicon Vetus accuses Anastasios of having both Euphemios and Makedonios murdered, the credibility of this account appears to be very doubtful.¹⁴⁰ No such information can be found in any of the contemporary sources, while Theophanes, who also relates the hearsay of Makedonios' assassination on the emperor's orders, does not mention Euphemios at all.¹⁴¹ It cannot be found in the work of George the Monk, either, even though it seems that his relation of Theodore Lector's History is reliable. Likewise, Victor of Tunnuna, another author to have drawn on Theodore's History, does not say anything about non-natural causes of Euphemios' death.¹⁴² Therefore, it does not seem likely that the account in question was derived from the work of this latter author.¹⁴³ Apart from that, the accounts in Theophanes and the Synodicon also contain some other discrepancies. For instance, the former states that the reason for Makedonios' relocation from Euchaita to Gangra was the Hunnic invasion, whereas the latter source notes that the emperor had banished the Patriarch straight to Gangra, at the same time mentioning, in passing, an incursion by the Goths. All these inaccuracies make the Synodicon's account seem rather implausible in this regard. Perhaps, the author's error stems from the chronological convergence of the deaths of the two patriarchs.

6. RECAPITULATION

Euphemios was an adamant follower of the Council of Chalcedon. From the beginning of his episcopate, he had expressed his wish to restore the ecclesiastical communion with Rome, but the unyielding position of the Popes, especially that of Gelasius I, ruined the bishop's hopes. Another notable feature of Euphemios' episcopate was his conflict with the See of Alexandria, where Peter Mongos, who had been a moderate opponent of Chalcedon, was succeeded by the definitely more anti-Chalce-

nople. The emperor and the bishop were constantly involved in the rivalry for their domains of activity, and charismatic patriarchs were able to achieve some considerable advantage over the emperor. The author notes that the rivalry between the secular and ecclesiastical centres of authority at Constantinople had even grown more intense at the time of the struggles over the Council of Chalcedon, when the ruler could not afford to lose his grip on the provinces, especially Egypt, and was apprehensive that the unity of the state might be jeopardized by Euphemios' activity, cf. MEIER, Anastasios I. 92.

¹³⁸ Theodore Lector, *Epitome* 457 (128, 22–27 HANSEN) = George the Monk IX 15 (625, 17 – 626, 1 DE BOOR); Theophanes AM 5989 (140, 20–26 DE BOOR).

¹³⁹ The information on Ancyra and the year 515 as the date of Euphemios' death can be found solely in Victor of Tunnuna s.a. 515.2 (32 PLACANICA). The Synodicon Vetus 115 (96 DUFFY – PARKER) suggests that Euphemios, as well as Makedonios, died at Gangra. Cf. JANIN, *Euphémios* 1411 and MEIER, Anastasios I. 90, who link the accounts of Theophanes and Victor of Tunnuna and argue that Euphemios had fled from Euchaita to Ancyra because of the Hunnic invasion. This suggestion, however, is not supported by any evidence in the sources. Theophanes AM 6008 (161, 31–32 DE BOOR) only notes that Makedonios fled from Euchaita to Gangra before the Huns' invasion and does not make any mention referring to Euphemios. As regards the doubt over the date given by Victor of Tunnuna, see also LENAIN DE TILLEMONT, *Mémoires pour servir à l'histoire ecclésiastique des six premiers siècles XVI* 806–807.

¹⁴⁰ Synodicon Vetus 115 (96 DUFFY – PARKER).

¹⁴¹ Theophanes AM 6008 (161, 31–162, 2 DE BOOR).

¹⁴² Victor of Tunnuna s.a. 515.2 (32 PLACANICA): *Eo tempore Euphemius Constantinopolitanus episcopus apud Ancyram Galatiae et Ariagne Augusta in regia urbe de hac vita transiere.*

¹⁴³ Nevertheless, Christian Günther Hansen considers both of these accounts as two versions given by Theodore Lector, *Epitome* 514 (148, 12–21 HANSEN).

donian patriarch, Athanasios II. Euphemios' efforts failed to produce any result, as the lack of any support from the emperor Anastasius had rendered any actual intervention in Egypt impossible. In spite of the difference in their approach to the question of Alexandria, where the emperor had been intent on preserving the *status quo*, especially in the face of the Isaurian rebellion, it was possible, nonetheless, to reach a certain *modus vivendi* between the ecclesiastical and imperial authorities in Constantinople during the first years of Anastasius' reign. Paradoxically, the vehement conflict that sealed the bishop's fate and led to his downfall was caused by political issues, not any doctrinal controversy. Anastasius suspected or obtained some proof of Euphemios' collaboration with the Isaurian rebels, which must have precipitated the bishop's removal and exile. We do not know precisely if the synod of 496, which had carried through the procedure, used the accusation of heresy as the formal cause of Euphemios' deposition. It is possible in view of the commonly held conviction in the Eastern sources that tend to charge Euphemios with Nestorian sympathies. It seems, however, that the response of the people of Constantinople confirms the view that the decision to exile Euphemios to Euchaita was motivated by political reasons. This also explains why the bishop's fall had taken place in 496, upon the consolidation of the Emperor's power in Constantinople after his victory over the Isaurian rebel forces and his eventual realization as to the bishop's disloyalty.

