

PAPERS AND MONOGRAPHS OF THE FINNISH INSTITUTE AT ATHENS VOL. IX

THE EASTERN MEDITERRANEAN  
IN THE LATE ANTIQUE AND  
EARLY BYZANTINE PERIODS

Edited by

Maria Gourdouba, Leena Pietilä-Castrén and Esko Tikkala

HELSINKI 2004

© Suomen Ateenan-instituutin säätiö (Foundation of the Finnish Institute at Athens), Helsinki 2004

ISSN 1237-2684  
ISBN 951-98806-3-1

Printed in Greece by D. Layias – E. Souvatzidakis S.A., Athens 2004

*Cover:* Detail of a map by Nicolas Sanson D'Abbeville, Paris 1665. Finnish Institute at Athens

## Contents

Preface	i	
LÁSZLÓ BORHY	Ewige Zeit – Ewiges Leben: Das Deckengemälde aus <i>Brigetio</i> und das kosmologische Zimmer des Cosmas Indicopleustes	1
SEppo HEIKKINEN	The Poetry of Venantius Fortunatus: The Twilight of Roman Metre	17
GUNNAR AF HÄLLSTRÖM	From Chaos to Cosmos – Interpreting the Hierarchies of Pseudo-Dionysius	33
STEFANIE A.H. KENNELL	Latin Bishops and Greek Emperors: Ennodius' Missions to Constantinople	41
GEORGIOS PALLIS	The Early Christian Attica: the Area of Maroussi	59
IOANNIS VOLANAKIS	Frühchristliche Monamente auf der Insel Rhodos – ein Überblick	75
List of Figures	95	

# Latin Bishops and Greek Emperors: Ennodius' Missions to Constantinople

Stefanie A.H. Kennell

In 515, when Pope Hormisdas sent his long-time friend Magnus Felix Ennodius and several other churchmen on a diplomatic mission to the Imperial court at Constantinople, the Churches of Rome and Constantinople had been in a state of schism for well over thirty years. The purpose of Ennodius' mission was to end this split between the Eastern and Western churches by inducing the Emperor Anastasius to accept the Papal position regarding the Council of Chalcedon and Pope Leo the Great's contribution to its decisions so that he would then make the Eastern Church submit to Roman authority. The mission was not a success. In 517, Ennodius was sent on a related errand; its result was similarly unsatisfactory. The failure of both missions was predetermined by the intransigence of both Pope and Emperor. No room for manoeuvre could exist in a situation where the irresistibly dogmatic certitude of the Bishop of Rome was pitted against the immovably tenacious pragmatism of an Emperor disposed to consider the Christological formulations of Chalcedon unnecessarily precise.<sup>1</sup> The situation would change only with the ruler; after Anastasius died, the pro-Chalcedonian Justin became Emperor and so Hormisdas finally succeeded in having the Roman position accepted in 519.

By this time, Ennodius himself was no longer directly involved in negotiations at Constantinople, though he seems to have assisted Pope Hormisdas with the composition of a letter to the new emperor, and died in July 521.<sup>2</sup> Recent surveys of the period make scant mention of Ennodius' interventions,<sup>3</sup> yet his epitaph, still visible in Pavia, credits him with ending the East-West schism (Fig. 12) and the fourteenth-century Pavian writer Opicino de Canistris gives him the title 'Teacher of the Greeks', *doctor Grecorum*. The events in which he was involved constitute minor details in the history of the tumultuous sixth century that are nonetheless significant for the light they shed on discordant perceptions. On the one hand, Hormisdas' directions to his legates precluded any activity approximating actual negotiation; on the other, the breach was ultimately closed by Imperial intervention rather than Papal admonition. What were Ennodius and his colleagues expected to accomplish in 515 and 517? An answer can be found by examining the assumptions and perceptions of the two opposing sides, which sprang from over a century of increasingly divergent experience and practice and even today underlie certain divisions in the community of those who call themselves Christians.

<sup>1</sup> Kennell 2000, 215-219.

<sup>2</sup> Caspar 1933, 154-155.

<sup>3</sup> J.M. Gaddis, s.v. Chalcedon, Council of, in Bowersock 1999, 369-370; Lee 2000, 55-57; Kennell 2000, 220-221.

## The Acacian Schism: its Causes and Consequences

The rupture Ennodius was sent to heal is known as the Acacian Schism.<sup>4</sup> Like the Photian Schism, it takes its name from the person the Bishops of Rome considered principally responsible for a grave breach of ecclesiastical discipline, although the rift was solemnly opened by Rome's own representative. In this case, the deemed guilty



Fig. 12. The epitaph of Ennodius in the chancel of the church of S. Michele Maggiore in Pavia.

the long term, the immediate practical result of the *Henoticon* was that not only Acacius himself but also the incumbents of the ancient patriarchal sees of Alexandria and Antioch subscribed to it, thereby restoring a semblance of ecclesiastical unity to the Empire. Until the opportunity for consensus offered by the *Henoticon*, these metropolitan bishops had dissented from the version of Orthodoxy promulgated since the Council of Chalcedon in 451, earning themselves the heretical label of Monophysites, whereas after 482 they could worship God and ponder theological issues more freely.<sup>7</sup>

<sup>4</sup> Schwartz 1934, 171-262.

<sup>5</sup> Gray 1979, 28-29; G. Fowden, *Empire to Commonwealth: consequences of monotheism in late antiquity*, Princeton 1993, 106-109; R. Lim, *Christian Triumph and Controversy*, in Bowersock 1999, 207.

<sup>6</sup> Allen 2000, 817; Caspar 1933, 22 n. 5; Frend 1976, 72; *NCE*, s.v. Acacius Patriarch of Constantinople.

<sup>7</sup> Chadwick 1967, 205-208; G. Fowden, *Religious Communities*, in Bowersock 1999, 93-94; Allen 2000, 818-820.

party was Acacius, Bishop of Constantinople, who in 482 participated in the drafting and acceptance of an Imperial document called the *Henoticon*. This document originated in the embattled Emperor Zeno's resolve to create, without resorting to further synods, a compromise statement of Christological doctrine that the dissenting Christians of the Empire – Egyptians, Syrians, Armenians, and others – could agree on.<sup>5</sup> Zeno's strategy was to affirm the formulations of the Council of Nicaea as the basic definition of the nature of Christ as the Second Person of the Trinity, while leaving aside all the refinements introduced by later councils from Constantinople to Chalcedon. Depending on the literature we choose to consult, the *Henoticon* is variously called “a masterpiece of imperial diplomacy”, “a purely political document that dispensed with dogmatic fidelity to principle”, “a fine piece of caesaro-papism”, or “a plea for reunion on a basis of reticence and compromise”.<sup>6</sup>

Regardless of its inadequacy in

Zeno's achievement in bringing the three great sees of the East and their ancillary churches back into communion with one another might have seemed laudable in some circles, but for Rome and its Latin-speaking constituency in the West, the expedients involved were wholly objectionable. By passing over the Council of Chalcedon, Zeno and Acacius had effectively dismissed Pope Leo's definition of Christ as one person in two natures, divine and human, as expressed in the famous *Tomus* read into the council's proceedings and incorporated into its final, emphatically Dyophysite statement of faith. That the bishops who gathered at Chalcedon believed this formulation owed its validity more to the theological thought of Cyril of Alexandria than to the doctrinal leadership of Pope Leo was conveniently overlooked by Westerners.<sup>8</sup> Latin-speakers at the time, as well as those later on, Ennodius among them, viewed Leo's role in the council as proof that they could make a significant contribution to the articulation of theological issues, an activity that had long been the province of Hellenophones.<sup>9</sup>

Rome's objections did not spring simply from a difference of opinion on an abstract point of theology. The fact that the Bishop of Constantinople had resumed communion with bishops of dubious doctrine who had moreover obtained their sees in circumstances that usually involved the removal of predecessors holding divergent theological views and violent behaviour by some members of their flocks did not meet with Papal approval either.<sup>10</sup> It appears, however, that Acacius' gravest offence in Roman eyes was in not keeping the Pope informed of ecclesiastical developments in the (now-Byzantine) Empire and obtaining Rome's guidance regarding any and all matters that might be considered problematic.<sup>11</sup> Though Pope Simplicius was made aware of the *Henoticon* and its omissions in 482, he died in 483. It was his successor Felix III who learned from other sources that Acacius had renewed communion with the anti-Chalcedonian Peter Mongus of Alexandria and who in 484 took the step of convoking a provincial council that issued a letter excommunicating the bishop of the Imperial capital.<sup>12</sup> Zeno's and Acacius' names were accordingly removed from the diptychs at Rome, the tablets that listed those for whom prayers were offered during the liturgy. Acacius, not surprisingly, reciprocated by striking the bishop of Rome's name from the diptychs of the Church of Constantinople.

The schism thus officially began during the pontificate of Felix and would not easily subside, thanks in large part to the ideological contribution of Gelasius, the deacon whose skill in letter-writing underpinned Felix' assertion of Roman rights vis-à-vis unauthorised activity in Constantinople, exemplified by the *tomus de anathematis vinculo* of 484, and who became Pope upon the death of Felix in February 492.<sup>13</sup> Gelasius' most famous achievement was to articulate the doctrine of the two powers, secular and ecclesiastical, each supreme in its own sphere but subordinate to the other outside it, with the power of the Church ultimately supreme, for the instruction of Anastasius, who had succeeded Zeno as Emperor in 491.<sup>14</sup> This doctrine,

<sup>8</sup> Gray 1979, 9-16.

<sup>9</sup> Herrin 1987, 102-103.

<sup>10</sup> Schwartz 1934, 4-19, 33-49.

<sup>11</sup> Caspar 1933, 16-24.

<sup>12</sup> Caspar 1933, 28-33.

<sup>13</sup> Schwartz 1934, 7-15, 19-24; Caspar 1933, 33-81; Ertl 1938, 61-66.

<sup>14</sup> Schwartz 1934, 106-111; Chadwick 1967, 245; Wirbelauer 1993, 47-49.

which would have wide currency in the West well beyond the Reformation of the sixteenth century, found little resonance in Eastern lands, where the traditional inseparability of religious and political life would survive into the twentieth century. Gelasius' preference for phrases using the verbs 'teach' (*docere*) and 'learn' (*discere*), whereby the Bishop of Rome was understood to be imparting instruction and the Emperor receiving it, for saying that it was God's will that the Emperor submit to Rome's authority in religious matters, and for identifying Peter the Apostle as the unique source of Catholic truth and ecclesiastical unity enabled him to state the Roman Church's position with trenchant confidence, at the same time ensuring resistance by emperors and churchmen less concerned about Chalcedon.<sup>15</sup>

For Latin-speaking Catholics, the West's rupture with a bishop "branded by Pope Felix as one who had sinned against the Holy Ghost and apostolic authority" was fully justified.<sup>16</sup> Orthodox churchmen who adhered to the teachings of Chalcedon also deplored the situation and desired its end, appealing to the Bishop of Rome for vindication; deposed pro-Chalcedonian bishops and the Sleepless Monks of Constantinople were among Rome's most sedulous informants, in the absence of permanent Papal representatives in the capital and other major cities, concerning the perceived misdeeds of emperors and bishops.<sup>17</sup> Other Easterners, who were not so persuaded that the formulations of Chalcedon had accurately and completely settled the question of the nature of Jesus Christ, thought Rome's stance an overreaction to a purely internal measure designed to bring a modicum of tranquillity to the far-flung and polyglot communities of the Empire.<sup>18</sup>

To understand why Eastern and Western Christians had such differing perceptions of the split that separated Rome from Constantinople, we need to take account of two of the basic assumptions that underlay their thinking: the apostolic pre-eminence unilaterally claimed by the bishops of Rome over all other sees in the Church, and the role of the emperor in relation to the Church, which was as much a result of simple physical proximity as of deliberate ideological policy. Ennodius' writings for Pope Symmachus and Pope Hormisdas and his missions to the Imperial court express the working-out of these assumptions.

### The Western Conception of Apostolicity

The Roman conception of apostolicity and the rights and privileges consequent upon it was constructed with materials from several sources. The famous Gospel verse, "Thou art Peter, and upon this rock will I build my Church" (*Matth. 16,18-19*), was of course the starting point, but early Fathers of the Church from Irenaeus and Ignatius to Clement and Origen also made reference to the apostolic foundation of the see of Rome.<sup>19</sup> It was Irenaeus of Lyon who named Peter and Paul as the founders of the Church of Rome, but distinguished them from Linus, whom he called the first bishop;

<sup>15</sup> Ertl 1938, 63-64.

<sup>16</sup> *NCE*, s.v. Acacius Patriarch of Constantinople.

<sup>17</sup> Gray 1979, 30-44; Herrin 1987, 104-105.

<sup>18</sup> Dvornik 1958, 109-119; Frend 1976, 74-78.

<sup>19</sup> V. Kesich, Peter's Primacy in the New Testament and the Early Tradition. *The Primacy of Peter: Essays in Ecclesiology and the Early Church*. J. Meyendorff (ed.), Crestwood NY 1992, 5-66.

this distinction between founders and bishops was maintained by Tertullian and Eusebius.<sup>20</sup> Latin Christians venerated the relics of St. Peter, and Western sees tended to appeal to Roman authority to settle local quarrels.<sup>21</sup> Since Rome was the only see in the western territories of the Empire that had an indisputable claim to having been founded by the leader of the Apostles, it enjoyed prestige far above the other churches of the Latin West, whose apostolic origin was second-hand at best.<sup>22</sup> That the eminence of the city of Rome had ever been connected with its unique political status as the capital of the Empire, at least until the inauguration of Constantinople as the New Rome in 330 was not generally acknowledged by its incumbents, who began not long after to emphasize Rome's Christian re-foundation by Peter and Paul.<sup>23</sup> Once the Latin- and Greek-speaking halves of the Empire began to go their separate ways in 395 and the Western court moved to the more defensible Ravenna in 402, the development of an independent Christian ideology for Rome proceeded apace, so that by the pontificate of Leo the Great (440-461), the Pope had become accustomed to expect, and usually received, Imperial assistance to implement his teachings.<sup>24</sup> Local Western synods might be convoked to resolve local disciplinary issues, but any disgruntled prelate could always appeal directly to the Bishop of Rome, whose decision on all matters was authoritative and binding without requiring confirmation by a council.<sup>25</sup> Such was the environment from which Ennodius' thinking arose.

### Authority among the Sees of the East

This Western ideology, centred on the persons of Peter and Paul, was to clash with the rather different Eastern attitude toward apostolicity and its relevance to the hierarchy of ecclesiastical governance. Rome's apostolic foundation may have endowed the see with a uniquely authentic authority in the eyes of Latin-speaking Christians, but the sees of the East did not find such authority so distinctive. Apostolicity was only one of the factors that determined a city's place in a Christian empire. Alexandria and Antioch could claim apostolic origin for their churches from their earliest beginnings, but they were at the same time the eastern Empire's most important cities, administratively and economically, so that it was seen as only natural that their ecclesiastical status as metropolitan bishoprics and, eventually, patriarchates should correspond with their political role.<sup>26</sup> Below the metropolitan level, other eastern cities could at least say that one Apostle or another had visited them, even if he did not bequeath them the relics of his martyrdom; the fact that cities of second- or third-rate administrative importance nonetheless had bishops who were entitled and expected to participate in the councils of the Church mattered more than appeals to apostolic prestige. The city of Jerusalem,

<sup>20</sup> Dvornik 1958, 40-43.

<sup>21</sup> Mathisen 1989, 44-68, 141-172.

<sup>22</sup> Dvornik 1958, 43-47.

<sup>23</sup> Jones 1964, 84.

<sup>24</sup> H. M. Klinkenberg, Papsttum und Reichskirche bei Leo dem Großen, *Zeitschrift der Savigny-Stiftung für Rechtsgeschichte, Kanonische Abteilung* 38 (1952), 44-47; Jones 1964, 211-212; C. Pietri, *Roma Christiana: recherches sur l'Église de Rome, son organisations, sa politique, son idéologie de Miltiade à Sixte III*, 1-2, Rome 1976, 503-514 et passim.

<sup>25</sup> Mathisen 1989, 45-48.

<sup>26</sup> Dvornik 1958, 4-18.

though hallowed by its associations, remained less notable politically and thus managed to acquire patriarchal status only in the 440s as a result of the rivalry between Alexandria and Antioch.<sup>27</sup>

In 325, the Council of Nicaea established certain rules for the governance of the Church as a whole. Among them was canon 6, which confirmed the principle that administrative and religious importance went hand in hand, so that Alexandria and Antioch had their own spheres of authority in Egypt and Syria, just as Rome had jurisdiction over the dioceses of Italy and Illyricum; Constantinople was not mentioned at all because it did not properly exist yet, and the old see of Heraclea retained metropolitan authority.<sup>28</sup> Not until the Council of Constantinople in 381 was the new capital's ecclesiastical and political status in the eastern half of the Empire clearly articulated, in canon 3, as second in honour only to Rome; at this time Rome made no protest. That the churches of the Old and the New Rome were to share equal honours, each see having authority in its own respective territory, were restated in canon 28 of the Council of Chalcedon, which placed the provinces of Pontus, Asia, and Thrace under Constantinopolitan jurisdiction and to which the Roman legates strongly but vainly objected.<sup>29</sup> The Imperial representatives who were charged with ensuring that Leo's Christological teaching was adopted by the participants at Chalcedon found it simply incomprehensible that the bishop of the Old Rome, spiritual leader of the Latin West, could at the same council begrudge the bishop of the New Rome an authority commensurate with his own in the territories of the Greek, Syriac, and Coptic East; more than seven and a half centuries would pass before Latin churchmen recognised canon 28 of Chalcedon, in 1215 when one of their own held the see of Constantinople thanks to the Fourth Crusade.<sup>30</sup> In the same way, the Bishop of Constantinople's use of the title of 'Ecumenical Patriarch' from the 480s onward was a further irritant to Romans who did not appreciate that the *oikoumene* was functionally equivalent to the Empire and the nomenclature thus reflected the status of the metropolitan bishop of the Empire's capital.<sup>31</sup>

### Divergent Traditions of Political and Religious Leadership

The emperor had occupied an exalted place in the affairs of the Church since the reign of Constantine the Great, particularly in regard to the convoking and regulating of councils of bishops within the Empire. Beginning with the Council of Nicaea in 325, the seven councils called 'ecumenical' by the Orthodox Church and therefore binding for its doctrine and organisation were all called by emperors as well as populated by representatively large numbers of bishops from a wide geographical area; no bishop of Rome was personally present until the Second Council of Constantinople in 553, when the emperor Justinian prevailed upon Pope Vigilius to attend. By virtue of the concern for establishing correct and unified doctrine he manifested by calling the

<sup>27</sup> Dvornik 1958, 48.

<sup>28</sup> Chadwick 1967, 131-132; H. Hess, *The Early Development of Canon Law and the Council of Serdica*, Oxford 2002, 82-85.

<sup>29</sup> Dvornik 1964, 37-50.

<sup>30</sup> Anastos 2001, 11-17.

<sup>31</sup> Caspar 1933, 16, 747; Anastos 2001, 25-26.

bishops of the Empire together at Nicaea, Constantine claimed quasi-episcopal status for himself, while his construction of the Church of the Holy Apostles in the new capital corroborated his virtual equality with the Twelve Apostles, so that he became the model for many sainted rulers who followed, in the West as well as the East.<sup>32</sup> Nor were the personalities of New Testament times the only examples for sovereigns who aspired to lead in the religious as well as the political sphere. With the growing awareness that Christianity was not going to sweep away existing governmental structures, Old Testament rulers such as Melchisedech, David and Solomon became favoured images for monarchs to identify with, images that were incorporated into the intellectual fabric of Romano-Byzantine society. For understanding how the late Roman-early Byzantine Empire functioned on its own terms, the tendentious Western label of 'Caesaropapism' is neither helpful to us nor would it have been comprehensible to individuals living during eras politically so characterised; emperors were expected to take an interest in theological matters as well as military and political affairs.<sup>33</sup> That rulers participated to some extent in the religious life of the lands they controlled was taken for granted until fairly recently, with the only real difference between Eastern and Western Christendom the unique spiritual authority claimed by the bishops of Rome beginning with Gelasius. Because emperors ceased to figure in the everyday life of the Latin Church after the middle of the fifth century, the Roman model of religious organisation developed to a large extent independently of civil power; secular rulers could still be called upon to do their duty vis-à-vis the Church, but bishops and abbots had the moral upper hand when it came to telling monarchs what they should believe.

In contrast, coordination of religious and political authority was essential to perform binding acts of consensus in the Byzantine empire, where matters of ecclesiastical moment were determined by emperor-convoked councils of bishops rather than a single supreme pontiff issuing unilateral decrees. The authority of the Popes in Italy was such that synods of suburbicarian bishops could approve doctrinal and disciplinary statements from their pen without demur, but that same authority required Imperial assistance to prevail at Eastern episcopal gatherings, as witness the proceedings at Chalcedon.<sup>34</sup> Pope Leo's *Tomus* would not have been upheld without the leadership of the Empress Pulcheria, with whom he had corresponded at length.<sup>35</sup> When it came to recognising the status of the see of Constantinople over the other sees of the East, the fact of Imperial residence carried more weight than the remonstrances of the Successor of Peter in distant Rome. Had the Imperial court continued to reside there instead of Constantinople, it is difficult to believe that Gelasius' formulations of Papal authority and Church-State relations could have developed in so distinctively assertive a fashion. For the Ostrogothic Arian Theoderic to rule Catholic Italy, it was both desirable and necessary for him to maintain respectfully cordial relations with the Bishop of Rome. The king did not intervene in ecclesiastical matters unless they presented a threat to civil order, and his own doctrinal preferences favoured a policy of

<sup>32</sup> T.D. Barnes, *Constantine and Eusebius*, Cambridge MA 1981, 214-219; Dagron 1996, 146-154.

<sup>33</sup> Dagron 1996, 290-322.

<sup>34</sup> M. Wojtytsch, *Papsttum und Konzile von den Anfängen bis zu Leo I (440-461)*, Stuttgart 1981, 333-348.

<sup>35</sup> K.G. Holum, *Theodosian Empresses: Women and Imperial Dominion in Late Antiquity*, Berkeley 1982, 209-216.



Fig. 13. A golden tremissis of Anastasius I (491-518).

tolerance.<sup>36</sup> In the East, the emperor Anastasius (Fig. 13) found himself in a slightly different position. His election solidly legitimated by marriage to the widow of his predecessor Zeno, he proved an administratively sound and fiscally responsible ruler, but his own Monophysite-friendly theological stance remained a source of weakness throughout his reign, serving as a pretext for revolts in the name of Chalcedonian orthodoxy.<sup>37</sup> His main priority was to maintain peace and prosperity, so that he found enforcing submission to Roman doctrinal policy a poor way to cultivate good relations with the leaders of the Empire's diverse Christian communities.

### Ennodius and the Bishops of Rome

Such is the situation into which Ennodius and his Italian colleagues were thrust in 515. How did his own personal views fit into the conflict? While the utterances in his writings suggest that his attitude towards Easterners was conditioned largely by particular rhetorical situations, so that pejorative stereotypes occur in speeches by Ligurian aristocrats and the *Panegyric* of Theoderic, Ennodius himself was a professed admirer of Greek learning and culture and can consequently not be classed as a xenophobic Latin-speaker.<sup>38</sup> Likewise, his basic attitude toward rulers fits comfortably into the Romano-Byzantine tradition, for in one poem he endows Theoderic with the attributes of victory, while in the *Panegyric* he describes the king in terms that could just as easily be applied to an emperor, praising him as "a prince in vigour, vigilance, and good fortune, a priest in mildness".<sup>39</sup>

At the same time, Ennodius' writing in defence of Pope Symmachus, in consequence of the schism that arose from the rival elections of the deacon Symmachus and the priest Laurentius to the see of Rome in 498, shows him closely following the path Gelasius had already trodden in asserting the unique authority of the Bishop of Rome.<sup>40</sup> The *Libellus pro Synodo* was composed in 503 to combat a pro-

<sup>36</sup> Moorhead 1992, 54-60; T.F.X. Noble, Theoderic and the Papacy, *Teoderico il Grande e i Goti d'Italia 1-2. Atti del XII congresso internazionale di studi sull'Alto Medioevo, Milano 2. - 6. Novembre 1992, Spoleto 1992*, 399-404.

<sup>37</sup> Lee 2000, 52-59.

<sup>38</sup> Kennell 2000, 206-208.

<sup>39</sup> Moorhead 1992, 46-47; Kennell 2000, 113-115, 123-124; Dagron 1996, 314; Ennod. *opusc.* 1,80 (Vogel 213,4-5): *exhibes robore vigilantia prosperitate principem, mansuetudine sacerdotem.*

<sup>40</sup> Wirbelauer 1993, 9-37, 148-154. Cf. *Lib. pontif.* 53,1-5 (Mommsen 120,8-122,19).

Laurentian pamphlet impugning the proceedings of an Italian synod, summoned by Theoderic, whose participants had determined that they were unqualified to sit in judgement on the Pope. After defending the conduct of the synod and the king at length, as well as casting aspersions on Symmachus' senatorial accusers, Ennodius affirms that the Successor of Peter is above every law regulating bishops in general because he is the divinely-ordained lawgiver for and head of the entire Church; accordingly, only God can judge him.<sup>41</sup> The patriarch-emperor dynamic that would have operated in the East is wholly absent here, as the heterodox king is credited for his restraint and propriety in understanding that his role was simply to preserve order and give aid to the legitimate Pope.

The early stages of Ennodius' contribution to the See of Rome's foreign policy, as we may term it, are visible in a late prose composition, the *in Christi nomine*, which has many points in common with a letter Pope Symmachus wrote to Eastern churchmen dated 8 October 512, which begins "No one should be surprised that we have now broken the silence maintained up to the present, since those words of the most prudent Solomon give the keynote: 'there is a time for speaking and a time for keeping silent'."<sup>42</sup> The Symmachan letter, true to its genre and official character, contains a larger number of Scriptural quotations and historical references and maintains a more conversational tone. Ennodius, on the other hand, prefers a more oratorical stance for his exhortation to bishops of suspect doctrine; assuming the Papal persona, he uses the first person plural throughout his composition.<sup>43</sup>

Ennodius' address opens with the speaker encouraged by "the weight of obedience" proffered by others "to raise up those doing good" and subdue evildoers.<sup>44</sup> Characterising Nestorius and Eutyches, long condemned as heretics, as "twin prodigies of a diabolical conception," Ennodius leads his audience through a landscape of aberrant Christological teachings whose most prominent promulgators are the Alexandrian bishops Dioscorus, Petrus Mongus and Timotheus Aelurus, and where orthodoxy is upheld by Flavianus of Constantinople and Proterius of Alexandria, the latter lynched by a mob supporting Aelurus.<sup>45</sup> Confronted with so horrific a consequence of error, the "brothers" being addressed are therefore expected to "hold to the fathers' judgement abiding on high and sticking close to blessed Peter" because the speaker desires "the unity of a pure Church"; the collegiality implicit in "brothers" is then swept away as the speaker proclaims his inability to tolerate "those belching empty blasphemies" and invokes surgical remedies for the gangrenous heresies besetting the Church.<sup>46</sup> Ennodius

<sup>41</sup> Ennod. *opusc.* 2 (Vogel 61,30-62,7); S.A.H. Kennell, Style and Substance in the *Libellus pro Synodo. Atti della prima Giornata Ennodiana, Pavia, 29-30 marzo 2000*. Pubblicazioni della Facoltà di Lettere e Filosofia dell'Università di Pavia 94. F. Gasti (ed.), Pisa 2001, 63-65.

<sup>42</sup> Ennod. *dict.* 6 (Vogel 322-323); the Symmachan text is reproduced on 322 in the note to line 15: *nullus stupeat servatum hactenus nos nunc solvisse silentium, cum prudentissimi Solomonis ista vox personet 'tempus loquendi et tempus tacendi'*.

<sup>43</sup> Kennell 2000, 202-206.

<sup>44</sup> Ennod. *dict.* 6,2 (Vogel 322,19-20): *nos praecipue, quos praelati ceteris hortatur pondus obsequii, decet aut bona facientes elevare aut mala comprimere.*

<sup>45</sup> Ennod. *dict.* 6,3 (Vogel 322,23-24): *Nestorius et Eutyches, gemina diabolicae informationis ostenta.*

<sup>46</sup> Ennod. *dict.* 6,6 (Vogel 323,10-15): *proinde, fratres, manentem in superis patrum et adhaerentem beato Petro tenete sententiam, quia nos mundae ecclesiae et non habentis maculam optamus unitatem. patienter ferre non possumus vana in Christum nostrum et blasfema ructantes. scimus, quia qui in putribus membris non utitur ferri medicina, serpentibus morbis praestat obsequia; nam nisi secentur tabefacta, contaminant.*

reserves his strongest censure for Acacius, who began his episcopal career defending the doctrine of Chalcedon against the usurper Basiliscus, then sank into perfidy, without explicitly stating that his crime was to collaborate with Zeno on the *Henoticon*. Deploring the deposition of a more recent bishop of Constantinople who had refused to hand over the original *acta* of Chalcedon in August 511, the address ends on an implacable note, by observing that “those who do not submit to the remedies that have been offered” deserved to lack consolation in their hour of need.<sup>47</sup> While the comparable passage in the letter attributed to Pope Symmachus refers directly to “those who believed the admonition of the Apostolic See was to be disregarded,” the fundamental similarity of these texts is unmistakable.<sup>48</sup> Any tendency to remonstrate or persuade has been ruthlessly suppressed; it is merely a matter of right, as defined and taught by the Successors of Peter, and wrong, as represented by all who fail to assent to that teaching without question.

## The Mission of 515

When Pope Hormisdas entrusted Ennodius and his colleagues with their letters of instruction and supporting documents in August 515,<sup>49</sup> correspondence had been going back and forth between Rome and Constantinople for some time. On 12 January of that year, Anastasius sent a letter to Hormisdas that opens with an allusion to Ecclesiastes (*Eccel.* 3,7) clearly meant to echo the opening phrase of Symmachus’ 512 letter cited above. He explains why he had not written sooner: “before this, for the harshness of those to whom the concern for the episcopate that you now hold had been entrusted was making us refrain from sending letters; now, however, sweet sentiment running from you has led us to remember the goodness of fatherly affection, so that we ask those things which God and our Saviour taught the holy Apostles with divine speech, most of all the blessed Peter, in whom he established the strength of his Church”.<sup>50</sup> The Emperor then mentions that he has called a council to deal with the problems of the churches of the East, exhorting “your Apostolate to make itself a mediator, so that when controversies have been eradicated unity is restored to the holy Church,” and concludes with the hope that all will come out right if the Pope remembers him with prayers and letters.<sup>51</sup> The letter was not received until 28 March. A week after that, Hormisdas replied, expressing his thanks that God’s “heavenly virtue” has deigned to end the silence and dwelling on the significance of peace as

<sup>47</sup> Kennell 2000, 205; Ennod. *dict.* 6,9 (Vogel 323,28-29): *qui enim oblati remediis non oboedient, merito nihil consolationis tempore quo premuntur habuerunt.*

<sup>48</sup> Vogel 1885, 323, note to line 27: *nam qui apostolicae sedis admonitionem neglegendam esse crediderunt, merito inciderunt in ea, quae evenire solent solatio destitutis.*

<sup>49</sup> Kennell 2000, 216-218.

<sup>50</sup> *Coll. Avell.* 107,1-2: *Beatitudini vestrae non putamus ignotum, quod pro temporis qualitate loquendum et tacendum etiam divinae scripturae provida est ammonitione dispositum. ... ante hoc siquidem duritia eorum, quibus episcopatus, quem nunc geritis, erat sollicitudo commissa, temperare nos a transmittendis faciebat epistolis; nunc autem currens de nobis suavis opinio ad memoriam nostram bonitatem paternae affectionis adduxit, ut illa requiramus, quae deus et salvator noster sanctos apostolos divino sermone docuit ac maxime beatum Petrum, in quo fortitudinem ecclesiae suae constituit.*

<sup>51</sup> *Coll. Avell.* 107,3: *hortamur ut ... mediatorem se apostolatus vester faciat, ut contentionibus amputatis unitas sanctae restituatur ecclesiae.*

“the mother of all good things” according to the Gospel of John (14,27).<sup>52</sup> Only in the last quarter of his letter does the Pope refer, without notable enthusiasm, to the Emperor’s intention to summon a council.

Unfortunately, Anastasius had sent another letter two weeks earlier (28 December 514) about the council intended to settle “certain doubts about the Orthodox religion”, that did not arrive in Rome until 14 May.<sup>53</sup> Stressing his awareness of the preeminent importance of religious matters, since he entrusts the well-being of the State to God, the Emperor informs the Pope that a synod will take place in Heraclea in July to reach a consensus concerning the true faith, “so that thereafter there can be no doubt or discord”, and invites Hormisdas to attend with whatever doctrinally knowledgeable bishops he may choose.<sup>54</sup> Hormisdas replied to this overture on 8 July 515, commending Anastasius’ zeal and saying that he would pray for the restoration of concord; when it comes to the planned synod, however, he says that he will entrust his “brothers and fellow-bishops” with confidential information about what must be done at the gathering so that Anastasius “can be more suitably apprised of everything”.<sup>55</sup>

Just over a month later, on 11 August 515, Ennodius and his colleagues – a bishop named Fortunatus, the priest Venantius, a deacon named Vitalis, and Hilarus, a notary – received their instructions for the mission to Constantinople.<sup>56</sup> Attending the synod that Anastasius had called for July was never in consideration; Hormisdas had other plans. The documents with which the papal legates were equipped were four in number: a letter to the Emperor himself, an arrestingly detailed series of directions on how to proceed from the moment they arrived on Greek soil (the so-called *Indiculus*), an outline of the points on which they had to insist (*capitula singularum causarum*), and a statement (*libellus*) that anathematized all the foes of Chalcedon and confirmed the validity of the doctrinal letters of Pope Leo.

The letter Hormisdas wrote for the legates to present to Anastasius focuses on the upcoming synod announced by the Emperor. Anastasius’ good intentions, the Pope tells him, are supposed “to seek out the venerable teachers of the Church”, for the splendour of good will “chooses either to be confirmed or to be corrected by the Apostolic and immaculate faith and by suitable preachers”.<sup>57</sup> In other words, if the Emperor intends what the Pope thinks he should, he will accept all the instruction given him. Hence, the next part of the message comprises Hormisdas’ review of the errors of Nestorius and Eutyches, who denied that Jesus Christ the son of Mary has both divine and human natures, and affirmation of the orthodox doctrine that “in one and the same

<sup>52</sup> Coll. Avell. 108,1: *Gratias supernae uirtuti, quae per uestrae pietatis affatus diuturnum dignata est terminare silentium ...; 3: pax est enim totius bonitatis initium, qua nihil, quantum ad catholicae fidei cultum, ualidius, nihil aestimari oportet excelsius ... hanc omnium bonorum matrem et nutricem Christum dominum nostrum his constat praedicasse discipulis dicentem: pacem meam do uobis, pacem relinquo uobis.*

<sup>53</sup> Coll. Avell. 109,2: *dubitaciones quaedam de orthodoxa religione.*

<sup>54</sup> Coll. Avell. 109,2: *ut deinceps nulla possit esse dubitatio uel discordia.*

<sup>55</sup> Coll. Avell. 110,2: *de his uero, quae pro synodali congregazione praecepistis, quid fieri oporteat, per fratres et coepiscopos meos, qui propere subsequentur, gloriae uestrae insinuanda mandaui, quorum suggestione, si divinus fauor mea vota prosequitur, competentius poteritis universa cognoscere.*

<sup>56</sup> Coll. Avell. 115, 116, 116a, 116b.

<sup>57</sup> Coll. Avell. 115,3: *ergo quia mansuetudo uestra futuram synodum scriptis sacratissimis indicauit ... gaudemus scientes, quoniam directarum mentium est uenerabilis ecclesiae magistris expetere; soli enim declinant examen conscientiae, quae iusta sunt, non tenentes, nam et feriato ore splendorem bonae uoluntatis enuntiat, qui per apostolicam immaculatamque fidem et per competentes praedicatores aut confirmari se optat aut corrigi.*

person each nature abides".<sup>58</sup> Appealing to Anastasius' learning and to the examples of his right-thinking predecessors Marcian and Leo, the Pope expresses his hope that the Emperor will take instruction, with the result that Dioscorus, Eutyches, Timotheus and Petrus Mongus are never again commemorated in the Church's prayers, the definitions of Chalcedon and the doctrinal letters of Pope Leo are upheld, and Acacius is relegated to the shadows.

Blandly assuring Anastasius that all will be well with the Empire, Hormisdas' letter assumes that he will meekly acquiesce. The next item, the *Indiculus*, thus contains the particulars of that anticipated assent, right down to the exact words and gestures the legates were supposed to use in their meeting with the Emperor. Among Hormisdas' assumptions is that Anastasius himself would accept and read the doctrinal *libellus* before the encounter proceeded further; given that diplomatic documents were normally screened by the *magister officiorum* prior to imperial audiences, this would have been highly unusual.<sup>59</sup> He also anticipated that the Emperor might ask for the letters the Pope sent to the usurper Vitalian, in which case the legates were supposed to reply, "our father the holy Pope has not told us this, nor can we do anything without his command", though the Emperor could delegate someone to whom the letters might be read aloud.<sup>60</sup> Hormisdas' scenario, whose only *dramatis personae* are the Emperor and the Papal legates, for all courtiers are mysteriously absent, supposed that a blend of instruction, exhortation, and tearful prayer would suffice to bring a piously receptive Emperor into the Roman sheepfold, ready to condemn every heretic the Pope chose to designate. Invoking St. Peter as the symbol of the Apostolic See's monopoly on universal truth, the *libellus* records what Hormisdas condemns and anathematizes – Nestorius, noted as having been condemned at the first Council of Ephesus by Pope Celestine (by means of a letter) and Cyril of Alexandria, Eutyches, Dioscorus, Timotheus Aelurus, Petrus Mongus, Acacius and Peter of Antioch – and what he acknowledges and approves of, namely "all the letters of blessed Pope Leo which he wrote about the Christian religion".<sup>61</sup> The positions outlined in the *capitula* differ only on two points: they begin by asserting the indispensability of "the holy synod of Chalcedon and the letters of the holy Pope Leo", which Anastasius was to direct the bishops of the Empire to accept and promulgate; subsequently, they require that all the bishops who were exiled for doctrinal reasons be investigated by the Apostolic See and proven Catholics be restored to their sees.<sup>62</sup>

These documents, which Ennodius was to present and Anastasius to read and accept, represent a tidy summary of the Roman position. Their emphasis on the teachings of Papal letters in preference to the canons of ecumenical councils would have galled Eastern sensibilities, while their condescendingly pastoral tone shows total incomprehension of the fact that Anastasius would not have thought himself

<sup>58</sup> *Coll. Avell.* 115,7: *ita enim in una eademque persona persistit utraque natura.*

<sup>59</sup> A. Gillett, *Envoy and Political Communication in the Late Antique West*, 411–533, Cambridge 2003, 222–230, discussing Constantine VII Porphyrogenitus' *De ceremoniis*; cf. 244–249.

<sup>60</sup> *Coll. Avell.* 116,8: *sic respondendum est, 'non hoc nobis pater uester sanctus papa praecepit nec sine iussione ipsius aliquid possumus facere; tamen ut sciatis simplicitatem litterarum ... iungite nobiscum personam, qua praesente traditae a nobis litterae relegantur'.*

<sup>61</sup> *Coll. Avell.* 116b,4: *suscipimus et probamus epistolam beati Leonis papae uniuersas, quas de Christiana religione conscripsit.*

<sup>62</sup> *Coll. Avell.* 116a,1: *consentientes etiam episcopi in ecclesia praesente plebe Christiana haec praedicare debent: amplecti se sanctam synodum Calcedonensem et epistolam sanctissimi papae Leonis.*

merely another sheep in the Successor of Peter's fold, but rather, in the Imperial tradition of Constantine the Great, just as much a shepherd as the bishops of his Empire, with a flock far larger and more diverse.

### Reactions at Constantinople and Rome

Though the legates were obliged to remain in Constantinople until the winter of 516, which did not make their journey home any easier, all discussion was for practical purposes over before it could begin owing to the nature of the documents they had brought.<sup>63</sup> The hard-line Roman stance could not fail to be rejected by the Emperor and any ecclesiastics who had not already appealed to Rome for support because of their own attachment to the definitions of Chalcedon. The letter Anastasius gave to Ennodius and his colleagues to carry back to their master in Rome showed how far he was willing to go. Commending the Papal legates for their exposition of the Christian faith and the unity of the Church as confirmed by 'apostolic teachings', he affirms the Incarnation and the two natures of Jesus Christ as well as anathematizes Nestorius and Eutyches.<sup>64</sup> The Emperor wonders, however, why Hormisdas "wanted to write some things about the most blessed fathers who met at Chalcedon", because they anathematized all novelties, including those of Nestorius and Eutyches, and affirmed the faith of Nicaea, while he himself wrote to the Alexandrians several times about their problems with Chalcedon and Leo.<sup>65</sup> The name of Acacius is not mentioned, nor is the Pope reminded that the fathers of Chalcedon regarded the contributions of Cyril of Alexandria to Eastern Christological thought more normative than those of Leo of Rome. Maintaining that he has done everything in his power to remove the ban of anathema and restore unity to the Church, Anastasius asks Hormisdas to consider the implications of what he has commanded, for "casting out living men on account of dead ones" will result in "much outpouring of human blood", as the legates will explain.<sup>66</sup>

The Emperor's letter ends with a request for prayers and a reminder of Christ's mandate of peace, but after Ennodius and his companions had returned to Italy, more letters were sent by both sides with minimal results. On 10 July 516, Anastasius dispatched a brief, hopeful missive to Hormisdas about diplomatic contacts that was delivered personally by Theopomitus and Severianus, trusted court officials deputed to provide additional information.<sup>67</sup> To this overture Hormisdas replied at greater length in the

<sup>63</sup> Schwartz 1934, 251-253.

<sup>64</sup> *Coll. Avell.* 125,1: *Gratias omnipotenti deo referimus, quod sanctitas uestra disciplinis caelestibus instituta, sicut poposcimus, legatos fidei Ennodium et Fortunatum ... destinauit, ... et ipsi sicut decuit declararunt et a nobis sicut oportuit agnouerunt, quia una est ecclesia dei apostolicis ubique firmata doctrinis; 5: cum omnibus etiam orthodoxis impiissimos Nestorium atque Eutychetem uitamus pariter et horremus eorum condemnantes et anathematizantes et personas et dogmata.*

<sup>65</sup> *Coll. Avell.* 125,7: *miramur autem, quam ob rem de beatissimis patribus, qui in Chalcedona conuenerunt, aliqua nobis scribere uoluitis ... maxime cum ipsa synodus dixerit anathema esse debere, quicunque aliam fidem, quam apud Nicaeam ... patres constituerunt; 8: attestantur nobis etiam diuinae litterae ad Alexandriam non semel sed multotiens destinatae ....*

<sup>66</sup> *Coll. Avell.* 125,11: *perpendite, quia grave esse clementia nostra iudicat de ecclesia uenerabili propter mortuos uiuos expelli nec sine multa effusione humani sanguinis scimus posse ea, quae super hoc scribitis, ordinari; 12: per omnia tamen uoluntatis nostrae puritatem legatorum uestrorum poteritis narratione cognoscere.*

<sup>67</sup> *Coll. Avell.* 111.

autumn, with an abundance of Scriptural allusions. He implies that the Emperor was not proceeding quickly enough to heal the Church's ills and urges him to "shun the slippery spots of deviance, keep your footsteps firm on the rock with us"; while acknowledging his correspondent's "mildness", the Pope demands that he "cut off the incurable parts" and treat the sick ones.<sup>68</sup> Hormisdas' reply dismisses a request Anastasius made to the Roman Senate in a letter he wrote 28 July, that they should persuade him to take a more peaceable stance; the letter from the Emperor he mentions had in fact asked both the senators and their bishop not to listen to "plausible talk from runaway clergy, composed only of mendacity", but instead to heed the Emperor's own legates in the interest of peace.<sup>69</sup> The Senate composed their own reply to Anastasius which was sent together with the Pope's letter; saying that they had been instructed by King Theoderic to follow their bishop's commands, the senators explicitly echo Hormisdas' sentiments as they tell the Emperor that cutting off the body part that causes offence is better than burning in eternal torment, though the peace of God and the virtue of charity are worthy in their fashion.<sup>70</sup>

## The Mission of 517

With the persistence of both Rome's enthusiasm for spilling the blood of far-away heretics and the Constantinopolitan preference for a more peaceable laissez-faire religious policy in the cities of the Empire, the arrival of 517 not surprisingly found the situation unchanged. Hormisdas nonetheless wanted to signal his continuing concern and involvement in Eastern ecclesiastical affairs, so in April of that year he dispatched Ennodius and another bishop named Peregrinus to the Imperial capital with a bundle of letters that stated the Apostolic See's position on various doctrinal and disciplinary matters with categorical firmness. Six of these letters concerned the schism and were addressed to Anastasius, Timotheus of Constantinople, all the bishops of the East, and several other sets of orthodox bishops, clergy, monks and laymen in the city of Constantinople and throughout the East; the *Liber Pontificalis* claims that Ennodius and his companions carried nineteen letters in all.<sup>71</sup>

Substantive negotiations do not appear to have been envisioned in 517. The dossier from Rome includes nothing reminiscent of the *Indiculus* of 515 and the letter to the Emperor tells its addressee that condemning the errors of Nestorius and Eutyches is not enough: he must "hate even their followers and comrades", especially Acacius, who is held responsible for everything that is bad about the Church in the

<sup>68</sup> *Coll. Avell.* 112,3: *unde et fateor me fuisse miratum, cur tam diu legatio promissa tardaverit, cum facienda uis sit, ut regna caelestia rapiantur;* 4: *ergo uiae, cui coepistis, insistite et spretis errantium lubricis nobiscum supra petram solida tenete uestigia;* 7: *mansuetudinem uestram;* 10: *quae insanabilia uidetis, abscidite, et quae aegra, curate.*

<sup>69</sup> *Coll. Avell.* 113,3: *non uidetur absurdum ... almae urbis Romae patres conscriptos imperiali petitioni coniunctos ea sperare, quae et nobis et sibi deo annuente in commune proficiant, hoc est, ne fugitiuorum audiant concinnatos sermones et mendacio solo compositos sed satisfactione suscepit, quam et ueritas et legatorum qui directi sunt inquisitio patefecit, ad desideratam pacem acceptabili deo uoluntate concurrant;* cf. *Coll. Avell.* 112, 9: *uos senatui urbis Romae, ut me ad pacem hortaretur; inuincitis.*

<sup>70</sup> *Coll. Avell.* 114,2: *dum uox sit ista dominica: uae mundo ab scandalis, et abscidere oportere homines scandalizantem partem membrorum, quam ut in ignem non renuntiando scandalis mittantur aeternum;* cf. Moorhead 1992, 196.

<sup>71</sup> *Coll. Avell.* 126, 128-132. Cf. *Lib. pontif.* 54,3 (Mommsen 127,1-5): *Idem secundo misit Ennodium ipsum et Peregrinum episcopum Mesenense portantes epistulas confortatorias fidei et contestationes secretas numero XVIII et textum libelli.*

East, excepting Alexandria.<sup>72</sup> Although he quotes the Gospel of Matthew more than once, Hormisdas draws his strongest inspiration from the Old Testament as he invokes the examples of Moses' uplifted arm enabling the host of the Israelites to prevail against their foes (*exod.* 17,11) and King Hezekiah, the destroyer of numerous foci of idolatry, including images and groves (*IV reg.* 18,4), in his charge to Anastasius to smite the hard hearts of the unfaithful and the poisons of the Devil.<sup>73</sup> Thus does the Successor of Peter, who in the Gospels appears as all-too-fallible, urge the Emperor to accede to his "trustworthy admonitions" by hating both sins and sinners.<sup>74</sup>

The Emperor's reply was composed 11 July 517. Anastasius reminds Hormisdas that Jesus Christ suffered and died for the sins of men, enabling them to learn the lessons of mercy, for which reason "we do not believe that we should think that those who have learned mercy should be thought unmerciful".<sup>75</sup> His oft-commended mildness exhausted by the Pope's unremitting demands for a response whose severity would devastate large tracts of the Empire, Anastasius declares an end to the diplomatic charades of a Pope devoid of persuasion, as he will not pray for persons "who are unwilling to be queried, for we can bear to be injured and nullified; we cannot be commanded".<sup>76</sup> He was not a sheep *comme les autres*.

Hormisdas' other letters of April 517 had the objective of enlisting and strengthening support among co-religionists of the pro-Chalcedonian party throughout the Empire.<sup>77</sup> The Pope tells the bishop of Constantinople what his responsibilities are, as also the bishops of the rest of the East, while he dispenses assurances of God's special consolation to orthodox bishops and exhorts them to stand firm.<sup>78</sup> The clergy, people and orthodox monks of the capital city receive particular injunctions about what they must do as upholders of Chalcedon and Leo's doctrinal letters, namely avoid contact with every sort of heretics, be they followers of Eutyches and Dioscorus or, still worse, Manichees, and remember how the people of Constantinople resisted "the shameless and monstrous presumption" of Basiliscus and Timotheus Aelurus.<sup>79</sup> Implicit in these letters is that Ennodius and his colleagues were to become involved in making effective contacts with groups of Orthodox who were reacting against Anastasius' policy of tolerance for limited heterodoxy; the *Liber Pontificalis* plainly states, "the legates of the Apostolic See quite secretly, by the hands of Orthodox monks, placed ... letters of faith throughout all the cities".<sup>80</sup> Such an activity would assuredly not have served further to endear the Papal legates to their Imperial hosts.

<sup>72</sup> *Coll. Avell.* 126,5: *primus innocentiae gradus est odisse culpanda, sed ueritatis interest, domine fili, et catholicae disciplinae, ut sectatores etiam eorum atque participes oderitis, quorum execrando principes iudicatis;* 7-8: *ne facile putet uestra clementia Acacii praetereundam esse personam ... ab illo per Orientales ecclesias fermentum nefandi erroris inoleuit;* 12: *sola ante Acacium Alexandria perfidiae suaे foeditate sordebat.*

<sup>73</sup> *Coll. Avell.* 126,4 and 13.

<sup>74</sup> *Coll. Avell.* 126,16: *acquiescite, precamur, fidelibus monitis.*

<sup>75</sup> *Coll. Avell.* 138,2-4; 5: *nos autem non ea credimus ratione, ut immisericordes esse putemus, qui misericordiam didicerunt.*

<sup>76</sup> *Coll. Avell.* 138,5: *sed postulationem nostram a praesenti tempore taciturnitate comprimimus, inrationabile iudicantes illis precum adhibere bonitatem, qui rogari se nolint contumaciter respuentes. iniuriari enim et adnullari sustinere possumus, iuberi non possumus.* See Kennell 2000, 219.

<sup>77</sup> Schwartz 1934, 254-255.

<sup>78</sup> *Coll. Avell.* 128-130.

<sup>79</sup> *Coll. Avell.* 132,2-4; 3: *recolite, ... quam impudens et monstruosa praesumptio, quantus etiam per uniuersum orbem fidei se uestrae feruor ostenderit.*

<sup>80</sup> *Lib. pontif.* 54,4 (Mommsen 127,27-30): *Legati vero sedis apostolicae secretius supra scriptas epistolas fidei XVIII per manus monachorum orthodoxorum et posuerunt per omnes civitates.*

As a result of the impossibility of accomplishing anything constructive at Constantinople on an official diplomatic level and the behind-the-scenes propagandizing of Ennodius and his fellow Italians, the legates were eventually sent back to Italy. If we believe the inherently biased account of the *Liber Pontificalis*, which claims that the legates, having refused to succumb to bribery, were tossed out the back door by the enraged Emperor and bundled onto a “dangerous ship,” their transport vessel seems to have been of questionable seaworthiness.<sup>81</sup> Leaving the credibility of these Neronian literary details aside, though, the account strongly suggests Catholic demonization of a steadfastly heterodox Emperor.<sup>82</sup>

### The End of the Schism

In 518, the waiting game at last paid off for Hormisdas. With the death of Anastasius on 9 July and the accession of the orthodox Justin the next day, changes were swift: a feast of the Council of Chalcedon was instituted 16 July, letters were sent concerning arrangements, Papal legates arrived in the capital 25 March of the following year, and three days later the Bishop of Constantinople subscribed to the terms of Hormisdas’ *libellus*, including the anathemas and the removal of all the offending names from the diptychs.<sup>83</sup> Ably assisting the new Emperor was his nephew Justinian, who may already have considered how useful the Bishop of Rome would be for the reconquest of Italy; in any case, he desired ecclesiastical unity.<sup>84</sup> But Hormisdas did not get everything he wanted: Canon 28 of Chalcedon remained untouchable and the bishop of the Empire’s capital the Ecumenical Patriarch. Later in the sixth century, more profound disillusionment awaited the bishops of Rome in their dealings with Emperors, but Ennodius and his Papal master, who died in 521 and 523 respectively, were spared such distress.<sup>85</sup> As the pressure of other responsibilities or failing health evidently kept Ennodius from participating in the successful mission of 519, his labours on behalf of his old friend Hormisdas in 515-517 can best be understood as helping to build Eastern support for the Roman, pro-Chalcedonian position and to lay a foundation for the eventual reunion of Catholics and Orthodox. Ennodius’ Pavian title ‘Teacher of the Greeks’ thus owes more to Italian provincial patriotism and Catholic self-aggrandizement than to accurate knowledge of which individuals had actually accomplished what in Constantinople.

Canadian Archaeological Institute at Athens

<sup>81</sup> *Lib. pontif.* 54,3 (Mommsen 127,13-26): *Volens itaque eos legatos per remunerationem corrumpere. legati vero sedis apostolicae contemptu Anastasio Augusto nullatenus consenserunt accipere paecunias, nisi satisfactionem sedis apostolicae operaretur. Tunc imperator repletus furia eiecit eos per posterulam et inposuit eos in navem periculosa cum milites ... et praefectianos nomine Eliodorum et Demetrium qui hoc dedit eis in mandatis imperator Anastasius, ut nullam civitatem ingredierentur.*

<sup>82</sup> Moorhead 1992, 196; Kennell 2000, 215, 219-220.

<sup>83</sup> Caspar 1933, 148-155; Allen 2000, 820.

<sup>84</sup> Dvornik 1964, 61; Anastos 2001, 19-21.

<sup>85</sup> Caspar 1933, 166-169; Chadwick 1967, 246.

## Bibliography

Allen 2000 = P. Allen, The Definition and Enforcement of Orthodoxy. The Cambridge Ancient History 14, *Late Antiquity: Empire and Successors, A.D. 425-600*. Averil Cameron, Bryan Ward-Perkins & Michael Whitby (eds.), Cambridge 2000, 811-834.

Anastos 2001 = M.V. Anastos, Constantinople and Rome: A Survey of the Relations between the Byzantine and the Roman Churches. *Aspects of the Mind of Byzantium: Political Theory, Theology and Ecclesiastical Relations*. S. Vryonis, jr., & N. Goodhue (eds.), Aldershot 2001, 1-119.

Bowersock 1999 = G.W. Bowersock, P. Brown, & O. Grabar (eds), *Late Antiquity: A Guide to the Postclassical World*. Cambridge MA and London 1999, 207.

Caspar 1933 = E. Caspar, *Geschichte des Papsttums von den Anfängen bis zur Höhe der Weltherrschaft* 2, Tübingen 1933.

Chadwick 1967 = H. Chadwick, *The Early Church*, Harmondsworth 1967.

*Coll. Avell.* = *Epistulae Imperatorum Pontificum aliorum inde ab a. CCCLXVII usque ad a. DLIII datae, Avellana quae dicitur collectio*. Corpus Scriptorum Ecclesiasticorum Latinorum 35,2. O. Günther (ed.), Vienna 1898.

Dagron 1996 = G. Dagron, *Empereur et prêtre. Étude sur le «césaropapisme» byzantin*, Paris 1996.

Dvornik 1958 = F. Dvornik, *The Idea of Apostolicity in Byzantium and the Legend of the Apostle Andrew*. Dumbarton Oaks Studies 4, Washington DC 1958.

Dvornik 1964 = F. Dvornik, *Byzance et la primauté romaine*, Paris 1964.

Ennod. *dict.* = *Magni Felicis Ennodii Opera*. Monumenta Germaniae Historica, Auctores Antiquissimi 7. F. Vogel (ed.), Berlin 1885 (Nachdruck München 1981).

Ennod. *opusc.* = *Magni Felicis Ennodii Opera*. Monumenta Germaniae Historica, Auctores Antiquissimi 7. F. Vogel (ed.), Berlin 1885 (Nachdruck München 1981).

Ertl 1938 = N. Ertl, Diktatoren frühmittelalterlicher Papstbriefe, *Archiv für Urkundenforschung* 15 (1938) 56-132.

Frend 1976 = W.H.C. Frend, Eastern Attitudes to Rome during the Acacian schism. *The Orthodox Churches and the West. Studies in Church History*. D. Baker (ed.), Oxford 1976, 69-81.

Gray 1979 = P.T.R. Gray, *The Defense of Chalcedon in the East (451-553)*, Leiden 1979.

Herrin 1987 = J. Herrin, *The Formation of Christendom*, Princeton 1987.

Jones 1964 = A.H.M. Jones, *The Later Roman Empire, 284-602*, Oxford 1964, repr. Baltimore 1986.

Kennell 2000 = S.A.H. Kennell, *Magnus Felix Ennodius: A Gentleman of the Church*, Ann Arbor, 2000.

Lee 2000 = A.D. Lee, The Eastern Empire: Theodosius to Anastasius, The Cambridge Ancient History 14, *Late Antiquity: Empire and Successors, A.D. 425-600*. Averil Cameron, Bryan Ward-Perkins & Michael Whitby (eds.), Cambridge 2000, 33-62.

*Lib. pontif.* = *Gesta Pontificum Romanorum* 1, *Liber Pontificalis*. T. Mommsen (ed.), Berlin 1898.

Mathisen 1989 = R.W. Mathisen, *Ecclesiastical Factionalism and Religious Controversy in Fifth-Century Gaul*, Washington DC 1989.

Moorhead 1992 = J. Moorhead, *Theoderic in Italy*, Oxford 1992.

NCE = *New Catholic Encyclopedia* 1, s.v. Acacius Patriarch of Constantinople (d. 489), New York 1907 (on the Internet at <http://www.newadvent.org/cathen/01082a.htm>).

Schwartz 1934 = E. Schwartz, *Publizistische Sammlungen zum acacianischen Schisma*. Abhandlungen der Bayerischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, phil.-hist. Abt., n.F. 10, München 1934.

Wirbelauer 1993 = E. Wirbelauer, *Zwei Päpste in Rom: der Konflikt zwischen Laurentius und Symmachus (498-514), Studien und Texten*. Quellen und Forschungen zur antiken Welt 16, München 1993.